

SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

16th January 2019

10.00 to 12.00 Committee Room 6, Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Membership: Jim Edgecombe (Chair), Phil Haigh (Chair of Sub Groups), Ludmila Morris, Duncan Greig, Kris O’Sullivan, Bernie Lloyd, Lisa Corrigan, Tony Eginton, Jo Palmer, Liz Horrigan, Ross Macdonald, Bob Charlton, Joan Greening, Tracey Hemming, Robert Jones, Jacqueline Lack, Peter Ryerson, Sudhi Pathak, Laurie Cornwell, Elaine Caffary, Lesley Knee, Alison Moore, Helen Manwaring.

Shadow Reps/Observers: Debbie Gilder, Darrell Butler, Julia Moss, Sandra Voisey, Graham Wells.

Officers: Peter Malewicz, Graham Young, Dan Kennedy, Tom Murphy, Kate Boulter (Clerk)

AGENDA

	Item	Time	Lead	Update
1.	Apologies	10.00 – 10.05		
2.	Minutes of meeting held on 12 th December 2018	10.05 – 10.10	JE	Report
3.	Matters arising from meeting on 12 th December 2018 not on the Agenda a) YPA and Skills Hub Funding Update	10.10 – 10.15	GY	Verbal
4.	Feedback from sub-groups a) Extraordinary Budget Meeting 8 January 2019	10.15 – 10.20	JE	Verbal
5.	Information Items a) Month 8 DSG Monitoring Report	10.20 – 10.30	GY	Report
6.	DSG Budget 2019/20 a) Outcome of Early Years Funding Consultation b) Outcome of De-delegation Consultation c) 2019/20 DSG Funding Settlement Update d) Outcome of DSG Budget Consultation e) Growth Contingency Allocation 2019/20 f) Proposed Amendments to Schools Funding Formula g) Special School Planned Places h) Proposed Budget 2019/20 i) Disapplication Request Update	10.30 – 11.55	GY GY PM GY GY GY GY GY GY PM	Report Report Report Report Report Report Report Report Report Report
7.	AOB	11.55 – 12.00		

Schools Forum and Sub Group Planned Meetings 2018/2019

	School's Forum Meetings 2018-19	
Meeting	Date & Time	Venue
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 13th March 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 4
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 15th May 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 26th June 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Thursday 26th September 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Thursday 7th November 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 4
Schools' Forum	Thursday 12th December 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6

HILLINGDON SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 16 January 2019 at 10am at the Civic Centre

Voting members

NAME	ORGANISATION	ATTENDANCE
Maintained Nursery (1)		
Ludmila Morris	McMillan Early Childhood Centre	PRESENT
Maintained Primary - Schools (4)		
Lisa Corrigan	Highfield Primary School	APOLOGIES
Duncan Greig	Breakspear Primary School	APOLOGIES
Bernadette Lloyd	Harefield Infant & Harefield Junior School	APOLOGIES
Kris O'Sullivan	Deanesfield Primary School	PRESENT
Maintained Primary - Governors (4)		
Jim Edgecombe (CHAIR)	Whiteheath Junior School	PRESENT
Tony Eginton	Minet Nursery & Infant School and Hillside Junior School	PRESENT
Phil Haigh	Cherry Lane Primary School	PRESENT
Jo Palmer	Hillside Infant School	PRESENT
Maintained Secondary (1)		
Liz Horrigan	Harlington School	PRESENT
Maintained Special (1)		
John Goddard	Hedgewood School	PRESENT
Academies (9)		
Bob Charlton	Charville Primary School	APOLOGIES
Joan Greening	Northwood Academy	PRESENT
Tracey Hemming	Middlesex Learning Partnership	PRESENT
Robert Jones	Haydon School	PRESENT
Helen Manwaring	Swakeleys School	PRESENT
Peter Ryerson	Guru Nanak Sikh Academy	PRESENT
(three vacancies)		-
Special Academies (1)		
Sudhi Pathak	Eden Academy Trust	PRESENT
Alternative provision (1)		
Laurie Cornwell	The Skills Hub	APOLOGIES
Private Voluntary & Independent Early Years Providers (2)		
Elaine Caffary	4 Street Nursery	PRESENT
Lesley Knee	Ruislip Methodist Preschool	PRESENT
14-19 Partnership (1)		
(vacant)		
Other attendees (non-voting)		
Independent Non-Maintained Special School		
Debbie Gilder	Pield Heath School	NOT REQUIRED
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Schools)		
Rachel Anderson	Dr Tipleetts School	PRESENT
Rachel Blake	Whiteheath Infant School	PRESENT
Sophia Shaikh	Grange Park Junior School	PRESENT
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Governor)		
John Buckingham		NOT REQUIRED
Mr Graham Wells	Colham Manor Primary School	PRESENT
Local Authority Officers		
Steve Denbeigh	LA Finance	PRESENT
Kate Boulter	Clerk	PRESENT
Dan Kennedy	LA	PRESENT

Peter Malewicz	Finance Manager - Children and Young People Services	PRESENT
Graham Young	Lead Finance Business Partner - School	PRESENT

		ACTION
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies were accepted and recorded in the attendance list (above). The following Shadow Representatives were attending in place of absent Maintained Primary members and had voting rights for this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rachel Anderson for Lisa Corrigan ● Sophia Shaikh for Bernadette Lloyd ● Rachel Blake for Duncan Greig <p>The Chair confirmed the meeting was quorate and could proceed to business.</p> <p>It was noted that Councillor David Simmonds, Cabinet Member for Education and Children's Services, had been invited to attend the meeting but was unable to do so due to another commitment.</p>	
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>GY declared that he was a member of the Interim Board for Oakwood School.</p>	
3.	<p>MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2018 AND 8 JANUARY 2019</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2018 were AGREED as a correct record subject to the following amendment:</p> <p><i>(Liz Horrigan), requested that the point of note relating to Harlington School needs to be amended to the following:</i></p> <p><i>LH – Point of note; the paper does not recognise Harlington's offer to facilitate an additional SRP as part of their upcoming new build</i></p> <p>Consideration of the minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 8 January 2019 was DEFERRED to the next meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2018</p> <p><u>Minute 5 - YPA and Skills Hub</u></p> <p>GY reported that the school had agreed a figure of £5K for each vacant place, which was consistent with the modelling presented to the Forum previously.</p>	
5.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>None.</p>	
6.	<p>FEEDBACK FROM SUB-GROUPS</p> <p>(a) HIGH NEEDS GROUP / DSG AND EY GROUP</p> <p>There had not been any meetings of the sub-groups since the last Schools Forum.</p>	

	<p>(b) EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 8 JANUARY 2019</p> <p>The Extraordinary Meeting had met to consider the outcome of the consultation responses, and modelling for the 2019/20 budget based on those responses. It had allowed members to put questions to officers and debate the proposals ahead of the decisions to be made at this meeting. Members had found it helpful to have the additional time and opportunity to consider the issues affecting the budget.</p>	
7.	<p>MONTH 8 DSG MONITORING REPORT</p> <p>At Month 8 the DSG was projecting an in-year deficit of £2,921K, a favourable movement of £619K on the Month 7 position due to the £775K increase in High Needs funding recently announced by the DfE. When the £4,125k deficit brought forward from 2017/18 was taken into account, the deficit to carry forward to 2019/20 was £7,046K.</p>	
8.	<p>DSG BUDGET 2019/20</p>	
	<p>(a) OUTCOME OF EARLY YEARS FUNDING CONSULTATION</p> <p>The Forum considered a summary of the responses received from stakeholders following the consultation on Early Years funding for 2019/20, which had taken place in December 2018.</p> <p>Stakeholders were asked to give views on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the impact that a (i) 3p and (ii) 6p reduction would have on the sustainability of provision, the quality of childcare, and the future educational outcomes of children. ● a proposal to reduce vulnerable children funding by £70k, which would bring the budget in line with the 2017/18 actual expenditure. <p>A total of 48 responses had been received from a School nurseries, PVI's and Childminders. The report set out a summary of the comments received, and the estimated financial impact per provider based on the 2018/19 budgeted number of universal hours.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on the responses, any funding reduction would impact on the sustainability of some providers, the quality of childcare and outcomes for children. ● Some time ago, the Forum had agreed a substantial increase in the base rate following a freeze of several years and in response to increasing costs in the sector. There was anecdotal evidence that this had improved quality of provision as settings were able to employ more qualified staff. ● The estimated financial impact of the proposed reductions per provider was fairly small. Larger settings would be better placed to absorb any funding decrease than small businesses, which could struggle to stay open. ● If the base rate were reduced, providers indicated they would limit the number of funded places to protect their financial sustainability. Settings which only provided funded places would be at risk. If the number of funded places reduced, the LA would not be able to meet the demand for places. This would affect the most disadvantaged children. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A further impact would be on the diversity of early years childcare providers within the Borough, if smaller settings closed and provision was mainly in larger PVI and schools. This would limit options for parents who preferred small settings or part-time care. ● A reduction of funded places in Hillingdon could drive parents across the county border into other LAs which offered a greater variety of settings. ● A reduction of 3p would achieve £100K savings, and 6p would achieve £200K savings. If places numbers were to drop as a result of a reduction in funding, there would be retrospective clawback at the rate the LA received funding. ● There were benefits to maintaining a diverse range of early years provision which enabled children from all backgrounds to access childcare. It seemed counter-intuitive to put settings or quality of provision at risk for the level of savings that would be achieved. ● Generally respondents felt that the vulnerable children budget could be reduced as it was not being fully utilised. However others felt that there was still significant need and that if the funding stream was better publicised it would be fully accessed. <p>It having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED:</p> <p>(1) to set the Early Years hourly base rate at £4.92 (no reduction); and</p> <p>(2) to set the vulnerable children budget at £139K (£70K reduction).</p>	
	<p>(b) OUTCOME OF DE-DELEGATION CONSULTATION</p> <p>The Department for Education (DfE) required local authorities to consult with primary and secondary LA maintained schools every year about the de-delegation of a number of central budgets. The Forum considered a summary of the responses received from stakeholders to the consultation on the de-delegation for 2019/20, which had taken place in December 2018.</p> <p>A total of 49 responses had been received representing maintained nursery, primary and secondary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal one had consulted on de-delegation of Trade Union Duties staff cover (£2.19 per pupil). 41.3% of respondents from primary schools, and 100% of respondents from nursery and secondary schools, had supported this de-delegation. <p>Proposal two had consulted on the de-delegation of Teachers Pensions administration (£1.22 per pupil). 87% of respondents from primary schools, and 100% of respondents from nursery and secondary schools, had supported this de-delegation.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At the extraordinary meeting held on 8 January 2019, members had asked for further details of the Trade Union Duties accounts, to give schools a better understanding of how the per pupil rate was set and how the de-delegated funding was managed. A written 	

	<p>report had been circulated, however members had further questions and the author was not present at the meeting to provide answers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The funding had not been agreed for 2018/19 and the removal of the service had impacted schools differently. ● Officers confirmed that all funds were held within the DSG, and any unused funds were rolled over. Reporting on the use of the funds could be included in the monthly monitoring reports to the Forum. <p>It having been put to a vote to the respective voting representatives, the Forum AGREED:</p> <p>(1) to de-delegate Trade Union duties staff supply cover costs for primary schools;</p> <p>(2) to de-delegate Trade Union duties staff supply cover costs for secondary schools;</p> <p>(3) to de-delegate Teachers Pension Administration for primary schools;</p> <p>(4) to de-delegate Teachers Pension Administration for secondary schools.</p>	
	<p>(c) 2019/20 DSG FUNDING SETTLEMENT</p> <p>The Forum considered an update on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget for 2019/20 following the release of the updated DSG Funding settlement on 17 December 2018, and the announcement that Hillingdon would receive an additional £775K High Needs funding in both 2018/19 and 2019/20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hillingdon’s Schools Block Funding would increase by £3,183k in 2019/20, equivalent to an increase of 1.48%. This excluded additional funding that would be provided to fund the Teachers Pay Award, which for Hillingdon mainstream schools would be approximately £1,983k. ● Hillingdon’s High Needs Block Funding would increase by £1,817k in 2019/20, equivalent to an increase of 4.82%. This excluded additional funding that would be provided to fund the Teachers Pay Award, which for Hillingdon special schools would be approximately £106k. ● The Central Schools Services Block would have additional funding of £37k in 2019/20. ● Overall, Hillingdon’s 2019/20 DSG Budget would increase by £5,037k, equivalent to an increase of 1.97%. Based on the latest projections, there would be a funding gap of £5,279k on the High Needs Funding Block, and the Council was seeking a transfer of £3,462k (equivalent to 1.574%) from the Schools Funding Block. ● Hillingdon had a net increase in pupil numbers, however secondary pupil numbers had increased, and primary pupil numbers had gone down. Analysis showed a drop in numbers in every primary year group when pupils moved on one academic year. <p>Members of the Forum NOTED the report and commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was anecdotal evidence that the drop in primary numbers was due to various factors including currency and other changes following the EU referendum, high house prices in the Borough, welfare reform affecting the benefits cap and parental preference. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was currently 11% capacity across Reception in the Borough. Some schools which had been asked to expand were unable to fill their additional forms. ● The reduction in numbers could have a financial impact on schools and this would be monitored. ● Hillingdon had one of the highest overall school balances in the country, which was attributed to the LA delegating a very high proportion of the DSG to schools and retaining little centrally. 	
	<p>(d) OUTCOME OF DSG BUDGET CONSULTATION</p> <p>The Forum considered a summary of the responses received from stakeholders following the consultation on the transfer of funds from the Schools Block in 2019/20, which had taken place in December 2018.</p> <p>A total of 65 responses had been received representing nursery, primary, secondary and special schools. The majority of these (50) responses were from primary schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal one had consulted on whether to transfer 0.5% of Schools Block funding to address High Needs pressures. 89.2% of respondents were against this proposal. ● Proposal two had consulted on whether to transfer an additional 1.45% from the schools block to cover the projected high needs deficit in 2019/20 (subsequently revised down to 1.1% in light of the additional £775K High Needs funding for 2019/20). 92.3% of respondents were against this proposal. <p>Members of the Forum commented that a significant proportion of consultees had responded, and 90% of respondents did not support any transfer of funds.</p> <p>The Forum NOTED the outcome of the consultation, which would be taken into consideration when setting the 2019/20 budget (minute 8(h)).</p>	
	<p>(e) GROWTH CONTINGENCY ALLOCATION 2019/20</p> <p>The Forum considered a report which set out the proposed draw down from the Growth Contingency Fund for expanding schools and new basic need academy schools, including schools that had permanently expanded and would take on additional pupils in September 2019, schools that were planned to expand for the first time in September 2019 and schools which had seen significant in-year growth in their lowest year group.</p> <p>It was noted that 2019/20 would be the first year that growth allocations were distributed to local authorities using a new formulaic method based on lagged growth data rather than historic spend. This resulted in a £1,077k reduction in growth funding for Hillingdon in 2019/20.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Secondary schools reported receiving enquiries from the LA on whether they would take additional children in each form above PAN. A range of funding models for this were being considered and would be brought to a future meeting, together with any proposed amendments to the Growth Contingency Policy to allow this. Consideration should also 	

	<p>be given to impact on school appeals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Primary schools were experiencing a reduction in numbers compared with planned places and this would eventually move through to secondary schools. <p>It having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED:</p> <p>(1) To hold back allocations for Harlyn Primary, Hillside Juniors and Oak Wood until further information was known regarding the prospective September 2019 intake;</p> <p>(2) to release the expanding schools funding to all other schools schools as set out in Appendix A of the report;</p> <p>(3) to agree the budget for diseconomies of scale funding for basic need academy schools as set out in the spreadsheet at Appendix A of the report, subject to on-going review.</p>	
	<p>(f) PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA</p> <p>The Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) provided local authorities with a modelling tool to complete the local funding formula with the schools census data built into the tool. If the LA considered that data to be unrepresentative, it was permitted to amend the data to more accurately reflect a school's circumstances.</p> <p>The Forum considered a report which noted some anomalies which appeared unrepresentative, together with proposals on how to treat the anomalies.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that the two schools that reported disproportionately high mobility (De Salis Studio College at 91% and Parkside Studio College at 96%) should be asked to provide further information on why their rates were so high.</p> <p>It having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED:</p> <p>(1) the estimated pupil numbers for John Locke Academy, Lake Farm Park Academy and St Martin's CE Primary School, as set out in the report;</p> <p>(2) the retrospective adjustments for John Locke Academy and St Martin's CE Primary, as set out in the report;</p> <p>(3) the amended mobility percentages for De Salis Studio College and Parkside Studio College, as set out in the report.</p>	
	<p>(g) SPECIAL SCHOOL PLANNED PLACES</p> <p>The Forum considered a report which the proposed funding arrangements for high needs placements at special schools and specialist resource provisions (SRPs) for 2019/20.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Where a place was given to a pupil from out of borough, funding was recovered from the home borough. ● Schools were still awaiting the outcome of submissions of expressions of interest to provide new build to increase capacity in special school places in the Borough. 	<p>TM</p>

It having been put to a vote, the Forum **AGREED** all the adjustments to special school and SRP places as set out in the report.

(h) PROPOSED BUDGET 2019/20

The Forum considered a report which consolidated all of the DSG funding the Council had been informed it would receive for 2019/20 and all of the adjustments required to the DSG revenue budget, to enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2019/20.

Members of the Forum commented that:

- For prior attainment rates, Model 1 would result in the biggest change. It was closest to the NFF, however, implementation of the new funding formula had been postponed more than once and it was not clear when, or in what form, it would be implemented. Models 1 and 2 moved funding from secondary to primary. Model 3 maintained primary funding at previous levels and maintained a primary : secondary ratio of 1 : 1.29.
- The consultation responses on proposed transfer of funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block had shown a high majority of stakeholders opposed any transfer.
- Any transfer would only serve to reduce the High Needs deficit. It would not make more funding available to support children and young people with High Needs. Schools would have less money to spend on educating children, and no child would gain from additional funding in the High Needs block.
- The High Needs deficit was due to funding not keeping pace with growing demand. The age group LAs were required to support from the High Needs budget had stretched from 0-18 to 0-25, with no corresponding increase in financial support from government. Transferring money from the Schools Block masked the reason for the deficit, at the expense of funding for mainstream education. It was important to be transparent about the severity of the funding position, so need could be properly assessed and adequate funding provided.
- JE read out the following statement from LBH which appeared on their website regarding the proposed Council budget for 2019/20: "*As previously reported to Cabinet and reiterated in the Budget Monitoring report on this agenda, a cumulative deficit of £7,665k is projected on the retained element of the Schools Budget at 31 March 2019. This deficit primarily relates to funding as determined under the Department for Education's national funding formula failing to keep pace with growing demand for high needs placements for pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans following introduction of the 2014 Children and Families Act. In light of the systemic nature of this risk, the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy has been developed on the assumption that Government will ultimately provide adequate funding to support implementation of the 2014 Act and therefore bring the Schools Budget back into balance – both locally and nationally.*" The Council's statement recognised that the High Needs deficit was due to funding failing to meet demand, and was not within the LA's control, and anticipated an eventual correction in funding from central government.
- When setting the budget for 2018/19, the Forum had agreed target savings which had not been achieved this financial year. The LA was asked to provide an update on staffing reviews and restructuring, and details of any planned consultations with stakeholders to help identify which organisational changes would be most effective.

	<p>It having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED:</p> <p>(1) to change the Primary Prior Attainment rates for the 2019/20 School Funding Formula, which would retain Primary and Secondary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19;</p> <p>(2) to transfer 0% from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, for the reasons set out above;</p> <p>(3) to confirm the budget set out in the report, subject to the changes agreed at this meeting, to recommend to Council as part of the 2019/20 to 2022/23 Medium Term Financial Forecast Budget Setting process.</p>	DK
	<p>(i) DISAPPLICATION REQUEST UPDATE</p> <p>The Forum NOTED the revised disapplication request submitted by the LA to the Secretary of State in light of the additional High Needs funding provided in the 2019/20, which reduced the additional transfer requested to £3,462k, equivalent to 1.574%.</p> <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Under the equalities impact assessment, the disapplication stated "This transfer of resources between the Schools Funding Block and the High Needs Funding Block will target funds to those pupil groups where the evidence is clear that they need additional support." The Forum reiterated its view that the transfer would not make more funding available to support children and young people with High Needs. It would only reduce the High Needs deficit. ● It was noted that the ESFA had not provided a date by which decisions would be made on the disapplication request. 	
9.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The next meeting of the Schools Forum would be held in the Civic Centre on Wednesday 13 March 2019 at 2pm.</p>	

The meeting closed at 12.20pm.

Early Years Funding Consultation

1. Introduction

The Local Authority and Schools Forum are required to consult with stakeholders on any proposed changes to funding each Early Years funding each year. This paper provides a summary of the responses received from stakeholders in response to the consultation on Early Years funding for 2019/20 which took place in December 2018.

2. Recommendations

Consider the responses to the consultation and agree on whether to;

(a) Set the Early Years hourly base rate at

- i. £4.92, or
- ii. £4.89, or
- iii. £4.86

(b) Set the vulnerable children funding budget at

- i. £209k, or
- ii. £139k

3. Background

At the beginning of October 2018, local authority officers attended an Early Years providers meeting to update setting managers on the DSG position. At this meeting, officers indicated that Hillingdon's hourly rate of funding was above the national average standing at £5.46 and therefore wished to understand what impact a reduction in the EYSFF base rate might have on settings across the authority. Although the attendance was quite low, it was clear from these discussions that each provider is different, whether it be delivery model or structure of staff and therefore the impact of a reduction would vary across the sector.

At the end of this meeting it was discussed and agreed, that any consultation should give the providers the opportunity to share information on how they operate in order to fully understand the market and the impact of any funding reduction decisions. Schools Forum would then be able to make more informed decisions when considering reductions to Early Years funding. The proposals sought views from stakeholders on what the impact of a 3p (approximately a £100k reduction in total funding) and a 6p (approximately a £200k reduction in total funding) reduction to the base rate would be on the following;

- the sustainability of the service/provision
- the quality of childcare provided
- the educational outcomes for children

The consultation was also used to request the following information from providers;

Information

- A brief explanation of the Delivery Model
- Staffing levels, with particular focus on recruitment difficulties
- Staffing pay ranges
- Premises rents/rates costs
- Ability of the setting to raise fees

Stakeholders were also asked to give views on the proposal to reduce the Vulnerable Children funding budget by £70k to £139k which would bring the budget in line with the 2017/18 actual expenditure

4. Consultation Responses

A total of 48 responses were received from a School nurseries, PVI's and Childminders. A breakdown of the response is in the table below;

Provision	Total no. of Responses	No. of Providers to Respond	% of Total Registered Providers
School	32	26	55%
PVI	13	11	11%
Childminder	3	3	1%
Total	48	40	

The response are detailed within Appendix A, with the following common themes to each of the questions;

Q. Stakeholders are asked to give views on the impact that a 3p reduction in the base rate would have on the following;

(a) The sustainability of your provision

Some providers considered that it would be possible to absorb this reduction whilst others indicated that it could start to put them in some financial difficulty

(b) The quality of childcare

Some providers felt that the quality of childcare could be maintained, whilst others indicated that a reduction in funding would lead to a reduction in quality

(c) The future educational outcomes of children

The majority of respondents felt that outcomes would suffer as a result of any funding reductions

Q. Stakeholders are asked to give views on the impact that a 6p reduction in the base rate would have on the following;

(a) The sustainability of your provision

Inevitably providers indicated that a greater reduction would put more pressures on sustainability with some indicating that a 6p reduction could put them out of business

(b) The quality of childcare

The general feeling was that a reduction in funding would lead to a reduction in the ability to retain good staff which would lead to a reduction in quality

(c) The future educational outcomes of children

The majority of respondents felt that outcomes would suffer as a result of any funding reductions

Q. Do you have views on the proposal is to reduce the vulnerable children funding by £70k, which would bring the budget in line with the 2017/18 actual expenditure?

Some respondents felt that this budget could be reduced as it was not being fully utilised. However others felt that there is still significant need and that if the funding stream was better publicised it would be fully accessed.

5. Summary

In summary, the general feeling of the responses is that any funding reduction would impact on the sustainability of some providers, the quality of childcare and the outcomes for children. However the financial impact per provider of the proposals is fairly small as illustrated, in Appendix B which illustrates estimated reductions of the proposals based on the 2018/19 budgeted number of universal hours.

6. Appendices

Appendix A – Summary of responses (This is a very large document do not print)

Appendix B – Illustration of the impact of reductions by setting (based on 18/19 budgeted universal hours)

De-delegation 2019/20 – Outcome of Consultation

1. Introduction

The Department for Education (DfE) requires local authorities to consult with primary and secondary maintained schools every year about the de-delegation of a number of central budgets. De-delegated funds are a deduction from a school's budget share and are held centrally to fund relevant services and can only apply to maintained primary and secondary school budgets. This paper provides a summary of the responses received from stakeholders in response to the consultation on the de-delegation for 2019/20, which took place in December 2018.

2. Recommendations

Note the feedback from the consultation and consider the responses when voting on whether to:

- (i) de-delegate, or
- (ii) fully delegate for each of the following
 - a) Trade Union duties staff supply cover costs,
 - b) Teacher Pensions Administration,

(N.B. only maintained schools can vote on this, with one vote having to be made per sector)

3. Consultation Feedback

In total, 48 responses were received. The number of responses by sector are in the table below and detailed in Appendix A;

Sector	Number of responses
Nursery	1
Primary	46
Secondary	2
Total	49

If only one entry per school is considered then the number of responses along with the proportion of responses for each sector and the responses as a proportion of the maintained pupil population are as follows;

Sector	Number of responses	% of schools in sector	% of pupil population
Nursery	1	100%	100%
Primary	34	69%	72%
Secondary	2	100%	100%
Total	37		

The responses to each of the proposals are summarised in the tables below;

Proposal 1 – de-delegation of Trade Union Duties staff cover (£2.19 per pupil)

Sector	Yes	%	No	%	Don't know	%	Total
Nursery	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Primary	19	41.3%	22	47.8%	5	10.9%	46
Secondary	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Total	22		22		5		49

Proposal 2 – de-delegation of Teachers Pensions administration (£1.22 per pupil)

Sector	Yes	%	No	%	Don't know	%	Total
Nursery	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Primary	40	87%	5	10.9%	1	2.2%	46
Secondary	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Total	43		5		1		49

At the Extraordinary Schools Forum meeting on 8 January 2019, the possibility of applying a weighting based on pupil numbers to the primary school responses was discussed. However this proved more complicated than at first thought as a consequence of there being more than one response from some schools, with the added complication that different responses from the same schools were not always consistent.

4. Summary

Decisions on de-delegation have to be taken by Schools Forum and will be taken separately in respect of maintained primary and maintained secondary schools and in each case the decision requires the agreement of a majority of the maintained representatives for the relevant phase on the Schools Forum. The analysis of the responses to the consultations should be considered by maintained school representatives when voting on de-delegation.

If the trade union facilities arrangements are not managed through de-delegation then schools would need to make local plans to cover the costs of trade union facilities directly from their budgets. The benefits of de-delegation is that it is a more efficient and cost effective way of managing facilities time with schools able to pool resources to cover the cost in a way that avoids costs falling unpredictably or unevenly across schools.

Should the proposal to de-delegate for Teacher Pensions administration not be agreed by

Schools Forum, schools will be required to deal with any queries that the Council receives from Teachers' Pensions, as the Council will no longer be able to liaise directly with the Payroll provider.

2019/20 Dedicated Schools Grant Funding Settlement

1. Introduction

This paper provides an update on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget for 2019/20 following the release of the updated DSG Funding settlement on 17 December 2018.

2. Action Required

i) **Schools Forum is asked to note the contents of this report.**

3. Background

2019/20 DSG Funding Update

The Department for Education (DfE) released the DSG Funding settlement on 17 December 2018, which includes the October 2018 school census pupil numbers. As part of this announcement, the DfE are providing additional funding for High Needs totalling £250 million, which will be equally distributed across 2018/19 and 2019/20, Hillingdon's share of this will be £775k in both 2018/19 and 2019/20. Furthermore, additional capital funding will be provided, but as of to date, the individual allocations have not been announced.

For the purposes of this update, the Early Years Block has been excluded, as this is adjusted throughout the year based on January headcount data. The main focus will be on the Schools Block, High Needs Block and Central Schools Services Block funding.

Schools Block

The Schools Block funding allocation is calculated using the updated School Block Unit of Funding (SBUF) multiplied by the latest October school census data, which in this case will be October 2018. Added to this is additional funding for Basic Need Growth, Premises costs and the impact of Mobility, which has been determined based on a new funding methodology.

The SBUF was released in July 2018 and is set out in table 1 below:

Table 1: SBUF

	2018/19	2019/20	Change	Change
	£	£	£	%
Primary	4,255.69	4,278.46	23	0.54%

KS3	5,566.68	5,697.71	131	2.35%
KS4	5,566.68	5,697.71	131	2.35%

This indicates that the base level of DSG funding has been increased by at least 0.5%, which is in line with the funding settlement announcement made at the end of 2017. For Hillingdon, the primary SBUF is in line with this, whereas the secondary SBUF has actually increased by 2.35%.

This SBUF has then been used to determine the total level of funding provided by multiplying this by the October 2018 school census pupil numbers, which for Hillingdon are set out in table 2 below:

Table 2: Pupil Numbers

	2018/19	2019/20	Diff	%
Primary*	28,036	27,930	-106	-0.38%
KS3	9,861	10,033	172	1.74%
KS4	6,295	6,388	93	1.48%
Total	44,192	44,351	159	0.36%

In overall terms, Hillingdon has an increase in pupil numbers, however the primary pupil numbers have gone down, where there was an expectation that there would continue to be a small increase, as the relevant October 2018 reception numbers were still expected to be greater than the year 6 and year 2 numbers in October 2017, that would drop out. A comparison of the data between the October 2018 and October 2017 pupil numbers does reflect that the October 2018 reception numbers are 313 higher than the October 2017 Year 6 figures and that the reception numbers have grown by 11 pupils when compared to the October 2017 reception numbers. This would then imply that there is a drop in the transition years, e.g. the October 2017 Year 1, that will become the October 2018 Year 2, and so on, does not have a one to one relationship, which is captured in table 3 below:

Table 3: October Census Data

Year	October 2017	October 2018	Transition Change
R	3,982	3,993	
1	4,157	3,939	-43
2	4,167	4,101	-56
3	4,008	4,066	-101
4	4,054	3,940	-68
5	3,981	3,972	-82
6	3,680	3,930	-51
Total*	28,029	27,941	-401

* The October census data differs slightly from the data used to determine the total pupil numbers reported in Table 2 due to some minor technical adjustments

This indicates that there has been a drop in every year group when the pupils move on one academic year. In fact, three schools in particular have seen a reduction of 30 or more pupils (Pinkwell 70 pupils, Brookside 44 pupils and Ruislip Gardens 30 pupils), which are generally spread across all year groups.

The final funding factor relates to Growth, Premises and Mobility, where a new formula

has been introduced to determine the level of growth funding. For Hillingdon, this results in a reduction of £629k when compared to 2018/19 funding, however, this does tie into an expected drop in the amount of funding that will be provided for expanding schools as a number of schools have reached their final year of growth.

Table 4 summarises the final Schools Block Funding that Hillingdon will receive in 2019/20 and compares this to the 2018/19 base budget:

Table 4: 2019/20 Schools Block Funding

	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Diff £000	Diff %
Primary	119,313	119,497	185	0.15%
KS3	54,893	57,165	2,272	4.14%
KS4	35,042	36,397	1,355	3.87%
Growth, Premises & Mobility	6,224	5,595	-629	-10.11%
Total Schools Block	215,472	218,654	3,183	1.48%

Hillingdon's Schools Block Funding will increase by £3,183k in 2019/20, equivalent to an increase of 1.48%. It should be noted that this excludes additional funding that will be provided to fund the Teachers Pay Award, which for Hillingdon mainstream schools will be approximately £1,983k.

High Needs Block

The High Needs Funding Block is determined by using four factors; the National Funding Formula, the number of pupils attending a special school, an import/export adjustment to reflect transfers of pupils between authorities and for 2019/20 additional high needs funding.

The funding provided for the number of pupils in special schools is calculated by multiplying the number of pupils by the Area Cost Adjusted Weighted Basic Entitlement Factor Unit Rate, which for Hillingdon is £4,446.45 per pupil, no change on the previous year's rate. Hillingdon's special school pupil numbers for 2019/20 have increased by 162 compared to 2018/19, resulting in additional funding of £720k in 2019/20.

Table 5 below summarises all of the movements in the High Needs Funding Block:

Table 5: 2019/20 High Needs Funding Block

	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Diff £000	Diff %
Actual high needs NFF allocations	33,511	33,833	322	0.96%
Total per pupil funding	3,206	3,926	720	22.47%
Import / export adjustments	978	978	0	0.00%
2019-20 additional high needs funding	0	775	775	
Total High Needs Block	37,695	39,512	1,817	4.82%

Hillingdon's High Needs Block Funding will increase by £1,817k in 2019/20, equivalent to an increase of 4.82%. It should be noted that this excludes additional funding that will be provided to fund the Teachers Pay Award, which for Hillingdon special schools will be approximately £106k.

Central Schools Services Block

The Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) is determined by using two factors; total mainstream pupil numbers and historic commitments. The funding provided for the number of pupils in mainstream schools is calculated by multiplying the number of pupils by the CSSB Unit of Funding, which for Hillingdon is £33.72 per pupil, an increase of £0.72 (equivalent to 2.18%) on the 2018/19 rate. Hillingdon's mainstream school pupil numbers for 2019/20 have increased by 158 compared to 2018/19, resulting in additional funding of £37k in 2019/20. There is no planned increase in the funding provided for historic commitments, in fact there is an expectation that this will diminish over time. Table 6 summarises the movement in the CSSB:

Table 6: 2019/20 Central Schools Services Block

	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Diff £000	Diff %
Total per pupil funding	1,458	1,495	37	2.55%
2019-20 CSSB funding for historic commitments	1,323	1,323	0	0.00%
2019-20 total CSSB block	2,781	2,818	37	1.34%

2019/20 Budget Update

With the publication of the DSG finance settlement, the figures can now be compared to the previous reported budget position and the impact on the disapplication request submitted to the DfE on 30 November 2018.

Table 7 below sets out the latest projected budget requirement for the High Needs Block and what action would be required to set a balanced DSG Budget for 2019/20:

Table 7: 2019/20 DSG Budget Update

As at the end of November 2018, the projected required transfer from the Schools Funding Block was £4,290k, equivalent to a transfer of 1.95%. Following the release of the DSG finance settlement on 17 December 2018 and the announcement of additional High Needs Funding, the required transfer from the Schools Funding Block will reduce to £3,462k, equivalent to 1.574%. As a result the Council will need to submit a revised disapplication request to the DfE on or before 15 January 2019.

To put this into perspective the Individual Schools Budget will increase by £4,611k, ignoring the Teachers Pay Award funding. Therefore, if the full £3,462k was transferred, the Individual Schools Budget would still increase by £1,149k.

4. Summary

Table 8 below sets out the total increase in the DSG Budget for 2019/20, excluding Early Years funding:

Table 8: Total 2019/20 DSG Budget

	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Diff £000	Diff %
Schools Block	215,472	218,654	3,183	1.48%
High Needs Block	37,695	39,512	1,817	4.82%
Central Schools Services Block	2,781	2,818	37	1.34%
Total DSG Budget	255,948	260,985	5,037	1.97%

This indicates that Hillingdon's 2019/20 DSG Budget will increase by £5,037k, equivalent to an increase of 1.97%. This relates to the DfE increasing the rate of funding for mainstream schools and for the CSSB. There is also an increase in funding relating to pupil number growth across all funding blocks. However, for the first time since the introduction of Fair Funding, primary pupil numbers have dropped by 106 pupils, which based on an analysis of the transition between academic years, appears to indicate a reduction in every year group. This has been offset by a growth in secondary pupil numbers of 265 pupils. The DfE have also provided additional High Needs funding, which for Hillingdon equates to £775k.

Based on the latest projections, the Council is expecting a funding gap of £5,279k on the High Needs Funding Block, which will require a transfer of £3,462k from the Schools Funding Block. However, even if schools and Schools Forum agrees to this, the proposal can only be agreed by the Secretary of State. If the Secretary of State does not agree to transfer the funds, the Council will be in a position where it will need to consider setting a deficit DSG Budget in 2019/20.

Schools Block Funding Transfer 2019/20 – Outcome of Consultation

5. Introduction

This paper provides a summary of the responses received from stakeholders in response to the consultation on the transfer of funds from the Schools Block in 2019/20 which took place in December 2018.

6. Recommendations

Note the contents of the report and consider the responses when determining the Schools Block budget for 2019/20.

7. Consultation Feedback

In total, 65 responses were received. The number of responses by sector are detailed in the table below;

Sector	Number of responses
Nursery	1
Primary	50
Secondary	11
Special	3
Total	65

The consultation was seeking feedback from stakeholders on two proposals. Firstly whether to transfer 0.5% of schools block funding to address High Needs pressures, as was agreed in 2018/19. The second proposal was seeking views on the transfer of an additional 1.45% from the schools block to fully cover the projected high needs deficit in 2019/20. The transfer of any funds, if agreed, will not result in an increase in Special School funding rates and is only to cover the projected High Needs deficit.

It should be noted that following the announcement of additional high needs funding for 2019/20, the high needs funding shortfall has reduced by £775k which has resulted in a reduction in the additional percentage transfer required to 1.1%.

The responses to each of the proposals are summarised in the following tables;

Proposal 1 – transfer of 0.5%

Sector	Yes	No	Total
Nursery	1	0	1
Primary	3	47	50
Secondary	1	10	11
Special	2	1	3
Total	7	58	65
%	10.8%	89.2%	

Proposal 2 – transfer of a further 1.45%

Sector	Yes	No	Total
Nursery	1	0	1
Primary	2	48	50
Secondary	0	11	11
Special	2	1	3
Total	5	60	65
%	7.7%	92.3%	

Alternative Proposals

Many of the respondents offered alternative proposals, with the common themes as follows;

- Lobby Central Government for additional funding
- Use council reserves
- Implement claw back facility from schools with high carry forward balances
- Raise council tax

8. Summary

It can be concluded that the majority of respondents are not in favour of either proposal to transfer funds from the Schools Block to address the projected deficit in high needs.

If a transfer of funds is not agreed by Schools Forum then the local authority will be unable to set a balanced High Needs budget. It should be noted that the local authority is

awaiting on a decision from the DfE regarding the disapplication request submitted seeking authority to transfer funds from the Schools block.

Growth Contingency Allocation 2019/20

1. Introduction

This report sets out the proposed draw down from the Growth Contingency Fund for expanding schools and new basic need academy schools, including schools that have permanently expanded and will take on additional pupils in September 2019, schools that are planned to expand for the first time in September 2019 and schools which have seen significant in-year growth in their lowest year group.

2019/20 sees the first year that growth allocations are distributed to local authorities using a new formulaic method based on lagged growth data (previously allocations were based on historic spend). There is some protection for local authorities that see a reduction in funding as a result of the mechanism, however there is still a £1,077k reduction in growth funding for Hillingdon in 2019/20.

2. Recommendation

Schools Forum is asked to agree:

- i) To release the expanding schools funding to schools as set out in Appendix A,
- ii) To hold back allocations for Harlyn Primary, Hillside Juniors and Oak Wood until further information is known regarding the prospective September 2019 intake,
- iii) To agree the budget for diseconomies of scale funding for basic need academy schools as set out in the spreadsheet at Appendix A, subject to on-going review,

3. Background

The Schools Funding formula does not include a factor to provide resources for schools that have or are expanding, nor does it include a factor for the set up costs or the required diseconomies of scale funding for new basic need academy schools. However, the funding arrangements do allow local authorities to put in place a Growth Contingency Fund Policy to fund schools that fall within these categories. The Growth Contingency

Fund is funded from the Schools Block.

c) Expanding Schools

The Growth Contingency Fund Policy, states that the funding for expanding schools will be based on the average rates of funding per pupil across the school sector. For 2019/20 the funds that will be provided for the expanding schools allocation has been estimated as £64,890.

This is an increase on the rate applied in 2018/19 following the increase in Schools Block funding (this assumes 0% transfer of Schools Block funding to address the high needs pressures). This figure will be finalised once the school funding formula has been signed off.

The spreadsheet included at Appendix A indicates that there will be 13 forms of entry which will need to be funded. Applying the estimated rate of £64,890, results in a total allocation of £843,570 being required in 2019/20 for expanding schools. Included within the allocation is a contingency for 4 additional forms of entry to allow for secondary school pupil growth. The local authority is working with secondary schools to establish how the expected growth in secondary school pupils might be met.

The spreadsheet included at Appendix B details the pupil numbers as at the October 2018 census at those schools that have expanded. The numbers indicate that in three of the cases the allocation of growth contingency is justified. However there are some exceptions within the 'Diff' column, which calculates and highlights where Reception/Year 3/Year 7 numbers are below capacity.

Based on this information, Schools Forum may wish to consider whether Growth Contingency funding is withheld for the following schools; Harlyn Primary, Hillside Juniors and Oak Wood (though the expectation is that the growth in secondary pupil numbers will result in Y7 at Oak Wood being full from September 2019), until they have been consulted with and Schools Forum have a clearer indication of what the September 2019 numbers are likely to be.

d) New Basic Need Academy Funding

The DfE places a requirement on a local authority to fund the difference between the actual running costs and the funding generated by the school funding formula of new and growing Basic Need Academies. The Council is required to calculate an estimated budget for the three new Basic Need Academy schools and work with each school to determine the actual running costs. The Council is then required to provide for any shortfall as diseconomies of Scale funding within the Growth Contingency Fund. In 2019/20 the diseconomies requirement for the three schools is estimated to be £500,000 with the majority of this relating to St Martin's which opened a year later than the other two schools and is still growing up to capacity. The expectation is that the funding requirement for John Locke Academy and Lake Farm Park Academy will be minimal as both schools have been able to set balanced budgets in the last three years without the need for diseconomies funding.

e) In-Year Growth

A new mechanism was introduced in 2017/18 to address the funding issues in relation to significant in-year growth. The proposal is that this mechanism will continue and funding will be applicable to schools who meet the following criteria;

- Schools not currently in receipt of growth contingency funding (or if an expanding school have increased in pupil numbers by at least one form of entry more than the agreed expansion),
- Schools not currently funded on estimated numbers (ie new schools),
- Schools which experience an in-year increase of over 25 pupils in the lowest class of the school (ie YR (Primary & Infant Schools)/Y3 (Junior Schools/Y7 (Secondary Schools)) which does not take them over PAN.

It is estimated that there will not be a budget requirement for in-year growth in 2019/20.

4. Summary

Schools Forum is being requested to create a Growth Contingency Fund budget for 2019/20 to fund expanding schools, the Basic Need Academies and In-Year Growth. The table below summarises the amount that will be required for 2019/20:

	Budget £
Primary School Expansion Funding*	456,045
Secondary School Expansion Funding	498,095
Basic Need Academy diseconomies Funding	500,000
In-year Growth Funding	0
Total Growth Contingency Fund Budget 2019/20	1,454,140

*assumes Harlyn Primary is not funded as in 2018/19

The total sum of £1,454k will need to be deducted from the Schools Block and held centrally. This is a £208k decrease to the 2018/19 budget of £1,662k.

2019/20 sees the first year that growth allocations are distributed to local authorities using a new formulaic mechanism based on lagged growth data. This new method of distribution has resulted in a £1,077k reduction in growth funding for Hillingdon (from £2,743k in 18/19 to £1,666k in 19/20). However the growth requirement for 2019/20 is below the allocation and the remaining £212k will be distributed to schools through the funding formula.

5. Appendices

A - Growth Contingency Allocations 2019/20

B - October 2018 census pupil numbers for expanding schools

School Funding Formula Amendments to Census data

1. Introduction

The Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) provides local authorities with a modelling tool to complete the local funding formula with the schools census data built into the tool. However, if it is considered that data is unrepresentative, local authorities are permitted to amend the data to more accurately reflect a schools circumstances.

Officers have reviewed the data set provided by the ESFA, and have noted some anomalies which appear unrepresentative. Proposals have been made as how to treat these anomalies.

2. Recommendation

Schools Forum is asked to consider the anomalies detailed below and agree the following;

- (a) The estimated pupil numbers for John Locke Academy, Lake Farm Park Academy and St Martin's CE Primary School,
- (b) The retrospective adjustments for John Locke Academy and St Martin's CE Primary,
- (c) The amended mobility percentages for De Salis Studio College and Parkside Studio College.

3. Data anomalies for consideration

a) Pupil Number Estimates

The Schools Finance Regulations require local authorities to estimate, for the purposes of producing its local school funding formula, the pupil numbers of those schools which have opened in the last 7 years and do not have pupils in all year groups it is deemed to admit into.

Officers have looked at the October 2018 census data, to produce suitable estimates for the purposes of modelling the school funding formula for 2019/20 for three schools (John Locke Academy, Lake Farm Park Academy & St Martin's CE Primary School) which regulations indicate should be calculated based on estimated pupil numbers.

There are 6 other schools which also opened in the last 7 years; Parkside Studio College, De Salis Studio College, Hewens Primary School, Rosedale Primary School, Heathrow Aviation Engineering UTC and The Global Academy. However, analysis of census data identifies that they have pupils in all admissible year groups from R-Y11. The Schools Revenue Funding Operational Guidance for 2018/19 states the following:

"If a school has opened in the last seven years and is already taking in pupils in all year groups, then there is no requirement to estimate numbers"

It is therefore proposed that for these six schools, the funding formula will not be based on estimated pupil numbers. Nanaksar Primary School also opened in the last 7 years, however as they are not currently admitting new intake, no estimates are required here.

Appendix A details the rationale for the estimated pupil numbers calculations.

b) Retrospective adjustments

Where a school is funded on estimates, local authorities are permitted to make a retrospective adjustment in the following funding year to account for any over or under estimate of pupil numbers, based on known census data, in order to correct the previous year's recouplement. A reconciliation between the estimates used and the actual census numbers indicates where there has been over or underestimates.

The local authority is proposing to apply a retrospective claw back in the 2019/20 funding formula for these schools, by multiplying the per pupil rate of funding for those schools by the number of pupils overestimated. This might have an impact on the level of diseconomies funding that will be needed to support the schools whilst growing, however this will only affect the 3 Basic Needs academies. The calculation of these adjustments is detailed in Appendix A.

c) Mobility Inconsistencies

There are 2 schools that have been highlighted where the mobility percentage is disproportionately high compared to other schools. These are De Salis Studio College (91%) and Parkside Studio College (96%).

Last year, the census data also indicated a very high mobility percentage for both these schools, and the decision was taken to amend this down so that it reflected the average mobility for other similar schools within Hillingdon. The proposal is this year to amend the mobility factor percentage for both schools to 7%, in line with the average mobility for all other secondary schools in Hillingdon.

4. Appendices

Appendix A - Proposed estimated pupil numbers for new & growing schools

Special School Planned Place Numbers 2019/20

6. Introduction

This report sets out the proposed funding arrangements for high needs placements at special schools and specialist resource provisions (SRPs) for 2019/20.

7. Recommendation

Schools Forum is asked to agree:

- iv) The proposed planned places funding

8. Background

Schools Forum are required to agree the planned place numbers at special schools and SRPs each year as part of the budget setting process.

Special School Planned Places

The planned places for each special school are set out in Appendix A. The following adjustments have been made to planned place numbers for 2019/20 to reflect current demand;

- Grangewood – increase from 96 to 113 planned places from September 2019,
- Hedgewood - increase from 140 to 145 planned places from April 2019,
- Pentland Field – increase from 140 to 147 planned places from September 2019.
- Young People's Academy – increase from 60 to 65 planned places (this was agreed by Schools Forum in October 2018).

SRP Planned Places

The planned places for each SRP are set out in Appendix A. The following adjustments have been made to planned place numbers for 2019/20 to reflect current demand;

- Hayes Park – increase from 13 to 14 planned places from April 2019,
- Lake Farm - increase from 10 to 12 planned places from September 2019 (school is new and growing),
- St Martin's - increase from 8 to 10 planned places from September 2019 (school is new and growing).

Where places are filled by pupils resident in another borough then there will be an Import adjustment made to the High Needs block to reflect this.

The funding mechanism allows for additional funding to be provided on a pro rata basis, where the actual placement numbers exceed the original planned place numbers

The Skills Hub

The Skills Hub converted to academy status on 1 September 2015. As part of this process it was agreed that the funding for the Pupil Support Team would be included within the determination of the planned place numbers and the top up rate of funding. The current position is to fund the Skills Hub on a planned place number of 70 places with top-up of £10,476 per place. The number of commissioned places at The Skills Hub is currently under review following a significant increase in demand in recent years.

9. Appendices

- Appendix A - Planned place numbers 2019/20

Proposed DSG Budget 2019/20

1. Introduction

This report provides Schools Forum with a consolidation of all of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding that the Council have been informed they will get for 2019/20 and all of the adjustments required to the DSG revenue budget, to enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2019/20.

2. Recommendation

Schools Forum are asked to;

- (a) Confirm which Prior Attainment rates should be used for the 2019/20 School Funding Formula;
 - i. No change to the prior attainment rates
 - ii. Changes to the primary and secondary rates (this would retain Primary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19 and would also keep the differential between the primary and secondary rates).
 - iii. Change the primary rate (this would retain Primary and Secondary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19)

- (b) Confirm what percentage of Schools Block funding should be transferred out to address pressures in other funding blocks;
 - i. 0%
 - ii. 0.5%
 - iii. 1.6% (if approved this will still need to be agreed by the DfE)

- (c) confirm the budget, as set out below, to recommend to Council as part of the 2019/20 to 2022/23 Medium Term Financial Forecast Budget Setting process, which will be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 14 February 2019 and agreed by Full Council on 21 February 2019, taking into account that there is an expectation that, where possible, the aim would be to set an in-year balanced Dedicated Schools Grant budget.

3. Dedicated Schools Grant Baseline 2019/20

The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) published the draft authority level DSG allocations for the schools, central school services, early years and high needs blocks on 17 December 2018.

The following table sets out the published baseline DSG budget for 2019/20, compared to

the 2018/19 DSG allocation updated in December 2018

Funding Block	DSG Budget 2018/19 £m	DSG Budget 2019/20 £m	Change in Budget £m	Increase %
Schools	215.47	218.65	3.18	1.5%
High Needs*	38.47	39.51	1.04	2.7%
Central Services	2.78	2.82	0.04	1.4%
Early Years	24.82	24.82	0	0%
Total DSG Budget	281.54	285.80	4.26	1.5%

* This includes the additional £775k allocated in 2018/19 & 2019/20

Estimated DSG Budget for 2019/20

In determining the final distribution of the DSG funds available, it is usually a requirement that predicted year end balances are built into the final determination. For 2018/19, there is a planned in year deficit on the DSG, which for month 8 was estimated to be £2.9m. When added to the DSG opening deficit balance of £4.1m, which it carried forward from 2017/18, it is projected that there will be a deficit of £7m carried forward to 2019/20. Given the size of the deficit, it was agreed that Schools Forum should at least aim to set a balanced budget for 2019/20 and where possible identify additional savings to contribute towards reducing the brought forward deficit.

Proposals for Use of DSG in 2019/20

Schools Block

Transfer of Schools Block funds

The Schools Block will continue to be ring-fenced in 2019/20, however, local authorities will be able to transfer up to 0.5% of their schools block funding to address funding pressures in other areas with agreement of Schools Forum. In December 2018, schools were consulted on two proposals to address the on-going pressures in High Needs. The first proposal was the transfer of 0.5% from the schools block, as was agreed in 2018/19. The second proposal was a further transfer of 1.45% which would cover the projected High Needs in-year deficit in 2019/20. Following the DfE announcement of additional High Needs block funding, resulting in an additional £775k for Hillingdon in 2019/20, the estimated High Needs funding requirement has reduced and the additional transfer needed to cover the shortfall has reduced to 1.1%. Schools Block budgets have therefore been produced which model each of the following scenarios; 0%, 0.5% and 1.6% transfer.

If Schools Forum were to approve the additional 1.1% transfer approval would still be needed from the Secretary of State.

Prior Attainment

Following receipt of the final Schools Block data, it became clear that there would be a requirement to model changes to the Prior Attainment rates. In previous years it has been possible to apply a weighting to the primary prior attainment data to reflect the fact that higher numbers of pupils are failing to meet the good level of development under the new EYFSP. Applying this weighting ensured that the change resulted in minimal impact to the funding formula.

However in 2019/20 there is no longer a primary weighting factor as all primary pupils will have been assessed under the new EFSP. The result of no weighting is an approximate increase of £5.6m through the primary Prior Attainment factor when compared with 2018/19, leading to a reduction in all AWPU rates and a change to the primary to secondary ratio to 1:1.24. It is therefore considered that this needs to be fixed and the following options were modelled for consideration;

- i. No change to the prior attainment rates
- ii. Changes to the primary and secondary rates (this would retain Primary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19 and would also keep the differential between the primary and secondary rates).
- iii. Change the primary rate (this would retain Primary and Secondary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19)

At the Extraordinary Schools Forum meeting on 8 January members indicated that model 3 appeared the option that kept most to the previously agreed funding principles and therefore the budget presented is based on this option. The Primary Prior Attainment rate has been slightly increased to £590 to ensure that a primary to secondary ratio of 1:1.29 is retained, as indicated in the modelling summary. Members will need to vote in order to confirm which of the three options they wish to adopt for 2019/20.

Growth Fund Contingency

A review of the Growth Fund Contingency requirement, which provides funding for expanding schools, diseconomies funding for new Basic Need Academies and funding for significant in-year growth, estimates that the budget in 2019/20 should be £1,454k. This is a reduction of £208k from the previous year. Schools Forum members will be asked to approve this allocation as part of Item 6e.

Retained Balance

It is good practice to retain a working balance for the DSG and in recent years a balance of £500k had been retained. However, given the on-going pressure, particularly in High Needs, it has not been possible to set a budget for 2019/20 with a reserve and therefore it is proposed that no contingency balance is retained.

Early Years Block

The draft Early Years Single Funding Formula for the provision of the 15 hours free entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds is calculated based on 5/12ths of the January 2019 census numbers and 7/12ths of the January 2020 census numbers. The allocation is therefore, draft as there will be further adjustments in July 2019 and July 2020. It is worth noting that approximately two thirds of this funding is delegated directly to schools for three and four year old provision.

There are a number of requirements on how local authorities are able to allocate Early Years funding to providers. These requirements are intended to ensure that funding provided is fairly distributed to providers. Schools Forum has not proposed to make any changes to the calculation of the Early Years funding formula.

Universal Free Entitlement - Base Rate

Local authorities are required to pass 95% of early years funding directly to providers in 2019/20. There is a requirement to set a universal base rate for all providers, and additionally the guidance states that the level of supplements should be capped at 10% of the total funding given to providers, with the remaining 90% distributed through the base rate. Given the limits on supplements, the Hillingdon base rate is set at 91% of available funding as used in 2018/19.

In December 2018, stakeholders were consulted on a proposed reduction of 3p or 6p per hour in the base rate. Schools Forum will need to take the views of those who responded to the consultation into account when they decide on what to set as the EYSFF base rate for 2019/20. For the purposes of the 2019/20 DSG Budget, it has been assumed that there is no reduction to the base rate level of funding.

Universal Free Entitlement - Funding Supplements

The government allow supplements up to a maximum of 10% of the total funding passed to providers. Local authorities will continue to be required to have a mandatory deprivation supplement but will have discretion over the metric used. Discretionary allowable supplements will be as follows; Rurality/Sparsity, Flexibility, Quality and English as an additional language. The following sets out what Hillingdon uses in the early years funding formula;

Deprivation Supplement

The DfE have confirmed that deprivation will continue to be a mandatory supplement in 2019/20. A considerable portion of funds is being channelled to local authorities through the early years funding formula and it is therefore considered appropriate that this is passed to providers. In 2018/19 the deprivation factor within the Hillingdon early years

formula was 7% with IDACI as the distribution driver, as this appears to be the best indicator of deprivation for 3 & 4 year olds. The proposal is that for 2019/20 this is retained at the same percentage.

IDACI Threshold Supplement

IDACI is a measure of deprivation based on the home postcode of the child. Each postcode is given a rank from 0 to 1, with 0 being least deprived and 1 the most. Analysis of the IDACI dataset for 3 and 4 year olds accessing the free entitlement indicates that the average IDACI rank for Early Years settings in Hillingdon is 0.2. The highest ranking that a setting has is 0.365. There are clear links between deprivation and additional need, and at the moment this is the most robust data set held to distribute additional needs funding. It is therefore proposed to retain the 2% supplement to distribute additional resource to those providers with an average IDACI rank which is higher than 0.25.

Maintained Nursery School Supplementary Funding

The government recognises that maintained nursery schools have additional costs and has confirmed that it will continue to provide supplementary funding to local authorities for maintained nursery schools in 2019/20. The supplementary funding for Hillingdon in 2019/20 is £239k and the proposal is that this will be passed to McMillan Nursery school in full to reduce the impact of the removal of the lump sum as a supplement for maintained nursery schools.

Disability Access Funding

The government introduced a new targeted early years Disability Access Fund in 2017/18, to enable a fixed lump sum payment of £615 per eligible child per year to be paid to early years settings that are providing a free entitlement place for 3 & 4 year olds. The funding is ring-fenced with the purpose of the funding to aid access to places. Funding will be passed straight to providers with eligible children and the provider is then responsible for the use of the funding. The Hillingdon allocation of this funding in 2019/20 is £104k.

Additional 15 hours Free Entitlement

Hillingdon has received £3,881k to fund the additional 15 hours free entitlement for eligible children in 2019/20. This funding will be adjusted to reflect actual numbers accessing the entitlement and therefore this funding will be earmarked in full for the delivery of the additional 15 hours free entitlement. The DfE have confirmed that the funding rate for the additional entitlement should be the same as for the universal 15 hours.

Two Year Old Provision

The funding rate to local authorities for disadvantaged two year olds remains at £5.92, which is below the rate paid to providers so there is no proposed increase to the hourly rate of £6 per hour. The current budget for Two Year Old provision is £2,218k, and based on the actual numbers in October 2018 there is no proposed change to the current base budget for this provision.

SEN Inclusion Fund

All local authorities were required to establish SEN inclusion funds for 3 & 4 year olds in their local funding systems from April 2017. The Inclusion team work with early years providers to determine how best this funding is distributed with the focus on children with lower level or emerging SEN. It is proposed that the £200k allocated to the SEN inclusion fund is retained and that this is taken from the early years block. The SEN inclusion funding will be included in the 95% pass through to providers and therefore does not count in the 5% that local authorities can centrally retain in 2019/20.

Early Years Centrally Retained

Early Years Centres

DSG funding for the three Early Years Centres has now ended and therefore there is a £138k reduction in the Early Years centrally retained budget requirement.

Provision for Vulnerable Children Placements

Following the reduction in the funding of the early years centres, a budget was established for the placement of vulnerable early years children. The budget was £209k in 2018/19, but has consistently underspent, it is therefore proposed that this budget is reduced by £70k to £139k, which would bring the budget in line with the prior year actual expenditure.

Family Information Service

The Family Information Service (FIS) team helps parents to access the free early years provision that they are entitled to for their children. This relates to the universal entitlement to free early education for all three and four year olds and also covers the entitlement to free childcare for the most disadvantaged two year olds. The FIS consists of the FIS Manager, 4.0 (FTE) FIS Officers and a Parental Childcare Advisor and the proposed budget for 2019/20 is £251k.

Early Years Advisory Service

The Early Years Advisory service provides targeted support, advice and guidance to all early years settings (including schools and Private Voluntary and Independent Nursery providers). Following the reduction in early years funding as a result of the fall in the number of three and four year olds accessing the free entitlement, there is a need to find savings within the Early Years block and a savings target was allocated against this

budget in 2018/19. The majority of this saving was achieved through vacant posts in 2018/19 whilst a full review of the service is on-going.

Central School Services Block

Non-statemented LAC placements

There is a continuing pressure linked to the number of looked after children who have been placed out of borough. Whilst the cost of these placements is shared between education, health and social care, there is still a requirement to retain the current DSG budget of £300k to reflect the on-going expenditure in this area.

Pupils Out of School

The local authority currently commissions fifty places at the in-borough alternative provision setting and the historic trend is for numbers at the start of the academic year to be below this number before gradually building up. Currently numbers accessing this provision are already in excess of the commissioned number, resulting in an additional cost pressure and therefore the budget has been increased by £195k to reflect this.

Support Service Costs

A proportion of the total support services costs for central services at the Local Authority are charged to the DSG under a nationally agreed model, which has historically been capped at the current rate. It is not proposed to amend this budget for 2019/20, though this area will be subject to on-going review.

ESG retained services

In the 2015 Spending Review, the DfE announced that ESG funding would cease in 2017/18 and that for those services defined as retained duties previously funded through the ESG, the funding and responsibility would be transferred into the DSG. The Schools Revenue Funding Operational Guide provides the definition of those services deemed to be retained duties. The DSG baseline includes a sum of £740k for retained duties, and it is proposed that this figure is retained in 2019/20 to fund these services.

Copyright Licences

The ESFA procures copyright licences centrally for all schools and the cost is then charged to the DSG. Previously this would have been charged to the Schools Block, but following the ring-fencing of the blocks the ESFA have advised that this should be charged to the Central School Services Block. A budget of £229k is therefore required to cover this cost.

High Needs Block

Planned Place Numbers

There have been a number of changes to planned place numbers as specified in the table below;

School	Change in Place Number	Month Change Effective	Change in Funding 2019/20 £
Grangewood	17	Sept 2019	99,167
Hayes Park SRP	1	April 2019	10,000
Hedgewood	5	April 2019	50,000
Lake Farm SRP	2	Sept 2019	20,000
St Martin's	2	Sept 2019	20,000
Total	27		199,167

The planned place numbers for 2019/20 are set out in the table below. Academies receive planned place funding directly from the ESFA. This funding is included in the amount recouped from the High Needs block. Import/Export

Special Schools

School	Sector Type	Status	Planned Place numbers Apr 19-Aug 19	Planned Place numbers Sep 19-Mar 20
Grangewood	Primary - Special	Academy	96	113
Hedgewood	Primary - Special	Maintained	145	145
Meadow	Secondary - Special	Maintained	235	235
Moorcroft	Secondary - Special	Academy	65	65
Pentland Field	All Age - Special	Free	140	147
Willows	Primary - Special	Academy	38	38
Young Peoples Academy	Secondary - Special	Academy	65	65
Alternative Provision				
The Skills Hub	Secondary - AP	Academy	70	70

SRPs

School	Sector Type	Status	Planned Place numbers Apr 19-Aug 19	Planned Place numbers Sep 19-Mar 20
Cherry Lane	Primary - SRP	Maintained	10	10
Coteford Infant	Primary - SRP	Maintained	10	10
Coteford Junior	Primary - SRP	Academy	13	13
Deanesfield	Primary - SRP	Maintained	8	8
Glebe	Primary - SRP	Maintained	10	10
Harlington	Secondary - SRP	Maintained	7	7
Hayes Park	Primary - SRP	Maintained	14	14
Lake Farm	Primary - SRP	Academy	10	12
Northwood	Secondary - SRP	Academy	10	10
Oak Wood	Secondary - SRP	Maintained	8	8
Pinkwell	Primary - SRP	Academy	10	10
St Martin's	Primary - SRP	Academy	8	10
Vyners	Secondary - SRP	Academy	16	16

SEN Top-up Funding

There is no proposal to make any changes to the banded funding model for the distribution of top-up funding in 2019/20. However, the High Needs sub-group are still reviewing the current model in order to identify opportunities for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the resource allocation process for children with SEN. The 2019/20 budgets for top-up funding have been increased by £2,204k to reflect current expenditure.

Independent & Non-Maintained Special Needs and Out of Borough Placements

The Council has seen an increase in the number and total spend on SEN placements in Independent and Non-maintained schools in the last year, predominantly as a result of a lack of capacity within in-borough provision. In the last two years the budget has been reduced to reflect expected savings based on the pupil age profile. For 2019/20 the budget has been increased by £1,100k to reflect these savings not being realised. Any future increase in placements will need to be offset by a reduction in costs as placements come to an end. There has also been an increase in the level of contributions from Health and Social Care towards these placements which has off-set some of this increase.

Additionally the Council are developing an efficiency plan and have already identified a range of management action to start to address this position.

Post-16 Special Educational Needs Placements

2018/19 has seen continued growth in the number of post-16 pupils with special educational needs requiring college placements. Currently the budget for post-16 college placements is £3,267k (split between FE Colleges and Independent Specialist Providers). Following further growth in numbers from September 2018 the budget has been increased to £3,732k. Any future growth will need to be managed within the current budget, for which the Council are developing an efficiency plan and have already identified a range of management action to start to address this position.

High Needs Recoupment adjustments

Following the amalgamation of Uxbridge College with Harrow College the planned places for the Harrow campus are now recouped from the Hillingdon High Needs block. An import adjustment has been estimated based on the January 2018 numbers. This adjustment will be updated based on the January 2019 census and the assumption has been made that the High Needs recoupment figure will reduce by £276k to reflect the growth in this cohort.

There is also an adjustment needed to reflect the change to Special Free School funding. The funding of planned places at Special Free Schools will now be included in the High Needs block of the DSG (previously these were funded separately by the ESFA). The High Needs recoupment figure for Hillingdon has been adjusted to reflect this change but a further adjustment is needed to the High Needs allocation which should be confirmed later this month and an assumption has been included for this within the High Needs budget workings.

SEN Support Services

The following specialist centrally retained SEN services support statemented and non-statemented pupils in mainstream, special schools and SRPs as well as pre-school children.

Early Support Team

The Early Support team consists of 2.8 (FTE) Home Portage Visitors who support parent and carers helping to build resilience within families with children and young people with additional needs or disabilities.

Inclusion Team

The Inclusion Team support settings in developing high quality inclusive practice, delivering effective early interventions to support children in developing the skills they need to access education. The team consists of a Team Manager, 2 (FTE) Senior Practitioners, 4 (FTE) EY Practitioners, 3 (FTE) Autism Specialists and 2 (FTE) Language Specialists.

Sensory Needs Team

The Sensory Needs team consist of HI and VI teachers and teaching assistants who provide specialist services for children and young people from 0-25 years with sensory needs.

2% Threshold

The 2% threshold recognises those schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with SEN and distributes an additional £6k funding for each pupil over the 2%. The budget requirement for this in 2018/19 was £449k and given the increase in the number of EHCPs in mainstream schools it is proposed that this should budget should be realigned in 2019/20 so that it is consistent with current projected spend.

Proposed DSG Budget for 2019/20

The following tables summarise the final DSG Budget for 2019/20 for each of the proposed Schools Block transfer options:

0% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	218,649
	Net Total	0
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)
	Expenditure	35,963
	Net Total	3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		3,499

0.5% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	217,556
	Net Total	(1,093)
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)

Expenditure		35,963
Net Total		3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		2,406

1.6% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	215,150
	Net Total	(3,499)
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)
	Expenditure	35,963
	Net Total	3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		0

The following table details the final DSG Budget for 2019/20 (assuming no Schools Block transfer is agreed):

Funding Block	Cost Centre description	Proposed Budget £'000
Schools	Schools Block Funding	(218,649)
Schools	Individual Schools Budget	217,195
Schools	Growth Fund Contingency	1,454
	Schools Block Total	0
Early Years	Early Years Block Income	(24,824)
Early Years	Early Years Single Funding Formula	17,191
Early Years	Early Years Single Funding Formula (additional 15 hrs)	3,881
Early Years	Maintained Nursery School Supplementary Funding	239
Early Years	Disability Access Fund	104
Early Years	SEN Inclusion Fund	200
Early Years	Core Childcare & Early Years (FIS)	251
Early Years	Early Years Advisory Teachers	185
Early Years	Provision for Vulnerable Children Placements	139
Early Years	Early Years Overheads	96
Early Years	Early Years Pupil Premium	123
Early Years	2YO Funding	2,218
	Early Years Block Total	(197)
High Needs	High Needs Block Income	(39,512)
High Needs	High Needs Block Academy Recoupment	7,879
High Needs	Estimated HN Recoupment adjustment	(730)
High Needs	Maintained ASB	3,447
High Needs	Top-up funding	21,256
High Needs	Independent placement provision (pre-16)	4,561
High Needs	Independent placement provision (post-16)	1,002
High Needs	FE college top up funding	2,730
High Needs	Hospital Tuition	75
High Needs	Spec Contingency Spec Needs	1,076
High Needs	Non-statemented pupils - exceptional funding	32
High Needs	Tuition - SEN out of school	93
High Needs	SEN Support Services	1,235
High Needs	High Needs Overheads	456
	High Needs Block Total	3,600
Central Schools	Central Schools Block Funding	(2,818)
Central Schools	DSG Funded Business Support	30

Central Schools	Schools Forum	5
Central Schools	Admissions	305
Central Schools	Hillingdon Virtual School	487
Central Schools	Non-statemented LAC placements	300
Central Schools	Education Safeguarding	166
Central Schools	Pupils Out of School	327
Central Schools	Copyright Licences	230
Central Schools	ESG Funded Services	754
Central Schools	Central Schools Block Overheads	310
	Central Schools Block Total	96
	Grand Total	3,499

The following table details the proposed budget movements between 2018/19 and 2019/20 (assuming no Schools Block transfer is agreed):

Cost Centre description	2018/19 Original Budget £'000	Movement £'000	2019/20 Proposed Budget £'000
Schools Block Funding	(215,472)	(3,177)	(218,649)
Individual Schools Budget	212,732	4,463	217,195
Growth Fund Contingency	1,662	(208)	1,454
Schools Block Total	(1,078)	1,078	0
Early Years Block Income	(26,307)	1,483	(24,824)
Early Years Single Funding Formula	16,993	198	17,191
Early Years Single Funding Formula (additional 15 hrs)	5,353	(1,472)	3,881
Maintained Nursery School Supplementary Funding	236	3	239
Disability Access Fund	101	3	104
SEN Inclusion Fund	200		200
Core Childcare & Early Years (FIS)	245	6	251
Early Years Advisory Teachers	185		185
Provision for Vulnerable Children Placements	209	(70)	139
Early Years Overheads	293	(197)	96
Early Years Pupil Premium	136	(13)	123
2YO Funding	2,218		2,218
Early Years Centres	138	(138)	0
Early Years Block Total	0	(197)	(197)
High Needs Block Income	(36,259)	(3,253)	(39,512)
High Needs Block Academy Recoupment	6,064	1,815	7,879
Estimated HN Recoupment adjustment	(1,068)	338	(730)
Maintained ASB	3,673	(226)	3,447
Top-up funding	19,052	2,204	21,256
Independent placement provision (pre-16)	4,063	498	4,561
Independent placement provision (post-16)	1,002		1,002
FE college top up funding	2,265	465	2,730
Hospital Tuition	75		75
Spec Contingency Spec Needs	871	205	1,076
Non-statemented pupils - exceptional funding	32		32
Tuition - SEN out of school	128	(35)	93
SEN Support Services	1,179	56	1,235
High Needs Overheads	260	196	456

High Needs Block Total	1,337	2,263	3,600
Central Schools Block Funding	(2,781)	(37)	(2,818)
DSG Funded Business Support	65	(35)	30
Schools Forum	5		5
Admissions	304	1	305
Hillingdon Virtual School	487		487
Non-statemented LAC placements	300		300
Education Safeguarding	165	1	166
Pupils Out of School	132	195	327
Copyright Licences	0	230	230
ESG Funded Services	754		754
Central Schools Block Overheads	310		310
Central Schools Block Total	(259)	355	96
Grand Total	0	3,499	3,499

Proposed DSG Budget for 2019/20

The following tables summarise the final DSG Budget for 2019/20 for each of the proposed Schools Block transfer options:

0% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	218,649
	Net Total	0
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)
	Expenditure	35,963
	Net Total	3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		3,499

0.5% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	217,556

Net Total		(1,093)
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)
	Expenditure	35,963
	Net Total	3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		2,406

1.6% School Block Transfer

Funding Block		£
Schools Block	Income	(218,649)
	Expenditure	215,150
	Net Total	(3,499)
High Needs Block	Income	(39,512)
	HN Recoupment	7,879
	HN Recoupment adj	(730)
	Expenditure	35,963
	Net Total	3,600
Early Years Block	Income	(24,824)
	Expenditure	24,627
	Net Total	(197)
Central School Services Block	Income	(2,818)
	Expenditure	2,914
	Net Total	96
Grand Total		0