

Schools Forum Agenda

Thursday, 5 February 2015

4.30 pm – 6.30 pm, Committee Room 3 - Civic Suite
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Janita Aubun tel 020 8314 7030
Email: janita.aubun@lewisham.gov.uk

Item	Pages
1. Minutes of Last Meeting	1 - 5
2. Matters Arising	
3. Election of Chair & Vice-Chair for the coming year	
4. Budget Monitoring	6 - 17
To consider the current budget monitoring position, a bid on the contingency and de-delegating of the contingency.	
5. Budget Update	18 - 23
To agree the DSG budget for next year and to agree the approach to completing the individual school budget return required by the DFE.	
6. SEND Consultation	24 - 31
To consider the response for the Department of Education's call for evidence on SEND funding.	
7. Any Other Business	

Dates of Future Meetings

19 March 2015

All meetings 4.30 to 6.30

Agenda Item 1

LEWISHAM SCHOOLS FORUM



Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 11th December 2014

Membership (Quorum = 40% i.e. 9)

✓ = present

✗ = absent

		Attendance
Primary School Headteachers		
Primary School	VACANT	
Steve Davies	Coopers Lane	✗
Liz Booth	Dalmain	✓
Paul Moriarty	Good Shepherd	✗
Lisa Pearson	Torridon Infants	✗
Michael Roach	John Ball	✗
Nursery School Headteacher		
Nikki Oldhams	Chelwood	✓
Secondary School Headteachers		
Anne Potter	Addey & Stanhope	✓
Bob Ellis	Conisborough College	✓
David Sheppard	Leathersellers Federation	✓
Carolyn Unsted (Chair)	Sydenham	✓
Special School Headteacher		
Lynne Haines	Greenvale	✓
Pupil Referral Unit Headteacher		
Liz Jones	Abbey Manor	✓
Primary & Special School Governors		
Keith D'Wan	Athelney	✓
Dame Erica Pienaar	John Ball	Apologies
Mark Simons	Coopers Lane	✗
Secondary & Secondary Special School Governors		
Pat Barber	Bonus Pastor	Apologies
James Pollard	Addey & Stanhope	✓
VACANT	Special School	
Academies		
Declan Jones	Haberdashers' Aske's	Apologies
14-19 Consortium Rep		
Theresa Williams	LeSoCo	✗
Early Years Rep		
Cathryn Kinsey	Clyde Nursery	✓
Diocesan Authorities		
Rev Richard Peers	Southwark Diocesan Board of Education	✗
Stephen Bryan	Education Commission	Apologies

Also Present	
Alan Docksey	Head of Resources & Performance
Dave Richards	CYP Group Finance Manager
Hayden Judd	Principal Accountant
Donal O'Sullivan	Consultant – Public Health
Kim Knappett	Teachers Union (ALT)
Nicola Maslin	CYP Finance
Simon Nundy	Trinity
Janita Aubun	Clerk

Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Dame Erica Pienaar, Declan Jones, Frankie Sulke, Stephen Bryan & Pat Barber.

1. Minutes of Meeting held on 25th September 2014

Minute number 3 on the contingency was queried. The chair has confirmed with the Vice Chair (who was chairing the meeting for that item) that the minute was accurate in her recollection.

The rest of the minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.

2. Matters Arising

No other matters arising.

3. Service Level Agreements – Public Health

Public Health Programme budget proposal 2015/16 – report presented by Donal O’Sullivan gave details of the proposal for the training programme to schools and the costs.

Donal O’Sullivan informed the Forum of the proposed SLA charges for nutrition, healthy lifestyles, drugs & alcohol, junior citizens programme, the prevention of smoking, sex and relationships within Primary and Secondary Schools. Recognition that drugs & alcohol currently has the most take-up with schools with nutrition the least. Special Schools have been excluded from this proposal but further discussions will take place with special schools

In addition the management of the EpiPen is to be taken up separately and outside of Forum.

It was agreed the officers should send details to schools

4. Budget Monitoring Report

High Needs SEN

There were no changes on the position from the previous Schools Forum. The High Needs block forecast overspend, remains at £1,501k.

School Budget Monitoring

The indications from the budget monitoring returns is that schools are projecting an end of year underspend of £10m based on past trends in school forecasting this is likely to grow by the year end to £15m.

The data about school’s performance and budget monitoring as at September 2014. For those schools who did not make a return Alan Docksey will be contacting the Headteachers of the schools concerned. Forum noted that for any schools where there is a new Head, extra support may be needed.

Question raised regarding the inclusion/exclusion of PFI figures in schools carry forward balances. Alan Docksey clarified that all such exclusions had been taken into account at the end of the financial year and Finance will continue to do this. We would not normally undertake this in-year. Lynne Haines mentioned again their outstanding single status issue for Greenvale and the impact this has on their school balances.

5. High Needs Sub Group Report

Report presented by Alan Docksey

It was agreed to:

- No longer add back the matrix funding deduction that was withdrawn last year. This would result in a further reduction in the top-up rates of £4,800.
- Reduce the collaborative funding reduction by £300k,
- Abbey Manor College £2k funding adjustment,
- To ask the sub group to continue its work for a year,
- Extend the brief of the group to incorporate home to school transport .

The Forum thanked the Headteachers for their work on the sub group.

Matrix Rates

- The sub group have recommended a further reduction in the matrix rates level for 2015/16.
These revised rates will bring Lewisham into line with other boroughs.
- Lo Need/Hi Incidence SEN – for 2015/16 the Sub-group recommended a reduction in the level of this funding distributed via collaboratives.

St Matthews Academy are not included in the above proposals.

Forum were informed that the next High Needs Sub Group meeting date has not yet been set is but likely to be in February.

All the above recommendations were upheld.

6. Budget Report

Report was presented by Alan Docksey for Forum to agree the DSG budget for 2015/16.

At the time of Schools Forum the figures were not yet available as the DFE is not likely to announce the provisional DSG financial settlement till the following week.

Contingency

The Forum discussed the proposal to agree a payment holiday on the contingency and not de-delegate the contingency fund for 2015/16 only. Officers were asked to bring to the next meeting details of the payments made from the contingency over the last three years. At the meeting the Forum would like to consider the level of the contingency.

Free School Meals

Nikki Oldhams' raised the issue of Lewisham's on-line publicity for FSM and pupil premium. Alan Docksey informed Forum that this is being looked into and a new on-line check system is being worked on which parents should be able to access. This is some 12 months away however.

The Forum Agreed to

- (a) Set 2015/16 ISB funding rates at the same level as 2014/15
- (b) Consider the funding settlement at the meeting on 5th February and if necessary revise the funding rates to schools
- (c) Agree with the continuation of the headroom projects that are funded through a DSG top-slice at the current level of funding
- (d) The Collaborative SEN funding continue to be passed to banker schools.
- (e) The former Standards Fund Collaborative funding is not de-delegated from 2015/16.
- (f) The primary and secondary 2015/16 budgets for de-delegation as proposed in the paper
- (g) Agree to budgets for central spend as proposed in the paper

7. Information Item – Schools Minor Works Programme

Included in Forum papers.

8. Any Other Business

None

Meeting closed 6.36pm

Date of next meeting 5 February 2015

SCHOOLS FORUM ACTION SUMMARY

ITEM	ACTION TO BE TAKEN	OFFICER(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	OUTCOME/CURRENT POSITION
SLA – Public Health	Revised paper for circulation to School Headteachers	Donal O’Sullivan	To be actioned
Budget Report	<p>Ever 6 early years info. For Cathryn Kinsey</p> <p>Contingency – benchmarking data to be provided showing comparisons with other boroughs</p>	<p>Alan Docksey</p> <p>Dave Richards</p>	<p>To be actioned</p> <p>To be actioned</p>

Financial Update and Budget Monitoring report

1. Purpose of the Report

This report looks at the budget monitoring position of the Dedicated Schools Grant, it considers the financial position of the mutual funds held by the Forum, whether the contingency for 2015/16 should be de-delegated and to consider a bid made on the contingency for falling rolls.

2. Recommendation

The Forum agree

- i) To not ask for a contribution from schools to the contingency mutual fund for 2015/16.
- ii) To set the future contingency provisionally at £650k
- iii) The Forum agree to the revised terms of the falling rolls contingency
- iv) The Forum agrees the contingency bid referred to in section 7

3 High Needs SEN

The High Needs SEN budget consists of the funding that is given to Special, Primary and Secondary schools for matrix children and resource bases, to FE providers and to independent schools. The latest indications are that the costs have risen over the last term by £300k. This relates to an increase in the number of matrix children, special schools placements and the independent sector placements. The details are provided in the table below

Type of placement	Numbers
Matrix and Resource Bases	680
Special Schools	547
Independent schools	413
Total	1640

The Department for Education on the 18 December notified us of an additional allocation to the high needs block of £0.7m for 2014/15. This relates to a adjustment that was not taken into account when the part recoupable academies were brought into the funding system. It is

proposed that the funding remains within the high needs block to help offset the budget pressure.

4. School Budget Monitoring

At the last meeting details of the schools' budget monitoring returns were provided. At the time there were 7 schools with returns outstanding. This has been reduced to three and the remaining schools were written to by the Head of Resources, CYP.

There remains two schools with deficit licence applications, Deptford Green and All Saints which are being reviewed.

5. Mutual Funds

The Schools Forum has a number of mutual funds it manages on behalf of schools. At the end of the year any balances are returned to schools or rolled forward to the next year. The current position of the funds is described below:

Fund	Budget	Spent or committed to date	Balance
	£000	£000	£000
Growth Fund	1,739	1,865	(126)
Contingency	1,253	280	973
Maternity Fund	831	694	137

5.1 Growth Fund

All Growth Fund allocations have now been actioned. The expenditure of £1.87m is £126k in excess of the budget as a result of the creation of more new places than was anticipated.

The 2014/15 Growth Fund budget is £1,739k and is made up as follows

- £672k bulge classes (equivalent of 12 bulge classes),
- £762k expanding schools (some new, some continuing. Covers 13 schools) and
- £306k continuing funding for resources (funding is paid each year as new places move through the school).

5.2. Contingency

5.2.1 No further bids have been made since the last meeting of the Forum.

5.2.2 Creation of a contingency for secondary schools with falling rolls

A bid from this contingency has been received. It will be tabled at the meeting (as it contains confidential information) for discussion and a decision on whether it should be approved. The details are discussed in section 7 of this report

5.3 Non-Sickness Supply Fund

At the end of last year the non-sickness supply budget was under spent by £89k.

The Autumn Term claims have now been actioned. The Summer and Autumn Term claims breakdown as shown in the table below:

Phase	Claim Type	Number	Amount	Average
			£	£
Primary	Jury	4	1,981	495
	Maternity	36	249,243	6,923
	Paternity	5	6,371	1,274
	Suspension	4	18,629	4,657
		49	276,225	5,637
Secondary*	Jury Service	3	2,706	902
	Maternity	16	132,025	8,252
	Paternity	1	1,640	1,640
		20	136,371	6,819
Special	Maternity	3	13,037	4,346
	Suspension	2	10,008	5,004
		5	23,045	4,609
		74	435,639	5,887

* includes all-through schools

The pattern of expenditure on maternity in previous years has not been followed to date in the current year. It looks as if the fund will

underspend at the year end. If this is the case the funding will be returned to schools. The amount will be confirmed once the accounts are closed and actioned in 2015/16.

6 Contingency

6.1 In the discussions at the last meeting when considering the Collaboratives Funding it was highlighted that Lewisham has the highest contingency per pupil in the country. This is partly due to the former standards funds given to schools being held in the contingency before it is passed to the collaboratives banker schools. If this is excluded, Lewisham's contingency per pupil is £38 or £1,300k, this compares with the national average of £5 per pupil. If we were to lower our contingency to this level it would stand at £200k. This would be below the spend on the contingency in two of the last three years.

6.2 At the meeting consideration was given to not de-delegating the contingency for 2015/16. Further thought was given to whether the balance from last year should be distributed.

6.3 It was requested that information be provided on benchmarking and past allocations from the contingency. These are shown in Appendix A and B respectively

6.4 There are five options that could be pursued in relation to the contingency. The advantages and disadvantages are described below

6.4.1 Option 1 - No payment is requested from schools for 2015/16

This would prevent the size of the fund growing to a level above need.

This would leaves balances above the benchmark spend.

6.4.2 Option 2 - To redistribute the current balance on the contingency

This would prevent the size of the fund growing to a level above likely need

The amount given to schools would be at the same level as in Option 1

More administration costs as a payment would have to raised to each school and processed by the school.

It would increase end of year balances in schools.

There would need to be a de-delegation amount in 2015/16.

6.4.3 Option 3 - To reduce the size of the contingency.

This would be achieved by lowering the amount of the de-delegation from schools. Looking at the data on benchmarking and past allocations (See Appendix A and B), this needs to be done. An element of judgement is needed but it would seem sensible to reduce the level of the average in Inner London. The average amounts per pupil in other Inner London authorities is £18 per pupil.

If we used the £18 per pupil benchmark this would amount to £650k for Lewisham

Currently the contingency here in Lewisham stands at

	Total	Per Pupil
	£'000	£
Current total	2788	78
Less collaborative funds now given to schools	1489	42
Revised Total	1299	36
Reduction needed to the average level of inner London Authorities	664	18
Revised Level	635	18

6.4.4 Option 4 - To leave the position as it is and to continue to de-delegate the funds from schools

This would seem unnecessary as there is already sufficient funds in the mutual fund. If option 2 is taken to pay the existing funds back to schools, then this option would be necessary.

6.4.5 Options 5 – Not to have a contingency

Under this option each school would individually bear the financial risk of unexpected events.

As we saw with some of the retrospective charges for NNDR costs for a school this could be significant. Schools managing them on their own would have to make major changes to the way the curriculum is delivered

6.5 It is recommended that option 1 is adopted as it has no detrimental impact,, minimises bureaucracy and doesn't inflate schools year end balances. It is proposed that the contingency de-delegation is reduced and this be brought in line with the inner London Authorities from 2016/17; this being set at £18 per

pupil or £650k. The level to be reviewed when next years budget is being determined along with all other budgets.

7 Bid to the falling rolls contingency

7.1 At the Forum meeting on the 25th September it was agreed to set aside part of the contingency to support secondary schools with falling rolls. This funding provides support to avoid the situation where a school may need to reduce the teaching complement to balance their budget, incurring redundancy costs, only to need to employ extra teachers in a few years time.

7.2 Support is available where

- i. Schools were judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (national requirement for such schemes).
- ii. Local planning data shows a drop in pupils of more than 60 and then a future rise within the next 3 years to a level above that at the time of the application for funds.
- iii. Funding will be provided for the cost of a teacher on a per pupil basis
- iv. The school would need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget
- v. There will be an annual review
- vi. An application for funding is made to the Schools Forum.

7.3 The bid received will be tabled at that meeting and redacted for confidential purposes of naming the school concerned.

7.4 The original intention of the fund was for a school to apply for support before the roll has fallen but it is then expected that the roll will rise above that level.

7.5 The school concerned is in a position where it is managing the financial consequences of a fallen roll rather than anticipating one. The overall pupil numbers in Lewisham are likely to be at their lowest point currently and therefore it is unlikely that any school would trigger the terms of the provision and it is recommended the conditions of the contingency are changed to reflect this. Revised terms are shown in Appendix C.

- 7.6 The impact on this Schools' budget in 2015/16 is a need to reduce staffing to balance the budget by around £120k. This would likely require 2 staffing redundancies or cost reductions.
- 7.7 The benchmarking data indicates that the schools staffing costs per pupil are already below the average for Lewisham and is not therefore a generous staffing cost per pupil. Similarly other costs benchmark below average.
- 7.8 The request for support will
- Alleviate the spending reduction required in 2015/16
 - Avoid the cost of potential redundancies
 - Enable the school to retain skilled and valued teachers
- 7.9 The schools roll is anticipated to grow by 48 pupils from September 2015 to September 2017. On the basis of 30 pupils per class ratio it is proposed the school is likely to need support of 1.5 teachers at an average cost is £66k. The funding support needed would be £99k.
- 7.10 The schools bid is for £200k. This reflects that there are 143 vacant places in the school. The carry forward from last year totalled £337k and it was planned to use £143k of this balance this year. Other events have meant all the carry forward will be used this year, leaving an on-going deficit which for 2015/16 is currently £197k.
- 7.11 If the bid was accepted in full, this would use the total of the fund and would have a detrimental impact on other schools. It is recommended the sum of £99k is approved.
- 7.12 Any support will of course be reviewed for pupil number movements in March 2016 to ensure the projected numbers are in line with the actual numbers, and further need for support be considered.

Dave Richards

Group Finance Manager – Children and Young People

Contact on 0208 314 9442 or by e-mail at
Dave.Richards@Lewisham.gov.uk

Allocations from the contingency

	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special		
2012/13	-	120,538	-	-	Kelvin Grove	Costs of Resource Base - opening not anticipated at time of budget setting
2012/13	-	6,256	-	-	Baring	Correction to floor area used in formula
2012/13	-	1,040	-	-	Lee Manor	NNDR for additional buildings
2012/13	-	110,000	-	-	Various	Late additions to bulge class program
2012/13	-	87,747	147,326	74,944	Various	Balances of closed schools
	-	325,581	147,326	74,944		547,851
2013/14	-	-	89,000	-	Trinity	Additional resources relating to opening of Primary phase
	-	-	89,000	-		89,000
2014/15	-	220,606	-	-	Gordonbrock	NNDR Backdating
2014/15	-	-	59,526	-	Prendergast Ladywell	NNDR Backdating
	-	220,606	59,526	-		280,132

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 4 Budget Monitoring
Appendix B

Contingency - Sum per pupil 2014/15

	£
ENGLAND - Average (mean)	9
ENGLAND - Average (median)	5
ENGLAND - Minimum	0
ENGLAND - Maximum	76
209 Lewisham	76
316 Newham	65
856 Leicester	47
812 North East Lincolnshire	47
203 Greenwich	36
204 Hackney	30
210 Southwark	30
353 Oldham	28
370 Barnsley	25
877 Warrington	25
205 Hammersmith and Fulham	24
925 Lincolnshire	24
867 Bracknell Forest	23
916 Gloucestershire	23
876 Halton	22
340 Knowsley	22
921 Isle of Wight	21
213 Westminster	20
384 Wakefield	19
822 Bedford Borough	18
206 Islington	18
302 Barnet	17
840 Durham	17
333 Sandwell	17
881 Essex	16
815 North Yorkshire	16
358 Trafford	16
308 Enfield	14
208 Lambeth	14
852 Southampton	14
872 Wokingham	14
909 Cumbria	13
878 Devon	13
383 Leeds	13
810 City of Kingston Upon Hull	12
845 East Sussex	12
315 Merton	12
356 Stockport	12
861 Stoke-on-Trent	12
935 Suffolk	12
211 Tower Hamlets	12
889 Blackburn with Darwen	11
202 Camden	11
811 East Riding of Yorkshire	11
382 Kirklees	11
892 Nottingham	11
373 Sheffield	11
393 South Tyneside	11
908 Cornwall	10

Contingency - Sum per pupil 2014/15

	£
830 Derbyshire	10
320 Waltham Forest	10
846 Brighton and Hove	9
825 Buckinghamshire	9
826 Milton Keynes	9
926 Norfolk	9
330 Birmingham	8
835 Dorset	8
888 Lancashire	8
928 Northamptonshire	8
879 Plymouth	8
342 St. Helens	8
359 Wigan	8
311 Havering	7
802 North Somerset	7
808 Stockton-on-Tees	7
304 Brent	6
831 Derby	6
371 Doncaster	6
309 Haringey	6
392 North Tyneside	6
318 Richmond upon Thames	6
334 Solihull	6
860 Staffordshire	6
869 West Berkshire	6
823 Central Bedfordshire	5
332 Dudley	5
307 Ealing	5
314 Kingston upon Thames	5
341 Liverpool	5
355 Salford	5
319 Sutton	5
357 Tameside	5
880 Torbay	5
335 Walsall	5
937 Warwickshire	5
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	5
351 Bury	4
895 Cheshire East	4
896 Cheshire West and Chester	4
919 Hertfordshire	4
821 Luton	4
317 Redbridge	4
354 Rochdale	4
936 Surrey	4
938 West Sussex	4
885 Worcestershire	4
380 Bradford	3
801 City of Bristol	3
391 Newcastle upon Tyne	3
807 Redcar and Cleveland	3
372 Rotherham	3
893 Shropshire	3
212 Wandsworth	3

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 4 Budget Monitoring
Appendix B

Contingency - Sum per pupil 2014/15

	£
344 Wirral	3
873 Cambridgeshire	2
313 Hounslow	2
929 Northumberland	2
850 Hampshire	1
891 Nottinghamshire	1
836 Poole	1
865 Wiltshire	1
301 Barking and Dagenham	0
800 Bath & North East Somerset	0
303 Bexley	0
890 Blackpool	0
350 Bolton	0
837 Bournemouth	0
305 Bromley	0
381 Calderdale	0
331 Coventry	0
306 Croydon	0
841 Darlington	0
390 Gateshead	0
310 Harrow	0
805 Hartlepool	0
884 Herefordshire	0
312 Hillingdon	0
207 Kensington and Chelsea	0
886 Kent	0
855 Leicestershire	0
352 Manchester	0
887 Medway	0
806 Middlesbrough	0
813 North Lincolnshire	0
931 Oxfordshire	0
874 Peterborough	0
851 Portsmouth	0
870 Reading	0
857 Rutland	0
343 Sefton	0
871 Slough	0
933 Somerset	0
803 South Gloucestershire	0
882 Southend-on-Sea	0
394 Sunderland	0
866 Swindon	0
894 Telford & Wrekin	0
883 Thurrock	0
336 Wolverhampton	0
816 York	0

Bid to the falling rolls contingency

Conditions of use

Support is available where

- i. Schools were judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (This is a national requirement)
- ii. Local planning data shows a drop in pupils of more than 60 and then a future rise within the next 3 years to a level above that at the time of the application for funds

or

the school is supporting the falling roll through a carry forward which will be fully utilised and the roll is expected to rise within the next 3 years.

- iii. Funding will be provided for the cost of a teacher on a per pupil basis. For 2015/16 this will be £2,200 per pupil.
- iv. The school would need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget
- v. The benchmarking data shows the school has a lower than average cost in comparison with other Lewisham schools
- vi. There will be an annual review
- vii. An application for funding is made to the Schools Forum.

Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Update 2015/16

1. Purpose of this Report

The Schools Forum met on the 11 December to consider the 2015/16 budget position. This was prior to the funding settlement being received from the Department of Education. The Forum agreed to review the details of the settlement at this meeting to consider whether any of the original decisions they made may need revision. This paper looks at the settlement and considers the impact.

2. Recommendations

The Forum agree

to confirm the decision to set next year's funding rates on the ISB at the same level as last year (2014/15)

3. DSG Settlement

The settlement was received on the 18 December and broadly it was in line with expectations.

- 3.1 The overall settlement is £275.8m; this compares with the 2014/15 original figure of £268.6m. The figure quoted at the last Forum meeting was higher than this but the funding for the 2 years olds has been excluded from this indicative settlement. The 2 year olds figure will be announced in June.
- 3.2 The funding rate for Lewisham will be £5,963. This is slightly higher than last year's figure. The change is due to two accounting adjustments:
 - a) A reduction for the carbon reduction commitment which will be managed nationally
 - b) An increase for cash transfer for part-recoupment academies becoming fully recoupable.
- 3.3 Otherwise nationally the schools block per pupil funding rates are in principle cash frozen, apart from the share of the £390m given to 69 local authorities regarded as the lowest funding authorities, on a per pupil basis.

- 3.4 The early years pupil premium is included within the DSG settlement, unlike the current main pupil premium. The early years pupil premium is £0.39m
- 3.5 The Early Years block is based on the 2014/15 numbers and this will be updated in July 2015 for the January 2015 census.
- 3.6 As anticipated the former non-recoupment academies are included within the funding settlement for the first time. For Lewisham this is St Matthew and the Haberdashers' Aske's Free school. The total funding adjustment is £8.1m.
- 3.7 The high needs block has been adjusted for the full year impact of growth in numbers during this current year at £0.2m.

The table below shows the changes in funding from last year

	£m	£m
Initial 2015/16 DSG Settlement		275.8
Previously Announced DSG for 2014/15	268.6	
Adjusted for part recoupment academies	0.7	269.3
Change in funding DSG funding from 2014/15 to 2015/16		6.5
Extra Pupil numbers (763 pupils)		4.6
Non recoupment academies transferred to DSG		8.1
Funding for 2 years excluded from settlement		-6.7
Early Years pupil premium		0.3
High Needs block growth in pupils		0.2
		6.5

- 3.8 As the settlement is in line with the expected settlement it is not proposed to recommend any changes to the funding rates provisionally agreed at the meeting of the Forum on 11 December 2014. The recommendations agreed at the last meeting are shown in Appendix A.

4 Settlement Details

- 4.1 The final pupils numbers agreed by the DFE are as follows

	Oct-13	Oct-14	Change	
Primary	22,155.5	23,179.5	1,024.0	4.6%
Primary Academy	1,145.5	1,157.5	12.0	1%
Secondary	8,672.5	8,486.5	-186.0	-2.1%
Secondary Academy	2,011.0	1,962.0	-49.0	-2.4%
Jan Uplift*1	57.0	45.0	-12.0	-21%
SEN Units	- 184.0	- 210.0	-26.0	14.1%
Total*2	33,857.5	34,620.5	763.0	2.3%
Newly Transferred Academies	-	1,350.0	1,350.0	
Total*3	33,857.5	35,970.5	2,113.0	6.2%

- 4.2 The schools funding formula has now been re-worked with the latest available data. In summary this would result in the following changes to school budgets between 2014/15 and 2015/16.

Change in funding as a percentage of budget (ISB Formula Plus MFG)			Number of schools	
			Gaining	Losing
over	8%	10	0	
6% to	7.99%	4	0	
4% to	5.99%	1	3	
2% to	3.99%	7	8	
0% to	1.99%	19	26	

The funding per school will be tabled at the meeting.

5 Conclusion

The settlement was expected but that does not mean it is a good settlement for Lewisham Schools. The freeze in funding rates will mean the extra costs of the pay award, increase pension costs and inflation will have to be met from existing resources. To mitigate this there is the reduced request for contingency, additional pupils numbers in primary and increase in the pupil premium.

With the changes to the high needs funding, 2015/16 will be a difficult.

The expectation is that these type of difficulties will continue for some time as the politicians try to reduce the national deficit.

Dave Richards

Group Finance Manager – Children and Young People

Contact on 0208 314 9442 or by e-mail at
Dave.Richards@Lewisham.gov.uk

Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Report decisions

At the meeting of the Forum on the 11 December 2014 the budget for 2015/16 was considered and the following changes were agreed:

- a) Agree to next year's funding rates on the ISB at the same level as last year (2014/15)
- b) Agree with the continuation of each of the following projects that are funded through a top-slice from the DSG at the current level of funding
 - Management Support To PFI/New Schools With Major Capital Projects
 - New Woodlands Outreach
 - Tutors For Looked After Children - Year 6
 - Social Workers At New Woodlands / Abbey Manor College
 - Partnership Development
 - Additional Tutors For Looked After Children – Key Stage 3
 - Social Workers In Special Schools
- c) By voting phase, agree the following budget for 2015/16 that will be de-delegated

Ref	Heading	Primary £'000	Secondary £'000
A	De-delegation for mainstream schools for Contingencies	0	0
B	Extended schools collaborative (contingency) allocation	0	0
C	Administration of free school meals	46	20
D	Staff costs – Supply Cover	594	206
E	Support for minority ethnic pupils/underachieving groups	112	48

d) The forum agree to the following budgets for central spend

Ref	Heading	Budget 2015/16 £'000	Budget 2014/15 £'000
A	Growth fund (to meet requirements for basic need and infant class size regulations)	1,800	1,793
B	Falling rolls fund for surplus places in good or outstanding schools where a population bulge is expected in 2-3 years	200	0
C	Admissions	604	604
D	Serving of Schools Forum	78	78
E	Capital Expenditure from Revenue	4,086	4,086
F	Contribution from combined budgets	903	903
G	Termination of employment costs	176	176

SEND funding: longer-term changes - Call for evidence

1. Purpose of the Report

To consider the response to the Department for Education's call for evidence on funding for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

2. Recommendation

- 1) To comment on the responses in Appendix A

3. Details

- 3.1 In July 2014 when the government announced the extra funding of £390m to those local authorities they believed to be the lowest funded, they indicated they wished to review the distribution of funding for pupils with high-cost SEND. At the time the minister said this would be a priority for reform during the next parliament and the reforms would support the changes in the Children and Families Act 2014.
- 3.2 The current government do not have fixed plans at the moment but are planning for a distribution that is more formulaic, and less based on past levels of allocation. The review is planned to cover the distributing of funds relating to SEND from national to local level and from local level to institutions.
- 3.3 To help them the DFE have commissioned some research, which is being undertaken by Isos Partnership.
- 3.4 Firstly the Isos Partnership are conducting in depth fieldwork in 13 local authorities. Lewisham is not one of the authorities selected.
- 3.5 The call for evidence was issued on the 13 November 2014 and asked interested parties about how SEN funds can be distributed more fairly. The call for evidence ends on the 27 February 2015.

4. What are the earlier indicators of the likely change?

- 4.1 As part of the call for evidence a large pack of data about children and young people with SEND was published, by local authority. This included information about attainment, funding and health data such as hospital admissions, low birth weights and disability living allowances.
- 4.2 The supporting data covers not only the High Needs block but the notional level of SEN within the Schools block. The figures for Lewisham are:

2014/15 DSG settlement	
High Needs Block	£43,4m
Total DSG	£268.5m
Pupils	42,389
High Needs Block per pupil	£1,024
Rank per pupil	2
Total School Budget Funding	£191.3m
Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	£28,4m
Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	14.8%
Rank %	14
Notional SEN per pupil	£669
Rank per pupil	6

The National position is shown in Appendix B to this report.

- 4.3 The above table shows that if you look at our funding we are one of the highest in the country. The exact position varies depending on the statistics you use to compare authorities but on a per pupil basis we are the second highest in the country. The issue with this funding is that it is not pupil related, opaque and not easily understood by Local Authorities. So reform in this area would be in line with some of the principles adopted for the distribution of the Schools Block. The desire for reform was first talked publicly about when the Minister announced the allocation of £390m. The approach here was for DFE to take a view on who they felt was the lowest funded and target resources towards them, not the authorities with the highest need. Under this, Lewisham did not receive any funding for the school block. It is a distinct possibility that a similar approach will be adopted and implemented in SEND. Whether ministers would have a desire to reduce authorities funding is an unknown, but there has been a reluctance to pursue this for schools' formula allocations.

5 Response

Our draft response has been drafted to highlight the need for greater transparency within the funding system and to ensure it is responsive to the needs of children and the growth in pupil numbers. It is also based on allowing as much local decision and flexibility as possible.

6. Conclusion

Our current level of funding compared to the rest of country is one of the highest. This should not be taken in isolation as needs of pupils and area costs need to be taken in account. In a time of austerity and reductions in public spending, resources will be scarce and it is likely that any available resources will be targeted to those deemed to be the lowest funded. The best case scenario for us is there is a move to link funding to the level of pupil numbers, allowing our pupil growth to be recognised and funding to follow.

Dave Richards,

Group Finance Manager – Children and Young People,

Contact on 0208 314 9442

or by e-mail at Dave.Richards@Lewisham.gov.uk

SEND - Call for Evidence - Local Authority funding data

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 6

Appendix B

LA No	LA Name
201	City of London
202	Camden
203	Greenwich
204	Hackney
205	Hammersmith and Fulham
206	Islington
207	Kensington and Chelsea
208	Lambeth
209	Lewisham
210	Southwark
211	Tower Hamlets
212	Wandsworth
213	Westminster
301	Barking and Dagenham
302	Barnet
303	Bexley
304	Brent
305	Bromley
306	Croydon
307	Ealing
308	Enfield
309	Haringey
310	Harrow
311	Havering
312	Hillingdon
313	Hounslow
314	Kingston upon Thames
315	Merton
316	Newham
317	Redbridge
318	Richmond upon Thames
319	Sutton
320	Waltham Forest
330	Birmingham
331	Coventry

2014-15 DSG					
High Needs Block	Total DSG	Pupils	High Needs Block per pupil	Rank	
£315,084	£2,471,453	2,333	135	151	
£32,279,853	£160,130,558	31,583	1,022	4	
£37,965,527	£245,180,375	43,702	869	11	
£36,092,656	£226,410,659	40,855	883	10	
£18,463,204	£119,086,670	26,128	707	41	
£25,207,097	£164,228,047	24,621	1,024	2	
£17,096,012	£82,729,635	25,460	671	57	
£36,491,216	£249,211,129	37,540	972	7	
£43,420,598	£268,560,818	42,389	1,024	2	
£38,469,041	£241,662,971	45,297	849	14	
£43,326,839	£316,126,475	44,547	973	6	
£41,272,056	£196,566,482	41,886	985	5	
£23,986,749	£126,162,270	30,416	789	24	
£23,901,798	£223,917,076	39,177	610	88	
£41,300,318	£277,989,503	61,281	674	53	
£27,124,029	£201,697,690	43,356	626	78	
£55,543,781	£272,648,013	48,890	1,136	1	
£47,776,655	£232,800,116	53,135	899	9	
£51,407,096	£284,464,529	63,415	811	16	
£43,346,449	£288,237,026	56,505	767	33	
£31,023,102	£294,253,655	56,969	545	122	
£31,131,008	£229,387,373	40,065	777	29	
£25,928,483	£183,673,380	37,581	690	47	
£18,874,748	£193,934,555	38,151	495	136	
£31,490,704	£238,891,620	52,403	601	93	
£33,240,839	£220,445,810	42,177	788	25	
£18,371,323	£118,272,928	28,079	654	61	
£27,607,450	£138,391,052	32,079	861	12	
£40,558,337	£367,894,016	57,673	703	43	
£36,015,132	£254,580,041	56,736	635	76	
£20,551,311	£128,611,551	33,198	619	80	
£31,283,777	£166,846,195	36,602	855	13	
£34,041,434	£237,213,129	43,735	778	28	
£121,707,955	£1,054,265,826	196,952	618	83	
£29,381,314	£264,404,829	54,718	537	127	

Summary of Schools Block Funding 2014-15 for SEN					
Total Funding (excl. MFG)	Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	Rank	Notional SEN per pupil	Rank
£1,614,378	£151,975	9.4%	74	65	152
£108,369,672	£20,799,851	19.2%	5	659	7
£171,551,975	£16,220,434	9.5%	73	371	62
£157,016,704	£36,495,571	23.2%	1	893	3
£81,761,987	£9,459,786	11.6%	46	362	68
£114,098,117	£24,324,453	21.3%	3	988	1
£56,115,386	£3,982,791	7.1%	117	156	142
£173,718,872	£37,059,576	21.3%	2	987	2
£191,286,247	£28,379,007	14.8%	14	669	6
£172,743,570	£10,556,035	6.1%	127	233	123
£205,753,480	£18,513,892	9.0%	78	416	43
£131,983,730	£18,978,796	14.4%	20	453	35
£88,032,448	£7,577,365	8.6%	91	249	116
£176,905,063	£12,248,447	6.9%	119	313	87
£209,779,119	£16,680,983	8.0%	101	272	108
£159,904,225	£15,950,320	10.0%	67	368	63
£188,668,316	£28,536,333	15.1%	11	584	10
£169,325,076	£19,269,889	11.4%	48	363	66
£203,286,887	£24,702,878	12.2%	38	390	53
£206,450,341	£22,701,427	11.0%	52	402	48
£233,103,844	£20,191,360	8.7%	88	354	70
£172,022,994	£11,712,781	6.8%	122	292	100
£140,555,140	£4,316,246	3.1%	151	115	149
£159,223,299	£7,929,970	5.0%	137	208	130
£181,922,892	£8,981,562	4.9%	139	171	134
£164,969,101	£22,244,294	13.5%	27	527	19
£88,676,417	£4,532,487	5.1%	134	161	137
£94,993,049	£8,188,178	8.6%	89	255	114
£291,939,319	£20,081,889	6.9%	120	348	72
£190,868,285	£19,136,617	10.0%	66	337	77
£95,349,741	£10,304,592	10.8%	57	310	91
£122,270,426	£11,859,647	9.7%	69	324	84
£179,217,629	£18,534,558	10.3%	60	424	42
£809,951,278	£153,447,239	18.9%	6	779	4
£212,130,822	£18,449,221	8.7%	86	337	77

SEND - Call for Evidence - Local Authority funding data

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 6

Appendix B

LA No	LA Name
332	Dudley
333	Sandwell
334	Solihull
335	Walsall
336	Wolverhampton
340	Knowsley
341	Liverpool
342	St Helens
343	Sefton
344	Wirral
350	Bolton
351	Bury
352	Manchester
353	Oldham
354	Rochdale
355	Salford
356	Stockport
357	Tameside
358	Trafford
359	Wigan
370	Barnsley
371	Doncaster
372	Rotherham
373	Sheffield
380	Bradford
381	Calderdale
382	Kirklees
383	Leeds
384	Wakefield
390	Gateshead
391	Newcastle upon Tyne
392	North Tyneside
393	South Tyneside
394	Sunderland
420	Isles Of Scilly

2014-15 DSG				
High Needs Block	Total DSG	Pupils	High Needs Block per pupil	Rank
£30,308,306	£236,052,053	47,075	644	68
£36,523,298	£263,897,269	54,172	674	53
£24,101,022	£162,990,393	39,714	607	90
£28,260,716	£228,191,555	49,825	567	108
£27,605,705	£202,170,023	41,769	661	59
£19,791,545	£115,125,971	20,535	964	8
£42,884,816	£340,246,038	69,316	619	80
£17,785,827	£128,665,146	26,385	674	53
£26,660,898	£193,582,774	43,083	619	80
£33,642,524	£237,278,790	50,641	664	58
£27,148,496	£233,724,209	49,844	545	122
£24,077,280	£144,153,536	30,398	792	22
£63,337,357	£418,303,424	80,029	791	23
£24,900,486	£217,408,017	42,371	588	98
£22,747,630	£177,576,988	33,624	677	51
£28,940,794	£182,076,487	36,498	793	21
£27,135,500	£191,765,750	43,949	617	85
£14,794,189	£175,226,912	35,030	422	149
£23,336,859	£174,743,394	40,449	577	102
£25,601,487	£229,891,524	45,327	565	110
£18,378,605	£157,683,204	32,617	563	111
£27,535,648	£220,253,846	48,065	573	106
£20,549,574	£217,917,323	43,653	471	142
£51,794,405	£372,196,066	79,152	654	61
£49,646,227	£471,785,685	100,401	494	137
£19,230,486	£170,757,069	37,134	518	133
£29,707,841	£325,466,872	66,995	443	145
£56,902,540	£539,350,130	118,147	482	140
£23,564,043	£241,282,356	54,106	436	146
£20,737,266	£134,817,318	29,442	704	42
£28,591,080	£191,736,666	41,828	684	49
£16,566,339	£139,911,919	30,479	544	124
£15,839,243	£110,144,781	21,139	749	35
£23,047,275	£197,911,269	41,169	560	113
		274	0	152

Summary of Schools Block Funding 2014-15 for SEN					
Total Funding (excl. MFG)	Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	Rank	Notional SEN per pupil	Rank
£190,277,760	£14,887,774	7.8%	103	316	85
£205,263,300	£24,032,950	11.7%	43	444	37
£127,091,859	£5,110,034	4.0%	145	129	147
£187,962,692	£13,660,707	7.3%	114	274	106
£154,162,127	£20,291,349	13.2%	29	486	27
£84,867,757	£11,110,639	13.1%	30	541	16
£253,448,571	£35,051,593	13.8%	25	506	24
£99,403,512	£3,795,880	3.8%	147	144	144
£153,783,212	£23,392,926	15.2%	10	543	15
£183,060,443	£8,149,285	4.5%	142	161	137
£183,967,457	£17,703,409	9.6%	70	355	69
£106,875,326	£9,512,319	8.9%	81	313	87
£310,242,600	£37,946,918	12.2%	37	474	31
£172,027,230	£13,847,875	8.0%	99	327	80
£143,179,883	£12,826,481	9.0%	80	381	55
£132,893,237	£11,062,522	8.3%	94	303	96
£149,187,536	£22,012,239	14.8%	16	501	25
£143,531,625	£5,678,169	4.0%	146	162	136
£140,635,069	£4,425,247	3.1%	150	109	150
£189,458,916	£14,740,244	7.8%	105	325	83
£126,209,911	£15,024,041	11.9%	41	461	32
£175,236,063	£13,383,782	7.6%	110	278	103
£179,022,739	£14,933,860	8.3%	93	342	75
£287,253,058	£44,472,252	15.5%	9	562	13
£374,948,329	£36,785,792	9.8%	68	366	64
£138,127,178	£14,961,376	10.8%	56	403	47
£266,517,707	£26,956,456	10.1%	63	402	48
£430,397,172	£37,054,962	8.6%	90	314	86
£197,842,028	£14,986,082	7.6%	111	277	104
£102,556,698	£7,901,511	7.7%	108	268	112
£144,890,094	£12,986,630	9.0%	79	310	91
£109,301,646	£8,489,737	7.8%	106	279	102
£83,272,719	£7,315,527	8.8%	83	346	74
£157,633,554	£12,888,941	8.2%	98	313	87
£2,514,447	£158,702	6.3%	126	579	11

SEND - Call for Evidence - Local Authority funding data

Schools Forum

05-Feb-15

Item 6

Appendix B

LA No	LA Name	2014-15 DSG					Summary of Schools Block Funding 2014-15 for SEN					
		High Needs Block	Total DSG	Pupils	High Needs Block per pupil	Rank	Total Funding (excl. MFG)	Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	Rank	Notional SEN per pupil	Rank
800	Bath and North East Somerset	£15,456,136	£118,333,781	29,289	528	129	£88,659,930	£8,094,027	9.1%	77	276	105
801	Bristol, City of	£42,218,604	£286,489,737	61,399	688	48	£215,570,705	£31,325,586	14.5%	18	510	22
802	North Somerset	£16,705,819	£139,867,880	29,862	559	114	£111,270,269	£12,928,623	11.6%	45	433	40
803	South Gloucestershire	£25,882,872	£175,333,790	39,688	652	64	£133,771,819	£15,821,599	11.8%	42	399	51
805	Hartlepool	£10,336,755	£76,006,299	14,937	692	46	£60,016,083	£5,645,676	9.4%	75	378	57
806	Middlesbrough	£18,404,296	£105,663,069	22,954	802	18	£75,672,114	£9,181,989	12.1%	39	400	50
807	Redcar and Cleveland	£14,820,322	£107,818,352	21,346	694	45	£85,345,595	£11,609,495	13.6%	26	544	14
808	Stockton-on-Tees	£20,536,681	£145,536,525	31,651	649	67	£111,954,469	£9,831,355	8.8%	84	311	90
810	Kingston Upon Hull, City of	£25,737,586	£195,047,249	38,113	675	52	£149,379,702	£5,270,716	3.5%	149	138	146
811	East Riding of Yorkshire	£19,102,622	£210,627,349	48,459	394	150	£174,214,795	£10,338,840	5.9%	129	213	126
812	North East Lincolnshire	£15,785,287	£109,783,648	23,958	659	60	£85,799,447	£10,539,397	12.3%	36	440	39
813	North Lincolnshire	£14,609,433	£117,720,365	23,764	615	86	£94,433,242	£7,790,010	8.2%	96	328	79
815	North Yorkshire	£43,243,460	£384,718,683	89,064	486	139	£308,948,345	£11,491,734	3.7%	148	129	147
816	York	£14,891,686	£112,041,452	26,537	561	112	£84,764,767	£12,208,889	14.4%	19	460	33
821	Luton	£22,796,374	£184,602,416	36,652	622	79	£144,076,795	£10,345,315	7.2%	116	282	101
822	Bedford Borough	£17,011,671	£126,917,721	31,086	547	120	£89,683,414	£4,429,565	4.9%	138	142	145
823	Central Bedfordshire	£24,811,913	£183,048,478	41,665	596	95	£145,298,155	£7,264,908	5.0%	136	174	133
825	Buckinghamshire	£68,379,704	£366,935,018	88,410	773	31	£258,207,480	£32,056,654	12.4%	35	363	66
826	Milton Keynes	£32,523,141	£215,147,735	44,428	732	36	£161,510,690	£16,230,657	10.0%	64	365	65
830	Derbyshire	£61,735,178	£502,056,921	111,951	551	117	£401,238,825	£56,062,113	14.0%	24	501	25
831	Derby	£26,689,097	£197,172,116	41,972	636	75	£135,784,822	£20,064,227	14.8%	15	478	30
835	Dorset	£36,824,734	£252,596,712	60,381	610	88	£199,594,591	£16,410,676	8.2%	97	272	108
836	Poole	£13,031,410	£87,747,080	20,221	644	68	£62,562,811	£4,842,032	7.7%	107	239	121
837	Bournemouth	£14,455,318	£101,917,124	23,503	615	86	£77,384,131	£8,313,795	10.7%	58	354	70
840	Durham	£46,169,587	£351,391,082	73,289	630	77	£272,247,779	£21,573,117	7.9%	102	294	97
841	Darlington	£9,050,916	£74,284,397	15,766	574	105	£56,256,163	£3,413,818	6.1%	128	217	125
845	East Sussex	£42,821,158	£332,412,285	70,924	604	92	£258,299,526	£26,495,545	10.3%	61	374	58
846	Brighton and Hove	£23,248,063	£164,855,743	36,479	637	72	£124,059,212	£12,695,350	10.2%	62	348	72
850	Hampshire	£90,395,984	£850,384,141	184,687	489	138	£684,237,914	£43,245,584	6.3%	125	234	122
851	Portsmouth	£15,464,194	£132,731,606	26,887	575	104	£103,277,829	£13,885,585	13.4%	28	516	21
852	Southampton	£18,107,574	£160,451,580	30,525	593	96	£124,931,304	£7,339,724	5.9%	131	240	119
855	Leicestershire	£52,330,040	£415,425,721	99,933	524	130	£334,175,475	£29,293,066	8.8%	85	293	98
856	Leicester	£40,212,332	£266,857,209	52,300	769	32	£202,567,165	£15,302,006	7.6%	112	293	98
857	Rutland	£3,967,577	£26,290,918	7,577	524	130	£21,106,711	£1,940,807	9.2%	76	256	113
860	Staffordshire	£62,193,080	£550,819,878	124,168	501	135	£445,012,564	£26,318,459	5.9%	130	212	127

SEND - Call for Evidence - Local Authority funding data

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 6

Appendix B

LA No	LA Name
861	Stoke-on-Trent
865	Wiltshire
866	Swindon
867	Bracknell Forest
868	Windsor and Maidenhead
869	West Berkshire
870	Reading
871	Slough
872	Wokingham
873	Cambridgeshire
874	Peterborough
876	Halton
877	Warrington
878	Devon
879	Plymouth
880	Torbay
881	Essex
882	Southend-on-Sea
883	Thurrock
884	Herefordshire
885	Worcestershire
886	Kent
887	Medway
888	Lancashire
889	Blackburn with Darwen
890	Blackpool
891	Nottinghamshire
892	Nottingham
893	Shropshire
894	Telford and Wrekin
895	Cheshire East
896	Cheshire West and Chester
908	Cornwall
909	Cumbria
916	Gloucestershire

2014-15 DSG				
High Needs Block	Total DSG	Pupils	High Needs Block per pupil	Rank
£28,707,948	£191,050,054	36,816	780	26
£37,111,482	£305,428,386	71,540	519	132
£24,282,892	£152,586,108	31,191	779	27
£12,850,990	£80,885,374	20,103	639	71
£15,774,452	£101,068,776	26,416	597	94
£17,542,633	£120,013,098	28,971	606	91
£16,461,323	£97,533,349	22,958	717	39
£20,507,953	£139,154,323	28,222	727	37
£17,588,219	£112,743,760	27,611	637	72
£63,799,038	£384,666,165	91,103	700	44
£26,986,002	£166,190,603	33,750	800	19
£14,193,053	£102,234,795	18,661	761	34
£20,080,076	£148,590,208	31,540	637	72
£59,589,510	£445,848,050	101,810	585	99
£25,442,647	£179,099,489	39,128	650	66
£14,039,244	£89,219,330	19,821	708	40
£114,873,684	£968,871,147	210,358	546	121
£16,170,229	£136,240,984	29,500	548	119
£20,345,296	£128,325,542	25,569	796	20
£13,334,680	£111,070,184	24,510	544	124
£43,729,805	£357,177,558	85,254	513	134
£147,434,209	£1,038,311,556	238,613	618	83
£32,422,502	£209,629,175	45,041	720	38
£98,001,229	£845,899,117	173,219	566	109
£21,667,553	£138,215,958	27,930	776	30
£16,263,938	£104,255,031	19,273	844	15
£56,176,408	£528,012,864	117,084	480	141
£24,464,411	£228,736,748	44,576	549	118
£24,891,413	£177,933,191	43,078	578	101
£16,053,380	£123,134,380	27,846	577	102
£35,072,406	£238,453,727	53,708	653	63
£41,320,007	£231,423,749	51,070	809	17
£31,221,922	£337,924,979	72,708	429	147
£39,052,750	£325,840,400	71,748	544	124
£51,125,165	£392,998,434	91,879	556	116

Summary of Schools Block Funding 2014-15 for SEN					
Total Funding (excl. MFG)	Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	Rank	Notional SEN per pupil	Rank
£140,261,578	£16,309,638	11.6%	44	443	38
£242,458,284	£11,957,918	4.9%	140	167	135
£116,455,675	£16,430,675	14.1%	23	527	19
£61,486,001	£3,151,197	5.1%	133	157	141
£76,116,935	£5,023,185	6.6%	124	190	131
£94,045,332	£4,629,987	4.9%	141	160	139
£68,006,895	£3,533,080	5.2%	132	154	143
£103,159,367	£21,703,724	21.0%	4	769	5
£87,067,524	£6,682,065	7.7%	109	242	117
£284,929,660	£24,735,210	8.7%	87	272	108
£121,511,231	£17,910,483	14.7%	17	531	18
£78,371,830	£3,918,592	5.0%	135	210	129
£118,541,548	£14,327,056	12.1%	40	454	34
£348,643,368	£38,116,673	10.9%	53	374	58
£134,915,011	£12,764,257	9.5%	72	326	82
£66,817,597	£9,538,891	14.3%	22	481	28
£772,230,725	£86,842,055	11.2%	49	413	45
£109,058,884	£14,182,116	13.0%	31	481	28
£96,458,683	£13,812,767	14.3%	21	540	17
£91,859,637	£10,103,635	11.0%	51	412	46
£287,172,249	£51,339,291	17.9%	7	602	9
£777,057,844	£89,352,914	11.5%	47	374	58
£156,980,788	£17,092,943	10.9%	55	379	56
£685,788,655	£110,822,653	16.2%	8	640	8
£105,316,125	£11,066,722	10.5%	59	396	52
£77,197,948	£3,400,757	4.4%	143	176	132
£426,876,284	£18,475,787	4.3%	144	158	140
£174,585,766	£12,190,217	7.0%	118	273	107
£139,983,716	£17,926,336	12.8%	33	416	43
£94,921,284	£6,972,254	7.3%	113	250	115
£191,409,646	£12,887,253	6.7%	123	240	119
£176,953,802	£19,866,338	11.2%	50	389	54
£278,241,717	£6,091,258	2.2%	152	84	151
£266,785,469	£22,269,889	8.3%	92	310	91
£313,654,183	£30,070,475	9.6%	71	327	80

SEND - Call for Evidence - Local Authority funding data

Schools Forum
05-Feb-15
Item 6

Appendix B

LA No	LA Name
919	Hertfordshire
921	Isle of Wight
925	Lincolnshire
926	Norfolk
928	Northamptonshire
929	Northumberland
931	Oxfordshire
933	Somerset
935	Suffolk
936	Surrey
937	Warwickshire
938	West Sussex

2014-15 DSG				
High Needs Block	Total DSG	Pupils	High Needs Block per pupil	Rank
£94,747,846	£829,318,590	207,428	457	144
£12,221,944	£87,738,583	17,873	684	49
£61,960,763	£485,898,190	106,833	580	100
£65,191,469	£532,278,292	116,653	559	114
£65,738,968	£497,651,170	115,688	568	107
£30,418,014	£208,597,485	46,728	651	65
£49,159,170	£417,691,620	106,678	461	143
£40,363,815	£334,791,541	76,302	529	128
£45,895,974	£453,230,902	107,474	427	148
£125,183,414	£725,345,392	186,176	672	56
£53,669,958	£360,307,904	83,511	643	70
£70,533,567	£519,042,868	119,341	591	97

Summary of Schools Block Funding 2014-15 for SEN					
Total Funding (excl. MFG)	Total Notional SEN (excl. MFG)	Notional Sen Total - proportion of funding	Rank	Notional SEN per pupil	Rank
£663,461,148	£45,267,719	6.8%	121	218	124
£69,189,606	£10,272,267	14.8%	13	575	12
£377,478,930	£47,700,479	12.6%	34	446	36
£426,982,748	£35,432,029	8.3%	95	304	95
£400,783,689	£31,208,152	7.8%	104	270	111
£163,244,762	£14,446,403	8.8%	82	309	94
£321,787,837	£25,774,373	8.0%	100	242	117
£260,005,769	£28,386,099	10.9%	54	372	61
£365,960,535	£36,748,825	10.0%	65	342	75
£547,264,936	£39,410,737	7.2%	115	212	127
£280,162,349	£35,910,500	12.8%	32	430	41
£407,897,182	£60,659,435	14.9%	12	508	23