

Swindon Borough Council

Schools Forum

Wednesday, 18 July 2018

Committee Room 6, Civic Offices at 5.00 p.m.

Maintained School Members:

Janet Urban
Mark Edwards
Charles Law
Alison Lowe
Ben Slater
Jackie Smith
Ray Williams

Chair - Primary Headteacher
Governor - Secondary
Special Governor
Primary Headteacher
Pupil Referral Unit Headteacher
Special Schools Headteacher
Primary Governor

Academy Members:

Nick Capstick
Fiona Godfrey
Andrew Henstridge
Emma Leigh-Bennett
Bob Linnegar
James Povoas
Karen Pyman
Clive Zimmerman

Special Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy
Mainstream Academy

Non-School Representatives:

Emma Lindsay
Jo Morris
Peter Smith
Steve Wain

Diocese of Bristol
Early Years
Trade Unions
16-19 Partnership

Observer Status

Education Funding Agency

Committee Officer: Rita Glen-Gallo

Telephone: 01793 463611 Email: rglen-gallo@swindon.gov.uk

Swindon Borough Council can be contacted at the Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN1 2JH (Telephone 01793 445500)

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Appointment of Chair**

3. Appointment of Vice-Chair

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Pages 5 - 8)

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 20th March 2018.

5. Public Question Time

See explanatory note below. Please phone the Committee Officer whose name and number appears at the top of this agenda if you need further guidance.

Members have previously agreed that public questions were to be submitted in writing at least 24 hours prior to a meeting to enable officers to provide a detailed response.

6. 2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Outturn Position FM (Pages 9 - 20)

7. 2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Position FM (Pages 21 - 34)

8. 2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update FM (Pages 35 - 100)

Date of Despatch: 10 July 2018 11 July 2018

Key:

Officers:

FM - Finance Manager

Public Question Time - Swindon Borough Council remains committed to increasing its accountability to the public and to promoting active citizenship. 15 minutes will be allowed at the start of all Council meetings for questions to the Chair from the public about the work of the Committee (except for confidential matters, and matters relating to planning and licensing applications). We will give priority to those who submit questions in writing at least two days before the meeting. Questions must be relevant, clear, and concise. You may not use Public Question Time as an opportunity to make speeches or statements.

(N.B. The Schools Forum has previously agreed that public questions can be submitted in writing up to 24 hours prior to a meeting and that, where possible, a written response be provided at the meeting.)

Questions in writing should be sent to the Committee Officer whose contact details appear on the agenda above or to the Director of Law and Democratic Services, we will publish it, along with the answer, alongside the Minutes. The process associated with asking a public question is set out in the "Public Question Time at Council Meetings Protocol and Guidance" available on the Council's Website.

(<http://ww5.swindon.gov.uk/moderngov/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13338&path=0>) or from the Committee Officer named above.

Access Arrangements – The Venue is wheelchair accessible and an infrared receiver hearing system is provided. If you would wish to attend the meeting but have any special requirement to enable you to do so please contact the Committee Clerk above, as soon as possible prior to the date of the meeting.

If you would like to receive any of the pages contained in this agenda in a larger print size please contact the Committee Officer whose name appears on the first page of this agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM

TUESDAY, 20 MARCH 2018

School Members: Rhian Cockwell, Primary Headteacher
Ray Williams, Primary Governor
Jackie Smith, Special Schools Headteacher
Charles Law, Special Governor

Non-School Members: Jo Morris, Early Years
Emma Lindsay, Diocese of Bristol

Officers: Anne MacKay (Finance Manager, Education)
Peter Nathan (Head of Education)

Also in attendance: Councillor Fionuala Foley.

Apologies for absence were received from Mark Edwards (Governor - Secondary), Janet Urban (Chair - Primary Headteacher), Ben Slater (Pupil Referral Unit Headteacher), Alison Lowe (Primary Headteacher) and Nick Capstick (Special Academy).

25. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17th January 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

26. 2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Position

The Finance Manager, Education, presented a report updating the Forum on the latest 2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) retained budget position, including (a) the year end position against the 2017-18 retained budgets on information available in January 2018, and (b) the ring-fencing of any DSG balance (positive or negative).

Following introduction of the report, the Finance Manager, Education, responded to members' questions and comments in respect of:

- Monitoring of the DSG in accordance with the Council's standard budgetary control procedures.
- Monitoring of the DSG position by the Education Leadership Team, Cabinet, People's Leadership team and Education Leadership Team.
- The centrally retained DSG budget of £33.346 million which included £1.351 million of 30 Hours Implementation funding.
- Additional funding and support to schools following banding adjustments in both special and mainstream settings and an increase in the number of pupils supported by High Needs Top Ups.
- The anticipated budget overspend of £127,000 which would reduce the existing unallocated DSG balance to an estimated balance of £419,000.

Resolved – (1) That the latest projection on the 2017/18 retained budget of an overspend of £127,000 be noted.

(2) That, further to (1) above, it be noted that the projected outturn position of the unallocated DSG budget will decrease to £419,000.

27. 2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget

The Finance Manager, Education, presented a report updating the Forum on the latest 2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement and Budget and issues arising including; (a) the Alternative Provision and Learning Review, (b) a High Needs Update, (c) and update on Early Years and Childcare Sufficiency, (d) an update on the Oakfield Project, and (e) The SRP Supplementary Funding 2018/19.

Following introduction of the report, the Finance Manager, Education, responded to members' questions and comments in respect of:

- The creation of a town wide inclusion protocol as part of the Alternative Provision review.
- Demand levels for Alternative Provision in both primary and secondary schools and the need to develop inclusive SEMH practice and expertise in mainstream schools and reduce the need for a reduction in demand for Alternative Provision.
- The transfer of £659,000 from the Schools block to the high needs block to address sufficiency for high needs provision.
- Work by the SEND Strategic Board to develop a broad programme of activity to address sufficiency and quality for the local offer for Special Educational Needs And Disability in Swindon.
- The implementation of the high needs review report which will need to address banding methodology and moderation, and the application of guidance regarding decision making at the point where an EHC assessment is being considered.
- The review of the high needs review implementation by the Headteachers Focus Group on 19th April 2018.
- The allocation of £338,333 grants to create an additional 1,277 Early Years places as identified in the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment report.
- The historical and current position of the Oakfield Project and in particular the financial implications arising from the projected £60,000 deficit.
- Current work and staffing to ensure the Oakfield Project remained viable.
- Interest from outside the Borough for 30 places in the Oakfield Project and a commitment that Swindon based pupils would receive priority of placements.
- Moves to gradual increase placement costs for the Oakfield project to remove future overspend (£150,000 had been allocated for the 2018/19 Financial Year).
- Current subsidies for pupil places at the Oakfield project.
- The creation of a new supplement of £57,000 for pupils in Special Resource Provision that do not receive the average £4,000 mainstream funding as calculated the Authority Pro-forma Tool.

Resolved – (1) That the significance and continuation of the Alternative Provision Review as detailed in Paragraphs 3.2 - 3.4 of the report be noted.
(2) That the update on the intended actions in 2018-19 to address the issues around sufficiency for high needs provision within the future envelope of the high needs budget allocation be noted.
(3) That the update on bid applications for the Early Years and Childcare Sufficiency Grant, set out in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.16 be noted.

- (4) That the update on the Oakfield Project as set out in Paragraphs. 3.17 to 3.25 of the report be noted.
- (5) That it be noted the projected in year project deficit of £60,000 for the Oakfield Project is expected to be lower than previously reported to this Forum.
- (6) That it be agreed that the project's year-end balance which will include the current in year balance already agreed Oakfield Project and the historic financial deficit be funded by the DSG.
- (7) That it be agreed that commissioned places at the Oakfield Project from September 2018 be charged to Swindon schools and academies at £12,000 per place for the academic 2018/19 year.
- (8) That the Local Authority proposal in relation to the new SRP supplement funding be noted.
- (9) That the calculation of funding due to schools and academies as set out in Appendix A of the report together with the anticipated payment dates to schools be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Outturn Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Author:	Finance Manager Education
Wards:	All
Locality Affected:	All
Parishes Affected:	All

1. Purpose and Reasons

- 1.1 To advise Schools Forum members of the final 2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) retained budget position.
- 1.2 The Local Authority (LA) is required to report the position on the DSG budget to the Schools Forum throughout the year and at the financial year end. This report provides Forum Members with the final year end position against the 2017-18 retained budgets. In accordance with grant conditions, the year-end DSG balance (whether positive or negative) is ring-fenced and must be carried forward to the following year, and the Schools Forum must be consulted on how the surplus or deficit is managed.
- 1.3 The retained DSG budget is monitored in accordance with standard Swindon Borough Council ("SBC") budgetary control procedures and a report is submitted to the Education Leadership Team each month. Updates are also periodically provided to Corporate Management Team, Cabinet and the People Services Leadership Team ("PSLT"). The council's budget monitoring timetable has recently been improved, the February monitoring forecast position was still being finalised as this report went to print.
- 1.4 Utilisation of the DSG contributes towards delivering the Council Vision Priority "Offer education opportunities that lead to the right skills and the right jobs in the right places".

2. Recommendations

The Schools Forum is recommended to:

- 2.1 Note that the latest projection on the 2017-18 retained budget is an out-turn position that will be **£0.345m** below budget (Para.3.2).
- 2.2 Note that the Early Years expenditure **£0.350m** to create additional places was carried forward and will be paid to providers during 2018/19 (Para. 3.5).
- 2.3 Note that after allowing for the following the projected out-turn position the unallocated DSG balance will be **£0.563m**.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager Education, Tel: 07795 256545, amackay@swindon.gov.uk.

2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Outturn Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

3. Detail

Latest 2017-18 Retained Budget Position

- 3.1 As reported to Schools Forum on 17th January 2017 the overall value of the 2017-18 centrally retained DSG budget is £33.346m, including £1.351m of 30 Hours Implementation Funding, which is included in the 3&4 year old budget.
- 3.2 Attached at **Appendix A** is the Education Leadership Team report based on information at the end of the financial year. This shows that the projected out-turn position is forecast to be £0.345m below the overall budget. The main reasons for the projected variances and commentaries on all high risk areas are provided in Appendix A.
- 3.3 The final position for the year is a favourable movement of £0.472m when compared to the previous position reported to forum in March of £0.127m above budget, which was based on the position at the end of January.
- 3.4 The main changes are an increase in High Needs Top ups following banding adjustments in both special and mainstream settings and an increase in the number of pupils supported by High Needs Top ups, and costs related to support provided to a school in financial difficulties. These additional costs are offset by a reduction in Post 16 places taken up and a recoupment adjustment for pupil growth confirmed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency and increased take up of Early Years 30 Hours provision, resulting in a favourable net movement.
- 3.5 At 17th January Schools Forum it was agreed that £0.350m of Early Years retained funding could be used to create places, this funding was not paid to providers by 31st March and therefore forms part of the underspend. As previously agreed it will be paid to providers during the 2018/19 financial year from the DSG balance brought forward.
- 3.6 The DSG balance brought forward was £0.568m, the year end position increases the balance to £0.913m. After allowing for the previously agreed funding allocation to create additional places £0.350m, the value of the unallocated DSG balance will be £0.563m.

Members of the Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that the latest projection on the 2017-18 retained budget is an out-turn position that will be £0.345m below budget. (Para. 3.2)**
- **Note that the Early Years expenditure £0.350m to create additional places was carried forward and will be paid to providers during 2018/19. (Para. 3.5)**

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager Education, Tel: 07795 256545, amackay@swindon.gov.uk.

2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Outturn Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

-
- Note that after allowing for the following the projected out-turn position the unallocated DSG balance will be £0.563m (Para. 3.6)

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 There are no proposals included within this report.

5. Implications, Diversity Impact Assessment and Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

- 5.1 Various financial implications are included in this report relating to management of the retained DSG budget

Legal and Human Rights Implications

- 5.2 There are no legal or human rights implications arising from this report.

All Other Implications (including Staff, Sustainability, Health, Rural, Crime and Disorder)

- 5.3 This report does not make any recommendations that affect these areas.

Diversity Impact Assessment

- 5.4 As there are no proposals in this report, a DIA has not been completed.

Risk Management

- 5.5 There are no specific risk management implications not highlighted in the body of the report.

6. Consultees

- 6.1 The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A - Education Leadership Team budget monitoring report

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager Education, Tel: 07795 256545, amackay@swindon.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: **Commissioning – Education Leadership Team**
 From: Anne Mackay, Finance Manager – Education
 Date: 3rd May 2018
 Subject: **Budget Monitoring Report 2017-18 DSG Services**
 Period: Period 2017/18 Year end outturn report May 2018

1) Background

The Council's corporate budget monitoring timetable requires each Group to report its forecast outturn position each month. This report is based on the actual year end information for 2017/18.

Although the DSG position is included in Corporate Management Team and Cabinet reports it is unlikely that elected members will be overly concerned as this is outside the SBC General Fund and is essentially an issue for the Head of Education and his leadership team to manage in consultation with the Finance Team and Schools Forum.

A summary of how the 2017-18 DSG has been allocated is provided below. The 30 hours implementation grant is now included in the budgets for the DSG allocation and 3 & 4 year old nursery entitlement.

Table 1 – DSG 2017-18 Overview

	£m	£m
<u>Delegated</u>		
Maintained Mainstream schools	43.164	
Maintained Specialist settings (Special Schools and SRP's)	7.854	
Maintained Specialist Settings - £0.510m ESFA Post 16 funding	(0.510)	
Academy Mainstream Recoupment	82.597	
Academy Specialist settings (Special Schools and SRP's) Recoupment	2.147	
Post 16 Transfer for FE Colleges	1.484	
Commissioned Services	1.034	
		137.769
<u>Centrally retained for provision</u>		
Disadvantaged 2 year old nursery places	2.059	
Free Nursery Entitlement 3 & 4 year olds (<i>incl. 30 hrs £1.351m</i>)	11.574	
In Year Pupil Growth	0.580	14.213
High Need SEN		
Portage, SEN equipment, Therapeutic services etc.	0.809	
SBC top ups – mainstream settings	11.882	
HN Contingency	0.065	
Tuition Service	0.881	
Out of Borough placements	2.407	
Post 16 provision (new responsibilities)	1.875	
Exclusions income	(0.335)	17.582
<u>Centrally retained to cover SBC and other costs</u>		
Admissions, Free School Meal eligibility checks, school licences, equal pay etc.	1.551	1.551
		33.346

Total DSG Allocation (including Early Years Pupil Premium of £0.128m)

171.115**2) High Risk Areas and Latest Projections**

Commentaries on all the main variances have been identified and those areas of the budget, which are inherently high-risk, and therefore have the potential to significantly affect the overall position, are provided below.

Table 2 – Latest Budget Monitoring Position				
Item	Notes	Budget 2017-18 £'000	Actual Variance for year £'000	Projected Variance Feb 18 £'000
<u>High-Risk Areas</u>				
2 year old nursery place funding	2	2,059	(222)	(180)
Free nursery education 3 & 4 year olds	3	11,574	(462)	(389)
High Needs Top ups	4	11,882	462	358
Notional SEN supplements (Mainstream)		400	0	0
External Placement Fees	5	2,407	(125)	0
HN Contingency	6	65	61	44
Post 16 HN Provision - New Responsibilities	7	1,875	(416)	(393)
School Exclusions / Dual registrations	8	(335)	(66)	(80)
Tuition Service	9	881	(114)	(63)
Schools Equal Pay Claims		31	0	0
Subtotal High Risk Areas		30,838	(882)	(703)
Other Low risk retained budgets	10	2,508	132	55
Total Retained Budgets		33,346	(750)	(648)
Maintained School Budgets (Mainstream)	11	43,164	(123)	(123)
Maintained School Budgets (Specialist Settings)		7,854	(5)	(5)
Commissioned Services		1,034	(0)	(0)
ESFA 6 th Form Place Funding		(510)	0	0
Total DSG School Budgets		51,541	(128)	(128)
Total DSG Expenditure Budgets		84,888	(878)	(776)
Mainstream Academy budgets for recoupment		82,597	0	0
ESFA direct funding of HN places	12	2,147	104	104
ESFA direct funding of Post 16 transfer FE Colleges		1,484	0	0
Total DSG Budget		171,116	(774)	(672)
DSG Funding allocation receivable	1	(84,888)	533	668
DSG Funding recouped ESFA for Academies		(82,597)	0	0
DSG Funding recouped ESFA for HN places	1	(2,147)	(104)	(104)
ESFA Post 16 transfer FE Colleges		(1,484)	0	0
Total DSG Funding Budgets		(171,116)	429	564

Total DSG Forecast		0	(345)	(108)
---------------------------	--	----------	--------------	--------------

The Leadership Team is asked to note the risk areas above and the actual outturn position, £0.345m below budget, will be reported to Corporate Management Team this month.

The main reasons for the variances from budget are provided below:

Note 1) DSG Funding Receivable
Budget allocation

£0.534m decreased funding

The budgeted DSG allocation is **£171.116m** including funding for Early Years Pupil Premium and an estimate of the DSG based on January 2017 and January 2018 census for 2 year olds and 3 & 4 year olds. As reported in previous years the LA budgets for the full DSG allocation from the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) but the actual cash received is the DSG allocation less Academy Recoupment, High Need places funded directly by the ESFA and ESFA Post 16 Transfer for Further Education Colleges, new for 2017-18. The budgeted DSG receivable is **£84.888m**.

Actual receipt

As reported previously and at **(A)** in table 3 below, after allowing for academy recoupment and ESFA Direct funding of HN places in Pre and Post 16 the 2017-18 DSG expected to be received is **£84.352m**, an overall variance in funding in 2017-18 of **£0.537m** when compared to budget. This reduction in funding is due to lower than anticipated census data for Early Years pupils for 2 year olds **£0.276m** (note 2) and 3 & 4 year olds **£0.468m** (note 3), which is partially offset by an increase in take up of 30 hour places (**£0.317m**) (note 3).

Included in the variance is **£0.104m** due to a late notification from the ESFA that the LA needs to fund the Element 2 for 26 places at a provision in a different local authority (note 12), which reduces the value of the DSG funding receivable.

The ESFA have finalised the January 2017 spring census and the final numbers for 2 year olds were slightly higher than anticipated and for 3 & 4 year olds were slightly lower than anticipated at year end leading to the receipt of an additional **£0.003m**. As shown at **(B)** in Table 3 below, the total DSG expected to be received is **£84.355m**, an overall adverse variance of **£0.534m** when compared to the DSG budget allocation.

<u>Table 3 – 2017-18 DSG receivable</u>			
Allocation	Budget £m	Expected £m	Variance £m
ESFA's DSG Allocation	(157.482)	(157.479)	0.003
ESFA DSG Early Years for 2 year olds	(2.059)	(1.783)	0.276
ESFA DSG Early Years for 3 & 4 year olds	(10.039)	(9.609)	0.430
ESFA DSG Early Years 30 Hours implementation	(1.351)	(1.668)	(0.317)
EFA DSG Early Years Disability Access Fund	(0.055)	(0.052)	0.004
ESFA DSG Early Years Pupil Premium	(0.129)	(0.093)	0.036
Total DSG allocation	(171.116)	(170.684)	0.433
Less Academy recoupment	82.597	82.597	0.000
Less ESFA Direct Funding of High Need places	2.147	2.251	0.104
Less ESFA Transfer for Post 16 FE Colleges	1.484	1.484	0.000
(A) DSG receivable 2017-18	(84.888)	(84.218)	0.537

Early Years Spring 17 Census 2 yr olds	0.000	(0.011)	(0.011)
Early Years Spring 17 Census 3 & 4 yr olds	0.000	0.009	0.009
Early Years Spring 17 census Pupil Premium	0.000	(0.001)	(0.001)
(B) DSG expected to be received in year 17-18	(84.888)	(84.355)	0.534

**Note 2 – Disadvantaged two year old nursery funding £0.222m Decreased expenditure
£0.276m Decreased funding**

The cost of the actual take up of 2 year old places was **£0.222m** lower than the budget of £2.059m in line with fewer places taken up overall than budgeted in the January 2018 pupil census.

The funding is based on the actual pupil numbers at the spring census 2017 (5/12ths) and spring census 2018 (7/12ths). The confirmed spring 2017 census numbers were lower than anticipated and in the draft spring 2018 census the numbers had decreased further so the funding forecast was recalculated for year end. The ESFA will not confirm the funding until July 2018 so the actual funding expected for 2017-18 is an estimate. Funding for early years is now calculated on the number of part time equivalents rather than full time equivalents.

Table 4 – Early Years 2 year old 2017-18 DSG Funding		
	2017-18 Budget	2017-18 Projection
January 2017 Census PTE (5/12) (confirmed)	679	600.00
January 2018 Census PTE (7/12)	679	579.32
Full Year Equivalent	679	587.94
2 year old funding rate per PTE	£3,032.40	£3,032.40
Total DSG receivable	£2,059,000	£1,782,860
Variance		(£276,139)

The estimated net decrease in 2 year old pupils of 91.06 PTE will also result in a **£0.276m** reduction of DSG.

**Note 3 – Free nursery education (3 & 4 year olds): £0.462m Decreased expenditure
£0.468m Decreased funding
£0.317m Increased funding 30 hours**

The 2017-18 actual position for 3 & 4 year olds is **£0.462m** lower than budget.

This element of DSG is based on participation and the LA anticipates that along with the decrease in expenditure there will also be a decrease in the amount of Dedicated Schools Grant receivable as the PTE numbers were lower than budgeted in the recent spring census, resulting in **£0.430m** reduced DSG.

The budget and actual expenditure for 3 & 4 year olds includes £1.351m for the 30 Hours Early Implementer scheme, the numbers of pupils taking up 30 hour places is higher than anticipated, increasing the expenditure but also the funding received for this element. The Pupil Premium expected to be paid through the 3 & 4 year olds budget is **£0.093m** which is £0.036m below budget.

At 17th January Schools Forum it was agreed that £0.350m of Early Years retained funding could be used to create places, this funding was not paid to providers by 31st March and therefore forms part of the underspend. It will be paid to providers during the 2018/19 financial year.

The ESFA will not confirm the funding until July 2018 so the funding projection is still provisional. Early Years DSG is calculated based on 5/12ths of the confirmed January 2017 census and 7/12ths of the January 2018 Early Years Census. The latest DSG calculation compared to the 2017-18 budget agreed by Schools Forum is summarised below.

Table 5 – Early Years 3 and 4 year old 2017-18 DSG Funding		
	2017-18 Budget	2017-18 Projection
January 2017 Census PTE (5/12) (confirmed)	3,880	3,733.20
January 2018 Census PTE (7/12)	3,880	3,700.56
Full Year Equivalent number of PTE	3,880	3,714.21
3 and 4 year old funding rate	£2,587.00	£2,587.00
Subtotal DSG receivable	£10,037,600	£9,608,666
Disability Access Fund	£55,300	£51,650
Early Years Pupil Premium	£128,500	£92,805
Total DSG receivable	£10,221,400	£9,753,121
Variance		(£468,279)

The estimated net decrease in early years' pupils of approximately 165.79 PTE will result in £0.429m reduction in DSG, when considered with the variances on the Disability Access Fund £0.004m and Early Years Pupil Premium £0.036m, the DSG funding is expected to be **£0.468m** less than budgeted.

Table 6 – Early Years 3 and 4 year old 30 hours 2017-18 DSG Funding		
	2017-18 Budget	2017-18 Projection
Prior to Sept 17 it was Early Implementer Grant	0.00	0.00
January 2018 Census (7/12)	895.48	1,105.51
Full Year Equivalent	522.36	644.88
3 and 4 year old funding rate	£2,587.00	£2,587.00
Total DSG receivable	£1,351,315	£1,668,306
Variance		£316,991

The take up of 30 hour places has increased by 210.03 places for the September to March period and this will result in the receipt of an additional **£0.317m** of DSG as per Table 6 above.

Note 4 – High Needs Top ups:

£0.462m Pressure

The expenditure for the year was **£0.462m** above budget. There have been a number of adjustments to both the bandings and number of pupils supported in mainstream and special provisions. There has also been additional expenditure with a psychological service and

additional Alternative Provision costs for permanently excluded pupils, resulting in a net increase of £0.073m in HN top ups since last month.

Note 5 – External placements:
budget

£0.125m

Below

The final position following adjustments to some placements and decisions about the share of costs for a small number of external placements was £0.125m below budget.

Note 6 – High Needs Contingency:

£0.061m Pressure

During the 2017-18 budget setting process Schools Forum agreed that a contingency of £0.065m would be held to cover additional high need top up and external placements costs. **£0.104m** was used to support a school in financial difficulty with Alternative Provision for some of its pupils and provide educational and leadership support. Schools Forum agreed £0.022m of support for this school and this is included in the pressure above. There is no remaining budget to offset the pressure in high Needs Top ups £0.462m (note 4) although the External Placement fees budget was £0.125m below budget (note 5). There is an overall pressure between the three budgets of £0.398m.

Note 7 – Post 16 HN Provision:

£0.416m Below budget

During the year there has been recoupment of bespoke funding from a provider. The final position for Post 16 provision has updated now that the impact of the new academic year intake has been assessed and the outturn position was **£0.416m** below budget.

Note 8 – School Exclusions:

£0.066m Above budget

As reported previously during the previous and current academic year Swindon has experienced a high rate of permanent exclusions and this has generated significantly higher levels of income than anticipated £0.153m, however short term placements are reducing (£0.087m), resulting in a favourable outturn position of **£0.066m** below budget.

Note 9 – Tuition Service:

£0.114m Below budget

Saving as project commitment reduced from full to part year **£0.012m** and an unspent contingency and reduced **£0.020m**. Reduction in demand for home tutors and agency staff combined with staff leavers increases the favourable position by **£0.082m**.

Note 10 – Low risk budgets:

£0.132m Above Budget

The main variances are pressures in The Oakfield Project for the 2017/18 academic year and historical deficit **£0.194m** as agreed by Schools Forum, pressure on Business Rates (NNDR) payable for nursery buildings that have been taken over by maintained schools **£0.017m** plus net minor variances **£0.071m** following the maintained schools year end. Partially offsetting the pressures are savings in Pupil Growth (Trigger Funding) payments **£0.057m**, the pooled equipment budget **£0.036m** and Admissions **£0.057m**.

Note 11 – School Budgets (Mainstream):

£0.123m Below Budget

The ESFA have confirmed the recoupment adjustment for pupil growth, a saving of **£0.123m**.

Note 12 – ESFA recoupment for academies and HN places:

£0.104m Pressure

The ESFA have recouped Element 2 funding to pay directly to a High Needs setting, the LA was informed of this in March 2017 **£0.104m**.

The Leadership Team is asked to note the actual out-turn position.

3) DSG Balance

In accordance with DfE grant conditions the DSG must be treated by the LA as being ring fenced for specified educational purposes and, in addition to consulting the Schools Forum on how each year's grant is allocated, the Forum must also be advised on any year end surplus or deficits. The forecast year end position incorporates an agreement made at the July 2017 Schools Forum and is as follows:

Table 7 – DSG Balance	Latest Position
Opening DSG balance brought forward from 2016-17	£0.568m
Plus year-end position (see table 2, including Support to St Luke's School (Schools Forum July 2017))	£0.345m
Actual DSG balance total	£0.913m
Agreed Early Years expenditure (Schools Forum January 2018)	(£0.350m)
Actual DSG balance unallocated	£0.563m

At the 4th July Schools Forum meeting, the Schools Forum representatives agreed a one off use of £0.022m of the DSG brought forward balance to support St Luke's School. At 17th January Schools Forum, representatives agreed the use of £0.350m of Early Years retained funding to create places following the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment. This funding was not paid out before year end and therefore forms part of the total balance carried forward, after allowing for this funding the unallocated DSG balance is £0.563m.

The Leadership Team is asked to note that the unallocated DSG balance is expected to be £0.563m and that all expenditure funded from this balance will need to be allowed under the Early Years and School finance regulations and be agreed by Schools Forum.

4) Subjective Analysis

The table below shows a summary of the year end position of £0.750m across the £33.346m centrally retained budget by type of expenditure, compared to the budget profiles is shown below. This presents a different view to the more traditional analysis by service area. This is a standard table used by the Finance Team which has been included in the DSG report to improve consistency.

Subjective analysis Outturn Position

Group Budget position by expenditure type	Year to date budget £'000	Year to date actual £'000	Year to date variance £'000
Employees	1,571	1,461	(110)
Premises	1,098	1,059	(39)
Transport	13	17	4
Supplies & Services	1,374	2,240	931
3rd Party Payments	35,043	30,231	(1,810)
Internal Recharges	1,938	2,058	121
Capital Financing	0	0	0
Income	(7,691)	(7,537)	154

Total	33,346	29,529	(750)
-------	--------	--------	-------

The Leadership Team is asked to note the addition of subjective analysis information and the continued need to agree realistic budget profiles for input to the oracle system.

5) Summary of Key Recommendations

The Leadership Team is asked to:-

- Note that the out-turn position, which is £0.345m below budget, will be reported to Corporate Board this month
- Note the risk areas above, the forecast out-turn position and suggested actions
- Note the Schools Forum agreement to use £0.022m of DSG reserves to support one school
- Note the Schools Forum agreement to use £0.350m of retained Early Years DSG is included in the DSG balance and will be paid out in 2018/19 financial year
- Note that the unallocated DSG balance will be £0.563m.

2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Author:	Finance Manager Education
Wards:	All
Locality Affected:	All
Parishes Affected:	All

1. Purpose and Reasons

- 1.1 To advise Schools Forum members of the latest projected 2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) retained budget position.
- 1.2 The Local Authority (LA) is required to report the position on the DSG budget to the Schools Forum throughout the year and at the financial year end. This report provides Forum Members with the projected year end position against the 2018-19 retained budgets based upon available information at the end of May 2018. In accordance with grant conditions, the year-end DSG balance (whether positive or negative) is ring-fenced and must be carried forward to the following year, and the Schools Forum must be consulted on how the surplus or deficit is managed.
- 1.3 The retained DSG budget is monitored in accordance with standard Swindon Borough Council ("SBC") budgetary control procedures and a report is submitted to the Education Leadership Team each month. Updates are also periodically provided to Corporate Management Team, Cabinet and the People's Services Leadership Team ("PSLT"). The council's budget monitoring timetable has recently been improved, the June monitoring forecast position was still being finalised as this report went to print.
- 1.4 Utilisation of the DSG contributes towards delivering the Council Vision Priority "Offer education opportunities that lead to the right skills and the right jobs in the right places".

2. Recommendations

The Schools Forum is recommended to:

- 2.1 Note that the latest projection on the 2018-19 retained budget is an out-turn position that will be **£0.333m** above budget.
- 2.2 Note that following the projected out-turn position the unallocated DSG balance will decrease to **£0.230m**.

3. Detail

Latest 2018-19 Retained Budget Position

- 3.1 As reported to Schools Forum on 17th January 2018 the overall value of the 2018-19 centrally retained DSG budget is £34.135m.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager Education, Tel: 07795 256545, amackay@swindon.gov.uk.

2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

- 3.2 Attached at **Appendix A** is the report that was issued on 7th June to the Education Leadership Team on based on information at the end of May. This shows that the projected out-turn position is forecast to be £0.333m above the overall budget. The main reasons for the projected variances and commentaries on all high risk areas are provided in Appendix A.
- 3.3 The main changes are an increase in take up of 30 hour places by eligible 3 & 4 year olds, which also increase the DSG funding expected. The High Needs Top ups forecast has been increased due to additional places in Post 16 special provision and projections for pupils expected to be in provisions in September and costs related to the provision of educational and leadership support provided to a school. These additional costs are offset by a reduction in costs as fewer places have been taken up by 2 year olds.
- 3.4 At this stage the LA is expecting that, although there continues to be a risk associated with the projection, it is expected that the year-end position of £0.333m (0.38%) above budget will occur, which will reduce the existing unallocated DSG balance.
- 3.5 Following the projected forecast of £0.333m the value of the unallocated DSG balance is expected to be £0.230m.

Members of the Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that the latest projection on the 2017-18 retained budget is £0.333m above budget**
- **Note that following the projected out-turn position the unallocated DSG balance will decrease to £0.230m**

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 There are no proposals included within this report.

5. Implications, Diversity Impact Assessment and Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

- 5.1 Various financial implications are included in this report relating to management of the retained DSG budget

Legal and Human Rights Implications

- 5.2 There are no legal or human rights implications arising from this report.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager Education, Tel: 07795 256545, amackay@swindon.gov.uk.

2018-19 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Position

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

All Other Implications (including Staff, Sustainability, Health, Rural, Crime and Disorder)

- 5.3 This report does not make any recommendations that affect these areas.

Diversity Impact Assessment

- 5.4 As there are no proposals in this report, a DIA has not been completed.

Risk Management

- 5.5 There are no specific risk management implications not highlighted in the body of the report.

6. Consultees

- 6.1 The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A - Education Leadership Team budget monitoring report
- 8.2 Appendix B - DSG Budget analysis by expenditure type
- 8.3 Appendix C - DSG Profiled budget to date compared with forecast and actual expenditure to date

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: **Commissioning – Education Leadership Team**
 From: Anne Mackay, Finance Manager – Education
 Date: 6th May 2018
 Subject: **Budget Monitoring Report 2018-19 DSG Services**
 Period: Period to May 2018

1) Background

The Council's corporate budget monitoring timetable requires each Group to report its forecast outturn position each month and this report is based on the information provided at the end of May 2018.

Although the DSG position is included in Corporate Management Team and Cabinet reports it is unlikely that elected members will be overly concerned as this is outside the SBC General Fund and is essentially an issue for the Head of Education and his leadership team to manage in consultation with the Finance Team and Schools Forum.

A summary of how the 2018-19 DSG has been allocated is provided below.

Table 1 – DSG 2018-19 Overview

	<u>£m</u>	<u>£m</u>
<u>Delegated</u>		
Maintained Mainstream schools	44.183	
Maintained Specialist settings (Special Schools and SRP's)	8.363	
Maintained Specialist Settings - £0.510m ESFA Post 16 funding	(0.510)	
Academy Mainstream Recoupment	86.501	
Academy Specialist settings (Special Schools and SRP's) Recoupment	1.709	
Post 16 Transfer for FE Colleges	1.350	
Commissioned Services	1.034	
		142.630
<u>Centrally retained for provision</u>		
Disadvantaged 2 year old nursery places	1.820	
Free Nursery Entitlement 3 & 4 year olds (<i>incl. 30 hrs £1.351m</i>)	12.205	
In Year Pupil Growth	0.433	14.458
<u>High Need SEN</u>		
Portage, SEN equipment, Therapeutic services, Oakfield, Notional SEN etc.	0.960	
SBC top ups – mainstream settings	12.547	
HN Contingency	0.150	
Out of Borough placements	2.841	
Post 16 provision (new responsibilities)	1.875	
Exclusions income	(0.216)	18.156
<u>Centrally retained to cover SBC and other costs</u>		
Admissions, Free School Meal eligibility checks, school licences, equal pay etc.	1.523	1.523
		34.136
Total DSG Allocation (including Early Years Pupil Premium of £0.093m)		176.765

2) Completion of Online Monitoring Forecasts

As part of the budget monitoring reporting process the LA is required to report to Corporate Board how active Budget Managers have been in contributing to the on line information used to collate period end information. For DSG service areas the end of May completion rate was 91% (39/43). There is one cost centre that cannot be confirmed due to system parameters.

The Leadership Team is asked to remind Budget Managers of the importance of this exercise and to encourage continued high participation for the remainder of the year.

3) High Risk Areas and Latest Projections

Commentaries on all the main variances have been identified and those areas of the budget, which are inherently high-risk, and therefore have the potential to significantly affect the overall position, are provided below.

Item	Notes	Budget 2018-19 £'000	Forecast Variance £'000
<u>High-Risk Areas</u>			
2 year old nursery place funding	2	1,820	(111)
Free nursery education (3&4 year olds)	3	12,205	404
High Needs Top ups (Mainstream and High Needs)	4	12,547	277
Notional SEN supplements (Mainstream)		400	0
External Placement Fees		2,841	0
HN Contingency	5	150	103
Post 16 HN Provision - New Responsibilities		1,875	0
School Exclusions / Dual registrations		(216)	0
Schools Equal Pay Claims		31	0
Subtotal High Risk Areas		31,652	673
Other Low risk retained budgets		2,484	0
Total Retained Budgets		34,135	673
Maintained School Budgets (Mainstream)		44,183	0
Maintained School Budgets (Specialist Settings)		8,363	0
Commissioned Services		1,034	0
EFA 6 th Form Place Funding		(510)	0
Total DSG School Budgets		53,070	0
Total DSG Expenditure Budgets		87,205	673
Mainstream Academy budgets for recoupment		86,501	0
EFA direct funding of High Need places		1,709	0
EFA direct funding of Post 16 transfer FE Colleges		1,350	0
Total DSG Budget		176,765	673
DSG Funding allocation receivable	1	(87,205)	(340)
DSG Funding recouped by the EFA for Academies		(86,501)	0
DSG Funding recouped by the EFA for HN places		(1,709)	0
EFA direct funding of Post 16 transfer FE Colleges		(1,350)	0
Total DSG Funding Budgets		(176,765)	(340)
Total DSG		0	333

The Leadership Team is asked to note the risk areas above and the forecast out-turn position of £0.333m above budget, will be reported to Corporate Management Team this month.

The main reasons for the variances from budget are provided below:

Note 1) DSG Funding Receivable

£0.340m increased funding

Budget allocation

The budgeted DSG allocation is **£176.765m** including funding for Early Years Pupil Premium and an estimate of the DSG based on January 2018 and January 2019 census for 2 year olds and 3 & 4 year olds, universal entitlement and 30 hours. As reported in previous years the LA budgets for the full DSG allocation from the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) but the actual cash received is the DSG allocation less Academy Recoupment, High Need places funded directly by the ESFA and ESFA Post 16 Transfer for Further Education Colleges. The budgeted DSG receivable is **£87.205m**.

Actual receipt

At (A) in table 3 below, after allowing for academy recoupment and ESFA Direct funding of HN places in Pre and Post 16 the 2018-19 DSG expected to be received is **£87.545m**, an overall variance in funding in 2018-19 of **£0.340m** when compared to budget. This increase in funding is due higher numbers anticipated in the census data for 3 & 4 year olds **£0.404m** (note 3), offset by lower anticipated census data for Early Years pupils for 2 year olds **£0.064m** (note 2)

Table 3 – 2018-19 DSG receivable

Allocation	Budget £m	Expected £m	Variance £m
ESFA's DSG Allocation	(162.741)	(162.741)	0.000
ESFA DSG Early Years for 2 year olds	(1.820)	(1.765)	0.064
ESFA DSG Early Years for 3 & 4 year olds	(12.062)	(12.466)	(0.404)
ESFA DSG Early Years Disability Access Fund	(0.050)	(0.050)	0.000
ESFA DSG Early Years Pupil Premium	(0.093)	(0.093)	0.000
Total DSG allocation	(176.765)	(177.106)	(0.340)
Less Academy recoupment	86.501	86.501	0.000
Less ESFA Direct Funding of High Need places	1.709	1.709	0.000
Less ESFA Transfer for Post 16 FE Colleges	1.350	1.350	0.000
(A) DSG expected to be received in year 17-18	(87.205)	(87.546)	(0.340)

Note 2 – Disadvantaged two year old nursery funding **£0.111m Decreased expenditure**
£0.064m Decreased funding

The January 2018 pupil census for the take up of 2 year old places is now anticipated to be lower than expected so the cost for the overall take up for the year is forecast to be **£0.111m** lower than the budget of £1.820m.

The decreased take up affects the funding as it is based on the actual pupil numbers at the spring census 2018 (5/12ths) and spring census 2019 (7/12ths). The confirmed spring 2018 census numbers are expected in July and currently the forecast is lower than budgeted and are expected to be at a similar level in the spring 2019 census so the funding forecast has been recalculated. .

Table 4 – Early Years 2 year old 2018-19 DSG Funding		
	2018-19 Budget	2018-19 Projection
January 2018 Census PTE (5/12)	600.17	579
January 2019 Census PTE (7/12)	600.17	579
Full Year Equivalent	600.17	579
2 year old funding rate per PTE	£3,032.40	£3,032.40
Total DSG receivable	£1,820,000	£1,755,760
Variance		(£64,240)

The estimated net decrease in 2 year old pupils of 21.17 PTE will result in a **£0.064m** reduction of DSG. These projections will be updated following the each term's final payments and updated again at year end.

Note 3 – Free nursery education (3 & 4 year olds): **£0.389m Decreased expenditure**
£0.404m Increased funding

The 2018-19 forecast position for 3 & 4 year olds is **£0.404m** higher than budget based on the expected spring 18 census take up. The numbers of 3 & 4 year old pupils taking up 30 hours is higher than expected and this has increased both the expenditure and income expected. The ESFA have allocated the universal (15) and extended (30) hour provision as one funding stream so we will continue to monitor the provision as a whole.

The Pupil Premium expected to be paid through the 3 & 4 year olds budget is **£0.093m** and at this point in the year is also expected to be in line with budget.

The ESFA will not confirm the funding until July 2019 so the funding projection will be provisional until then. Early Years DSG is calculated based on 5/12ths of the January 2018 census which will be confirmed in July and 7/12ths of the January 2019 Early Years Census. The latest DSG calculation compared to the 2018-19 budget agreed by Schools Forum is summarised below and is now on Part Time Equivalent (PTE).

Table 5 – Early Years 3 and 4 year old 2018-19 DSG Funding		
	2018-19 Budget	2018-19 Projection
January 2018 Census PTE (5/12)	4,660.97	4,817.37
January 2019 Census PTE (7/12)	4,660.97	4,817.37
Full Year Equivalent number of PTE	4,660.97	4,817.37
3 and 4 year old funding rate	£2,587.80	£2,587.80
Subtotal DSG receivable	£12,061,616	£12,466,390
Disability Access Fund	£50,400	£50,400
Early Years Pupil Premium	£92,800	£92,800
Total DSG receivable	£12,204,816	£12,609,590
Variance		£404,774

The estimated net increase in early years' pupils of approximately 156.40 PTE will result in a **£0.404m** increase in DSG funding. This forecast will be updated each term and at year end.

Note 4 – High Needs Top ups:

£0.277m Pressure

The forecast for expenditure is now expected to be **£0.277m** above budget. The forecast has been updated to include projections for pupils expected to be in provisions in September including Year 0 pupils. There have been a number of adjustments since the budget was set including an increase of places in Post 16 special provision, partly offset by a reduction in Pre 16 places for the same provision. Payments for TIPs SEN also contributes to the overall net increase of £0.277m in HN top ups since the budget was set.

Note 5 – High Needs Contingency:

£0.103m Pressure

During the 2018-19 budget setting process Schools Forum agreed that a contingency of £0.150m would be held to cover additional high need top up and external placements costs. The budget has not been forecast as underspent at this point in the year as there continues to be inherent risks with these demand led budgets. **£0.103m** has been forecast to support a school previously in financial difficulty with the provision of educational and leadership support.

The Leadership Team is asked to note the forecast out-turn position.

3) DSG Balance

In accordance with DfE grant conditions the DSG must be treated by the LA as being ring fenced for specified educational purposes and, in addition to consulting the Schools Forum on how each year's grant is allocated, the Forum must also be advised on any year end surplus or deficits. The forecast year end position incorporates an agreement made at the January 2018 Schools Forum and is as follows:

Table 6 – DSG Balance	Latest Position
Opening DSG balance brought forward from 2017-18	£0.913m
Less Early Years and Place Sufficiency expenditure (agreed 2017/18)	(£0.350m)
DSG balance brought forward unallocated	£0.563m
Less the forecast year-end position (see table 2)	(£0.333m)
Estimated DSG balance unallocated	£0.230m

The Leadership Team is asked to note that the unallocated DSG balance is expected to be £0.230m and that all expenditure funded from this balance will need to be allowed under the Early Years and School finance regulations and be agreed by Schools Forum.

4) Subjective Analysis

The table below shows a summary of the latest projected position of £0.648m across the £33.346m centrally retained budget by type of expenditure, compared to the budget profiles is shown below. This presents a different view to the more traditional analysis by service area. This is a standard table used by the Finance Team which has been included in the DSG report to improve consistency.

Subjective analysis Delegated DSG May 2018

Group Budget position by expenditure type	Year to date budget £'000	Year to date actual £'000	Year to date variance £'000	Total Budget 2018/19 £'000	Forecast Variance 2018/19 £'000
Employees	190	236	45	1,141	0
Premises	1,124	1,099	(25)	1,132	0
Transport	2	(4)	(6)	10	0
Supplies & Services	450	142	(307)	1,562	182
3rd Party Payments	3,445	8,487	5,042	34,320	487
Internal Recharges	1,760	109	(1,651)	2,006	4
Capital Financing	0	0	0	0	0
Income	(2,136)	(2,280)	(144)	(6,035)	0
Total	4,834	7,788	2,954	34,135	673

To better understand the above table the following annexes are attached to this report.

- **Appendix B** – this shows a breakdown of all the 2018-19 retained budgets by type of expenditure and income and produces the totals in the “Total budget 2018-19” column in table 7 above
- **Appendix C** – this shows a breakdown of each services profiled budget to date compared with actual spend to date. This will present useful information for both year to date actuals and full year projections. The aim is to highlight and address variances now, rather than wait until nearer the year end where late changes undermine confidence in our reporting.

The Leadership Team is asked to note the addition of subjective analysis information and the continued need to agree realistic budget profiles for input to the oracle system.

5) Improving Forecasting

Given that we are accountable to the Schools Forum regarding the effective management of the DSG, meetings with senior Budget Managers will be scheduled through to the end of 2018-19 to take place shortly after the month end forecasting deadlines. This will enable all high risk forecast figures to be regularly challenged and this enabled the wider budget position to be assessed, particularly on high need budgets, prior to reporting through to corporate board and in some months the Schools Forum.

6) Summary of Key Recommendations

The Leadership Team is asked to:-

- Note that the forecast out-turn position, which is a projection of £0.333m above budget, will be reported to Corporate Board this month
- Note the risk areas above, the forecast out-turn position and suggested actions
- Note that the unallocated DSG balance is expected to be £0.230m.

DSG Budget Analysis by Expenditure Type

SF 18 07 18 - DSG Retained Budget Monitoring - May 18

Appendix B

Service Area	2018/19 Budgets by Expenditure Type								
	Employees £'000	Premises £'000	Transport £'000	Supplies & Services £'000	3rd Party Payments £'000	Internal Recharges £'000	Capital Financing £'000	Income £'000	Total £'000
Free nursery education (3&4 year olds)	339.8	-	5.0	11.5	11,704.0	144.5	-	-	12,204.8
Pupil Premium and other grants	-	-	-	-	2,145.5	744.6	-	(2,890.1)	-
School subscriptions	-	-	-	197.1	-	-	-	(46.5)	150.6
Disadvantaged two year olds	-	-	-	-	1,819.9	-	-	-	1,819.9
Equal Pay	-	-	-	-	-	31.0	-	-	31.0
Central Charges	-	-	-	-	-	1,280.1	-	(187.9)	1,092.2
LAC Pupil Premium	-	-	-	596.7	-	(596.7)	-	-	-
DSG NNDR	-	1,122.3	-	-	-	-	-	(1,122.3)	-
Nyland Primary Behaviour Support	-	-	-	130.5	-	-	-	(130.5)	-
Trade Union Facilities	15.7	-	-	7.7	-	-	-	(23.4)	-
Schools' Forum	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	2.0
Admissions Forum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trigger funding	-	-	-	-	387.3	-	-	-	387.3
Pupil Growth set up costs	-	-	-	-	46.0	-	-	-	46.0
Admissions	245.5	-	0.3	7.7	-	43.9	-	(60.4)	237.0
Free School Meals administration	-	-	-	-	-	20.2	-	(20.2)	-
Therapy	-	-	-	-	-	125.0	-	-	125.0
High Needs top ups	-	-	-	-	12,546.6	-	-	-	12,546.6
Statemented Pupils Equipment	-	-	-	24.0	-	106.0	-	-	130.0
Education Support Services Monitoring	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	10.0
Out of Borough fees	-	-	-	-	3,126.7	-	-	(286.0)	2,840.7
Travellers children	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	2.0
Post 16 new responsibilities	-	-	-	-	2,116.3	-	-	(241.3)	1,875.0
Broadband Connectivity	-	-	-	383.8	-	-	-	(383.8)	-
The Oakfield project	377.0	9.4	2.8	19.0	25.8	6.0	-	(290.0)	150.0
Portage	163.2	-	2.1	1.7	-	10.7	-	(26.0)	151.7
Notional SEN	-	-	-	-	400.0	-	-	-	400.0
School Exclusions	-	-	-	30.0	-	80.4	-	(326.8)	(216.4)
High Needs Contingency	-	-	-	150.0	-	-	-	-	150.0
Expense Category Totals	1,141.2	1,131.7	10.2	1,561.7	34,320.1	2,005.7	0.0	(6,035.2)	34,135.4

This page is intentionally left blank

End of May 2018 Budget Monitoring

SF 18 07 18 - DSG Retained Budget Monitoring - May 18 - Appendix C

Service	Budget to date	Actual to date	Variance to date	Full Year budget	Full year forecast	Full Year Variance
Free Nursery Education Commissioning - three & four year olds	£203,874	£4,777,882	£4,574,008	£12,204,800	£12,608,342	£403,542
DFE Additional Grants	(£124,100)	(£145,581)	(£21,481)	£0	£0	£0
School subscriptions	£150,600	(£671)	(£151,271)	£150,600	£150,600	£0
Free Nursery Education Commissioning - two year olds	£0	£561,739	£561,739	£1,819,900	£1,709,274	(£110,626)
DSG Retained Equal Pay	£31,000	£0	(£31,000)	£31,000	£31,000	£0
DSG Retained Contingency	£1,092,200	(£187,289)	(£1,279,489)	£1,092,200	£1,092,200	£0
LAC pupil premium	£93,300	£41,630	(£51,670)	£0	£0	£0
DSG NNDR	£0	(£26,294)	(£26,294)	£0	£0	£0
Universal Infant Free School Meals	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Nyland Primary Behaviour Support	(£108,750)	(£108,771)	(£21)	£0	£0	£0
Trade Union Facilities	(£4)	(£12,694)	(£12,690)	£0	£0	£0
Schools' Forum	£332	£525	£193	£2,000	£2,000	£0
Pupil Growth Trigger Funding	£64,550	£0	(£64,550)	£387,300	£387,300	£0
Pupil Growth Set Up Costs	£7,666	£0	(£7,666)	£46,000	£46,000	£0
Admissions	£49,558	(£1,634)	(£51,192)	£237,000	£237,000	£0
Free School Meals administration	(£8,600)	(£10,385)	(£1,785)	£0	£0	£0
Therapy	£0	£0	£0	£125,000	£125,000	£0
SEN Resourcing Assessment Panel	£2,069,838	£1,980,135	(£89,703)	£12,546,600	£12,823,660	£277,060
Statemented Pupils Equipment	£110,000	£107,517	(£2,483)	£130,000	£130,000	£0
Quality Assurance of commissioned services	£10,000	£0	(£10,000)	£10,000	£10,000	£0
Out of Borough School Fees	£473,448	£378,495	(£94,953)	£2,840,700	£2,840,700	£0
Travellers Children	£332	£0	(£332)	£2,000	£2,000	£0
Post 16 - New Responsibilities	£352,712	£294,545	(£58,167)	£1,875,000	£1,875,000	£0
Broadband Connectivity	£63,966	£0	(£63,966)	£0	£0	£0
The Oakfield Project	£29,572	£73,158	£43,586	£150,000	£150,000	£0
Year 11 Protocol	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Portage	£25,272	£19,589	(£5,683)	£151,700	£151,985	£285
Notional SEN	£66,666	£0	(£66,666)	£400,000	£400,000	£0
School Exclusions and short term placements	£30,936	£31,414	£478	(£216,400)	(£216,400)	£0
High Needs Contingency	£150,000	(£20,615)	(£170,615)	£150,000	£253,100	£103,100
OVERALL TOTAL	£4,834,368	£7,752,694	£2,918,326	£34,135,400	£34,808,761	£673,361

This page is intentionally left blank

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Author:	Finance Manager – Education
Wards:	All
Locality Affected:	All
Parishes Affected:	All

1. Purpose and Reasons

1.1 The Schools Forum meeting on 17th January 2018 received a report on the 2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Settlement and Budget. This report provides members with an update on various issues that have arisen since that meeting. This report addresses:

1. The Oakfield Project
2. High Needs update including the impact of September 2018 increase in places and an update on Special Free School Place funding
3. Advisory Teaching Services (previously referred to as Commissioned Services)
4. Post 16 budget update
5. Early Years Funding
6. Notional SEN
7. Termination of employment costs
8. SEND Capital
9. Basic Need Funding
10. Free Schools
11. Consultation on 2019/20 Local Funding Formula for Schools and Academies

1.2 These proposals contribute towards delivering the Council Vision Priority “Offer education opportunities that lead to the right skills and right jobs in the right places.”

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

2. Recommendations

The Schools Forum is recommended to:

- 2.1 Note that the Oakfield project will transfer as an entity to EOTAS and this will take place by the 2018/19 academic year (July 2019) (Para. 3.3)).
- 2.2 Note the High Needs update on the intended actions in 2018-19 (Para. 3.5 – 3.12)
- 2.3 Agree to set up a High Needs Sub Group (Para. 3.10)
- 2.4 Note the 2019/20 full year impact of the increased places in September 2018 (Para. 3.13 – 3.15)
- 2.5 Note the change in responsibility for funding places in Special Free Schools from April 2019 (Para. 3.16 – 3.18)
- 2.6 Note that a full review of the Advisory Teaching Services will be reported to Schools Forum in October (Para. 3.19)
- 2.7 Note the LA's latest estimate is that a total of 353 FTE post 16 (excluding sixth form) high needs students will need to be financed during the 2018/19 academic year (Para. 3.23)
- 2.8 Note the annual allocations for categories of providers and the overall financial year and academic year budget position shown in Table 3 (Para. 3.27)
- 2.9 Note a contingency budget of £0.230m for 88 identified high needs students with no confirmed destination in the financial year (Table 3)
- 2.10 Note that the current budgeted figures would result in an underspend of £380k, and that the banding values / contingency will be reviewed as part of the October Schools Forum report (Table 3)
- 2.11 Agree the 2018/19 indicative banding values shown in Table 4
- 2.12 Note that the indicative banding values will be reviewed if there is significant variance in actual take up of places (Para. 3.29)
- 2.13 Agree a stakeholder consultation by the Early Years team to assess the impact of reducing the number of Tasks per term, and to increase the funding paid up front for 3 and 4 year olds from 50% to 75% and also to assess demand for monthly payments (Para. 3.33)
- 2.14 Note that following the consultation the outcome will be reported to January's Schools Forum meeting for implementation prior to the commencement of the summer term 2019 (Para. 3.36)

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

- 2.15 Agree a stakeholder consultation assessing the impact of amending the middle rate funding criteria for 3 and 4 year old funding (Para. 3.39)
- 2.16 Note that a consultation will take place on options for the 2018/19 Notional SEN formula (Para. 3.43)
- 2.17 Agree that the LA can offset any termination of employment costs against the savings made in each DSG service area, where the termination of employment costs are less than the savings incurred (Para. 3.45)
- 2.18 Note that if agreement is given the LA will apply to the Secretary of State for a Disapplication of the Finance Regulations in autumn 2018 (Para. 3.45)
- 2.19 Note the update on SEND Capital (Para. 3.46 – 3.48)
- 2.20 Note the update on Basic Need Funding (Para. 3.50)
- 2.21 Note the update on Free Schools (Para. 3.52 – 3.54)
- 2.22 Note that the LA will arrange a consultation event for all schools and academies in November (Para. 3.57)
- 2.23 Note that an Extraordinary Schools Forum meeting may be required to agree on principles of the new formula for 2019/20 (Para. 3.58)

3. Detail

Settings

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is ring fenced funding provided by the Department for Education (DfE) to meet the educational needs of early years, school age and all 0 to 25 year old high need pupils, any decisions on how the grant is utilised indirectly affects all settings.

Alternative Provision – Oakfield Project

- 3.2 The Oakfield project has been a successful Key Stage 4 pre-exclusion setting which has provided for between thirty to thirty five pupils at risk of exclusion. It was due to close in 2010 as the local authority felt it could no longer run the provision on financial grounds. At the time though, secondary schools felt that it should continue and took over the management of the project in the belief that they could reduce costs and still run it effectively. Since September 2017, the project has come back under local authority control with a management committee temporarily managing the provision. At the school's forum meeting in December 2017, it was agreed to ensure that additional funding was provided to Oakfield to enable it to have a balanced budget. A budget of £0.150m has been established in 2018/19 and this will be used to partially offset the cost of places commissioned by Swindon Schools and Academies.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

- 3.3 The Oakfield project will move into the EOTAS provision in the academic year 2018/19. This will involve a transition period which is necessary due to the complexities of the site itself and integrating staffing into EOTAS. Once this has been achieved, a further report will be presented to Schools Forum (Spring 2019) to review the funding that will be required to support the project within EOTAS, it is expected that the current budget may be reduced as there should be some efficiencies due to economies of scale.
- 3.4 More information may be obtained from Peter Nathan, Head of Education pnathan@swindon.gov.uk.

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that the Oakfield project will transfer as an entity to EOTAS and this will take place by the 2018/19 academic year (July 2019) (Para. 3.3)**

High Needs update

- 3.5 The transfer of 0.5% schools block (£0.659m) to the high needs block was approved in the expectation that schools forum would be appraised of the intended action in 2018-19 to address the issues around sufficiency for high needs provision within the future envelope of the high needs budget allocation.
- 3.6 The growth in child population continues to be out-matched by the growth in demand for high needs funding at SEN Support and EHCP level. There is multi-agency senior leader engagement with the impact of Swindon's level of demand. There are early indications that the rate of increase in new statutory plans is reducing and that numbers at SEN Support are stabilising.
- 3.7 EHCP data indicates that Swindon continues to identify complex needs at an early age and cessation of plans over time, is not yet a significant or consistent feature.
- 3.8 Based on January 2018 data, new EHCP issued during the 2017/18 year rose by 19.4%, nationally by 14.4%. We refuse initial requests for assessments at a far lower percentage (0.5%) compared with National 22.6% and only a low proportion do not proceed to an issued EHCP 1.7% compared to National 6.7%. The planned review of guidance and decision making criteria will support a better understanding of whether this is appropriate for our local context.
- 3.9 The SEND Strategic Board to underpin the strategic direction of SEND in Swindon, agreed to a strategic action plan with seven work streams.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Work stream <i>What is working well and why, identifying and enabling what needs to change and how we know it is better.</i>	Governance lead <i>Challenge, monitoring, accountability</i>	Key tools/documents
1. Governance and Strategy	SEND Strategic Board	SEND Strategy
2. Performance and accountability	Quality and Improvement sub group	Self evaluation framework (SEF)
3. Joint commissioning and Local Offer	Joint Commissioning Group, ASD Strategy & Early Help Board Quality and improvement sub group	Joint Commissioning Strategy Local Offer compliance & annual reports
4. Participation and engagement	Participation and engagement SEND Board sub-group	Self-evaluation framework
5. Whole system approach to SEND 5a. High Needs Review implementation	SEND Strategic Board & Schools Forum	High Needs Review Report
6. Sufficiency and accessibility planning	SEND Strategic Board Participation and engagement sub group	Sufficiency plan Schools Forum HN paper Accessibility plan
7. Transfers & transitions, preparation for adulthood	Transition Board Participation and engagement sub group	HE and SI strategies

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

- 3.10 Work streams 5 & 6 are of particular relevance to Schools Forum and are likely to carry financial implications. They are a follow up to the High Needs review carried out in July 2017. The LA recommends establishing a High Needs subgroup for a period of two years, Schools Forum are asked to agree to this proposal. Volunteers for the High Needs subgroup will then be sought. This is to oversee and support options appraisal in order to deliver the recommendations set out in the High Needs review and the operational implementation delivered by the work streams. The High Needs review is attached at Appendix A.
- 3.11 The Local Authority review of Special Educational Needs & Disabilities Assessment & Commissioning Team ('SENDACT') have identified potential for both efficiencies and development through work with a new platform and management system provider. This is expected to support a more dynamic and accessible Local Offer platform and potentially a more accessible statutory assessment process for parents and young people, providers and officers.
- 3.12 Further information may be obtained from Roz Pither, Strategic Commissioner Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) 07823 525243
rpither@swindon.gov.uk

Impact of September 2018 increase in places

- 3.13 In 2018/19 the number of specialist places in Special Schools and Special Resource Provision is a net increase of thirty nine from September 2018, to 826. Twenty of the places are in the new Special Free School, Churchward which opens in September 2018, the place funding is currently funded directly by the ESFA. From 2019/20 the place funding will be included in the LA's High Needs budget as per Para. 3.16, this will require a place funding budget of £0.200m in 2019/20 but the change in responsibility is expected to be fully funded in 2019/20 by the ESFA for 2018/19 places.
- 3.14 To maintain the September 2018 provision through 2019/20 it is expected that a further budget of £0.67m of place funding will be required for the net increase of nineteen additional places. Based on budgeted average bandings a further budget in excess of £0.580m for High Needs top ups is estimated to be required for the thirty nine places. All additional places commissioned after September 2018 will increase the pressure on the High Needs block.
- 3.15 The DSG High Needs budget allocation is expected to increase as the pupils filling the September places will be included in the £0.004m per pupil basic entitlement funding. The additional 19 places should increase the 19/20 DSG High Needs allocation by £0.076m.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Update on Special Free School Place funding

- 3.16 ESFA currently hold the budget and provide place funding for Special Free Schools but from April 2019 the responsibility for funding places at Special Free Schools moves to Local Authorities DSG High Needs Block.
- 3.17 The ESFA will provide additional High Needs block in 2019/20 by including the Special Free School commissioned places filled in September 2018 in the basic entitlement (as above) and they will also adjust the 2019/20 DSG High Needs block by £0.006m for each 2018/19 Special Free School place. The LA will notify the ESFA of the number of places to be funded and the ESFA will deduct the place funding from the DSG High Needs Block and pay it to the Special Free School.
- 3.18 Churchward Free School opens in September 2018 with 20 places and is expected to rise to 36 in September 2019. £0.200m place funding will be required in 2019/20 to fund the 20 places open in September for the full year as per the funding requirement in Paragraph 3.13. A further place funding budget of £0.093m is required for the additional 16 places from September 2019. The ESFA's expectation is that the new responsibility for Special Free School place funding in LA's budget will be cost neutral but they are yet to establish how place funding for Special Free Schools growing to capacity will be funded and how to mitigate the cost pressure that significantly increasing place numbers will put on LAs' budgets. The High Needs top up budget will need to be increased for the additional places from September 2019 from within the overall 2019/20 DSG allocation.

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note the High Needs update on the intended actions in 2018-19 (Para. 3.5 – 3.12)**
- **Agree to set up a High Needs Sub Group (Para. 3.10)**
- **Note the 2019/20 full year impact of the increased places in September 2018 (Para. 3.13 – 3.15)**
- **Note the change in responsibility for funding places in Special Free Schools from April 2019 (Para. 3.16 – 3.18)**

Advisory Teaching Services (previously referred to as Commissioned Services)

- 3.19 A full review of Advisory Teaching Services will be on the agenda for the October Schools Forum meeting. The services were previously referred to as Commissioned Services but they are commissioned for and on behalf of schools, so the change in name better reflects this. The October Schools Forum report is

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

expected to bring the outcome of monitoring and review of the services, benchmarking exercise and an options appraisal for consideration for April 2019 and beyond. This is in context of the need to review and rationalise the high needs block expenditure in line with the DSG statutory regulations relating to the ring-fencing of the DSG Schools Block. The 2018/19 Advisory Teaching Services budget can be found in the table below.

Table 1 – Advisory Teaching Services (Previously referred to as Commissioned Services) Budget 2018/19	
Service	2018/19
Commonweal – Physical Impairment Advisory Service	£77,100
Even Swindon – Speech and Language	£22,200
Millbrook – Specific Learning Difficulties Support Service	£66,900
Nylands – Therapeutic services primary SEMH support	£87,410
Red Oaks – Hearing Impaired Support Service (£239.7k) & HI Outreach (£77.5k)	£317,200
Uplands – Autistic Spectrum Disorder	£87,000
Uplands – Junior Autistic Spectrum Condition Support Service	£135,800
Uplands - Visually Impaired and Assistive Technology Support Service	£240,650
Total	£1,034,260
Nylands – Outreach Service - NCOT	Delegated to Primary Schools

- 3.20 Further information on Para. 3.19 may be obtained from Carey Tulloch, SEND Commissioning Manager ctulloch@swindon.gov.uk

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that a full review of the Advisory Teaching Services will be reported to Schools Forum in October (Para. 3.19)**

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Post 16 budget update

- 3.21 The Post 16 academic year runs from August to July, however the DSG is allocated and reported on a financial year basis. Therefore this report is aligned to the financial year.
- 3.22 The total funding available for 2018/19 financial year for post 16 providers (excluding school 6th forms) is £1.875m. Table 2 below shows how the LA's latest 2018/19 commissioning plans compares to the ESFA approved places.

Table 2 – Indicative 2018/19 Academic Year FTE Placements					
	ESFA	Jun-18	Projected	Variance	Notes
	Approved	Actual	Sep-18	Sept To ESFA	
	Places 2018	Placements	Placements	Approved	
Cirencester College	14	6	6	(8)	1
New College	45	81	87	+42	
Swindon College	144	103	78	(66)	
Wiltshire College	4	6	3	(1)	
Colleges Total	207	196	174	(33)	
Training Providers Total	36	24	30	(6)	
ISPs	5	5	4	(1)	2
UET	51	48	58	+7	3
ISP's Total	56	53	62	+6	
Unknown destinations	0	88	87	+87	4
Overall Total	299	361	353	+54	5

- 3.23 The LA expects to fund element 3 top ups for a total of 353 students during the 2018/19 academic year which is an increase of 60 over the ESFA approved placements collated through the High Needs Return. Returns have only allowed limited amendments and our commissioned places remain largely fixed, we are

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

not able to control high needs places at provisions out of area such as Cirencester College or at independent provision such as UET.

3.23.1 Note 1 – This year we are projecting that numbers will exceed the commissioned places. Element 2 funding for approved providers is allocated on a lagged learner basis by the ESFA in line with the October census data.

3.23.2 Note 2 – A total of 4 ISP placements are now expected. Element 1 and 2 is funded on a lagged basis in the same way as FE Colleges and training providers, funding for unused places cannot be rerouted back to the LA and this number is not subject to change through the High Needs Return annually.

3.23.3 Note 3 – The ESFA currently fund 45 placements at UET. Element 1 and 2 is funded on a lagged basis in the same way as FE Colleges, training providers and other ESFA approved ISPs. The college had put forward an exceptional case for additional Element 2 funding to account for continued growth, however this has been refused by the ESFA.

3.23.4 Note 4 – There are 87 students identified as meeting the high needs criteria where a post 16 destination is not yet known. This is normal at this time of the year.

Members of the Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note the LA's latest estimate is that a total of 353 FTE post 16 (excluding sixth form) high needs students will need to be financed during the 2018/19 academic year (Para. 3.23)**

Proposed 2018/19 ISP costs

- 3.24 For placements at Independent Specialist Provider Colleges (ISPs) including the Uplands Educational Trust ('UET'), annual costs are at individually negotiated rates. Pupils attend ISPs when their needs cannot be met within the mainstream or special school 6th form, or mainstream FE College provision with additional support or a bespoke package. Where appropriate, placements are jointly commissioned with social care and health agreeing contributions. ISP placements from September 2018 are estimated at 62 places with 2018/19 financial year costs of £0.338m.
- 3.25 In September 2014 the Universal Banding approach was implemented in all FE Colleges and Training Providers for High Needs students. The banding scheme was based on the model already used in special schools and SRPs. All students are funded at the same level and a range of supplements were agreed. Students

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

have been allocated against the same 6 prime need bandings used for special school and SRPs and indicative post 16 banding values were calculated based on the funding envelope provided by the ESFA for the new responsibilities as calculated below:

3.25.1 Total funding envelope financial year **£1.875m**.

3.25.2 Less term 5 and 6 costs from the 17/18 academic year **£0.425m**

3.25.3 Balance available for terms 1-4 of the 18/19 academic year **£1.450m**
(September-March)

3.25.4 Less ISP costs September – March (see table 3 below) **£0.316m**

3.25.5 Balance available for FE Colleges and Training Providers September – March **£1.134m**

3.26 At this stage in the year the LA is unable to confirm precise funding allocations for individual providers because some students have not confirmed their placements for the 2018/19 academic year yet. The table below provides the LAs best estimates which are as follows

Table 3 – Indicative 2017/18 Academic Year Allocations					
	Actual Places June 2018	Latest Estimated places Sept 2018	2018/19 Financial Year payment April – Aug	2018-19 Financial Year payment Sept - March	Financial Year Total April 2018-March 2019
Cirencester College	6	6	£6,427	£8,998.15	£15,425
New College	81	87	£189,228	£264,919.44	£454,148
Swindon College	103	78	£173,719	£145,568.17	£319,287
Wiltshire College	6	3	£10,183	£8,306.57	£18,490
FE College Total	196	174	£379,557	£427,792	£807,349
Training Providers Total	24	30	£23,235	£95,446	£118,682
ISPs	5	4	£78,215	£151,384	£229,600
UET	48	58	£226,131	£385,298	£611,429
Income from Social Care			(£282,187)	(£220,486)	(£502,673)
ISP Total	53	62	£22,159	£316,197	£338,355

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Contingency	88	87	0	£230,362	£230,362
Overall Total	361	353	£424,951	£1,069,798	£1,494,749

- 3.27 The projection based on the current known student numbers and the bandings allocated would mean a total financial year spend of £1.495m, this is £0.380m below the current budget of £1.875m. This is partly because of an increase in special school 6th form places. The banding values / contingency will be reviewed as part of the report to be presented to Schools Forum in October.
- 3.28 A contingency budget of £0.230m has been established for the period September-March for the identified pupils who are high needs where a destination has yet to be confirmed.
- 3.29 A local funding formula was devised and implemented in September 2014 to distribute the available funding to FE Colleges and Training Providers. Based on current projections of student numbers it is recommended that the 17/18 banding values are maintained. However, this will be reviewed following enrolment in the new academic year if there is a significant variance in actual take up of places. Table 4 below shows the proposed funding values for September 2018.

<u>Table 4 – Proposed 2018/19 Post 16 High Need Band Values & Supplements</u>			
<u>Universal Banding Descriptor</u>	<u>Values 2017/18 Academic Year (AYr)</u>	<u>Indicative Values 2018/19 AYr</u>	<u>Difference in Value</u>
Band 1 – 100%	£7,910	£7,910	£0
Band 2 - 90%	£7,119	£7,119	£0
Band 3 - 60%	£4,746	£4,746	£0
Band 4 – 37.5%	£2,966	£2,966	£0
Band 5 - 30%	£2,373	£2,373	£0
Band 6 – 15%	£1,187	£1,187	£0
<u>Supplements</u>			
Medical Needs	£750	£750	£0
Manual Handling	£500	£500	£0
Transition	£250	£250	£0
Workshop / High Risk Environment	£400	£400	£0
Open campus	£250	£250	£0

- 3.30 It is not possible to fund post 16 providers (excluding school sixth forms) at the same level as schools due to the funding levels available.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

- 3.30.1 Medical Needs: for students with a significant medical need that would require a high level of medical assistance/supervision.
- 3.30.2 Manual Handling: for students with a disability that would require a significant level of manual handling.
- 3.30.3 Transition: for students who are transferring from a Special School or Special Resource Provision on band 1 or 2. This supplement would only apply during the first year at College.
- 3.30.4 Workshop / high risk environment: for students working in a higher risk learning environment that would require additional support/supervision.
- 3.30.5 Open campus: for students who are socially or emotionally highly vulnerable, as a result of their SEN needs, and require closer supervision when attending an open campus environment.
- 3.31 More information on Para. 3.21 – 3.30 may be obtained from Carey Tulloch, SEND Commissioning Manager ctulloch@swindon.gov.uk

Members of the Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note the annual allocations for categories of providers and the overall financial year and academic year budget position shown in Table 3 (Para. 3.27)**
- **Note a contingency budget of £0.230m for 88 identified high needs students with no confirmed destination in the financial year (Table 3)**
- **Note that the current budgeted figures would result in an underspend of £380k, and that the banding values / contingency will be reviewed as part of the October Schools Forum report (Table 3)**
- **Agree the 2018/19 indicative banding values shown in Table 4**
- **Note that the indicative banding values will be reviewed if there is significant variance in actual take up of places (Para. 3.29)**

Early Years Funding Processes

- 3.32 Early years funding is currently paid to providers via a digital solution supplied by Capita One. Providers submit headcount information through Tasks; Interim Task submitted prior to start of term and equates to 50% of 3 and 4 year old funding and 75% of 2 year old funding paid up front, Actual Task which is the balance (remaining 50% of 3 and 4 year old funding and 25% of 2 year old funding) and finally an Amendment Task which allows for any changes to be

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

accounted for such as increase in hours or new starters. Each Task takes places each term (Summer, Autumn and Spring). In total there are nine Tasks over a financial year.

- 3.33 Each Task involves time and resource commitment from providers, early years funding team, finance team and ICS team to administer. Schools Forum Members are asked to approve a consultation with stakeholders to explore the possibility of removing one Task from each term. The proposal is to replace the Interim Task with the Actual Task. The Amendment Task would remain unchanged. This would leave two Tasks per term, reducing the total tasks over a financial year by three.
- 3.34 To ensure providers are not financially burdened by this change the proposal is to increase the funding paid up front at the start of term for 3 and 4 year olds to 75%. This is in line with the rate 2 year old funding is paid. With the introduction of 30 hours free childcare policy providers are now more dependent on the income received through early years education funding and therefore this should be recognised.
- 3.35 As part of the consultation providers will be given the opportunity to provide feedback with regards to demand for monthly payments as opposed to a percentage of whole terms funding paid up front. This is in line with Department for Education recommendations that local authorities should give providers the option of being paid monthly from September 2018.
- 3.36 The proposal is to carry out a consultation during the autumn, reporting findings to January's Schools Forum meeting for implementation of any changes prior to commencement of the summer term 2019.

Members of the Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Agree a stakeholder consultation by the Early Years team to assess the impact of reducing the number of Tasks per term, and to increase the funding paid up front for 3 and 4 year olds from 50% to 75% and also to assess demand for monthly payments (Para. 3.33)**
- **Note that following the consultation the outcome will be reported to January's Schools Forum meeting for implementation prior to the commencement of the summer term 2019 (Para. 3.36)**

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Early Years Funding Rates – 3 and 4 year olds

- 3.37 Since April 2017 Early Years providers have been given the option of selecting three different funding rates for 3 and 4 year olds. The three rates are dependent on flexibility as follows:
- 3.37.1 Base rate £3.86 + £0.14 enhancement which equals £4.00 per hour for Providers who deliver funded places term time only, and offer funded sessions for fewer than 10 hours per day.
- 3.37.2 Base rate £3.86 + £0.14 enhancement + £0.35 flexibility supplement, which equals £4.35 per hour for providers who deliver funded places all year round (at least 48 weeks of the year), and offer funded sessions for fewer than 10 hours per day
- 3.37.3 Base rate £3.86 + £0.14 enhancement + £0.70 higher flexibility supplement = £4.70 per hour Providers who deliver funded places all year round (at least 48 weeks of the year), and offer funded sessions consecutively for 10 hours per day or more
- 3.38 There are a number of providers who could operate flexible all day sessions (at least 10 consecutive funded hours per day) however are prohibited from offering all year round (at least 48 weeks per year) sessions due to lack of premises out of term time, for example PFI schools. These providers are offered no incentive to offer this so are limited to the lower funding rate which doesn't make offering the flexibility financially viable.
- 3.39 The proposal is to consult on a change to amend the middle funding rate to include providers who offer funding sessions consecutively for at least 10 hours per day OR at least 48 weeks per year.
- 3.40 The consultation would be included as part of the wider consultation proposed to cover Early Years Funding Processes.
- 3.41 More information on Para.3.32 – 3.40 may be obtained from Danielle Maundrell, Strategic Commissioning Manager – Early Years Planning 07769 281726 dmaundrell@swindon.gov.uk

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Agree a stakeholder consultation assessing the impact of amending the middle rate funding criteria for 3 and 4 year old funding (Para. 3.39)**

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Notional SEN formula

- 3.42 The new local formula for financing maintained Swindon schools and academies (as if they were maintained schools) is expected to impact on the Notional SEN formula calculation. The current Notional SEN formula includes the funding allocated for Low Prior Attainment and 40% of Deprivation funding (Free School Meals allocation based on Ever 6 ('FSM') and Income Deprivation Affecting Child Indices ('IDACI')) is deemed to be SEND related. The formula also includes a small percentage, 0.23% in January 2018, of the Age Weighted Pupil Unit funding, this element is flexed to ensure the budget of £0.400m is maximised but not overspent.
- 3.43 The values for all of these formula factors have changed significantly in 2018/19 and there is a new FSM factor. Modelling of options for the 2018/19 Notional SEN formula will be shared in consultation with mainstream schools and academies at the start of the autumn term. The outcome of the consultation will be presented to Schools Forum for deliberation and agreement of the 2018/19 Notional SEN formula.

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that a consultation will take place on options for the 2018/19 Notional SEN formula (Para. 3.43)**

Termination of employment costs

- 3.44 In Swindon we are transforming our services through a number of work streams in the Swindon Programme. We would like to drive out efficiencies and savings in all service areas, however due to the current School Funding Operational guidance and Finance Regulations. In the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2017 it states that Schools Forum can approve the charging of termination of employments costs to the DSG in year if the savings achieved are equal or greater than the costs incurred and approved by Schools Forum or the Secretary of State before April 2013, however Statement 3 of the same regulations states that the costs cannot exceed that of the previous year. Swindon have not charged any termination of employment costs to the DSG since before 2013.
- 3.45 The LA asks for Schools Forum's approval to offset any future DSG termination of employment costs against the savings made in each DSG service area, where the termination of employment costs are less than the savings incurred. This will enable the LA to apply to the Secretary of State for a Disapplication of the Finance Regulations, the disapplication process is expected to be available in November 2018 for 2019/20.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- Agree that the LA can offset any termination of employment costs against the savings made in each DSG service area, where the termination of employment costs are less than the savings incurred (Para. 3.45)
- Note that if agreement is given the LA will apply to the Secretary of State for a Disapplication of the Finance Regulations in autumn 2018 (Para. 3.45)

SEND Capital

- 3.46 On the 4th March 2017 the Department for Education (DfE) announced capital allocations specifically for capital investment in provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disability. Swindon was allocated £977,620 over three years from April 2018 (£325,873 per year). Through this SEND Capital Investment Fund the Local Authority wanted to invest in as many schemes as possible that meet the priorities to enable a greater proportion of children with SEND to benefit from this fund. The Local Authority opened a bidding round for match funded projects in order to increase the overall level of investment in SEND provision, but also meet as wide a range of needs as possible.
- 3.47 The Local Authority received a good response of nineteen bids in total. Within these bids there were a lot of nurture/sensory rooms and well-being spaces, a greenhouse and purchase of laptops. Thirteen of the bids were approved and six bids were declined.
- 3.48 Taking into account the thirteen successful bids the total amount of Capital investment funding comes to a total of £279,811.69 with the schools contributing a further 25%. A summary of the bids is set out in Appendix B.
- 3.49 Further information may be obtained from Gareth Cheal, Education Place Planning and Admissions Manager gcheal@swindon.gov.uk

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- Note the update on SEND Capital (Para. 3.46 – 3.48)

Basic Need Funding

- 3.50 In May 2018 the Government announced a nationwide allocation of £630m to Local Authorities to provide a basic need of places for 19/20. However, due to

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

the number of new settings planned to open and offer capacity, Swindon were not allocated any basic need funding along with approximately a third of LAs across the country. Officers will review the school place planning requirements for 2019/20, but with additional secondary places opening at the Deanery and additional primary school places opening at William Morris School and potentially Badbury Park, the initial indications are that there will be sufficient capacity.

- 3.51 Further information may be obtained from Gareth Cheal, Education Place Planning and Admissions Manager gcheal@swindon.gov.uk

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note the update on Basic Need Funding (Para. 3.50)**

Free Schools

- 3.52 In May 2018 the Government announced a new free school wave, which will enable Multi Academy Trusts ('MAT') to apply for new provision in November 2018. The LA has been in discussion with a number of MATs and are actively promoting bids for four new schools in new housing developments around Blunsdon and to the East of Swindon. The Free School wave aims to prioritise thirty five schools in areas of basic need and low standards, but also wants to increase the number of new free schools in the North of England.
- 3.53 It is likely that Swindon will have strong bids submitted and the indication is that the successful schools will be announced in early 2019.
- 3.54 In addition the free school guidance included information about a specific primary/Alternative Provision ('AP') free school wave, with more information being released in summer 2018. The guidance states the DfE will invite local authorities to submit Expressions of Interest (EOI) in summer 2018. Once they have decided which EOIs should be taken forward, the DfE will run competitions in the successful areas and invite applications to open around thirty special and AP free schools. Further information will be reported to Schools Forum in October 2018.
- 3.55 Further information may be obtained from Gareth Cheal, Education Place Planning and Admissions Manager gcheal@swindon.gov.uk

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note the update on Free Schools (Para. 3.52 – 3.54)**

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

Consultation on 2019/20 Local Funding Formula for Schools and Academies

- 3.56 In setting the 2018/19 and 2019/20 individual school budgets (ISB) the LA has the option to either use the National Funding Formula ('NFF') formula school funding allocations or to agree a local formula with Schools Forum to enable the LA to deal with local issues including Pupil Growth, subject to consultation with schools and academies. In anticipation of the 2019/20 NFF technical guidance and funding allocation and the timetable information being released by the ESFA, the LA is expecting to hold a consultation on 2019/20 local funding formula with schools, academies and other stakeholders in the autumn.
- 3.57 The LA will arrange a consultation event for all stakeholders to be held in November (provisional date is Tuesday 20th November in the Council Chambers).
- 3.58 The LA anticipates that it will need to arrange an extraordinary Schools Forum meeting in December to agree the formula and principles that will be applied to the funding allocated to Swindon for 2018/19. This will enable the decision on the final formula for 2019/20 to be made at the January Schools Forum meeting. Further information will be presented at the October Schools Forum meeting.

Members of Schools Forum are now asked to:

- **Note that the LA will arrange a consultation event for all schools and academies in November (Para. 3.57)**
- **Note that an Extraordinary Schools Forum meeting may be required to agree on principles of the new formula for 2019/20 (Para. 3.58)**

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 Members of the Forum may provide alternatives in the course of the meeting.

5. Implications, Diversity Impact Assessment and Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

- 5.1 Various financial implications are included in this report relating to management of the retained DSG budget.

Legal and Human Rights Implications

- 5.2 Legal and Human rights implications have been taken into account in preparing this report. It is considered that the recommendations are compatible with Convention Rights.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Anne Mackay, Finance Manager - Education on 07795 256545 or amackay@swindon.gov.uk

2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant Update

Schools Forum

Date: 18th July 2018

All Other Implications (including Staff, Sustainability, Health, Rural, Crime and Disorder)

- 5.3 No additional implications were raised in the preparation of this report.

Diversity Impact Assessment

- 5.4 The proposals within this report are designed to allocate funding targeted at disadvantaged pupils and at pupils with low prior attainment and / or special education needs in order to narrow the attainment gap between these and other pupils.

Risk Management

- 5.5 Any specific risk management implications are highlighted in the body of the report.

6. Consultees

- 6.1 The Board Director, Resources (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None.

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A - High Needs Review
8.2 Appendix B – SEND Capital summary

Swindon

Review of The High Needs Block

July 2017

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1.1 Evidence	4
1.2 High Needs Review Steering Group.....	4
1.3 Recommendations.....	4
1.4 Next Steps- Addressing the Recommendations	6
2.0 CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW	6
2.1 Objectives	6
2.2 Outcomes	6
2.3 Evidence Base.....	6
2.4 Swindon Council Commission	7
2.5 Quality Assurance	7
2.6 Definition.....	7
2.7 The 2015 Review of the Specialist Provision in Swindon for Special Educational Needs (SEN)	9
3.0 REQUIRED OUTCOMES	9
3.1 The Overarching Purpose.....	9
3.2 The Objectives of the Review are to:	9
3.3 Four key outcomes are envisaged flowing from the Review:	9
3.4 Strategic Planning	10
4.0 THE HIGH NEEDS BLOCK	11
4.1 School Funding for Special Education Needs	11
4.2 Element 1 and Element 2	11
4.3 LA Central Funding for Special Educational Needs–The High Needs Block	11
4.4 High Needs Place Funding.....	12
4.5 High Needs Funding Operation Guide 2017-2018.....	12
4.6 The High Needs Block in Swindon	13
4.7 The Operation of the High Needs Block	16
4.8 Swindon Top-Up Values	17
4.9 The Band Values	18
4.10 Mainstream School Top-Up Bands.....	18
4.11 Swindon Special Schools and Special Resource Provision (SRPs) Top-Up Bands	21
4.12 Education Other than at School (EOTAS) (Alternative Provision)	23
4.13 Exclusions	24
4.14 Identification of SEMH	26
4.15 EOTAS Funding	29
4.16 Post-16	30
4.17 Out of Borough Placements	32
5.0 THE PATHWAYS TO ASSESSMENT	32
5.1 Information guide and applications for high needs assessments	

6.0 FEEDBACK FROM PARENTS AND	33
6.1 Parent and Carer Forum	
6.2 Feedback provided by PAC	
6.3 Impact on the High Needs Budget	
6.4 Education Psychology Service	
6.5 Labelling Children	
7.0 THE VIEWS OF THE SCHOOLS	34
7.1 Questionnaire responses – mainstream schools	
7.2 Questionnaire responses – special schools	
8.0 ANALYSIS	36
8.1 High Needs Block spending patterns.....	36
8.2 The Operation Guide.....	36
8.3 Not a mainstream culture?.....	37
8.4 Funding complexities	37
8.5 School pressures.....	37
8.6 Learning Need.....	37
8.7 Some conclusions from analysis.....	37
8.8 Parent approval of the current system.....	38
8.9 Out of Borough placements.....	38
8.10 Improving the SEND educational framework.....	38
9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	39

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Swindon Borough Council commissioned a review of its High Needs Block funding in April 2017 as required by the Department for Education.

The review took place between 24 April 2017 and 19 July 2017 and was carried out by external consultant, Andrew Blow. The purpose was to review and advise on the way that the High Needs Block is used in the Borough of Swindon, and advise on how best to use mainstream, specialist and alternative provision across the area.

The objectives were to:

- Support Swindon Borough Council to deliver better outcomes for children and young people
- Enable a better fit between needs and services
- Look at ways to raise levels of satisfaction with SEND
- Provide better value for money
- Improve relationships between service users and providers.

1.1 Evidence Base

The evidence base for this review included consulting with a range of key stakeholders including:

- Head teachers of special schools
- Parents and carers
- Headteacher of EOTAS
- SENDCos in schools and settings
- Swindon Association of Secondary Heads
- Swindon Association of Primary Heads
- Finance Officers at Swindon Borough Council (SBC)
- Principal Education Psychologist SBC
- SBC Lead Officer for Exclusions
- Lead SENAT officers

In addition, a range of documentation was analysed including:

- SBC Local Offer website
- The SEN Performance Scorecard. (SEN 2)
- The High Needs Budget finance spreadsheets
- Exclusion Reports
- EOTAS Funding Reports
- High Needs LA Benchmarking Tool

1.2 High Needs Review Steering Group

A High Needs Review steering group was set up to monitor the progress of the review and to offer support and guidance as well to consider the recommendations arising out of the review. The group consisted of key stakeholders including Headteachers, parent representation and key local authority officers from education and early help agencies. This group met three times over the period of the review.

1.3 Recommendations

The review generated 14 recommendations covering a range of aspects of issues relating to the High Needs Block funding. These are covered in detail at the end of the report. In summary though the recommendations are as follows:

- 1) There need to be clearer protocols for managing the HNB funding to ensure that the way funding is used and directed is evidence based and meets need.
- 2) There needs to be consistent, evidence-based SEND reasons for any disparities in funding which are clearly evidence based within an SEND context.
- 3) A detailed matrix of descriptors for each level of need within in each area of need is required. This should relate to settings where possible so that the borough can develop a clearly defined continuum of provision.
- 4) There should be agreed costs across services against specific interventions. A matrix could be developed to allow this to happen across education, health and social care.
- 5) The same rates should apply for SEN Support interventions in schools to enable schools to cost Element 2 costs.
- 6) There needs to be a secure and clear set of protocols for information sharing and decision making between SEN, Social Care and the CCG regarding placements in all complex cases.
- 7) The current work to bring clarity to the funding of EOTAS needs to be continued to ensure appropriate funding is in place to meet the needs of pupils in this provision
- 8) The funding of special schools should be reviewed to avoid the use of a complex banding system moving to more of a place based and top-up system. This would give more financial stability to schools.
- 9) A similar funding model as suggested in 8) could be used for SRPs to also provide more financial stability.
- 10) The banding system used for mainstream schools should be retained. However, the banding system should be re-visited to ensure that the values of bands more readily can be applied to the cost of the additional interventions requested or identified by the reports used when making an EHC application.
- 11) Make more use of timed interventions in EHC Plans, for example at times of transition so that the funding can be removed when it is no longer needed without lengthy bureaucracy.
- 12) Consider devolving further an initial portion of HNB funding to schools based on a formula derived from the number children and young people on SEN Support. This will enable the school to quickly access HNB funding when needed. This funding would need to be ring-fenced, individual child or young person focused and separately accountable to the local authority through the governing body.
- 13) There is a need to reverse the current trend of rising exclusions from an already high base and the over-identification of SEMH (behavioural) difficulties through re-focusing on how children and young people learn best (metacognition)¹ and become successful in mainstream schools. An increasing proportion of these children and young people are being excluded from school, either for fixed terms or permanently. The data clearly suggests that a proportion of these have had some other SEN identified prior to being labelled SEMH. Other children and young people with other SEN are also being excluded.
- 14) Re-establish the quality assurance of the use of SEN funding in schools. The outcomes of this process will inform best practice, hold schools to account and ensure the most cost-effective use of HNB funds.

¹ Metacognition – being aware of and making use of an individuals cognitive processes to support learning.

1.4 Next Steps – Addressing the Recommendations

The final High Needs review steering group discussed the final draft report and its recommendations and the report will be considered by the SEND board at its next meeting. The recommendations will be prioritised to enable full discussion with consideration of whether to and how to implement the recommendations. The report will then be taken to a number of other bodies such as the primary, secondary and special school Headteachers groups, an appropriate parents/carers group as well as Schools Forum. A final agreed report will be published on the My Care, My Support website.

2.0 CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

The review took place between 24 April 2017 and 19 July 2017.

The purpose was to review and advise on the way that the High Needs Block is used in the Borough of Swindon, and advise on how best to use mainstream, specialist and alternative provision across the area.

2.1 Objectives

The Objectives were to:

- Support Swindon Borough Council to deliver better outcomes for children and young people
- A better fit between needs and services
- Higher satisfaction
- Better value for money
- Better relationships between service users and providers.

2.2 Outcomes

Four outcomes are expected to flow from this review

1. A revised Strategic Funding Plan for high needs provision
2. More effective collaboration between local authorities
3. Better value for money in special schools and other specialist institutions
4. Improved strategic and operational working with Health and Social care partners.

2.3 Evidence Base

The evidence base for this review included:

- Head teachers of special schools
- Parents and carers
- Headteacher of EOTAS
- SENDCos in schools and settings
- Swindon Association of Secondary Heads
- Swindon Association of Primary Heads
- Finance Officers at Swindon Borough Council (SBC)
- Principal Education Psychologist SBC
- SBC Lead Officer for Exclusions
- SBC Local Offer website
- Lead Officers for EHCP assessments.
- Data from:
 - The SEN Performance Scorecard. (SEN 2)
 - The HNB spreadsheets

- Exclusion Reports
- EOTAS Funding Reports
- High Needs LA Benchmarking Tool

2.4 Swindon Council Commission

In 2015 Swindon Council commissioned a review of the Specialist Provision in Swindon for Special Educational Needs (SEN). That review was triggered by a Cabinet report in September 2014 that showed the relatively high proportion, compared to national, regional and statistical benchmarks, of children and young people (CYP) in Swindon who had a Statutory Statement of SEN and were placed in specialist provision. The review report proposed to commission research to strengthen the LA's understanding of the drivers behind the observed trends, and to use that understanding as a basis for the development of options to reduce trends and/or manage the cost implications.

This report constitutes that next step.

2.5 Quality Assurance

The review was overseen by a project steering group. The core steering group included representatives from the following bodies: Swindon Borough Council (SBC), Swindon Association of Secondary Heads (SASH), Swindon Association of Primary Heads (SAPH) and the Association of Swindon Special School Heads (ASSSH). The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Public Health and Swindon Parent Carer Forum.

2.6 Definition

For the purposes of this review I am identifying that the term "High Needs Provision" reflects the provision that is funded through the High Needs Block.

This provision could be in a mainstream school, in a resourced provision in a mainstream school, or in specialist providers, including special units or, special schools and academies, non-maintained and independent special schools and special post-16 institutions.

2.7 The 2015 Review of the Specialist Provision in Swindon for Special Educational Needs (SEN)

2.7.1 The 2015 review gathered evidence from families, children, service teams, providers as well as data analysis round provision and outcomes.

This review produced and tested a number of hypotheses that impact upon the levels of expenditure in the High Needs Block budget.

These hypotheses focused on the causes behind the following:

1. Swindon identifies and statements (since September 2014 gives EHC Plans) to a relatively high proportion of children and young people (C&YP).
2. More pupils are identified as having BESD (Social, Emotional and Health (SEMH) needs since Sept. 2014) and are excluded from school in Swindon than in many other LAs.
3. Swindon spends more on high needs pupils than many other LAs
4. Outcomes for children and young people with SEND are no better and often less positive than those achieved by children and young people with SEND in other LAs.

The report found support for each of the main hypotheses.

2.7.2 Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 directly impact upon the focus of this current review which is concerned with the level and use of the HNB funding and as such provides significant

evidence for areas which should be addressed when considering the use and levels of HNB funding. Hypothesis 4 relates to the overarching purpose of the HNB and all work with C&YP with SEND which is to improve their outcomes as a consequence of the support and intervention provided.

The contributory factors to the hypotheses, 1, 2 and 3 are:

- A longstanding consensus that significant investment in specialist provision is the best way to meet the needs of the most vulnerable learners.
- The response to a child's or young person's SEND is driven by a deficit model and does not sufficiently focus on the assets, strengths and talents that the child or young person, their family and community can contribute.
- A lack of confidence that mainstream schools, particularly secondary schools have the resources, expertise and confidence to meet a wider and more complex range of SEND with recourse to an EHC Plan.
- Use of Early Help Record identifies some needs that are more social than educational.
- Some children have their needs identified and addressed early enough.
- Not enough children make sufficient progress through SEN Support (including the use of specialist intervention).
- Some pupils do not have their SEND identified and addressed appropriately
- The reliance on specialist provision has limited the extent to which the wider system has assumed responsibility for more vulnerable learners.
- Too many children and young people attend out-of-borough specialist provision
- Sometimes there is only an educational response to needs that have significant social and/or health element.

2.7.3 The report identified a number of key areas for development including:

1. The need to measure the impact of provisions to identify:
 - If children and young people achieve good outcomes,
 - Which provisions give the better outcomes
 - If there are other provisions that could get similar or better outcomes.
2. The need to build capacity and confidence in mainstream schools to meet a wider range of SEND. That there are some pockets of very good inclusive practice across primary and secondary schools.
3. Specialist provision is often suggested as the solution when mainstream schools say they cannot meet needs, or in a crisis with little innovation around mainstream schools meeting needs.

2.7.4 The report questioned the extent to which the level of multi-agency support and expertise that is available in early years is sustained once a child enters full-time education.

2.7.5 The report concludes that “unless something changes the reliance on statutory provision is likely to remain high and that the LA will have to invest further in specialist provision.” The report also highlights the extent to which current policy and practice, “unintentionally channels at least a proportion of children and young people with SEND, who might otherwise have their needs met within [SEN Support] towards [statutory assessment] and specialist provision.”

2.7.6 In determining the appropriateness or otherwise of how the HNB is spent the current review will need to consider the drivers that Swindon uses both consciously and inadvertently to direct the ultimate spend, including the thresholds of need and provision

at which individual schools, colleges and other settings consider that they have exhausted the Element 2 funding for a particular child or young person.

In doing this, the review draws upon the evidence base and findings of the 2015 review and the conclusions in 2.7.3. above.

3.0 REQUIRED OUTCOMES

3.1 The Overarching Purpose

The overarching purpose of the review is to gather information from schools, other providers, parents and young people and neighbouring authorities to review and advise on the way high needs funding is currently used and advise Swindon Borough Council on how best to use mainstream, specialist, and alternative provision across the area.

3.2 The Objectives of the Review are to:

Support Swindon Borough Council to deliver better outcomes for children and young people, and:

1. A better fit between families' needs and the services provided;
2. Higher satisfaction with services;
3. Better value for money, and reduced costs (as long term benefits emerge);
4. Better relationships between those providing services and those using them.

3.3 Four key outcomes are envisaged flowing from the Review:

3.3.1 A revised **Strategic Funding Plan for high needs provision** that makes sure there is an attractive offer for parents and young people which will meet the needs of future cohorts, at a cost that is sustainable. This plan is to demonstrate appropriate respective levels of funding between areas of need and services which could include:

- Measures to support mainstream schools in meeting the SEN of a wider range of pupils, and in retaining them within their school (Inclusion). For example through workforce training, and clear routes to access advisory specialist expertise; e.g. educational psychology service, specialist behaviour support for children and young people with SEMH.
- Review the impact on these developments of the traded EPS arrangements.
- Use existing and new analysis to identify:
 - If there is a need to create or expand within-borough special schools, and/or expand specialist provision attached to mainstream schools (special units or resourced provision);
 - Changes to the capacity and focus of existing specialist places, to cater for past and projected changes to the profile of needs, including additional capacity in ASC, through engagement with potential Free School developments and an increase in complex needs in the borough;
 - Changes in the focus of existing staff development programmes that support staff in providing the best teaching and learning experience for children and young people with SEND as prevalent in Swindon.

3.3.2 **More effective collaboration between local authorities** to secure efficient and consistent delivery across borders and within local authorities of:

- SEN assessment and support services (e.g. consistency of EHC Plan formats)

- Specialist regional provision for more complex needs
- More standardised approaches to high needs top-up funding that facilitate better cost control and reductions in bureaucracy.

3.3.3 Better value for money in special schools and other specialist institutions.

- Evidence for how effectively the current pattern and quality of special educational and alternative provision meets needs in the area. Including feedback from parents and young people on the local offer (including the quality of existing provision and any gaps);
- Evidence for how effectively the current pattern of SEN provision and alternative provision prepares children and young people for adult life (viz: the Four Pathways from earliest years to employment and/or higher education; independent living; participating in society; and being as healthy as possible as an adult)
- Proposals for increasing effectiveness through improved benchmarking of costs and other measures leading to improved procurement of utilities that releases more resources that can be focused on improving the quality of provision and outcomes.

3.3.4 Improved strategic and operational working with Health and Social Care partners and how that is demonstrated in the Local Offer.

- Joint funding for SEND;
- Identifiable linkages within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for SEND and reviews of education, health and social care provision;
- The development and review of the local offer; identification of any gaps in provision with parent/carer/YP feedback and monitoring;
- Ensuring that the local offer is responsive to the needs of local children and young people and their families.

3.4 Strategic Planning

3.4.1 Generate a high level strategic plan based on recommendations. The review should inform the development of a strategic high needs funding plan that sets out how provision should be made, using the high needs funding Swindon expects to receive in future, in a way that works for parents and young people. The review should ensure the pattern of provision is suitable to meet changing needs, that parents and young people find it attractive, and that it will be affordable within future allocations.

3.4.2 The strategic plan should cover the special educational provision offered by early years providers, mainstream and special schools (including academies, and non-maintained and independent special schools), and the range of post-16 institutions (including further education and sixth form colleges, and special schools post-16 institutions) and the way in which those mainstream and special schools and other institutions access the training and workforce development relating to SEN and disabilities they need.

3.4.3 The plan should be developed in consultation with neighbouring authorities, particularly where children with SEN and disabilities from one local authority area receive their special provision in another.

4.0 THE HIGH NEEDS BLOCK

4.1 School Funding for Special Education Needs

The SEND Code of Practice (January 2015) in paras 6.97 to 6.99 states:

“It is for schools, as part of their normal budget planning, to determine their approach to using their resources to support the progress of pupils with SEN. The SENCO, head teacher and governing body or proprietor should establish a clear picture of the resources that are available to the school. They should consider their strategic approach to meeting SEN in the context of the total resources available, including any resources targeted at particular groups, such as the pupil premium.” (6.97)

This will enable schools to provide a clear description of the types of special educational provision they normally provide and will help parents and others to understand what they can normally expect the school to provide for pupils with SEN. (6.98) This information must be published on the school’s website under the SEN Information Report.

Schools are not expected to meet the full costs of more expensive special educational provision from their core funding. They are expected to provide additional support, which costs up to a nationally prescribed threshold per pupil per year. The responsible local authority, usually the authority where the child or young person lives, should provide additional top-up funding where the cost of the special educational provision required to meet the needs of an individual pupil exceeds the nationally prescribed threshold. (6.99)

4.2 Element 1 and Element 2

Schools, colleges and other institutions are funded through their delegated budgets with core funding (Element 1) and a notional SEN budget which is formula based (Element2).

Element 1, the core funding, is the funding a school, college or other institution receives to provide high quality teaching. The Code of Practice (paras 6.36 – 6.43) provides clear guidance regarding the responsibilities of teachers for the “progress and development” of the pupils in their class, including “where pupils access support from teaching assistants or specialist staff.” It describes how for higher levels of need schools should have arrangements in place to draw upon more specialised assessments from external agencies and professionals. Where it is decided that a pupil does have SEN, arrangements for appropriate support should then be made through the school’s approach to SEN Support. SEN Support is a graduated approach clearly described in the Code of Practice, paras 6.44 – 6.55.

For pre-16 pupils with SEN at mainstream schools and academies without specialist provisions, local authorities must provide these schools and academies with sufficient funding in their delegated budget to enable them to support these pupils’ needs, up to the cost threshold of £6,000 per pupil per year. This is called the notional SEN budget. (sometimes referred to as Element 2) Local authorities must specify how much of the funding a school receives through the school funding formula constitutes its notional SEN budget. Should a pupil require further support which costs more than £6,000, the additional funding required should be met by top-up funding from the local authority placing the child at the school. Top-up funding rates are agreed locally (current funding system, DfE March 2016). This is Element 3 and is funded from the High Needs Block Funding.

Thus it can be clearly seen that the criteria for a school applying for additional Element 3 funding are linked to an expenditure threshold.

4.3 LA Central Funding for Special Educational Needs – The High Needs Block

High needs funding from the High Needs Block (HNB) supports 0-25 year olds with SEN

and disabilities (SEND). It also supports those of school age who are not in school because they are excluded or otherwise not able to attend school. Alternative provision (AP) for such children and young people includes pupil referral units and hospital schools.

A child or young person has 'high needs' if their education costs more than approximately £10,000 per year. Funding is allocated to local authorities based on their past spending patterns, with some adjustments to take into account the expanded 0-25 age range and to reflect other funding changes introduced in 2013. (Current Funding System, DfE March 2016)

Pages 13 and 14 of Current Funding System, DfE March 2016, describe in detail the funding system from the High Needs Block. It is for the local authority to determine how much top-up funding it allocates, but top-up funding rates should reflect the additional support costs an institution incurs.

Local Authorities have varied methods of allocating HNB Funding to meet the needs of children and young people in schools, colleges and other institutions who have high level Special Educational Needs.

These methods are linked to the way in which the local authority administers its procedures for assessing, funding and allocating Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Some local authorities devolve some funding from the HNB directly to schools, which enables the schools to fund the provision for a child or young person with high levels of need without having to go through an EHCPI assessment. Other local authorities make it a requirement for a child or young person to have an EHCP in order to access HNB funding. Some local authorities allocate funding on a banding system based upon the levels of need. Other local authorities allocate funding to precisely pay for the support that it has been identified that the child or young person needs.

This variation makes direct comparisons of level of spend and use of HNB funds between Local Authorities less reliable. However the elements that contribute to the higher level statistics do provide useful evidence.

4.4 High Needs Place Funding

Place funding is allocated to an institution and includes the funding pupils and students attract for their core education and basic programmes and to provide a contribution to the additional costs associated with a support package. High needs places are typically funded at £10,000 per year in pre-16 settings, although this amount varies dependent on institution type.

4.5 High Needs Funding Operation Guide 2017-2018

Although many of the pupils and students receiving high needs funding will have either statements of SEN or EHC plans, local authorities have the flexibility to provide high needs funding outside the statutory assessment process for all children and young people with high needs up to the age of 19.

Local authorities are encouraged to work with providers in their area (particularly mainstream schools and academies, early years settings and further education institutions) to ensure there are clear processes for allocating top-up funding, so that the statutory assessment process is not the sole means of securing additional support for children and young people with SEND.

Information about these processes should be published, for example in the local offer of SEND services and provision. This does not replace the statutory right for institutions,

parents or young people to request an EHC plan assessment, but should provide local authorities with greater flexibility in meeting the costs of additional support for those with high needs incurred by institutions. (6.1)

DfE urge local authorities to reduce administrative costs, particularly for institutions with students from multiple local authority areas, by adopting common commissioning approaches with neighbouring authorities and using the same agreements for high needs pupils and students across all institutions. (6.2)

An institution will be allocated funding based on the total number of high needs places. For many high needs pupils or students the institution is named in the statement of SEN or EHC plan. However, for funding purposes, once this place funding is allocated to an institution it is not associated with or reserved for a specific local authority or individual pupil or student. It is for the institution to decide how best to apportion their total allocated place funding across the actual number of local authority commissioned places, taking into account the provision and support that may be specified in the statements of SEN or EHC plans. Once a pupil or student is placed in an institution, the commissioning local authority then agrees an amount of top-up funding for the individual pupil or student over and above the place funding to make up the full cost. The rate of top-up funding may reflect a degree of under or over occupancy of place numbers.

Other factors that could impact on the way local authorities determine the top-up funding for individual pupils and students are:

- The way institutions set their budgets and break down their costs and overheads
- The extent to which local authorities and institutions agree on standardised rates, local banding arrangements and streamlined administration to reduce the need for detailed negotiation of different top-up funding amounts for each pupil or student. Place funding is not withdrawn if an individual does not occupy the place. It provides institutions with a guaranteed budget for the year that gives them a degree of financial stability. A local authority may expect an institution to explain why a specific level of top-up is appropriate for a particular pupil or student before entering an agreement, but cannot seek to recover funding for places which it perceives as being unused from the previous or current academic year. Places should not be earmarked or reserved for a particular local authority. (6.3)
- For those institutions that cater solely for children aged under 5, such as nursery schools, it is not a requirement that places are funded at £10,000, supplemented by top-up funding for individual children. (7.1)

4.6 The High Needs Block in Swindon

The data for this section is derived from the HN Budget 2017-18 and the Budget Summary 2016-2017 Table 2 Schools Budget by sector 2016-2017. The HNB allocation to LAs is similar across the two periods.

4.6.1 Swindon has an HNB income of £30.22 million².

In 2017 this sum is used as follows:

1. Top up funding (individual C&YP)	£15.17 million
2. Out of Borough placements	£ 2.41 million
3. Place funding (Special Schools, Special Resourced Provisions and Alternative Provision)	£8.38 million

² Swindon High Needs Budget.

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 4. Delegated Schools Budget HNB Direct Funding Recoupment | £3.63 million |
| 5. Centrally retained | £0.63 million |

4.6.2 The place funding supports:

569 children and young people in special schools

172 children and young people in Special Resourced Provisions (SRP)

195 children and young people in Alternative Provision (AP), including 10 places purchased at Oakfield for 2018.

4.6.3 For special schools and SRP's

- Place funding is at £10,000 per place.
- Top up funding per children and young people is determined by the band they are allocated.
- Supplements are provided to support additional needs.

4.6.4 For alternative Provisions

- Place funding varies, for some it is a fixed total per year, for others funding is per place at £10,000 per place.
- Top up funding is at £8,700 or £6,250
- Some are funded at a daily rate.
- Some top ups are paid by the excluding school, others from the HNB.

The AP arrangements are further explored in Section 3.13.

4.6.5 The lines in the Budget Summary which relate to the HNB are those used for comparator purposes by the EFA. It is not easy to reconcile the funding lines between the high needs block expenditure sheet and the budget summary. For example in the budget summary there is a figure at line 1.2.5 SEN Support Services. These are defined in the guidance as including:

"The costs of non-delegated centrally retained specialist SEN support services for pupils with or without statements or EHC plans, whether supported directly by the local authority or commissioned by them. This will include services for visual, hearing and physical impairment, specific learning difficulties, speech, language and communication, profound and severe learning difficulties, and autism. You should include:

- the costs of these services for 0-5 year olds
- any costs of providing these services to home educated children
- the costs of early years SENCOs who are centrally managed across a number of early years providers."

4.6.6 This line has an allocated figure of £478,088. There is no comparable figure identified in the High Needs Expenditure Budget for the total of this spend nor the component factors. There is a line in the High Needs Budget that refers to Commissioned Services for £1.3m, which from the definition, could be part identified as SEN Support Services.

4.6.7 These two budget summary documents are overseen by two separate finance teams and there does not appear to be written guidance as to how they relate. This makes it difficult for those overseeing the operating functions of the budget from an SEND strategic perspective, rather than as an accounting exercise, to be able to align budget expenditure with the SEND data to make strategic decisions, nor to make clear comparisons with other LAs for modelling purposes.

4.6.8 This lack of clarity is also significant because this figure plus other lines which contribute to top-up funding have produced the comparator referred to elsewhere in the report which shows that Swindon is a low spender in SEN support services, yet a very high spender in top up funding.

4.6.9 Comparison of Swindon's High Needs Block Funding spend per head with their statistical neighbours³ and England shows that Swindon is a high spending authority on top up funding but a low spending authority on SEN support and inclusion services in maintained schools.

In the table below in the "position" column 1 is highest spending out of 11 comparators and 11 is lowest spending.

Element	Position of Swindon out of 11 against 10 Statistical Neighbours	Spend £	Highest £	Lowest £	England £
Place Funding	4	143	178	71	118
Top Up funding (maintained schools, academies, free schools and colleges)	1	317	317	138	206
Top Up funding (non-maintained and independent schools and colleges)	6	63	175	0	84
SEN support and inclusion Services	9	32	202	29	59
Alternative provision services	2	20	46	0	7
Hospital education services	1	10	10	0	4

4.6.10 In addition, Swindon has in place a number of initiatives to support schools, for example:

- the SEND Champions Initiative which enables key practitioners to support new SENCOs and also to share effective practice
- The Teaching School, an alliance of 47 schools which provides training and support for schools including training for new SENDCOs and in good practice in supporting children with challenging behaviour in Early Years,
- The SEN Forum which brings together all key agencies involved in SEND to discuss and move forward on key SEND issues
- The Nyland Campus Outreach Team also provides support for schools and children with challenging behaviour from Early Years to the end of Year 6.
- School to school support also operates in the borough, for example the support provided by St Luke's School to Beckmead and Jonty Clarke which shows the

³ High Needs LA Benchmarking Tool

impact specialist support and advice can have on reducing exclusions and improving provision.

- The ASC and ARC Advisory service has a team of 8 based at Uplands School and is valued by schools.
- A highly experienced special school Headteacher has been commissioned to review the effectiveness of SRPs and support special schools. He will also pilot a small scale project on reducing exclusions.

In addition to the above, the SEND board meets termly to discuss on and decide/advise on key policy issues relating to SEND within the borough. A transitions board is in place to look at better meeting the needs of young people as they transition on to adulthood and possible continued support from adult services. This board also has a focus on moving towards independent living and the employment and training as appropriate.

4.7 The Operation of the High Needs Block

4.7.1 In order to introduce greater consistency Swindon Borough Council implemented a band based approach of top-up funding for all mainstream students requiring SEND support over and above that provided by the delegated resources. The universal banding was designed to follow the model established for specialist settings and FE Colleges. The model was consulted on in the autumn term 2014 and a pilot scheme was put in place in April 2015. At the September 2015, Schools Forum the pilot was reviewed and it was agreed that this would be implemented from April 2016.

4.7.2 Swindon has a comprehensive guide to the High Needs Funding Arrangements in the local authority that is refreshed each year. This provides detailed information for parents, settings, schools and colleges about the funding arrangements and how to apply for funding giving clear guidance about the information that needs to be submitted and the processes gone through. There is a strong emphasis in the documents on what has been done to support the child's learning and development, what has been successful and what needs to be done further, and what the cost will be.

4.7.3 The guidance notes that the delegated funding allocated to mainstream schools/academies, enables early intervention, and appropriate provision for all students with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities. It states that only in exceptional circumstances should there be a need to apply for Additional High Needs funding or an Education Health and Care (EHC) Plan.

4.7.4 However, whereas the England national figure for the percentage of pupils with an EHC Plan/Statement has been stable at 2.8% for since 2012, the percentage for Swindon rose from 3.5% in 2012 to 3.8% in 2015 and 2016. It has now reduced to 3.7%.

4.7.5 The similar comparison for pupils with SEN Support for England has fallen from 17.0% in 2012 to 11.6% in 2016, and the Swindon figure has fallen from 17.2% in 2012 to 12.9% in 2016. The figure for January 2017 shows a rise 13.3%.

4.7.6 Swindon's statistical neighbours showed a figure very much in line with the England figure for EHC Plans/Statements for this period and for pupils with SEN Support a fall to 9.8%.

4.7.7 The Swindon SEN Scorecard is therefore showing that despite the recent fall by 0.1% the borough is still on a rising trend for EHC Plans compared the falling trend both nationally and with statistical neighbours, and is doing so at a higher level of numbers.

4.7.8 The rate of requests for Statutory Assessment has recently stabilised with a small increase from 39 per 10,000 of the population to 40.4 per 10,000, whereas for England and the statistical neighbours the rate is greater than Swindon's at 45.0 and 43.4 respectively.

4.7.9 The number of requests for Statutory Assessment needs to be seen in the context of other data and the picture is complex. For example in 2015 Swindon refused 22.5% of initial requests for assessments, but in 2016 did not refuse any. Whereas Swindon's statistical neighbours refused 24.3% in 2015 and 31.4% in 2016. For England the figures were 27.4% and 28.2% respectively. When looking at the percentage where a decision was made to assess but then to not issue a plan the figures show:

	2014	2015	2016
Swindon	0.0%	0.7%	3.5%
Statistical Neighbour	8.7%	4.7%	3.3%
England	3.7%	3.8%	4.4%

This data, in turn needs to be seen in the context of; the trend in Tribunal decisions which show an increase in finding for parents who are challenging an LA decision not to assess, and the increased efforts by Swindon SEN Team to seek successful mediation outcomes.

4.7.10 For children and young people at SEN Support, Swindon mirrored the fall in trends from 2012 – 2015, but whereas the national trend has continued downwards, Swindon's trend has begun to rise into 2017. This will place an upward pressure on the HNB.

4.8 Swindon Top-Up Values

4.8.1 As has been noted Swindon has developed a banding system to allocate HNB top-up funding to individual C & YP.

4.8.2 Children in primary and secondary special schools and SRPs are funded through top-ups across 6 bands where Band 1 is the highest value and Band 6 is the lowest value

4.8.3 For the purposes of managing the HNB Swindon uses the standard areas of need.

4.8.4 Taking into account the 8 lines of needs plus the two lines of behavioural support plus two lines for EOTAS this makes 12 lines of funding category supported by:

- 3 nursery bands,
- 6 primary special school bands,
- 6 secondary special school bands,
- 6 mainstream school bands
- 6 post-16 college and training provider bands.

4.8.5 In addition, there are 15 supplements that apply to special schools and SRPs and to a smaller extent to post-16 colleges and training providers.

The SEMH supplements only apply for children and young people in the highest three bands, and the special school supplement for ASD is only available to pupils who are on Band 1. None of the supplements apply to children and young people in mainstream school placements. Within the terminology there is an inconsistency between the use of ASD and ASC.

4.9 The Band Values

Early years and Foundation Stage (EYFS)

4.9.1 Nursery settings are funded at high, medium or low rate according to the decisions made by the assessment panel based on the child's needs. These are hourly rates varying between £12, £8 or £4 per hour. Very clear information is given in High Needs Funding Arrangements 2016-2017 (Swindon Borough Council) regarding the process for Independent Playgroups/Nurseries and Mainstream Nurseries to apply for this funding.

4.9.2 Swindon Portage and Special Tots are funded from the Delegated Schools Budget.

4.9.3 Nursery children with identified SEN can be funded from £238,000 HNB funding via top ups at a high rate of £12 per hour, a medium rate of £8 per hour, or a low rate of £4 per hour.

4.9.4 These rates are provided by Swindon to a setting to support the education of an individual child. If, in doing this, the setting uses this funding to provide additional adult support, the setting will need to provide the on-costs of that employment from within its own budget. Alternatively it may take the cost of the on-costs from the hourly rate. These rates therefore provide very marginal additional resource at a critical stage in a child's development.

4.9.5 The SEN Inclusion Fund is an additional source of income for Early Years providers which is available through the local authority, however, **this information for providers nor parents is not currently readily available on the Swindon Local Offer website, My Care, My Support.**

4.9.6 Children in Koalas pre-school setting for children with SEND are aged 0-4 years 11 months and supported by the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Swindon Borough Council (SBC) through the Social Care budget. The majority of children in Koalas have an existing statutory assessment and EHC Plan, others are being assessed.

4.9.7 The usual pathway from Koalas is to a special school or to a primary school with an SRP. Some go to mainstream school supported by a plan.

4.10 Mainstream School Top-Up Bands

The table below shows the mainstream school top-up values and the difference between a band and the one above it.

Mainstream schools the band values

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6
Primary and secondary band	£8,285	£6845	£5405	£3965	£2525	£1085

values						
Difference from band above	n/a	£1440 17.4%	£1440 21.0%	£1440 26.6%	£1440 36.3%	£1440 57.0%

4.10.1 The Mainstream bands have a consistent difference of value between each band. This has the benefit of being consistent and transparent, however it is a rising percentage difference with the band above because of the decreasing value of that band. **The LA may wish to revisit the decision to have a consistent financial difference when relating the value of the additional support required to the movement of funding from one band to the next.**

4.10.2 When a child leaves a pre-school setting, where they have been receiving support, to enter their primary education they may be assessed for an EHC Plan. If they have not been supported by HNB funding up to this point, a plan makes the HNB funding available. If they have an existing EHC Plan, this will be reviewed. The panel makes a decision about which band of funding the child will receive. This is done based upon the Banding Descriptors. The same set of descriptors apply to learners in all phases and sectors and in some cases the same level of need is used in every band, for example, “has difficulties developing appropriate relationships with peers”.

4.10.3 For a child leaving Early Years at age rising 5 a learning barrier or learning delay may well be linked to a developmental delay. Children at 4 years of age are hugely variable and are progressing along a developmental pathway at very different rates. Consequently the wording “has difficulties developing appropriate relationships with peers” could be identified in response to a range of circumstances that may be developmental, cognitive, social or medical. The descriptors do not take account of these differences.

4.10.4 Interviews with officers working with these descriptors for children moving into their primary school have identified difficulties with using them accurately. For example, “has difficulties developing appropriate relationships with peers” is placed within Cognition and Learning Difficulty, in all six bands but does not appear in “Speech and Language Difficulty”.

4.10.5 The greatest area of difficulty is identified when a child is exhibiting behavioural issues that are very likely to be connected to anxieties about learning and being “normal”. If a child has experienced some learning difficulties in pre-school settings when moving to a primary setting they will carry the issues with them.

I Can Talk Issue 6 (ICAN)⁴ quotes the work of Jerome, A.C., Fujiki, M., Brinton, B. and James, S.L. (2002) Self-Esteem in Children with Specific Language Impairment Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research 45, 4, p700-14 in describing how for many children with SLCN, their language skills are not proficient enough to be used as a learning tool and so they can fail before the task has even begun, and how:

“This can be incredibly frustrating and have a serious impact on how they see themselves and how they are seen by their peers”.

4.10.6 If they have levels of anxiety and frustration related to these they will communicate through behaviour as the strongest communication they have.

⁴ Speech, Language and Communication Needs and Primary School-aged Children- ICAN 2008

McNamara and Moreton⁵ in discussing children's behavioural reactions to feedback reinforcing their academic low self esteem as "destructive, aggressive, a lack of motivation, sullen looks or over-talkative and noisy interruptions."

This will tend to elevate the funding expectations of the receiving school.

4.10.7 When this level of descriptor imprecision is linked to the band differences identified shown in the table above, the difference in funding a child might receive at that transition point in their school journey could be significant.

4.10.8 It could also lead to over funding when viewed in the context of the third bullet point as identified in paragraph 5.14.1 of the 2015 Review:

"A lack of confidence that mainstream schools, particularly secondary schools have the resources, expertise and confidence to meet a wider and more complex range of SEND with recourse to an EHC Plan."

4.10.9 The difference between Band 4 and Band 5 for mainstream schools is shown in the table above. If a child is allocated Band 4 funding when the actual cost of providing the identified support in the EHC plan would lie near the top of Band 5 the borough would be overfunding to the extent of £1440 per year.

4.10.10 The incidence of reducing funding against an EHC Plan is low, as is the incidence of ceasing to maintain a plan (or previously a statement), as evidenced from the school responses, and this compounds the overspend as it becomes generated over the period the child or young person is in education which is up to age 18. The data for the 16 – 19 and 20-25 age groups shows:

	2016		2017	
Age group	Swindon (Jan)	England (Jan)	Swindon (March)	England (Jan)
16 - 19	12.8%	16.1%	19.1%	20.2%
19 - 25	0.1%	0.4%	0.6%	2.7%

4.10.11 Swindon is already seeing growth in the proportion of plans in the older age groups with the greatest movement in the 16-19 year old group.

4.10.12 Evidence from interviews with officers, headteachers and parents shows that the extent to which primary (and secondary schools) feel able, or are able, to be equally inclusive of children with SEN is variable. There is some highly inclusive practice in schools, for example Westrop Primary School, where the various pots of funding are used in an holistic way that is creative and generates good outcomes for children.

4.10.13 Swindon has 13 Special Resourced Provisions supporting 172 C&YP and many are well run according to recent quality assurance visits. There are 6 special schools which cater for 569 children and young people of which 4 are judged good or better (one outstanding school was recently "School of the Year" in the TES awards) one is requires improvement and one is in special measures (it has however, improved significantly due to intervention and will move to join a successful academy chain in January 2018). However, according to a recent Ofsted inspection of one school and recent discussions

⁵ S McNamara & G Moreton Changing Behaviour, David Foulton 2001

with the LA DfE SEN advisor the local authority does need to know its special schools better (there is no SEN adviser to schools). The LA agrees with this assessment and the LA is recruiting an SEN consultant with a background in Lead Inspector/SIP and working in Special Schools.

4.10.14 SENCOs have a legal duty under The Education (Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators) (England) Regulations 2008 (hyperlink) 5.(2)(b) (vii) in

“Promoting the pupil’s inclusion in the school community and access to the school’s curriculum, facilities and extra-curricular activities”.

In addition, the Code of Practice Jan 2015 identifies as a key function for the SENDCO:

“Advising on the deployment of the school’s delegated budget and other resources to meet pupils’ needs effectively” (6.90)

“The SENCO has an important role to play with the headteacher and governing body, in determining the strategic development of SEN policy and provision in the school. They will be most effective in that role if they are part of the school leadership team.” (6.87).

4.10.15 At present Swindon does not have an agreed, published definition of Quality First Teaching which will define the practice threshold (although this is clear with the national Teaching Standards) when Element 2 funding may be required to enable children and young people to make appropriate progress. The SENDCO also has an important function in helping teachers to understand that threshold.

4.11 Swindon Special Schools and Special Resource Provision (SRPs) Top-Up Bands

Primary Special Schools and SRPs

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6
Band Value	£11,668	£10,501	£7,001	£4,376	£3,500	£1,750
Difference from band above	n/a	£1,167 10.0%	£3,500 33.3%	£2625 37.5%	£876 25.0%	£1750 50.0%

Secondary Special Schools and SRPs

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6
Band Value	£12,282	£11,054	£7,369	£4,606	£3,685	£1,842
Difference from band above	n/a	£1228 10.0%	£3,685 33.3%	£2,763 37.5%	£921 20.0%	£1843 50.0%

Primary/Secondary Special School differential

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6
Band value difference	£614	£553	£368	£230	£185	£92
Difference as a percentage of secondary	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%

Special to Mainstream Differential

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Band 6
Mainstream primary	£3383	£3656	£1596	£411	£975	£665

difference from special primary						
Mainstream difference	-29%	-34.8%	-22.8%	-9.4%	-27.9%	-38%
Mainstream secondary difference from special secondary	£3997	£4209	£1964	£641	£1160	£757
Mainstream difference	-32.5%	-38.1%	-26.7%	-13.9%	-31.5%	-41%

4.11.1 The difference between the bands within primary and secondary special schools shows a broadly consistent variation and the primary secondary difference remains constant at 5% of the equivalent secondary band. However, secondary special schools are funded at a band premium over primary special schools. In addition the mainstream to special band differences show a significant variation of between 38% and 9% in the case of primary and 41% to 13.9% difference in the case of secondary.

In mainstream schools 535 out of 592 band awards are in bands 2,3,4,5.

In special schools bands cluster in bands 1,2 and 3 with 427 out of 461 with 14 of the remainder being bespoke.

In SRP's there is a clear peak in band 3 with 83 out of 176, and 159 band awards are in the top 4 band values.

This leaves only 16 out of 176 band awards in the bottom 3 bands and one bespoke band.

4.11.2 These patterns suggests that a review of the place value funding and the top-up funding for each special school, based upon the profile of needs of the population of each school, could reveal that an increased place value plus funding to meet the cost of additional bespoke provision would provide:

- A reduced bureaucratic process,
- More focused funding,
- A more consistent budget with which to manage the school staffing.

4.11.3 A more clearly defined continuum of provision from mainstream SEN Support, mainstream EHC Plans, SRPs and special schools to low incidence, high level out of borough placements, which enables in-borough special schools to effectively meet higher level needs than is currently the case, combined with place funding that supports the described provision would generate the possibility of reducing the cost of out of borough placements.

4.11.4 Supplements

Supplement funding is identified within the top-up funding for primary and secondary pupils in special provision, and for a limited number of supplements, for post-16 providers. The supplements give additional funding on a personalised basis for:

- Manual handling (including Post-16)
- Medical needs (including Post-16)
- ASD in SRPs
- ASD in band 1
- Access to mainstream inclusion
- SEMH (3 levels for high band C&YP)
- Therapy (3 levels)

- Teaching requires British Sign Language
- Transition (Post-16 only)
- High Risk Areas (Post-16 only)
- Open Campus (Post-16 only).

4.11.5 The total spent on supplements in 2016-17 fell compared to 2015-16 by £160,595, (8.5%). During the same period the only supplements that saw an increase in funding were medium and high level SEMH at an increase of £18,240 and £42,750 respectively. All other supplements saw a fall in funding levels.

4.11.6 This fall in funding is reflected in a drop in the children and young people receiving supplements of 239. The fall came from all supplements bar the high and medium level SEMH supplements which saw an increase of 10 and 6 children and young people respectively.

4.11.7 The local authority has come to an agreement with Schools Forum to release HNB funding without, or prior to, getting an EHC Plan. The SEN Service is requiring schools to provide detailed provision maps to show how the existing funding for a child or young person is used to support their SEN, and its impact, when applying for an EHC plan or a revision of funding under an EHC Plan. This type of fiscal control will need to be rigorously extended to the early release funding and should not slow the process as every children and young people who is on SEN Support should have such a plan to show how their Element 2 funding is used.

The July 2017 DfE note of visit indicates that there needs to be greater clarity around what constitutes Quality First Teaching with schools and parents. This may give rise to a lack of clarity regarding the threshold for using Element 2 funding in schools and the threshold for requests for statutory assessment – although as noted earlier, a national definition is in place. Furthermore, the focus (for example within Ofsted) has focused much more on learning and outcomes.

4.12 Education Other than at School (EOTAS) (Alternative Provision)

Swindon currently operates with the following Alternative Provision for children and young people who have been permanently excluded from mainstream schools, or are unable to attend mainstream school for some other reason or vulnerability.

Name	Phase	Size
The PRU at Stratton	Secondary	45
Riverside	Sec	45
Marlborough House	Hospital School	20
LA tuition Service	Sec	70 available but actual numbers vary from low in September to high in the summer.
Oakfield		35
Nylands	Primary	8

The Hospital School provides education for inpatients at the Children's Unit in the Great Western Hospital

The Oakfield is a consortium offer by secondary academy schools. It is currently under review as the consortium has broken up and the local authority is now stepping in to manage the setting. It is not run by EOTAS, but EOTAS has purchased 10 places at £10,000 each for 2017-2018.

The Tuition Service will join EOTAS in a transition period from September 1st 2017 until April 1st 2018.

To improve the quality of provision, two new buildings have been bought to rehouse EOTAS and the Tuition service as previous buildings have not been up to standard and not been able to provide a broader curriculum offer.

4.12.1 In addition there are two special schools for children and young people with social, emotional and mental health needs. The primary school has 42 places and the secondary school 77 places. The primary school is used as the provision to support primary aged pupils permanently excluded and who have an EHC Plan.

4.12.2 Swindon reserves 203 places for children and young people whose behaviour is such that they cannot be educated in mainstream schools, and 119 places in special schools for children and young people with Social Emotional and Mental Health Needs.

4.12.3 The percentage of new EHC Plans during the year in 2016 given to children and young people in alternative provision was 4.1% which was significantly higher than the figure for England as a whole (1.0%). For 2017 (May) the figure for Swindon is lower at 2.1% with England at 1.1%, but the accounting period is not finished.⁶

4.12.4 This data indicates that Swindon is investing significantly in supporting the education of C&YP who have been identified as having Social Emotional and Mental Health needs, or are unable to attend mainstream school because of their behaviour.

4.13 Exclusions

Comparative data⁷ for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 shows

Primary Sector

Academic year	Number of permanent exclusions	Number of FTE's	Number of pupils with FTE	Total days FTE
2015/16 end term four	4	201	105	274
2016/17 end of term four	9	220	95	383

This shows a 9% rise in fixed term exclusions (FTE), and the days lost to education has risen by 40%. 20 schools have excluded pupils and 44% of the FTEs have come from one school.

⁶ Swindon SEN Performance Scorecard May 2017

⁷ Swindon Exclusions Report end of Term 4 2017

Secondary Sector

Academic Year	Number of permanent exclusions	Number of withdrawn permanent exclusions	Number of FTE's	Number of pupils with FTE	Total days FTE
2015/16 end of term four	12	19	592	345	1173
2016/17 end of term four	31	23	855	460	1773

4.13.1 These data show a 158% increase in permanent exclusions in 2016-2017 compared to the same period in 2015-2016 with one school accounting for 26% of the permanent exclusions.

4.13.2 The number of FTE's has risen by 263 (44%) and days lost to education has risen by 600 (51%).

4.13.3 Five secondary schools used the practice of permanently excluding a pupil and then withdrawing the exclusion. There were 23 such events in 2016-2017 which means, in effect, that secondary schools responded to the behaviour of 54 young people this year by permanently excluding them in the first instance.

4.13.4 The percentage of children and young people with an identified SEN receiving at least 1 fixed term exclusion most recent data.⁸

		2012/13 %	2013/14 %	2014/15 %
SEN Support	Swindon	6.5	6.1	6.0
	Statistical Neighbours	5.7	5.8	n/a
	England	5.4	5.1	5.6
EHC Plan/Statement	Swindon	10.8	8.3	8.1
	Statistical Neighbours	6.2	6.0	n/a
	England	6.6	6.4	6.3
All SEN	Swindon	6.1	6.5	6.4
	Statistical Neighbours	4.6	5.8	n/a
	England	5.5	5.4	5.7

This data shows that Swindon consistently excludes more children and young people from mainstream education who have identified SEND than their statistical neighbours and in England as a whole.

⁸ Swindon SEN Performance Scorecard May 2017

4.13.5 There have been no permanent exclusions from special schools in Swindon for a number of years and the number of fixed term exclusions has fallen by 42% compared to 2015-2016 (due in the main to considerable improvement in practice in one school).

4.13.6 There have been no permanent exclusions within EOTAS and the number of fixed term exclusions and days lost to education value of have both fallen compared to the same period in 2015-2016.

4.13.7 The most recent data for the numbers of EHC Assessments carried out by EOTAS for C&YP who they support having been permanently excluded is

	Total population	Number assessed for EHC Plans this year	Number assessed for EHC Plans last year	Number in each setting with EHC Plans currently	Number in each setting with plans last year
Stratton	42	8	7	2	4
Riverside	61	14	2	8	11
Marlborough House	13	0	0	0	0

4.14 Identification of SEMH

The Swindon data for the trends in identification of primary needs shows no immediately obvious trends other than significant increases in SEMH figures for year groups 5 to 11 at SEN Support level for years 2015-2017. However, when these numbers are tracked for the same cohort year on year, the following patterns emerge.

Cohort in Year 8 in 2016	In 2016 (In Y8) EHC Plans	In 2017 (In Y9) EHC Plans	In 2016 (In Y8) SEN Support	In 2017 (In Y9) SEN Support
MLD	25	9	87	75
SEMH	19	21	73	72

4.14.1 The number of children and young people who have an EHC plan with a primary need of MLD within the same cohort drops from 25 to 9 between Year 8 and Year 9 which suggests that the primary need has been re-identified. There is a similar pattern, though not so marked, for Year 9 into Year 10 (29 to 20), and for Year 10 into Year 11 (29 to 20). When the total cohort is looked at (Years Nursery to Year 11) the number of MLD plans drops from 197 to 118, whereas the number of plans for other primary needs remain broadly constant.

A similar pattern can be seen for SEN Support with MLD dropping from 1149 to 1073, but SEMH primary needs rise (829 to 902).

As has been noted above, the number of permanent exclusions has risen from 12 to 31 and the number of fixed term exclusions from 592 to 855.

4.14.2 Comparative data from the DfE for the most recent years available (Swindon 2015 and 2016, England 2016)⁹ shows:

⁹ Swindon SEN performance scorecard

SEMH

SEN Support	2016	2017
Swindon	21.1%	21% to date
England	17.3%	Not yet available

EHC Plans Statements	2016	2017
Swindon	17.4%	15.9% to date
England	12.3%	Not yet available

SLCN

SEN Support	2016	2017
Swindon	15.4%	15.9% to date
England	20.9%	Not yet available

EHC Plans Statements	2016	2017
Swindon	19.9%	10.9% to date
England	14.0%	Not yet available

MLD

SEN Support	2016	2017
Swindon	27.3%	23.7% to date
England	26.8%	Not yet available

EHC Plans Statements	2016	2017
Swindon	12.4%	10.4% to date
England	13.4%	Not yet available

These data show that, compared to England as a whole, Swindon identifies more children and young people as requiring support for SEMH at both SEN Support and EHC Plan and uneven patterns in SLCN and MLD.

4.14.3 Whereas these data do not give a definitive picture, they suggest that there are underlying issues that are impacting upon the number of children and young people who are being excluded from schools with identified or unidentified SEN.

1. The highest proportion of exclusions are for “Persistent Disruptive Behaviour”¹⁰,

¹⁰ Swindon Exclusions 2017 04 Report

Reason for Exclusion 2016-2017	FTE total	FTE %	PEX Total	PEX %
Persistent Disruptive Behaviour	598	42	15	37
Physical Assault against an Adult	109	8	12	29
Physical assault against a Pupil	225	16	8	20
Verbal Abuse against an Adult	213	15	3	7
Verbal Abuse against a Pupil	64	4	2	5

2. Swindon has a high, and rising proportion of children and young people identified as having social and emotional and mental health difficulties.
3. Swindon has relatively low comparative funding of SEN support services and high levels of HNB support spending.
4. Swindon invests significantly in support services for behaviour and SEMH in the primary phase.
5. Swindon is experiencing an increasing number of exclusions especially within the secondary phase.
6. The pattern of primary needs (4.15.0) and the high number of FTE's for persistent disruptive behaviour suggests that primary needs are being re-identified from learning to SEMH with disruptive behaviour being an issue.
7. The case studies received from special schools show that they are addressing underlying issues that are causing the children and young people behavioural responses.
8. Words such as "anxiety", "frustration" are common plus the increased incidence of ASD.

4.14.4 As has been noted above (3.11.4) going to school is a major event in a child's life. They become part of large numbers of children of their own age attending and they wish to be part of that "normal" group. Research shows that they go expecting to learn and to make friends because that is what they have been told school is about. If they have a learning barrier, they find that something is causing them not to fulfil that expectation in the same way as those with whom they wish to be friends. If they are supported with this barrier and they acquire the skills of resilience or find alternative strategies their self-esteem can remain intact. This process is enhanced if they discover that school is showing them that they have other valuable qualities both to themselves and the people with whom they associate.

4.14.5 Where this does not happen, anxiety and frustration and confusion build which often results in behavioural responses to which schools respond by excluding the child or young person. Schools are under additional pressures to meet performance targets and these provide an additional leverage on the exclusion pathway.

4.14.6 When a child is excluded for their behavioural response the process itself re-confirms to the child or young person that those in authority who are expert and understand these things are rejecting them from the normal system. This provides another layer to:

- Frustration at not learning,
- Fear through not understanding why
- Anxiety that they are different and will become separate.
- And now rejection.

McNamara and Moreton provide a comprehensive, referenced analysis of the antecedents of emotional and behavioural difficulties in Chapter 1 of Changing Behaviour¹¹ that illustrates these processes.

4.14.7 The cost of this to the local authority can be seen in the amount being spent under the supplements and the pressure being experienced by the EOTAS service. The amount spent on SEMH supplements rose by £51,490 between 2015 and 2016 whereas the amount spent on speech and language therapy, occupational therapy and physiotherapy supplements fell by £24,337, £33,990 and £33,907 respectively.

4.14.8 To support behaviour outside the EOTAS system Swindon uses:

- The special school, SRP and mainstream bands,
- An SEMH graduated response Assessment Class band for special schools,
- Two SEMH special schools – Nylands and St Lukes as well as some out of borough provision

4.15 EOTAS Funding

The funding of the different elements of EOTAS makes this quite a complex system from a financial perspective. In summary, the total budget spent is £2.1m and this assumes a traded income of £0.3m.

The sources of income and the amounts of different types of income vary between settings and there needs to be enhanced clarity in the amounts from various funds, nor an immediately clear rationale that lies behind those sums. This is currently being reviewed at length through discussions with secondary schools and other providers.

The available information at the time of this report indicates that:

- The young people in the Tuition Service do not benefit from any top-up funding from the HNB.
- The Tuition Service is funded at a block sum of £880,800.
- Stratton PRU is funded at £10,000 place for 45 places funding plus 45 top-ups of £8,700.
- The Hospital School has fixed funding at £191,500 from the DSG.
- Marlborough House has fixed funding at £276,800
- Riverside is funded per place at £10,000. The school placing the pupil in this setting pays top-ups at £6,250.

4.15.1 From September 2017 the Tuition Service will be included as part of EOTAS.

A detailed piece of work is being done to determine the precise costs and the sources of the funding for children and young people who are not attending fulltime in maintained Swindon Schools with the aim of moving to place funding with top up criteria that provide funding to match need for all and a financial model that supports inclusion and disincentives exclusion.

4.15.2 The budget for the PRU has an “earning target” of £335K.

¹¹ S McNamara & G Moreton Changing Behaviour, David Foulton 2001

This is derived from an agreed formula with schools of between £22 to £28 per day from the 6th day following a permanent exclusion up until the 31 March in that year charged at a maximum 195 days in a school year.

Under this model, the maximum that a secondary school may be charged is between £5,320 to £8,180 for a PEX.

4.15.3 When compared to the cost of intervention to support a young person to remain in school, permanent exclusion appears to be a (financially) preferable option for schools and the current process could be seen as subsidising schools to exclude and moving costs from the schools delegated budgets to central HNB funding.

4.16 Post-16

4.16.1 There are 2 main FE providers, Swindon College and New College. There are a range of training providers such as Catch 22 and Green Labyrinth and the Uplands Educational Trust Training Centre. Crowdys Hill special school has also just opened a post-16 provision.

Attainments for SEN Learners in Swindon by age 19 have fluctuated year on year from 2013/14 to 2015/16. However, the gap between SEN learners' attainments and non-SEN learners' attainments in Swindon is smaller than that for England as whole for Level 2, Level 2 including English and mathematics and for Level 3.

The pressures on the colleges to be able to provide an appropriate range of programmes with appropriate support is becoming increasingly difficult as the demand grows and more learners with SEND stay within the system from age 16 to 19 and 19 to 25. In addition the numbers of those returning to seek education beyond 19 is increasing.

4.16.2 Swindon College states that it is under pressure with staffing and there are insufficient resources to support all those who require it.

4.16.3 Both colleges are represented on School's Forum. The college representatives have status as full members except that they are unable to vote on matters relating to schools funding. It is felt by some members of the college community that Schools Forum business is generally only of relevance to 0-16 providers and that this contributes to a lack of understanding of the issues with which the colleges are dealing when transitioning a young person with SEND from school to college.

4.16.4 When a young people in Year 12 enters Swindon College with an EHC plan, the funding bands from the school including the five supplements that are available in the college setting move with that young people. The college finds this helpful, as it removes one significant administrative task during a period when a learner with SEND will be experiencing a lot of change and will be needing significant support. Not least the need for the learner to adapt to a large, complex and open campus

The Keeping in Touch (KIT) meetings aiming to develop a strategic approach to the relationship between schools/college within the Brunel SEN MAT and Swindon Borough Council are valued by the special schools.

4.16.5 The college say that the size of the cohort that they admit means that it does not have the capacity to cost in detail every student's needs and so the banding system is helpful. The expansion of the 16-25 year old programmes has added to the pressure and

the college feels that not all schools yet fully understand the issues and difficulties that the colleges face.

The annual review process is seen to present a “massive challenge” to the Swindon College who understand that whilst the LA expects the college to carry these out, the same demand is not made on New College. Swindon College say they do not have the resources to be able to attend annual reviews prior to Year 11 and this impacts upon the ease of transition.

4.16.6 Students can change their views late in the process and so the scope for flexibility in funding is needed during Year 11 and into Year 12.

The inherited bands help with this area of potential complexity. If one student is slightly under-funded this can be balanced by another student who is slightly over-funded and so overall the college manages the system to meet needs. Many students with SEND attend programmes designed for all students and which have currency in the market place in order to enhance their employment opportunities. The college view is that learners with SEND can succeed in these programmes, but require support to do so.

4.16.7 At present the Swindon College does not have the resource to offer personal care and so that is not offered.

4.16.8 The complexities of the funding system for learners with SEND between 19 and 25 years who wish to be supported on college programmes may be illustrated with the following case study.

Case Study

A student who is rising 19 years of age at Swindon College and was at another college before she attended her current college. Before that she had attended a secondary school with a special resourced provision. She was in FE when the conversions from Statement to EHCP took place and she was not transferred. Because of that, she currently has Element 1 in the same way as any other mainstream student without SEN. At the moment she accesses 1:1 support in class for a scribe, in unstructured time she has her carers in the college to support her. The college see it as their duty to support this student whether or not she is funded, which is what they do.

She approached the college to ask if there is any funding that she could access for the academic year beginning in September 2017. The College can only access Element 3 for students that have an EHCP (from Sept 2017) and the College can only claim Element 2 for those students that have Element 3 awarded. So the college is currently unable to access any SEND funding for this student. The student will also have to pay her own fees and the college is unable to remit these.

If the LA agreed to an EHCP at the minimum level of funding the college could draw down the Element 3 and Element 2. However, the student would have to request that she wanted to be considered for an EHCP and so far she has not. The College intends to find a way to mitigate these fees without the need for an EHCP but it still means that the College cover all her support costs.

The college sees a noticeable increase in students applying to be assessed for EHCP as soon as they realise that they are going to be charged fees at the age of 19. The college tries to maintain all students up to the age of 18 years and 11 months for support if they need it so many don't feel the need for the protection that an EHCP provides up to the age

of 19 when they becomes liable for fees. At this point the cost of FE programmes is potentially prohibitive in them carrying on with their studies unless they have an EHC plan. This is the reason for the EHC plan application and not the severity of the learning need which may not meet the threshold for an EHC plan as it has been applied up to the age of 19 years.

4.17 Out of Borough Placements

Out of Borough Placements, sometimes called external placements, covers those pupils who, for a range of reasons and often because of the complexity of their needs, are placed in a school or setting that is not maintained by Swindon Borough Council.

4.17.1 The indicated budget spend on these placements is £2.1m plus EFA additional funding making £2.4m. Actual costs to the date of this report are £1.6m supporting 22 children and young people at an average cost of £72,727. The range of costs per placement is a lowest of £3,658 to a highest of £208,985. This is broadly in line with statistical neighbours. National comparators are difficult to interpret in this context because of the variations that can lie behind the figures.

4.17.2 There are currently no clear, agreed terms of engagement nor protocols between Social Care, CCG and the SEN Service regarding the decision-making for high-cost, complex out-of-borough placements, nor out-of-borough placements that are made on grounds other than education.

Information sharing from Social Care to SEN when Social Care change a placement, sometimes at short notice, needs to be improved and decisions are often taken without any prior consultation with, or even disclosure to, the SEN service. There are consequent funding implications for both services (and sometimes also the CCG) for which there is no agreed procedure. Social Care currently ask for a one-third contribution toward the cost of the placement even though the SEN service can meet the educational needs with an in-borough placement.

The view of the SEN service is that as the child or young person's educational needs can be met in an in-borough placement the cost to the SEN service should be the cost of the in-borough placement. The costs in these cases when placed out-of-borough are often high.

4.17.3 This type of case exemplifies the need for very clear terms of engagement where services collaborate in supporting a child or young person, as is required under the Children and Families Act 2014.

5.0 THE PATHWAYS TO ASSESSMENT

5.1 Swindon has a substantial information guide for Early Years, Mainstream Schools and Academies, FE colleges, training providers and specialist provisions.

5.1.1 Schools and settings are advised on how to make applications for High Needs funding and the supporting evidence including an Early Help Record and Plan to show what has been put in place and its impact.

Schools are then asked to detail what additional support is to be put in place to meet each outcome by the range of agencies involved including the school

5.1.2 A concern from schools is that the documentation tends to be repetitive and to be burdensome. Where urgent support is needed, for example when a child enters a primary school and has no previous evidence of special needs, the time taken to accumulate the evidence means that the child does not get the support they need quickly.

5.1.3 On receiving the documents, if the SEN team are of the view that the application does not meet the criteria for it to be considered by the panel, the parents and the school are given clear feedback and offered support if necessary. When the application has been considered by the LA, if the decision is not to assess, the school and parents receive support.

5.1.4 The pathway within the LA from application to plan is designed to be as smooth as possible and to avoid delay. A flowchart showing the process is available on the Local Offer website, My Care, My Support.

6.0 FEEDBACK FROM PARENTS AND CARERS

6.1 Obtaining representative feedback from parents and carers (P&C) in this aspect of the borough's services is difficult because where the process has gone well and their child or young person is settled well in school, P&C just want to settle into being a parent. The tribunal data for 2015-2106 shows there were 6 hearings and one was conceded.

Feedback was provided by the Parents and Carers Forum whose membership tends to be from those P & C who have experienced difficulties in securing the support that they wished for their child and have limited membership.

6.2 Feedback received during the review from P & C focuses significantly on the processes and the provision put in place rather than directly at the allocation of the high needs funding. However those concerns expressed which relate to the remit of this review are:

- Needs are not being met at an early age
- The use of exclusions to access resources
- The slow production of reports from CCG
- Lack of understanding of SEN amongst governors
- Training of senior managers in SEN
- Lack of true partnership between Swindon and parents
- Education Psychology Service (EPS) and Social Care (SC) do not routinely contribute to annual reviews
- Lack of EPS capacity and failure of schools to buy the service.
- Increase in refusal to assess
- Financial criteria are used to inform provision rather than needs
- Lower level needs not being met results in escalation, and then these become behaviour difficulties
- Lack of confidence in support being delivered outside EHC plan, hence the demand for a plan
- No QA round SEN Support
- Concern around schools not buying in the help they need.
- Concern about the quality of SENDIAS

6.3 These concerns impact upon the use and level cost of the HNB and resonate with the issues identified elsewhere in the report. For example the lack of confidence in the nature of support being provided at SEN Support can lead to increased applications for EHCP assessments and HNB support where a child or young person's needs can be met effectively through the delegated Element 2 funding.

6.4 The concerns voiced around schools not buying the services they need also links to the capacity within the Education Psychology Service to provide Early Intervention support which in turn links to lack of clarity in identifying needs and the use of labelling as a short-cut to identifying provision. The EPS acknowledges that the level of effectiveness of the current deployment pattern of the service is dependent upon the school or setting SENDCo. EPS currently prioritise Years -1, 5 and 9 if the needs of the child have changed. The schools value the Early Years inputs and support prior to a request for assessment. However, risk in this age-related deployment pattern is that children develop at different rates that will be influenced by many factors, and working to a rigid form of development pathway could lead to a child's needs being missed or wrongly identified. This risk should be also seen in the context of the reduction of Speech and Language Therapy and Occupational Therapy spending identified in 3.15.6. The recently appointed Principal Education Psychologist is aware of the issues around the current deployment and team organisation and is working to resolve these.

6.5 There is a professional concern about the use of labelling (e.g.ASD/ASC) in order to obtain resources to support a child or young person, rather than addressing the accurately observed barriers to learning and development. Work is being done by Dr Krishna Bannerjee on how this may be addressed and this work is illustrating how a child or young person could be more effectively and economically supported through not trying to label these needs. Setting this in the context of the increase in the incidence of diagnosed ASD/ASC indicates a possible significant avoidable cost.

7.0 THE VIEWS OF THE SCHOOLS

A questionnaire was sent to the SENDCos in all mainstream schools. There were 8 responses (out of a possible 83 – approximately a 10% return). One was from the Tuition Service and one was from a federation of three schools and one had an SRP. The range of the numbers of pupils in the mainstream schools with EHC Plans or Statements was from 2 to 12.

7.1 The responses to the questions were:

7.1.1 Does the level of HNB funding allocated to an individual child or young person enable the school/setting to provide the interventions stated in their EHC Plan?

There was a split between responses, some saying generally this was the case, but others said that it was nowhere near enough and that it did not cover the full cost. It was observed that staff recruitment can be a problem in order to find the support that the pupil needs.

7.1.2 Do you find the way in which the LA allocates HNB funding easy to understand? If not, please state why.

The majority of replies confirmed that they could understand the way the funding is allocated. However, the following points were made:

- There is a lot of duplication in the documentation requested.
- Schools have to wait a long time for reports so pupils with high needs are not getting the support quickly enough.
- The paperwork does not always capture the child's needs.
- It is unclear why some children get funding and others do not.

7.1.3 If a young C or YP needs/circumstances change can you secure additional HNB resources quickly?

The general view is that it is too slow and bureaucratic but the Early Help Record does help it progress quicker. The pace does not meet parents' expectations.

7.1.4 When you make a request for an EHC Plan, or following a Review of an existing plan, do you specify the additional resource needed and how much it will cost to implement?

Some schools do and some do not. There was a view that schools can now specify what they need, but it is not easy to specify a precise intervention or associated cost.

7.1.5 Have you ever requested a reduction in top-up funding for a C or YP or recommended ceasing a plan? If so how many times?

Reduction in funding

One school – twice

One school once

Seven schools – never

Ceasing a plan

Two schools – twice

One school - once

Five schools - never

7.1.6 Any other comments

- The level of need being refused funding seems to be rising every year,
- Applications for EHC plans are very time-consuming.
- It is necessary to make repeated requests.
- SENAT cannot cope with double-sided documents.
- Some parents still think they are getting funded for TA hours.
- Parents do not realise that the level of funding in each band has been reduced.
- They do not understand that this is happening at LA and national level.
- It would be helpful to have requests for funding accepted before the end of the summer term. (To aid recruitment and put resources in place)

7.2 The views of the special schools

The special school head teachers group provided information directly to the reviewer. Their comments were:

- There needs to be some form of band funding combined with place funding to give graduated funding within the same school.
- The paperwork that schools need to prepare for a statutory assessment is largely fit for purpose but there are elements of repetition, for example in completing the banding sheet where the amount of funding needed is identified.

- The band descriptors are not sufficiently detailed nor do they relate sufficiently to the areas of need. In addition they do not recognise the links to the cost involved to meet that need.
- Schools should get used to time-restricted funding.
- Funding should be available for EYFS children before they start school/nursery to support a graduated response.
- Carry-over of funding is needed at transition points in a pupil's education.
- The Parent Contribution forms are not overly user-friendly, for example for parents who have English as a second language or may have a learning difficulty.
- Schools should be more accountable for commissioning alternative provision from within their delegated budgets. This is a repeated concern.
- The use of notional funding (Element 2) in mainstream schools should be quality assured.
- There is not a consistent level of pay for comparable SEN TA roles across different schools. SRPs, special schools and mainstream schools all have different agendas round funding because of the different environments in which they work, for example staffing, spaces, school organisation.
- When funding ceases when a student leaves, the staff cannot be moved as easily and this impacts upon school budgets
- Better use should be made of existing plans from other LAs when children and young people move into the borough from outside Swindon. Interim arrangements to avoid dislocation of learning would be helpful.
- There is a perception that there are bands for different needs that are funded differentially.
- Supplements are awarded based on the cost not on need.
- Funding cannot be back-dated
- The accuracy of information held and used for C & YP funding allocation needs rigorous checking but this is extremely time consuming.
- Some bespoke timetables are partly or wholly funded.
- Funding can be hard to understand as there is no set funding formula.

8.0 ANALYSIS

8.1 The High Needs Block spending patterns, like any budget account, are created by a series of decisions and actions which derive from imposed constraints and the cultural and political imperatives of the decision makers. These imperatives are, in turn, influenced by the stakeholders. The HNB, very specifically, is seen to impact on the lives of individual children, young people and their families and as such is a highly emotive area.

The way in which the sums of money are allocated from the HNB can illustrate these underlying influences. Special Educational Needs by virtue of its name means that special cases will arise. Where a way of funding those needs is found which lies outside the agreed funding arrangements and creates a special case, it also creates precedent. In seeking to resolve these conundrums a local authority will make adjustments that can appear inconsistent and unfair. Swindon is no exception to this.

8.2 The High Needs Funding Operation Guide 2017-2018 (EFA) identifies factors that could impact upon the way a local authority administers its HNB and illustrates the

complexity of this area. It further urges that the statutory assessment process is not the sole means of securing additional support for children and young people with SEND.

8.3 Feedback has identified that there has developed in Swindon in some schools, a culture that mainstream schools increasingly cannot meet the SEND needs of children and young people without increasing funding and, even then, for more young people a mainstream school is not the appropriate setting.

8.4 The evidence in section 4 supports this, as Swindon has developed over time a complex funding process with needs being supported in a range of settings at different levels. This has occurred through the addition of funding elements introduced to resolve identified difficulties that schools experience. However, this complexity is not always accompanied by clear enough criteria to always support the funding decisions.

8.5 The pressures that schools, staff, headteachers, governors are under from the constrained curriculum and emphasis on attainment levels mean that their priority is how they can resource the children and young people achieving their targets. The nature of the curriculum means that children and young people are expected to learn and demonstrate that learning in a particular way. Yet the work of Howard Gardner and others has clearly demonstrated that children and young people learn in many different ways. This is especially true for young people with identified “barriers” to learning.

8.6 Section 3.15.0 shows a concerning issue that the number of Year 8 EHC plans for MLD in 2016 was at 25, but in 2017 that figure has dropped to 9, but it is unclear where there are other changes to compensate. However over the whole of the school cohort there is a clear decrease in learning as a primary need (76) and a similar sized increase in SEMH (73).

8.7 The data in section 3.15 and the conclusions drawn elsewhere in this report suggest that Swindon is at a point where the combined pressures of:

- Reduced school budgets resulting in a loss of learning support staff
- The pressure on results for schools and headteachers,
- The culture that special needs are best supported in special settings, including Special Resourced Provisions within mainstream schools
- Not always effectively addressing the needs of children with SEND at points of transition,
- Children and young people’s behaviour in school not being seen as a response to their experiences, anxieties, frustrations, and sense of being unable to meet their learning and social expectations in school,
- Reduced support for schools,
- Constrained EPS access.

Plus:

- A complex HNB funding pattern
- Lack of sufficiently detailed guidance in some areas of need on the application of funding based on the areas of need and the support and intervention needed by the child or young person leading to appropriate placement and funding,
- Lack of criteria referenced shared funding agreement between Education, Social Care and CCG, especially for high-cost out-of-borough placements, based upon agreed principles about the impact of health and social care inputs on the ability of a C or YP to attend and benefit from education.

Is leading to:

- Schools increasingly seeking to integrate children into the school rather than develop the school to include the child.
- An increase in pupils with learning needs being re-identified as behaviour needs (SEMH)
- An increase in exclusions from an already high level.
- A continuing demand for specialist placements
- Increased demand for HNB funding.

This will generate a number of key pinch-points and issues for schools, parents/carers and young people and the local authority within the system which could lead to doubt and possible loss of trust, friction, challenge, and cost. However, this is not the case currently.

8.8 The evidence, some anecdotal, shows that there is a majority parents of children and young people who are happy with their child's school and are not dissatisfied with the process that they have been through to secure an EHC plan and HNB support, and do trust that the school will do the best for their child or young person. Parents and schools welcomed the speeding up of the EHC process that has allowed quicker access to funding. The reform to the Special Needs Assessment Team that has contributed to this has also been welcomed. The dashboard shows that 100% of plans were completed within 20 weeks in December 2016.

8.9 The cost of Out-of-Borough SEND placements (OOB) is an outcome rather than a contributory element to the management of the HNB. Where a local authority has:

- A clearly defined continuum of SEN provision through mainstream placements, SRP's, special schools,
- Clear descriptors of the needs and their severity that are met in the various settings,
- A shared understanding of Quality First Teaching and the threshold of SEN Support.
- Effective arrangements to enable schools to access external support for children and young people with identified SEN.
- The use of Element 2 and Element 3 is quality assured.
- The number of specialist SEN places required is based upon accurate strategic projections and clear expectations of inclusion
- Clearly described expectations of the level of needs met through the notional, delegated SEN funding,
- A HNB funding arrangement based upon the levels of needs to be met in various settings and clear, costed interventions and staffing levels,
- A clear adhered-to protocol of shared decision making between SEN, Social Care and the CCG with respect to decision-making about the appropriate placement for complex cases.
- A clear set of agreed guidelines regarding the shared responsibilities for funding complex case placements based upon the priorities of a case from each services stated delivery perspectives.

Children and young people will be placed in appropriate settings and the numbers of SEN placements in regional, low incidence, high-cost settings will be controlled to a minimum for that population.

8.10 There is evidence from a range of sources that in Swindon there could be improvements to the educational framework within which SEND education functions and the allocation of funding takes place. This impacts at many levels from supporting

SENCOs in making judgements about thresholds of practice and therefore funding, to matching funding to needs and placements. Without such a clear framework which is understood and accepted by all stakeholders there can be no move to a new culture of inclusion, a commonly applied set of principles and the budgets brought under control.

The relationship between 7.10 and 7.11 and the Local Area Inspection of the implementation of the Children and Families Act, 2014 is clear. When all aspects are in place the LA can be secure in responding to the key questions of how effectively do we identify needs, and how effectively do we meet needs?

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS TO CLARIFY AND REDUCE THE USE OF THE HNB TO SUPPORT C&YP IN DIFFERENT SETTINGS WITH THE BOROUGH, AND ENABLE FUNDING DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN ON THE BASIS OF AGREED RATIONALES WITH CLEAR SEND MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT.

9.1 Develop clearer protocols for managing the High Needs Block Funding

There is a need to develop clearer protocols for managing the High Needs Block Funding from an SEND strategic perspective based upon the SEND data.

This will require clearer alignment between the HNB as it is spent and the way in which the HNB is allocated in the Budget Plan.

1. Ensure that there are consistent, evidence-based SEND reasons for any disparities in funding

Ensure that there are consistent, evidence-based SEND reasons for any disparities in funding between pre-school, primary and secondary schools, and if a banding system is retained, between the bands.

These differences should be published so schools and parents can understand them.

2. Create a detailed matrix of descriptors for levels of need

Create a detailed matrix of descriptors for each level of need within in each area of need and relate that to settings where possible so that the borough can develop a clearly defined **continuum of provision**.

This matrix will inform the nature and levels of need met by:

- mainstream schools though their delegated notional SEN budget,
- HNB funded children and young people in mainstream classes
- Specialist Resource Provisions
- Special schools.
- Out of borough provision for very low incidence high level needs.

In negotiating and agreeing the level of needs met by SRPs it is suggested that criteria related to levels of inclusion into mainstream classes/activities for a child or young person at entry and as targets are discussed so that there is clarity about whether an SRP is a special unit within a mainstream school and/or a facility to develop inclusion for the child or young person concerned.

3. Cost interventions against agreed rates.

A matrix could be developed that will identify the interventions that are appropriate for different levels of need and the services providing support and intervention.

These interventions to be costed against agreed rates from SEN, Social Care and the CCG. These rates are the level at which the borough and CCG will fund through

High Needs Block funding, an EHC plan, or through an agreement for emergency short-term provision. The matrix would provide clarity about those Social Care and Health provisions which specifically support education as opposed to social and health wellbeing.

4. The same rates will apply for SEN Support interventions.

When a school is accounting for the costs of interventions funded by their delegated notional SEN budget, Element 2, in order to apply for HNB funding (either through an EHC Plan or not) the same rates will apply.

5. Secure a clear set of protocols for information sharing and decision making between SEN, Social Care and the CCG

Secure a clear set of protocols for information sharing and decision making between SEN, Social Care and the CCG regarding placements in all complex cases, especially out-of-borough high cost placements

This would include agreement regarding the funding responsibilities between SEN Services, Social Care and CCG with respect to all complex cases, but especially out-of-borough placements.

This protocol and agreement to take account of those placement decisions that need to be taken quickly in order to safeguard a child or young person but will still maintain their best opportunities for education in order to sustain their future life chances.

6. Continue the current work to bring clarity to the funding of EOTAS

a) Continue the current work to bring clarity to the funding of EOTAS and align it with the funding model for SEND based upon levels of SEND and evidence based interventions as appropriate.

b) Review the level of school contribution to the cost of educating an excluded child or young person in order to remove any financial disincentive for inclusion.

c) Check to ensure that the funding is sufficient in the short term to provide enough places and support for the number of children or young people who require it.

This Recommendation links to Recommendation 12.

7. Review the funding for special schools

At present the funding for a young person in a special school consists of the place funding at £10,000, plus a band funding, and possibly a supplement.

As is shown in 3.12.1 the number of children and young people in special schools with bands 1,2 and 3 is 427 out of 461, and there is a similar clustering in Specialist Resource Provisions.

It is recommended that the borough review the place funding for special schools to identify a place funding value that contains two elements.

a) The place element at £10,000,

b) An agreed top-up element that is consistent as a base level for **all** the children and young people in that special school. (3.12.1 - 4.12.3)

The size of the place funding top-up will be criteria based using the matrix referred to in Recommendation 4. If a place is taken by a child or young person from another authority the same agreement as currently exists will continue with the other local authority paying the top-up funding as now. This is why there needs to be two elements.

Where a child or young person's EHCP identifies specific provision that is higher than/different to/supplementary to those identified as being met by the provision funded by the two elements of the place funding these will be funded to the school as precise bespoke elements at cost.

This will reduce the need for a complex banding system for special schools and will enable a very clear relationship between the needs of the child or young person and the cost. It will also give a securer financial base for the school based upon their core business.

8. A similar funding model for SRPs

In other local authorities a similar funding model for SRP's as that described in Recommendation 8 is used to give a predictable funding model for SRP's. The premise for an SRP is that as a child or young person progresses through the school they will become increasingly included in the mainstream school so that the SRP resource that supports them can be switched increasingly to another who needs it more.

In general such a model recognises a differential between an SRP that meet SLCN needs and one that meets ASD needs on the basis that where SLCN comes from an ASD the issues are more complex and may need additional support for effective inclusion, particularly on entry to the provision.

This model of reducing support gives an opportunity for greater fiscal control but requires the use of an effective matrix of needs in a defined continuum in order to identify the amount of place funding top-up. The clear identification of the range of needs which fit with increasing inclusion is essential for this model to work. This model is recommended for SRP's.

9. Retain and review the banding system for mainstream schools.

Schools value a banding system for allocating high needs block funding, and it brings an element of simplicity to the work of the funding panel. However, there must of course be a link between the value of the band and the cost of the interventions requested. All schools should be maintaining a costed provision map for a child or young person from when they first enter SEN Support so that they can make decisions about the effectiveness of their use of both Element 2 and HNB funding. When this is done the application for HNB funding is straight forward.

The recommendation is that the banding system is re-visited to ensure that the values of bands more readily can be applied to the cost of the additional interventions requested or identified by the reports used when making an EHC application.

This recommendation includes simplifying the application documents to avoid the duplication of information that SENDCos identify that they are currently required to do.

10. Time Limited Interventions

Make more use of timed interventions in EHC Plans, for example at times of transition so that the funding can be removed when it is no longer needed without lengthy bureaucracy.

11. Devolve a tranche of HNB funding directly to mainstream schools

Consider devolving further an initial portion of HNB funding to schools based on a formula derived from the number children and young people on SEN Support.

This will enable the school to quickly access HNB funding when needed. This funding would need to be ring-fenced, individual C or YP focused and separately accountable to the local authority through the governing body.

If a child or young person funded through the devolved funding is subsequently awarded an EHC Plan, any further HNB funding awarded, which is associated with the plan, will need to be specifically targeted against the additional support that the plan will provide.

- *Chunk of HNB to schools – formula based on SEN support learners*
- *System exists SENAT*
- *In the south west HNB was distributed*
- *Is the problem taken away by doing this?*
- *Look at Nottingham LEA = twice a year – mainstream*

12. Reverse the current trend of rising numbers of exclusions

There is a need to reverse the current trend of rising exclusions from an already high base and the **over-identification of SEMH (behavioural)** difficulties through re-focusing on how children and young people learn best (**metacognition**)¹² and become successful in mainstream schools.

Section 3.15 and 7.6 clearly indicates that the proportion of children and young people who are identified as having SEMH is high compared to other local authorities and is rising.

An increasing proportion of these children and young people are being excluded from school, either for fixed terms or permanently. The data clearly suggests that a proportion of these have had some other SEN identified prior to being labelled SEMH. Other children and young people with other SEN are also being excluded.

This creates both an upward drive of HNB costs in later school and college years but also is very likely damaging to the C&YP concerned and their families.

If early intervention, transition at year 6 and then into KS4 were more effective in promoting learning and meeting these C&YP's emotional and needs linked to social environments and learning at these critical points, the indicators are that more young people would be far better (and less expensively) included in the education system with the accompanying benefits in life outcomes and reduced costs downstream.

The impact of the reduction of funding in schools reducing the numbers of pastoral staff and teaching assistants is noted as having a possible impact on these figures. The pressure to improve some data in schools such as Progress 8 and Attainment 8 is also likely to have an impact with the focus on raising standards in core subjects and EBACC.

There is clearly some good practice already in place within the primary and secondary phases in Swindon where children and young people are being included and successful. It is recommended that the borough identifies and builds on this practice to build a culture of inclusion in mainstream schools, using the work in Recommendation 3 to provide a framework to enable all staff in mainstream schools to acquire the understanding and skills to be able to understand and teach a diversity of learners.

Without this happening, the continuum of provision for SEN will not become a reality, exclusions will continue at an unacceptably high level, the HNB will not be contained and the human outcome will be more young people not being appropriately educated alongside their peers and being valued for who they are

¹² Metacognition – being aware of and making use of an individual's cognitive processes to support learning.

13. QA SEN funding in schools

Re-establish the quality assurance of the use of SEN funding in schools. The outcomes of this process will inform best practice, hold schools to account and ensure the most cost-effective use of HNB funds.

The LA has the statutory responsibility for the provision and progress for all children and young people with an identified SEN at a Swindon address regardless as to where they are educated.

The Children and families Act 2014 requires that the local authority knows how effectively it identifies SEN and how effectively it meets the needs of children and young people with SEN.

This responsibility lies at the heart of the key questions that Ofsted will ask when they carry out a Local Area Inspection. Whereas the inspection team for a local area inspection will not make judgements about individual schools it will want to know how the local authority knows the answers to these questions and will verify those answers in the field.

Final decisions: PN

This needs to go to SEN Board

CCG Agenda – in the future

ASH Agenda – in the future

An Executive Summary needs to be prepared from these notes for Guidance to SEN Board

Must go to schools forum in the future

Priorities to be determined

Timeline and project plan to be created/prepared

What is already happening? Initiatives

This page is intentionally left blank

Provision			Investment in facilities (£)		Total (£)	Additional Information about each project
Provision URN	Provision name and address	Provision category	Special provision fund investment in facilities	Other investment in facilities	Total investment in project	LAs should use this section of the table to set out more details about the aims of the project. Beyond this further information can be listed in their strategic plan or directly on their local offer page.
135364	Swindon Academy, Beech Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN2 1JR	Mainstream	£12,285	£4,096	£16,381	Create a new Sensory room
138636	Holy Family Catholic Primary School, Marlowe Avenue, Park North, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 2PT	Mainstream	£53,664	£17,888	£71,552	Create a new Nurture provision
N/A	Nursery of Narnia	EY	£9,472	£3,157	£12,629	Install accessible toilet and changing facilities to the first floor
137264	Lydiard Park Academy, Grange Park Way, Grange Park, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN5 6HN	Mainstream	£22,193	£7,397	£29,590	To develop a Log cabin/ shepards hut.
135206	Covingham Park Primary School, The Harries, Covingham Park, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 5BD	Mainstream	£10,000	£2,500	£12,500	Create a new Nurture provision
137265	Kingsdown School, Hyde Road, Stratton St Margaret, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN2 7SH	Mainstream	£57,502	£19,168	£76,670	Create a new Nurture provision
137684	The Dorcan Academy, St Paul's Drive, Covingham, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 5DA	Mainstream	£22,887	£7,626	£30,513	Create a new Sensory room
137191	Lethbridge Primary School, Lethbridge Road, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN1 4BY	Mainstream	£9,891	£3,297	£13,188	Create a new Nurture provision
130851	New College Swindon, New College Drive, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 1AH	Post 16	£7,500	To be Confirmed	£7,500	Create a new Sensory Greenhouse
130851	New College Swindon, New College Drive, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 1AH	Post 16	£23,596	To be Confirmed	£23,596	Purchase and install new accessible doors
126213	Even Swindon Primary School, Pasture Close, Raybrook Park, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN2 2UJ	Mainstream	£19,575	£6,525	£26,100	Create a new Nurture provision
136860	Highworth Warneford School, Shrivenham Road, Highworth, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN6 7BZ	Mainstream	£8,826	£3,575	£12,401	To purchase laptops
136293	Goddard Park Community Primary School, Welcombe Avenue, Park North, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN3 2QN	Mainstream	£22,421	£7,474	£29,895	Installation of a lift.

This page is intentionally left blank