

# Worcestershire Schools Forum (WSF) Agenda 5 November 2020

2.00pm

Remote Meeting

Held Via MS Teams

Document Details:

Status: V 0.1

Date: November 2020

Document Location:

[http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/download/552/worcestershire\\_schools\\_forum\\_framework\\_downloads](http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/download/552/worcestershire_schools_forum_framework_downloads)

Contact: Andy McHale



# Contents

## **AGENDA**

Agenda Item 1 Apologies

Agenda Item 2 Declaration of Interests

Agenda Item 3 Declaration of potential Conflict of Interests with Items on the Agenda

Agenda Item 4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020

Agenda Item 5 Matters Arising from The Minutes

Agenda Item 6 Any Other Business

Agenda Item 7 Draft Statutory Instrument DSG Deficit Related Statutory Override

Agenda Item 8 School Funding 2021-22 Local Issues –

a) Recommended Policy

b) WSF Required Decisions

Agenda Item 9 High Needs Update

a) F40 Survey

b) DfE HN Planning Template

Agenda Item 10 Pupil Growth Fund (PGF) Considerations 2020-21

Agenda Item 11 F40 Group Update Minutes of Executive Committee 16 September 2020

Date of Next Programmed WSF Meeting: -

Thursday 21 January 2021 at 2.00pm Via MS Teams



**MEETING OF THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)**

**Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020 at 2pm  
Remote Meeting Held Via MS Teams**

**A G E N D A**

1. Apologies
2. Declaration of Interests
3. Declaration of Potential Conflict of Interests  
With Items on the Agenda
4. Minutes of the Last Meeting 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020 (attached)
5. Matters Arising from the Minutes
6. Any Other Business
7. Draft Statutory Instrument DSG Deficit  
Related Statutory Override (attached)
8. School Funding 2021-22 Local Issues –  
a) Recommended Policy (attached)  
b) WSF Required Decisions (attached)
9. High Needs Update  
a) F40 Survey (attached)  
b) DfE HN Planning Template (attached)

**Phil Rook**

Director of Resources

Worcestershire  
Children First

Worcestershire  
County Council

PO Box 73  
County Hall  
Spetchley Road  
Worcester  
WR5 2YA

Tel 01905 846300

E-mail

[prook@worschildrenfirst.org.uk](mailto:prook@worschildrenfirst.org.uk)

10. Pupil Growth Fund Considerations 2020-21 (attached)

11. F40 Group Update  
Minutes of Executive Committee 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020 (attached)

Date of Next Meeting: - Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021 at **2pm**  
Remote Meeting Via MS Teams

Please pass apologies to Andy McHale who can be contacted on  
Tel 01905 846285 or e-mail [amchale@worcschildrenfirst.org.uk](mailto:amchale@worcschildrenfirst.org.uk)

---



# worcestershire county council

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)

Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
Remote Meeting Held Via Zoom

The meeting started at 2.25 pm

The meeting start was delayed due to IT connectivity issues.

### IN ATTENDANCE:

#### WSF Members

Malcolm Richards (Chair)	-	Governor, Bromsgrove
Marie Pearse	-	HT Evesham Nursery School
Paul Essenhigh	-	Executive HT Catshill Middle, Catshill First and Nursery Schools
Emma Pritchard	-	Principal The Black Pear Trust
Bryn Thomas	-	HT Wolverley CE Secondary School (until 3.20pm)
Chris King	-	CEO Severn Academies Educational Trust
Lorraine Petersen	-	Governor, Bromsgrove
Jeff Robinson	-	Governor, Malvern Hills
John Bateman	-	Governor, Aspire Alternative Provision (AP) Free School
Stephen Baker	-	Union Representative
Tricia Wellings	-	PVI Sector

#### Local Authority (LA)

Phil Rook	-	Director of Resources Worcestershire Children First
Sarah Wilkins	-	Director of Education and Early Help Worcestershire Children First (until 3.30pm)
Andy McHale	-	Service Manager Funding and Policy Worcestershire Children First
Caroline Brand	-	Schools Finance Manager Worcestershire County Council

### 2. APOLOGIES

Nathan Jones	-	HT Meadow Green Primary
Adrian Ward	-	HT Trinity High School
Bec Garratt	-	HT Wyre Forest School
David McIntosh	-	Governor, Wyre Forest
Tim Reid	-	Church of England Board of Education
Greg McClarey	-	Archdiocese of Birmingham
Edward Senior	-	16-19 Providers

Councillor Marcus Hart

- Cabinet Member with Responsibility for  
Education and Skills  
Worcestershire County Council

### **3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

3.1 The Chair welcomed Emma Pritchard, Principal The Black Pear Trust, to her first WSF meeting in the Primary Headteacher category.

3.2 In response to a query from a member of the WSF, Andy advised prospective PVI representatives had been contacted and invited to attend the WSF as observers, but none had taken up the offer. The Chair further advised Tricia Wellings would represent the sector until replacements were secured.

### **4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None.

### **5. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTERESTS WITH ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

None.

### **6. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (9<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Agreed.

### **7. MATTERS ARISING**

#### **7.1 Covid 19 Issues Update**

(a) Phil advised that schools had been able to claim for additional costs from the DfE, but the conditions of grant funding were quite restrictive. Phil further advised that claims for £0.2m had been approved by the DfE and schools who claimed would receive the money shortly. This was split between premises costs £0.09m, free school meals £0.08m and cleaning costs £0.03m.

(b) The WSF commented as follows: -

- Schools are picking up significant costs just to stay open and there is a need to know the Government position together with if there is a further opportunity to make additional applications in the Autumn Term.
- Schools were actively canvassing their local MPs on the position on additional financial support with a member of the WSF meeting their local MP later in the week.
- No additional funding will result in both partial and full school closures and the ESFA are not giving academies any real support.
- The list of areas for claiming is very limited and additional staffing due to cover self-isolation and additional accommodation costs are significant.
- Data collection on this by the DfE needs to be more dynamic and there are the current daily returns on absence that could be enhanced to support this.
- Track and trace are not effective with schools registering as priority but with no confirmation received.
- When will schools receive the grant funding?

- Early years settings have not been targeted for funding by the DfE.

(c) The LA responded as follows: -

- Sarah advised the LA has daily meetings with the DfE and the LA continues to raise issues on additional costs, the capability of the testing capacity and data collection.
- The WSF were requested to send specific details on additional costs for use in these meetings and for the MP meeting.
- Phil indicated there was likely to be another claims window.
- Caroline confirmed the grant funding had just been received by the LA and would be distributed to those qualifying schools in receipt of grant funding as soon as possible.

## 7.2 F40 Group Letter

(a) The WSF noted the contents of the letter from F40 to the DfE and the suggestions for supporting school additional cost pressures.

## 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

## 9. WSF ATTENDANCE RECORD 2019/20

9.1 The WSF noted the attendance list from the last academic year 2019/20.

9.2 The WSF noted the number of vacancies continues to be high in specific categories and were encouraged to canvass their respective groups for nominations.

## 10. SCHOOL AND LA FUNDING UPDATE 2021-22

### 10.1 DfE Funding Announcements July 2020

(a) Andy advised the DfE had announced their policy direction for 2021-22 on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020. The key issues were as follows: -

- The ESFA have published provisional funding allocations for 2021-22 for the schools, high needs and central school services national funding formulae (NFF).
- The DfE will publish provisional DSG allocations for LAs for 2021-22 in December 2020 based upon the October 2020 census and other 2020 data sets.
- For the **Schools NFF**: -
  - This will continue to have the same factors as in 2020-21.
  - Funding for supporting the costs of teachers' pay and pension employer contribution, currently funded by specific grant and the supplementary fund, **has been added by the DfE to the NFF from 2021-22**. This is on a per pupil rate into the AWPU – primary £180 and secondary £265.
  - Key factors in the NFF will increase by approximately 3%.
  - The minimum per pupil funding levels will be set at £4,180 for primary, £5,215 for KS3, £5,715 for KS4 and £5,415 for standard secondary schools with 5-year groups. These rates reflect the impact of the mainstreaming of the pay and pensions grants.
  - The NFF funding floor will be set at 2.00% per pupil.
  - The policy of no gains cap in the NFF will continue.

- For the **Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF)**: -
  - LAs will continue to have discretion over their LSFF and in consultation with schools, will ultimately determine allocations in their area.
  - The DfE will continue to make the use of the national Minimum Funding Levels (MFLs) per pupil, at the values in the school NFF, compulsory for LAs to use in their LSFF.
  - LAs will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) in the LSFF, which in 2021-22 must be between +0.50% and +2.00%.
  - LAs can only transfer up to 0.5% of their School Block to other blocks of the DSG, with Schools Forum approval.
- The **High Needs DSG** will continue to have the same factors as at present and will be increased by a further £730m, or 10%, in 2021-22.
- Information for the **Early Years DSG** will be published later in the year.
- The **Central School Services DSG** will increase by 4% in 2021-22 for the ongoing responsibilities that LAs continue to have for all schools, while funding for historic commitments within this block will decrease by a further 20% for those LAs in receipt of this funding. The latter will have significant implications for the Early Intervention Family Support Service (EIFS)

(b) The WSF noted and changes and the indicative DSG allocations and NFF funding rates for the mainstream schools funding formula in Appendices A and B. The WSF commented as follows: -

- The DfE policy to mainstream the specific grants supporting pay and pensions is a key issue for schools in terms of budget planning and needs to be communicated effectively to schools. This is not a LA 'top slice' but a change in DfE policy.
- Can the mainstreamed grant be tracked and matched to actual costs given there is a national shortfall estimated to the £455m?
- How can the exceptional funding still available in this year be claimed?
- How has the former grant been mainstreamed for special schools?
- There will be a further significant impact on the work of the EIFS.

(c) The LA responded as follows: -

- Andy advised the amount included in the NFF for the former grants can be tracked into the DSG as the NFF AWPU rates, as well as being increased by 3%, have been further increased by £180 in primary and £265 in secondary, as shown in Appendix B of the report.
- Andy further advised it will not be possible, as now, to align the grant to actual costs as it is allocated on a per pupil rate and schools are assumed by the DfE to fund some of the pay costs. With the grant to be included in the NFF it will be subject to the MFG and capping (if any).
- The WSF noted, the mandatory NFF MFLs have been increased by the former grant per pupil rates e.g. primary MFL will be £4,180 not £4,000 as previously advised. For special schools, Andy confirmed the former grant had been included in the DfE High Needs NFF by increasing the basic entitlement factor.
- Sarah advised the current EIFS funding gap was being supported through the troubled families reserve but there will be a review of the Early Help functions given the DSG position as part of the budget process. Sarah confirmed the Wyre Forest and Hagley provision was in the process of being TUPE transferred into WCF, this will take place on 1 October 2020.

## 10.2 Local Consultation Process for 2021-22



(a) The WSF were requested to consider the consultation process issues for 2021-22.

(b) Andy introduced the report which detailed the areas for consideration – the LSFF, transfers from the Schools Block to High Needs, de-delegation for maintained schools and the provision of central services for all schools.

(c) Given the continuation of existing DfE national policy into 2021-22, the LA recommended to the WSF the following: -

- For the last 3 years schools have supported the decisions detailed above, so the usual full consultation document need not be issued.
- The WSF endorse and approve the continuation of the 2020-21 arrangements into 2021-22.
- A communication is sent to schools to that effect, giving details of the continuing DfE policy for 2020-21 continuing into 2021-22 and that no change is proposed to the current local policy.
- A brief report is considered by WCC Cabinet at their meeting on 10th December 2020 to approve continuing with the current arrangements into 2021-22.
- The WSF at its meetings in November 2020 and January 2021 formally approve the arrangements as required for de-delegation and centrally retained services together with the endorsement of the completion of the APT for 2021-22 to the ESFA by 21st January 2021 as required.

(d) The WSF commented that stability for schools is key and agreed to endorse and approved the LAs proposed approach detailed above.

## **RESOLVED –**

**The WSF endorsed and approved for 2021-22: -**

- **Not to issue the usual consultation document;**
- **The LSFF to continue as far is affordable and practicable to be based upon the DfE Year 4 NFF parameters;**
- **No transfer of 0.5% of the Schools Block funding to support High Needs budget pressures;**
- **Continuing the current arrangements for delegation or de-delegation for maintained mainstream schools and for the central retention of designated centrally retained services;**
- **For a communication to be circulated to this effect to all schools, including details on the DfE policy arrangements for 2021-22.**

### 10.3 DfE MFG Variation Approval Requests

The WSF noted the required application process and timelines for LAs to request any disapplication to the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations in 2021-22.

## **11. REQUIRED CHANGES TO THE SCHEME FOR FINANCING MAINTAINED SCHOOLS**

11.1 Andy advised of some required directed DfE changes to the Scheme from April 2021 because of updates to the DfEs statutory guidance. These related to requirements for 3-year budget forecasts and submission of deficit recovery plans for deficits in excess of 5%.

11.2 The WSF noted the requirements and the maintained school members approved the changes.

**RESOLVED –**

**The WSF maintained school members approved the required changes to the WCC Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools from April 2021.**

## **12. OTHER MATTER**

12.1 Sarah advised the DfE are being pressed upon funding for catch up premium and supporting the cost of free school meals. A member of the WSF commented the DfE national funding mechanism works extremely well and so needs to be retained.

**The meeting closed at 3.40pm**

The date of the next WSF meeting is: -

Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020 at 2pm  
Via Remote Meeting MS Teams

REPORT TO THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)  
DRAFT STATUTORY INSTRUMENT  
DSG DEFICIT RELATED STATUTORY OVERRIDE

**1. PURPOSE**

1.1 To share with the WSF issues relating to the proposed accounting treatment of DSG deficits.

1.2 For the WSF to note the issues raised.

**2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 The WSF are aware of the issues for all LAs in managing DSG deficits in respect of High Needs.

2.2 Although the DSG is a ringfenced grant LAs must account for DSG issues within its consolidated accounts.

**3. CURRENT POSITION**

3.1 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) have published a draft Statutory Instrument (SI) to amend the current accounting regulations. A copy is attached for information at **Appendix A**.

3.2 In summary, the effect is expected to be: -

- All DSG deficits carried over from 2019-20 into 2020-21, and any subsequent deficit positions for the term of the override, to be moved to an unusable reserve through a statutory accounting adjustment for all reporting periods while the SI is in effect.
- The unusable reserve will record deficits until such time as the override expires (following 2022-23).
- Any surplus positions will not be transferred to the unusable reserve while the SI is in effect but will continue to be held ring-fenced as they currently are.
- At the end of the effective period of the SI, the deficit position will offset by whatever surplus has accumulated.
- Government will review the position as at the end of the current SI period to determine the need for any further extension of the SI.
- The SI does not in any way restrict the DfE regulations that permit LAs to use general funds for school budget expenditure, provided the Secretary of State has given the required approval. It would be expected that if LAs chose to use general funds in this way then the deficit position, howsoever reduced by the appropriate application of general funds, would then be subject to this SI.

3.3 The MHCLG wishes to ensure that the SI fulfils its objectives, mitigates the risks identified for which this SI was proposed, does not create disproportionate additional risks and is technically robust.

3.4 These amendments are expected to be laid by 6<sup>th</sup> November 2020 with a proposed effective date of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 The WSF notes and considers the issues relating to the SI.

Phil Rook  
Director of Resources  
Worcestershire Children First

October 2020

---

S T A T U T O R Y   I N S T R U M E N T S

---

**2020 No. [draft of 21 October]**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND**

**The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting)  
(England) (Amendment) Regulations 2020**

<i>Made</i> - - - -	***
<i>Laid before Parliament</i>	***
<i>Coming into force</i> - -	***

The Secretary of State, in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 21(1) and 123(1) and (2) of the Local Government Act 2003(a), makes the following Regulations.

**Citation and commencement**

1.—(1) These Regulations may be cited as the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2020.

(2) These Regulations come into force on 29th November 2020.

**Amendment of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003**

2. After regulation 30K of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003(b) insert —

**“Deficit relating to schools budget**

**30L**—(1) This regulation applies in relation to accounts prepared for the financial years beginning on 1st April 2020, 1st April 2021 and 1st April 2022.

(2) In this regulation—

“Dedicated Schools Grant” means the grant of that name paid to a local authority by the Secretary of State under section 14(1) of the Education Act 2002(c);

“schools budget” has the meaning given to in section 45A(2) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998(d);

---

(a) 2003 c. 26.

(b) S.I. 2003/3146. There are amending instruments but none is relevant.

(c) 2002 c. 32.

(d) 1998 c. 31; section 45A(2) was inserted by section 41(1) of the Education Act 2002 and amended by paragraph 3(4)(a) and (b) of Schedule 16 to the Education Act 2005, and S.I. 2010/1158.

“sixth form grant” means a grant of that name paid to a local authority by the Secretary of State under section 14 of the Education Act 2002 in respect of sixth form pupils.

(3) Where a local authority has a deficit in respect of its schools budget for a financial year beginning on 1st April 2020, 1st April 2021 or 1st April 2022, the authority –

- (a) must not charge to a revenue account an amount in respect of that deficit; and
- (b) must charge the amount of the deficit, calculated in accordance with paragraph (4) or (5), to an account established, charged and used solely for the purpose of recognising deficits in respect of its schools budget.

(4) A local authority has a deficit in respect of its schools budget for the financial year beginning on 1st April 2020 if—

$$(A + B - C) > (D + E + F)$$

where—

A is the amount of the authority’s expenditure incurred on the schools budget for the financial year beginning on 1st April 2020, recognised in accordance with proper practices<sup>(a)</sup>;

B is the amount of the authority’s accumulated outstanding deficit, if any, in respect of the schools budget, recognised in the authority’s accounts relating to the financial year beginning on 1st April 2019, in accordance with proper practices;

C is the amount, if any, that the authority transfers from its general fund<sup>(b)</sup> in respect of its school budget expenditure in the financial year beginning on 1st April 2020;

D is the amount of the authority’s Dedicated Schools Grant in the financial year beginning on 1st April 2020;

E is the amount of the authority’s accumulated surplus, if any, in respect of the schools budget, recognised in the authority’s accounts relating to the financial year beginning on 1st April 2019, in accordance with proper practices;

F is the amount of the authority’s sixth form grant in the financial year beginning on 1st April 2020.

(5) An authority has a deficit in respect of its school budget for a financial year beginning on 1st April 2021 or 1st April 2022 if—

$$(G - H) > (I + J + K)$$

where—

G is the amount of the authority’s expenditure incurred on the schools budget for the financial year to which the accounts relate, recognised in accordance with proper practices;

H is the amount, if any, that the authority transfers from its general fund in respect of its school budget expenditure in the financial year to which the accounts relate.

I is the amount of the authority’s Dedicated Schools Grant in the financial year to which the accounts relate;

J is the amount of the authority’s accumulated surplus, if any, in respect of the schools budget, carried forward from the preceding financial year, recognised in accordance with proper practices;

---

(a) See section 21(2) of the Local Government Act 2003 for the definition of ‘proper practices’.

(b) See section 91 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 c.41 for the definition of ‘general fund’.

K is the amount of the authority's sixth form grant in the financial year to which the accounts relate.

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government  
Name  
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State  
Date Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

#### **EXPLANATORY NOTE**

*(This note is not part of the Regulations)*

The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 (“the 2003 Regulations”) make provision about the accounting practices to be followed by local authorities, in particular with respect to the charging of expenditure to revenue accounts.

These Regulations insert a new regulation 30L into the 2003 Regulations. New regulation 30L provides that where a local authority has a deficit on its school budget, the authority must not charge any such deficit to its revenue account. Instead, new regulation 30L provides that local authorities must charge any such deficit to a separate account, established and usable solely for that purpose.

New regulation 30L will apply to accounts prepared for the financial years beginning in 2020, 2021 and 2022, and establishes formulas for calculating whether a local authority has a schools budget deficit in relation to each such financial year.

A full regulatory impact assessment has not been produced for this instrument as no impact on the private or voluntary sectors is foreseen.

**Andy McHale**  
Service Manager – Funding and Policy  
Worcestershire Children First

PO Box 73  
County Hall  
Spetchley Road  
Worcester  
WR5 2NP

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
Our ref: AMCh/NFF 2021-22

**AGENDA ITEM 8a)**  
**WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**5<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2020**

Dear Colleague,

**SCHOOL FUNDING LOCAL POLICY DIRECTION**  
**FOR MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS IN 2021-22**

The purpose of this letter is to share the DfE policy direction for school funding for 2021-22 and recommend the local policy direction for 2021-22.

On 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020, the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) confirmed the pre-16 school's revenue funding for 2021 to 2022.

The full details are on the attached link: -

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-funding-formula-tables-for-schools-and-high-needs-2021-to-2022>

Details of the arrangements are summarised at **Appendix A**.

This confirms key aspects including: -

- The DfE NFF will continue to have the same factors as in 2020-21.
- The actual DfE NFF factors and units of resource for 2021-20 and 2021-22 detailing the increases in the national units of resource.
- **Funding for supporting the costs of teachers' pay and pension employer contribution, currently funded by DfE specific grant and the supplementary fund, has been added by the DfE to the NFF from 2021-22.** This is on a per pupil rate into the AWPU – primary £180 and secondary £265.
- The mandatory Minimum Funding Levels (MFLs) per pupil will be set at £4,180 for primary, £5,215 for KS3, £5,715 for KS4 and £5,415 for standard secondary schools with 5-year groups. **These rates reflect the impact of the mainstreaming of the pay and pensions grants.**

Schools are requested to consider the NFF aspects for 2021-22 and the mainstreaming, by the DfE, of the teachers pay and pension grants into the NFF. **From 2021-22, schools will no longer receive these as additional grants but**



**for mainstream schools within the School Budget Share as part of the LAs Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF).** For maintained schools this will be from April 2021 and for academies from September 2021, meaning academies will continue to receive separate grant direct from the ESFA until the end of August 2021.

Given this position, and that for the 3 years 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21, the WSF and mainstream schools have supported the LSFF to be based on the DfE NFF parameters, no transfer of Schools Block funding, some de-delegation for maintained mainstream schools and for centrally retained services for all schools, **the LA is proposing to continue with the current arrangements for a further year for 2021-22.**

This approach was endorsed and approved by the Worcestershire Schools Forum (WSF) at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

The details of the current arrangements for 2020-21 to continue into 2021-22 are attached at **Appendix B** together with the required timeline for implementation.

If you have any comments on the proposed local policy for 2021-22 please do not hesitate to contact me on my e-mail address below.

With very best wishes,

Yours sincerely



**Andy McHale**

Service Manager – Funding and Policy  
Worcestershire Children First

Office: 01905 846285 | Mobile: 07971998978  
[amchale@worcschildrenfirst.org.uk](mailto:amchale@worcschildrenfirst.org.uk)  
[www.worcestershire.gov.uk](http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk)



## APPENDIX A

### THE EDUCATION AND SKILLS FUNDING AGENCY (ESFA) POLICY FOR SCHOOL'S REVENUE FUNDING FOR 2021 TO 2022

#### 1. Schools NFF

- This will continue to have the same factors as in 2020-21 but the ESFA have made two technical changes: -
  - Funding from the teachers' pay grant and the teachers' pension employer contribution grant, including the supplementary fund, has been added to the formulae from 2021-22. This is on a per pupil rate into the AWPU – primary £180 and secondary £265.
  - The 2019 update to the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) has been incorporated so that deprivation funding allocated through the formulae is based on the latest data.
- The NFF allocations provide increases to the funding block in 2021-22: -
  - School Block DSG funding is increasing by 4% overall, compared to 2020-21, with the funding floor allocating at least 2% more in pupil-led funding per pupil, and higher minimum per pupil funding levels. This will allow the key factors in the NFF to increase **by approximately 3%**.
  - Increased total funding through the sparsity factor from £26m to £42m nationally, as a first step towards expanding the support the NFF provides for small and remote schools from 2022-23.
- Further key aspects of the NFF for 2020-21 are: -
  - The minimum per pupil funding levels will be set at £4,180 for primary, £5,215 for KS3, £5,715 for KS4 and £5,415 for standard secondary schools with 5-year groups.
  - The NFF funding floor will be set at 2.00% per pupil.
  - Premises funding will continue to be allocated at LA level based on actual spend in the 2020-21 APT, with the PFI factor increasing by the RPI(X) inflation measure of +1.56%.
  - The NFF policy of no gains cap in the NFF will continue so that schools could attract their full core allocations under the formula. This approach will depend on affordability and LAs have to flexibility to introduce a funding cap.
  - Growth funding will be based on the same methodology as this year.
- The NFF unit of resource rates for 2020-21 and 2021-22 for mainstream schools are attached for information in **Table 1** below.

**TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF DfE NFF FORMULA FACTOR UNITS OF RESOURCE**

<u>FORMULA FACTOR</u>	<u>2020-21</u> £	<u>2021-22</u> £	<u>NFF INCREASE</u>
<u>AWPU</u>			
Primary	2,857	3,123	) (2020-21 +3%) + £180 Teacher Pay ) and Pension Grants
KS3	4,018	4,404	) (2020-21 +3%) + £265 ) Teacher Pay and Pension
KS4	4,561	4,963	) Grants
<u>Minimum Funding Levels</u>			
Primary	3,750	4,180	) £4,000 + £180 Teacher Pay and ) Pension Grants
KS3	4,800	5,215	) (2020-21 +3% Rounded) + £265
KS4	5,300	5,715	) Teacher Pay and Pension Grants
Secondary	5,000	5,415	)
<u>Deprivation FSM</u>			
Primary Annual	450	460	) +2% Rounded
Secondary Annual	450	460	)
Primary Ever 6	560	575	) +3% Rounded
Secondary Ever 6	815	840	)
<u>Deprivation IDACI</u>			
Primary A	600	620	) +3% Average Across Sector
Primary B	435	475	)
Primary C	405	445	)
Primary D	375	410	)
Primary E	250	260	)
Primary F	210	215	)
Secondary A	840	865	) +3% Average Across Sector
Secondary B	625	680	)
Secondary C	580	630	)
Secondary D	535	580	)
Secondary E	405	415	)
Secondary F	300	310	)
<u>Low Prior Attainment</u>			
Primary	1,065	1,095	) +3% Rounded
Secondary	1,610	1,660	)
<u>English as an Additional Language</u>			
Primary	535	550	) +3% Rounded
Secondary	1,440	1,485	)
<u>Lump Sum</u>			
Primary	114,400	117,800	) +3% Rounded
Secondary	114,400	117,800	)
<u>Sparsity</u>			
Primary	26,000	45,000	) Reflects Increase to DfE
Secondary	67,600	70,000	) NFF Policy

## 2. Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF)

- LAs will continue to have discretion over their LSFF and in consultation with schools, will ultimately determine allocations in their area.
- The DfE will continue to make the use of the national Minimum Funding Levels (MFLs) per pupil, at the values in the school NFF, **mandatory** for LAs to use in their LSFF.
- In addition, two important restrictions will continue: -
  - LAs will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) in the LSFF, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.50% and +2.00%. This allows LAs to mirror the real terms protection in the NFF.
  - LAs can only transfer up to 0.5% of their School Block to other blocks of the DSG, with Schools Forum approval. To transfer more than this, or any amount without Schools Forum approval, LAs will have to make a request to the DfE, even if the same amount was agreed previously.

## 3. High Needs NFF

- This will also continue to have the same factors as at present.
- High Needs DSG is increasing by a further £730m, or 10%, in 2021-22, bringing the total high needs budget to over £8bn. The NFF will ensure that every LA receives an increase of at least 8% per head of population, compared to this year, and up to 12%.

## 4. Early Years NFF

- Information for the Early Years DSG will be published later in the year.

## 5. Central School Services DSG

- This will increase by 4% in 2021-22 for the ongoing responsibilities that LAs continue to have for all schools, whilst funding for historic commitments within this block will decrease by a further 20% for those LAs in receipt of this funding.
- The latter will have significant implications for the Early Intervention Family Support Service (EIFS)

**6. The ESFA have re-iterated the government's intention to move to a 'hard' NFF for schools, where budgets will be set based on a single, national formula.** The DfE recognise that this will represent a significant change and will work closely with LAs, schools and others to make this transition as smoothly as possible.

## APPENDIX B

### EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS FOR LOCAL SCHOOL FUNDING POLICY

1. For 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 schools and the WSF supported the following: -

- The **LSFF for mainstream schools, both maintained and academies, being based upon the DfE NFF parameters** as far as is practicable and affordable subject to the Schools Block DSG available.
- **No transfer of Schools Block DSG for mainstream schools, both maintained and academies**, to the High Needs Block DSG to support cost pressures.
- Support the arrangements for **delegation and de-delegation, for maintained mainstream schools only**, as detailed in **Table 1** approved by WSF maintained mainstream school members: -

**Table 1: Delegation/De-Delegation Decisions for Maintained Mainstream Schools Only**

<b>Phase/Service [Formula Factor for De-delegation indicated]</b>	<b>Primary Delegation</b>	<b>Primary De-delegation</b>	<b>Secondary Delegation</b>	<b>Secondary De-delegation</b>
School Specific Contingency (SSC) <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
Behaviour Support Services <b>[Low Prior Attainment]</b>	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
14-16 Practical Learning Options <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Support for Minority Ethnic Pupils/ Underachieving Groups – English as an Additional Language <b>[EAL 3 Years]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Traveller Children	No	Yes	No	Yes

<b>[Low Prior Attainment]</b>				
Free School Meal (FSM) Eligibility <b>[FSM Annual]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Schools Insurance <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
Staff Costs/Duties Supply Cover –  Civic Trade Union HR Related <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	No No No	Yes Yes Yes	No No No	Yes Yes Yes
Additional School Improvement Services	No	No	No	No
Former General Duties Previously Funded by the Former Education Services Grant (ESG)	N/A	No	N/A	No

- Support the arrangements for **centrally retained services for all schools, maintained and academies**, as detailed in **Table 2** approved by the whole WSF: -

**Table 2: Centrally Retained Services Decisions for All Schools Maintained and Academies**

For the LA to decide  <b>WSF approval is not required</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Needs Block provision</li> <li>• Central Licences negotiated by the Secretary of State</li> </ul>
CSSB  <b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis NOT LIMITED by previous budget provision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Admissions</li> <li>• Servicing of Schools Forum</li> <li>• Services previously funded by the ESG retained duties that LAs hold for all schools</li> </ul>

<p>Other Services</p> <p><b>WSF approval is required</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central early years block provision</li> <li>• Any movement of funding out of the schools' block</li> <li>• Any deficit from the previous funding period that reduces the amount of the school's budget</li> <li>• Any brought forward deficit on de-delegated services which is to be met by the overall school's budget</li> </ul>
<p>CSSB services</p> <p><b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis LIMITED by previous budget provision</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to Combined Budgets Historic Commitments (Early Intervention Family Support Service)</li> </ul>
<p>Approved to be centrally retained before allocating formula</p> <p><b>Subject to WSF approval including criteria where appropriate</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for significant pre-16 <b>pupil growth to meet basic need</b> and to enable all schools to meet the infant class size requirement</li> </ul>
<p>No current provision made as no historic budget commitment or this has now time expired</p> <p><b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis LIMITED by previous budget provision where NO NEW COMMITMENTS can be now entered into</b></p> <p><b>[Note – there is no central budget provision for any of these areas]</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back-pay for equal pay claims</li> <li>• Remission of boarding fees at maintained schools/academies</li> <li>• Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils</li> <li>• Prudential borrowing costs</li> <li>• SEN transport costs</li> <li>• Funding to support falling rolls to prepare for future population growth meeting specific criteria for good or outstanding schools where growth in pupil numbers is expected within 3 years</li> <li>• Capital Expenditure Funded from Revenue (CERA)</li> <li>• Existing Termination of Employment/ Redundancy Costs</li> </ul>

2. Given the policy direction from the DfE for 2021-22 and that previously there has been local support detailed above, **it is proposed that all the above current arrangements in paragraph 1 continue for 2021-22.**

3. The timeline for implementation is detailed in **Table 3**.

**Table 3: Timeline**

<b>DETAIL</b>	<b>DATE</b>
Meeting of the WSF to discuss and agree continuing with the current arrangements in 2020-21 into 2021-22	15 September 2020
Meeting of the WSF to consider their decisions for de-delegated and centrally retained services	5 November 2020
Report to Cabinet making recommendations for the Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF), de-delegated and centrally retained budgets for 2021-22	10 December 2020
Confirmation by the DfE/ESFA of: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October 2020 census data and other 2020 data sets</li> <li>• Final LSFF Authority Proforma Tool (APT) for 2021-22</li> <li>• DSG Allocations for 2021-22</li> </ul>	) Late ) December ) 2020
LA to consider impact of the new October 2020 data sets for LSFF APT submission for 2021-22	Late December 2020/Early January 2021
Meeting of the WSF to: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impact of the new October 2020 data sets</li> <li>• Agree submission for the final LSFF APT 2021-22 to the ESFA</li> </ul>	) 13 or 21 ) January 2021
LA to submit final data for Schools Budget DSG LSFF APT for 2021-22	21 January 2021
LA to confirm School Budget Shares 2021-22 for their maintained mainstream schools	By 28 February 2021
LA to confirm initial School Budget Shares 2021-22 for their maintained specialist providers	By 28 February 2021
ESFA to confirm General Annual Grant (GAG) 2021-22 to academies	By 31 March 2021



**REPORT TO THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)**  
**SCHOOL FUNDING 2021-22 LOCAL ISSUES –**  
**WSF REQUIRED DECISIONS**

## **1. PURPOSE**

1.1 For the WSF to consider the parameters for the Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF) for 2021-22.

1.2 For the WSF to make required decisions under their responsibilities within the School Forum (England) Regulations 2012 in respect of: -

- The potential to transfer Schools Block DSG for 2021-22 to support High Needs pressures.
- De-delegation for maintained mainstream schools.
- Centrally retained services for all schools.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 Following the WSF on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2020 where the Government policy for the NFF and other school, funding matters for 2021-22 were discussed, the WSF endorsed and approved the continuation of the current local funding arrangements for 2020-21 into 2021-22.

2.2. This was confirmed in a detailed communication to all schools summarising the key national issues for 2021-22 together with the proposed local policy.

2.2 This included for 2021-22 the intention to continue with the LSFF based on the DfEs NFF Year 4 parameters, no transfer from the Schools Block to support High Needs and continuation of the existing arrangements for de-delegated services for maintained schools and centrally retained services for all schools.

## **3. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

3.1 There were no responses received to the communication sent to schools.

3.2 The decisions to be made are as follows: -

- For the LSFF to continue with the existing LSFF based upon the DfEs NFF Year 4 parameters.
- No transfer of the Schools Block to support High Needs.
- Central Retention
  - For maintained schools support for current de-delegation to continue.
  - For all schools support for centrally retained services to continue.

3.3 In terms of the LSFF it is unclear at this stage whether the full DfE is affordable and this will be subject to further analysis when the Schools Funding Settlement 2021-22 is announced in late December 2020. This will be discussed further with the WSF at its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2021.

3.4 A summary of the recommended actions is detailed at **Appendix A**.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 The WSF considers the issues for endorsement and decision for 2021-22.

4.2 The WSF to make required decisions under their responsibilities from the School Forum (England) Regulations 2012 in respect of Schools Block transfer, de-delegated and centrally retained services.

Andy McHale  
Service Manager Funding and Policy  
Worcestershire Children First

November 2020

**WSF ENDORSEMENT AND DECISIONS FOR WCC LOCAL SCHOOL FUNDING POLICY FOR 2021-22**

1. For 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and now 2021-22, schools and the WSF have supported the following: -

- The **LSFF for mainstream schools, both maintained and academies, being based upon the DfE NFF parameters** as far as is practicable and affordable subject to the Schools Block DSG available.
- **No transfer of Schools Block DSG for mainstream schools, both maintained and academies**, to the High Needs Block DSG to support cost pressures.
- The existing arrangements for **delegation and de-delegation, for maintained mainstream schools only**.
- The existing arrangements for **centrally retained services for all schools, maintained and academies**.

2. Given the policy direction from the DfE for 2021-22 and that previously there has been local support detailed above, **it is proposed that all the above current arrangements in paragraph 1 will continue for 2021-22.**

**3. On this basis the WSF is requested to make the following decisions: -**

**3.1 Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF)**

To **endorse** the LSFF in 2021-22 for mainstream schools to continue as far is affordable and practicable to be based using the DfE Year 4 NFF parameters using the DfE required data sets with the formula factors and estimated units of resource in the DfEs NFF as detailed in the communication to schools.

To **note** the final decision on the NFF is for WCC Cabinet to take at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

**3.2 Schools Block Transfer**

The WSF considered its statutory responsibility in making a decision on the transfer of Schools Block Funding. In line with the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012, the WSF considered the issue.

To **not approve** any transfer in 2021-22 of Schools Block funding to support High Needs budget pressures.

**3.3 De-delegation for Maintained Mainstream Schools**

The WSF considered its statutory responsibilities in making decisions on the delegation or de-delegation of services currently centrally retained in the DSG. In line with the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012, the WSF maintained school members by phase considered these areas.

For the maintained school members by phase to **approve**: -

- The continued initial delegation and transfer of the following centrally retained services for 2021-22 as in 2020-21 as follows: -

<b>FORMULA FACTOR</b>	<b>SERVICE</b>
Basic Per Pupil	School Specific Contingencies (not early years) Support for Schools in Financial Difficulties 14-16 Practical Learning Options Schools Insurance Staff Costs Supply Cover Licences and Subscriptions
Deprivation	FSM Eligibility
EAL	Support for Minority Ethnic Pupils
Low Cost High Incidence SEN Prior Attainment	Support for Underachieving Groups Behaviour Support Services

- The delegation or de-delegation of these areas by reducing the formula amounts for maintained mainstream schools as follows in **Table 1**: -

**Table 1: Delegation/De-Delegation Decisions for Maintained Mainstream Schools Only**

<b>Phase/Service</b> <b>[Formula Factor for De-delegation indicated]</b>	<b>Primary Delegation</b>	<b>Primary De-delegation</b>	<b>Secondary Delegation</b>	<b>Secondary De-delegation</b>
School Specific Contingency (SSC) <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
Behaviour Support Services <b>[Low Prior Attainment]</b>	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
14-16 Practical Learning Options <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Support for Minority Ethnic Pupils/ Underachieving Groups – English as an Additional Language <b>[EAL 3 Years]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Traveller Children <b>[Low Prior Attainment]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Free School Meal (FSM) Eligibility <b>[FSM Annual]</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes

Schools Insurance <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
Staff Costs/Duties Supply Cover –  Civic Trade Union HR Related <b>[Per Pupil (AWPU)]</b>	No No No	Yes Yes Yes	No No No	Yes Yes Yes
Additional School Improvement Services	No	No	No	No
Former General Duties Previously Funded by the Former Education Services Grant (ESG)	N/A	No	N/A	No

### **3.4 Centrally Retained Services for All Schools**

The WSF considered its statutory responsibilities in making decisions on other centrally retained DSG services. In line with the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012, the WSF considered these areas.

To **approve** the continued central retention in 2021-22 of the centrally retained services as detailed in **Table 2**, limited to the 2017-18 budget level or as prescribed by the DfE (indicative budgets are shown either limited to previous year levels or estimated funding subject to final clarification and change)

**Table 2: Centrally Retained Services Decisions for All Schools Maintained and Academies**

For the LA to decide  <b>WSF approval is not required</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Needs Block provision</li> <li>• Central Licences negotiated by the Secretary of State – £0.41m estimated</li> </ul>
CSSB  <b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis NOT LIMITED by previous budget provision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Admissions – £0.6m estimated</li> <li>• Servicing of Schools Forum – £0.06m estimated</li> <li>• Services previously funded by the ESG retained duties that LAs hold for all schools – £1.26m estimated</li> </ul>
Other Services  <b>WSF approval is required</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central early years block provision – limited to existing DfE prescribed level</li> <li>• Any movement of funding out of the schools' block – nil</li> <li>• Any deficit from the previous funding period that reduces the amount of the school's budget – carry forward the deficit</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any brought forward deficit on de-delegated services which is to be met by the overall school's budget – nil</li> </ul>
<p>CSSB services</p> <p><b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis LIMITED by previous budget provision</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to Combined Budgets Historic Commitments (Early Intervention Family Support Service) – £0.96m actual (reflecting the 2020-21 amount being reduced by a further 20% because of the DfE change to the Central Services Schools Block DSG)</li> </ul>
<p>Approved to be centrally retained before allocating formula</p> <p><b>Subject to WSF approval including criteria where appropriate</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for significant pre-16 <b>pupil growth to meet basic need</b> and to enable all schools to meet the infant class size requirement – yet to be advised by the DfE</li> </ul>
<p>No current provision made as no historic budget commitment or this has now time expired</p> <p><b>WSF approval is required on a line by line basis LIMITED by previous budget provision where NO NEW COMMITMENTS can be now entered into</b></p> <p><b>[Note – there is no central budget provision for any of these areas]</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Back-pay for equal pay claims</li> <li>Remission of boarding fees at maintained schools/academies</li> <li>Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils</li> <li>Prudential borrowing costs</li> <li>SEN transport costs</li> <li>Funding to support falling rolls to prepare for future population growth meeting specific criteria for good or outstanding schools where growth in pupil numbers is expected within 3 years</li> <li>Capital Expenditure Funded from Revenue (CERA)</li> <li>Existing Termination of Employment/ Redundancy Costs</li> </ul> <p>Nil Provision for any of these areas</p>

### **3.5 General Issue**

The WSF considered the need to exercise its responsibilities to inform the County Council Cabinet of the issues discussed and decisions for the 2021-22 LSFF, WSF decisions on transfer from the Schools Block, delegation/de-delegation for maintained schools and other centrally retained services for all schools.

To **approve** that all these above decisions be communicated to the Worcestershire County Council Cabinet as required.

Insert your LA number (3 digits)

885

LA Name

Worcestershire



Information that we have collected about your LA is as follows:

Please download a copy of this file and complete/overwrite the white boxes. Then open the survey and transfer your answers to the questions as indicated. This form does not need to be sent to f40 and is for your records. Thank you.

SURVEY CLOSING DATE: 30th October 2020

SURVEY LINK:

IF AVAILABLE

IF AVAILABLE

	2017-18 £m starting point	2018-19 £m	2019-20 £m	increase on last yr	Estimate of 2020-21 £m	increase on last yr	Estimate of 2021-22 £m	Estimate of 2022-23 £m
Total DSG £m		402.93	414.06	2.76%	441.57	6.64%		
In yr DSG balance (use minus sign before deficit amount)		(5.86)	Q4 (5.60)		Q5 (1.95)		Q10 (1.95)	Q12 (1.95)
DSG balance at yr end	5.23	(0.63)	(6.23)		(8.18)		(10.13)	(12.08)
Total HNB £m		49.85	51.67	3.64%	60.10	16.32%		
In yr HNB balance (use minus sign before deficit amount)		Q7 (7.70)	Q8 (8.70)		Q9 (1.95)		Q11 (1.95)	Q13 (1.95)
HNB balance at yr end	Q6 (3.40)	(11.10)	(19.80)		(21.75)		(23.70)	(25.65)
HNB as % of DSG		12.37%	12.48%		13.61%			
		<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>		<b>2020</b>			
Total Pupils @ January		87,089	87,862	0.89%	88,464	0.69%		
Pupils with Statements or EHC Plans		2,491	2,643	6.10%	2,949	11.58%		
Pupils with SEND above as % of total pupils		2.86%	3.01%		3.33%			

Based upon what you know now, will you attempt to move funding between blocks?

	Drop down boxes	2018-19	Drop down boxes	2019-20	Drop down boxes	2020-21	Drop down boxes	2021-22	Drop down boxes	2022-23
Did you attempt to move funding between blocks?	Q14	No	Q16	No	Q18	No	Q20	No	Q21	No
Were you successful?	Q15		Q17		Q19					

Please add any comments you wish to make into the box below.

The DSG HN deficit of £3.4m at the end of 2017-18 was funded from accumulated DSG reserves so technically the HN Block was balanced but there was an underlying structural deficit. This was seen in 2018-19 where the DSG HN deficit was £7.7m net (£8.9m gross after applying one-off HN DSG of £1.2m), which was funded by using all the remaining DSG reserves some of which were earmarked for other areas of the DSG. Consequently, a DSG deficit of £0.63m for HN remained as at 31st March 2019 and was carried forward into 2019-20. The HN DSG overspent by £8.7m in 2019-20 and with other DSG variations resulted in a cumulative HN DSG deficit of £6.23m as at 31st March 2020. WCC received £8.7m of additional HN DSG in 2020-21 as part of the DfEs 3-year budget strategy. This has only allowed the HN budget to be rebased to endeavour to cover the cost pressures from the previous year - it is not available to meet further demand in 2020-21, any repayment of the deficit b/fwd or allocating enhanced top up rates to providers. The above £1.95m predicted ongoing annual overspend in the HN DSG is based upon current demand but is likely to be much higher. WCC has also been allocated further additional HN DSG of £7.8m in 2021-22 but this includes amounts for mainstreaming of the current grant funding for teachers pay and pensions estimated at £1.5m. The net increase of £6.3m will only support the current deficit. To stand any chance of meeting current demand and managing the structural deficit there will need to be a further allocation to the HB DSG by the DfE in year 3 2022-23 of their multi year budget settlement and further increases in subsequent years. This could allow the HN DSG to be managed in the medium to long term.

Note: Due to Local Government reorganisation, this spreadsheet does not work for Dorset or Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole local authorities.

**REPORT TO THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)**  
**HIGH NEEDS UPDATE – DfE HN PLANNING TEMPLATE**

**1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 For the WSF to consider new national reporting requirements relating the HN DSG
- 1.2 For the WSF to receive further reports as required.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 On 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) published information on their new requirements for managing the HN DSG.
- 2.2 This is in response to most of LAs being in a deficit position on their HN budget.

**3. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 The DSG conditions of grant for 2020-21, requires that any LA with an overall deficit on its DSG account at the end of 2019-20 financial year, or whose DSG surplus has substantially reduced during the year, must be able to present a plan to the DfE for managing their future DSG spend. The plan should be shown to the local Schools Forum and should be kept regularly updated throughout the year to reflect the most recent forecast position and be viewed as an on-going live document.
- 3.2 To help LAs meet this requirement, the ESFA have devised a management plan template. This is a supportive tool which has been created with an emphasis on enabling LAs to formulate and present their DSG management plans in a format that allows them to focus attention on comparison of high needs provision against spend.
- 3.3 The ESFA encourage all LAs to use the template as a planning tool. They believe this will be particularly useful when discussing and sharing complex funding information to a variety of stakeholders. The ESFA expect the plan to be updated and presented at schools' forum meetings and any high needs sub-groups regularly, and at least on a termly basis.
- 3.4 LAs should aim to present the first version of the plan to the schools' forum in time for its budget planning discussions for 2021-22 and before the deadline for block movement requests, if it is submitting one.
- 3.5 The ESFA have designed the template to help LAs in forming evidence-based and strategic future plans for the provision of children and young people (CYP) with special education needs and disabilities (SEND). The ESFA contend a strong advantage to using this management plan template will be the function to compare data on high needs spend between various LAs, taken from the high needs benchmarking tool. This will enable comparison against statistical neighbours and national averages, whilst providing a consistent reporting format to help LAs share best practice and initiatives.



3.6 The ESFA have published comprehensive step-by-step guidance to further help LAs complete the DSG management plan template. This is provided for information at **Appendix A**.

3.7 The template has clearly defined tabs including which the guidance follows so that LAs can focus their attention on each provision type which will enable them to monitor how DSG funding is being spent, whilst showing all of the data in a standardised way. The areas covered includes: -

- Children and Young People Data
- Financial Modelling
- Governance Arrangements
- Placements
- Stakeholders
- Provision Types
- LA Benchmarking Data

3.8 Extracts showing the template cover and finance tabs are detailed at **Appendix B**.

3.9 The WSF are advised this is a major piece of set up, development and ongoing work which will require dedicated time, resource and ownership from the SEND Service and other WCC services. The WSF are reminded of the work already undertaken by the HN sub-group in considering the budgetary pressures relating to HN.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 The WSF notes and considers the issues for the ESFA requirements for managing the HN budget.

4.2 The WSF receives drafts of the template on an ongoing basis as required.

Andy McHale  
Service Manager Funding and Policy  
Worcestershire Children First

October 2020



Department  
for Education



Education & Skills  
Funding Agency

# **Dedicated schools grant (DSG) management plan template**

**Guidance for local authorities**

**September 2020**

# Contents

1. Summary	5
1.1 About this guidance	5
1.2 Review date	5
1.3 Who is this guidance for?	5
1.4 Overview of the DSG management plan template	5
1.5 Further guidance	7
2. Glossary	8
3. How to complete the management plan template	9
3.1 Detailed overview	9
4. Cover tab	11
5. Management plan introduction tab	12
6. Summary: financial/children and young people narrative tab	13
6.1 Financial plan narrative	13
6.2 High needs trends	13
6.3 Outcomes	14
7. Financial summary tab	15
7.1 Summary of 2020 to 2021 position	15
7.2 Financial plan per funding block	15
8. Children and young people summary tab	25
8.1 Data tables	25
8.2 Graphs	28
9. Governance and management tab	29
9.1 Sign off and review of the management plan	29
9.2 Workstream log	29
10. Stakeholder engagement, co-production and consultation tab	30
10.1 Schools forum	30
10.2 Education institutions	30
10.3 Parents and carers	31
10.4 Children and young people	31

10.5 Elected members (councillors, mayors)	32
10.6 Health partners	32
11. Local authority (LA) specific narrative tab	33
11.1 Key risks and mitigations	33
11.2 Management plan support	33
11.3 Overall EHCP data and projected trends	34
11.4 Strategy and approach to workforce	34
11.5 Strategy and approach to EHCP rates	34
11.6 Managing demand pressures	35
11.7 Sharing best practice and effective practices	36
11.8 Assumptions	36
11.9 Block movements and disapplications	37
11.10 Population	37
11.11 Governance and commissioning arrangements with CCGs	37
11.12 Capital	38
11.13 Early years	38
11.14 Special educational needs (SEN) transport costs	38
11.15 SEN other costs	38
12. Placement type narrative tab	39
12.1 Key pressures and issues	39
12.2 Summary of strategy and approach to placement type	40
12.3 Initiatives	41
12.4 Health, social care, therapy services and care provision	41
12.5 Summary of the inputs made by health and social care partners and proportion of current costs	41
12.6 Health and social care contributions	41
12.7 Outline of current and future demand for therapy services	42
13. Placement type tabs	43
13.1 Data tables	44
13.2 Total projected mitigated expenditure (forecast with savings and invest to save measures) data table	44

13.3 Total projected unmitigated expenditure (forecast based on current trends without mitigating actions) data table	45
13.4 EHCP and CYP data tables	46
13.5 Graphs	46
<b>14. Data from the High needs benchmarking tool v6 tabs</b>	<b>47</b>

# 1. Summary

## 1.1 About this guidance

This guidance has been produced by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) as a reference tool for all local authorities (LAs). It provides support when completing plans for managing their dedicated schools grant (DSG).

## 1.2 Review date

This guidance will next be reviewed in 2021.

## 1.3 Who is this guidance for?

In response to feedback from LAs and other stakeholders, we have designed a management plan template to help LAs to manage their DSG. ESFA has developed and enhanced this template in partnership with over 60 attendees from LAs, their representatives and other stakeholders via user research groups and collated feedback.

This document is a step-by-step guide to help LAs complete the [DSG management template](#). The template is a supportive tool to enable LAs to formulate and present their DSG management plans. It will be particularly useful for LAs when discussing and sharing proposals with internal and external bodies, including schools forum (particularly any high needs working groups), special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) partnership or oversight boards established by the council, parent and carer forums and relevant council committees.

Please note: safety valve funding negotiations are a separate exercise to the DSG management plan template. Guidance on this can be found within the 'High needs safety valve funding' section, page 43 of the '[Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 operational guide](#)'.

## 1.4 Overview of the DSG management plan template

The DSG is a ring-fenced specific grant, provided outside the local government finance settlement. It must be used in support of the schools budget for the purposes defined in regulation 6 and schedule 2 of the [School and Early Years Finance \(England\) Regulations](#).

The [DSG: conditions of grant 2020 to 2021](#) paragraph 5.2, requires that any LA with an overall deficit on its DSG account at the end of the 2019 to 2020 financial year, or whose DSG surplus has substantially reduced during the year, must be able to present a plan to the Department for Education (DfE) for managing their future DSG spend. We also realise that there will be a requirement for LAs to share this information with their stakeholders, such as schools forums, parent and carer forum, local headteacher boards or groups.

To help LAs to meet this requirement we have provided a DSG management plan template. This template will help LAs:

- comply with paragraph 5.2 of the DSG: conditions of grant 2020 to 2021
- monitor how DSG funding is being spent
- compare data on high needs spend between LAs
- highlight areas where LAs may wish to review spending
- form evidence-based and strategic future plans for the provision of children and young people with SEND
- present complex funding information simply to schools forums and other external stakeholders
- provide a consistent reporting format to help LAs share best practice and initiatives

The template will help LAs to focus attention on comparisons of high needs provision and spend, to produce the required plan. We encourage all LAs to use the template as a planning tool.

We expect the plan to be updated and presented at schools forum meetings and any high needs subgroups regularly and at least on a termly basis. The LA should aim to present the first version of the plan to the schools forum in time for budget planning discussions for 2021 to 2022 and before the deadline for block movement requests, if it is submitting one. We realise that the management of DSG balances, both bringing spend in line with income and repaying deficits, will take time for some LAs. We have developed the template in such a way that it is intended to be a live document.

Management plans should reflect the most current forecast DSG position and be published on the LA local offer website as set out in the [Special educational needs and disability \(SEND\) Code of Practice: 0 to 25 years](#). Relevant leads in the finance and special educational needs (SEN) areas should sign off each version of the management plan (with sign off to be at least at assistant director level).

If you have any questions regarding this guidance or template, please contact the Financial Management mailbox: [Financial.management@education.gov.uk](mailto:Financial.management@education.gov.uk).

## 1.5 Further guidance

These are additional guidance documents you may also find helpful:

- Further guidance on DSG balances can be found on pages 46 to 48 of the '[Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 operational guide](#)'.
- Further guidance on benchmarking can be found in the information tab of the '[High Needs Benchmarking Tool v6](#)'.
- Further guidance, allocations and conditions of grant for pre-16 schools funding can be found within the '[Local authorities: pre-16 schools funding](#)' collection page.



## 2. Glossary

The 'Introduction page' within the [DSG management plan template](#) provides information and reference links to all acronyms that are used throughout this document, for ease of reference.

### 3. How to complete the management plan template

This document describes how to use and complete the management plan template and has been designed as a reference guide.

Please note that based on user feedback, the template has been created using Microsoft Excel. As such, it is expected that users completing the template will at least have a basic knowledge of this software.

This template relies on calculations running automatically as you select your LA and enter data. To ensure that this is happening correctly please check your settings by clicking on the **Formulas** tab, in the **Calculation** group, click **Calculation Options**, and then click **Automatic**.

On selecting an LA or comparison years, some users may experience issues with errors. Please be patient, as this may take some time to update, this appears to be caused by using older versions of excel.

#### 3.1 Detailed overview

It is recommended that you save a copy of the management plan template locally before you start to edit. In addition, we advise you to continue to save the workbook often so that you do not lose any updates you add.

The guidance has been composed with deliberate repetition between tabs. This is intended so that you are able to jump from section to section within the template dependent on your role and responsibility. Tabs are connected and you are only required to add data once, which then pulls through to other cells within the template.

The template is made up of a number of individual tabs along the bottom of the screen, which are colour coded depending on type:

Tab colour guide
Summary tab - Some user narrative and data input
Introduction – no user input
Narrative tab - user narrative input
Placement type tab - user data input
Data from the High Needs Benchmarking Tool v6

Within each tab, sections are coloured to represent the following:

### Cell colour guide

User input cells - Editable - this is where you (the user) will need to enter data

Prepopulated cells - Un-editable/prepopulated

Calculation cells - Automatic calculation outputs/un-editable

To note: we have designed the template so that if you wish to provide any further information on any of the tabs (for example links to further supporting information or evidence), there is blank space to do so.

The option to include additional information is in response to user research. However, we would not expect to see documents inserted in lieu of appropriate narrative being provided on the template. Additional documents should only be added to evidence decisions being taken or statements being made.

The free text boxes within the narrative tabs on the template should provide a brief commentary of a maximum of 2 paragraphs, summarising your plans

## 4. Cover tab

The 'Cover' tab is a narrative tab which requires some user input.

It is important that the blue cells are updated to show who and when last updated the management plan template.

Row number	User input instructions
7	Drop-down menu to select the relevant local authority name.
9	Drop-down menu to select the relevant year to compare data from within the high needs benchmarking tabs (this will not have an impact on any other tab or other data within the tool).
11	Cell 'D' is a user input cell to input the date the management plan was last modified.
12	Cell 'D' - intended for internal use for local authority (LA) version control.

### 4.1 Local authority change log

These boxes are for internal use within the LA to record version history as and when amendments to the management plan are made.

We encourage you to update your plan regularly throughout the year to reflect the most recent forecast position and view this as an on-going live document.

We expect all management plan template users to keep this change log updated throughout the year, on a termly basis and in line with presenting to schools forum meetings

## 5. Management plan introduction tab

The 'Management plan introduction' tab provides information on the purpose of completing a management plan and a glossary of terminology used throughout the management plan template. This tab does not require any user input.

The '[Template contents](#)' section provides hyperlinks which enable speedy navigation through the template. Each tab has a link in cell 'A1' to take you back to the table contents.

The 'Data' section provides details of all published data we have prepopulated throughout the template and hyperlinks to these data sources.

## 6. Summary: financial/children and young people narrative tab

The 'Summary: financial/children and young people (CYP) narrative' tab comprises 3 separate free text boxes which requires user narrative input.

Please add comments and narrative within the blank free text boxes.

### 6.1 Financial plan narrative

This narrative should be no more than one concise paragraph which provides a high-level summary of proposed strategies for managing the pressures on the dedicated schools grant (DSG) budget.

Please do not refer to further documentation.

This free text box should provide a short narrative detailing how you are managing pressures on the DSG and your strategy for doing so. When completing this box, consideration should be given to:

- how pressures will be prioritised in order to be addressed
- an assessment of how the management plan addresses these pressures
- proposals put in to place to help alleviate these pressures

### 6.2 High needs trends

Narrative provided in both 'High Needs trends' and 'Outcomes' free text boxes should be no more than one concise paragraph which provides a high level summary of the strategies for managing the funding of CYP from the high needs block and how the management plan proposals will ensure positive outcomes for CYP.

Please do not refer to further documentation.

This free text box should provide a short review of high needs trends and the strategy proposals for managing the number of CYP receiving individual funding from the high needs block. When completing this section, consideration should be given to the following:

- managing demand, top ups and alternative provision (AP) within the LA
- measures to ensure these issues are being addressed
- how the management plan aligns with the special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) Strategic Plan alongside the LA's priorities

## 6.3 Outcomes

This free text box should provide a brief description of outcomes. For example:

- greater support for early intervention
- improvements in the capacity of mainstream schools to meet needs without the need for EHCPs
- opportunities to attend schools closer to home

Where proposals may pose a risk to outcomes, this section should briefly describe what is being done to mitigate this risk.

## 7. Financial summary tab

The 'Financial summary' tab requires some user narrative and data input.

### 7.1 Summary of 2020 to 2021 position

	£ ,000s
Carry forward from 2019 to 2020	£0
Mitigated budget	£0
Unmitigated budget	£0
Saving	£0
Projected carry forward to 2021 to 2022	£0

This summary table provides the 2020 to 2021 key figures at a glance. It contains calculation cells which pull through dedicated schools grant (DSG) and user input data taken from cells D51, G23, H23 and G51 of the 'Financial plan per funding block' table.

The savings row shows the difference between the mitigated (forecast after accounting for the cost reductions and/or invest to save measures in place) and unmitigated (forecast prior to accounting for any cost reduction and/or invest to save measures in place) budgets.

### 7.2 Financial plan per funding block

In relation to the ['DSG: conditions of grant 2020 to 2021'](#) any local authority (LA) required to provide information to the department will be expected to complete this level of financial detail, as laid out in this table and share this with schools forum and other stakeholders.

This table enables you to input the overall DSG position (pre-recoupment total) financial data for both actual and forecast spend. Actual spend will be 2018 to 2019 financial year and 2019 to 2020 financial year. Forecast spend will be 2020 to 2021 financial year, going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far). We expect your actual spend to match the section 251 budget and outturn return data.

Supporting narrative for any data discrepancies can be included in the additional comments table to the right-hand side of this tab.

All data input in the 'Overall DSG position (pre recoupment total)' table should match the budget on which you are reporting and should reconcile with the latest published DSG allocations.



All expenditure should be input as a positive figure and all income should be input as a negative figure. This will show a surplus as a negative and a deficit as a positive figure.

When completing the 'Overall DSG position (pre recoupment total)' table, users should note the following:

'Outturn': We would not expect LAs to complete future years' outturn positions in advance. The outturn position for each year should be added as soon as it is known.

'Mitigated forecast': forecast after accounting for the cost reduction and/or invest to save measures in place. This is gross funding and you must ensure that you include recoupment amounts in your expenditure.

'Unmitigated forecast': forecast prior to accounting for any cost reduction and/or invest to save measures in place; a 'do nothing' forecast. This is gross funding and you must ensure that you include recoupment amounts in your expenditure.

To note: income should reconcile to the latest DSG allocation announcement for 2020 to 2021 with a clear assumption for any in year early years (EY) adjustments (the adjustment based on January 2021 census).

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
14 F	Date outturn last updated	Populate this cell with the date the outturn position is updated.

### 7.2.1 Expenditure (Positive figures)

The cells within this section for each funding block should be input as positive figures.

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
18 to 22 C and E	Schools block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actual spend for 2018 to 2019 financial year</li> <li>• actual spend for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> </ul>

	<p>Central school services block</p> <p>Early years block</p> <p>High needs block</p> <p>Planned spend from DSG reserves</p>	<p>To note: row 21 requires no user input. This is a calculation row which pulls through prepopulated total expenditure data for each placement type in the high needs block – both historic and planned spend as per s251 rows table.</p> <p>This row is the sum of rows:</p> <p><math>83 + 88 + 93 + 98 + 103 + 108 + 113 + 118 = \text{row 21}</math></p>
<p>18 to 22</p> <p>D and F</p>	<p>Schools block</p> <p>Central school services block</p> <p>Early years block</p> <p>High needs block</p> <p>Planned spend from DSG reserves</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actual budget for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> <li>• outturn for 2020 to 2021</li> </ul>
<p>18 to 22</p> <p>G to P</p>	<p>Schools block</p> <p>Central school services block</p> <p>Early years block</p> <p>High needs block</p> <p>Planned spend from DSG reserves</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• forecast spend for 2020 to 2021 financial year and going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far)</li> </ul> <p>To note: row 21 requires no user input. This is a calculation row which pulls through prepopulated total expenditure data from the high needs block – both historic and planned spend as per s251 rows table.</p> <p>This row is the sum of rows:</p> <p><math>83 + 88 + 93 + 98 + 103 + 108 + 113 + 118 = \text{row 21}</math></p> <p>To note: The unmitigated forecast for the schools block and central schools services block are calculated cells based on user input from the mitigated budget.</p>
<p>23</p> <p>C to P</p>	<p>Total expenditure</p>	<p>This is a calculation row which is the sum of rows 18 to 22 for each column C to P.</p>

## 7.2.2 DSG income (negative figures)

The cells within this section should be input as negative figures and used to input estimated income before any block transfers. You should include any assumptions on additional future funding.

Please use indicative allocations if these are available. If not available, please detail assumptions made at rows 25 to 28. Supporting narrative for assumptions should be recorded in the assumptions free text box on the 'Local Authority (LA) specific' tab in the [management plan template](#).

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
25 to 28 C to E	Schools block Central school services block Early years block High needs block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actual income for 2018 to 2019 financial year</li> <li>• actual budget for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> <li>• actual income for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> </ul>
25 to 28 F to P	Schools block Central school services block Early years block High needs block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• income for 2020 to 2021 financial year and going up to 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far).</li> </ul> <p>The outturn for 2020 to 2021 and unmitigated forecast columns are calculated cells which will show the same data as the mitigated budget data</p> <p>To note: income should reconcile to the latest DSG allocation. It should take into account of the provisional allocations for 2020 to 2021 that were announced in July, with a clear assumption for any in-year early years adjustments (the adjustment based on the January 2021 census).</p>
29 C to P	Total income	This is a calculation row which is the sum of rows 25 to 28 for each column C to P.

### 7.2.3 High needs block- other income (negative figures)

The cells within this section for each funding block should be input as negative figures and used to input any other income within the high needs block (HNB).

Clinical commissioning groups (CCG's) contributions could include:

- the CCG's contribution to the health component of high cost placements that are initially paid for by the HNB
- the CCG's contribution to jointly funded services that are initially funded from the HNB

Row 33: 'Other (please specify)' is a row requested by LAs to record any other HNB income. Supporting narrative for this data can be input in the 'additional comments', column R table to the right-hand side of the table.

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
31 to 32 C to E	CCG contribution  Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actual other income you received for 2018 to 2019 financial year</li> <li>• actual budget for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> <li>• actual other income you received for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> </ul>
31 to 32 F to P	CCG contribution  Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• forecast of any other income you may receive for 2020 to 2021 financial year and going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far).</li> </ul> <p>Include any narrative of assumptions made in column R 'Additional comments' table to the right-hand side of the 'Financial plan per funding block' table.</p>
33 C to P	Total other income	This is a calculation row which is the sum of rows 31 to 32 for each column C to P.

## 7.2.4 Block transfers (income/block moved to as a negative, outgoing/block moved from as positive. Should net to 0)

The cells within this section for each funding block should be entered as negative figures and used to input previously agreed block transfers for financial years 2018 to 2019, 2019 to 2020 and 2020 to 2021.

You should also record any proposed future years block transfers. Please note that we have not announced arrangements beyond 2021 to 2022. Therefore, you will need to have a fall-back position if what you are proposing is not allowed either in the DSG: conditions of grant or through the outcome of a disapplication request.

Supporting narrative for any proposed future years block transfers should be recorded in the 'Block movements and disapplications' free text box on the 'Local authority (LA) specific' tab in the template. Further guidance on block transfers can be found in the 'Movement between blocks' section, pages 39 to 43 of the ['Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 operational guide'](#).

Income (block moved to) should be shown as a negative figure. Outgoing block movement (block moved from) should be shown as a positive figure. The total should net to zero.

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
35 to 38 C to E	Schools block Central school services block Early years block High needs block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>previously agreed block transfer amount for 2018 to 2019 financial year</li> <li>actual budget for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> <li>actual block transfer amount for 2019 to 2020 financial year</li> </ul>
35 to 38 F to P	Schools block Central school services block Early years block High needs block	forecast block transfer amounts for 2020 to 2021 financial year and going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far).

39 C to P	Total block transfers	This is a calculation row which is the sum of rows 35 to 38 for each column C to P.  To note: this row should net to zero.
--------------	-----------------------	--

## 7.2.5 In year net position – deficit/(surplus)

The cells within this section are auto calculated and provide the overall in year net position for each funding block and require no user input. The overall in year calculation is the sum of the following rows:

Expenditure + 2. DSG income + 4. Block transfers = 5. In year net position deficit/surplus.

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
41 C to P	Schools block	No user input required.  This is a calculation cell which is the total schools block sum of:  1. Expenditure (row 18) + 2. DSG income (row 25) + 4. Block transfers (row 35) = 5. In year net position deficit/surplus (row 41)
42 C to P	Central school services block	No user input required.  This is a calculation cell which is the total central school services block sum of:  1. Expenditure (row 19) + 2. DSG income (row 26) + 4. Block transfers (row 36) = 5. In year net position deficit/surplus (row 42)
43 C to P	Early years block	No user input required.  This is a calculation cell which is the total early years block sum of:

		1. Expenditure (row 20) + 2. DSG income (row 27) + 4. Block transfers (row 37) = 5. In year net position deficit/surplus (row 43)
44 C to P	High needs block	No user input required.  This is a calculation cell which is the total high needs block sum of:  1. Expenditure (row 21) + 2. DSG income (row 28) + 3. High needs block other income (row 33) + 4. Block transfers (row 38) = 5. In year net position deficit/surplus (row 44)
45 C to P	Total net	This is a calculation row which is the sum of rows 41 to 44 for each column C to P.

## 7.2.6 Other

The cells within this section for row 47: 'Council contribution' should be input as a negative figure and used to input both previously agreed transfers of funds and proposed requests to transfer funds.

Row number and column	Row description	User input instructions
Row 47 C to P	Council contribution (negative)	This row should be used to input both previously agreed and proposed future years transfers from your general fund account.  To note: from the 2020 to 2021 financial year all council contributions require approval from the secretary of state if the local authority had a DSG deficit at the end of the previous financial year.  Further guidance on making this type of request can be found in the 'High needs safety valve funding' section, page 43 of the <a href="#">Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 operational guide</a> .

		The disapplication proformas can be found within the <a href="#">‘Pre-16 schools funding: local authority guidance for 2021 to 2022’</a> .
Row 48 C	Add brought forward deficit/(surplus) (net)	This is a user input cell.  You will need to input the actual brought forward deficit/(surplus) (net) position at the end of 2018 to 2019 financial year.
Row 48 D to P	Add brought forward deficit/(surplus) (net)	This is a calculation cell which pulls data through from row 51: ‘Planned year end position’.
Row 49 C to P	Brought forward earmarked amounts in other blocks	This is a user input cell.  To note: this is an optional memorandum item and is not used in the planned year end position calculation.
Row 51 C to P	Planned year end position	This is a calculation cell and is the sum of:  ‘Total net’ (row 45) + ‘Council contribution’ (row 47) + ‘Add brought forward deficit/(surplus) (net)’ (row 48) = ‘Planned year end position’ (row 51)

### 7.2.7 Other spend—historic and planned spend as per s251 lines

Data tables within this section contain both prepopulated and user input cells.

The yellow prepopulated cells contain published data taken from the [s251 budget and outturn returns for 2017 to 2018](#) financial year and the [s251 budget and outturn returns for 2018 to 2019](#) financial year.

The blue user input cells require data for the 2020 to 2021 financial year and onwards up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far).

Column	User input instructions
C and D	No user input required.  These columns contain prepopulated published data which is pulling through from published s251 data.



E	This column requires input of the outturn position reported as at the end of 2019 to 2020 financial year.
F to J	These columns require input of the total projected mitigated expenditure (forecast accounting for savings and invest to save measures).
L to P	These columns require input of the total projected unmitigated expenditure (do-nothing forecast).

**7.2.8 High needs block—historic and planned spend as per s251 lines (populated from data in each tab)**

All data within this section is prepopulated.

The total expenditure rows for each placement type pulls through data from the ‘Total expenditure’ row, which is a sum of prepopulated and user input data on each of the placement tabs elsewhere within the template.

‘Year on year change’ cells are calculation cells and require no user input. These calculate the difference between the current year’s total and the previous year’s total.

Placement total % change year on year’ cells are calculation cells and require no user input. These calculate the percentage difference between the current year’s total and the previous year’s total.

## 8. Children and young people summary tab

The 'Children and young people (CYP) summary' tab requires no user input.

### 8.1 Data tables

The data tables within the 'CYP' tab contain prepopulated data from published sources and calculation cells which pull through data from the placement type tabs elsewhere in the template.

Row number and column	Data table name	Data table information source
9 to 13 C to J	Total number of EHCPs by age group (with estimated future projections).	<p>This data table contains both prepopulated and calculation cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns C to E uses prepopulated data taken from the <a href="#">Special educational needs survey 2020 (SEN2)</a> which provides the amalgamated total figure for 2018, 2019 and 2020 in column E.</li> <li>• Columns F to J are calculation cells which pull through data from the total numbers in the corresponding tables entered within each placement type tab elsewhere in the template.</li> </ul>
19 to 23 C to J	<p>Total number of CYP receiving individual top ups with no EHCP by age group (with estimated future projections).</p> <p>To note: for CYP under 5 this includes those supported by the early years block (EYB) as well as the EYB as a source of top up.</p>	<p>This data box contains calculation cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns C to J are calculation cells which pull through data from the total numbers in the corresponding tables entered within each placement type tab elsewhere in the template.</li> </ul>

<p>29 to 33</p> <p>C to J</p>	<p>Total number of CYP supported by the high needs block with no EHCP or individual top up (with estimated future projections).</p>	<p>This data box contains calculation cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns C to J are calculation cells which pull through data from the total numbers in the corresponding tables entered within each placement type tab elsewhere in the template.</li> </ul>
<p>39 to 51</p> <p>C to J</p>	<p>Total number of EHCPs by primary need (with estimated future projections).</p>	<p>This data box contains calculation cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns C to J are calculation cells which pull through data from the total numbers in the corresponding tables entered within each placement type tab elsewhere in the template.</li> </ul>
<p>39 to 51</p> <p>L to N</p>	<p>Published census data – prepopulated</p> <p>Total number of EHCPs by primary need.</p>	<p>This data box contains prepopulated cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns L to N uses prepopulated data taken from the <a href="#">school census</a> which provides the amalgamated total figure for 2018, 2019 and 2020 in column N.</li> </ul> <p>To note: We have included this data for your reference only. It is recognised that the school census information provides data according to where a pupil attends school and not where they live. The data LAs hold on the numbers of EHCPs they maintain and are responsible for funding may differ from the school census particularly where there are significant movement of pupils across local authority boundaries.</p> <p>There is a caveat that the census data only collects school aged pupils therefore does not include further education (FE) and</p>

		<p>'other' groups such as work based placements and young people not in education, employment or training (NEETS) with EHCPs.</p> <p>For reference <a href="#">SEN2</a> data includes information on the following cohorts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• post 16</li> <li>• FE colleges</li> <li>• other FE</li> <li>• sixth forms</li> <li>• special establishment</li> <li>• educated elsewhere</li> <li>• not in education, employment, or training</li> <li>• other apprenticeships</li> <li>• traineeships</li> <li>• supported internships</li> </ul>
57 to 63  C to J	Total number of EHCPs by provision type (with estimated future projections).	<p>This data box contains calculation cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Columns C to J are calculation cells which pull through data from the total numbers in the corresponding tables entered within each placement type tab elsewhere in the template.</li> </ul>

The data used within 'Total number of EHCPs by age group (with estimated future projection)' in columns C to E is the actual position for historical EHCP numbers as taken from the [SEN2](#). These published figures can be found within the 'Download associated files' dropdown on the Education, health and care plans page. Future template versions will be updated as and when future published data becomes available.

The data used within 'Published census data – prepopulated total number of EHCPs by primary need' in columns L to N is the actual position for historical EHCP numbers as taken from the [school census](#). These published figures can be found within the 'Download associated files' dropdown on the 'Special educational needs in England' page. Future template versions will be updated as and when future published data becomes available.

Your forecast EHCP numbers should take into account the CYP currently receiving support as will be reported on the high needs census and projected numbers rather than an annual average.

We recognise this may not be the number used for budget planning but is an indicator of the likely pressures on the high needs block over time and should be viewed in this context.

## 8.2 Graphs

The information displayed within the graphs is representative of the prepopulated and user input data entered in the 'CYP' tab. The graphs show historic and projected years total numbers broken down by each table's information.

## 9. Governance and management tab

The 'Governance and management' tab is a narrative tab which requires user input. The tab comprises of 2 separate free text boxes to complete.

Please add comments and narrative within the blank free text boxes.

### 9.1 Sign off and review of the management plan

This text box is for all relevant contributing parties to sign off the management plan.

We expect the management plan to be signed off by the Director of Children's Services and the s151 officer within your local authority (LA) and across other areas which have also contributed.

The management plan should be taken to your schools forum meetings and discussed by members.

### 9.2 Workstream log

This is an optional tool enabling you to record internal management plan workflow activity. None of the input here feeds into any other cells and can be completed or left blank at the discretion of the user.

## 10. Stakeholder engagement, co-production and consultation tab

The 'Stakeholder engagement, co-production and consultation' tab requires user narrative input. It comprises 6 separate free text boxes to provide details on how you ensure engagement with your various stakeholders.

Please add comments and narrative within the blank free text boxes.

When completing these narrative boxes, consideration should be given to the impact of the engagement with your stakeholders regarding your plans. For example, recommendations for improving service planning and delivery should be made in conjunction with engagement with key stakeholders. Please provide detail of the consultation processes you have already carried out and plans for further engagement to address gaps.

This tab comprises the following stakeholder categories:

### 10.1 Schools forum

This free text box should detail evidence of consultation with your schools forum regarding your DSG management plans including any feedback or comments. Evidence could include minutes detailing conversations regarding planned proposals (links to this evidence may be attached within this free text box). In completing this section, you may wish to include narrative and evidence of:

- details of consultation with the schools forum regarding proposals and their views on these
- how engaged the schools forum is and plans for further engagement

### 10.2 Education institutions

This free text box should provide a comprehensive summary evidencing how local early years settings, schools and colleges and other providers are likely to support and implement any proposals that relate to them.

Consideration should be given as to how the LA has engaged with different education institutions or groups, such as headteacher groups, governors, special educational needs coordinators (SENCOs) and alternative provision (AP) representatives. In completing this section, you may wish to include narrative and evidence of:

- details of consultation with schools and the wider sector on proposals and their views on these
- how engaged local schools and the wider sector are and plans for further engagement, including their responsibilities in the management plan proposals

### 10.3 Parents and carers

The '[SEND Code of Practice](#)' states that every LA must ensure that children and young people (CYP) and their parents/carers are involved in discussions and decisions about their individual support and about local provision.

When completing this section, it is important to consider the following:

- consultations take place when proposals are at a formative stage and early enough to make a difference
- adequate time has been given to consultees to respond
- consultees have been given sufficient information about the proposals to make a response
- there is a conscientious consideration of the responses
- 

This free text box should provide a summary of any such consultations. We welcome and encourage you to work together with your parent and carer forum before completing this template and include their feedback and suggestions in this free text box.

This template should be available to the public with key proposals presented in a format that provides evidence of dialogue between you and the parent and carer forum.

### 10.4 Children and young people

This free text box should provide details of how you have engaged with CYP regarding your plans, such as the Youth Participation Forum and how likely CYP will support any management plan proposals that relate to them. In completing this section, you may wish to include information on:

- how far consideration is given to the views of CYP
- plans to ensure positive engagement with the CYP sector



As with parent and carer forums, we welcome and encourage you to work together with your CYP or formulate plans to do so before completing this template.

This template should be available to the public, with key proposals presented in a format that encourages dialogue between you and CYP.

## **10.5 Elected members (councillors, mayors)**

This free text box should confirm that the management plan has been completed in conjunction with the council. You may also use this text box to provide summaries or links to relevant minutes of council meetings and agenda papers.

## **10.6 Health partners**

This free text box should provide a comprehensive summary detailing how health partners are likely to support and implement any management plan proposals and how you have engaged with them so far. In completing this section, you may wish to include information on:

- how far consideration is given to the views of your health partners
- plans to ensure positive engagement with your health partners going forward

## 11. Local authority (LA) specific narrative tab

The 'Local authority (LA) specific narrative' tab requires user narrative input. The tab comprises 15 separate free text boxes to provide details regarding strategies and plans which relate specifically to your authority.

If you wish to provide further information of these there is space at the bottom of this tab to include links to this evidence, however it is imperative these text boxes are completed and that further evidence is to provide detail of the decisions made, rather than in lieu of completing the box.

Please add comments and narrative within the blank free text boxes.

The tab comprises the following LA specific categories:

### 11.1 Key risks and mitigations

This free text box is to set out key risks which could have an impact on the success of your management plan and the mitigations you will put in place to manage these. You should provide an overall high-level summary of your plan; consideration should be given to both financial and service delivery risks.

It may be helpful to bullet point each risk with its own mitigation so that it is clearly shown and where a risk is identified, you are able to clearly set out the actions you will take to address these. These could be further broken down into short, medium, or long-term.

### 11.2 Management plan support

This free text box is for you to detail how the department and your stakeholders can provide support to help you devise and deliver an effective management plan. In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- support from the Department for Education (DfE) and Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). Examples such as, sharing the initiatives other LAs are currently using, what you would find most helpful from the LA workshops or the provision of informative webinars
- looking at good practice within neighbouring LAs
- support from stakeholders
- support within your authority

- how you are planning to achieve this

### 11.3 Overall EHCP data and projected trends

This free text box should provide a concise commentary of the key pressures (2 to 3 of the most pressing concerns) for any significant trends regarding your education, health and care plan (EHCP) numbers. You should include analysis of the data you have input within the children and young people (CYP) tab on the [management plan template](#) comparable with national and statistical neighbours.

### 11.4 Strategy and approach to workforce

This free text box should detail what you are doing to support education establishments to meet the needs of CYP with special educational needs (SEN) and to ensure the promotion of inclusive practice. We expect this to be a concise paragraph or bullet points to detail 2 to 3 of your most important actions. In completing this section consideration should be given to:

- assessing whether you have a skilled workforce with sufficient staff to undertake their duties. For example, the services to support mainstream schools such as specialist support teams/outreach from non-maintained special schools or independent schools
- if there is a requirement for improvement, your plans for recruitment and retention, including proposals to develop and sustain the high needs workforce (including those directly employed in delivery and administrative capacities, those indirectly employed in other organisations within the delivery chain, and your approach to retention and development)

### 11.5 Strategy and approach to EHCP rates

This free text box should detail how you are ensuring there is provision in place for all CYP with different needs, including strategy proposals going forward. We expect this to be a concise paragraph or bullet points to detail 2 to 3 of your identified key strategies. In completing this section consideration should be given to:

- the quality of the places available
- the sharing of expertise and good practice across your providers
- how providers are encouraged to work together
- how robust panel experts make decisions on EHCPs

- how working in partnership with other LAs ensures EHCPs are given out at the appropriate level
- evidence of the quality of high needs provision
- the provision in place will ensure CYP with different needs are able to access the most suitable places for their needs
- how external placements are commissioned, the arrangements in place, including how value is measured and how it is ensured
- relationships concerning tribunal cases.
- the support in place to enable CYP to be provided for adequately in other schools and colleges
- SEN placement planning and the process for reviewing additional support above the core offer (in mainstream and independent)

## 11.6 Managing demand pressures

This free text box should provide details of your plans to manage demand pressures within EHCP rates, including how the threshold for EHCP numbers is assessed and the overall increase in numbers requiring support from the high needs block (HNB). This should include demand pressures within EHCP rates for the 20-25 cohort of young people within your authority.

In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- the overall increase in numbers requiring support from the HNB and the demand for places across all placement settings
- managing demand pressures at the key pressure points and how associated risks are managed alongside proposed actions
- how sufficiency strategies are used to inform placement practice and measures taken when gaps are identified
- managing cost and spend per capita and any risk associated with any actions which will be taken
- organisational arrangements in place to support the effective management of high needs resources

## 11.7 Sharing best practice and effective practices

This free text box should provide details on how you have been engaging with other LAs and sharing both best practice and effective practice. In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- sharing cost reduction strategies such as better commissioning, scrutiny and review of costs. For example, review of post 16 commissioning or review of alternative provision (AP) providers
- comparisons of top up rates against neighbouring LAs
- investing in local provision strategies used by neighbouring LAs to reduce reliance on more expensive out of authority placements
- demand management strategies around key spending thresholds. For example, improving the effectiveness of moderation panels or training and support for mainstream providers to meet the needs of CYP with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)
- effective early intervention practices. For example, the provision of short-term preventative funding to avoid the need for EHCPs and longer term top up funding

## 11.8 Assumptions

This free text box should provide details of future years' assumptions including how you have arrived at projected numbers, such as any future funding or growth assumptions or any other calculations which are not explained elsewhere within the document. When completing this section consideration should be given to:

- the formula used to arrive at the calculations and assumptions made
- why these assumptions have been made
- strategies to reduce costs

Particular thought should be given to calculations made in the financial tab regarding spend, including all s251 budget and outturn return lines, numbers of CYP for future years detailed in each placement type tab and also how any population growth may affect these numbers

## 11.9 Block movements and disapplications

This free text box should detail plans for proposed block movements and disapplications for future years as detailed on the financial tab.

When completing this section consideration should be given to how these will fit into your overall strategies and ensure that assumptions are as transparent and realistic as possible.

Further guidance on block transfers and disapplications can be found in the 'Movement between blocks' section, pages 39 to 43 of the ['Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 operational guide'](#) alongside the disapplication proformas within the ['Pre-16 schools funding: local authority guidance for 2021 to 2022'](#).

## 11.10 Population

This free text box should detail your assumptions regarding population growth within the LA and how these calculations have been made. When completing this section consideration should be given to:

- the formula used to arrive at the population forecast
- why these assumptions have been made

## 11.11 Governance and commissioning arrangements with CCGs

This free text box should detail your approach to jointly commissioning services for CYP with SEND, including how you are using these services and will continue to strengthen these arrangements going forward. In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- how senior leaders across the LA and clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) work closely together to plan, commission and deliver services for CYP with SEND
- ensuring there is a robust governance structure in place to embed and support a joint working relationship, for example, it may be appropriate to create an improvement board
- how a strong vision cutting across both the LA and CCG on delivering services for CYP is ensured, including the effective use of funding

## 11.12 Capital

This free text box should be used to explain your plans regarding capital funding. In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- priorities with regards to capital funding and any challenges that you may be currently facing (such as, any free schools planned locally, plans to develop units in mainstream, reshape of the local offer)
- high-level details on any short, medium and long-term milestones or planned projects
- how you expect planned capital investment to support the wider strategy
- contingency plans if primary plans are delayed or rejected and the impact this might have on any associated pressures or savings

## 11.13 Early years

This free text box should detail any increases in SEND within the early years (EY) block and to describe key strategies in supporting EY and how any issues will be addressed. In completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- key strategies in providing support early to prevent needs from escalating
- the impact of the SEN inclusion fund being retained centrally
- services that are funded from centrally retained EY funding such as EY speech and language therapy services

## 11.14 Special educational needs (SEN) transport costs

This free text box should provide a year by year breakdown of your SEN transport costs, including any breakdown of costs charged to the DSG.

Further guidance on SEN transport costs can be found within [SCCHEDULE 2 Regulations 6 and 8 Part 1](#) (historic commitments, paragraphs 1d and 3).

## 11.15 SEN other costs

This free text box should provide a summary of your other costs charged to the high needs block of the DSG.

## 12.Placement type narrative tab

Please add comments and narrative within the blank free text boxes.

The 'Placement type narrative' tab requires user narrative input. There are links at the top of this tab which when clicked enable you to be quickly directed to the relevant placement type section within it.

The placement types are as follows:

- mainstream (mainstream schools or academies placements)
- resourced or SEN Units (resourced provision or SEN Units placements)
- special schools (maintained special schools or special academies placements)
- NMSS or independent (non-maintained special schools or independent (NMSS or independent) placements)
- hospital schools or AP (hospital schools or alternative provision (AP) placements)
- post 16 and FE (post 16 and further education (FE) placements)
- health, social care (health, social care, therapy services and care provision)
- other (other placements or direct payments)

Each placement type has 3 separate free text boxes to input narrative. When including a summary of Post 16 placements, consideration should be given to the following:

- post 16 and FE placement type should include young people aged 16+ who are on the roll of mainstream FE, sixth form colleges and special sixth form colleges
- for all other placement types, you should include young people aged 16+ who are on roll with an EHCP

### 12.1 Key pressures and issues

This free text box should describe the key pressures and issues within each placement type, including the changes in data and projected trends for the next 5 years. In this section consideration should be given to:



- details of what have been and are your current key pressures and issues including the reasons behind the changes in the data and projected trends for the next 5 years
- a brief commentary on the data, providing context or explanation for any significant changes in data and projected trends
- a list of the top 5 key pressures pinpointed for priority

## 12.2 Summary of strategy and approach to placement type

This free text box should provide a brief commentary of current strategies and approaches to the placement type including your proposals to invest long term to meet a wider range of needs. When completing this section strategic plans might include:

- your approach for managing the demographic demand pressures. For example, managing the growth in EHCPs, managing demand in special schools, AP and out of authority placements
- measures to support mainstream schools in meeting the SEN of a wider range of pupils. For example, through workforce training or clear routes to access specialist expertise
- identification of who currently delivers AP (local authority-maintained school, or a pupil referral unit, academies, independent or un-registered provision) and what percentage of the AP cohort are in each type of establishment
- changes to the focus of existing specialist places, to cater for different or more complex needs
- the creation or expansion of specialist provision attached to mainstream schools (special units or resourced provision)
- the use of AP within mainstream schools (in-school units or resourced provision)
- identification of the need to create or expand social, emotional, mental health in schools rather than AP
- strategic engagement with specialist providers or AP in the NMSS or independent sector, to ensure places offered reflect the changing needs of CYP. The process for places and how appropriate provision is sourced
- expansion of existing specialist places, to cater for CYP in AP with EHCP plans

## 12.3 Initiatives

This free text box should detail any current initiatives you are trailing in each placement type. You should include how these are going, such as:

- the reasons for choosing these initiatives
- your confidence that overall, your initiatives will be cost effective
- the value these initiatives will add

In completing this section, consideration should also be given to how you are evaluating these initiatives.

## 12.4 Health, social care, therapy services and care provision

The 3 separate free text boxes in this section should be used to detail future demand of contributions from other services for CYP within the LA.

## 12.5 Summary of the inputs made by health and social care partners and proportion of current costs

This free text box should provide a detailed summary of the inputs made by these partners and the proportion of current costs which are covered for health and social care needs of CYP within the LA. When completing this section, consideration should be given to:

- provision costs shared with the health authority
- the proportion of cost being met by health and proportion of cost being met by social care
- your relationship with partners and if practice could be improved, how this could be achieved
- contributions made by the health authority in both costs and in writing EHCPs for CYP

## 12.6 Health and social care contributions

This free text box should provide details of what you are doing to make sure there are appropriate contributions from health and social care services to ensure the needs of CYP are being met. When completing this section, consideration should be given to opportunities to identify health and social care contributions and compare these to statistical neighbouring LAs.

To note: we are aware that LAs may record this information differently.

## **12.7 Outline of current and future demand for therapy services**

This free text box should provide a brief outline of current and future demand for therapy services and arrangements you have with health services.

When completing this section, consideration should be given to proposals to manage and meet this demand, including the authority's input into this service.

## 13. Placement type tabs

The 'Placement type' tabs detailed below (this is the same placement type list as set out on Page 40 of this guidance document) provide data information for individual placement settings and require user data input.

- mainstream (mainstream schools or academies placements)
- resourced or SEN Units (resourced provision or SEN Units placements)
- special schools (maintained special schools or special academies placements)
- NMSS or independent (non-maintained special schools or independent (NMSS or independent) placements)
- Hospital schools or AP (hospital schools or alternative provision (AP) placements)
- post 16 and FE (post 16 and further education (FE) placements)
- health, social care (health, social care, therapy services and care provision)
- other (other placements or direct payments)

## 13.1 Data tables

Data tables in placement type tabs contain both prepopulated and user input cells.

Yellow cells: prepopulated cells which contain published data cannot be amended.

Blue cells: user input cells for you to input data.

Purple cells: calculation cells which cannot be amended.

White cells: require no data input. Placement type tabs that include s251 line 1.0.2 (high needs place funding within individual schools' budget) will not have a figure for 2017 to 2018 financial year as this category was introduced from the 2018 to 2019 budget. Previously this category was included in s251 line 1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget (before academy recoupment).

To note:

- for post 16 and FE placement type you should include young people aged 16+ who are on the roll of mainstream FE, sixth form colleges and special sixth form colleges
- for all other placement types, you should include young people aged 16+ who are on roll with an EHCP

## 13.2 Total projected mitigated expenditure (forecast with savings and invest to save measures) data table

This data table contains both prepopulated and user input cells. The yellow prepopulated cells contain published data which has been taken from:

- [s251 budget and outturn returns for 2017 to 2018](#)
- [s251 budget and outturn returns for 2018 to 2019](#)

To note: the pre-populated s251 data is gross therefore projected data must be input as gross for continuity.

Row number and column	Data table name	Data table information source
Starting from 9 up to 25 (due to variation on each placement type tab)  C and D	Published outturn date – prepopulated	Columns C and D use prepopulated data taken from the s251 budget and outturn returns for 2017 to 2018 financial year and 2018 to 2019 financial year.
Starting from 9 to 25 (due to variation on each placement type tab)  E	Outturn	Column E requires user input.  You will need to input the outturn position at the end of 2019 to 2020 financial year.
Starting from 9 to 25 (due to variation on each placement type tab)  F to J	Total projected mitigated expenditure (forecast with savings and invest to save measures	Columns F to J require user input.  You will need to input predicted forecast budget data going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far) which shows the cost reductions if the measures in the management plan are implemented.

### 13.3 Total projected unmitigated expenditure (forecast based on current trends without mitigating actions) data table

This data table contains blue cells which are user input cells for you to input total projected unmitigated expenditure (forecast based on current trends without mitigating actions) up to a 5-year forecast period.

Row number and column	Data table name	Data table information source
9 to 25 (due to variation on each placement type tab)  L to P	Total projected unmitigated expenditure (forecast based on current trends without mitigating actions)	Columns L to P require user input.  You will need to input predicted forecast budget data going up to and including 2024 to 2025 financial year (if you wish to forecast this far) which shows no cost reduction and/or invest to save measures in place and therefore will be reporting a 'do nothing' forecast.

### 13.4 EHCP and CYP data tables

These 4 data tables contain user input cells for you to input both historic and estimated future projections of children and young people (CYP) with or without an education, health and care plan (EHCP) who are supported within the high needs block. These data tables are included in every placement type tab apart from 'Health, Social Care' and the data entered in these tables will pull through to the 'Children and young people summary' tab elsewhere in the template.

### 13.5 Graphs

The information displayed within the graphs is representative of the data on each tab. These show calculated cells which combine prepopulated and user input data.

## 14. Data from the High needs benchmarking tool v6 tabs

These 3 tabs within the DSG management plan template are taken from the '[High Needs Benchmarking Tool v6](#)' and are named:

- Compare SEN
- Compare s251
- Compare high needs NNF

Further details of the data within these 3 tabs can be found within the glossary and sources tab in the [management plan template](#).





Department  
for Education



Education & Skills  
Funding Agency

© Crown copyright 2020

This publication (not including 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](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Reference: [000-000-000]



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



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)





**Worcestershire County Council 885**  
**DfE Approved Pupil Growth Fund (PGF) Criteria**

Additional funding for mainstream maintained schools and academies to support basic need will be made available in circumstances where: -

- The LA carries out a formal consultation and approves to increase the capacity of a school.
- The LA requests schools to increase their PAN and the school has the capacity.
- The LA requests schools to admit significant additional pupils as a consequence of a school closure.

Additional funding will be made in relation to the number of additional pupils taken.

Funding will be given: -

For maintained schools on a 7/12 basis only to cover the period September to March each year as the period April to August will be covered by the schools budget being based on numbers from the previous October census.

For academies on a full year basis to cover the period September to August each year as additional funding based upon the previous October census does not start until the beginning of the next academic year. This will be payable in two instalments in the Autumn and Summer Terms to reflect the two different financial years in the LA.

No allocation will be made to a school that has not been the subject of a consultation where a school: -

- Has surplus places and then takes additional children up to the PAN.
- Admits over PAN at their own choice.
- Is directed and/or requested to admit additional pupils as result of errors, appeals, fair access panel, SEN, LAC, etc as these numbers will be extremely low on an individual school basis.

Funding will be allocated on the increase in actual numbers on the difference in pupils leaving in the previous year top year group and those joining in the new academic year admitting year group. For example, in a primary school between the numbers leaving Year 6 and numbers entering Reception for 7 years from date of increased capacity.

This principle will apply in all cases. The LA reserves the right to re-consider this if there are genuine reasons why a school is not up to the basic need requirement in the October census and the following January census reflects the more appropriate position.

As permitted the LA will also consider the use of the Pupil Growth Fund to support the cost of new schools impact on the Schools Block DSG for the required allocations in the APT submission for any new mainstream schools opened under the DfE Free Schools programme. This will be assessed on an individual school basis and reflect the cost to the Schools Block DSG of including estimated pupil numbers and other data in the APT, which due to lagged funding the pupil numbers and other data are not funded in the actual DSG allocation until the following year.

**REPORT TO THE WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM (WSF)**  
**PUPIL GROWTH FUND CONSIDERATIONS 2020-21**

**1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To discuss with the WSF some issues relating to the Pupil Growth Fund (PGF).
- 1.2 For the WSF to consider and potentially approve changes to the existing arrangements.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 As part of the national funding arrangements for mainstream schools funding is based on lagged pupil numbers with the previous October pupil census determining budget allocations from the following April for maintained schools and the following September for academies.
- 2.2 LAs are not permitted to adjust school budget allocations in-year to take account of pupil number changes and general pupil turnover and growth must be managed by schools through lagged funding.
- 2.3 The only exception to this is where schools expand and increase their PAN following approval from their LA as part of local basic need. The rules on this are quite specific and are included in the ESFAs School Revenue Funding Operational Guidance.
- 2.4 This allows LAs to operate a PGF to support increases in pupil numbers for basic need and allows LAs to provide in-year revenue funding. LAs are required to have criteria that can be applied for basic need funding and these must be approved with their schools' forum.

**3. CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 The LA has for several years operated a PGF as permitted and has criteria previously approved by the WSF. A copy of the current criteria is attached for information at **Appendix A**.
- 3.2 Also, as required the LA discusses annually with the WSF the level of funding for the PGF and provides a list of those schools that qualify.
- 3.3 Funding to support pupil growth is **provided as an addition to the Schools Block DSG**. The DfE have introduced a NFF arrangement for the PGF and WCC is currently allocated in 2020-21 £2.32m from the national NFF for the PGF. The LA uses its total Schools Block to support both the LSFF based on the DfE NFF and the PGF.
- 3.4 In keeping with most LAs, WCCs local criteria provide for funding the difference in the pupil numbers for the new admissions against the previous PAN at the relevant AWPU. In WCC the criteria provide for this on an actual pupil number basis.

#### **4. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

4.1 The DfE have confirmed it is up to LAs to determine how and when their growth funding is allocated to schools in their area.

4.2 There has been communication from a school in receipt of PGF that has primarily challenged the DfE on the use of the AWPU as the funding rate for the PGF now that there are national Minimum Funding Levels (MFLs) in place. Given the criteria are set locally this challenge has also been sent to the LA.

4.3 The DfE's guidance for 2020-21 does not closely prescribe the methodology by which LAs must allocate the funding, although it does mention approaches LAs might want to consider using lump sum and/or per pupil funding.

4.4 The DfE does not require LAs to set growth funding levels per pupil at the MFLs. The DfE does require LAs to pass the MFLs through to schools in its Local Schools Funding Formula (LSFF) but not in the PGF operated by LAs, which are currently outside these arrangements. This could be viewed as a gap in the DfE's national funding policy.

4.5 The Schools Minister has confirmed WCCs current arrangements for the operation of the local PGF are compliant with the regulations. WCC also, as required, meets the mandatory requirements for the MFLs in the Schools Block DSG for the LSFF.

4.6 The PGF AWPU rates in 2020-21 are Primary £2,857 and Secondary £4,018, whereas the MFLs are £3,750 and £5,000 respectively. Modelling using the 2019 data shows that the effect of using the MFL rates as opposed to the AWPU rates will require a further £0.36m from the PGF in a full year (£0.21m in 2020-21).

#### **5. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

5.1 The WSF is requested to consider the following options for the PGF: -

- Option 1 – no change to the existing arrangements and continue to use the AWPU rates as previously agreed.
- Option 2 – change the PGF to use the DfE MFL rates from 2020-21.
- Option 3 – change the PGF to use the DfE MFL rates from 2021-22.

5.2 All the above options impact on the PGF budget as the per pupil rates, both AWPU and MFL, increase as the LA implements the DfE NFF. It is anticipated that all the options can be funded from within the LAs PGF NFF allocation as part its Schools Block DSG, but the WSF are reminded of the overall DSG budget pressure, particularly relating to HN.

#### **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 The WSF notes and considers the issues for the PGF funding detailed in the report.

6.2 The WSF considers the above options and approves its preference for the PGF.

Andy McHale  
Service Manager Funding and Policy  
Worcestershire Children First

October 2020



## **f40 Executive Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, September 16, 2020 – Conference Call**

### **1. Attendances, apologies, and changes to committee membership**

**Present:** Cllr James McInnes (Chair); Karen Westcott (Secretary); Emily Proffitt (Staffs headteacher); Margaret Judd (Dorset Council); Cllr Peter Downes (Cambs Schools Forum); Jackie Smith (CEO Brunel SEN MAT & Uplands Educational Trust); Andrew Minall (Hampshire CC); Julia Harnden (ASCL); Cllr Richard Long (Kent CC); Steven Edmonds (NGA); Phil Haslett (Glos CC); Christine Atkinson (East Riding of Yorkshire); Cllr Mary Evans (Suffolk CC); Richard Soper (Worc Community Trust).

**Apologies:** Carole Thomson (Oxfordshire Schools Forum); Cllr Alex Dale (Derbyshire CC); Matt Western (Labour MP); Howard Emmett (North Yorks CC); Judy Shaw (NAHT); Deborah Myers (East Riding of Yorkshire); Cllr Bob Standley (East Sussex CC).

### **2. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2020**

The minutes were **APPROVED** as a correct record of the meeting.

### **3. Letter to the DfE re Covid-19 and the impact on education**

Members said the letter to the DfE was welcome and they believed follow up letters should be sent as the Covid-19 situation evolved and the impact on schools changed.

It was agreed that a second letter should be sent to the DfE with an update on funding and Coronavirus issues. MJ, AM and KW to write the letter and then circulate it to members.

### **4. Update on the latest position**

- a. All pupils return to school

It was agreed that schools had done remarkably well to be ready for the return of all pupils in September.

PH said they were facing many issues now due to the number of coronavirus cases increasing, and they should have some recognition from the DfE that the delay in testing and lack of guidance was impacting on them.

He said it was very difficult for schools to deal with both teachers and pupils being away from school while they waited prolonged periods for tests. In many cases, people tested negative and so would be able to get back to the classroom, but without tests they were having to stay at home unnecessarily.

EP agreed. She said, as a headteacher, it was very stressful at the moment. She said she was taking numerous phone calls every day from parents wondering whether their children had colds or coronavirus. She said she was not qualified to diagnose anyone.

The lack of available tests had also proven to be a problem at her school, with one parent being asked to travel from Staffordshire to Inverness to get their child tested.

JS said the lack of testing was proving an issue within her academy trust for children with special needs. She said a number of her staff were unable to work because they were isolating and were awaiting tests.

She said there were also added complications because there were huge variances in what different areas were doing to operate around Covid. JS said her trust straddled two different local authority areas, which made matters confusing.

ME said the implications of the pandemic was akin to a financial domino trail – the knock-on effect to other areas was huge. She said there was capacity to test people, but not to process the test results in a lab.

Members said they had all seen a good return to school in September, which was promising. Many said in their areas there had been around a 90% return to class.

#### b. Budgets and extra costs

JS said the lack of testing was proving an issue within her academy trust for children with special needs. She said a number of her staff were unable to work because their own children had been sent home from their schools with suspected cases, and they were awaiting tests.

As a result, she said she was having to use supply teachers far more than usual, and she had concerns that her teaching costs would be astronomical this year. If they could get tests quicker, they would be able to return to work sooner if they received a negative result.

ME said the implications of the pandemic was like a financial domino trail – the knock-on effect to other areas was huge. She said they had been told there was capacity to test people, but not to run the test results in a lab.

AM said he believed the DfE should support schools on an ongoing basis with Covid. He said he didn't believe this was a situation where the DfE could draw a line in the sand with regards to giving support around extra Covid costs.

PH said he believed the only way schools would get additional staff costs back was by demonstrating the contrast between what they spent last year on staffing, and what they have spent during the pandemic.

AM said it was important that f40 stuck to funding issues when it corresponded with the DfE, as that was the group's remit.

JMcl agreed but said any issues that impacted on school and education budgets should be included, especially where they were seen as directly causing additional funding problems.

He said the lack of testing was an example of this. He said if people were able to get tested more quickly, those with negative results would be back to the classroom immediately, thus removing the need for prolonged use of supply teachers. He said schools needed to be supplied with more testing kits.



He said it was also about confidence of parents, that their children were safe at school. He believed parents' confidence was plummeting. He said the lack of testing was driving both a confidence issue and a staffing and costs issue in schools.

MJ said f40 needed to write a new letter that reiterated the need for additional funds for schools, and highlighted the factors driving them.

SE said he believed the test and trace system was not fit for purpose.

EP said she had also been forced to spend more on teaching resources as the current social distancing guidelines meant children could not share learning equipment and resources, as in the past.

#### c. School transport

PH said in Gloucestershire they were just coping with regards schools transport. However, he said they didn't know yet what the costs would be for the whole year. He said a rise in costs was expected, but the details were difficult to pin down at present.

AM said in Hampshire the school transport system around Covid was working sufficiently, but it had taken a few days for issues to be ironed out initially.

JMcl said in Devon it was costing the authority an additional £100,000 to pay for school transport measures during Covid – over and above the extra funding it had received from Government to help pay for it.

He said the additional funds from the DfE were only made available up to the October half-term, and he believed more assurances were needed that extra financial support would be provided after that time. He said he believed each authority would need additional money for school transport until May of next year.

JS said it was not just about the cost of school transport. She had concerns about the parameters of it, too. She said children were mixing on school buses, but then going into different support bubbles once they arrived at school. She said at her academy trust they were not involved in who children mixed with on buses.

RL said so far, the additional funding for school transport had been sufficient in Kent, but as more and more children went back to school, it may not be enough. He said they faced the possibility of not taking any more applications for subsidised travel passes in the future.

MJ said in Dorset they were trying to create seating plans for transport to ensure children remained in their school bubbles whilst going to and from school.

EP said in Staffordshire there were also seating plans on the buses to match school bubbles.

ME said in Suffolk they were coping with the numbers and had extra mini-buses on standby in case demand increased.

#### d. Other issues/challenges

ME said following the return of school in September, Suffolk CC had seen an increase in the number of parents choosing Elective Home Education (EHE).

JMcl said in Devon there had also been a spike in the number of parents choosing to home school their children.

PH said the same spike had been seen in Gloucestershire, and JH said it was an emerging issue across the country.

PH said he believed that children taken out of school to be home schooled, and then brought back into the system later on, may have greater learning needs that the school would need to meet.

And he said despite efforts by the council and the schools to meet short-term special educational needs, they were still seeing a greater number of Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) applications coming in than they normally would have at this time of year.

JMcl said in Devon, the same pattern was emerging, with EHCP applications continuing to rise. He said the Higher Needs Block deficit budget was a major problem.

He said in the next letter to the DfE, the importance of the SEND review resumption should be voiced.

JH said she believed the strict criteria for schools to claim additional costs between March and July meant not all of the available funding had been claimed, so money remained in the Covid support budget. She hoped the remaining budget would be carried over to assist schools during the autumn term.

She said she believed 14,000 schools had already made a claim to the DfE to recoup extra Covid costs.

JH said the rise in children being home schooled had raised concerns. She said children taken out of school now would not be included in the School Census in October, which counts pupil numbers and helps calculate funding for schools next year.

If some of those children are then brought back into the school system next year, funding for them will not have been included in school budgets. In these cases, schools would have to make their funds stretch.

SE said he had heard that Education Secretary Gavin Williamson had informed the Education Select Committee that the review on SEND would be delayed until 2021.

JS said there were many pressures on the SEND system, and the money needed to go to the right people and places.

JMcl said the letter to the DfE should include evidence on the growing pressure on the SEND sector and the increasing demand for EHCPs due to Covid.

PH said the DfE needed to separate the High Needs issues into two separate areas; sustainable funding for the future and the treatment of the current deficit budgets.

**Action:** It was agreed that a second letter would be sent to the DfE outlining current funding pressures on schools and the ongoing impact of the pandemic. The letter will include:

- The need for additional funding for schools to cover extra costs – including extraordinary costs
- The lack of testing for teachers and pupils
- Impact on staffing costs

- School transport costs
- The rising number of EHCP applications
- The need for the SEND review to resume
- Issues around growing HNB deficit budgets

## 5. SEND review

KW said she had contacted Tony McArdle, chair of the SEND Leadership Board and an independent adviser to the SEND review, to find out when it was resuming. She said she was still awaiting a response and would prompt him again.

## 6. f40 SEND stats

MJ updated members on the SEND statistics f40 was collecting. She said it had been decided that every local authority in England should now be asked to contribute, rather than just the 42 f40 members, so a fuller picture could be created of the SEND funding issue.

Additional questions and detail is also being included in the survey to enable greater comparisons to be drawn. The data from the survey will be used by f40 in the campaign for greater SEND funding and an overhaul of the SEND system.

MJ said she would send the draft form to members of the Executive for their feedback and suggested amends.

JH said it was important that the statistics were used appropriately by the DfE, and not simply used to determine how little SEND funding each local authority could manage on.

She said moving towards a hard funding formula for SEND was not going to happen overnight, and there was still an opportunity to make the funding system work more effectively.

JMcl said the survey needed to be as simple as possible to encourage people to complete it.

PD said he had no idea how local authorities were going to pay off their High Needs deficit budgets, especially those authorities that were earmarked to merge with others during the local government restructure. He said he believed the DfE had put its head in the sand over the issue.

JMcl said his fear was that the DfE looked at what the average deficit budget was, and only offered to pay off that amount for each local authority – with the council being left to pay off the rest of their SEND deficit.

**Action:** MJ to work with KW and the DTW team to get the survey circulated to local authorities.

## 7. f40 conference

KW informed members that the LGA office was not yet open for meetings and was not likely to be available for hire for some time.

The decision has been taken not to plan for an f40 conference this year. There may be opportunities to have speakers give presentations via webinar. KW said the preferred option for this would be to have them spread over a number of days, rather than all on one day.

**Action:** KW to investigate the possibility of setting up webinar presentations from key speakers.

## **8. Collaboration Group**

KW informed members that f40 members MJ, AM and KW would be joining other members of the Collaboration Group for a remote meeting on Tuesday, October 6.

## **9. FMRT meeting**

KW informed members that f40's FMRT group would be meeting on Monday, September 21.

## **10. Membership invoicing**

KW informed that invoicing was now taking place, for the reduced subscription fee of £250 for 2020. Normal invoicing will resume in April 2021. f40 currently has 42 members.

## **11. Financial update**

KW updated the Executive Committee and said f40 had a healthy bank balance.

## **12. Date of next committee meeting in December 2020**

KW suggested the next meeting be held during the first two weeks of December, either Wednesday 2 or 9.

**Action:** KW to circulate a doodle poll to gauge when is best and then schedule.