



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333 CONTACT: Philippa Gibbs
philippa.gibbs@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7638
FAX: 020 8290 0608 DATE: 13 June 2019

To: Members of the
SCHOOLS' FORUM

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| David Dilling (Chairman) | Primary Academy Governor (Charles Darwin Academy Trust) |
| David Bridger (Vice-Chairman) | Non-School Representative (Church of England)(Aquinas Trust) |
| Richard Edmunds | Primary Academy Head Teacher (Warren Road Primary School) |
| Patrick Foley | Primary Maintained Head Teacher (Southborough Primary School) |
| Ben Greene | Secondary Academy Governor (Bullers Wood MAT) |
| Neil Miller | PRU Head Teacher/Governor Academy (Bromley Trust Academy) |
| Karen Raven | Secondary Academy Head Teacher (Chislehurst School for Girls) |
| Andrew Rees | Secondary Maintained School Head Teacher (St Olaves Grammar School) |
| Gareth Walters | Primary Academy Governor (Compass Academy Trust) |
| David Wilcox | Secondary Academy Governor (Darrick Wood School) |
| Izabela Lecybyl | Non-School Representative (Catholic Church) |
| Angela Leeves | Non-School Representative (Early Years) |
| Sam Parrett | Non-School Representative (14-19 Partnership) (Bromley Trust Academy) |
| Izabela Lecybyl | Non-School Representative (Catholic Church) |
| Angela Leeves | Non-School Representative (Early Years) |
| Sam Parrett | Non-School Representative (14-19 Partnership) (Bromley Trust Academy) |
| 1 x vacancy | Non-School Representatives (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee) |
| 1 x vacancy | Special Head/Governor Maintained |
| 1 x vacancy | PRU Head Teacher/Governor Maintained |
| 1x vacancy | Primary Academy Headteacher |
| 1 x vacancy | Non-School Representatives (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee) |
| 1 x vacancy | Primary School A |
| 1 x vacancy | PRU Head Teacher/Governor Maintained |
| 1 x vacancy | Special Head/Governor Maintained |

A meeting of the Schools' Forum will be held at the Bromley College of Further and Higher Education, Rookery Lane, Bromley, BR2 8HE on **THURSDAY 20 JUNE 2019 AT 4.30 PM** *

*** PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME AND VENUE**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

A G E N D A

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10TH JANUARY 2019 (Pages 3 - 8)**
- 3 FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES, AND THOSE WHO NEED ALTERNATIVE PROVISION – CALL FOR EVIDENCE CONSULTATION RESPONSE (Pages 9 - 40)**
- 4 SPENDING BY PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND SPECIAL MAINTAINED SCHOOLS IN 2018/19 (Pages 41 - 46)**
- 5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

All meetings are at Bromley College unless otherwise stated.

19th September 2019

7th November 2019

9th January 2020

SCHOOLS' FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held at 4.30 pm on 10 January 2019

Present:

David Dilling (Chairman)	Primary Academy Governor
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Matthew Apsley	Primary Academy Headteacher
Richard Edmunds	Primary Academy Head Teacher
Ben Greene	Secondary Academy Governor
Angela Leeves	Non-School Representative (Early Years)
Neil Miller	PRU Head Teacher/Governor Academy
Karen Raven	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
David Wilcox	Secondary Academy Governor

Also Present:

David Bradshaw	Head of ECHS Finance
Jared Nehra	Director of Education
Amanda Russell	Head of Schools Finance Support
Philippa Gibbs	Democratic Services Officer

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Izabela Lecybyl and Andrew Rees.

The Chairman welcomed Ben Greene (Secondary Head Teacher Representative) and Jared Nehra (Director of Education, LBB) to the meeting.

22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Matthew Apsley declared that the introduction of a Falling Rolls Fund would affect his school.

23 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th November 2018, were approved and signed as a correct record.

Under matters arising; a Secondary Head Teacher representative sought an update on the representations that had been made concerning funding for new Free Schools being top sliced from the Schools' Block. In response, the Head of Schools' Finance Support confirmed that the issue had been raised with colleagues in other London Boroughs as well as the DfE. The Head of Schools' Finance Support reported that whilst other London Boroughs were experiencing similar issues it appeared that they were not as concerned about the issue as Bromley. Representatives from the DfE had suggested that the issues within Bromley could be overcome through accounting with lagged funding each year. Whilst the suggestion was understandable the view of LBB Officers was that this

was not a viable solution to the problem and therefore should not be implemented. The Head of ECHS Finance reported that he, the former Interim Director of Education, the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families, and a representative from schools had met with local MP Bob Neill to discuss concerns. The Local MP had agreed to write to the Minister responsible to raise the issue and outline concerns. Once a response from the Minister had been received it would be circulated to the Schools' Forum. A Secondary School representative further reported that she had raised the issue with a union who had not been aware of the figures involved and had also agreed to take up the issue.

The Vice-Chairman raised the issue of declarations of interest at meetings. During the ensuing discussion it was noted that whilst all Members of the Forum technically had a pecuniary interest, unlike school governing bodies the Schools' Forum was a consultation forum with no formal decision making powers. It was noted that Members of the Forum were appointed to represent their respective sectors and there was an expectation that Members would be representing the interests of their sectors as a whole, not their individual schools. In view of this it was agreed that that 'Declarations of Interest' item on the agenda would be removed.

The Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that work was underway to fill the vacancies on the Schools' Forum.

24 2019/20 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT **Report ED18085**

The Schools' Forum considered a report providing an outline of the final DSG allocation for 2019/20 and the budgeted expenditure across the four separate blocks. The final Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding for 2019/20, updated to reflect October 2018 pupil numbers, had now been provided to all LAs. The final allocation included the additional funding for SEND announced by the Secretary of State which for Bromley was £788,032 for both 2018/19 and 2019/20.

The DSG for 2019/20 was divided into four blocks – High Needs, Early Years, Schools and Schools Central, with expected grant income detailed below:

2019/20 Dedicated Schools Grant					
	High Needs Block	Early Years Block	Schools Block	Schools Central Block	Total
Gross Grant Funding	£48,820,619	£20,691,309	£208,637,223	£1,938,460	£280,087,611
Recoupment adjustment	-£7,813,333				-£7,813,333
Net Grant Allocation	£41,007,286	£20,691,309	£208,637,223	£1,938,460	£272,274,278

Central Schools Block

There were a number of pressures within the block due to certain items of expenditure over which the Local Authority had no control such as the costs of licenses (from which all schools benefitted).

It was proposed that a financial contribution would be made by the Council in order to balance the block. On behalf of the Schools' Forum, in anticipation of the Council's Executive approving the additional funding, the Chairman thanked the Council for the very necessary financial contribution.

Early Years Block

It was noted that the Local Authority provided higher rates of funding for 2 year olds than the grant received from government. This was done at the expense of 3 year old funding and this position had not been reviewed for a couple of years. The Early Years Representative highlighted there was a higher staff ration for two year olds than for 3 & 4 year olds and it was suggested that this may explain the higher levels of funding.

Schools Block and High Needs Block

Falling Rolls Fund:

A Secondary Head Teacher representative noted that there had been no agreement or recommendation from the Schools' Forum concerning whether specific funding for a falling rolls fund should be earmarked. It was noted that the report demonstrated that there were 306 surplus places in the primary sector within Bromley that were being nominally funded. Members of the Schools' Forum suggested that this was symptomatic of the way in which Bromley had evolved over time with primary schools now feeling the impact of the lack of strategy. There was now a pool of schools experiencing falling rolls and as a result these schools would be facing serious financial difficulties.

It was noted that at a previous meeting the Schools' Forum had requested information on trends and this had not yet been provided. The Forum had also requested that the Head of Strategic Place Planning attend a meeting of the Forum to advise Members. Members agreed that they could not commit to any long-term decisions until this happened.

The Head of Schools' Finance Support highlighted the strict requirements and criteria in place surrounding eligibility for Falling Rolls Funding. In summary, the following eligibility criteria had been set:

1. Low numbers
2. Judged Good or Outstanding
3. LA to demonstrate that places would be required in 3 to 4 years.
4. Schools required to submit detailed financial data.

The full criteria were set out in the minutes for the meeting of the Schools' Forum which was held on 20th September 2018.

The Director of Education agreed that the Head of Strategic Place Planning should come to a future meeting to advise the Forum. It was noted that the Pupil Place Planning document needed to be more outward facing and work to achieve this would commence.

Noting the eligibility criteria and recognising that the purpose of the Fallings Rolls Fund was to provide support to schools facing financial difficulties in order not to set a precedent for future years the Schools' Forum considered approving the Falling Rolls Fund for 1 year only. It was felt that if it could be demonstrated that falling rolls in a school were a "blip" and not a trend the schools should be supported. It was also felt that approval of the fund for a year would also give the Local Authority sufficient time to provide the Schools' Forum with the information it required to take a longer term decision. The Schools' Forum emphasised that in considering approving the Falling Rolls Fund for 1 year only it was not setting a precedent.

The Chairman put to the vote the motion that a falling rolls fund be introduced for one year only.

7 in favour
0 against

The motion was CARRIED.

Local Authority Disapplication Request:

The Head of Schools' Finance Support reported that following the last meeting of the Schools' Forum a full consultation with schools was undertaken and feedback from the consultation was attached at Appendix 3 to the report. The Local Authority had submitted the disapplication request to the DfE and the outcome was awaited.

The Secondary Head Teacher representative noted that the feedback that had been received from the schools was overwhelmingly against the proposals and it was confirmed that this feedback had been submitted to the DfE together with the application. Members of the Forum highlighted that reading the responses that had been received was extremely depressing in terms of the untenable financial situation in which schools now found themselves.

Noting that an additional £788,032 High Needs Block funding had been received for 2018/19 and 2019/20, the Schools' Forum expressed disappointment that the Local Authority had subsequently taken the decision to withdraw £1m from the initial £2m of Council funding it was originally contributing. The Schools' Forum highlighted that the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families had attended meetings with Head Teachers and had openly and honestly made an offer to support schools. A Secondary Head teacher representative commented that it appeared the Local Authority was now renegeing on its offer. It was

acknowledged that the Local Authority was also facing funding cuts however, the Schools' Forum felt that if the Local Authority were to honour the funding commitment that had been made the disapplication request would have been unnecessary.

The Director of Education, LBB responded that he fully understood the concern of Members of the Schools' Forum however there was underfunding of £3m which needed to be addressed and this level of underfunding had a significant impact on a Borough the size of Bromley. The only mechanism available to the Local Authority for raising the issue of underfunding was the disapplication request. The £788,032 additional funding for 2018/19 and 2019/20 which had been provided in recognition of the unprecedented demands being placed on the High Needs Block was insufficient to meet the additional demands that were being placed on already stretched and underfunded services.

It was noted that any of the additional funding for 2018/19 that was not used would be placed in the DSG Reserves in order to mitigate against risk of a deficit budget in future years.

Members of the Schools' Forum highlighted that there was a need to ensure that there was sufficient funding to support children with SEND attending mainstream schools. The Forum heard that there had been reports in the Local Press that LB Bexley was supporting Kemnal in relation to SEN provision. Members expressed disappointment suggesting LB Bromley could have done something similar and worked with The Kemnal Academies Trust (TKAT) regarding SEN provision on the Kemnal site in order to help to tackle the High Needs issues in Bromley.

Members of the Forum agreed that at the last meeting of the Schools Forum there had been a vote not to support the disapplication request. The subsequent consultation feedback had also suggested that the request should not be supported and on that basis there was no reason to change the decision.

The Chairman put to the vote the motion that the disapplication requested submitted by the Local Authority is not supported by the Schools Forum.

6 in favour
1 against.

The motion was CARRIED.

The Schools Forum wished to express and acknowledge that it understood the reasons behind the disapplication request and that there was an obvious lack of Central Government funding for High Needs, but they felt that the Schools Block was suffering enough through lack of Government Funding and therefore the disapplication request was refused.

The Schools Forum noted that the comments from the Schools' Forum would be fed back to the Council's Education, Children and Families Budget and Performance Monitoring Sub-Committee which was due to meet in public at 7pm on Wednesday 23rd January 2019.

It was also noted that the DfE had requested that a copy of the minutes from the Schools' Forum be provided as soon as possible.

The Vice-Chairman noted that almost all primary schools in the Borough benefitted from the Minimum Funding Guarantee increment (additional funding from Government) which reduced every year. If the DfE increased the DSG allocation to primary schools this MFG Funding would be clawed back. It was emphasised that there was an urgency to primary schools across the Borough getting on top of their finances as it was clear from financial forecasts that the financial landscape for schools was not going to improve. A Secondary Head Teacher representative highlighted that in Bromley primary schools had been generously funded above the primary/secondary ratio for a number of years and therefore the current financial challenges were redressing this imbalance.

The Head of Schools' Finance Support confirmed that the Local Authority had until 16th January 2019 to submit the figures to the DfE.

RESOLVED: That:

- 1. A falling rolls fund be introduced for one year only; and**
- 2. The disapplication requested submitted by the Local Authority is not supported by the Schools Forum.**

25 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

26 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Details of meeting dates for 2019/20 would be circulated when they were available.

The Meeting ended at 6.00 pm

Chairman

Report No.
ED18085

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **SCHOOLS' FORUM**

Date: **Thursday 20th June 2019**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND
DISABILITIES, AND THOSE WHO NEED ALTERNATIVE
PROVISION – CALL FOR EVIDENCE CONSULTATION
RESPONSE**

Contact Officer: Amanda Russell, Head of Schools Finance Support
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: Amanda.Russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Jared Nehra, Director of Education, Care and Health Services

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

This report provides an outline of the Local Authority's draft response to the DfE consultation document.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- i. **The Schools Forum is asked to review the draft response, with a view to either endorsing the LA response or formulating separate response.**

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Department for Education has recently launched a consultation to look specifically at the funding for children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities, and those needing alternative provision (AP). Whilst the government accepts that the overall amount of funding available is the most pressing concern, this call for evidence is intended to help them to understand how the current funding is distributed and what improvements could be made to the funding arrangements in the future.
- 3.2 Full details of the consultation can be found at the following link:
<https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/funding-for-send-and-those-who-need-ap-call-for-ev/>
- 3.3 The closing date for the consultation is 31st July 2019. The LA has put together a draft response which is being shared with the Schools Forum. Please note that some of the responses are still being formulated at this early stage of the process. The Forum is asked to consider the LA responses with a view to either endorsing the LA response or formulating it's own response. All schools are also being encouraged to respond on an individual basis.
- 3.4 The consultation response is attached at appendix 1.



Department
for Education

Funding for special educational needs and disabilities, and those who need alternative provision

Call for evidence questions

Launch date 03 May 2019

Respond by 31 July 2019

Contents

Introduction	3
Issue date and deadline	4
Enquiries	4
Respond online	4
Questions	5
About You	5
Funding for pupils with SEND in Mainstream schools	7
Funding for SEN through the schools funding formula	9
Targeted funding and support for SEN provision in schools	10
The notional SEN Budget	11
The £6,000 threshold	13
Provision for pupils with SEN in mainstream schools	16
Funding for pupils who need alternative provision (AP) or are at risk of exclusion from school	18
Funding for students with SEN in further education	20
Improving early intervention at each age and stage to prepare young people for adulthood sooner	22
Effective partnership working to support children and young people with complex needs	24
Other aspects of the funding and financial arrangements	25

Introduction

We have heard local authorities', schools' and colleges' concerns about the rising costs of provision for children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) and those who are disabled, and about the reducing availability of specialist advice and support. We are listening and will be looking carefully at how much overall funding is required nationally as we prepare for the next government spending review.

Although we entirely accept that the overall amount of funding available is the most pressing concern, this call for evidence is intended to help us understand how the current available funding is distributed and what improvements could be made to the funding arrangements in the future. It is also looking at factors in the current funding system that may be contributing to the escalation of costs, without necessarily securing better long-term outcomes for pupils and students. We want to know how the funding system can be improved so that we make sure that we get the best value out of any additional funding that is made available in future.

Please read the document "[Provision for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities, and for those who need alternative provision: how the financial arrangements work](#)" before answering the questions.

The provision for most children and young people with SEN is made in mainstream schools, and the initial focus of this call for evidence – questions 1 to 10 – is on how we fund that provision, including some technical aspects of the funding arrangements. There is a continuum of provision, however, and we want to gather evidence from special schools making provision for pupils with more complex SEN, and from those making alternative provision. Please see questions 16 to 19 for specific questions on alternative provision.

We are also extending this call for evidence to the post-16 funding arrangements for young people with SEN. Although there are significant differences between the 5 to 16 funding system and the 16 to 19 funding system, it is important that we understand the picture across all provision for children and young people with SEN, including those who need to stay in the education system beyond the age of 19. Questions 20 to 25 of this questionnaire will be of particular interest to those working with young people with SEN aged 16 and over.

Our ambition for young people with SEN, for those who have disabilities, and those who are placed in alternative provision or are at risk of exclusion from school, is exactly the same as for every other child and young person – to achieve well in school and college, find employment and go on to live happy and fulfilled lives. The questions on pages 26 to 28 of this questionnaire cover other system-wide aspects of the funding arrangements that may be working against the realisation of this ambition.

This questionnaire is intended to gather views and evidence from schools, colleges, local authorities and others with an interest in provision for these children and young people. We estimate that this call for evidence will take around **2 hours** to complete in full.

We have also asked the Council for Disabled Children to organise a small number of workshops across the country, so that we can discuss the themes in this call for evidence in greater detail. If you would like to attend one of these events, please register your interest at senfinancialev events@ncb.org.uk, giving your name, role, organisation and email address. They will send you information about the events as soon as it is available.

Issue date and deadline

The consultation was issued on 03 May 2019, and will close on 31 July 2019.

Enquiries

By email:

HighNeedsFundingReform.consultation@education.gov.uk

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

Respond online

To help us analyse the responses please use the online system wherever possible. Visit [our consultation website](#) to submit your response.

By email

HighNeedsFundingReform.consultation@education.gov.uk

By post

Funding Policy Unit
4th Floor Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT

Questions

About You

A) Please provide your name:

B) What is your email address?

C) Are you responding as an individual, or as part of an organisation? (Circle)

D) What is your role?

E) What is the name of your organisation?

LB Bromley

F) What type of organisation is this?

Local Authority

G) Which local authority are you responding from?

LB Bromley

H) Are you happy to be contacted directly about your response?

Yes

Information provided in response to consultations, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

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

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

The Department for Education will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and, your personal information will only be used for the purposes of this consultation. Your information will not be shared with third parties unless the law allows it.

You can read more about what the DfE does when we ask for and hold your personal information in our [personal information charter](#).

I) Do you wish for your response to remain confidential?

No

Funding for pupils with SEND in Mainstream schools

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.1 - 3.4** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Mainstream schools educate the majority of children with SEN, using funds from their annual budget share (in the case of local authority maintained schools) or annual grant (in the case of academies). When developing the funding formula for mainstream schools, local authorities must ensure that funding is provided to enable schools to meet additional needs of their pupils, including those with SEN and who are disabled.

Funding for SEN through the schools funding formula

Local authorities use additional needs factors in their local funding formulae. The new national funding formula also includes factors to reflect the additional needs of a school's cohort, including deprivation factors such as children from families eligible for free school meals and the attainment of pupils in the prior phase of their education (known as low prior attainment).

We don't use measures relating directly to schools' or local authorities' assessments of pupils with SEN, as these would provide a perverse incentive to over-identify pupils as having SEN.

The following questions seek views on whether the schools funding formula, at both national and local level, could be improved to make sure that schools are receiving the funds they need to provide SEN support.

1) What formula factors are most important in providing schools with enough money to ensure they meet the needs of their pupils with SEN? Please rank the following factors in order of importance with 1 as the most important.

Factor	Rank
Age-weighted pupil unit of funding	4
Low prior attainment†	1
IDACI†† – a measure of area deprivation	3
Eligibility for free school meals – a measure of deprivation relating to individual children	2
Mobility – additional funding for schools that have a high proportion of pupils who start at a school mid-year	6
Standard lump sum – intended to reflect fixed costs of a school, however many pupils and teachers are required	5
Other (please add below any other factors you think are important for ensuring that schools get an annual budget that enables them to provide appropriate SEN support)	

Further information

† Low prior attainment is an important proxy measure that gives an indication of the number of pupils in a school who have achieved a low level of attainment in their previous phase of education. This has been used in local funding formulae, alongside deprivation measures, for a number of years, particularly as a proxy for the number of pupils with SEN. However, we recognise that prior attainment as a funding factor for SEN has limitations, and will not capture all pupils with SEN.

†† IDACI stands for Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index, and is a collation of different deprivation indicators produced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Funding for SEN through the schools funding formula

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.5 - 3.12** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Low prior attainment is an important proxy measure that gives an indication of the number of pupils in a school who have achieved a low level of attainment in their previous phase of education. This has been used in local funding formulae, alongside deprivation measures, for a number of years, particularly as a proxy for the number of pupils with SEN. However, we recognise that prior attainment as a funding factor for SEN has limitations, and will not capture all pupils with SEN.

Nevertheless, we are exploring whether tiering this factor (introducing more than one level of prior attainment to differentiate between those who narrowly missed the standard or were at the bottom of their cohort) might improve our targeting of funding to those with the highest level of need. We would welcome views on this. Any specific proposals for changing this factor in future would be subject to further consultation.

2) Would allocating more funding towards lower attainers within the low prior attainment factor help to better target funding towards the schools that have to make more SEN provision for their pupils?

Yes

3) What positive distributional impact would this change in approach (e.g. creating tiers of low prior attainment) create for mainstream primary and secondary schools?

The low prior attainment proxy is useful in that it does not create a perverse incentive to over-identify special educational needs from an attainment perspective. In terms of the 'tiered system', we would be concerned if the proposed way forward meant that a lower tier extracted funding from the existing tier, as this would put further pressure on the already existing burden of an insufficient notional budget for some schools.

4) Would such a change in approach introduce any negative impact for mainstream primary and secondary schools?

The one area that is likely to be significantly impacted is the ability to meet the growing and more complex needs of children and young people in mainstream settings who are cognitively able, but are suffering with a range of challenges across two broad areas of need; social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) and communication and interaction, specifically ASD.

Targeted funding and support for SEN provision in schools

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.13 - 3.18** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Many local authorities make available to mainstream schools additional funding from their high needs budget, to support schools who have more pupils with SEN than the local formula may suggest. Local authorities have budgeted to spend £57 million on this in 2018-19.

We would like to gather views on whether the targeting of extra SEN funding to specific mainstream schools, to take into account their particular cohort of pupils with SEN or disabilities, should be more standardised.

- 5) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements below, and in the comments box give the advantages and disadvantages of your preferred approach. Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Local authorities should retain the flexibility to develop, in consultation with their schools, their own method of targeting extra SEN funding to schools that need it.	Y		
Central government should provide more guidance for local authorities on how they should target extra SEN funding to schools, but local authorities should remain responsible for determining the amounts in consultation with their schools.	Y		
Central government should prescribe a consistent national approach to the targeting of additional funding to schools that have a higher proportion of pupils with SEN and/or those with more complex needs.		Y	

Comments

Historically Bromley has not made use of this facility, but would want to reserve the right to do so in the future should the need arise. However whilst the LA would welcome further guidance from central government regarding this, we would not want to see this becoming too prescribed as it would inevitably lose the flexible approach that this requires in order to be able to react to local need.

The notional SEN Budget

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.19 - 3.24** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

For the last 20 years or so, mainstream schools' funding has included the identification of a notional SEN budget that is intended to indicate an approximate amount within the school's overall funding for meeting the costs of the provision for supporting children with SEN (notionally up to £6,000 per pupil).

Some have questioned how meaningful this is for schools, particularly given the range of different approaches local authorities take in calculating the notional SEN budget, and because it is notional and not widely understood, and also taking into account the extent to which schools feel their overall budgets are stretched. Others argue that it is important to have an amount identified so that funding intended for pupils with SEN is not spent on other provision. Currently information about schools' notional SEN budgets is published.

6) Is it helpful for local authorities to continue to calculate a notional SEN budget for each school, and for this information to be published, as now?

Please Tick (✓)

Very helpful	Y
Somewhat helpful	
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	
Somewhat unhelpful	
Very unhelpful	

7) For those responding from a school, who in your school(s) is involved in decisions about spending from the school's notional SEN budget?

Please Tick (✓) all that apply – n/a

Governors	
Head teacher / principal	
Senior leadership team	
SENCO	
Teachers	

Other (Please comment)	
------------------------	--

8) Should the national funding formula for schools include a notional SEN budget, or a way of calculating how much of each school's funding is intended to meet the costs of special provision for pupils with SEN?

Yes

Do you have any further comments on the notional SEN budget?

A nationally led SEN notional budget across the country provides consistency in understanding the system and supports more equality for children and young people when moving schools/locations. This does however rely on schools utilising the SEN notional budget in a consistent way and being more open and transparent about their approaches. It would be useful if updated benchmarking were to be carried out and for there to be a national framework in place for the use of funds. Local areas must (under the SEND Code of Practice) set out the local offer, often called ordinarily available provision. It would be useful for there to be a nationally threshold of what should be included in the ordinarily available provision, leaving flexibility to account for local differences i.e. sensory support service, or an ASD specific service which might be in place.

The £6,000 threshold

Please refer to paragraphs 3.25 - 3.34 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

From 2013-14 the school and high needs funding system was changed to bring in a more consistent approach. Local authorities were required to provide schools with sufficient resources through the formula to meet the costs of their pupils' additional SEN support up to £6,000. Schools could access high needs top-up funding for the costs of support in excess of this common threshold. In this way schools would have the resources to meet the costs of supporting those with lower level needs, and – through the top-up funding – the excess costs of those with more complex needs.

The arrangements from 2013 were intended to reduce the perverse incentive for schools in some areas to argue for increased costs of support so that they would have the full costs met. The introduction of the £6,000 threshold was also intended to encourage schools to meet lower level SEN without the need to “label” pupils as having SEN either to receive additional funding from the local authority or to drive placement decisions.

We have heard from schools about their increasing difficulties in meeting the costs of SEN support up to £6,000. We recognise that costs have risen since 2013. We want to know whether the difficulties that schools have brought to our attention are simply a reflection of a shortage of funding to meet those costs, or whether the level or operation of the £6,000 threshold needs to be reviewed.

We are therefore keen to hear views on whether the threshold should be altered. Changing the threshold for top-up funding within the current system would mean changes in the distribution of funding between schools funding and high needs funding through the national funding formula and consequent changes in the expectations we would have on the special provision made by schools and local authorities respectively. It is clear, therefore, that we would need to approach any change very carefully, with a clear understanding of the impact, and on how any adverse impact could be avoided.

A lower threshold would imply schools making a lower level of provision for pupils with SEN before accessing top-up funding from the local authority, but would therefore require more funding from local authorities' high needs budgets. It has been argued that this would encourage schools to make more provision available for children with SEN because they would be able to access additional resources more readily, and that this would ultimately reduce the demand for special school places.

A higher threshold would imply schools making more provision for pupils with SEN from their budgets, requiring a higher level of funding allocated through the schools funding formula (and in particular the additional needs factors), before accessing top-up funding. Some think this would be beneficial because it would not only give schools greater

control over the available resources, but also reduce the demand on local authorities' high needs budgets, and possibly reduce the requests for education, health and care needs assessments where these might be sought primarily for financial reasons.

We are also keen to understand whether schools in particular circumstances are finding the £6,000 threshold more difficult to operate than others. If there are this could mean either changes to the operation of the threshold, or changes to the way that local authorities target funding from their high needs budgets.

9) Please indicate whether or not you agree with the following statements.

Please Tick (✓)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
The level of the threshold makes little or no difference to the system for making special provision: it is the level of funding available to schools and local authorities that is crucial.	Y		
The £6,000 threshold should be lower, so that schools do not have to make as much provision for pupils with SEN from their annual budgets, before they access top-up funding from the local authority.†			Y
The £6,000 threshold should be higher, so that schools have to make more provision for pupils with SEN from their annual budgets, before they access top-up funding from the local authority.††			Y
The operation of the £6,000 threshold should take account of particular circumstances.	Y		

Further information

†This implies a change in the balance of funding between schools and local authorities, with more going to the latter to support higher levels of high needs top-up funding.

††This implies a change in the balance of funding between schools and local authorities, with more resources going to schools to support higher levels of special provision.

10) If you have agreed with the final statement in question 9, please indicate below which circumstances you think would be relevant for a modified threshold or different funding arrangement.

	Yes	No	Not Sure
Schools that are relatively small.			Y
Schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs† or EHC plans.			Y
When pupils with EHC plans are admitted to a school during the year, which may create unintended consequences.††			Y
Other (please specify below)			

Further information

†Those requiring provision costing more than £6,000, where the school has to fund the first £6,000 of costs, with the excess costs met by top-up funding from the local authority's high needs budget

††For example, driving up demand for EHC plans at the pupil's previous school. Please also indicate if you think this should operate differently for in-year admissions, rather than normal transition times.

Comments:

NB –need further information from SEN regarding potential overall impact on LA for each of the options.

Provision for pupils with SEN in mainstream schools

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.35 - 3.40** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

The Children and Families Act requires schools, other providers, and local authorities to co-operate with each other in preparing and publishing the “local offer” of provision and services for children and young people with SEN and disabilities. This must be done working with parents and young people. The local offer should include a description of the SEN support ordinarily available in each school, including primary and secondary mainstream schools, as well as additional services and provision provided by the local authority and other agencies external to the school. In addition, all maintained schools and academies must publish information on their websites about their arrangements for supporting pupils with SEN.

We would like to know more about how well the local offer of special provision is understood and communicated.

11) If you are responding on behalf of a school, do you have a clear understanding about what provision is “ordinarily available” to meet pupils’ special educational needs in your school?

Yes / No

Comments:

N/A

12) How is this determined?

Please Tick (✓)

On a school-by-school basis	
As part of a multi-academy trust	
Part of a whole-local authority approach	
Part of a cluster of schools	

13)How is this offer communicated to parents?

Please Tick (✓) all that apply.

School's published SEN information report	
Published local offer,	
Discussions between teacher(s) and parents	
Discussions between SENCO and parents	
Other (please specify)	

If the offer is publicly available, please provide a web link.

14) Does your local authority make it clear when a child or young person requires an education, health and care (EHC) plan?

Yes / No / Not sure

15)How is this articulated?

Published local offer	
School's published SEN information report	
Other publicly available document	
Unpublished local authority policy	

If this is publicly available, please provide a web link.

Funding for pupils who need alternative provision (AP) or are at risk of exclusion from school

Please refer to **paragraphs 4.1 - 4.9** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Local authorities are responsible for arranging suitable education for children who – because of permanent exclusion, illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education, without such arrangements being made. Schools arrange AP for pupils through off-site directions to improve their behaviour and for pupils who have been subject to a fixed-period exclusion of more than five school days.

Local authorities are responsible for funding AP they arrange for children who have been permanently excluded from school. Schools usually contribute to or pay the full costs of AP they arrange for pupils who are on their roll. Local authorities can recover funding from schools who permanently exclude a child, but this is rarely the same as the cost of the pupil's subsequent education in AP.

We are interested to gather evidence about whether current high needs funding arrangements empower local authorities, schools and providers to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion from school, provide high quality AP and take collective responsibility for delivering best value from the funding available from the high needs and schools' budgets.

16) Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. Please Tick (✓)

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Not sure	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
The current funding arrangements help schools, local authorities and AP to work together and to intervene early where such action may avoid the need for permanent exclusion later		Y			
The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate		Y			

17)How could we encourage more collaboration between local authorities, schools and providers to plan and fund local AP and early intervention support?

A more devolved funding model should be considered aligned to school accountabilities for the educational outcomes of pupils. A defined AP/SEMH budget within the High Needs funding based on national benchmarks and invested locally via the schools forum would encourage local partnership working, collective responsibility and joint endeavour to plan effective AP provision in local areas

18)What changes could be made to improve the way that the AP budget is spent, to better enable local authorities, schools and providers to use the local AP budget to provide high quality AP, intervene early to support children at risk of exclusion from school, or reintegrate pupils in AP back into mainstream where appropriate?

Improve commissioning of AP by providing certainty of future funding levels to allow better commissioning over longer timescales - 5 year+ and more long term planning. This will encourage new AP providers and help to develop the AP market in local areas and also allow existing AP providers to develop their services and staffing without the constant concerns over future funding.

Local Partnerships established between LA's, schools and AP partners and supported via a new funding model with a remit to understand local context on pupil need and plan interventions and places locally. This could include financial disincentives to exclusion and incentives on the reintegration of pupils back to mainstream

19)Please use the box below to share any examples of existing good practice where local authorities, schools and AP settings have worked together effectively to use the AP budget to provide high quality AP, intervene early to support children at risk of exclusion from school, or reintegrate pupils in AP back into mainstream where appropriate.

Primary outreach service and KS4 vocational offer established recently which was agreed in partnership by the LA, schools and AP provider is an example of good partnership working in this area. Certainty of future funding within a defined budget needs to be provided to ensure sustainability.

Funding for students with SEN in further education

Please refer to **paragraphs 5.1 - 5.9** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

We would welcome views from colleges, schools and other providers of post-16 education, as well as from local authorities and organisations representing these providers, on any ways in which the operation of the funding system is acting as a barrier to young people's preparation for adulthood. Evidence from young people and their parents would also be welcome.

We are also planning a short focused consultation early in the summer of 2019 on specific proposals for a limited number of more technical changes to the operation of the funding arrangements for special post-16 institutions.

**20) Are there aspects of the operation of the funding system that prevent young people from accessing the support they need to prepare them for adult life?
Not sure**

21) Notwithstanding your views about the sufficiency of funding, please describe any other aspects of the financial and funding arrangements that you think could be amended to improve the delivery of provision for young people with SEN.

As above

22)If you are able to provide any examples where local authorities and colleges have worked together effectively to plan provision to meet the needs for SEN support and high needs, please describe these below.

We have been working with our mainstream Secondary Head Teachers and are now progressing opportunities to have in place a new vocational pathway for Bromley KS4 students for Sept 2019. The offer will provide a diverse vocational offer, including high quality pastoral support, that leads to credible post 16 options.

LBB are working in partnership with the Secondary Head Teachers and London South East Academies Trust (LSEAT) to put this offer in place, with the final proposal yet to be endorsed through Members.

Improving early intervention at each age and stage to prepare young people for adulthood sooner

Please refer to **paragraphs 6.1 - 6.7** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

We want to understand whether the current operation of the funding system is creating a financial perverse incentive to resist a commitment of resources or restrict the availability of services when problems first arise, when such spending could in fact lead to a longer-term reduction in the complexity of support needed, and so longer-term savings. In a system that is intended to secure outcomes that imply a reducing need for support for many young people, as they prepare for employment and living more independently, it would be perverse if the lack of resources at one stage was leading to increasing costs later.

We are therefore keen to gather evidence on the extent to which financial and funding arrangements are driving the escalation of costs, and preventing those making spending decisions from taking an “invest-to-save” approach that leads to reducing costs in the longer term. If they are, we would appreciate views on how the arrangements could be changed to address this.

23) Are the current funding or financial arrangements making early intervention and prevention more difficult to deliver, causing costs to escalate?

Yes

Transition to adult social care – although not really relevant to mainstream HNB, more specialist so may be more applicable to expand the Summer 2019 consultation that they have indicated.

24) If you can you provide examples of invest-to-save approaches with evidence that they can provide value for money by reducing the costs of SEN support, SEN provision or other support costs (e.g. health or social care) later, please describe these below.

All of the initiatives below are as a result of a wide reaching review of the services delivered to support mainstream schools. At this point in time, it is too early to demonstrate evidence in terms of reduction in costs. We do however know that these changes are increasing confidence and skills within the mainstream sector.

- SEN Advisory Teams has reviewed and revised its referral pathway, which now supports improved access support and advice for CYP with EHCPs in mainstream schools.
- Bromley SEN Training Collaborative works to discuss and deliver the training offer across a wide range of professional bodies - CEOs, Head Teachers, SENCos, Teaching Assistants, Newly qualified teachers and teachers. Specialist Leaders in Education appointed to work in schools and funding supports schools to release staff.
- Advisory teachers recruited specialising in speech, language and communication needs working with schools to develop a communication friendly approach throughout the school environment. Also offering whole school CPD, some of which will be in partnership with health colleagues.
- SEN Advisory Service will offer an advice and support phone line for SENCos and teachers in schools (2 hours each day) so that advice and guidance can be easily sought in a timely way. Intensive key working (for CYP with an EHCP) can be sought for families who need help with a wider range of holistic needs.
- The graduated approach framework (including ordinarily available provision) now reviewed and revised, offering SENCos and school teams advice with regard to identification and assessment of needs. Also outlines research based strategies and interventions.
- Team around the school approach, including working more closely with IASS to identify schools that may need focused support.
- Transition events in place, which support schools with key stage transfers enabling schools to receive vital information about pupils who have SEN to prepare staff teams and work with new families so that transitions to run as smoothly as possible.
- SEN information reports are regularly audited to ensure they provide clear information to families and practitioners regarding what support is offered.
- A new jointly funded post has been recruited to: Local Offer Development Officer to support the development and upkeep of the LO, ensuring it is easy to navigate for families and young people and that it is clear what is available from universal to specialist support.
- Bromley is a CAMHS Trailblazer site, piloting the delivery of children and young people Mental Health Support Teams (MHSTs) in schools, and the four week waiting time for access to specialist CAMHS
- ASD Partnership Group includes parents and practitioners across education, health and care –

focusing on developing provision and support across the local area for children, young people and families.

- Nurture Group Network bringing together mainstream schools to develop nurture group provision, providing a safe and supporting environment that meets the different developmental stages of each individual child.
- Champions Development Networks, focusing on the joint-practice development of provision and practice in Autism and Social, Emotional and Mental Health - high level of engagement from schools across Bromley with strong peer to peer support and sharing of best practice.

25) If you think there are particular transition points at which it would be more effective to access resources, please indicate below those you believe would be most effective to focus on.

Please Tick (✓) all that apply.

The transition from early years provision to reception class in primary school	Y
The transition from Year 6 in primary school to Year 7 in secondary school	Y
The transition from secondary school to further or other tertiary education	Y

Please indicate below any other transition points that you think we should look at.

College to adult services – although please note comments in Q23, so this probably needs to be shelved until the Summer 2019 consultation. It relates to the perverse incentive to stay in college (HNB) because of lack of services or good planning.

Effective partnership working to support children and young people with complex needs

Please refer to **paragraphs 7.1 - 7.8** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

When different organisations are responsible for their own budgets they are of course rightly interested in how best to discharge their responsibilities within the resources available to them. Separate funding streams and budgetary control are an inevitable feature of a complex landscape of provision, based on different legislation. This, however, can create barriers which discourage the partnership working that is essential for meeting the needs of those children and young people with SEN and who are disabled, and others with complex needs. Furthermore, conflict between budget holders can increase when budgets are tight and flexibility to move funding is reduced.

We would like to explore potential developments in funding arrangements that would overcome these barriers, empower effective collaborative working that can meet the complex needs of children and young people, and encourage budget holders to:

- share their resources and use appropriate pooling arrangements to most effectively meet the complex needs – and improve the outcomes – of children and young people (without arguments over who should pay for what);
- avoid taking inappropriate action to pass costs on to others, where this simply moves the cost pressures elsewhere and does not help to address the problem;
- strengthen joint leadership and strategic commissioning of services.

26) Please describe as briefly as possible below changes that you think could be made to the funding system nationally and/or locally that would foster more effective collaborative approaches and partnership arrangements.

Please refer to Q24

Other aspects of the funding and financial arrangements

Please refer to **paragraphs 8.1 - 8.4** of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

We are aware that the amount of funding that is allocated to the Department for Education, and the amount that the department allocates to local authorities and others, is very important for making good quality provision for our most vulnerable young people. Securing a sufficient amount of funding for education in future, will remain a priority for the department.

But we want to make sure that there is nothing in the funding and financial arrangements, irrespective of the level of funding, that is creating barriers to informed decision-making in the best interests of children and young people.

It would also be helpful to have views on those aspects of the current system that are actively helping the right decisions to be made, so that we can make sure that they are not changed.

27) Are there any aspects of the funding and financial arrangements, not covered in your previous responses, that are creating perverse incentives?

Parental preference for a mainstream provision, where it is the view of professionals that the placement does not meet needs. The threshold in law cannot be underestimated, and it can be very challenging to balance appropriateness of placement with funding that may be required to meet needs in a mainstream setting.

28)What aspects of the funding and financial arrangements are helping the right decisions to be made, both in securing good provision for children and young people with additional needs, and in providing good value for money?



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2019

This document/publication (not included logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk

Report No.
ED

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Schools' Forum**

Date: **20th June 2019**

Decision Maker: **Education Budget Sub-Committee**

Date:

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

TITLE: SPENDING BY PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND SPECIAL MAINTAINED SCHOOLS IN 2018/19

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools' Finance Team
Tel: 020 8603 3572 E-mail: amanda.russell@liberata.com

Chief Officer: Jared Nehra, Director of Education

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides information on all revenue and capital balances held by Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools as at 31 March 2019, and also provides a comparison to the balances held at the same time in the previous year.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Committee is invited to consider the financial position of Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools at the end of the 2018/19 financial year and to identify any matters for specific comment and referral to the Portfolio Holder.**
- 2.2 **The Schools' Forum is asked to note the balances for information.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: N/A
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Dedicated Schools Grant 2018/19
 4. Total current budget for this head:
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional) – N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours – N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-statutory - Government guidance:
 2. Call in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected) - N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 This report highlights the financial position of Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools as at 31 March 2019 the end of the 2018/19 financial year.
- 3.2 Balances are reported in accordance with the DfE Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR) Regulations. This is the framework for reporting income and expenditure and balances. It provides schools with a benchmarking facility for comparison between similar schools to promote self-management and value for money. A CFR return is produced for all schools maintained by the Local Authority as at 31 March 2019.
- 3.3 The CFR framework consists of five balances, which provide an overall picture of a school's resources available from one year to the next, and gives information on balances carried forward. The balances are categorised as follows:
- BO1 Committed Revenue Balances
 - BO2 Uncommitted Revenue Balances
 - BO3 Devolved Formula Capital Balances
 - BO5 Other Capital Balances
 - BO6 Community Focused Extended Schools Balances
- Nb BO4 Other Standard Fund Capital Balances has been deleted as it related to standards funds which no longer exist.
- 3.4 The average level of revenue balances (BO1 and BO2) both committed and uncommitted for Maintained Primary School stands at 11% of School Budget Shares which remains unchanged from end of 2017/18. Secondary school balances have decreased significantly from 7% to 0%. Special School balances remain unchanged at 8%.
- 3.5 A comparison of the levels of school balances as at 31 March 2019 compared to the previous year is shown in the table below.

	Primary Schools £000	Secondary Schools £000	Special Schools £000
Revenue balances only as at: 31.03.19			
Committed Revenue Balances (BO1)	48 (1%)	0 (0%)	171 (2%)
Uncommitted Revenue Balances (BO2)	681 (10%)	3 (0%)	557 (6%)
	729 (11%)	3 (0%)	728 (8%)
Revenue balances only as at: 31.03.18			
Committed Revenue Balances (BO1)	57 (1%)	28 (0%)	169 (1 %)
Uncommitted Revenue Balances (BO2)	509 (10%)	333 (7%)	597 (7 %)
	566 (11%)	361 (7%)	766 (8%)

- 3.6 Full details of schools balances can be seen at **Appendix 1**

- 3.7 All schools with balances in excess of 8% have been asked to complete a proforma detailing the reason for holding a high balance and their plans for reducing the balance in year.
- 3.7 The DFE also require further analysis to be undertaken in relation to this data. LAs are required to provide information on how they are proposing to address the issue if an:

A: LA has overspent its Dedicated Schools Grant by 2% or more (ie it is 2% or more in deficit)

B: LA has underspent its Dedicated Schools Grant by 5% or more (ie it is 5% or more in surplus)

C: LA has 2.5% of its schools that have been in deficit of 2.5% or more for the last 4 years and their individual deficit must have been at least £10,000 each year. We will only ask LAs for more information where at least three schools in the LA meet the criteria

D: LA has 5% of schools that have had a surplus of 15% or more for the last 5 years and their individual surplus must have been at least £10,000 each year. LAs will only be asked for more information where at least three schools in the LA meet the criteria.

Schools that would fall into these categories have been highlighted on the table at **Appendix 2** – for 2018/19 no schools fall into this category.

- 3.8 This report also provides information on those schools with a deficit revenue balance. As at 31 March 2019, there were no schools with a deficit balance.
- 3.9 In accordance with DfE requirements the SFT will work with schools with high balances to ensure that they are being used effectively. Schools are advised that revenue funding is allocated on an annual basis to support the cost of education for their current pupils and therefore it is not acceptable for schools to retain high levels of revenue funding to protect against possible funding reductions in future years.
- 3.10 **Appendix 3** shows a statement from each of the schools with large uncommitted surplus balances outlining the reasons for this and the management action to be taken to reduce the balances to a reasonable level.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Whilst this report provides details of school balances, there are no financial implications to be considered.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

	2018-19									2017-18			Appendix 1	
	BO1 Committed Revenue Balances	BO2 Uncommitted Revenue Bal 31/03/2018	B02 Rev Bal as % of 2019/20 SBS	BO1 & B02 Rev Bal as % of 2019/20 SBS	School Budget Share 2019-20	BO3 Devolved Formula Cap Balances	BO5 Other Capital Balances	BO6 Community Focussed Ext Schools	Total Balance C/fwd as at 31-Mar-18	BO1 Committed Revenue Balances	BO2 Uncommitted Revenue Bal 31/03/2017	B02 Rev Bal as % of 2017/18 SBS	BO1 & B02 Rev Bal as % of 2017/18 SBS	
Primary Schools	£	£			£	£	£	£	£	£	£			
Bickley Primary	18,041	73,808	4%	6%	1,652,686	23,716	0	0	115,565	28,157	84,683	5%	7%	
Downe Primary	0	53,290	11%	11%	470,889	15,773	0	0	69,063	0	28,224	6%	6%	
Edgebury Primary	0	185,736	15%	15%	1,237,295	14,464	0	0	200,200	0	76,655	7%	7%	
Poverest Primary	23,505	211,844	12%	14%	1,723,303	13,015	13,163	0	261,527	18,993	185,828	11%	13%	
Southborough Primary	6,616	156,647	9%	9%	1,822,255	3,847	28,600	0	195,709	10,320	133,757	7%	8%	
Sub-total	48,161	681,325	10%	11%	6,906,428	70,814.91	41,763	0.00	842,064	57,470	509,146	10%	11%	
Secondary Schools														
St. Olaves	0	3,267	0%	0%	5,243,221	0	65,712	0	68,978	28,000	333,248	7%	7%	
Sub-total	0	3,267	0%	0%	5,243,221	0.00	65,712	0.00	68,978	28,000	333,248	7%	7%	
Special Schools														
Marjorie Mcclure	131,553	95,419	4%	9%	2,588,620	12,341	0	0	239,313	105,989	95,547	4%	8%	
Riverside	39,509	461,657	7%	8%	6,205,665	38,082	33,913	33,141	606,302	62,946	501,556	8%	9%	
Sub-total	171,062	557,076	6%	8%	8,794,285	50,423	33,913	33,141	845,614	168,935	597,103	7%	8%	
TOTAL	219,223	1,241,667	6%	7%	20,943,934	121,238	141,387	33,141	1,756,657	254,405	1,439,497	8%	9%	

	2018-19		2017-18		2016/17		2015/16		2014/15	
	BO1 & B02									
	Combined	Rev Bal								
	Rev Bal	as %								
		of 2019/20		of 2018/19		of 2017/18		of 2016/17		of 2015/16
		SBS								
Primary Schools										
Bickley Primary	£91,848	6%	£112,840	7%	£201,053	12%	£112,840	7%	£211,532	13%
Downe Primary	£53,290	11%	£28,224	6%	£658	0%	£28,224	6%	£21,322	4%
Edgebury Primary	£185,736	15%	£76,655	7%	£82,699	8%	£76,655	7%	£165,309	16%
Poverest Primary	£235,349	14%	£204,820	13%	£248,163	18%	£204,820	13%	£234,088	12%
Southborough Primary	£163,263	9%	£144,077	8%	£179,247	10%	£144,077	8%	£149,406	8%
Secondary Schools										
St. Olaves	£3,267	0%	£361,248	7%	£500,677	10%	£361,248	7%	£460,919	9%
Special Schools										
Marjorie McClure	£226,972	9%	£201,536	8%	£173,576	7%	£201,536	8%	£136,847	2%
Riverside	£501,166	8%	£564,502	9%	£431,123	8%	£564,502	9%	£354,630	7%