

Agenda Schools Forum

Monday 2 October 2023 at 2.30 pm
In the Council Chamber - Sandwell Council House, Oldbury

1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair

To elect the Chair and Vice-Chair of Schools Forum for a period of two years.

2 To note Neil Toplass as the new Special Academies Representative and Oliver Flowers as the new Special Schools (Maintained) Representative

To note Neil Toplass as the new Special Academies Representative and welcome Oliver Flowers as the new Special Schools (Maintained) Representative.

3 Apologies for Absence 11 - 12

To receive any apologies for absence.

4 Declarations of Interest 13 - 14

Members to declare any interests in matters to be discussed at the meeting.

5 Minutes 15 - 26

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2023 as a correct record.



- 6 **School Funding 2024-25** 27 - 30
- To note the changes to the National Funding Formula (NFF) and approve the approach and modelling options to the 2024-25 Local Formula.
- 7 **De-Delegated, Education Functions & Central Schools Services Block - Impact 2022-23 and Funding 2024-25** 31 - 74
- To consider the Impact Reports on De-Delegation and Education Functions and agree to the requests for funding on these areas for 2024-25.
- To consider and approve the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) 2024-25 Budget and to agree to move funding from the Schools Block to the CSSB for Safeguarding and Attendance.
- 8 **Falling Rolls Fund 2024-25** 75 - 84
- To consider the introduction of a Falling Rolls Fund (FRF) for all Sandwell schools experiencing falling rolls from 2024-25 and to consider the establishment of a FRF option from the two presented to Schools Forum on assessing the eligibility criteria.
- 9 **Early Years 2023-24 Funding** 85 - 88
- To note the Early Years 2023-24 funding.
- 10 **Future Meeting Dates**
- All meetings are in person at the Sandwell Council House.
- 2 October 2023
 - 6 November 2023
 - 11 December 2023
 - 15 January 2024
 - 18 March 2024
 - 17 June 2024

11 **AOB**

The election of new members following the updated membership structure.

To consider the establishment of a Working Group to consider the establishment of a Schools in Financial Difficulty Budget (Special School and PRU) and bring a detailed report to a future meeting.

Shokat Lal
Chief Executive
Sandwell Council House
Freeth Street
Oldbury
West Midlands

Distribution

N Toplass (Chair)
J Barry, M Arnull, S Baker, D Barton, E Benbow, K Berdesha, L Bray,
D Broadbent, O Flowers, C Hadley, C Handy, D Irish, W Lawrence, S Mistry,
D Steen and J Topham

Contact: democratic_services@sandwell.gov.uk

Schools Forum Distribution to Members:

| Body / Number of positions on Forum | Nominated Member | Nominated Substitute |
|--|---|--|
| Head Teachers Advisory Forum – Maintained Primary Schools (5) | Ms S Baker Mr J Barry Ms W Lawrence Vacancy Mrs S Mistry | L Paino A Connop S Penny Nomination awaited K Duff |
| School Governors – Maintained Primary Schools (2) | Mrs D Steen Mrs E Benbow | Nomination awaited Nomination awaited |
| Head Teachers Advisory Forum – Maintained Secondary Schools (1) | Christina Handy-Rivett | M Smith |
| School Governors – Maintained Secondary Schools (1) | Mrs D Broadbent | Nomination awaited |
| Special School (Maintained) (1) | Oliver Flowers | Nomination awaited |
| Pupil Referral Unit (Maintained) (1) | Ms K Berdesha | Ms K Hazelwood |
| Academies Primary (3) | Ms L Bray Vacancy Vacancy | Nomination awaited Nomination awaited Nomination awaited |
| Academies Secondary (6) | Mr D Irish Mr M Arnull Mr J Topham Vacancy Vacancy Vacancy | Nomination awaited Nomination awaited Nomination awaited Nomination awaited Nomination awaited Nomination awaited |
| Special Academies | Mr N Toplass (Chair) | Nomination awaited |
| Trade Union (1) | Mr. D Barton | Phil Jones |
| Early Years Partnership (1) | Vacancy | Nomination awaited |
| 14-19 Provider (1) | Ms C Hadley | M Salter |

Schools Forum: Voting Blocks (Who can vote and on what?)

| Secondary Maintained Block | Voting |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | Can vote on all business except primary school de-delegation. |
| Headteachers | |
| J Christina Handy-Rivett | |
| | |
| Governors | |
| Mrs D Broadbent | |

| Primary Maintained Block | Voting |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | Can vote on all business except secondary school de-delegation. |
| Headteachers | |
| Sally Baker | |
| Jamie Barry | |
| Vacancy | |
| Wendy Lawrence | |
| Seema Mistry | |
| | |
| Governors | |
| Ms L Howard | |
| Mrs E Benbow | |

| Special Block | Voting |
|-----------------------|---|
| <u>Oliver Flowers</u> | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and education functions. |

| Academies Block | Voting |
|--------------------------|---|
| James Topham (Secondary) | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and education functions. |
| Dave Irish (Secondary) | |
| Mark Arnull (Secondary) | |
| Lucy Bray (Primary) | |

Schools Forum: Voting Blocks (Who can vote and on what?)

Continued...

| Pupil Referral Unit | Voting |
|----------------------------|---|
| Kuldip Berdesha | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and education functions. |

NON-SCHOOL MEMBERS

| Early Years Partnership | Voting |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Vacancy | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and education functions. |

| Trade Union | Voting |
|--------------------|--|
| Darren Barton NUT | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and school funding formula. |

| 16-19 Provider | Voting |
|-----------------------|--|
| Claire Hadley | Can vote on all business except primary and secondary school de-delegation and school funding formula. |

- (a) A meeting will only be quorate if 40% of the total active membership is present (Voting Members Only). Where a nominated substitute member is in attendance on behalf of a duly appointed member, he/she shall be included in the number of persons present for the purposes of determining if a quorum has been achieved.

- (b) If the meeting is inquorate, it will be able to proceed but cannot legally take decisions (E.g. Election of a Chairperson, or a decision relating to funding conferred by the funding regulations). An inquorate meeting can respond to authority consultation and give views to the authority. The authority can take account of such views

Information about meetings in Sandwell



If you are attending the meeting and require assistance to access the venue, please contact Democratic Services (democratic_services@sandwell.gov.uk).



If the fire alarm sounds, please follow the instructions of the officers present and leave the building by the nearest exit.



Only people invited to speak at a meeting may do so. Everyone at the meeting is expected to be respectful and listen to the discussion.



Agendas with reports with exempt information should be treated as private and confidential. It is your responsibility to ensure that any such reports are kept secure. After the meeting confidential papers should be disposed of in a secure way.



This meeting may be recorded and broadcast on the Internet. If this is the case, it will be confirmed at the meeting and further information will be provided.



You are allowed to use devices for the purposes of recording or reporting during the public session of the meeting. When using your devices they must not disrupt the meeting – please ensure they are set to silent.



Members who cannot attend the meeting should submit apologies by contacting Democratic Services (democratic_services@sandwell.gov.uk)



All agenda, reports, minutes for Sandwell Council's meetings, councillor details and more are available from our [website](#)

Schools Forum

Apologies for Absence

To receive any apologies for absence from the members of Schools Forum.



This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum

Declarations of Interest

Schools Forum members to declare any interests in matters to be discussed at the meeting.



This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of Schools Forum

Monday 19 June 2023 at 2.30pm
in the Council Chamber, Sandwell Council House, Oldbury

Present: N Toplass (Chair)
J Barry (Vice-Chair) M Arnall, S Baker, E Benbow, C Hadley,
K Hazelwood, D Irish, W Lawrence, S Mistry, M Smith, D
Steen and J Topham.

Officers: Julie Andrews (Assistant Director - Education Services)
Abi Asimolowo (Head of Financial Business Partnering)
Elaine Taylor (Finance Business Partner)
Connor Robinson (Democratic Services Officer)

20/23 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from L Bray, D Broadbent and C Handy-Rivett.

21/23 **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

22/23 **To note Claire Hadley as the new 16 to 19 Provider Representative**

The Forum welcomed Claire Hadley as the new 16 to 19 Provider representative.



Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2023 be approved as a correct record.

24/23 **School Balances 2022/23 and Budget Plans 2023/24**

Schools Forum was updated on the balances held by schools at the end of 2022/23 and the projected balances for 2023/24.

An updated report was circulated owing to a mistake in the published report in appendix 2.

Appendix 2 had been updated to reflect the current RAG rating of the projected balances for 2023-24 as indicated by the Budget Plans received from schools:

| RAG | Primary | Secondary | Special |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Red | Less than 1% or greater than 10% balance | Less than 1% or greater than 8% balance | Less than 1% or greater than 10% balance |
| No. of Schools | 31 | 2 | 1 |
| Amber | 1%-2% OR 8%-10% balance | 1%-2% OR 5%-8% balance | 1%-2% OR 8%-10% balance |
| No. of Schools | 13 | 1 | 1 |
| Green | 2%-8% balance | 2%-5% balance | 2%-8% balance |
| No. of Schools | 20 | 0 | 1 |

Forum noted how it was important that schools balance budget priorities well whilst planning for any foreseeable changes in coming years. Schools were advised to take effective action to avoid deficit budgets or excessive balances above recommended limits.

The total school balances by phase as at the end of 2022/23 had been summarised and compared to the position at the end of 2021/22:



| | 2021-22 £m | In-Year Movement £m | 2022-23 £m |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Budget Share | 30.404 | (2.420) | 27.984 |
| Capital | 0.484 | 0.607 | 1.091 |
| Other Funds | 0.437 | (0.189) | 0.248 |
| Total | 31.325 | (2.002) | 29.323 |

The Forum were informed that no schools were closing with a deficit budget share in 2022/23.

There were three schools that had converted into an academy during the financial year 2022/23 which were Rounds Green Primary school, Moat Farm Junior and Tipton Green Primary.

The conversion of these schools into academies and the transfer of balances to them was reflected in the reduction of balances held by the primary schools.

The projected balances for 2023-24 as indicated by the Budget Plans received from schools indicated that 24 primary schools were projecting to hold balances above 10% and seven primary schools were projecting to hold balances below 1% at the end of 2023-24. In total, there was a decrease of four primary schools in the Red category. The number of primary schools rated Green had increased by three to 20 whilst those rated Amber had decreased by 1 to 13.

There was no secondary schools projecting to hold balances above 8% and there were two secondary schools projecting holding balances below 1% at the end of 2023-24. This was an increase of one school projecting balances below 1% based on their 2023-24 budget plans. One Secondary school was rated Amber.

There was one special school projecting to hold a balance above 10% and no special school is projecting to hold a balance below 1%. There was no change in the number of schools projecting balances above 10% and there was no change in the number of



schools projecting balances below 1% based on their 2023/24 budget plans.

There was one school projecting a deficit balance at the end 2023/24. The authority would be working with this school to review their budget plan and agree a licensed deficit plan where appropriate and it would put plans in place to regularly review the financial position of the school going forward.

There were two schools that have yet to submit their budget plans for 2023/24.

Forum was advised that there were a number of strategies in place to support schools experiencing difficulties in their budgets and a process of escalation was in place if required that would work to mitigate any potential implications.

It was recognised that budget planning was very difficult with so many variables, contributing to the potential for many different scenarios. It was suggested that a range of potential scenarios be presented to Forum for them to consider, allowing them to see clearly potential impacts on future budgets.

The Forum noted the balances held by schools at the end of 2022/23 and the RAG ratings of the projected balances for 2023/24.

25/23

Special Educational Needs High Needs Block Provisional Outturn Report 2022-2023

Forum received the High Needs Block (HNB) provisional outturn report for the Financial year 2022/23.

The HNB budget for 2022/23 reported to Schools Forum on 26 September was £60.808million, net of the usual recoupment by the Department for Education (DfE).

The balance brought forward as at 1 April 2022 was £3.930million surplus. An additional grant amount of £0.082m had been received from the DfE in March 2023. The anticipated surplus reported to



Schools Forum on 20 March 2023 was £0.197million. The current provisional outturn position was £1.723million surplus.

The overall balance in the HNB as at 31 March 2023 was £5.653million. The Variances were reported as:

Variation 1 – Independent Schools

Out of borough placements, closed with an overspend of £0.761million. There had been slippage in the dates when pupils were expected to take up places and a reduction in the anticipated tri-partite funded places following a meeting in January 2023 with Sandwell Children’s Trust.

Variation 2 – Mainstream Schools

There had been an increase in both EHCP assessments and the funding of early years pupils which had resulted in an overspend of £0.730million in delegated funding to school for individual pupil support.

Variation 3 – Focus Provision Schools

There had been an increase in EHCP assessments which has resulted in an overspend of £0.173million on the delegated funding provided to Focus Provisions.

Variation 4 – SEN Special Unit

A new Special Unit was opened at Uplands Primary School. It was previously budgeted for within the SEN Developments cost centre when the budgets for 2022/23, as discussions had been still underway with the school at that point. More Pupils have been placed in the provision than was expected and the outturn was £0.207million overspend.

Variation 5 – High Point Special School

There were more pupils on roll at High Point from 1 September 2022 than was anticipated when the budget was first prepared. This had resulted in an overspend of £0.156million.

Variation 6 – Early Years

An amount of £0.480million from the Early Years Grant was used to offset the early support for pupils in private provider settings and



those in mainstream early years settings. The funding to private providers out turned at £0.874million resulting in an overspend of £0.324million. The £0.480million would be insufficient to cover the full costs of meeting the needs of the pupils in early year's settings.

Variation 7 – Recoupment

The Element 3 top up for pupils placed in Sandwell schools that were the responsibility of a neighbouring LA are funded by Sandwell for all pupils in the special schools and Looked After Children pupils placed in mainstream schools. This was recouped from the relevant authority. There had been an increase in pupils being placed which had resulted in an increase in recoupment income, with Shenstone being the highest importer of pupils due mainly to the location of the school. This had resulted in an additional £0.837million since the budgets had been produced. This budget for recoupment is always set with prudence as the income was not guaranteed and should pupils leave in particular at phase transfer and are replaced with Sandwell responsibility pupils, the income would cease.

Variation 8 – Albright Education Centre

A small number of pupils had been placed temporarily at Albright Education Centre pending a permanent placement being agreed. These had been funded through element 3 top-up for the period of occupancy. It was also found that the centre had been overfunded following an incorrect budget allocation which had now been recouped.

Variation 9 – SEN and Support for Inclusion Services

The total variances equate to a saving of £0.493m across 9 service areas. These were mainly due to staff turnover, maternity leave, opting out of the LA superannuation scheme and full-time budgeted posts covered by staff on reduced hours and the inclusion of 2022/23 pay awards. Early Year's have also received income of £0.060million from the Early Year's Block for 2-year olds trajectory funding to provide specialist equipment that was not utilised in 2022/23. This would remain in the overall HNB balances and be available to set spend against in 2023/24.



Variation 10 SEN

SEN Developments was showing an underspend of £1.546million – The underspend was as follows:

- HNB surplus balancing figure of £0.629million, which was the difference between the calculated budgets as at 1 April 2022 and the HNB Grant initial settlement 2022/23.
- Additional grant of £0.37million received in July 2022.
- Additional grant of £0.082million received in March 2023.
- The funding for the Special Unit had been held here and was now
- accounted for in variance 4 above equating to £0.27million.
- Slippage on planned expansions for specialist places, that had now been accounted for in 2023/24 of £0.195million.

Forum noted the continued variation in the HNB that had fluctuated over the academic year. The fluctuation was due to continued changes and predications and it was appreciated that these changes did not necessarily apply themselves to long term strategic planning.

Additional workstreams had been set up to consider the SEND funding and how the HNB was allocated. The ongoing Working Group into SEND funding had been halted to prevent the duplication of work and would wait for feedback from the workstreams.

Forum noted the contents of the report in relation to the 2022/23 HNB Grant Provisional Outturn Report for the 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023.

26/23

Dedicated Schools Grant Outturn 2022/23

Forum was informed on actual expenditure incurred for the Dedicated Schools Grant blocks of funding, Early Year Block Central School Services Block, centrally retained and the de-delegated budgets over the financial year 2022/23.

The Summary provisional DSG outturn was presented to Forum:



Summary Provisional 2022/23 DSG (£'000)

| | 2021/22 B/F | Income | Expenditure | In Year Bal | TOTAL C/F |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Schools Block | (358.91) | (308,463.03) | 309,038.17 | 575.14 | 216.23 |
| HNB | (3,930.30) | (60,890.09) | 59,063.53 | (1,826.56) | (5,756.86) |
| EYB | 206.11 | (24,113.58) | 23,889.42 | (224.16) | (18.05) |
| CSSB | 12.90 | (2,283.29) | 2,272.27 | (11.02) | 1.88 |
| TOTAL | (4,070.20) | (395,749.99) | 394,263.39 | (1,486.60) | (5,556.80) |

The Early Years Block initial allocation for 2022/23 was £23.386million. Due to adjustments for participation, the actual grant income received was £24.114million the net effect of which was a £0.727million increase.

The actual expenditure incurred during 2022/23 regarding the use of the Early Years Block:

Early Years Block (£'000)

| Service Area | Budget 2022/23 | Actual Expenditure | Variance |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Early Learning 2-year olds | 3,584 | 4,173 | 589 |
| Early Years - PVI | 10,697 | 10,730 | 33 |
| Early Years - Schools | 7,240 | 7,240 | 0 |
| EY – Pupil Premium | 307 | 326 | 19 |
| SEN Inclusion Fund | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| Disability Access Fund | 118 | 26 | (92) |
| Central Services | 961 | 915 | (46) |
| Early Years Adjustment | 727 | 0 | (727) |
| Total | 24,114 | 23,889 | (225) |

The actual expenditure incurred regarding the use of the Central School Services Block:



Central School Services Block (£'000)

| Service Area | Budget 2022/23 | Actual Expenditure | Variance |
|---|----------------|--------------------|------------|
| School Forum | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Pension Administration | 146 | 146 | 0 |
| Stat/Regulatory/Education Welfare/Asset Mgt | 1,284 | 1,284 | 0 |
| Admissions & Appeals | 453 | 445 | -8 |
| Copyright Licenses ¹ | 397 | 397 | 0 |
| Total | 2,283 | 2,272 | -11 |

The Pupil number growth allocation agreed by Schools forum was £1.3million. There was growth fund brought forward from 2021/22 of £0.336million making total funding available to be £1.636million. Total growth fund paid during the year amounted to £2.211million representing an overspend of £0.575million and would be the first call on 2023/24 PNG funding allocation.

De-delegated budgets, expenditure and variances were noted as:

| Service Area | Adjusted Budget 2022/23 £'000 | Actual Expenditure £'000 | Variance £'000 |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Health & Safety Licenses | 4 | 6 | (2) |
| Evolve Annual License | 0 | 5 | (5) |
| Union Facilities Time | 219 | 177 | 42 |
| School Improvement | 100 | 100 | 0 |
| Schools in financial difficulty | 0 | 88 | (88) |
| Total | 323 | 376 | (53) |

Education Functions budgets, expenditure, and variance:

| Service Area | Budget 2022/23 £'000 | Actual Expenditure £'000 | Variance £'000 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Education Benefits Team | 175 | 175 | 0 |
| Children's Clothing Allowance | 33 | 33 | 0 |
| Safeguarding & Attendance | 264 | 264 | 0 |
| Total | 472 | 472 | 0 |



27/23 Constitution Review

Forum was advised that the Schools Forum Constitution and membership structure had not been updated since 2016. The changes proposed both for the constitution and membership structure were taken from the updated DfE guidance and reflected national and regional best practice.

The majority of the changes were administrative and had given more detail on the role and function of Schools Forum. The membership structure had also been updated to reflect the changes in pupil proportionality between maintained and academy settings, the proposed changes would increase the Schools Forum Membership from 20 to 24 members:

| Comparison Membership Breakdown | | |
|---|------------|-----------------------|
| | OLD | Proposed (NEW) |
| Schools Members | | |
| Maintained Primary | 5 | 5 |
| Maintained Secondary | 1 | 1 |
| Maintained Governor Primary | 3 | 2 (-1) |
| Maintained Governor Secondary | 2 | 1 (-1) |
| Maintained Primary and Secondary Total | 11 | 9 (-2) |
| Special Schools (Maintained) | 1 | 1 |
| PRU (Maintained) | 1 | 1 |
| School Members Total | 13 | 11 (-2) |
| Academies Members | | |
| Academy Primary | 1 | 3 (+2) |
| Academy Secondary | 3 | 6 (+3) |
| Academies Primary and Secondary Total | 4 | 9 (+5) |
| Special Academies | 0 | 1 (+1) |
| Academies Members Total | 4 | 10 (+6) |
| Non-School Members | | |
| 16 to 19 Provider | 1 | 1 |
| Early Years (PVI) | 1 | 1 |
| Trade Union Representative | 1 | 1 |
| Non-School Members Total | 3 | 3 |
| Schools Forum Total Membership | 20 | 24 |



Forum had been presented with a number of variations with regards to the possible membership structure. It was determined that option one was the preferable option.

Option one:

| Draft Membership Breakdown | |
|---|-----------|
| Schools Members | |
| Maintained Primary | 5 |
| Maintained Secondary | 1 |
| Maintained Governor Primary | 2 |
| Maintained Governor Secondary | 1 |
| Maintained Primary and Secondary Total | 9 |
| Special Schools (Maintained) | 1 |
| PRU (Maintained) | 1 |
| School Members Total | 11 |
| Academies Members | |
| Academy Primary | 3 |
| Academy Secondary | 6 |
| Academies Primary and Secondary Total | 9 |
| Special Academies | 1 |
| Academies Members Total | 10 |
| Non-School Members | |
| 16 to 19 Provider | 1 |
| Early Years (PVI) | 1 |
| Trade Union Representative | 1 |
| Non-School Members Total | 3 |
| Schools Forum Total Membership | 24 |

Resolved that:-

(1) The changes to the Schools Forum Constitution be approved.

(2) The changes to the membership structure as outlined in option one be approved.

28/23 **Future Meeting Dates**

The Forum noted the future meeting dates:-

- 2 October 2023
- 6 November 2023
- 11 December 2023



- 15 January 2024
- 18 March 2024
- 1 July 2024

29/23 **AOB**

Forum was asked to consider the position of Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2023/24 and 2024/25 academic year the potential for any nominations.

Forum members were asked to communicate the now vacant positions to the academy schools in preparation for the new year.

Meeting ended at 3.46pm

Contact: democratic_services@sandwell.gov.uk



ILO - UNCLASSIFIED

Schools Forum

2 October 2023

School Funding 2024-25

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Note the changes to the National Funding Formula (NFF).
- 1.2 Approve the approach and modelling options to the 2024-25 Local Formula

2. Purpose

- 2.1 This is year 2 of a 5-year Government plan to implement a direct NFF whereby funding will be allocated directly to schools based on a single national formula with an expectation of full implementation by 2027-28.
- 2.2 To ensure a smooth transition towards the direct NFF Local Authorities will continue to be required to bring their own formulae closer to the schools NFF.

3. Report Details

2024-25 Headlines

- 3.1 As per the “National Funding Formulae for Schools and High Needs (July 2023)” publication the total core school’s budget will total over £59.6 billion in 2024-25 which is the highest ever level per pupil in real terms.
- 3.2 Funding through the mainstream schools NFF is increasing by 2.7% per pupil in 2024-25 compared to 2023-24 which means that funding through the NFF will be 8.5 % higher per pupil in 2024-25 compared to 2022-23.

[ILO: UNCLASSIFIED]

- 3.3 In addition to the funding set out here the government announced additional funding for teachers pay. This will be allocated to mainstream schools through Teachers Pay Additional Grant (TPAG). Information and funding related to TPAG is NOT included here as TPAG will be allocated outside the NFF for 2024-25.
- 3.4 From 2024-25 Local authorities must once again move their local formula factor values a further 10% closer to the NFF, except where local formulae are already mirroring the NFF. Sandwell has been named as one of only 21 authorities whose formulae are substantially different to the NFF compared with 72 who now mirror the NFF and a further 24 who mirror the NFF in most factors in 2023-24.
- 3.5 Other headlines include:
- The core factors in the schools NFF (such as the basic entitlement, and the lump sum that all schools attract) will increase by 2.4%.
 - Through the minimum per pupil funding levels, every primary school will receive at least £4,655 per pupil, and every secondary school at least £6,050.
 - The funding floor will ensure that every school will attract at least 0.5% more pupil-led funding per pupil, compared to its 2023-24 allocation.
- 3.6 High Needs funding is increasing by a further £440m (4.3%) in 2024-25 following the £970m increase in 2023-24 and £1 billion increase in 2022-23. This is a total increase of over 60% since 2019-20.
- 3.7 The high needs NFF will ensure that every Local Authority receives at least 3% increase per head of their ages 2-18 population.

Changes to the NFF in 2024-25

- 3.8 The APT formula model calculates school allocations based on an updated funding formula for 2024 to 2025. The main changes this year relate to:

- The introduction of a national formulaic approach to allocating split sites funding. This ensures that split sites funding will be provided on a consistent basis across the country. This will affect one school in Sandwell.
 - A new worksheet has been added to allow LA's to provide details of eligibility criteria for growth and falling rolls funding (see point 3.11 below).
 - A validation check has been added to ensure sufficient funding is allocated to notional SEN.
 - An adjustment has been added to the MFG baselines to ensure that funding previously allocated through the mainstream school's additional grant is protected.
- 3.9 The 2023-24 Mainstream Schools Additional Grant (MSAG) is being rolled into the schools NFF from 2024-25 by
- Adding an amount representing what schools receive through the grant into their baselines
 - Adding the value of the lump sum, basic per pupil rates and free school meals Ever 6 parts of the grant onto the respective factors in the NFF.
- 3.10 The Minimum Funding Guarantee will continue in 2024-25 between +0.0% and +0.5%.

Growth Fund / Falling Rolls Fund

- 3.11 As a reminder growth funding is provided within a Local Authorities schools block DSG allocation but unlike other factors in the NFF a provisional growth allocation is not published. This is because it is based on the October 2023 census which is not yet available.
- 3.12 New for 2024-25 and to support LA's to plan ahead for their growth fund allocation in the DSG settlement is a forecasting tool which will be supplied to LA's by the DFE. School Organisation colleagues will be able to input the October 2023 census data into this tool to give an estimate of the growth fund we could expect to receive in 2024-25.
- 3.13 It will be based on the observed differences between the primary and secondary number on roll between October 2022 and October

2023. The growth allocation for each LA will be £1,550 per new primary pupil and £2,320 per new secondary pupil plus a lump sum of £76,195 for each brand-new school

- 3.14 Falling Rolls fund is also provided within the NFF Schools block and the new forecasting tool can also be used to calculate an estimate of this funding.
- 3.15 Local Authorities with falling rolls funding must follow new requirements but as we introduce this for the first time in 2024-25 then the changes outlined do not apply. There is a separate Schools Forum report setting out the 2 options for falling rolls eligibility criteria.

Modelling Options

- 3.16 It is proposed that 3 modelling options are undertaken for the NFF schools block funding which can be presented to the November meeting:
 - (1) Minimum Transition (using the maximum transition period)
 - (2) Accelerated Transition (using a 2-year transition period)
 - (3) National Funding Formula

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That Schools Forum note the changes to the local funding process for 2024-25.
- 4.2 That Schools Forum approve the approach to the modelling options.

Elaine Taylor, Business Partner – Children’s Services

Date: 25/09/2023

Contact Officer: Elaine Taylor

Email: elaine_taylor@sandwell.gov.uk

ILO - UNCLASSIFIED

Schools Forum

2 October 2023

De-Delegated, Education Functions & Central Schools Services Block - Impact 2022-23 and Funding 2024-25

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Consider the Impact Reports attached/presented by Officers on the 2022-23 spending on De-Delegation and Education Functions and agree to the requests for funding on these areas for 2024-25.
- 1.2 Consider and approve the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) 2024-25 Budget.
- 1.3 Agree to move funding from the Schools Block to the CSSB for Safeguarding and Attendance.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To present impact reports on the 2022-23 spending on the De-Delegated and Education Functions and to approve requests for funding in these areas for 2024-25.
- 2.2 To inform members on 2022/23 CSSB outturn and the provisional 2024/25 allocation (subject to change with October 23 census)
- 2.3 To ask School Forum approval for movement of the Safeguarding and Attendance funding from the Schools Block to the Central Schools Services Block.

3. Report Details

- 3.1 Appendix 1 contains all the 2022-23 impact reports for your consideration

[ILO: UNCLASSIFIED]

3.2 Appendix 2 contains all the 2024-25 funding requests.

3.3 A Summary of the De-Delegated and Education Functions is as follows:

| REF | Full Title of Proposal | Lead Officer | Budget 23-24 | Request 24-25 |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| De-delegated - Maintained Schools only | | | | |
| DD1 | Health and Safety Licences and Subscriptions | Julie Andrews | £5,990 | £5,800 |
| DD2 | EVOLVE Annual Licence Fee | Chris Davies | £6,300 | £7,300 |
| DD3 | Union Facilities Time | Julie Andrews | £159,000 | £159,000 |
| DD4 | School Improvement Services | Julie Andrews | £150,000 | £150,000 |
| DD5 | Schools in financial difficulty | Julie Andrews | £100,000 | £100,000 |
| TOTAL DD | | | £421,290 | £422,100 |
| Education Functions - Maintained Schools only | | | | |
| EF1 | Education Benefits Team | Sue Moore | £134,000 | £134,000 |
| EF2 | Children's Clothing Support Allowance | Sue Moore | £33,000 | £33,000 |
| EF3 | Safeguarding & Attendance | Sue Moore | moved to CSSB5 | moved to CSSB5 |
| TOTAL EF | | | £167,000 | £167,000 |

3.4 A Summary of the CSSB is as follows:

| REF | Title | Budget 23-24 | Provisional Budget 24-25 |
|---|--|-------------------|--------------------------|
| CSSB - As per ESFA | | | |
| CSSB1 | Statutory/Regulatory/ Education Welfare/Asset Management | £1,724,680 | £1,801,593 |
| CSSB2 | Schools Forum | £3,000 | £3,000 |
| CSSB3 | Admissions Services | £452,600 | £452,600 |
| CSSB4 | Historical Commitment - Pensions Administration | £116,720 | £93,376 |
| TOTAL CSSB (Provisional - Updated December 2023) | | £2,297,000 | £2,350,569 |
| CSSB5 | Safeguarding & Attendance (ALL Schools) | £455,000 | £512,000 |

3.5 The 2023-24 CSSB Budget was spent with no variances.

3.6 The only known 2024-25 figure is the 20% reduction in the historic commitment – Pensions Administration. Where possible, we have retained the proposed allocation the same as 2023-24 levels and any additional allocation has been earmarked against Statutory responsibilities.

4. Recommendations

4.1 That Schools Forum consider the details within the Impact Reports and agree to the requests for funding for 2024-25 from the De-delegated and Education Functions outlined above.

- 4.2 That Schools Forum consider and approve the 2024-25 CSSB Budget. Please be advised that the CSSB is still subject to further changes and Schools Forum will be updated when the actual Copyright licenses fees are known and the outcome of October 2023 census becomes known.
- 4.3 That Schools Forum consider and approve the movement of funding for Attendance and Safeguarding from the Schools Block to the CCSB.

Elaine Taylor, Business Partner – Children’s Services

Date: 25/09/2023

Contact Officer: Elaine Taylor

Email: elaine_taylor@sandwell.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

| DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2024-25 | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | Health & Safety Licences & Subscriptions - CLEAPSS | |
| Lead Officer | Julie Andrews | |
| Reference Number | DD1 | |
| Annual Funding Proposal (£) | £5,800.00 | |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓) | Primary | Secondary |
| | ✓ | ✓ |
| What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil. | Primary | Secondary |
| | Service to be apportioned on an amount per pupil, subject to confirmation of 2024-25 subscription formula from CLEAPSS. | |
| Is the service provided a statutory function | Yes | |
| If Yes please provide detail | | |
| As detailed in the 'benefits to schools' forum' section below | | |
| How has this proposal been calculated? | | |
| <p>This proposal has been calculated based on the subscription and licence cost for the service outlined below, with a support element (salary costs) to administer the associated functions. Please note that costs included in this proposal have been estimated, based on 2023 - 2024 subscription rates from CLEAPSS as costs for 2024-25 have not yet been confirmed and so may be subject to change. However, based on the current subscription rate the cost is likely to be around 16.5 pence per pupil. An individual charge of £65 per school is included for the radiation protection advisor subscription (RPA) for the 3 Sandwell MBC secondary schools, pending confirmation of the actual cost from CLEAPSS (£195 in total). The salary costs for administering the subscription and conducting the monitoring visits for 24/25 will be £1260</p> <p>CLEAPSS: subscription to the national school science and design and technology advisory body.</p> | | |
| What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services) | | |
| <p>CLEAPSS membership allows access to termly newsletters, a wide range of free safety publications, model risk assessments, and a telephone helpline. An additional element of the subscription for Secondary schools meets the statutory duties as required by the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999, of having an appointed suitable Radiation Protection Advisor (RPA) and ensuring the safe management of radioactive substances.</p> | | |
| What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered) | | |
| All elements of the subscription proposal relate to statutory requirements | | |
| What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal? | | |

Employers have specific responsibilities to ensure the safety of their employees who work with ionising radiations (and others affected by their work). Schools are not exempt and if the practical work comes within the scope of the Ionising Radiations Regulations 2017, schools must comply with the regulations. Failure to comply with their statutory duty could result in action being taken by the Enforcing Authorities (Health and Safety Executive), Head Teacher and Governing Body.

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Salaries (£) | £1,300 | |
| Services (£) | £4,300 + £200 | (subscription rates tbc) |
| Schools (£) | | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

Expenditure will be monitored by the Assistant Director for Education Services, on behalf of the schools.

How will impact be evaluated?

The proposal facilitates specialist advice and support for safe Design & Technology and Science curricular activities across both primary and secondary phases.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

N/A

| DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2022-23 | |
|---|---|
| Impact report | |
| Title of the Budget | DD1 Health and Safety Licences and Subscriptions |
| Lead Officer: | Julie Andrews |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £5,990 |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools. (E.g. KPI's, service statistics, etc.) | |
| <p>CLEAPSS: subscription to the national school science and design and technology advisory body.</p> <p>CLEAPSS advice and guidance documents cover many aspects of practical science and technology, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance and training on how to carry out effective experiments and demonstrations - safely. • Guidance on all aspects of health and safety in school science, D&T and art • How to use particular pieces of apparatus • How to look after various species of animals or plants. <p>A helpline run by qualified staff in a variety of disciplines provides additional support to schools as required throughout the school year</p> <p>For those schools that store and use radioactive materials, CLEAPSS provides comprehensive guidance on managing, storing, and handling the materials and the equipment that is used for teaching about radioactivity.</p> | |

This page is intentionally left blank

| DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2024-25 | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | Renewal of EVOLVE Licence – educational visits. | |
| Lead Officer | Christopher Davies | |
| Reference Number | DD2 | |
| Annual Funding Proposal | £7,300 | |
| Date of Funding Proposal | 19/9/2023 | |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓) | Primary | Secondary |
| | ✓ | ✓ |
| What proportion will each phase bear Please state as an amount per pupil. | Primary | Secondary |
| | 16 pence (£5,4k) | 16 pence (£1,9k) |
| Is the service provided a statutory function | Yes | |
| The software being licensed is not a statutory requirement, but it is an essential tool used to ensure the Council fulfils its H&S duty in respect of its employees, and those in their care. | | |
| How has this proposal been calculated? | | |
| This is the license fee for the EVOLVE software provided by eduFOCUS. | | |
| What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services) | | |
| Schools and LA use this software to ensure the safe and robust management of off-site educational visits. | | |
| What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered) | | |
| N/A | | |
| What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal? | | |
| Schools will lose access to a key mechanism used to safely plan and deliver learning outside of the classroom. | | |
| How will the amount be deployed? | | |
| Salaries | £ | |
| Services | £ | 7,300 |
| Other costs | £ | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

This is an annual license.

How will impact be evaluated?

By the number of schools and children attending off-site visits.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

Income is not generated solely through the license. Income is generated by Service Level Agreements – of which access to the software is an element – and also training delivered by the LA Educational Visits Advisers to teachers and visit leaders. The SLA revenue equates to approximately £50kp/a

| DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2022-23 | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Impact report September 2022 | | | |
| Title of the Budget | EVOLVE Annual License Fee | | |
| Lead Officer: | Christopher Davies | Reference no: | DD2 |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £6,300 | | |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools. (E.g. KPI's, service statistics, etc.) | | | |
| <p>To renew the licence for the LA and all schools to access the computerised EVOLVE system supporting the safe and effective management of Educational Visits; and fulfilling the Council's H&S duty in respect of its employees, and those in their care.</p> | | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

| DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2024-25 | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Title of Proposal | DD3 Union Facilities Time | Date September 2023 |
| Lead Officer | Julie Andrews | Contact Tel. 07919 291012 |
| Annual Funding Proposal (£) | £135,028 | £23,972 |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓)? | Primary | Secondary |
| | ✓ | ✓ |
| What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil. (Please note that this year some Academy MATs have made contributions to the Facilities Fund enabling the per pupil cost to be reduced for maintained schools. Discussions for further contributions are taking place and should further contributions be received, this will enable further reductions for the maintained sector in the future. | Primary | Secondary |
| | £5.58 | £5.58 |
| Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes) | Yes | Yes |
| <p>Facilities time is for 'trade union representatives' i.e. "employees who have been elected or appointed in accordance with the rules of [their] union to be a representative of all or some of the union's members in the particular company or workplace, or agreed group of workplaces where the union is recognised for collective bargaining purposes." (ACAS)</p> <p><u>The legal position:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Union representatives have a statutory right to reasonable paid time off from employment to carry out trade union duties and to undertake trade union training." (ACAS) • "You must give appointed [by a trade union] safety representatives the paid time necessary to carry out their functions [and to] undergo training in these functions, as is reasonable under the circumstances." (Health & Safety Executive) <p>There is no definition of "reasonable" other than that it should be enough time for representatives to "perform effectively", taking into account factors such as the size of the organisation and its workforce and the need for workers to be able to access their union representatives.</p> <p>Withdrawal from a pooled arrangement does not remove legal obligations under the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 to provide paid time off for trade union duties Although there is no specific budget heading, all schools receive funding for facility time through the core grant, and therefore this should be spent on facility time release as intended</p> | | |
| How has this proposal been calculated? | | |
| In 2016, The JUP agreed a re-distribution of funding within the unions. This takes account of union membership numbers and a commensurate allocation of facilities time for representatives that reflects those numbers. | | |

The spend in 2012-13 was £350k. For 2013-14 and 2014-15, Schools' Forum decided that it would de-delegate £238k (Primary phase only) and £0k (Secondary phase). This meant a one-third reduction in the overall funding available to fund facilities time (since 2012-13) and also meant 100% of the central arrangement was funded by the Primary phase. In 2015-16 & 2016-17 & 2017-18, this was reduced to £199k with a slight increase to £202k in the subsequent three years. The total amount increased slightly to £207k in 2022-23 to take into consideration increases in staffing costs. The request for funding was reduced in 2023-24 to £136k for the Primary phase, plus £23,000 for the Secondary phase should they decide to continue their UFT funding. In total, funding allocated was £159,000. As stated above, in light of MAT contributions, the per pupil cost is reduced for maintained schools

The proposal is to request funding for 2024-25 of £159,000 to include both the Primary and Secondary phases as detailed above based on current pupil numbers in each one. This would remain consistent with the level of funding requested in 2023-24.

**What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal?
(Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)**

- The benefit to Primary and Secondary schools of agreeing to de-delegate funding is that it will enable a single central arrangement to be administered by the LA on behalf of all contributing, maintained schools in Sandwell. Otherwise individual schools will have to arrange and fund their own negotiations, whilst staff will not have recourse to local officials.
- Local officials have local knowledge and are available quickly. The current 'local officials and a central arrangement' provides a mechanism for resolving issues at a local level that could otherwise escalate.
- Local Union Officials play a key role in updating key policies and guidance documentation through Joint Union Panel meetings (JUP), Central Health and Safety Committee meetings and side panel meetings
- Facilities funding also ensures local casework can involve a local rep, who, unlike regional reps, will usually be available at short notice and have good local knowledge. This frequently enables issues to be resolved more quickly and effectively.
- Trade union duties that might be undertaken on behalf of members include:
 - Disciplinary/grievance hearings
 - Formal capability meetings
 - Sickness absence meetings
 - Terms and conditions of employment
 - Investigations
 - Termination of employment
 - Suspension of employment
 - Consultation relating to TUPE
 - Section 188 redundancy notices
 - Investigating members' complaints regarding health, safety or welfare at work
 - Making representations to the employer on the above
 - Representing members in workplace consultations on Health & Safety
 - Attending safety committee meetings
 - Facilitating settlement agreements

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

- The statutory aspect of this policy relates to the facilities time that union representatives are entitled to. Please see below for impact if forum do not agree to the proposal.

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

- Facilities funding enables the local authority to negotiate directly with trades unions on behalf of all maintained schools. This means individual schools do not have to spend time being involved in a similar process on their own. As a result, this saves both, significant time and money, allowing more to be achieved in the long run.
- The impact would be that LA maintained schools where the governing body is the employer – Trust and Voluntary Aided schools - have sole responsibility for providing “reasonable” union facilities time but may choose to exercise this through participation in a centrally-run system.
- For Community and Voluntary Controlled schools, funding and employer powers rest with governing bodies whilst the LA remains ‘employer of last resort’ – therefore there is a joint responsibility to ensure “reasonable” facilities time.
- If Schools Forum do not agree to fund a central arrangement, each school would become individually responsible for meeting the legal requirement to give union officials representing their staff reasonable paid time off for their union duties.
- School-level union representatives are not necessarily accredited by their unions to carry out the full range of union duties. If school reps without appropriate accreditation are used to represent members during a dispute this can adversely affect both the member and the school. The union has the responsibility to ensure that the rep is correctly accredited or they leave themselves vulnerable to being sued by their members for incorrect support and advice.
- The loss of area reps, who have local knowledge of and relationship with both members and school leaders, would push the work onto the regional reps who do not have those relationships or time to provide the service that the current system allows for.
- The LA would still need to maintain a much smaller ‘residual function’ covering Community and VC schools, i.e. a central forum for borough-wide policies so funding for this would have to come from reducing funding for other services, as there is no other alternative funding source.

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------|---|
| Salaries (£) | 100% on salaries | The LA would allocate this funding amongst the unions in accordance with the agreed funding formula |
| Services (£) | | |
| Schools (£) | | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

- The salaries and on-costs are maintained in a single cost centre and subject to regular monitoring.

How will impact be evaluated?

- The proposed central arrangement enables employers and those with delegated employer responsibilities to fulfil their legal responsibilities in a simple and cost-effective way.
- The arrangement also enables union officials to perform their essential duties as defined by ACAS.
- An outline of the strategic work undertaken by unions over the past year.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

- None. However, income has been received from a number of Academy MATs and this has been re-invested in the Union Facilities funding allowing for a per pupil reduction in the charge to maintained schools.

| DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2022-23 Impact report | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Title of the Budget | DD3 - Union Facilities Time |
| Lead Officer: | Julie Andrews |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £177,000 |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools. (E.g. KPI's, service statistics, etc.) | |
| <p>Facilities Funding was distributed between the unions represented on the Joint Union Partnership in line with the 2016 agreement on facilities time.</p> <p>Facilities funding enables the local authority to negotiate directly with trades unions on behalf of all contributing, maintained schools. This means individual schools do not have to spend time being involved in a similar process on their own. As a result, this saves both, significant time and money, allowing more to be achieved in the long run.</p> <p>In conjunction with Sandwell HR a clear programme of policy review has been established for the forthcoming year (this takes account of issues raised by schools). As made clear above, this allows for a LA-wide policy to be negotiated via Joint Union Panel (JUP) and avoids individual schools having to follow the same time-consuming and costly process.</p> <p>JUP continues to play a key role in reviewing and updating a range of key policies and guidance documentation. In the recent past this has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary • Management of Absence • Grievance • Redundancy • Model Pay Policy • Appraisal • Leave of Absence • Teachers Capability • Domestic Abuse <p>Facilities funding enables local union representation to work with the LA on a number of other matters for all maintained schools. Policies that have been reviewed over time include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single Managing Allegations policy in conjunction with LADO • School Complaints Procedure • Social Media guidance for schools • A policy for supporting employees from malicious behaviour • A Workload Charter (in conjunction with JEG) • Place planning and school expansions • Maintaining an overview of the way the Apprenticeship Levy is being used • School Amalgamations • Academy conversion • Physical Intervention/Restraint policy • Redundancies • Drugs, Alcohol and Substance misuse policy | |

DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2022-23
Impact report

Facilities funding also allows unions to meet regularly with LA Health and Safety representatives via the Central Safety Committee to both monitor and consult on specific H&S matters. This includes the development and reviewing of any school specific health & safety guidance documents which will be circulated to unions. Updates will also be provided on the health and safety training offer made available to our schools. Monitoring activities include reviewing statistical incident data, summaries of health and safety management audits and workplace inspections to identify trends and any possible remedial action.

Facilities funding also ensures local casework can involve a local representative, who, unlike regional representative, will usually be available at short notice and have good local knowledge. This frequently enables issues to be resolved more quickly and effectively.

The number of meetings that union officials attend is significant with twice termly JUP meetings, three Health and Safety Committee Meetings per year as well as a significant number of side panel committees. This is in addition to the numerous meetings, phone calls and the preparation needed to cover individual casework.

Throughout the pandemic unions met remotely with the Local Authority Officers on a regular basis, initially this was daily but then reduced to take place twice a week. This continued to provide an important forum to discuss immediate concerns in a timely manner, allowing for quick resolution of issues.

DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2024-25

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | School Improvement Service | |
| Lead Officer | Julie Andrews | |
| Reference Number | DD4 | |
| Annual Funding Proposal | £150,000 | |
| Date of Funding Proposal | 01 September 2023 | |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓) | Primary | Secondary |
| | ✓ | ✓ |
| What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil. | Primary | Secondary |
| | £5.26 | £5.26 |
| Is the service provided a statutory function? | | |
| If Yes please provide detail | No | |
| How has this proposal been calculated? | | |
| The amount requested is a contribution to the current School Improvement Service and would contribute towards the cost of advisory support, including 3 core visits per term to each maintained school. | | |
| What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services) | | |
| <p>Aa a minimum entitlement, all maintained primary, secondary, special schools and PRUs to receive a termly visit from a School Improvement Adviser (SIA). Each visit will have a clear focus and an agenda which has been prepared and sent to schools in advance of the visits. Visits will focus on the school's self-evaluation. Where appropriate, support packages will be developed in discussions between leaders, managers, and governors of schools to help schools to improve standards and provision.</p> <p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support school self-evaluation processes offering support and challenge where appropriate to ensure every school is at least a 'good' school using the current Ofsted criteria • Support schools to improve at any stage of their development from inadequate to outstanding • Early identification of those schools that need particular levels of support and those that may be able to offer support to other schools and providers • Target resources to narrow the gap between vulnerable and disadvantaged children and young people and their peers • Take decisive action to address poor performance, by providing a programme of targeted support to enable standards to improve | | |

- Promote high standards in education by supporting effective school-to-school collaboration through a range of options including Learning Communities, Learning Hubs and Teaching Schools
- Support schools to deliver an appropriate curriculum, including the National Curriculum
- Provide support to leadership at all levels including senior and middle leaders as well as governing bodies
- Support schools in becoming autonomous, self-evaluating and successful inclusive institutions.
- Support schools by providing up to date information on Ofsted Inspection. Helping schools before, during and after an inspection
- Provide a service of quality assurance to schools relating to all aspects of school improvement
- Support school leaders and governors in recruitment processes
- Support for school improvement costed at a very competitive rate

Through this arrangement, School Improvement Advisers are able to monitor schools and ensure that they can:

- Be an evaluative friend: facilitating opportunities for leadership to reflect on the school's performance, identify strengths and priorities for improvement and plan for effective change and improvement
- Provide an external perspective on aspects of the school's performance, development, and improvement through joint evaluation activity
- Provide an objective review of the school's performance data by considering its most recent national test results, trends over time, other pupil achievement and well-being data, and the views of pupils, parents and carers and elected councillors
- Discuss and agree priorities for the forthcoming year to ensure that they are suitably ambitious to meet the school's and community's aspirations
- Challenge the school on its capacity to improve and its priorities for improvement
- Signpost to effective provision and practice
- Agree the overall school effectiveness category
- Evaluate the impact of any brokered support package

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

N/A

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

- Schools will need to purchase school improvement support from other providers to provide all the above, which may be less cost-effective
- Potential for individual school performance to decline
- Schools are more likely to slip into Ofsted categories without school improvement support
- Greater responsibility on schools to resolve significant issues which may occur e.g. underperformance or a sudden decline in leadership capacity.
- Reduction in the information advice and guidance that is provided to schools over the year including Ofsted updates.
- Schools will need to find alternative ways to ensure effective quality assurance across all aspects of school improvement including governor support and challenge
- Less effective signposting to effective provision and practice
- Reduction in guidance for governors

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|------------------------|----------|---|
| Salaries (£) | £150,000 | Contribution to the total SIA salaries budget |
| Services (£) | | |
| Other costs (£) | | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

- Existing budget meetings with LA finance officers
- Quality assurance of visits to schools by senior officers
- Quality assurance of visit reports by senior officers

How will impact be evaluated?

- End of year performance of schools across the Local Authority
- Outcomes of Ofsted inspections across the year

Please detail any income generated by the service?

- Income will not be directly generated from this funding although the service as a whole generates some additional income through a variety of ways including support to other schools and academies both in Sandwell and in other local authorities.

This page is intentionally left blank

| DE-DELEGATED OUTTURN 2022-23 Impact report | |
|---|--|
| Title of De-Delegated Budget | DD4 School Improvement Services |
| Lead Officer: | Julie Andrews |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £100,000 |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools. (eg KPI's, service statistics, etc) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core visits were undertaken to all maintained schools over the year. • Feedback received from headteachers and governors confirm that they continue to value this support • Numerous schools have been supported to appoint Headteachers through a rigorous recruitment process over the last 12 months. • Safeguarding and attendance have been key focuses over the last 12 months through core visits. Safeguarding has also been impacted on through additional one-off supportive reviews. • Additional support visits have been provided to maintained schools where there has been a need identified. This has had a direct impact on outcomes before inspection. <p>Monitoring and evaluation confirmed the following strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant evidence of high-quality evaluative writing in many reports (see below for feedback evidence). • Helpful comments included in many reports which support school improvement (see feedback section). • Reports indicate a wealth of activities taking place in termly visits, which support school improvement. • Reports confirm that activities that are relevant and appropriate to individual schools • Clear evidence that SIAs know their schools well and discussion is focused on relevant key priorities, providing support as well as challenge • Head teachers and governors value the range of meetings and support that the SIAs offer. <p>Feedback from schools:</p> <p>All of the below were sent on email and cover feedback from head teachers, subject leaders, governors and OFSTED HMI inspectors. There are contributions about all advisers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just a quick email to thank you for your support this year. We have very much appreciated your input as we seek to do things better and better for the sake of our little people. | |

- Your support for XXXX paid dividends on her maths deep dive. Thanks again.
- Thank you, I thoroughly enjoyed the visit yesterday. Your approach and line of questioning were exactly what I like. Thank you for the speed at which you have produced the draft report. The report is an accurate and helpful account of the visit and our discussion. Thank you.
- Before the inspection: Thank you for your visit feedback. I think you captured it all very well. ***** and I found it very useful. Once again thank you for your really good input.
- After the inspection: Thank you for all of your support over the past few weeks and months. We really appreciated it and it has certainly made a difference to our approach to lots of our teaching and our other systems particularly attendance and safeguarding. Just thank you for being there for us before and during the inspection!
- Thank you, everyone found you very supportive, it's appreciated.
- As you know, you have been a real help to me and the school over the last few terms. Thank you. Thank you for your time today. We found it to be an enjoyable and supportive experience.
- Thanks for emailing the visit report. Both ** and I found the visit very useful and supportive.
- Thanks for this. The visit was very useful and my staff were very positive about the whole experience. It enabled them to really clarify future improvement properties, so they valued your input.
- Feedback from yesterday has been very positive. Everyone found the process very useful. It has made us all think about being succinct when answering the question and has given us all action points to work on. They have all said they would like more sessions like this to improve their confidence and to help them effectively answer questions.'
- XXXX has just messaged me to say how useful she found the session after school today and how it has really helped to build her confidence. Thanks so much for your support, she certainly feels more prepared and hopefully this will steer her in the right direction!
- I just wanted to thank you again for your time today I found the meeting very helpful and I think XXXX did too. Thank you so much for your time and support yesterday. XXXXX and XX_X have both

said how helpful the meetings were and I certainly found them very helpful and supportive too.

- Thanks for your support and challenge. Thank you very much for your support, SIA visits and SEF work.....
- Much thanks for the support you have given myself (as Chair) and the school this year
- On behalf of ***** and myself, thank you for all of your support and advice over this year and we appreciate the input you've had with what we are aiming for at *****.
- Thanks, this report reads really well and has the accuracy and clarity we sought. Thank you for all your support with the Ofsted.
- Ofsted final feedback by the HMI to the school: External support from the LA has helped and HT mentoring, SIG group, SIAs and EYFS lead and adviser have all been recognised as contributing by leaders and this impact can be seen by the HMI.
- Governor feedback: you are good to work with, always professional, but also with humour. As I wrap up after 40+ years (of working in education) I can honestly say you've been one of the most professional, intelligent and lovely folk I've had the privilege of meeting on the road!
- Governor on HT recruitment: I would like to thank you both for all your support yesterday with the interviews. I really appreciated your guidance and expertise. It was a daunting task but having your support helped me enormously. I appreciate it is what you do, but it was the level of professionalism and kindness you both offered, gave me the confidence with the whole process. It took away any feelings of inadequacy I had.
- A HT reflecting on a difficult visit: Thank you so much for your support. Difficult messages may be hard to hear, but you deliver them kindly and we always trust that you are honest and objective. Thank you.
- There are many more!!

Ofsted inspections:

- The latest data (June 2023) shows that there has been a further increase in the proportion of schools and academies across all phases rated good or better by Ofsted (September 2022 - 85%; June 2023 - 85.7%).

| DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2024-25 | | | NO: DD5 |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Title of Proposal | DD5 Schools in Financial Difficulty | Date | September 2023 |
| Lead Officer | Julie Andrews | Contact Tel. | 07919 291012 |
| Annual Funding Proposal (£) | 2023-24 | | |
| | £100,000 | | |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓)? | Primary | Secondary | |
| | ✓ | ✓ | |
| What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil. | Primary | Secondary | |
| | £3.51 | £3.51 | |
| Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes) | | | |
| Maintained | | | |
| How has this proposal been calculated? | | | |
| <p>The DSG and the Council continue to face greater financial risk due to the increasing number of schools falling into financial difficulty. This is largely due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School unable to set a balanced budget and getting into financial difficulties. • Sponsored Academy conversions, when a school with a deficit becomes a sponsored academy, the deficit remains with the LA, to be funded from its core budget. If it converts with a surplus this goes to the new trust. • It is expected that the impact from the National Funding Formula may lead to further requests from this funding source. <p>School deficits are not an allowable charge on the LA's schools budget (funded by its allocation of Dedicated Schools Grant); however, if the schools forum has agreed to de-delegate a contingency provision, then the deficit may be funded from that contingency, depending on the criteria agreed for its use.</p> <p>All schools are required to submit a balanced budget that has been agreed with Governors by 15th May each year. Those schools that are unable to balance their budgets can submit a licensed deficit application by the same date that will be considered in line with the scheme guidance. This has to be agreed by the Director for Children's Services and the Chief Finance Officer of the Council.</p> <p>This contingency would be to assist maintained schools where, for a range of potential reasons they are experiencing financial difficulty to a degree likely to impact adversely on the education of pupils. The maximum bid that schools can request is £125,000.</p> <p>The amount proposed of £100,000 in 2024-25 is to maintain a contingency to fund schools in financial difficulty and to be able to deal with deficit balances of closing schools. This request would add to the existing £495,600 carried forward from the previous year.</p> | | | |

- The contingency cannot be overspent in any financial year. Once the funding has finished, no more applications/cases will be considered for that financial year.
- Schools are expected to self-fund a proportion of any claim equivalent to an agreed percentage of their annual budget and eligibility for support also takes into account the school's previous, current, and future balances.

**What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal?
(Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)**

The funding provides temporary support to schools to temporarily to resolve issues systematically to meet immediate financial pressures.

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

Not applicable

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

A deficit incurred from a sponsored academy conversion has to be retained by the authority. The funding of a deficit would have a detrimental impact on the services the Council are able to provide to schools.

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Salaries (£) | | |
| Services (£) | | |
| Other costs (£) | | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

The expenditure will be monitored by the Assistant Director for Children and Education. Regular updates will be reported to School Forum.

How will impact be evaluated?

Via reports to Schools Forum annually on how the funding has been deployed and through budget monitoring.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

N/A

| DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2022-23 | |
|---|--|
| Impact report | |
| Title of the Budget | Schools in Financial Difficulty |
| Lead Officer: | Julie Andrews |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £100,000 |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools. (E.g. KPI's, service statistics, etc.) | |
| <p>One request was received between April 2022 and March 2023 for £29,000 (Brickhouse Primary School). The amount remaining from the 2022-23 allocation was £71,000. In addition, £408,944.93 was carried forward from the previous year. Therefore, the amount held within the contingency fund at this point stands at £479,944.93</p> <p>It is expected that the impact from the National Funding Formula may lead to further requests from this funding source.</p> | |

This page is intentionally left blank

| EDUCATION FUNCTIONS PROPOSAL 2024-25 | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | Education Benefits Service |
| Lead Officer | Sue Moore |
| Reference Number | EF1 |
| Annual Funding Proposal | £134,000 |
| Date of Funding Proposal | September 2023 |
| Is the service provided a statutory function | YES |
| If Yes please provide detail | |
| <p>There is a statutory duty for eligibility for FSM to be checked There is a statutory duty for Home to School transport entitlement to be assessed</p> | |
| How has this proposal been calculated | |
| <p>Calculations based on the number of pupils in maintained schools eligible for FSM's as at October 2023. Funding will be deducted from each school based on the number of pupils eligible for FSM. Academies will be charged separately cost of service per eligible pupil.</p> | |
| What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services) | |
| <p>As with previous years the service has been enhanced to support schools to maximise income for schools from Pupil Premium and offer support above and beyond normal service provision. This has been beneficial to schools particularly as it ensures they secure additional funding. However, the removal of Education Service Grant (£2.9m) by DfE has had significant impact on the council's ability to maintain services at the current enhanced level. It is not the council's intention to pass the entire loss of this grant on to schools but will make significant savings to ensure that minimal requests are passed to schools for funding. The Education Funding Agency requires the council to negotiate with schools on the amount that can be held back as a de-delegated proposal for this service. Given the current financial climate the council is proposing that a proportion of these costs are met by schools. The above DSG de-delegated proposal is based on schools contributing to of anticipated costs for financial year commencing Apr 2024.</p> <p>Administration for FSM eligibility is undertaken by Education Benefits Team and the team's performance targets are to increase FSM eligibility and maximise Pupil Premium for Sandwell Schools.</p> | |

This funding will provide an auditable system to schools that has reduced the bureaucracy for school's administrators regarding FSM eligibility applications

- a) FSM eligibility is determined and instant eligibility checks done for schools/families, removing requirement for benefit evidence to be produced.
- b) Education Benefits check for new FSM claims each month to ensure continuous auditable eligibility for schools. Schools are updated weekly, using secure data transfer systems, of new and discontinued eligibility to FSM's
- c) All administration for the roll out of Universal Credit ensuring schools benefit from accurate 'protection' period dates to ensure Pupil Premium is maximised. No renewal/checking system for schools to administer.
- d) No need for families to reapply and claim continues until pupil leaves school if parent/carer remains in receipt of eligible benefits. Those families that are not eligible will continue to be checked on a monthly basis so that if circumstances change and they become eligible, school/family will be notified and there will be no need for family to make another application.
- e) Real time updated eligibility to schools.
- f) on-line application facility available for parents/carers
- g) Schools benefit from the increased FSM applications which have been generated by the following initiative. The School Clothing Scheme now generates FSM applications for those families who apply for clothing vouchers and do not have a current live FSM's claim.
- h) Continued awareness campaign and promotion of FSM's at events throughout the Borough.
- i) Universal FSM's for all KS1 pupils – eligibility checks on all KS1 pupils to ensure that all Pupil Premium pupils can be identified for those families entitled to a Universal meal.
- j) Eligibility checks, appeals and policy development for statutory Home to School transport entitlement
- k) Administration of School Clothing Scheme
- l) Administration of Home to School Transport (mainstream)

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

Schools will have to administer an auditable system for new FSM applications and all revisions of current applications as they would have no access to the Eligibility Checking System and Inland Revenue support for queries.

Evidence/proof of benefits will need to be obtained by school to determine eligibility for FSM's, Universal meals pupils eligible for Pupil Premium and Early Years Pupil Premium (nursery).

Schools will not benefit from the increased eligibility to FSM created by initiatives managed by the LA/Education Benefits Team (See (g) above)

Loss of expertise and knowledge from the Education Benefits Team who provide an advice/guidance service to schools and families.

School clothing support would need to be administered and managed by schools who would need to set up their own schemes to support low income families who cannot afford to purchase school uniforms.

Schools would need to administer all changes of eligibility and eligibility protection periods within the legislation re the roll out of the Universal Credit benefit scheme.

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Salaries | £134,000 | |
| Services | £ | |
| Schools | £ | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

Ongoing budget monitoring procedures

How will impact be evaluated?

Numbers eligible to FSM's and Pupil Premium generated

Please detail any income generated by the service?

Academies are charged for service and costs to maintained schools are reduced pro rata
Income generated from external customers is offset against costs to reduce costs of service to Sandwell maintained schools

This page is intentionally left blank

| EDUCATION FUNCTIONS PROPOSAL 2024-25 | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | Children's Clothing Support Allowance |
| Lead Officer | Sue Moore |
| Reference Number | EF2 |
| Annual Funding Proposal | £33,000 |
| Date of Funding Proposal | September 2023 |
| Is the service provided a statutory function | NO |
| Please provide overview | |
| Sandwell Local Authority (LA) has traditionally provided a contribution towards the purchase of school clothing to parents on a low income with children transferring to, or in, secondary school and to those starting school for the first time, where there is a requirement for them to have a uniform (year reception and years 7 to 11). | |
| How has this proposal been calculated | |
| Cost of £20/£25 vouchers for school uniform issued to low income families entitled to receive FSM | |
| What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services) | |
| Assists families most in need of financial support who struggle with the cost of school uniform. Generates FSM application – Criteria is the same as for FSM's and an application is generated by the clothing application thus identifying those who have not made an application for FSM. The scheme captures those families who are unwilling to apply for FSM's but do apply for the clothing voucher. | |
| What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered) | |
| N/A | |
| What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal? | |
| Schools will not benefit from the additional FSM/Pupil Premium generated by the Sandwell scheme. Risks identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have impact on attendance for those pupils no longer entitled if they are unable to purchase a uniform; • Could result in pupils being unable to purchase a uniform and subject to bullying; • Pupils from low income families in Sandwell would be affected. | |

| How will the amount be deployed? | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| Salaries | £ | |
| Services | £33,000 | |
| Schools | £ | |
| How will expenditure be monitored? | | |
| Secure vouchers issued are monitored on a weekly basis | | |
| How will impact be evaluated? | | |
| Number of new FSM applications /Pupil Premium generated | | |
| Please detail any income generated by the service? | | |
| Academies are charged for this service and have not been included in the 33K figure which is for maintained schools only | | |
| Administration costs are absorbed by the Education Benefits Service | | |

DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2024-25

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Full Title of Proposal | Safeguarding / Schools Attendance Support Service | |
| Lead Officer | Sue Moore / Ramsey Richards | |
| Reference Number | CSSB5 (EF3) | |
| Annual Funding Proposal | ££512,000 (from April 2024) | |
| Date of Funding Proposal | September 2023 | |
| Which phase of school does this support (✓) | Primary | Secondary |
| | ✓ | ✓ |
| What proportion will each phase bear Please state as an amount per pupil. | Primary | Secondary |
| | £8.60 per pupil | £8.60 per pupil |
| Is the service provided a statutory function | Yes | |

If yes, please provide detail

1. Safeguarding (MASH / Domestic Abuse screening & notifications / Support for designated safeguarding leads plus Position of Trust / Child death and serious case reviews/ SSCB s175/s157 safeguarding audits etc.
2. School support to improve & maintain pupil attendance (data plus guidance, and advice).
Legal action - penalty notices and prosecution of irregular attendance.
Monitoring and enforcement of pupil registration regulations / removal from roll etc.
3. Child employment & entertainment licensing
4. Children Not in School: Children missing education / Children missing from education / Welfare Support
5. Children Educated Otherwise than at school e.g. Elective Home Education and Alternative Provision

How has this proposal been calculated?

Schools Funding Forum: Safeguarding / Schools Attendance Service

This DSG Education Functions proposal based on 34.3% of anticipated costs for financial year commencing Apr 2024..

Cost of current service delivery (financial year commencing Apr 2023)

1. £307,800 – Safeguarding (including Service line management / supervision)
2. £662,000 – Schools Attendance Support (front facing plus duty and admin)
3. £260,100 – Child employment & licensing plus Elective home education
4. £ 95,200– Children not in school x1 plus PNs and Court

Total: £1,325,100

**What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal?
(Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)**

The Schools Attendance Support Service, core offer, as from September 2023 is in line with the DFE expectations based on the White paper. The current provision includes 1.5 allocated attendance support officer per town plus continuing support from, a duty practitioner, a court practitioner and 1 CME Officer.

The Service will ensure:

- Targeted schools’ meetings for those with greatest need this academic year.
- Locality based “attendance solutions panel” meetings with Strengthening Families.
- Cohort focused interventions e.g., persistent absence plus educational neglect.
- Attendance campaign: “Attend School for Best Start in Life” (launched September 2022 & 2023).
- Permanent duty practitioner providing consistent support & guidance to schools.
- Permanent Court practitioner to focus on prosecutions and evidential reliability.

The National average for front facing attendance support officers is 1 ASO per 5000 pupils - excludes CNiS / CME. Sandwell has 52600 pupils and 9 front (locality) facing attendance support officer posts = 1 ASO per 5800 students.

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

All service functions are statutory.

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

Based on available data, any reduction in capacity / resources and/or loss of income is likely to have a detrimental impact of the Local Authorities ability to maintain and enhance support as required by current statutory duties and responsibilities.

Please see additional Impact Report submitted with this funding proposal.

To effectively manage the significant increase in referrals, including penalty notices and court work we will need to further increase the capacity of the team from income generated – see table below * **(next page)**

How will the amount be deployed?

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| Salaries | £512,000 | |
| Services | £ | |
| Other costs | £ | |

How will expenditure be monitored?

Finance / Quality standards programme executive

How will impact be evaluated?

Quality standards programme executive

Please detail any income generated by the service?

| * | 2020-21 (Sept - Aug) | 2021-22 Sept - Aug) | 2022-23 (Sept - Jul) |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Penalty notices issued by the local authority to parents or guardians in relation to their child or children's school attendance. | 44 | 927 | 3011 |
| 2. Revenue generated from penalty notices issued in relation to school attendance. | £2,880 | £49,920 | £150,000 (@ July 2023) |
| 3. Prosecutions pursued / pending due school absence | Nil (Covid) | 83 | 191 @ 040723 |

This income is used to maintain the “administration of justice” as per current legislation.

DE-DELEGATED/EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OUTTURN 2021-22

Impact report September 2023

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------------|
| Title of the Budget | Safeguarding / Schools Attendance Support Service | | |
| Lead Officer: | Sue Moore / Ramsey Richards | Reference no: | CSSB5 |
| 2022-23 Funding: | £455,000 - option 2 as agreed previously | | |
| A brief outline on how the funding was used, and the service impact to maintained schools and academies. (E.g. KPI's, service statistics, etc.) | | | |

Safeguarding

Please see data below for academic year 2022/23:

| Type of Referral | Number |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| MASH | 1844 |
| DA Notifications | 7707 |
| MARAC | 937 |
| TOTAL | 10488 |

| Outcomes for MASH/STRAT | 2022/23 |
|--|----------------|
| Section 47 (Joint and single agency) | 707 |
| Single Assessment | 685 |
| Early Help/Targeted Support | 106 |
| Universal Services (Single Agency Responses) | 66 |
| NFA: No Role for services | 73 |
| Total – MASH involvements | 1637 |
| <i>Outcome not recorded</i> | <i>207</i> |

Snapshot - Impact of other duties completed by MASH education staff:

- Advice support and guidance including Sample policy development has been offered to all education providers
- Training materials for Safeguarding material developed and made available to DSL's to use with school staff
- Facilitation of School DSP's visiting MASH to better understand Sandwell Safeguarding Processes
- Development of, support for and analysis of schools S175/157 Safeguarding audit

- Onsite school audits have also been carried out this academic year.
- 12 Single agency training sessions have been delivered including Threshold moderation and Safeguarding awareness sessions
- 5 DSP Forums facilitated
- Support provided to CDOP via the completion of child death returns liaising with schools and supporting rapid reviews etc
- LH chairs the L & D Subgroup and represents LA education on the neglect strategy subgroup. This will help drive the Attendance is everyone's business / Educational Neglect agendas.
- LH has delivered 24 Multi Agency Safeguarding courses (including GCP2, Core working together and Neglect) over the academic year 2021/22 and has supported the development of courses and training events over the year.
- QPPA support via engagement and information gathering from education providers around key themes
- 7 -minute briefing and guidance has been developed and has been uploaded onto the SCSP website following the "School Attendance is everyone's business event – 29th September 2022.

Attendance

Our journey so far

- Changed Service Name from Attendance & Prosecution Service to Schools Attendance Support Service
- Produced a 'Schools Attendance Support Pack'
- Held multiple training sessions for schools
- Introduced an Attendance Audit Tool
- Supported with County Lines Intensification Week
- Produced an Illness Guidance
- Started work on Educational Neglect with Partners
- Held Half Termly Attendance Forums
- Produced Half Termly Newsletters
- Started to build relationships with schools



Working Together

- Children’s Commissioner, Rachel de Souza, confirms shared duty of all agencies responsible for safeguarding to take action to improve school attendance
- Conference held 29th September 2022 included
 - Sandwell Schools
 - Sandwell Children’s Trust including Strengthening Families, Horizons and the Youth Justice Service
 - Health and Public Health colleagues including School Nurses
 - Police
 - Violence Reduction Partnership
 - SCVO and our voluntary and community sector partners.



Data period ending Half term 6 2022/23

- Data confirms the challenges ahead in terms of attendance / persistent absence and the expectations of the DFE / White Paper.

| % | ALL 54,910 | Primary | Secondary | Special | PRU | Authorised | Unauthorised |
|----------------|--------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----|------------|--------------|
| 90-100% | 41,557 (75.68%) | 24,259 | 16,880 | 354 | 64 | 3.12% | 1.00% |
| 70-90% | 10,989 (20.01%) | 5,799 | 4,939 | 159 | 92 | 9.12% | 6.15% |
| 50-70% | 1,208 (2.20%) | 405 | 700 | 30 | 73 | 16.27% | 21.38% |
| 0-50% | 1,156 (2.11%) | 291 | 675 | 39 | 151 | 22.25% | 48.25% |



Number of Referrals to HT6 2022/23

| | HT1 | HT2 | HT3 | HT4 | HT5 | HT6 | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Leave of Absence | 300 | 188 | 281 | 210 | 372 | 608 | 1959 |
| Legal Intervention Referral | 43 | 59 | 93 | 61 | 113 | 138 | 507 |
| Attendance Support Request | 68 | 82 | 71 | 45 | 53 | 126 | 445 |
| Removal from Roll | 649 | 295 | 239 | 151 | 191 | 201 | 1726 |
| Removal from Roll EHE | 67 | 52 | 71 | 40 | 45 | 68 | 343 |
| Non-Arrival / Refusal of Place | 143 | 55 | 27 | 22 | 26 | 40 | 313 |
| School Attendance Orders | 7 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 17 |
| Children Missing Education - Closed | 124 | 101 | 96 | 54 | 54 | 104 | 533 |
| TOTAL | 1401 | 833 | 883 | 585 | 856 | 1285 | 5843 |



Legal work undertaken

Court action as at 29/08/2023

3396 Penalty Notices prepared and still more to come (compared to 925 in the 21/22 academic year)

365 Court files produced/part produced - including

63 have been heard in court, found guilty and fined

101 are in preparation

42 are currently in the Legal process awaiting trial

Total fines imposed by Court – including Victim Surcharge and Costs £24,865

Lowest total fine to any one parent £141

Highest total fine to any one parent £1709



Our Work Continues 2023-24

- Revised the Schools Attendance Support Pack
- About to launch the Illness Guidance and Educational Neglect
- Start to work with Faith Groups to help support the local communities
- Potential LA 'Rewards Scheme' to celebrate good and improved attendance
- Work with schools to promote 'Whole School Approach'

This page is intentionally left blank

ILO - UNCLASSIFIED

Schools Forum

2 October 2023

Falling Rolls Fund 2024-25

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Approve the introduction of a Falling Rolls Fund (FRF) for all Sandwell schools experiencing falling rolls from 2024-25.
- 1.2 If approval is given to set up a FRF to then approve an option from the two presented to Schools Forum on assessing the eligibility criteria.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To ask Schools Forum approval for the introduction of a FRF (or not) and any subsequent eligibility criteria to be used to fund Sandwell schools experiencing falling rolls.

3. Report Details

- 3.1 After meeting as a sub group in July 2023 to discuss the criteria to be used for eligibility for FRF there were 5 options considered and it was acknowledged that there were 2 viable options that could potentially work for Sandwell.
- 3.2 In August 2023 the Department of Education updated the Growth and Falling rolls funding guidance. The new guidance includes only 2 eligibility options. These are outlined in Appendix 1.
- 3.3 It should be noted that previously only schools rated good or outstanding could qualify for falling rolls funding and this criterion has now been removed.
- 3.4 It should also be noted that where Local Authorities operate a falling roll fund they will only be able to provide funding where

[ILO: UNCLASSIFIED]

school capacity data (SCAP)¹ shows that school places will be required in the subsequent three to five years. This is a mandatory requirement.

- 3.5 Where the places are not expected to be required the expectation is that the PAN² would be reduced.
- 3.6 Appendix 1 includes an analysis of the options and an analysis of the data collected in Appendix 2.
- 3.7 Appendix 2 (spreadsheet) contains falling roll data including all Sandwell schools. Where a school meets the criteria under the guidance it is shaded red.
- 3.8 Until October census figures are known and finalised, it is difficult at this time to estimate how much funding will be needed for the 2024-25 FRF. An estimate of this will be provided as soon as it is known.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That Schools Forum decide if a FRF is necessary and give formal approval of its introduction.
- 4.2 That Schools Forum consider and approve an option for the criteria for eligibility to access the FRF from 2024-25.

Sue Moore, Assistant Director – Education Support Services, Children and Education

Date: 25/09/2023

Contact Officer: Rachel Hill

Email: Rachel_hill@sandwell.gov.uk

¹ SCAP is a statutory collection. The Local Authority must complete statutory collections by law unless there's a good reason not to.

² School Admission Code 2021, The Education (Determination of Admission Arrangements) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2002 defines Published Admission Number as "...a number for each relevant age group. This is the age group at which pupils are or will normally be admitted to the school e.g. reception, year 7 and year 12."

Setting Falling Rolls Funding criteria:

The updated guidance provides only 2 viable options of compliant criteria.

Option 1

- the total number on roll (NOR) has dropped by at least 5% between last October census and the previous year's October census
- spare capacity³ of the school is a minimum of 15% of PAN
- school capacity data shows that school places will be required in the subsequent 3 to 5 years

Where a school meets all the above criteria, funding will be provided using the following calculation:

- the NOR as at last October census will be deducted from the NOR of the previous October's census. The result will be multiplied by the current basic entitlement rate, appropriate to phase, pro rata April to August (5 months)

Or

Option 2

Additional funding is allocated based on a proportion of the basic entitlement for vacant places below 85% of the PAN for the normal year of entry (reception or year 7) and also for the next year group after entry (year 1 and year 8). Funding is available for a maximum of 3 years (provided PAN data shows places are needed in the next 3 to 5 years) after which a school's PAN may be adjusted or other action taken.

³ "The number of places the school can provide for. For local authority-maintained schools, capacity is defined by a physical measurement and calculated in the [net capacity assessment](#)."

For academies, including free schools, capacity is reported as per their funding agreement, subject to any information that the local authority holds in addition."

Analysis of Appendix 2 falling roll data collection is as follows:

Option 1

All schools that have a difference of more than 5 % between 2021 and 2022 have been highlighted red.

This criteria does not always give a clear picture of a falling roll. For example Great Bridge Primary admitted over its PAN in 2021 but not in 2022. Therefore, the data is showing a drop between the two years of 6.25% but the school has a NOR in 2022 that matches its PAN. Where this has happened at other schools those too have not been highlighted.

Also, Cape Primary NOR in 2021 is 15.07% lower than its PAN. In 2022 the NOR is less than in 2021 but as the criteria compares 2022 to 2021 is shows as only a 2% drop rather than another year of a falling roll (16.9% lower than its PAN).

The only school that meets all three of the criteria under option 1 is Perryfields Academy. The calculation applied to this qualifying school would be the NOR as at last October census (976) will be deducted from the NOR of the previous October's census (1061). The result will be multiplied by the current basic entitlement rate/AWPU (£5184.44), appropriate to phase, pro rata April to August (5 months); $1061 - 976 \times \text{£}5184.44 / 12 \times 5 = \text{£}183,615.58$

Option 2

Looks at a pattern of falling rolls over a two year period and is based only on the year of entry rather than the whole school as in Option 1. Schools where the NOR is lower than 85% PAN have been highlighted in red. As mentioned previously the SCAP 2023 does not forecast an increase in Primary places over the next 3 years so no primary school would qualify for funding. SCAP 2023 does forecast the need for Secondary places in the next 3 years. Therefore, Oldbury Academy and Perryfields Academy would meet all the criteria in Option 2.

The calculation for funding in option 2 refers to a "proportion of the basis entitlement/AWPU". It does not say what that proportion should be.

An example of the calculation that could be applied is NOR October 2022 deducted from PAN x basic entitlement/AWPU for example Perryfields Academy PAN 240 – NOR 181 x £5184.44 = £305,881.96.

Option 1

| School | PAN | NOR Census Oct 21 | NOR Census Oct 22 | Census differenc e 21-22 | Capacity | Spare capacity mini 15% of overall PAN | SCAP data places required next 3 - 5 years Y/N |
|------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| ABBEY INFANTS | 270 | 263 | 255 | 3.04% | 270 | 5.56% | N |
| Abbey Junior School | 360 | 354 | 353 | 0.28% | 360 | 1.94% | N |
| Albert Pritchard Infant | 270 | 237 | 230 | 2.95% | 270 | 14.81% | N |
| All Saints CoFE Primary School | 420 | 413 | 410 | 0.73% | 369 | -11.11% | N |
| Annie Lennard School | 210 | 204 | 200 | 1.96% | 210 | 4.76% | N |
| Bearwood Primary School | 420 | 406 | 406 | 0.00% | 418 | 2.87% | N |
| Blackheath Primary | 420 | 435 | 444 | -2.07% | 450 | 1.33% | N |
| Bleakhouse Primary School | 420 | 392 | 394 | -0.51% | 412 | 4.37% | N |
| BRANDHALL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 396 | 405 | -2.27% | 420 | 3.57% | N |
| BRICKHOUSE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 210 | 196 | 206 | -5.10% | 198 | -4.04% | N |
| BURNT TREE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 394 | 401 | -1.78% | 420 | 4.52% | N |
| Cape Primary | 630 | 535 | 523 | 2.24% | 616 | 15.10% | N |
| CAUSEWAY GREEN PRIMARY | 420 | 404 | 410 | -1.49% | 420 | 2.38% | N |
| Christ Church CoFE Primary School | 420 | 410 | 389 | 5.12% | 420 | 7.38% | N |
| Corngreaves Primary | 210 | 206 | 207 | -0.49% | 210 | 1.43% | N |
| Crocketts Community Primary School | 420 | 425 | 425 | 0.00% | 420 | -1.19% | N |
| Devonshire Infant Academy | 270 | 272 | 269 | 1.10% | 270 | 0.37% | N |
| Devonshire Junior Academy | 360 | 356 | 360 | -1.12% | 360 | 0.00% | N |
| Eaton Valley Primary School | 420 | 418 | 410 | 1.91% | 420 | 2.38% | N |
| Ferndale Primary School | 630 | 570 | 542 | 4.91% | 630 | 13.97% | N |
| Galton Valley Primary School | 420 | 454 | 419 | 7.71% | 420 | 0.24% | N |
| George Betts | 420 | 389 | 392 | -0.77% | 411 | 4.62% | N |
| Glebefields Primary School | 420 | 384 | 361 | 5.99% | 412 | 12.38% | N |
| Grace Mary Primary School | 210 | 214 | 227 | -6.07% | 210 | -8.10% | N |
| Great Bridge Primary School | 420 | 448 | 420 | 6.25% | 420 | 0.00% | N |
| Grove Vale Primary | 420 | 418 | 420 | -0.48% | 420 | 0.00% | N |
| Hall Green Primary School | 420 | 417 | 412 | 1.20% | 420 | 1.90% | N |
| Hamstead Infant School | 180 | 161 | 173 | -7.45% | 176 | 1.70% | N |
| HAMSTEAD JUNIOR SCHOOL | 240 | 227 | 235 | -3.52% | 240 | 2.08% | N |
| Hanbury Primary School | 420 | 422 | 421 | 0.24% | 420 | -0.24% | N |
| Hargate Primary School | 420 | 422 | 418 | 0.95% | 420 | 0.48% | N |
| Harvills Hawthorn Primary Sch | 420 | 419 | 424 | -1.19% | 420 | -0.95% | N |
| Hateley Heath Primary Academy | 420 | 396 | 384 | 3.03% | 420 | 8.57% | N |
| Highfields Primary School | 420 | 395 | 412 | -4.30% | 420 | 1.90% | N |
| Holy Name | 210 | 190 | 199 | -4.74% | 210 | 5.24% | N |
| Holy Trinity C.E. | 420 | 411 | 416 | -1.22% | 402 | -3.48% | N |
| Holyhead Primary Academy | 210 | 192 | 191 | 0.52% | 172 | -11.05% | N |
| JOSEPH TURNER PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 401 | 409 | -2.00% | 391 | -4.60% | N |
| Jubilee Park Academy | 210 | 179 | 178 | 0.56% | 210 | 15.24% | N |
| King George V Primary | 210 | 205 | 205 | 0.00% | 210 | 2.38% | N |
| LANGLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 409 | 401 | 1.96% | 412 | 2.67% | N |
| Lightwoods Primary Academy | 420 | 381 | 415 | -8.92% | 406 | -2.22% | N |
| Lodge Primary School | 420 | 420 | 399 | 5.00% | 420 | 5.00% | N |
| Lyng Primary School | 420 | 443 | 433 | 2.26% | 448 | 3.35% | N |
| Mesty Croft Primary | 420 | 409 | 397 | 2.93% | 361 | -9.97% | N |
| MOAT FARM INFANT SCHOOL | 360 | 357 | 360 | -0.84% | 330 | -9.09% | N |
| MOAT FARM JUNIOR SCHOOL | 480 | 482 | 480 | 0.41% | 444 | -8.11% | N |
| Moorlands Primary School | 210 | 199 | 206 | -3.52% | 210 | 1.90% | N |
| NEWTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL | 210 | 197 | 193 | 2.03% | 192 | -0.52% | N |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------|------|---------|---|
| Oakham Primary School | 420 | 414 | 419 | -1.21% | 420 | 0.24% | N |
| Ocker Hill Academy | 256 | 252 | 251 | 0.40% | 237 | -5.91% | N |
| Ocker Hill Infant School | 180 | 176 | 182 | -3.41% | 180 | -1.11% | N |
| OLD HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 210 | 189 | 199 | -5.29% | 207 | 3.86% | N |
| Old Park Primary School | 420 | 422 | 417 | 1.18% | 450 | 7.33% | N |
| Our Lady and St. Hubert's | 420 | 421 | 414 | 1.66% | 420 | 1.43% | N |
| PARK HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 210 | 213 | 211 | 0.94% | 210 | -0.48% | N |
| Pennyhill Primary School | 630 | 622 | 578 | 7.07% | 630 | 8.25% | N |
| Perryfields Primary School | 420 | 360 | 341 | 5.28% | 420 | 18.81% | N |
| Reddal Hill Primary School | 420 | 380 | 395 | -3.95% | 327 | -20.80% | N |
| Rood End Primary School | 420 | 453 | 460 | -1.55% | 464 | 0.86% | N |
| Rounds Green Primary School | 420 | 368 | 345 | 6.25% | 420 | 17.86% | N |
| ROWLEY HALL PRIMARY | 630 | 598 | 585 | 2.17% | 617 | 5.19% | N |
| Ryders Green Primary School | 420 | 417 | 419 | -0.48% | 420 | 0.24% | N |
| Sacred Heart Primary School | 420 | 406 | 401 | 1.23% | 420 | 4.52% | N |
| Shireland Hall Primary Academy | 630 | 608 | 627 | -3.13% | 630 | 0.48% | N |
| Shireland Technology Primary School | 420 | 208 | 264 | -26.92% | 420 | 37.14% | N |
| Silvertrees Academy | 270 | 258 | 259 | -0.39% | 270 | 4.07% | N |
| Springfield Primary School | 420 | 415 | 411 | 0.96% | 420 | 2.14% | N |
| St Francis Xavier School | 210 | 211 | 201 | 4.74% | 210 | 4.29% | N |
| St James CE Primary School | 420 | 438 | 412 | 5.94% | 415 | 0.72% | N |
| St John's CE Primary Academy | 210 | 201 | 197 | 1.99% | 207 | 4.83% | N |
| St Margaret's C.E. School | 210 | 209 | 201 | 3.83% | 207 | 2.90% | N |
| ST MARTIN'S C.E.PRIMARY | 210 | 209 | 208 | 0.48% | 204 | -1.96% | N |
| St Matthew's C of E Primary School | 420 | 343 | 387 | -12.83% | 448 | 13.62% | N |
| St Philip's Catholic Primary School | 210 | 208 | 205 | 1.44% | 210 | 2.38% | N |
| St. Gregory's Catholic Primary School | 210 | 238 | 241 | -1.26% | 203 | -18.72% | N |
| ST. JOHN BOSCO CATHOLIC PRIMARY | 210 | 210 | 212 | -0.95% | 210 | -0.95% | N |
| ST. MARY MAGDALENE C OF E PRIMARY | 210 | 207 | 210 | -1.45% | 191 | -9.95% | N |
| St. Mary's Catholic Primary School | 210 | 212 | 209 | 1.42% | 180 | -16.11% | N |
| St. Paul's C of E Academy | 210 | 203 | 203 | 0.00% | 203 | 0.00% | N |
| Summerhill Primary Academy | 840 | 759 | 743 | 2.11% | 724 | -2.62% | N |
| Tameside Primary Academy | 420 | 466 | 417 | 10.52% | 592 | 29.56% | N |
| TEMPLE MEADOW PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 352 | 359 | -1.99% | 410 | 12.44% | N |
| The Priory Primary School | 420 | 387 | 411 | -6.20% | 420 | 2.14% | N |
| Timbertree Primary School | 210 | 204 | 205 | -0.49% | 210 | 2.38% | N |
| TIPTON GREEN JUNIOR | 360 | 359 | 351 | 2.23% | 360 | 2.50% | N |
| Tividale Community Primary | 420 | 412 | 414 | -0.49% | 420 | 1.43% | N |
| TIVIDALE HALL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 420 | 410 | 402 | 1.95% | 396 | -1.52% | N |
| Uplands Manor Primary School | 630 | 807 | 768 | 4.83% | 772 | 0.52% | N |
| Victoria Park Academy | 630 | 620 | 603 | 2.74% | 630 | 4.29% | N |
| Wednesbury Oak Academy | 420 | 399 | 413 | -3.51% | 397 | -4.03% | N |
| Whitecrest J and I | 210 | 205 | 206 | -0.49% | 210 | 1.90% | N |
| Wood Green Junior School | 360 | 357 | 341 | 4.48% | 360 | 5.28% | N |
| YEW TREE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 630 | 590 | 613 | -3.90% | 630 | 2.70% | N |
| Bristnall Hall Academy | 1100 | 1015 | 1041 | -2.56% | 1100 | 5.36% | |
| George Salter Academy | 1250 | 1175 | 1225 | -4.26% | 1689 | 27.47% | |
| Gospel Oak School | 1200 | 1158 | 1152 | 0.52% | 1477 | 22.00% | |
| Holly Lodge School | 1400 | 1393 | 1391 | 0.14% | 1614 | 13.82% | |
| Oldbury Academy | 1550 | 1364 | 1356 | 0.59% | 1603 | 15.41% | |
| Ormiston Forge Academy | 1550 | 1496 | 1518 | -1.47% | 1968 | 22.87% | |
| Ormiston Sandwell Community Academy | 1200 | 1106 | 1139 | -2.98% | 1263 | 9.82% | |
| Perryfields Academy | 1200 | 1061 | 976 | 8.01% | 1200 | 18.67% | Y |
| Phoenix Collegiate | 1750 | 1669 | 1684 | -0.90% | 2058 | 18.17% | |
| Q3 Academy | 1050 | 1054 | 1053 | 0.09% | 1150 | 8.43% | |
| Q3 Academy Tipton | 1500 | 1393 | 1392 | 0.07% | 1659 | 16.09% | |
| Q3 Langley | 1500 | 1254 | 1310 | -4.47% | 1500 | 12.67% | |
| Sandwell Academy | 1000 | 992 | 1000 | -0.81% | 1330 | 24.81% | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------|------|--------|--|
| Shireland Biomedical UTC | 600 | 98 | 149 | -52.04% | | | |
| Shireland Collegiate Academy | 1375 | 1257 | 1301 | -3.50% | 1708 | 23.83% | |
| St Michael's C.E. High School | 1200 | 1222 | 1216 | 0.49% | 1228 | 0.98% | |
| Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School | 750 | 716 | 727 | -1.54% | 891 | 18.41% | |
| West Bromwich Collegiate Academy | 750 | 486 | 646 | -32.92% | 750 | 13.87% | |
| Wodensborough Ormiston Academy | 1150 | 1106 | 1140 | -3.07% | 1150 | 0.87% | |
| Wood Green Academy | 1300 | 1290 | 1287 | 0.23% | 1604 | 19.76% | |

Option 2

| | PAN | Actual NOR normal year of entry October 2022 | | Actual NOR year group after entry October 2022 | | SCAP data places required next 3 Y/N |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|----------|---|----------|--|
| | | No | % of PAN | No | % of PAN | |
| ABBEY INFANTS | 90 | 78 | 86.67% | 87 | 96.67% | N |
| Abbey Junior School | 90 | 88 | 97.78% | 87 | 96.67% | N |
| Albert Pritchard Infant | 90 | 60 | 66.67% | 79 | 87.78% | N |
| All Saints CofE Primary School | 60 | 53 | 88.33% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Annie Lennard School | 30 | 24 | 80.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| Bearwood Primary School | 60 | 52 | 86.67% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Blackheath Primary | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Bleakhouse Primary School | 60 | 49 | 81.67% | 53 | 88.33% | N |
| BRANDHALL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 61 | 101.67% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| BRICKHOUSE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 30 | 29 | 96.67% | 28 | 93.33% | N |
| BURNT TREE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 50 | 83.33% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Cape Primary | 90 | 50 | 55.56% | 61 | 67.78% | N |
| CAUSEWAY GREEN PRIMARY | 60 | 56 | 93.33% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Christ Church CofE Primary School | 60 | 40 | 66.67% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Corngreaves Primary | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| Crocketts Community Primary School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Devonshire Infant Academy | 90 | 90 | 100.00% | 90 | 100.00% | N |
| Devonshire Junior Academy | 90 | 88 | 97.78% | 92 | 102.22% | N |
| Eaton Valley Primary School | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 57 | 95.00% | N |
| Ferndale Primary School | 90 | 52 | 57.78% | 79 | 87.78% | N |
| Galton Valley Primary School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| George Betts | 60 | 48 | 80.00% | 53 | 88.33% | N |
| Glebefields Primary School | 60 | 38 | 63.33% | 50 | 83.33% | N |
| Grace Mary Primary School | 30 | 29 | 96.67% | 32 | 106.67% | N |
| Great Bridge Primary School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Grove Vale Primary | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 61 | 101.67% | N |
| Hall Green Primary School | 60 | 55 | 91.67% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Hamstead Infant School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 55 | 91.67% | N |
| HAMSTEAD JUNIOR SCHOOL | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Hanbury Primary School | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Hargate Primary School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Harvills Hawthorn Primary Sch | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Hateley Heath Primary Academy | 60 | 26 | 43.33% | 56 | 93.33% | N |
| Highfields Primary School | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Holy Name | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 28 | 93.33% | N |
| Holy Trinity C.E. | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Holyhead Primary Academy | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 21 | 70.00% | N |
| JOSEPH TURNER PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 56 | 93.33% | 57 | 95.00% | N |
| Jubilee Park Academy | 30 | 19 | 63.33% | 25 | 83.33% | N |
| King George V Primary | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| LANGLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 51 | 85.00% | N |
| Lightwoods Primary Academy | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 58 | 96.67% | N |
| Lodge Primary School | 60 | 38 | 63.33% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Lyng Primary School | 60 | 50 | 83.33% | 57 | 95.00% | N |
| Mesty Croft Primary | 60 | 50 | 83.33% | 50 | 83.33% | N |
| MOAT FARM INFANT SCHOOL | 120 | 120 | 100.00% | 120 | 100.00% | N |
| MOAT FARM JUNIOR SCHOOL | 120 | 120 | 100.00% | 118 | 98.33% | N |
| Moorlands Primary School | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 27 | 90.00% | N |
| NEWTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL | 30 | 28 | 93.33% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| Oakham Primary School | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 61 | 101.67% | N |
| Ocker Hill Academy | 64 | 57 | 89.06% | 65 | 101.56% | N |
| Ocker Hill Infant School | 60 | 62 | 103.33% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| OLD HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 27 | 90.00% | N |
| Old Park Primary School | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Our Lady and St. Hubert's | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| PARK HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|---------|---|
| Pennyhill Primary School | 90 | 59 | 65.56% | 88 | 97.78% | N |
| Perryfields Primary School | 60 | 33 | 55.00% | 33 | 55.00% | N |
| Reddal Hill Primary School | 60 | 60 | 100.00% | 53 | 88.33% | N |
| Rood End Primary School | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 57 | 95.00% | N |
| Rounds Green Primary School | 60 | 35 | 58.33% | 57 | 95.00% | N |
| ROWLEY HALL PRIMARY | 90 | 77 | 85.56% | 78 | 86.67% | N |
| Ryders Green Primary School | 60 | 58 | 96.67% | 56 | 93.33% | N |
| Sacred Heart Primary School | 60 | 56 | 93.33% | 56 | 93.33% | N |
| Shireland Hall Primary Academy | 90 | 86 | 95.56% | 89 | 98.89% | N |
| Shireland Technology Primary School | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 58 | 96.67% | N |
| Silvertrees Academy | 90 | 82 | 91.11% | 91 | 101.11% | N |
| Springfield Primary School | 60 | 57 | 95.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| St Francis Xavier School | 30 | 28 | 93.33% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| St James CE Primary School | 60 | 58 | 96.67% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| St John's CE Primary Academy | 30 | 23 | 76.67% | 25 | 83.33% | N |
| St Margaret's C.E. School | 30 | 25 | 83.33% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| ST MARTIN'S C.E.PRIMARY | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| St Matthew's C of E Primary School | 60 | 51 | 85.00% | 61 | 101.67% | N |
| St Philip's Catholic Primary School | 30 | 29 | 96.67% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| St. Gregory's Catholic Primary School | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| ST. JOHN BOSCO CATHOLIC PRIMARY | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| ST. MARY MAGDALENE C OF E PRIMARY | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| St. Mary's Catholic Primary School | 30 | 29 | 96.67% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| St. Paul's C of E Academy | 30 | 25 | 83.33% | 29 | 96.67% | N |
| Summerhill Primary Academy | 120 | 81 | 67.50% | 104 | 86.67% | N |
| Tameside Primary Academy | 60 | 29 | 48.33% | 47 | 78.33% | N |
| TEMPLE MEADOW PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 58 | 96.67% | 48 | 80.00% | N |
| The Priory Primary School | 60 | 51 | 85.00% | 60 | 100.00% | N |
| Timbertree Primary School | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 28 | 93.33% | N |
| TIPTON GREEN JUNIOR | 90 | 83 | 92.22% | 90 | 100.00% | N |
| Tivdale Community Primary | 60 | 59 | 98.33% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| TIVIDALE HALL PRIMARY SCHOOL | 60 | 49 | 81.67% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Uplands Manor Primary School | 90 | 75 | 83.33% | 90 | 100.00% | N |
| Victoria Park Academy | 90 | 74 | 82.22% | 87 | 96.67% | N |
| Wednesbury Oak Academy | 60 | 58 | 96.67% | 59 | 98.33% | N |
| Whitecrest J and I | 30 | 30 | 100.00% | 30 | 100.00% | N |
| Wood Green Junior School | 90 | 73 | 81.11% | 87 | 96.67% | N |
| YEW TREE PRIMARY SCHOOL | 90 | 90 | 100.00% | 87 | 96.67% | N |
| Bristnall Hall Academy | 220 | 219 | 99.55% | 221 | 100.45% | Y |
| George Salter Academy | 250 | 249 | 99.60% | 250 | 100.00% | Y |
| Gospel Oak School | 240 | 230 | 95.83% | 244 | 101.67% | Y |
| Holly Lodge School | 280 | 267 | 95.36% | 266 | 95.00% | Y |
| Oldbury Academy | 310 | 260 | 83.87% | 240 | 77.42% | Y |
| Ormiston Forge Academy | 310 | 308 | 99.35% | 305 | 98.39% | Y |
| Ormiston Sandwell Community Academy | 240 | 240 | 100.00% | 222 | 92.50% | Y |
| Perryfields Academy | 240 | 146 | 60.83% | 181 | 75.42% | Y |
| Phoenix Collegiate | 350 | 343 | 98.00% | 329 | 94.00% | Y |
| Q3 Academy | 210 | 207 | 98.57% | 217 | 103.33% | Y |
| Q3 Academy Tipton | 300 | 295 | 98.33% | 280 | 93.33% | Y |
| Q3 Langley | 300 | 296 | 98.67% | 300 | 100.00% | Y |
| Sandwell Academy | 200 | 203 | 101.50% | 200 | 100.00% | Y |
| Shireland Biomedical UTC | 120 | 110 | 91.67% | 0 | 0.00% | Y |
| Shireland Collegiate Academy | 275 | 250 | 90.91% | 279 | 101.45% | Y |
| St Michael's C.E. High School | 240 | 239 | 99.58% | 237 | 98.75% | Y |
| Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School | 150 | 144 | 96.00% | 141 | 94.00% | Y |
| West Bromwich Collegiate Academy | 150 | 157 | 104.67% | 155 | 103.33% | Y |
| Wodensborough Ormiston Academy | 230 | 233 | 101.30% | 220 | 95.65% | Y |
| Wood Green Academy | 260 | 260 | 100.00% | 259 | 99.62% | Y |

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum

2 October 2023

Early Years 2023-24 Funding

This report is for information

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Note the contents of the report.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To inform members on 2023-24 funding rates and budgets available to the local authority which have been introduced by the Education and Skills Funding agency.

3. Report Details

- 3.1 In June 2023, the Education and Skills Funding Agency updated the “Early Years entitlements: local authority funding of providers – Operational Guide 2023-24”
- 3.2 The Department for Education (DfE) provides local authorities with 6 relevant funding streams which together form the early years block of the dedicated schools grant (DSG).
- 3.3 They are:
- 1) the 15 hours entitlement for disadvantaged 2-year-olds
 - 2) the universal 15 hours entitlement for all 3- and 4-year-olds
 - 3) the additional 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of 3- and 4-year olds
 - 4) the early years pupil premium (EYPP)
 - 5) the disability access fund (DAF)
 - 6) maintained nursery school (MNS) supplementary funding
- 3.4 The main changes from the requirements for the 2022/23 financial year are:

- clarification of local authorities' responsibilities in notifying providers of changes to local funding formulae
- additional information on the allocation of supplementary funding to maintained nursery schools
- in paying EYPP to early years providers, additional clarification on the payment of EYPP to childminders and further clarification on the payment of EYPP to providers for children in local authority care
- increases in the value of EYPP and DAF

3.5 **Local authority funding of the entitlements for 3 and 4-year-olds**

3.6 DfE funds local authorities on the same basis for both the universal 15 hours entitlement and the additional 15 hours entitlement for working parents. This is because the statutory framework and the quality requirements for the 2 entitlements are the same

3.7 Therefore local authorities are to fund their providers in the same way for both sets of hours and not to distinguish between the 2. This means using the same hourly base rate and same supplements for both entitlements.

3.8 **95% pass-through requirement**

Local authorities are required to plan to pass-through 95% of their 3- and-4-year-old funding from the government to early years providers.

3.9 The '95%' includes the following budget lines:

- base rate funding for all providers
- supplements for all providers
- the top-up grant element of SENIFs paid to providers
- contingency funding

The remaining 5% expenditure

- 3.10 The remaining 5% of expenditure could include the following:
- centrally retained funding (for central services or services in-kind, including special educational needs and disability (SEND) services)
 - transfer of any funding to 2-year-olds
 - any extra hours that local authorities choose to fund in addition to the government’s entitlement hours for 3- and 4-year-olds
 - any funding movement out of the early years block

The Early Years Allocations to the authority and funding rates to providers for 2023/24

3.11 A breakdown of the funding for the early years block as per the July 2023 allocation is shown in the table below:

| Description | Funding (£m) |
|---|---------------------|
| Universal entitlement – 3 & 4 Year olds | 16.051 |
| Additional 15 hours entitlement | 4.788 |
| 2-year old entitlement | 4.166 |
| Early Years Pupil Premium | 0.350 |
| Disability Access Funds | 0.135 |
| Total Funding | 25.490 |

- 3.12 At Spring Budget, the Chancellor announced we will invest additional funding for the existing early years entitlements worth £204m in 2023-24 (from September 2023) and £288m in 2024-25.
- 3.13 This is for local authorities to increase hourly rates paid to childcare providers for the government’s existing entitlement offers.
- 3.14 The grant provides supplementary funding for all existing early years funding streams: 3-4YOs; 2YOs; Disability Access Fund (DAF); Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP)
- 3.15 It covers the funding period September 2023 to March 2024
- 3.16 The funding rate is therefore;

| | 2023-24 EY DSG (Apr-Mar) | 2023-24 EYSG (Sept-Mar) | 2023-24 Effective rate (Sept-Mar) |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 2-Year-Olds (per hour) | £5.81 | £1.90 | £7.71 |
| 3-4-Year-olds (per hour) Flexibility & Deprivation is unchanged | £4.44 | £0.35 | £4.79 |
| EYPP (per hour) | £0.62 | £0.04 | £0.66 |
| DAF (per year) | £828 | £30.00 | £858 |

4. Recommendations

4.1 That Schools Forum Note the contents of the report.

Date: 22.09.2023
Contact Officer: Sara Baber.