

SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

SCHOOLS GROUP:

Maggie Waller (Chair), Julia Shepard (Vice-Chair), Christine Bamigbola, Barbara Clark, Gillian Coffey, John Constable, Henry Duffy, Martin Davis, Helen Huntley, Diane Lister, Maureen Mallinson, Paul McAteer, Charlie McGeachie, Kevin O'Driscoll, Kathy Perry, Jon Reekie, Mary Sparrow, Maggie Stacey, Jo Rockall and Kate Webb

OBSERVERS:

Lynda Bussley

OTHER ATTENDEES

Councillor Natasa Pantelic and Angela Mellish

LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

Robin Crofts, Margaret Dennison, Emma Foy, Christina West, Clair Pyper, Julie Evans and Wendy Sagar

DATE & TIME: WEDNESDAY, 18TH APRIL, 2012 AT 8.00 AM
BEECHWOOD CONFERENCE AND RESEARCH CENTRE, LONG READINGS LANE, SLOUGH

AGENDA

Page

1. Apologies
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of last meeting 6th March 2012 and Matters Arising **(Pages 1 - 4)**
4. Services to Schools and Academies - Charging Policy 2012-13 **(Pages 5 - 10)**
5. School Specific Contingency **(Pages 11 - 14)**
6. Local Authority Budgets Funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant **(Pages 15 - 20)**

7. Latest Schools Budgets 2012-13 **(Pages 21 - 26)**
8. School Funding Reform and Arrangements for 2013-14 **(Pages 27 - 28)**
9. Accountability for Dedicated Schools Grant **(Pages 29 - 34)**
10. Consultation - Improving the Assurance System for financial management in LA maintained schools **(Pages 35 - 42)**
11. SEN Funding Review Update **(Pages 43 - 74)**
12. Academies Update (verbal)
13. Updated Work Programme 2011-12 **(Pages 75 - 76)**

Slough Schools Forum- Meeting held on Tuesday, 6th March, 2012

Present: Maggie Waller, Holy Family Primary School (Chair)
Julia Shepard, Beechwood Secondary School (Vice-Chair)
Gillian Coffey, Lynch Hill Primary School
John Constable, Langley Grammar
Henry Duffy, Ryvers Primary School
Martin Davis, Colnbrook Primary School
Helen Huntley, Special Schools
Maureen Mallinson, Westgate Secondary School
Charlie McGeachie, Montem Primary School
Jon Reekie, James Elliman Primary School
Mary Sparrow, Wexham Secondary School
Maggie Stacey, St Anthony's RC Primary School
Jo Rockall, Herschel Grammar School
Bea Williams, Slough & Eton Academy

Observers: Lynda Bussley, NUT

Officers: Christina West, Clair Pyper, Wendy Sagar and Rochelle Fearon

PART I

102. Apologies

Apologies were received from Barbara Clark, Robin Crofts, Emma Foy, Jon Reekie and Paul McAteer. Paul had requested that Bea Williams attend as his substitute. Bea left the meeting, the substitution was discussed and formally ratified by the group, and Bea re-joined the meeting.

103. Declarations of Interest

None

104. Minutes of Last Meeting - 26th January 2012

- Teaching School: Gillian Coffey reported that building capacity funding has been granted and the process of a formal application is being undertaken.
- SBC SMT consultation: A formal response on behalf of Schools Forum was submitted and further clarification received back from the Chief Executive just before half term. This was circulated but unfortunately the timing made it difficult for members to respond further. Maggie Waller wrote again to the Chief Executive reinforcing the concerns of Schools Forum before the 20 February deadline. Clair Pyper informed the group that the Chief Executive will be writing in detail to the schools shortly. Clair will be incorporating the views expressed by headteachers into the review of LA services she is currently undertaking
- Transactional services: this is progressing well and the contract is due to be signed this week.

The minutes were confirmed as an accurate record.

105. Response to Consultation on School Funding Reform

A response on behalf of Schools Forum was submitted to the DfE by Slough Borough Council. A briefing paper analysing responses had been circulated with the agenda. Wendy Sagar reported the DfE have indicated that the process will continue to the next stage and further consultation will be issued. However there is no clear indication of when this will be and the forthcoming period of purdah before the May elections could well create a further delay.

106. Education Finance Settlement 2012-13

The DfE published the financial settlement for schools on 14 December 2011. The main aspects of the announcement concerned the DSG, the Minimum Funding Guarantee (GUF) and the increase in Pupil Premium. GUF figure from last year is unchanged and will be **£5,540.04**. The national Minimum Funding Guarantee is also unchanged at -1.5%. From 2012-13 the Pupil Premium will be increased to £600 and eligibility extended to include all pupils who have been eligible for Free School Meals at any point over the past six years. The increase is new money available to schools.

107. Indicative Budgets 2012-13

Indicative budgets have been made available to schools and it is important to note that the key issue for the local authority is the number of schools becoming Academies as this has a huge impact on funding. Headlines include:

- The increase in DSG is due to the growth in pupil numbers.
- School specific contingency and central DSG have been included at 2011-12 levels for planning purposes.
- Available Headroom is currently less at £0.223m though we may be eligible for some on-off amounts of funding in due course e.g. exceptional circumstances grant
- A summary of Formula Factors has been provided in Appendix B of the report circulated with the agenda and these have remained unchanged.
- All resource units have been funded using the Slough formula.
- The LA is working hard to resolve the funding issues affecting Haybrook and the Virtual School and this will continue in collaboration with the Headteacher outside of this meeting
- It should be recognised there are risks around pupil numbers as exact figures will not be known until June.

Wendy Sagar emphasised that these are indicative figures and work will continue on refining budgets. The outcome of this work will be presented to Schools Forum on 28 March. There are also other issues which have been discussed at SSEF and another meeting of that group is scheduled for 12 March. It is also important to note that the outcome of the SEN Review may require some transitional protection funding. It is expected that this can be funded from a one off carry forward from the centrally managed budgets.

Maggie Waller thanked officers for the timely circulation of budgets under difficult circumstances.

108. Schools Budget Monitoring Quarter 3 2012-13

A report outlining the projected financial position after the 3rd quarter was discussed and it was clarified that Appendix A gives the position of schools at the end of December 2011, with a projected year end balance. Some schools are exceeding the level set for the balance control mechanism. Christina West has circulated information where relevant. Christina clarified that it will be made clear in the final position statement which schools hold

'cluster' monies and confirmed that individual plans for projected spend will be requested and made available to the group after year end.

Discussion took place around the size of Slough schools' balances which continue to increase against a backdrop of falling levels nationally. Schools Forum needs to be assured that monies are allocated for planned spend. Referring to the paper circulated Mary Sparrow proposed the addition of a column indicating what balances are being earmarked for. Christina confirmed that schools' plans are reflected in this way in the final report at year end. Any proposals for implementation of the balance control mechanism will be discussed at SSEF and Mary Sparrow sought an assurance that relevant headteachers will be involved. Clair Pyper and Maggie Waller both gave an unqualified assurance that this would be the case.

109. SEN Review - Funded Banding Model

1. Membership of the Task and Finish Group has been updated and work is moving forward. Schools Forum is requested to validate the principles for the direction of the review. Schools Forum endorsed the principles.
2. Wendy Sagar clarified that the aim is to complete the review within the existing funding envelope but recognised that any changes may well require transitional funding arrangements to be made.
3. Clair Pyper highlighted the rising number of vulnerable pupils which is disproportionate to the increase in school population, especially in the areas of ASD and children moving towards a higher level of need. It is vital we undertake relevant forecasting work.
4. Helen Huntley expressed concerns that there is no indicative budget for the PRU which makes planning difficult. Wendy acknowledged this and advised that work is continuing with Helen to ultimately reach a position where long term the PRU is funded on a per pupil basis. Interim arrangements would be put in place in the interim.
5. Bandings are being worked on by the Review Group and schools will be consulted. Mainstream delegation is being discussed and will possibly be left until April 2013, with work continuing prior to September 2012.
6. Helen Huntley and Charlie McGeachie expressed concerns over the increasing pressure on Haybrook and Littledown. Clair Pyper advised that a report on the rebuilding programme is going to SBC Cabinet next week and linked to that will be the charging mechanism for Academies. Clair made it clear that Haybrook funding is a separate issue from the SEN Funding Review.
7. Charlie also raised the question of the £40k allocated for funding Services Supporting Behaviour which has not progressed. Clair reported that Julie Evans has been on leave and the matter will be resolved when she returns.
8. Clair Pyper and Helen Huntley will discuss Haybrook funding outside of Schools Forum in order to resolve the situation as quickly as possible. Julia Shepard gave examples of, and expressed concerns about, anomalies and unresolved funding within different areas of provision relating to previous financial years. Depending on the national funding formula for 2013-14, the Forum discussed the danger that these anomalies could be 'locked in'. Clair Pyper suggested that identifying the most significant areas was key and it was agreed, for example, that ongoing work by Jackie Wright is already making progress.
9. Maggie Waller predicted that some difficult decisions will be required in the future once the principles have been discussed and agreed.

110. Academies Verbal Update

10. A draft charging policy has now been prepared. The policy will be brought to the next meeting of Schools Forum prior to implementation for Academies from 1 April 2012.
11. Existing SLAs will continue with unchanged prices and terms and conditions rolling forward from 1 April.
12. Clair highlighted the significant and complex amount of work the LA has to undertake linked to schools adopting Academy status. There are no additional LA staff available as no support has been forthcoming from the DfE, plus the LA is also losing funding from

those schools. Clair has raised the issue at a national level but has received a negative response and only one of the schools involved has offered any financial contribution. Currently three schools will become Academies on 1 April, two on 1 June and one in September. There are a further four in the pipeline.

13. Lynda Bussley expressed concern that Slough Borough Council has taken a politically passive stance to the development of Academies within the town. This was felt to be an issue to raise with elected members and not the Schools Forum.

111. Forward Plan Revisions

- Centrally managed budgets 2012-13
- Schools specific contingency 2012-13
- Final Schools Budget 2012-13
- Accountability
- Charging policy
- Update on SEN Funding Review

Please note that since the meeting the provisional date of 28 March meeting has been cancelled and rescheduled for Wednesday, 18 April

Following that meeting further meeting dates are:

Wednesday, 16 May 2012

Tuesday, 4 July 2012

112. AOB

Maggie Waller proposed that a review of membership be undertaken to ensure the widest representation of all parties.

The meeting closed at 0940 with thanks to staff at Beechwood School for their continued support and hospitality.

(Note: The Meeting opened at 8.15 am and closed at 9.40 am)

**SLOUGH SCHOOL FORUM
18TH April 2012**

**Services to Schools and Academies - Charging Policy 2012-13
(Director of Resources & Regeneration)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek the views of Schools Forum on the charging arrangements for 2012/13 for Local Authority Services traded directly with maintained schools and academies. The main change is the inclusion of a number of newly traded services arising from the movement of funding from the Local Authority to academies.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the arrangements for traded services in 2012-13.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Local Authority reviews its Services for Schools each financial year in order to ensure that it continues to offer high quality and responsive services that provide 'best value' within the market for schools services generally. The authority has now reviewed its Services for Schools offer for 2012/13. The Service Level Agreement (SLA) offer is available on the Slough website.
- 3.2 In addition, Academies now receive funding for specific services previously held centrally by the Local Authority and provided for free to maintained schools. In 2011/12 Slough passed over some £353,000 of funding from Dedicated Schools Grant to the DfE from the Local Authority budgets funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant. This is combined with the Revenue Support Grant deduction made in 2011/12 of £366,000.
- 3.3 In order to ensure a level playing field between maintained schools and academies, it is now appropriate that academies should be charged for any services that they continue to receive and for which funding has been passed to them through Local Authority Central Services Equivalent Grant (LACSEG).
- 3.4 This arrangement will only apply for the financial year 2012-13. From 1 April 2013, the DfE is proposing greater delegation of centrally managed budgets to all maintained schools and Academies.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 At a meeting of the Schools Forum on 26th January 2012 funding was approved for a project to develop a Charging Policy for Academies. The policy is in respect of service responsibilities and funding that have transferred to the Academies and that were previously provided for free by the Local Authority
- 5.2 The services the council provides for schools are in three categories:
- Core / Statutory Services - apply to all maintained schools and Academies,
 - Traded services – available on a traded basis to all schools and academies, and
 - Additional Services – available free to maintained schools and from 1st April 2012 are chargeable to Academies
- 5.3 Slough will continue to provide statutory services to all schools and Academies.
- 5.4 Where Slough has historically offered a Traded Service to all maintained schools, this service will continue to be offered to maintained schools and Academies. Services will be available to Academies on the same basis as the offer to maintained schools. Some of these services will remain relevant to Academies, some will not. Academies will decide which services to procure from the Local Authority. The list of traded services is as follows;
- Counselling and Mediation
 - Behaviour Support Associates
 - Education Property Management
 - Free School Meal Eligibility HUB
 - Governor Support
 - Health and Safety advice and support
 - Human Resources / Employee Relations
 - ICT for School Administration (Capita Support Contract)
 - ICT Technical Support (Advice and support for purchase of ICT equipment / Software)
 - Legal
 - Occupational Health
 - Outdoor Play Equipment Inspection
 - Payroll
 - Psychology (non-statutory)
 - Radiation Protection
 - Risk Management and Insurance
 - Bursar Support
 - School Catering (for those in the contract)
 - School Crossing Patrols
 - School Financial Management Support
 - Service for Autism
 - Tree Management

- 5.5 Where functions or services have transferred to Academies, formal charging arrangements will be put in place for Academies. The full list of functions and services for which Academies assume responsibility is attached at Appendix A. The following services will commence more formal Academy charging arrangements from 1st April 2012.
- Admissions Appeals (Set up costs, attendance at appeal)
 - Attendance Work (Attendance Panel attendance and Fixed Penalty Notice issue)
 - Behaviour Support Service (Specialist Support Teachers annual packages, Individual bespoke intervention programmes)
 - ICT Technical Support (Advice / Support in respect of the management, maintenance and support of broadband networks)
 - Internal Audit services
 - School Emergency Planning Services
 - Trade Union Duties (via Montem Primary School)
- 5.6 The pricing model applied for the above services is based on actual cost, which is consistent with the model applied to all other traded services.
- 5.7 School Improvement / Raising Achievement services could be traded with Academies. However, the service is only funded to fulfil the Council's statutory functions for its residual maintained schools (Schools Forum - September 2011). Therefore, the council will not be providing any kind of non-statutory traded school improvement service for either its maintained schools or academies.
- 5.8 A letter was sent to all Academies on 30 March regarding available services for 2012-13.
- 5.9 Should Academies decide not to purchase services from the local authority, it will be necessary for services to be reduced.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 Not applicable.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

None

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner (ECS)
(01753 875627) <mailto:wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk>

List of Local Authority services that are included in the remit of LACSEG

Services and costs funded by Dedicated Schools Grant
Behaviour Support Services
14-16 Practical Learning options
Support to underperforming Minority ethnic groups and bilingual learners
School meals and milk
Assessment of free school meals eligibility
Repair and maintenance of kitchens
Museum and library services
Licences and subscriptions
Central staff costs (maternity, long term sickness and trade union duties)
Costs of certain employment terminations
Services and costs funded by Revenue Support Grant / Council Tax
Costs of a Local Authority's statutory and Regulatory duties
- Financial accounting requirements – including accounts, returns, VAT returns
- Financial assurance including internal and external audit
- Procurement advice and compliance
- Pension scheme administration
- HR employer functions
- Health and Safety compliance
- Governor support
- Strategic ICT and data management services
Asset management costs (excluding strategic LA capital planning and Mgt of BSF / PFI)
School improvement services
Monitoring of national curriculum assessment
Education Welfare Services (excluding prosecutions for non-attendance, Tracking children missing from education, child employment)
Pupil Support (Clothing Grants)
Music services
Visual and performing arts services
Outdoor education services
Certain redundancy and early retirement costs

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012
School Specific Contingency
(Director of Education and Children's Services)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise Schools Forum of the projected outturn 2011-12 and proposed budget 2012-13 in respect of the School Specific Contingency.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the projected outturn 2011-12 and proposed budget 2012-13 in respect of the School Specific Contingency.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for School's Forum to be aware of the level of the School Specific Contingency and of the inclusion of the contingency in the Local Authority Central Services Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) for Academies in 2012-13.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 Schools Forum will be aware that a number of budgets are set aside under the heading of School Specific Contingency.
- 5.2 Budgets within the contingency have been set up to support schools where circumstances change during the financial year, either on a school by school basis, or on a borough-wide basis, for example, a difference between the anticipated Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) when the budgets were built and the final allocation confirmed by the Department for Education (DfE).
- 5.3 Appendix A sets out the projected outturn compared to the budget approved by Schools Forum last year. Members of the Forum will note that the overall variation is a projected overspend of £4k. However this masks a number of underlying issues.
- 5.4 The budget for DSG – withdrawn grants was transferred into headroom and has already been allocated to schools.
- 5.5 The budget for practical learning is subject to LACSEG recoupment and has been reduced by £184,530 over the course of the year as a

result of the full and part year impact of maintained secondary schools converting to Academy status.

- 5.6 There have been some significant movements between the various budgets within the contingency, particularly noticeable in respect of new statements. Members of Schools Forum have previously been alerted to the increasing numbers of pupils with statements.
- 5.7 Appendix B sets out the proposed school specific contingency for 2012-13. The proposals incorporate a number of technical adjustments and budget movements. The gross budget across school specific contingency and transfers to local authority managed budgets remains at the same level as 2011-12.
- 5.8 Over the course of the last financial year and during the charging policy review, it became clear that a number of the budgets within the school specific contingency should be reported within the local authority managed budgets. These budgets have been transferred from the school specific contingency to the centrally managed budgets for 2012-13.
- 5.9 The remaining budgets have all been reviewed in the light of experience during 2011-12 and anticipated requirements during 2012-13. The EYSFF contingency has been retained at the current level as a result of the increasing provision of early years education by childminders which is difficult to predict. The difference between the 2011-12 gross budget and 2012-13 gross budget requirement, including transfers is £178,000. This additional budget has been allocated to new statements as the pressure on the budget is not expected to reduce.
- 5.10 With effect from 1 April 2012, the DfE are including school specific contingency in the LACSEG recoupment framework.
- 5.11 As a result, the schools specific contingency budget has been shown on a gross and net budget basis. Those academies open on 31 March 2012 will receive a per pupil amount appropriate to their phase (primary, secondary) based on the per pupil budget set for the remaining maintained schools (net budget). The resulting estimated adjustment is shown in the recoupment column. Any maintained school converting to Academy status on 1 April 2012 or later will receive the same per pupil amount (on a pro-rata basis). This will then reduce the available budget for the remaining maintained schools.
- 5.12 The DfE have issued guidance in respect of exclusions from LACSEG recoupment. As a result, the specific funding for Arbour Vale can be excluded along with the EYSFF contingency (which applies to nursery age pupils) and rates for maintained schools (as Academies are reimbursed for actual rates costs). The appropriate representations will be made to the DfE in order to secure these exemptions.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 Not applicable.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

- 7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner, Education & Children's Services
(01753 875627) <mailto:wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk>

Appendix A

Service Area	Approved April 2011	In Year Effect Recoupment	Latest Budget	Projected Outturn	Projected Variance
	£	£	£	£	£
Contingency Budgets					
Significant September Intake	216,300		216,300	170,000	- 46,300
Bulge Classes / New Forms of Entry	372,200		372,200	354,000	- 18,200
Practical Learning	339,000	184,530	154,470	154,470	-
Rates	5,600		5,600	32,000	26,400
6th Day Provision	48,000		48,000	48,000	-
Public Service Support	20,000		20,000	-	- 20,000
Grant Contingency	50,000		50,000	-	- 50,000
DSG Pupil Number Variation	150,000		150,000	-	- 150,000
Arbour Vale - Banding Support	321,600		321,600	321,600	-
EYSFF Contingency	200,000		200,000	40,000	- 160,000
Union Representation	20,000		20,000	19,800	- 200
New Statements	348,000		348,000	770,000	422,000
Hard to Place	219,000		219,000	219,000	-
DSG - Withdrawn Grants	209,250		-	-	-
Total Contingency Budgets	2,518,950	184,530	2,125,170	2,128,870	3,700

Appendix B

Service Area	2011-12			2012-13		
	Gross Latest Budget	Full Year Effect Recoupment	Latest Net Budget	Gross Budget	Recoupment	Proposed Net Budget
	£	£	£			£
Contingency Budgets						
Significant September Intake	216,300		216,300	216,300	21,550	194,750
Bulge Classes / New Forms of Entry	372,200		372,200	200,000	10,610	189,390
Rates	5,600		5,600	49,800	-	49,800
Grant Contingency	50,000		50,000	-	-	-
DSG Pupil Number Variation	150,000		150,000	150,000	33,580	116,420
Arbour Vale - Banding Support	321,600		321,600	321,600	-	321,600
EYSFF Contingency	200,000		200,000	200,000	-	200,000
Total Contingency Budgets	1,315,700	-	1,315,700	1,137,700	65,740	1,071,960
Under DfE Guidance, rates Arbour Vale - Banding Support and EYSFF contingency are exempt from recoupment.						
The following budgets should not be reported in the School Specific Contingency:						
<u>Transfer to LA Managed Budgets</u>						
Practical Learning				339,000		
6th Day Provision				48,000		
Public Service Support				20,000		
Union Representation				20,000		
New Statements				526,000		
Hard to Place				219,000		
<u>Transfer to ISB 2011-12</u>						
DSG - Withdrawn Grants				209,250		
Total budget movements				1,381,250		
Total 2011-12 approved budget				2,518,950		

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**Local Authority Budgets Funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant
(Director of Education & Children's Services)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present to Schools Forum the anticipated financial outturn for the local authority managed budgets funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the financial year 2011-12.
- 1.2 To present to Schools Forum the funding required for the local authority managed budgets funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budgets for 2012-13.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the expected outturn for 2011-12 and endorses the proposed budget for 2012-13.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for Schools Forum to be aware of the expected financial outturn of local authority budgets funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant and the proposed budgets for 2012-13.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1.1 Schools Forum will recall that as part of the indicative budget position presented last month, local authority managed budgets for 2012-13 were incorporated into the funding model at the same level as the budget approved by Schools Forum for 2011-12 for planning purposes.
- 5.1.2 Appendix A sets out the original approved budgets together with the budget changes approved by Schools Forum during the financial year 2011-12, the impact of Academy recoupment and expected outturn for the financial year 2011-12. Schools Forum will note that there is an anticipated underspend of £739,500. This is primarily due to an underspend on placements in independent schools for pupils with special educational needs (SEN) (£380k) and on the reconfigured school improvement support approved during the year (£180k).

- 5.1.3 Appendix B sets out the gross and net budget requirement for 2012-13. The budget requirement is presented on a gross and net basis due to the impact of LACSEG Academy recoupment. In addition, and as advised in the report on schools specific contingency, a technical change has been made to transfer a number of budgets (£1.172m) into the local authority managed budgets in order to meet DfE reporting requirements.
- 5.1.4 During the financial year 2011-12, a thorough review of local authority managed budgets was conducted by officers and SSEF. The resulting changes have continued to be incorporated into the budgets proposed for 2012-13.
- 5.1.5 At this stage, until the 2011-12 outturn is confirmed, it is considered prudent to retain the budgets at the same level as 2011-12. As members of the Forum are aware, there are significant numbers of new statements which may result in expensive placements in independent schools. In the case of school improvement, the reconfigured support agreed during 2011-12 will be provided for the full financial year in 2012-13.
- 5.1.6 Members of the Forum should note that particular pressures anticipated in 2012-13 include:
- Funding of the Pupil Referral Unit at Haybrook College,
 - Funding of the Outreach Service,
 - New statements as the numbers of children with SEN are increasing, and
 - Other SEN support budgets, such as sensory impairment, due to increased numbers of children with special needs.
- 5.1.7 The proposed budget includes an increase in funding (£70k) for sensory impairment in order to meet demands on the service. The budget for new statements has been increased (£194k) through reallocation of the contingency and local authority managed budgets. In addition, the budget (£252k) available to support vulnerable children will be available to contribute towards additional funding of the pupil referral unit and / or outreach service. These budgets will require close monitoring during 2012-13.
- 5.1.8 The pressures will be reviewed further in advance of proposals for distribution of headroom at the next meeting of Schools Forum.
- 5.1.9 **The total proposed local authority managed budget for 2012-13 is therefore £9,109,180 at 1 April 2012.** Members of the Schools Forum should note that this budget will reduce as additional schools, including Cippenham Infants, Cippenham Primary and Westgate, convert to Academy status.

5.1.10 The gross and net local authority managed budgets have been incorporated into the separate report on the overall Schools Budget.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer – Strategic Director of Resources

6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 None.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

SSEF papers 2011-12

Schools Forum agendas, reports and minutes

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business partner, Education & Children's Services (01753 875627)

wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk

Kate Appleyard, Senior Accountant (Education & Children's Services) (01753 875547) kate.appleyard@slough.gov.uk

Appendix A

Service Area	Approved April 2011	Schools Forum 9 June	Schools Forum 28 Sept	Schools Forum 1 December	Schools Forum 26 January	In Year Effect Recoupment	Latest Budget	Projected Outturn	Projected Variance
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
School Improvement									
Infrastructure/Broadband connectivity	77,100	- 54,000					23,100	23,100	-
Primary & Secondary Improvement	276,700	- 212,000					64,700	114,700	50,000
New Arrivals in Primary Schools	28,000	- 20,000					8,000	1,000	- 7,000
EMA	49,500	- 26,000					23,500	23,500	-
Roma Community Project	77,200	- 62,000					15,200	2,700	- 12,500
Traveller Service	82,400	- 55,000					27,400	5,900	- 21,500
Raising Achievement Management	30,000	- 30,000					-	-	-
School Improvement			652,000				652,000	472,000	- 180,000
Extended Schools Sustainability - Cluster	462,100	- 28,000					434,100	434,100	-
Ethnic Minority Achievement	207,400	- 207,400					-	-	-
1-2-1 Tuition and Participation	47,200	- 47,200					-	-	-
Primary Strategy	231,200	- 205,000					26,200	26,200	-
Secondary Strategy	30,000	- 30,000					-	-	-
Raising Participation Age (Formerly Diploma)	107,400	-				- 40,520	66,880	66,880	-
School Intervention	21,500	- 21,500					-	-	-
Gifted & Talented	6,500	- 6,500		31,000			31,000	31,000	-
Excellence in Clusters	194,600	- 194,600					-	-	-
	1,928,800	- 1,199,200	652,000	31,000	-	- 40,520	1,372,080	1,201,080	- 171,000
School Services									
Admissions	159,500						159,500	159,500	-
SEN Transport	40,000						40,000	40,000	-
School Lunch Grant	46,500	- 46,500					-	-	-
Choice Advisor	19,300						19,300	19,300	-
	265,300	- 46,500	-	-	-	-	218,800	218,800	-
Inclusion									
Inclusion Management	31,400	- 31,400					-	-	-
Littledown - Primary Provision for Behaviour	103,600						103,600	103,600	-
Autism	171,100						171,100	161,100	- 10,000
Tree House	98,500	- 98,500					-	-	-
Sensory Impairment	400,000						400,000	400,000	-
Slough & Eton RB	102,100	- 102,100					-	-	-
Arbour Vale - Outreach Development	50,800	- 50,800					-	-	-
Haybrook Provision	873,300						873,300	873,300	-
Vulnerable Children	61,700						61,700	6,700	- 55,000
Services Supporting Behaviour	484,100					- 125,980	358,120	358,120	-
Mental Health Primary	2,200	- 2,200					-	-	-
SENASS	433,000				150,000		583,000	583,000	-
Independent Schools	2,146,400	- 196,000					1,950,400	1,570,400	- 380,000
SEN Recoupment	495,000						495,000	495,000	-
Langley Academy Resource	90,900	- 90,900					-	-	-
Behaviour & Attendance	277,300				60,000		337,300	337,300	-
SDG - Inclusion	108,800	- 108,800			56,000		56,000	56,000	-
	5,930,200	- 680,700	-	-	266,000	- 125,980	5,389,520	4,944,520	445,000
Early Years									
Early Years Support	121,700						121,700	101,700	- 20,000
Early Years Inclusion	85,800	- 15,800					70,000	51,500	- 18,500
	207,500	- 15,800	-	-	-	-	191,700	153,200	- 38,500
Children & Families									
Educ Resource Services (former LACES)	133,700	- 27,000					106,700	106,700	-
Strategy Information & Resources									
Schools CERA	149,100						149,100	64,100	- 85,000
Schools Forum	48,300				15,000		63,300	63,300	-
SIMS Training	8,000	- 8,000				- 1,920	1,920	1,920	-
Unallocated		1,977,200	- 652,000	- 31,000	- 281,000		321,700	321,700	-
Transfer to ISB		- 691,500							-
Non Controllable	337,200						337,200	337,200	-
	542,600	1,277,700	- 652,000	- 31,000	- 266,000	- 1,920	869,380	784,380	- 85,000
Total Centrally Managed Budgets	9,008,100	- 691,500	-	-	-	- 168,420	8,148,180	7,408,680	- 739,500

Appendix B

Service Area	2011-12			2012-13		
	Gross Latest Budget	Full Year Effect Recoupment	Latest Net Budget	Gross Budget	Recoupment	Proposed Net Budget
	£	£	£			£
<u>School Improvement</u>						
Infrastructure/Broadband connectivity	23,100		23,100	30,000		30,000
Primary & Secondary Improvement	64,700		64,700	64,700		64,700
New Arrivals in Primary Schools	8,000		8,000	-		-
EMA	23,500		23,500	23,500		23,500
Roma Community Project	15,200		15,200	15,200		15,200
Traveller Service	27,400		27,400	27,400		27,400
School Improvement	652,000		652,000	652,000		652,000
Extended Schools Sustainability - Cluster	434,100		434,100	434,100		434,100
Ethnic Minority Achievement	57,000		-	-		-
Primary Strategy	26,200		26,200	26,200		26,200
Raising Participation Age (Formerly Diploma)	107,400	57,000	50,400	107,400	60,740	46,660
*Practical Learning				339,000	191,720	147,280
Gifted & Talented	31,000		31,000	31,000		31,000
Excellence in Clusters	-		-			-
	1,412,600	57,000	1,355,600	1,750,500	252,460	1,498,040
<u>Inclusion</u>						
Littledown - Primary Provision for Behaviour	103,600		103,600	103,600		103,600
Autism	171,100		171,100	171,100		171,100
Sensory Impairment	400,000		400,000	470,000		470,000
Haybrook Provision	873,300		873,300	873,300		873,300
*6th Day Provision				48,000		48,000
Vulnerable Children	61,700		61,700	61,700		61,700
Services Supporting Behaviour	484,100	175,000	309,100	484,100	68,870	415,230
SENASS	583,000		583,000	583,000		583,000
Independent Schools	1,950,400		1,950,400	1,950,400		1,950,400
SEN Recoupment	495,000		495,000	495,000		495,000
*Provision for new statements				542,100		542,100
Behaviour & Attendance	337,300		337,300	337,300	47,990	289,310
SDG - Inclusion	56,000		56,000	56,000		56,000
	5,515,500	175,000	5,340,500	6,175,600	116,860	6,058,740
<u>School Services</u>						
Admissions	159,500		159,500	159,500		159,500
*Hard to Place				219,000		219,000
SEN Transport	40,000		40,000	40,000		40,000
Choice Advisor	19,300		19,300	19,300		19,300
*Public Service Support				20,000	5,050	14,950
*Union Representation				20,000	5,050	14,950
	218,800	-	218,800	477,800	10,100	467,700
<u>Early Years</u>						
Early Years Support	121,700		121,700	121,700		121,700
Early Years Inclusion	70,000		70,000	70,000		70,000
	191,700	-	191,700	191,700	-	191,700
<u>Children & Families</u>						
Educ Resource Services (former LACES)	106,700		106,700	106,700		106,700
<u>Strategy Information & Resources</u>						
Schools CERA	149,100		149,100	149,100		149,100
Schools Forum	63,300		63,300	48,300		48,300
Vulnerable Children	321,700		321,700	251,700		251,700
Non Controllable	337,200		337,200	337,200		337,200
	871,300	-	871,300	786,300	-	786,300
Total Centrally Managed Budgets	8,316,600	232,000	8,084,600	9,488,600	379,420	9,109,180
*Transfer from contingency				1,172,000		
Total Centrally Managed Budgets Comparison				8,316,600		

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**Latest Schools Budget 2012-13
(Director of Education & Children's Services)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present to Schools Forum the latest Schools Budget for the financial year 2012-13 including an updated view of the available headroom.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the updated Schools Budget for 2012-13.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for Schools Forum to be aware of the latest DSG budget position for Schools and the Local Authority.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1.1 Schools Forum will recall that in March 2012, a summary of the indicative Schools Budget 2012-13 together with a comparison to the Schools Budget for 2011-12 was presented to Schools Forum.
- 5.1.2 Appendix A provides an update on the movements since then.
- 5.1.3 The indicative Individual School Budgets (ISB) budgets have now been finalised and were distributed to schools on 29 March 2012. All formula value factors are at the same level as in 2011-12. A minimum funding guarantee of -1.5% for 2012-13 has been applied to 3 schools.
- 5.1.4 There are changes within the overall ISB budget, principally within special schools. A correction was made to the agreed number of places in Millside (£171k) and to the numbers and bandings at Arbour Vale (£194k).
- 5.1.5 There are reports elsewhere on this agenda covering school specific contingency and the centrally managed budgets in more detail. The proposed budgets have now been included in this update.

- 5.1.6 Schools Forum will note that the headroom available is **£729k**. Detailed reports with proposals for the use of headroom will be brought to the next meeting of Schools Forum on 16 May 2012.
- 5.1.7 Appendix B sets out the final allocations for each phase, analysed by formula factor.
- 5.1.8 The funding for Post 16 education has now been confirmed by the Young Persons Learning Agency. Sixth form allocations have been incorporated into the final budgets issued to schools

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer – Strategic Director of Resources

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 None.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

- 7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Appendix A – Summary Schools Budget 2012-13

Appendix B – Formula Factors – Final Budgets 2012-13

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner (ECS) (01753 875267) wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk

Christina West, Interim Senior Accountant (Schools) (01753 477209) christina.west@slough.gov.uk

Appendix A

	Indicative 2012-13			Latest 2012-13			Gross Change	
	Gross	Academy**	Net	Gross	Academy**	Net	£	%
Estimated Expenditure								
<u>ISB Formula Allocation</u>								
Primary	52,381,258	2,351,049	50,030,209	52,466,013	5,797,377	46,668,636	84,755	0%
Secondary (exc Post 16)	48,742,567	26,128,667	22,613,900	48,801,587	31,002,975	17,798,612	59,020	0%
Special	8,314,367	0	8,314,367	8,679,161	0	8,679,161	364,794	4%
EYFSS & Nursery	8,341,975	272,839	8,069,136	8,399,775	-	8,399,775	57,800	1%
Total ISB	117,780,167	28,752,555	89,027,612	118,346,536	36,800,352	81,546,184	566,369	0%
School Specific Contingency	2,518,950	0	2,518,950	1,137,700	65,740	1,071,960	-1,381,250	-55%
Central DSG Items	9,153,659	473,004	8,680,655	9,488,600	379,420	9,109,180	334,941	4%
Total Estimated Expenditure	129,452,776	29,225,559	100,227,217	128,972,836	37,245,512	91,727,324	-479,940	0%
Estimated Income								
DSG	128,445,827	29,225,559	99,220,268	128,312,866	37,245,512	91,067,354	-132,961	0%
SBC PFI Contribution	809,700	-	809,700	809,700	0	809,700	0	0%
Estimated YPLA Grant	420,372	-	420,372	579,740	0	579,740	159,368	38%
Total Estimated Income	129,675,899	29,225,559	100,450,340	129,702,306	37,245,512	92,456,794	26,407	0%
Headroom	223,123	0	223,123	729,470	0	729,470	506,347	227%
Notes:								
Academy **	Langley Academy, Slough Grammar, Langley Grammar, Baylis Court, Lynch Hill, Slough & Eton, Herschel Grammar open 31 March 2012							
Academy ISB now includes	Cippenham Infants, Cippenham Primary and Westgate which open on 1 April 2012							
Central DSG LACSEG 2012-13	Full year effect of Academy ** using 2011-12 section 251 and Jan 11 pupil numbers							

Appendix B

FUNDING DISTRIBUTION SUMMA		2012-13					
Factors	Amount Delegated	% of Phase Total	% of Overall Total	Original	Change £	Change %	
Primary							
AWPU	33,539,273	64.0%	26.9%	32,004,589	1,534,684	4.8%	
SEN							
<i>Pupils with Statements</i>	1,465,041	2.8%	1.2%	1,222,271	242,770	19.9%	
<i>PWoS - IMD</i>	411,687	0.8%	0.3%	384,115	27,572	7.2%	
<i>PWoS - SATS KS1</i>	1,304,734	2.5%	1.0%	1,336,101	-31,367	-2.3%	
<i>Resource Units</i>	1,147,091	2.2%	0.9%	970,857	176,233	18.2%	
<i>Turbulence</i>	260,883	0.5%	0.2%	117,819	143,064	121.4%	
<i>Social Deprivation - FSM</i>	1,724,485	3.3%	1.4%	1,623,174	101,311	6.2%	
<i>Social Deprivation -IMD</i>	1,902,138	3.6%	1.5%	1,541,177	360,961	23.4%	
<i>Small School Protection</i>	35,800	0.1%	0.0%	61,290	-25,490	-41.6%	
<i>Catering</i>	833,538	1.6%	0.7%	788,333	45,205	5.7%	
<i>Rates</i>	548,540	1.0%	0.4%	509,449	39,091	7.7%	
<i>New Schools</i>	158,213	0.3%	0.1%	44,494	113,719	255.6%	
<i>Lump Sum</i>	1,577,114	3.0%	1.3%	1,544,928	32,186	2.1%	
<i>Partial Class Size</i>	19,476	0.0%	0.0%	29,214	-9,738	-33.3%	
<i>PFI Factors</i>	267,949	0.5%	0.2%	253,728	14,221	5.6%	
<i>Teachers Pay Grant</i>	730,166	1.4%	0.6%	637,931	92,235	14.5%	
<i>Expansion Funding</i>	171,808	0.3%	0.1%	175,276	-3,468	-2.0%	
<i>Mainstreamed Grants</i>	6,311,432	12.0%	5.1%	6,026,242	285,190	4.7%	
Primary Total	52,409,368	100.0%	42.0%	49,270,988	3,138,380	6.4%	
Secondary							
AWPU	30,395,336	55.3%	24.4%	21,059,717	9,335,619	44.3%	
SEN							
<i>Pupils with Statements</i>	874,730	1.6%	0.7%	730,623	144,107	19.7%	
<i>PWoS - SATS KS2</i>	844,455	1.5%	0.7%	778,773	65,682	8.4%	
<i>PWoS - IMD</i>	930,576	1.7%	0.7%	791,333	139,243	17.6%	
<i>Resource Units</i>	720,491	1.3%	0.6%	366,853	353,638	96.4%	

	2012-13					
Factors	Amount Delegated	% of Phase Total	% of Overall Total	Original	Change £	Change %
Special Schools						
Places	5,564,022	64.1%	4.5%	4,891,422	672,600	13.8%
Supplements	429,135	4.9%	0.3%	288,491	140,644	48.8%
Pupil Led Funding	671,726	7.7%	0.5%	627,227	44,499	7.1%
Catering	41,221	0.5%	0.0%	45,733	-4,512	-9.9%
Lump Sum	344,025	4.0%	0.3%	344,025	-0	0.0%
Residential Unit	398,032	4.6%	0.3%	398,032	0	0.0%
PFI Factors	477,811	5.5%	0.4%	471,666	6,144	1.3%
Teachers Pay Grant	86,624	1.0%	0.1%	90,842	-4,218	-4.6%
Mainstream Grants	589,689	6.8%	0.5%	563,438	26,251	4.7%
Deprivation - FSM	76,876	0.9%	0.1%	90,245	-13,369	-14.8%
Special Total	8,679,161	100.0%	7.0%	7,811,120	868,040	11.1%
Primary MFG	56,645	0.0%	0.0%	220,295	-163,650	-74.3%
Secondary MFG	168,004	0.0%	0.1%	-	168,004	
Nursery MFG	0	0.0%	0.0%	-	0	0.0%
Special MFG	0	0.0%	0.0%			
Minimum Funding Guarantee	224,650	0.0%	0.2%	220,295	4,355	2.0%
All Schools Total	124,657,319		100.0%	106,841,033	17,816,286	100.0%
	ISB		% of Overall Total	ISB	Change £	Change %
Primary	52,466,013		44.3%	49,491,283	2,974,730	5.7%
Secondary	48,801,587		41.2%	35,031,868	13,769,719	28.2%
Nursery	470,282		0.4%	469,230	1,052	0.2%
EYFSS	7,929,493		6.7%	7,659,479	270,014	3.4%
Special	8,679,161		7.3%			
	118,346,536		100.0%	92,651,860	17,015,515	14.4%

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**School Funding Reform and arrangements for 2013-14
(Director of Education & Children's Services)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Schools Forum that the DfE has now published a further consultation on School Funding Reform and arrangements for 2013-14.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum establishes a Task and Finish Group to work with officers on a response to the consultation.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for Schools Forum to consider the consultation on school funding reform and arrangements for 2013-14 and decide whether to respond. If Schools Forum does wish to respond, members should note that the deadline for responses is 21 May 2012.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 On 26 March, the Secretary of State for Education announced the next stage of consultation on reform of the funding system. This follows earlier consultations in April and October 2011.
- 5.2 A briefing on the consultation is attached at Appendix A.
- 5.3 The consultation runs for a period of eight weeks, closing on Monday 21 May.
- 5.4 Changes to school funding are a key issue for Slough Schools Forum and are likely to impact on all maintained schools and Academies. It is therefore appropriate that a task and finish group is set up to ensure Schools Forum input to a draft response.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer – Strategic Director of Resources

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 None.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

- 7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Consultation document and associated reports on the consultation section of the DfE website

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner (Education & Children's Services)
(01753 875627) wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**Accountability for Dedicated Schools Grant
(Joint Report – Director of Resources and Regeneration / Director of
Education & Children’s Services)**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report seeks to clarify arrangements for accountability in respect of the Local Authority, maintained schools and Academies for non-delegated Dedicated Schools Grant.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Schools Forum is requested to note the accountability processes required to ensure that the Director of Resources and Regeneration is able to meet her s151 accountability responsibilities.

3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Members of Schools Forum are aware of the statutory reporting responsibilities of the s151 officer and the strategic responsibility of the Local Authority to ensure clear, fair and transparent accountability on behalf of all schools for the Dedicated Schools Grant. It is appropriate for Schools Forum to be familiar with the arrangements to meet these responsibilities.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The arrangements for financial accountability outlined in paragraph 5 below are considered to be the minimum required to provide the s151 officer with the assurance she requires to enable her to sign statutory returns.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Strategic Decision Making

- 5.1 Members of Schools Forum will recall advice at a previous meeting concerning the Council’s constitution and commissioning changes. The Constitution requires Cabinet approval to any recommendation that a service currently delivered directly should be commissioned from another organisation, including a school.
- 5.2 The outcome and financial accountability framework below does not seek to alter in any way the current arrangements for schools management of their delegated budgets or funding for statemented pupils. The framework applies to devolved and centrally managed budgets, including resource units.

Accountability for Outcomes

- 5.3 Attached at Appendix A is a template which Headteachers and managers will be asked to complete. The information required has been kept to a minimum and focuses on comparing the actual outcomes with the intended outcomes.
- 5.4 Completed templates will need to be submitted to the Local Authority by 31 December each year. Local authority officers will review the submissions with SSEF. The local authority will use the outcome of the review to inform proposals for devolved and centrally managed budgets for the following financial year.
- 5.5 Although the new financial year has started, it is considered appropriate to undertake this exercise for devolved and centrally managed 2011-12 budgets during the summer term.
- 5.6 These arrangements formalise the process of reviews that have been carried out during 2011-12.

Financial Accountability

- 5.7 Attached at Appendix B is a template Headteachers and managers will be asked to complete. The information required has been kept to a minimum and focuses on comparing the actual spend with the budget.
- 5.8 Templates will be issued as part of the closure of accounts process each year. Completed templates will need to be submitted to the Local Authority by 30 April each year.
- 5.9 If the budget allocation has not been fully spent on the specific function or scheme for which it was provided, the remaining balance will be reviewed. Local authority officers will review the under or overspend in May and either (i) agree a carry forward, (ii) reduce any new year allocation or (iii) request a repayment / include in headroom.
- 5.10 Quarterly payments in advance will be made to schools where the following years budget has been profiled.
- 5.11 Should any audit issues be identified in respect of actual spend on devolved or centrally managed budgets, schools may be asked to make repayments.
- 5.12 The above financial accountability arrangements will support delivery of outcomes for children.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

6.1 Head of Legal

The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of the report.

6.2 Section 151 Officer

The financial accountability arrangements will ensure that the s151 officer is able to meet her statutory responsibilities.

6.3 Access Implications

There are no access implications.

7 **CONSULTATION**

Principal Groups Consulted
SSEF.

Method of Consultation
Meeting.

Representations Received
Not applicable

Background Papers
None

Contact for further information
Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner, Education and Children's Services
e-mail: wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk
telephone: 01753 875627

Appendix A Centrally Managed Budget Accountability

Function / scheme	
Budget 2011-12	
Brief Description of service, including details of staffing	
Intended Outcomes	
Actual Outcomes	
Cost per pupil of intervention	
Recommendation for future of function / scheme	

Appendix B Centrally Managed Budget Financial Accountability

Function / scheme			
Budget 2011-12		Actual Spend 2011-12	
£		£	
Cost per pupil of intervention 2011-12			
Planned (Budget)		Actual	
£ per pupil		£ per pupil	
Budget 2012-13			
£			
Planned spend profile 2012-13:			
April to June	July to Sept	Oct to Dec	Jan to Mar
£	£	£	£
Cost per pupil of intervention 2012-13			
Planned (Budget)			
£ per pupil			

I certify that I have spent £ on the above activities and acknowledge that the supporting information is available for audit.

Headteacher Name	
Headteacher Sign	
Date	
Academy / School	

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**Consultation - Improving the Assurance System for financial
management in LA maintained schools
(Director of Resources and Regeneration)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Schools Forum that the DfE published consultation on improving the Assurance System for financial management in LA maintained schools on 2 April 2012.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum members work with officers on a response to the consultation.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for Schools Forum be aware of the consultation on improving the assurance system for financial management in LA maintained schools and decide whether to respond. If Schools Forum does wish to respond, members should note that the deadline for responses is 11 May 2012.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 On 2 April, the Secretary of State for Education wrote to Local Authorities and Chairs of Schools Forum to announce a consultation on improving the assurance system for financial management in LA maintained schools.
- 5.2 In October 2011, the National Audit Office published a report 'Oversight of financial management in local authority maintained schools'. The report recognised a weakness in the current assurance system and the DfE accepted their findings. As a result, the DfE agreed to strengthen their arrangements for approaching LAs about the financial management of their schools, where there were problems identified.

The DfE plan to use the information they already collect, or plan to collect, to identify where there may be problems with LAs' or their schools' financial management. The DfE will analyse this information, including 2010-11 outturn, against six proposed criteria to identify

which LAs' information indicates that there is a reason for concern. The consultation sets out the proposed criteria and how the DfE plans to approach the LAs identified.

- 5.3 A summary of the proposed criteria and consultation questions is attached at Appendix A. The proposed timetable for implementation is attached is attached at Appendix B.

The consultation runs for a period of six weeks, closing on Friday 11 May.

This consultation emphasises the importance of financial management of the Dedicated Schools Grant. The LA, working with Schools Forum, has recently reviewed aspects of financial management. The accountability mechanisms outlined elsewhere on this agenda will support financial management of use of the Dedicated Schools Grant. A recent revision to the Scheme for Financing Schools incorporated an updated balance control mechanism.

- 5.4 Contributions to the LA response are invited from members of the Forum, either by e-mail or a short task and finish group following this meeting.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer – Strategic Director of Resources

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 None.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

- 7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

You can access the consultation documents via this link:
<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/>

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner (Education
& Children's Services)
(01753 875627) wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk

Improving the Assurance System for Financial Management in Maintained Schools

Proposed Criteria for Approaching LAs

Proposed Criterion A: An LA has over-spent its DSG by 2% or more (i.e. it is 2% or more in deficit)

Question 1: Do you agree it is appropriate to approach an LA that has over-spent its DSG by 2% or more?

Proposed Criterion B: An LA has under-spent its DSG by 5% or more (i.e. it is 5% or more in surplus)

Question 2: Do you agree it is appropriate to approach an LA that has under-spent its DSG by 5% or more?

Proposed Criterion C: An LA has 2.5% of schools that have been in deficit of 2.5% or more since 2007-08 (i.e. for 4 years)

Question 3a): Do you agree it is appropriate to approach an LA if it has 2.5% of schools that have been in deficit of 2.5% or more since 2007-2008 (i.e. for 4 years)?

Question 3b): If no, should the percentage of schools in deficit be higher or lower than 2.5% for an approach to be made?

Question 3c): If no, should the percentage of deficit for each school be higher or lower than 2.5% for an approach to be made?

Question 4: Which is a better indication that pupils' interests could be put at risk by schools' persistent deficits:

- % of schools in an LA that are in deficit; or
- % of deficit that schools in an LA are in?

Proposed Criterion D: An LA has 5% of schools that have had a surplus of 15% or more since 2006-07 (i.e. for 5 years)

Question 5a): Do you agree it is appropriate to approach an LA if it has 5% of schools that have had a surplus of 15% or more since 2006-07 (i.e. for 5 years)?

Question 5b): If no, should the percentage of schools in high surplus be higher or lower than 5% for an approach to be made?

Question 5c): If no, should the percentage of high surplus for each school be higher or lower than 15% for an approach to be made?

Question 5d): If no, should the number of years that each school has been in high surplus be longer or shorter than 5 years for an approach to be made?

Question 6: Which is the best indication that pupils' interests could be put at risk by schools' long-term high surpluses:

- % of high surplus that schools are in; or
- % of schools in an LA that are in high surplus; or
- number of years that schools have been in high surplus?

Question 7: How many years of a high surplus would it take to be reasonably confident that a school does not have a clear plan for how that money will be used?

Proposed Criterion E: For 2011-12, of an LA's schools that never attained FMSiS, and are still eligible, at least 1 did not complete the SFVS by 31 March 2012

Question 8: For 2011-2012, do you think it is reasonable that we approach an LA if at least 1 school that did not achieve FMSiS at all, and is still eligible, did not complete the SFVS by 31 March 2012?

Proposed Criterion F: For 2012-13 onwards, 2% or more of an LA's schools did not complete the SFVS by the end of March deadline
--

Question 9a): Do you agree that we should reduce the threshold for 2012-13 onwards, to allow for a small minority of schools in each LA to not complete the SFVS?

Question 9b): If yes, do you agree that we should automatically allow for a set percentage of schools in each LA to not complete the SFVS?

Question 9c): If so, is 2% an appropriate set percentage?

Question 10a): If you disagreed with the proposal in question 9a, would publishing acceptable reasons for exemptions be a better approach?

Question 10b): Are our proposed exemptions the right ones?

Question 10c): Are there any other exemptions that should be included?

Question 11a): Do you agree that it is appropriate for us to approach all LAs caught by at least 1 of the criteria?

Question 11b): Of the 6 proposed criteria, do some give a better indication than others that problems may be putting pupils' interests at risk?

Question 11c): Which of the 6 proposed criteria do you consider to give a better indication than others that problems may be putting pupils' interests at risk?

Proposed Process (Appendix B)

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed initial process and timeline?

Question 13: Do you agree that it would be better for us to initially approach those LAs identified in the autumn rather than the following spring?

Question 14: Do you agree that those LAs identified should be required to submit an additional assurance as part of their next CFO assurance statement?

Question 15: If there are LAs where we do not consider their additional assurance or revised return to be adequate, how should we escalate the issue?

Question 16: Do you agree with the proposed process and timeline for 2010-11 information?

Question 17: Do you think it would be effective to involve Schools Forums in this process? If so, how can this best be done?

Academies

Question 18: What is the best way for us to take schools that have become Academies into account?

Proposed Timetable

Activity	Date
Write to LAs that meet the criteria based on analysis of 2010-11 s251 outturn and CFO assurance statements asking them to provide a high-level explanation, timetable and actions <i>(This will not include SFVS criteria because SFVS was only launched for 2011-12 onwards)</i>	June 2012
Issue CFO assurance statements 2011-12	July 2012
Receive required replies from LAs that meet the criteria	31 July 2012
Consider information provided and follow-up with any LAs where we are not reassured	14 August 2012
Deadline for s251 2011-12 outturn returns	25 August 2012
Receipt of CFO assurance statements 2011-12	31 Oct 2012
Analyse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DSG assurance statements 2011-12 for SFVS returns and DSG over/under-spends - s251 2011-12 outturn Identify LAs to approach	Sept - Nov 2012
Write to CFOs of LAs that meet the criteria based on 2011-12 analysis asking them to provide a high-level explanation, timetable and actions	Nov-Dec 2012
Receive required replies from LAs	Dec-Jan 2013
Consider information provided and follow-up with any LAs where we are not reassured	Jan-Feb 2013
Issue CFO assurance statements for 2012-13 including the additional assurance and information required from those LAs that met our criteria for 2011-12	July 2013
Deadline for s251 2012-13 outturn returns	25 August 2013
Receipt of CFO assurance statements 2012-13	31 Oct 2013
Analyse DSG assurance statements 2012-13 for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SFVS returns - DSG over/under-spends; and - whether we are reassured by the additional assurance (and information) provided by LAs identified previously Analyse s251 2012-13 outturn Identify LAs to approach	Sept - Nov 2013
Escalate our concerns for those LAs previously identified where we are not reassured by their assurance / information / progress	Nov-Dec 2013
Write to CFOs of LAs that meet the criteria for the first time asking them to provide a high-level explanation, timetable and actions	Nov-Dec 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
18 April 2012**

**SEN Funding Review Update
(Director of Education and Children's Services)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 School's Forum received an update on progress with the SEN Funding Review at their meeting on 6 March 2012. This report updates members of the Forum on the further progress made and the consultation planned for April and May 2012.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the progress being made with the SEN Funding Review.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for School's Forum to be aware of the consultation process, as Schools Forum must be consulted on any proposals to change the fair funding formula.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 The last meeting of Schools Forum approved the following principles for the SEN Review:
- Reduce the number of bands, including simpler definitions and wider bands,
 - Bands can be applied consistently across all types of schools (including possible extension to the PRU),
 - Reduce bureaucracy,
 - Consistent with DfE SEN and funding proposals,
 - Delivered within the current funding envelope,
 - Support personal budgets if implemented,
 - Simple to understand, and
 - Demonstrate open and transparent decision making.
- 5.2 Officers have now prepared a consultation document which explains the current banding model and associated funding, along with the proposed banding model and associated funding. This document is attached at Appendix A.

- 5.3 The Task and Finish Group met on 26 March. Officers sought input from the Task and Finish group on the proposed consultation questions and consultation process. The consultation proposals are:
- Use a consistent Funded Banding model for all pupils across all settings, and
 - Increase delegation to mainstream schools.
- Questions also cover the timing of implementation of these proposals.
- 5.4 The consultation document, including specific questions in relation to the proposals, will be circulated to all Academies and maintained schools on 23 April. The closing date for the consultation is 30 May 2012.
- 5.5 Following discussion at the Task and Finish Group, the consultation process will include consultation sessions to which headteachers, Governors, bursars and SENCO's will be invited. The sessions will be held on Thursday 10 May at 6pm and Tuesday 15 May at 2pm. In addition, a question and answer register will be maintained and made available to all schools and Academies.
- 5.6 The next meeting of the Task and Finish Group will be held on 12 June. The meeting will review consultation comments.
- 5.7 Following the consultation and any further input from the Task and Finish Group, officers will refine the proposed changes to the fair funding formula. The proposals will be submitted to Schools Forum on 4 July.
- 5.8 Although the planned implementation date is 1 September, this will be reviewed. In addition to considering consultation feedback, officers will also be mindful of the recently issued School Funding Reform proposals for 2012-13.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer

- 6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 SEN Task and Finish Group.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Meeting.

Representations Received

7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Agenda, papers and minutes of Task and Finish Group 7 February 2012.

Agenda, papers and minutes of Task and Finish Group 26 March 2012.

Contact for further information

Jackie Wright, Head of Services for Children with Learning Difficulties & Disabilities, Education & Children's Services

(01753 787672) <mailto:jackie.wright@slough.gov.uk>

Wendy Sagar, Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner, Education & Children's Services

(01753 875627) <mailto:wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk>

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

SEN FUNDING REVIEW

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

APRIL 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

Over recent years a number of developments have taken place both nationally and locally with regards to support for pupils with special educational needs (SEN). There has been a general move towards increasing the amount delegated to schools so that they can provide quick and effective support to children with SEN and Slough was one of the first local authorities (LAs) to adopt this approach. Many LAs now delegate the majority of their SEN budgets to mainstream schools for those pupils who are included in mainstream. This means that schools have the necessary funding to support pupils with SEN without the need for statements.

During 2010-2011 Slough consulted schools on increasing the level of delegation and simplifying the bands of support that apply to mainstream schools. This was not supported by all schools and it was decided at that time not to proceed. Schools requested that more work was undertaken in relation to simplifying the bands before re-considering the level of delegation.

Consultation has recently been issued by the Department for Education (DfE) in relation to school funding reform. It is currently proposed that there will be a maximum level of funding to be provided by mainstream schools (DfE recommendation £6K) and a national level of funding for pupils with SEN in special schools and resource units (£10k) from April 2013. There is also a Green Paper on SEN: Support and Aspiration which is currently being explored by pathfinder LAs and this includes the notion of a national banded funding model which may apply from 0 – 25 years, along with a single assessment process and single plan between education, health and care. The Green Paper also discusses personal budgets and the DfE recently suggested that this could include support in schools.

In making any changes to the funding for SEN in Slough for both statemented and non-statemented pupils, it is important to be mindful of the likely national changes and aim to prepare for these and avoid multiple changes if at all possible.

With this in mind a SEN Funding Task and Finish Group was established by Schools Forum to make recommendations in relation to the following principles:

- reduce bureaucracy;
- consistent with DfE SEN and funding proposals;
- simple to understand; and
- demonstrate open and transparent decision making.

In practice this will mean:

- reducing the number of bands, including simpler definitions and wider bands;
- bands being applied consistently across all types of schools (Including possible extension to the PRUs);
- delivered within the current funding envelope; and
- support personal budgets if implemented.

This consultation document sets out the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group and includes the recommended banding model which would apply to all pupils with SEN regardless of their placement.

2. CURRENT SEN FUNDING

2.1 Special Schools

Slough has 3 special schools; Arbour Vale, Millside (within Haybrook) and Littledown. There is currently a set of short descriptors that are used to determine the band for a pupil when it is clear that they will be attending a special school. There are 14 bands that can apply to pupils who attend Arbour Vale School and 2 bands that can apply to pupils who attend Millside or Littledown, although a 3rd band was added recently to reflect the individual programmes that are required for a few pupils who cannot access school provision. The description of the Arbour Vale bands in particular are not fit for purpose and do not describe the needs of pupils who are in the school and this can lead to some difficulties in agreeing the appropriate band for a pupil. This is particularly true for pupils with autism who do not have severe learning difficulties. The current special school descriptors are attached at **Appendix A**.

The level of funding for each of these special school bands is calculated through a funding formula.

The formula is fundamentally place-led but there are also supplemental allocations for exceptional needs, plus factors as used in the mainstream formula e.g. lump sum, free school meals, teachers pay grant.

Each year it is agreed with the Headteachers the number of places that will be available at each band, based on current pupils and known or predicted changes. There is significant pressure on all 3 schools to increase capacity to accommodate the rising number of pupils with complex SEN. No in year adjustments should be made to special school budgets unless there are exceptional circumstances and there is an expectation that they will manage their budgets to meet the needs of all the pupils placed in the schools.

2.2 Resourced Mainstream Schools

Slough has 9 mainstream schools that are specially resourced to cater for a group of pupils with similar needs:

- Colnbrook
- Ryvers
- Wexham
- Priory (2 resources)
- The Westgate
- St Ethelbert's
- Slough & Eton
- Foxborough
- The Langley Academy

The number of pupils in each resourced school is agreed with the Headteacher each year based on the existing pupils and known changes. The resourced schools are now generally full and the Task and Finish Group established as part of the Additional Needs Strategy will shortly make recommendations about the need to set up a number of new resourced schools and a funding model will be required for this work.

There are no descriptors that apply to the resourced schools although each school has admission criteria which describe the profile of the pupils who can be considered for placement. The current funding mechanism was introduced in 2004/05 and relies on a formula based on:

- Pupil : staff ratio
- Management resources
- Additional resources
- Specialist resources

Currently the AWPU for the pupils in the resource is then deducted although pupils are generally included in mainstream for the majority of the week. In 2010 a minor change was agreed through Schools Forum to enable the Local Authority (LA) to provide 'top up' funding where a pupil's profile is outside that normally associated with the resource and to make use of the mainstream NWPU model to determine whether or not a 'top up' should be applied and if so, the financial value of this.

It is possible to calculate a per place cost for each resourced school and these vary from £9,185 to £20,695. For some of these schools, the level of funding no longer enables the needs of the pupils to be met as the complexity has increased and more funding has been allocated through 'top up' arrangements.

2.3 Mainstream Schools

The current model for funding pupils with SEN in mainstream schools is through delegation based on social deprivation and prior attainment and additional funding for pupils with statements of SEN. The method for delegating funding was reviewed and amended from April 2010 to provide a more consistent and understandable approach. There is no intention to set this out here or to make any suggested changes to the method of delegating at this time.

For pupils with statements of SEN there is a document that sets out the descriptors that apply to the Needs Weighted Pupils Units (NWPU) which was initially written by officers in Berkshire County Council. There are 27 different NWPU and the document is set out at **Appendix B**. When a statement is considered by the LDD Advisory Panel a recommendation is made about which NWPU would best describe the pupil's profile of need. There is a legal expectation or assumption that all pupils will be educated in mainstream so a NWPU should be recommended for all pupils. This document is very old and is no longer fit for purpose. It is also considered by all those that have to use it as a working tool, including Headteachers, that there are too many different bands and this can lead to confusion and likely inconsistency in funding for pupils with statements in mainstream schools.

Each of the different NWPU has a monetary value which is then turned in to a number of learning support assistant hours to write in the statement, as there is a legal requirement for statements to be specific. However, due to changes over time, the value of the NWPU will not actually purchase the level of hours that are set out. There is also an expectation that schools will use their delegated funding for all pupils with SEN, including those with statements, so if a statement sets out that a pupil requires 18 hours per week, in reality the school is expected to provide around the equivalent of 23 hours per week. Although statements have to be specific, the LA is

strongly of the opinion that individual 1:1 support is not generally the appropriate way to support pupils to be included and to make progress.

The LA wants to encourage schools to be more creative in their use of SEN funding to ensure that all pupils have access to good quality teaching and that they do not become excessively dependent on adult support. However, there is a legal requirement to deliver the provision as set out in Part 3 of a statement. Benefits of a move to greater delegation is to permit greater flexibility in approach, increase opportunities for early intervention, increased stability in workforce allowing more investment in training and a reduction in the level of bureaucracy and legality related to statements.

3. PROPOSED SEN FUNDING

- 3.1 It is proposed that Slough adopts a new banded funding model with fewer, wider bands that apply to all pupils whether they are placed in mainstream, resourced schools or special schools. It is proposed that this new model should be in operation from September 2012 and that all pupils would move across to the new equivalent band from that time.
- 3.2 The bands have been developed during 2011/12 in consultation with LDD Panel members, Educational Psychology Service, SEN officers and SEN Funding Task and Finish Group members.
- 3.3 The banded model is attached at **Appendix C** with estimated monetary values based on the existing levels of funding that are in place.
- 3.4 The bands are progressive and it is expected that all schools will make the provision described in the preceding bands.
- 3.5 The resource places will retain the AWPU thus enabling pupils to be included in mainstream lessons as much as possible.

<p>Proposal 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The funding model based on Bands 1a - Band 8 is applied to all pupils with SEN, across all settings.b) The funding model should be implemented from 1st September 2012.

- 3.6 Band 1a is already delegated to schools. Depending on the outcome of this consultation process, it is recommended that band 1b is immediately delegated to schools which will assist with greater consistency and a more understandable system. This means that any pupils in mainstream with statements who have NWPU's of 1X, 2U, 2V, 3T will have funding delegated rather than allocated on an individual basis. There are currently in the region of 60 pupils with these NWPU's, out of around 380 statemented pupils in mainstream schools, but the majority of these are already classified as low complexity and no funding is allocated. It is suggested that the annual reviews for these pupils would need to give careful consideration as to whether or not

the statement is serving any purpose and if not, it should be considered whether or not to recommend that the statement is ceased. It is not anticipated that there would be any need for transitional protection as the financial impact of this change is minimal. However this will be reviewed on an individual basis to ensure there is a smooth transfer to minimise impact on individual schools.

Proposal 2

Delegated funding for SEN pupils in mainstream schools should be extended to include pupils assessed as up to and including Band 1b, effective from 1st September 2012.

- 3.7 It is proposed that any further increase in delegation should not take place until April 2013 when the national picture should be clearer and this will then avoid the need to implement different levels of transitional protection to schools at different times.
- 3.8 It should be noted that the level of delegation proposed from April 2013 is approximately £2.6k less per stated pupil than that which schools decided against during 2011 so the impact on individual budgets will be less significant. This is in order to align the Slough model with the anticipated national model.
- 3.9 However, it is proposed that from April 2013 the level of delegation should be increased to include band 1c, thus amalgamating all of band 1 in to a single band which sets out clearly what schools are expected to provide from within their own delegated funding. The suggested monetary value of band 1c is £6k which, when added to the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU), should create an opportunity to move to a £10k level for SEN pupils if this is how the Government decides to proceed.

Proposal 3

Delegated funding for SEN pupils in mainstream schools should be extended to include pupils assessed as up to and including Band 1c , effective from 1st April 2013.

- 3.10 It is also proposed that schools should be encouraged to make use of the Audit Commissions Value for Money Resource Pack to assist in clearly demonstrating the provision that is made, the costs of this, the pupils who are benefitting, the expected outcomes, the actual outcomes and the value for money achieved. This will assist with sharing good practice between schools based on robust evidence and will provide schools with greater clarity for Ofsted about the provision made and the outcomes achieved for pupils with SEN. This approach could equally be applied to other vulnerable groups.
- 3.11 Depending on the outcome of this consultation, the guidance criteria for statutory assessments will be revised to adjust the expected threshold in preparation for April 2013. There will then be a further number of pupils with

statements where no funding is delivered and annual reviews will need to give this careful consideration and make recommendations accordingly. There are currently in the region of 50 pupils who would be on band 1c all of whom are allocated individual funding.

- 3.12 The Green Paper pathfinder areas are looking at designing a banded funding model that applies from age 0 to age 25. In Slough it is not currently possible to change the funding system outside the usual school age range but it is considered that this approach will assist in making these changes once there is clarity about any new national model.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 **The consultation period will run from 23 April 2012 to 30 May 2012 with two question and answer sessions with officers to be held on 10th May at 6pm and 15th May at 2pm, venues to be confirmed.**
- 4.2 **Consultation responses should be sent to Christina West by 12.00 noon on 30 May 2012.**
- 4.3 Please refer to the timetable for the SEN Funding Review at **Appendix D** in relation to actions following completion of this consultation period.

5. CONCLUSION

The SEN Funding Task and Finish Group has given careful consideration to objectives set out by Schools Forum in recommending a move to a new single banded funding model that will apply to all pupils with SEN whether they are placed in mainstream school, resourced school or special school.

5.1 Reduce bureaucracy

Greater delegation leading to a reduction in the need for statements in itself reduces bureaucracy and provides greater opportunities for early intervention, creativity in developing solutions and a more stable and well trained workforce. This banded funding model will also simplify the process for decision making in the LA and the work of the LDD Panel. The model is simpler to understand for all concerned.

5.2 Consistent with DfE SEN and funding proposals

It is not possible to ensure complete consistency with DfE proposals as these have not yet been confirmed. However, any single banded funding model in place should assist in making whatever changes are required from April 2013 and onwards in relation to a new national school funding framework and SEN funding models developed through the Green Paper pathfinders.

5.3 Simple to understand

As mentioned above, the proposed model has far fewer bands and the descriptions aim to be simple to understand. As it is no longer appropriate to describe levels of difficulty in terms of IQ, and there are no nationally agreed

methods for describing these difficulties, the model is based on knowledge of local officers and Headteachers. During the consultation process they will be applied within the LDD Panel to provide a more in depth investigation to ascertain whether this objective has been met. They will also be shared with Special Voices parental participation group for comment.

5.4 Demonstrate open and transparent decision making

The Group considers that if the new model is simpler to understand, reduces bureaucracy and applies to all pupils regardless of the setting in which they are educated, this will assist in working in an open and transparent way and in making good and consistent decisions. However this will require testing once in operation and it is proposed that an internal review through the LDD Advisory Panel is undertaken prior to the end of the academic year 2012 – 2013 to establish whether this objective has been met and if not, to consider what changes are required. This will also take account of the developments within the national funding model.

5.5 Reducing the number of bands, including simpler definitions and wider bands

The proposed model moves from the 54 current bands across all settings to 8 wide bands, although band 1 will be split in to 3 parts initially. The proposed definitions have been built up based on existing descriptors with supporting advice and guidance from members of the Task and Finish Group, LDD Panel members, the Educational Psychology Service and SEN Officers.

5.6 Bands being applied consistently across all types of schools (including possible extension to the PRUs)

This is the basis for the proposed model. It will apply to all pupils with SEN regardless of the setting in which they are educated.

It would be possible, in consultation with the relevant Headteachers to apply this model to places within the PRU in all its different settings in Slough. This will require further work.

5.7 Delivered within the current funding envelope

This was a general aim within this work and the modelling that has been undertaken has sought to match old to new bands as far as possible to remain within the current funding envelope. However, there are circumstances that make this improbable.

- It is considered that removing the AWPU from resourced schools for their resource places is inappropriate as the pupils are all on roll at the school and are included in mainstream lessons for much of the school week. The place in the mainstream school cannot be filled by another pupil.
- Many resourced schools were also in receipt of 'top ups' to reflect the additional needs of some pupils, although this funding is technically within the same funding envelope it does not appear within the per place funding for resourced schools.

- Current band ASDb, which has a value of £16,894, is to be matched to Band 4, value £20,000, in the proposed model. This will cost an additional £135,000.

5.8 Support personal budgets if implemented

This work is being undertaken by the Green Paper pathfinders LAs and there is no information available yet about the future requirements. However, DfE colleagues recently suggested that this could now be extended to actual provision in school, whereas at the outset it was suggested this might apply to extras such as home to school transport. It should be noted that personal budgets do not have to be allocated as a direct payment to the parents/carers and these are separate processes. Any simpler banding system will assist with any future move to allow personal budgets for related to the new Education, Health and Care Plans but it is not possible to provide any more information at this stage.

Wendy Sagar
Interim Corporate Finance Business Partner

Christina West
Interim Senior Accountant Schools

Jackie Wright
Head of Children with Additional Needs

Special School Definitions of Need

Category	Descriptor
EBD	<p>General descriptor from DfES guidance Jan 2004</p> <p>Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulty (BESD) – Pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties cover the full range of ability and a continuum of severity. Their behaviours present a barrier to learning and persist despite the implementation of an effective school behaviour policy and personal/social curriculum.</p>
EBD 1a	<p>BESD primary need. Pupils may have difficulties with social interaction and find it difficult to work in a group or cope in unstructured time. They may have poor concentration, temper outburst and be verbally aggressive to peers and adults. <i>Level of support yet to be identified.</i></p>
EBD 1b	<p>BESD primary need. Pupils may not be able to function at all in group situations and exhibit persistent and frequent violent behaviour which requires physical intervention. Other pupils may display similar signs of low esteem, under achievement and inappropriate social interaction, but without outwardly challenging behavioural outbursts. They will be withdrawn, quiet and find it difficult to communicate. <i>Level of support yet to be identified.</i></p>
MLD	<p>General descriptor from DfES guidance Jan 2004</p> <p>Moderate Learning Difficulty (MLD) — Pupils with moderate learning difficulties will have attainments significantly below expected levels in most areas of the curriculum, despite appropriate interventions. Their needs will not be able to be met by normal differentiation and the flexibilities of the National Curriculum. Pupils with moderate learning difficulties have much greater difficulty than their peers in acquiring basic literacy and numeracy skills and in understanding concepts. They may also have associated speech and language delay, low self-esteem, low levels of concentration and under-developed social skills.</p>
MLD 2a	<p>MLD primary need. No additional difficulties. Strong possibility of integrating into mainstream 1:5 support</p>
MLD 2b	<p>MLD primary need. Some additional difficulties relating either to medical, physical, behavioural and social, sensory or communication. Requiring more than the average 1:5 support</p>
MLD 2c	<p>MLD primary need. Significant level of additional need which may be equal to the primary need in degree of difficulty and the way it affects learning - medical, physical, behavioural and social, sensory, communication and interaction or autism. Requiring some 1: 1 support but for no more than 25% of their time. Eg non ambulant pupils, severe epilepsy, visual impairment</p>

MLD - exceptional	Pupils identified as needing 1:1 support, usually for medical or significant behavioural reasons.
SLD	General descriptor from DfES guidance Jan 2004 Severe Learning Difficulty (SLD) - Pupils with severe learning difficulties have significant intellectual or cognitive impairments. This has a major effect on their ability to participate in the school curriculum without support. They may also have difficulties in mobility and co-ordination, communication and perception and the acquisition of self-help skills. Pupils with severe learning difficulties need support in all areas of the curriculum. They may also require teaching of self-help, independence and social skills. Some pupils may use sign and symbols but most will be able to hold simple conversations. Their attainments may be within the upper P scale range (P4-P8) for much of their school careers (that is below level 1 of the National Curriculum).
SLD 3a	SLD primary need. Working on 'P' levels 4-8. No additional difficulties. 1:3 support
SLD 3b	SLD primary need. Some additional difficulties relating either to medical, physical, behavioural and social, sensory or communication. Attainments P3-P8 Requiring more than the average 1:3 support
SLD 3c	SLD primary need. Significant level of additional need which may be equal to the primary need in degree of difficulty and the way it affects learning - medical, physical, behavioural and social, sensory, communication and interaction or autism. Requiring 1:1 support for up to 50% of the time in order to access the curriculum and to meet their additional needs
SLD - exceptional	Pupils identified as needing full time 1:1 support (32.5 hours per week), usually for medical, behavioural and/or health and safety reasons. Attainments P3-P8
PMLD	Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulty (PMLD) - Pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties have complex learning needs. In addition to very severe learning difficulties, pupils have other significant difficulties, such as physical disabilities, sensory impairment or a severe medical condition. Pupils require a high level of adult support, both for their learning needs and also for their personal care. They are likely to need sensory stimulation and a curriculum broken down into very small steps. Some pupils communicate by gesture, eye pointing or symbols, others by very simple language. Their attainments are likely to remain in the early P scale range (P1-P4) throughout their school careers (that is below level 1 of the National Curriculum).
PMLD 4a	Working at 'P' levels 1-4. Highly complex needs requiring 1:1 input for significant periods of time in order to access the curriculum. Need 1:1 support for at least 30% of the time
ASD	General descriptor from DfES guidance Jan 2004

	<p>Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) - Pupils with autistic spectrum disorder find it difficult to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand and use non-verbal and verbal communication • understand social behaviour — which affects their ability to interact with children and adults • think and behave flexibly – which may be shown in restricted, obsessional or repetitive activities. <p>Pupils with ASD cover the full range of ability and the severity of their impairment varies widely. Some pupils also have learning disabilities or other difficulties, making diagnosis difficult.</p> <p>Pupils with autistic spectrum disorders may have a difficulty in understanding the communication of others and in developing effective communication themselves. Many are delayed in learning to speak and some never develop meaningful speech. Pupils find it difficult to understand the social behaviour of others. They are literal thinkers and fail to understand the social context. They can experience high levels of stress and anxiety in settings that don't meet their needs or when routines are changed. This can lead to inappropriate behaviour.</p> <p>Some pupils with autistic spectrum disorders have a different perception of sounds, sights, smell, touch and taste and this affects their response to these sensations. They may have unusual sleep and behaviour patterns.</p> <p>Young pupils may not play with toys in a conventional and imaginative way but instead use toys rigidly or repetitively e.g. watching moving parts of machinery for long periods with intense concentration. They find it hard to generalise skills and have difficulty adapting to new situations and often prefer routine.</p>
ASD 5a	ASD primary need with severe learning difficulties. Requiring 1:2 adult support
ASD 5b	ASD primary need with severe learning difficulties. Significant level of additional need generally related to challenging behaviour. Requiring 1:2 adult support as a minimum and 1:1 support for up to 30% of the time in order to access the curriculum
ASD 5c	ASD primary need with severe learning difficulties. Requiring 1:1 support, usually due to behavioural needs, occasionally medical, often in the interests of health and safety of themselves, other pupils and staff.
ASD exceptional	ASD primary need with severe learning difficulties. Requiring 2:1 support, usually due to behavioural needs, occasionally medical, usually in the interests of health and safety of themselves, other pupils and staff.

LDD Panel Descriptors

The descriptors for each level and band follow a common pattern:

- A statement of the level of support required in terms of teaching or *special support assistance* ratios;
- The arrangements which might be appropriate to provide this support;
- Examples of the needs which would be covered by the particular level or band.

The following points should also be noted:

1. Neither the arrangements nor the examples are exhaustive: they are intended for the guidance of the panel and schools as to how a child's needs should be assessed in terms of the teaching or *special support* arrangements made, indicating the range of needs that are covered by the *descriptor*. The *principal requirement* is that each child's needs *should* be met, as specified in the statement.
2. The *teaching levels 1 to 4* are based on the need for teaching support, i.e. they relate to learning difficulty. For example, a severely physically disabled would not necessarily need a corresponding high level of teaching support, unless there were also learning difficulties. *However, Level 5 reflects the very high level of teaching support required for a child of normal intellectual ability accompanied by profound and sensory impairment.*
3. The *support bands* are based on the need for *special support assistance*, i.e. they relate to the need for additional support to facilitate access to the curriculum in light of the child's disability. In the case of bands Y and Z, which cover children with very complex and/or severe disabilities, the funding is at NNEB rates to reflect the high level of skilled support required.
4. In setting levels and bands the significant determination is the support required by each individual pupil, according to their statement: the examples are for illustration and guidance.

TEACHING LEVELS – LEVEL 1

Support

Special educational needs for which the governors are responsible from the resources available to schools. Level 1 allocates no additional teaching resources above the basic AWPU funding.

Arrangements

- Teaching in small groups for part of the week to develop skills in particular areas of the curriculum.
- Individual short teaching sessions for 3 or more times per week.
- Opportunities to discuss progress.
- Opportunities to reinforce skills learned and/or follow an individual programme of work.
- Differentiated work within the curriculum.

Examples

- Pupils in the normal age range of learning ability and attainment in the context of the National Curriculum.
- Pupils with general or specific learning difficulties, whose level of attainment is below the normal range, who require support within a mainstream setting, and for whom this support is most appropriately provided by a non-teaching assistant working under the direction of the teacher.
- Pupils with speech and language difficulties, following a programme of daily exercises planned by a speech and language therapist.
- Pupils with physical difficulties, whose ability and attainment fall within the normal range.
- Pupils with sensory impairment, whose ability and attainment fall within the normal range.
- Pupils with mild/moderate behavioural difficulties, e.g. necessitating withdrawal from the classroom on an infrequent basis. Such pupils would be taught in a mainstream setting with no additional support for the major part of the week.
- Pupils for whom a period of short-term intervention, e.g. to follow a behaviour modification programme is planned.
- Pupils requiring daily support to help with organisation, or to provide basic emotional support.

TEACHING LEVELS – LEVEL 2

Support

Additional teaching support to provide an overall 1:10.3 teacher-pupil ratio, when taking both AWPU and NWPU into account.

Arrangements

- Small group teaching throughout the day *within a special school setting*.
- Access to small group and/or in class support within a mainstream setting on a daily basis.
- Withdrawal for intensive individual/small group teaching.
- Delivery of the National Curriculum at a slower pace and/or with an emphasis on basic skills/development of specific skill areas.
- Opportunities for reinforcement and over-learning and/or practical experiences.

Examples

- Nursery and infant pupils requiring longer term assessment.
- Pupils with moderate of specific learning difficulties, where the difficulties are severe enough to require small group teaching throughout the day of *additional* teaching support to follow the National Curriculum in a mainstream setting.
- Pupils with speech and language disorders or sensory impairment who require additional teaching support to follow the National Curriculum in a mainstream setting.
- Pupils with a physical *disability* and associated learning difficulties, who require additional teaching support to follow the National Curriculum in a mainstream setting.
- Pupils whose emotional and behavioural difficulties in social communication require small group support in a consistent and well structured environment.

TEACHING LEVELS – LEVEL 3

Support

Additional teaching support to provide an overall 1:7.9 teacher-pupil ratio, when taking both AWPU and NWPU into account.

Arrangements

- Intensive teaching support throughout the day, in a special school setting.
- Access to small group teaching in addition to teaching support in the mainstream setting for the greater part of the day.
- Individual programme planning and monitoring.

Examples

- Pupils with severe learning difficulties, who require a small teaching group with a high level of teacher support and individual programme planning.
- Pupils with speech and language difficulties or sensory impairment, who require access to small group teaching for part of the day and additional teaching support within the mainstream.
- Pupils with a physical disability and additional learning difficulties who require access to small group teaching for part of the day and additional teaching within the mainstream.
- Pupils whose emotional and behavioural difficulties require small group support, and who, in addition, have moderate or specific learning difficulties or difficulties in social communication.

TEACHING LEVELS – LEVEL 4

Support

Additional teaching support to provide an overall 1:5.2 teacher-pupil ratio, when taking both AWPU and NWPU into account.

Arrangements

- Education in small groups, with opportunities for individual teaching during the course of the day, covering all major areas of experience, with a multi-disciplinary approach facilitating communication with others and interaction with the environment.

Examples

- Pupils whose complex learning difficulties, which may be accompanied by communication *difficulties* and/or physical *disability*, require a high level of teaching input to develop and deliver individual programmes.
- Pupils with speech and language disorders or sensory impairment who require to be taught in a small group throughout the day.

TEACHING LEVELS – LEVEL 5

Support

Additional teaching support to provide an overall 1:3.1 teacher-pupil ratio, when taking both AWPU and NWPU into account.

Arrangements

- Specialist intensive teaching in a small group and on an individual basis throughout the day in very exceptional circumstances.
- Small group and individual teaching throughout the day, and with individual teaching support to facilitate mainstream experience.

Examples

- Pupils of normal intellectual ability having profound sensory impairment, e.g. blind and/or profoundly deaf, as well as profound physical disability. That is, pupils who require teaching support to enable them to receive instructions, to make use of materials and facilitate their responses.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND T

Support

Special *educational* needs for which the governors are responsible *from the resources available to schools*. Band T allocates no additional resources for special support assistance *but enables the LA to issue a monitoring statement*.

Arrangements

- Support and supervision for periodic small group work.
- Daily programmes of work recommended by a specialist teacher or para-medic.
- Occasional support in the use of care or specialist equipment.

Examples

- Support for teaching in small groups to develop literacy skills.
- Support for one aspect of literacy, e.g. spelling or presentation of work.
- In class support for differentiated work in specific curriculum areas on a daily basis.
- Pupils with mild hand control problems, which require the loan of equipment from the Teaching and Support Service.
- Pupils who use wheelchairs, sticks or callipers, and who are proficient in their use and in their own hygiene.
- Pupils with medical problems who are able to manage their own medication with some supervision.
- Pupils in need of only occasional guidance in the use of specialist equipment, e.g. radio aids and desk top visual aids.
- Pupils in need of support regarding the use, care and maintenance of hearing aids, spectacles and desk top equipment.
- Pupils in need of periodic support, individually or in small groups, to supervise activities addressing language delay, auditory perception and basic skills development.
- Pupils who will benefit from an improved adult/pupil ratio to ensure physical safety in PE or off school site activities.
- Isolated incidents of disturbing behaviour or persistent low level disruption.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND U

Support

Additional special support assistance to provide an overall 1:10.5 adult-pupil ratio.

Arrangements

- Support for small group work throughout the day, e.g. in a special school setting.
- Access to small group and/or in-class support on a daily basis.
- Withdrawal for individual work under the direction of the teacher on a regular daily basis.
- The production of additional materials to ensure differentiation and access to the curriculum.

Examples

- Pupils needing longer term assessment, requiring adult support within a small group, or in-class support within a mainstream class.
- Pupils with moderate or specific learning difficulties, who require either support within a small group setting throughout the day, or access to small group/in-class support on a daily basis.
- Pupils with speech and language difficulties requiring daily adult support to implement programmes advised by the speech and language therapist.
- Pupils with physical difficulties or sensory impairment, who require regular monitoring of programmes for skill development, e.g. self-help, mobility.
- Pupils requiring supervision of programmes of work on a daily basis, e.g. for the development of keyboard skills.
- Pupils in need of support to provide scribing facilities.
- Pupils requiring daily support for the management of their behaviour over an extended period.
- Pupils requiring regular guidance and support for emotional or organisational problems.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND V/W

Support

Additional *special support assistance* to provide an overall 1:8.1 adult-pupil ratio.

Arrangements

- Support for intensive small group work throughout the day, e.g. general classroom support and implementation of individual programmes under the direction of the teacher.
- Support for part of the day to facilitate an integration programme.
- Access to adult supervision and/or care throughout the day.

Examples

- *Pupils with severe learning difficulties requiring small group work throughout the day.*
- Pupils with learning difficulties, which may be associated with speech and language difficulties and/or physical difficulties, who require a high level of adult support for care, supervision and the implementation of programmes under the direction of the teacher.
- Pupils with speech and language difficulties, *requiring access to daily adult support in a small group and/o in-class support within a mainstream setting.*
- Pupils with physical difficulties, who require frequent assistance to ensure mobility and posture and self organisation.
- Pupils with sensory difficulties, requiring supervision of small group work skill development, and/or auditory training, and/or language/literacy development.
- Pupils with sensory difficulties, requiring support for part of each day to ensure the reception of classroom instructions and understanding and the teacher's understanding of their responses.
- Pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties, who require support for small group work, and also for some individual work under the direction of the teacher.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND X

Support

Additional special support assistance to provide an overall 1:7.1 adult-pupil ratio.

Arrangements

- Access to personal support on a daily basis for a substantial part of the day.

Examples

- Pupils with learning difficulties, which may be associated with speech and language difficulties and/or physical difficulties, and who also have a significant sensory impairment, who require a high level of adult support for care, supervision and the implementation of programmes under the direction of the teacher.
- Pupils with speech and language disorders or physical difficulties or sensory impairment who require a high level of adult support for the greater part of the day to facilitate access to mainstream teaching.
- Pupils with physical difficulties, who require assistance in toileting and feeding and IT access.
- Pupils in need of repetition and reinforcement of classroom instructions as a constant need across their integrated programme.
- Pupils whose behaviour requires a high level of adult supervision and control to avoid potentially damaging situations.
- Pupils who require support in most social situations within a school setting to avoid extreme distress or anxiety.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND Y

Support

Additional *special support assistance* to provide an overall 1:3.5 adult-pupil ratio.

Arrangements

- A high level of personal support for care and/or supervision and the implementation of individual programmes.

Examples

- Pupils with minimal physical control who require assistance for all basic needs.
- Pupils requiring special facilities for the reproduction of materials, e.g. Braille.
- Pupils requiring signing facilitator support across the curriculum.
- Pupils needing adult guidance and supervision because of persistent and extreme anti-social behaviour and/or extreme problems of self-control.

SUPPORT BANDS – BAND Z

Support

Additional special support assistance to provide an overall 1:1.6 adult-pupil ratio.

Arrangements

- Personal support throughout the school day.

Examples

- Pupils who require constant personal support because of a potentially life-threatening medical condition.
- Pupils in any setting who require constant individual supervision for the safety of themselves and/or others.

Pupils whose sensory or physical impairment prevents access to the curriculum or the normal life of the school without constant adult support.

BANDED FUNDING MODEL

Funding delivered through each band is in addition to AWPU within mainstream schools and those with specialist resource bases. There are also other streams of funding within special schools.

Bands are progressive in nature and provision at early bands should be arranged in addition to that which is described for higher bands i.e. each list is not a standalone and is not exhaustive. These are examples only.

Band 1a - £0

This includes pupils with:

- General or specific learning difficulties requiring regular support from an LSA under the direction of a teacher
- Speech and language difficulties following programmes set by a Speech and Language Therapist eg language delay, auditory perception and basic skills development
- Physical difficulties whose ability and attainment are in the normal range who require frequent assistance to ensure mobility, posture and self organisation
- Medical problems able to manage medication with supervision
- Sensory impairments whose ability and attainment are in the normal range who require guidance in the use of specialist equipment including radio aid, hearing aid, visual aids and support to ensure reception of classroom instructions and understanding
- Mild/moderate behaviour, emotional or social difficulties requiring short term interventions, daily support with organisation and small group work to retain focus
- A need for increased supervision during PE, breaks or off site activities to ensure safety

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Teaching in small groups for part of the week to develop skills in particular areas of the curriculum
- Individual short teaching sessions for 3 or more times a week
- Opportunities to reinforce skills learned
- Opportunities to follow an individual programme of work
- Differentiated work in the classroom and homework including production of materials
- Support in the use or care of specialist equipment
- Support to manage medication
- Access to adult supervision and/or care throughout the day

- Support with personal care
- Access to an individual work station where necessary
- Access to aids and adaptations and equipment to facilitate access to disabled pupils
- Regular contact with parents/carers to support progress and parental confidence
- Access to support services as appropriate to the pupil's needs

Band 1b - £0

This includes pupils with:

- General or specific learning difficulties requiring small group teaching for the greater part of the day or additional teaching support on an individual basis and who require repetition and reinforcement of instructions as a constant need
- Learning difficulties that may be associated with speech and language difficulties, physical difficulties or sensory impairment
- Speech and language disorders who require additional teaching support
- Sensory impairment who require additional teaching support
- Physical difficulties who require additional teaching support and assistance in toileting, feeding and IT access
- Behavioural, emotional or social difficulties or social communication difficulties requiring small group support in a consistent and well structured environment

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Access to personal support for part of each day including toileting and feeding
- Small group teaching for part of each day
- Access to in class support on a daily basis
- Withdrawal for intensive individual or small group teaching for specific programmes
- Delivery of the National Curriculum at a slower pace with an emphasis on basic skills
- Opportunities for practical experiences to support reinforcement and over learning
- Implementation of programmes designed by therapists e.g. speech and language therapy, occupational therapy, physiotherapy and release of staff to be trained by therapist

Band 1c - £6k

This includes pupils with:

- Significant learning difficulties, speech and language difficulties, sensory impairment, physical disability or behavioural, emotional or social difficulties who require small teaching groups for a large proportion of the day together with a differentiated curriculum

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Access to small group support for a large part of the day
- A personalised curriculum with regular monitoring

- Teacher oversight with stringent measurement of impact of interventions delivered
- Termly planning with support services and therapists including systematic and regular communication, joint target setting, an agreed Lead Professional/Key Worker

Band 2 - £10k

This includes pupils with:

- Learning difficulties, which may include communication difficulties, physical disability, speech and language disorder, sensory impairment
- Limited physical control who require assistance for basic needs
- Requirement for special facilities eg reproduction of materials using Braille, signing facilitators
- Behaviour difficulties which require support to avoid potentially damaging situations and those that require support in social situations to avoid distress or anxiety

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- A high level of personal care
- Staff with skills in Braille, or willing to learn
- Staff able to sign, or willing to learn
- Small group teaching for the majority of the day with opportunities for individual work under the direction of the teacher
- Adult support to facilitate communication with others and interaction in the environment

Band 3 - £15k

This includes pupils with:

- Complex learning difficulties including communication difficulties, physical disability, sensory impairment and associated behavioural, emotional and social difficulties
- Potentially life threatening medical conditions requiring regular personal support
- Sensory or physical impairment that limits access to the curriculum and normal life of the school without constant adult support
- Behavioural, emotional and social difficulties who have poor concentration, frequent temper outbursts, verbally abusive to peers and adults and their behaviour presents as a barrier to learning despite the implementation of an effective school behaviour policy, personal/social curriculum, extended involvement of support services. Pupils may also have difficulties at home.

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- A high level of personal support for care needs
- Implementation of individual programmes
- Access to appropriate therapy inputs and staff to deliver programmes
- Small teaching groups
- A staffing ratio of 1:1 for parts of the day in order to meet specific needs and support inclusion
- Curriculum broken down in to small steps including within the P levels

Band 4 - £20k

This includes pupils with:

- Complex learning difficulties and/or other significant needs such as medical, physical, behavioural, social, sensory, communication and interaction
- Profound and multiple learning difficulties with significant care needs
- Challenging behaviours linked to learning and social communication difficulties
- Emotional needs linked to mental health difficulties

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Sensory stimulation
- Curriculum broken down in to small steps usually within the P levels
- Support with communication through gesture, eye pointing, symbols or very simple language
- Small class/teaching groups with additional support at a ratio of 1:1 for parts of the day
- Individual programmes often within the pupils home using interactive online learning leading to integrate in small group study.

Band 5 - £25k

This includes pupils with:

- An inability to function at all in a group situation
- Persistent and frequent challenging behaviour which requires physical intervention
- Highly complex, profound and multiple learning difficulties encompassing a number of areas eg medical, physical, sensory.
- High dependence on adult support
- Profound sensory impairment but not necessarily learning difficulties

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Small class groups with additional support at a ratio of at least 1:1 and 2:1 at times either due to behavioural outbursts or needing 2 adults to be present for medical interventions
- Requirement for individual programmes and implementation of therapeutic interventions and care needs
- Access to appropriate communication aids and resources

Band 6 - £30k

This includes pupils with:

- Profound sensory impairment (may not have learning difficulties) eg blind and/or profoundly deaf as well as profound physical disability
- Multi sensory impairment ie blind and deaf
- Social communication difficulties with severe learning difficulties and challenging behaviour
- Significant sensory processing difficulties

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Specialist intensive teaching in small groups and on an individual basis throughout the day
- Staffing ratio of at least 1:1 at all times and 2:1 at times
- Implementation of individual programmes devised by a multi-professional team through the team around the child

Band 7 - £40k

This includes pupils with:

- Extreme challenging behaviour unable to cope in a school setting

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Individual programmes including off site activities leading to gradual reintegration in to a school setting
- Learning through creative activities
- Engagement in short term or part time programmes with other providers
- Staff trained to work with young people with extreme and persistent challenging behaviour and an understanding of current research and practice in this area

Band 8 - £50k

This includes pupils with:

- Severe learning difficulties combined with extremely challenging behaviour linked to a diagnosis of autism and possibly medical needs requiring a constant and consistent level of care with highly trained and experienced members of staff

Schools will be expected to arrange provision such as:

- Staff trained to work with pupils with autism and related difficulties requiring a consistent approach throughout the school day at a ratio of 2:2 i.e. 2 adults to 1 pupil
- A high level of contact with parents/carers to ensure consistency of approach and modelling of strategies wherever possible
- A high level of communication with other professionals involved with the child to ensure a consistency between settings with joint target setting and monitoring, through a team around the child

Summary

New Band	Previous Bands
Band 1a	NWPU 1T, 1U, 1V
Band 1b	NWPU 1X, 2U, 2V, 3T
Band 1c	NWPU 2X, 3U Special School bands MLDa, MLDb
Band 2	NWPU of 1Y, 2Y, 3V, 3X, 4T, 4U Special School bands MLDe, SLDa
Band 3	NWPU of 3Y, 4V, 4X Special School bands SLDb, ASDa, EBDa Resourced school places
Band 4	NWPU of 1Z, 2Z, 3Z, 4Y Special School bands MLDe, SLDe, ASDb, PMLDa
Band 5	NWPU 4Z Special School bands SLDe, EBDb, PMLDe
Band 6	NWPU 5Z Special School band ASDc
Band 7	Special School band EBDc
Band 8	Special School band ASDe

Review of SEN Funding

Updated Timetable for Review

By When	Action
End January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect detailed information from Special Schools and Resource Units (questionnaire) • Collate and review information from Special Schools and Resource Units • Develop new banding model • Model current and proposed funding; make provision in draft Schools Budget 2012-13
7 February	Task and Finish Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consider proposals for 1 April 2012, • consider draft banded funding model, and • agree updated timetable for 1 September 2012
6 March	Principles approved by Schools Forum:
26 March	Task and Finish Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider feedback from Schools Forum, • Consider draft consultation document, and • Plan for consultation
18 April	Consult Schools Forum
23 April to 30 May	Consultation with schools, groups etc
10 May	Consultation Session 6pm
15 May	Consultation Session 2pm
16 May	Schools Forum
30 May	Consultation deadline
12 June	Task and Finish Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider feedback from consultation, and • Agree recommendation to Schools Forum on banded funding model
June	Officers fine-tune banded funding model and proposals, following consultation
4 July	Final proposals submitted to Schools Forum
September 2012 or April 2013	Proposed implementation

Slough Schools Forum – 2011/12 Work Programme

Wednesday 18 April 2012

- Accountability
- Charging Policy
- SEN Review Update
- School Specific Contingency
- Centrally Managed Budgets
- Latest Schools Budget 2012-13
- School Funding Reform and Arrangements for 2013-14
- Financial Management Assurance Consultation
- Academies
- Updated Work Programme 2011-12

Wednesday 16 May 2012

- Non-schools outturn 2011-12
- Headroom 2012-13
- Draft response to School Funding Reform and Arrangements for 2013-14
- Implementation of School Funding Reform and Arrangements for 2013-14
- Academies
- Updated Work Programme 2011-12

Tuesday 4 July 2012

- Outcome of consultation on proposals for changes to SEN Funding
- Schools Outturn 2011-12
- School Budget Plans
- Confirmation of Final DSG allocations 2012-13 (subject to DfE notification date)
- School Balances
- Academies
- Draft Work Programme 2012-13

This page is intentionally left blank