
SCHOOLS' FORUM

Thursday 23 November 2023 – 10am

Conference Suite, CETL

A G E N D A

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Apologies | Chair |
| 2. | Minutes from Schools' Forum meeting on 18 th October 2023 and Matters Arising | Chair |
| 3. | Indicative Schools Block Budget Update 2024/25 (D) | Amanda Whitehead |
| 4. | Growth Fund Block Transfer Proposal 2024/25 (D) | Amanda Whitehead |
| 5. | High Needs Block 2024/25 (D) | Danielle Swainston |

Date and Time of Next Forum Meeting – Thursday
7 December 2023, 10am CETL Conference Suite

<p>Schools’ Forum Meeting 18 October 2023</p>

Attendees:

Members

Carole Bradley (CB) (Academy Primary)
 Chris Connor (CC) (Maintained Primary)
 Sue Sharpe (SS) (Maintained Primary)
 David Turner (DT) (Maintained Primary)
 Mark Tilling (Chair) (Maintained Secondary)
 Louise Mazzezy (on behalf of Phil Pritchard)
 Diane Crannage (sub Tracey Gibson)
 Lee Walker (Academy – Primary)
 Lisa Grieg (LG) (Academy – Special)
 Toni Ray (TR) (Early Years)
 Zoe Westley (ZW) (Academy – Special)

Local Authority Officers

Sandra Shears (SSh) -
 Children’s Finance

Fiona Stobbs (FS) – Senior
 Advisor Inclusion / SEND

Amanda Whitehead (AW) –
 Assistant Director Education

Danielle Swainston (DS) –
 Assistant Director Joint
 Commissioning

Jane Watt (JW) - Children’s
 Finance

Agenda Item	Action
<p>1 Apologies -</p> <p>Apologies were submitted by the following and accepted by Forum:</p> <p>Joanne Wilson – Academy Secondary Sara Crawshaw and her sub Nick Lindsay – RC Diocese Linda Richardson – PVI Early Years Leanne Yates and her sub Alison Darby – Maintained Primary Vikki Wilson – CoE Diocese Chris Simmons – Academy Trustee Jane Reed – Post-16 Tracey Gibson (Diane Crannage attending on her behalf)</p>	
<p>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting – 21 September 2023 – and Matters Arising</p> <p>JW apologised that LW had been missed from the list of attendees.</p> <p>Minutes approved.</p>	

	<p>Outstanding Action 1: SSh confirmed that declaration of interest forms had been issued to Members for completion.</p> <p>Outstanding Action 2: Develop High Needs Block recovery plan will be discussed under agenda item 6</p>	
3	<p>Schools Forum Membership Update</p> <p>SSh confirmed that CS is able to continue as an academy representative at Forum in his new role as Trustee (as opposed to governor). CB agreed to confirm that academies wish CS to continue at Forum in his new role.</p> <p>SSh explained that the overall Forum membership calculation had been reviewed to reflect Ward Jackson conversion and the forthcoming conversion of Grange Primary School. Should LY wish to continue as a Forum representative, her membership could transfer to an academy place. This would leave one vacancy for a maintained school governor. Through discussion, it was suggested that the preferred solution would be for a maintained head teacher who was also a governor.</p> <p>Expressions of interest to be sought from maintained school governors</p>	<p>CB</p> <p>Maintained School Reps</p>
3a	<p>Statutory Services 2024/25</p> <p>At their meeting on 21 September 2023, Maintained School Representatives received a proposal from the local authority to charge £60 per pupil to cover the cost of statutory services that used to be funded from the Education Services Grant.</p> <p>SSh reminded Forum that, should approval not be given to the charge, the Council would need to disapply to the Secretary of State. This had been the case for the 7 previous financial years.</p> <p>DT felt that approval should not be given as the funding position and principle of this being a budget cut was unchanged. MT asked that it was noted that the lack of approval was in response to the principle of this being a budget cut and did not reflect any issue with the quality of statutory services provided by the authority.</p> <p>Decision</p> <p>Maintained school representatives voted unanimously to not approve the proposal. (4 against; 0 for; 0 abstentions)</p>	
4	<p>Individual School Budget Shares 2024/25</p> <p>JW explained that a delay was necessary in presenting draft school budgets to Forum for 2024/25. Although modelling work had been completed as planned, ESFA had announced that errors had been made</p>	

	<p>in the provisional allocations released in July and that new allocations, along with a revised APT would be issued during week commencing 19 October.</p> <p>JW outlined the change in overall funding for the schools block in 2024/25. There had been a reduction of £0.739m between the original allocation and revised allocation. The Primary Unit of Funding (PuF) has reduced by £49; the Secondary Unit of Funding (SuF) has reduced by £65.</p> <p>Forum asked for early sight of the draft budgets, with worked examples, ahead of the next meeting on 23 November 2023.</p>	JW
5	<p>Trade Union Facility Time Update</p> <p>SSh confirmed that during 2023/24 to date, there has been no facility time request made on the budget and no timesheets submitted by the host school for the NASUWT representative.</p> <p>SSh explained that funding the Dedicated Education Officer (DEO) for 2024/25 using the trade union facility time reserve was only possible if all schools signed up to the SLA. At the present time, a number of schools had not confirmed sign up. However, it was recognised that system issues with the new website may be having an impact. MT asked if any schools had confirmed they did not wish to sign up and SSh confirmed not.</p> <p>SSh to liaise with the Council’s HR service to understand the position on sign up. A further report would be brought back to Forum if any schools confirmed they were not signing up.</p> <p>Decision</p> <p>That the report be noted, including the assumption that 100% of schools sign up to the SLA.</p>	SSh
6	<p>High Needs Block Recovery Plan Scope</p> <p>DS explained that this item was intended as an introduction to work needed on the recovery plan and set out the position ahead of budget setting for 2024/25. There is a high level of concern from the Council’s Section 151 Officer around gaining control of the position, although there is a clear understanding of the challenge this presents.</p> <p>DS clarified that, although the SEND and AP Change Programme funding will allow us to test approaches and potential opportunities, it is not likely to solve overspending.</p> <p>MT asked if the exercise to assess the impact of the Free School delay was going ahead. DS had raised this with DfE who confirmed there would</p>	

<p>7</p>	<p>Horizon School and Alternative Provision Projected Outturn 2023/24</p> <p>AW explained that, although Forum had confirmed that projected outturn reports were no longer required, this report was being presented at the request of the Executive Head Teacher. The report was intended as a position statement at this stage. Budgets have now been combined for Horizon School and Alternative Provision (AP). There have been 14 permanent exclusions since the start of the academic year which is extremely concerning.</p> <p>AW drew particular attention to section 5 of the report and stressed the need to get a handle on AP across the town. ER is suggesting a full review of provision so we can introduce a robust process around this, working closely with the Council’s Commissioning Team. The review needs to ensure we have access to regulated, quality provision outside of Horizon. CB asked what had changed to have 14 permanent exclusions and also asked what was meant by the term “hub and spoke”. AW explained that growth in permanent exclusions is a national issue and that case studies on pupil history are needed to establish lessons learned. The reference to hub and spoke is to show a model is needed where Horizon is not the only provision – we need other quality assured provision in the mix of solutions.</p> <p>MT commented that it would be useful for the report to include an update on fair access. He was aware of 5 for HTCS since June for example. AW agreed and mentioned that the Behaviour and Attendance Panel managed fair access but that it was proposed that this should be integrated with the new Inclusion Panel. MT explained that he was most concerned about Haven provision as he has seen a significant rise in anxiety related / emotional issues.</p> <p>DT suggested speaking to Tees Valley Collaborative Trust about their model and AW confirmed that such models are being explored as part of the review.</p> <p>ZW commented that the SEMH Free School may have an impact on Horizon / AP provision. Because of the time that has passed since this was originally looked at, it needs to be reviewed again. DS clarified that Horizon is not an SEMH provision but acknowledged that there will be Horizon pupils with SEMH needs.</p> <p>MT stressed the importance of the Hartlepool Inclusion Partnership and attendance from appropriate primary Heads. CB confirmed that she had already seen confirmation of primaries being involved so this does seem to be in place.</p> <p>Decision</p> <p>That the report be noted</p>	
----------	---	--

	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><u>Growth Fund</u> SSh summarised work carried out to date by the review group. The group met several weeks ago and models were created to look at movements in pupil numbers between the 3 census points using historic data. DfE have confirmed eligibility for growth funding can include the requirement for a new class or half class. Different tolerances were set within the models – firstly a tolerance of 15 pupils (below which no growth funding would be allocated) and secondly a tolerance based on percentage of school roll. Secondary schools were excluded from the modelling as they already come under the Managed Moves process where funding follows the child.</p> <p>None of the models showed significant pupil growth above the tolerance between census points.</p> <p>AW highlighted 271 pupils who have moved between schools, started from Out of Area in the UK, or from overseas since the start of the school year. SSh clarified that these figures were discussed at the latest growth review group meeting so had been considered. The 271 pupils should be attending the school on October census date so should be funded.</p> <p>SSh explained that any information must use census point as the basis, else the administrative burden would be too great. SS acknowledged that her school would appear steady at census point but that significant movement was happening in between. However, SS understood the need to use census point as an independent data set and because of the administration involved.</p> <p>CB asked if the growth funding could be transferred into the high needs block, having understood the challenge faced with balancing the budget under agenda item 6. DT added that this seemed the reasonable approach and was his thinking from being part of the growth review group.</p> <p>MT asked for a paper at the next Forum meeting so that members could vote on a recommendation to use the growth funding to support high needs block spending in 2024/25.</p>	<p>SSh</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Date and Time of Next Forum Meeting – Wednesday 23 November, CETL Conference Suite</p>	

OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LOG

Meeting	Description	Owner
01/03/23	Develop 3 year recovery plan for High Needs Block spending	Schools Forum

Financial Year 2022/23: Children’s Services Committee – Log of Schools’ Forum Recommendations and Committee Decisions

Last Updated: 6 June 2023

Committee Date	Report	Recommendation and Decision Details
15/11/22	Dedicated Schools Grant (Former Education Services Grant rate per pupil) – Disapplication Request	<p>The Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Agreed the 2023/24 funding rate at £60 per pupil/place. b) Agreed to submit the disapplication request to the Secretary of State to set the Education Services General Duties rate at £60 per pupil/place for 2023/24. c) Noted this will be the seventh consecutive year the local authority has applied for disapplication and that the previous six applications have been successful. d) Agreed that a request for additional funding be sought from the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Children’s Services Committee, to assist in discharging statutory responsibilities to schools.
17/01/23	Dedicated Schools Grant - SCHOOL BUDGET SHARES 2023/24 AND CENTRAL SCHOOL SERVICES BLOCK 2023/24	<p>The Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted the contents of the report; b) Noted the agreement by Schools’ Forum to centrally retain funding of £0.572m, with the residual £0.139m being transferred to the schools block; c) Agreed the MFG to be used for 2023/24 and noted the recommendation from Schools’ Forum of applying an MFG of 0.5%, alongside a 3% cap; d) Approved the individual school budget share for 2023/24
14/03/23	DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT – EARLY YEARS BLOCK 2023/24	<p>The Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) noted the contents of this report and the outcomes from the consultation with providers and Schools’ Forum; b) noted the recommendation by Schools’ Forum to centrally retain funding of 5%;

		<p>c) approved the hourly rate funding formula for three to four year old provision for 2023/24, passing an increase of 6p on to all providers through the base rate;</p> <p>d) approved option 3 for payment of the new TPG / TPECG supplement as recommended by Schools' Forum;</p> <p>e) approved the hourly rate funding formula for two year old provision for 2023/24, passing the increase of 22p on to providers through the hourly rate.</p>
14/03/23	Dedicated Schools Grant – High Needs Block 2023/24	<p>The Committee:</p> <p>a) noted the contents of the report;</p> <p>b) approved the proposed new 25 place primary ARP from 1 April 2023 and the extension of 22 secondary ARP places with effect from 1 January 2024 at a cost of £0.205m;</p> <p>c) noted the agreement from School's Forum to establish a solution focused forum, bringing challenge to the current process in order to reduce the significant cost of independent school fees;</p> <p>d) approved an increase of 6 places at Horizon School and the introduction of a new top-up rate of £14k for Horizon School and £1.6k for Haven at a total cost of £0.120m;</p> <p>e) agreed the proposed uplift of 4% to top-up ranges for IPS and ARPs and cessation of the clawback process at a total cost of £0.270m;</p> <p>f) noted that once further work is complete and a cost model established for both special academies, a proposal will be presented to Members at a future Committee;</p> <p>g) approved the creation of 2 SEND Officer posts to increase capacity at a cost of £0.089m;</p> <p>h) approved the creation of an early year's offer with a focus on early intervention at a cost of £0.116m (make up of posts in the team yet to be agreed);</p> <p>i) approved the overall budget requirement of £20.807m, noting that the budget allocation is £18.661m;</p> <p>j) noted that Schools Forum have committed to draw up a plan which will look to address the deficit over a three-year period.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Report to Hartlepool Schools' Forum 23 November 2023 From Amanda Whitehead – Assistant Director Education</p>
--

Item 3: Indicative Schools Block Budget Update 2024/25

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide indicative Individual School Budgets (ISBs) for 2024/25 following the ESFA's release of the revised draft Authority Proforma Tool (APT) on 9 October 2023.
- 1.2 Schools' Forum are aware that ESFA discovered an error in the original allocations issued for 2024/25 in August 2023. Correction of the error involved a reduction in both the Primary Unit of Funding (PUF) and Secondary Unit of Funding (SUF) by £49 and £65 respectively. The correction also amended each of the funding factor rates.
- 1.3 Indicative ISBs are currently based on the pupil counts and characteristics from the October 2022 census. Figures will be updated by ESFA during December to reflect the October 2023 census.

2. Background

- 2.1 Schools' Forum agreed the budget requirement for the historic and ongoing commitments from the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) 2024/25 at their meeting on 21 September 2023. After funding the budget requirement, there is excess funding of an estimated £0.093m to transfer into the Schools Block for 2024/25.
- 2.2 A local Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) can be set to a maximum 0.5% for 2024/25 (unchanged from 2023/24) as per the Schools Revenue Funding Operational Guide for 2024/25.
- 2.3 Schools' Forum are considering a block transfer from the growth fund to the High Needs Block for 2024/25 under a separate item on this meeting agenda. Although the growth fund forms part of the Schools Block, the indicative funding and draft ISBs included in this report exclude any growth funding. The allocation for growth is not published until December 2023.
- 2.4 Forum will recall that DSG Schools Block funding is on the basis of primary pupil numbers multiplied by the PUF and secondary pupil numbers multiplied by the SUF. Although the distribution and allocation of the NFF to individual schools is more complex with multiple formula factors at varying rates, the actual receipt of overall funding is a very simple calculation based on the PUF and SUF.

- 2.5 The table below shows the changes in the PUF and SUF over recent years in both monetary and percentage terms.

Rate	2021/22 Increase*		2022/23 Increase		2023/24 Increase**		2024/25 Increase***	
PUF	£329.19	7.49%	£108.96	2.31%	£263.33	5.45%	£285.75	5.60%
SUF	£485.36	8.80%	£199.35	3.32%	£380.42	6.13%	£344.72	5.24%

(*) Increase includes mainstreaming of Teachers Pay and Pension Grant

(**) Increase includes mainstreaming of Supplementary Grant

(***) Increase includes mainstreaming of the Mainstream Schools Additional Grant

3. Indicative ISB Modelling for 2024/25

- 3.1 On the basis of pupil counts and characteristics from the October 2022 census, a local MFG of the maximum 0.5% appears affordable without the implementation of a cap. Affordability is based on the new Primary Unit of Funding (PUF) and Secondary Unit of Funding (SUF) rates provided by ESFA for 2024/25 multiplied by the October 2022 pupil count. However, this position may change once October 2023 pupil numbers and characteristics are reflected in the formula.
- 3.2 Appendix A lists indicative school budget shares for 2024/25 and assumes that Forum support a maximum MFG of 0.5%. Key assumptions included in Appendix A are:
- Based on pupil numbers and pupils characteristics from the October 2022 census;
 - Includes the transfer-in of £0.093m from CSSB;
 - Applies the maximum MFG of 0.5%;
 - Allocates the mandatory sparsity factor at the minimum level allowed within the regulations;
 - Uses the indicative DSG funding of **£80.380m** for 2024/25 published by ESFA.
- 3.3 ESFA made a change to the National Funding Formula (NFF) in 2023/24. The funding factor for Sparsity became mandatory and authorities were obliged to allocate a minimum of 10% of the NFF factor to eligible schools. Two schools within Hartlepool are eligible for sparsity funding within the NFF. For 2024/25, local authorities must move their local formula factor values at least a further 10% closer to the NFF. The draft ISBs at appendix A assume that the minimum allowable amount is allocated within the Hartlepool formula.
- 3.4 In the indicative budgets, one primary school would receive a minimum per pupil uplift as the school's per pupil funding does not meet the minimum per pupil guarantee within the formula. This position may change once the NFF is updated for the October 2023 census.
- 3.5 Although a number of schools receive less than a 0.5% increase in their overall indicative budget for 2024/25 (shown in column I), all schools receive at least a 0.5% increase per pupil because of the MFG (shown in column J). The 0.5% increase per pupil calculation excludes the lump sum and premises budgets.
- 3.6 Appendix B to the report presents three worked examples taken from Appendix A. The first two examples illustrate a school that passes the Minimum Per Pupil Funding

(MPPF) test and the third school fails the test and therefore receives an uplift to ensure funding is provided to the level of the MPPF (£4,610 for primary schools and £5,995 for secondary schools).

- 3.7 At their meeting on 21 September 2023, Forum received information from the Council's Data Team that suggests an overall increase of 31 pupils in the October 2023 census (in comparison to October 2022). It is therefore unlikely that a cap will be required to support an MFG of 0.5%. However, as pupil characteristics such as deprivation and low attainment will also be updated for the October 2023 census, the need for a cap cannot be 100% ruled out. Schools' Forum may wish to consider the application of a cap alongside MFG if this is the case once the final NFF is published.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Forum is asked to

- Note the contents of the report;
- approve the application of a maximum 0.5% MFG, with the application of an appropriate cap to make this affordable for 2024/25 ISBs

Please note: Final ISBs will be based upon October 2023 pupil counts and characteristics once they are published by ESFA in December.

All Forum Members are eligible to vote.

APPENDIX A: Indicative ISBs 2024/25 (Based on October 2022 Census)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
School Reference	MPPF Test Result	2024/25 Pre MFG Budget (Excl ESG and De-Del)	MFG 0.50%	Cap 0.0%	2024/25 Post MFG Budget	2023/24 post MFG Budget (incl supplementary grant)	Budget Increase +£ / Decrease (£)	Budget Increase +% / Decrease (%)	Per Pupil Increase %
1	PASS	1,789,944	0	0	1,789,944	1,747,414	42,530	2.43%	2.65%
2	PASS	842,551	0	0	842,551	818,143	24,407	2.98%	3.59%
3	PASS	8,838,778	0	0	8,838,778	8,711,209	127,570	1.46%	1.50%
4	PASS	7,457,296	0	0	7,457,296	7,348,762	108,534	1.48%	1.51%
5	PASS	9,132,757	0	0	9,132,757	8,996,144	136,613	1.52%	1.55%
6	PASS	993,090	2,478	0	995,568	991,314	4,254	0.43%	0.50%
7	PASS	1,510,210	0	0	1,510,210	1,488,519	21,692	1.46%	1.61%
8	PASS	489,025	36,007	0	525,032	523,157	1,875	0.36%	0.50%
9	PASS	1,595,157	0	0	1,595,157	1,572,755	22,402	1.42%	1.57%
10	FAIL	1,411,733	0	0	1,411,733	1,392,197	19,536	1.40%	1.56%
11	PASS	2,235,451	0	0	2,235,451	2,203,491	31,960	1.45%	1.55%
12	PASS	1,604,507	0	0	1,604,507	1,581,779	22,728	1.44%	1.58%
13	PASS	2,103,867	0	0	2,103,867	2,073,958	29,909	1.44%	1.55%
14	PASS	1,668,968	0	0	1,668,968	1,641,018	27,950	1.70%	1.87%
15	PASS	1,617,704	0	0	1,617,704	1,594,562	23,142	1.45%	1.59%
16	PASS	1,128,397	0	0	1,128,397	1,112,437	15,960	1.43%	1.64%
17	PASS	519,595	51,852	0	571,448	569,285	2,163	0.38%	0.50%
18	PASS	8,706,377	0	0	8,706,377	8,580,845	125,532	1.46%	1.49%
19	PASS	5,152,639	0	0	5,152,639	5,077,701	74,938	1.48%	1.53%
20	PASS	1,080,286	0	0	1,080,286	1,058,281	22,005	2.08%	2.39%
21	PASS	1,446,841	0	0	1,446,841	1,424,587	22,254	1.56%	1.73%
22	PASS	671,434	0	0	671,434	652,758	18,676	2.86%	3.62%
23	PASS	1,175,457	0	0	1,175,457	1,155,687	19,770	1.71%	1.94%
24	PASS	524,054	44,712	0	568,766	566,637	2,129	0.38%	0.50%
25	PASS	1,912,872	0	0	1,912,872	1,879,686	33,186	1.77%	1.95%
26	PASS	1,901,732	0	0	1,901,732	1,857,126	44,606	2.40%	2.63%
27	PASS	1,281,040	0	0	1,281,040	1,262,116	18,924	1.50%	1.73%
28	PASS	1,593,558	0	0	1,593,558	1,571,259	22,299	1.42%	1.59%
29	PASS	1,869,510	0	0	1,869,510	1,843,213	26,296	1.43%	1.57%
30	PASS	1,278,113	0	0	1,278,113	1,257,493	20,620	1.64%	1.88%
31	PASS	2,282,346	0	0	2,282,346	2,224,674	57,672	2.59%	2.82%
32	PASS	1,874,104	0	0	1,874,104	1,847,985	26,119	1.41%	1.56%
33	PASS	1,383,363	0	0	1,383,363	1,351,229	32,134	2.38%	2.72%
34	PASS	646,067	0	0	646,067	640,019	6,048	0.94%	1.23%
35	PASS	618,616	0	0	618,616	605,027	13,589	2.25%	2.90%
TOTAL		80,337,438	135,049	0	80,472,487	79,222,468	1,250,019		

Appendix B: Three Worked Examples – Minimum Per Pupil Funding (MPPF)

School 24 (90 pupils on roll)	£	Notes
What is the total MPPF guarantee for this school?	414,900	This is calculated as 90 pupils @ £4,610. £4,610 is the MPPF guarantee for primary schools in 2024/25
MPPF Test Result	PASS	
What is the actual MPPF for the school?		
Basic entitlement	321,559	90 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)
FSM	30,300	
IDACI	6,055	
EAL	699	
Low Attainment	24,570	
Sparsity	3,476	
Lump Sum	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £1,493
Actual MPPF total	521,059	Actual MPPF is £5,790 (compared to £4,610 Minimum)
Difference between MPPF guarantee and actual MPPF total	(106,159)	A negative figure here means the school is above the £4,610 MPPF so does not receive an uplift
Budget increase	2,129	This is an increase of 0.38%
Explained by:		
Increase in Basic entitlement	15,305	
Increase in FSM	3,075	
Increase in IDACI	85	
Increase in EAL	12	
Increase in Low Attainment	315	
Increase in Sparsity	1,820	
Increase in Lump Sum	6,400	
Supplementary Grant Mainstreamed	(17,820)	
Decrease in MFG	(7,063)	
TOTAL	2,129	

School 19 (685 pupils on roll)	£	Notes
What is the total MPPF guarantee for this school?	4,106,575	This is calculated as 685 pupils @ £5,995. £5,995 is the MPPF guarantee for secondary schools in 2024/25
MPPF Test Result	PASS	
What is the actual MPPF for the school?		
Basic entitlement	3,632,606	685 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)
FSM	658,680	
IDACI	409,953	
EAL	6,340	
Low Attainment	274,124	
Sparsity / Mobility	0	
Lump Sum	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £196
Actual MPPF total	5,116,104	Actual MPPF is £7,469 (compared to £5,995 Minimum)
Difference between MPPF guarantee and actual MPPF total	(1,009,529)	A negative figure here means the school is above the £5,995 MPPF so does not receive an uplift
Budget increase	74,938	This is an increase of 1.48%
Explained by:		
Increase in Basic entitlement	173,434	
Increase in FSM	71,210	
Increase in IDACI	6,134	
Increase in EAL	80	
Increase in Low Attainment	3,862	
Increase in Lump Sum	6,400	
Supplementary Grant Mainstreamed	(186,182)	
TOTAL	74,938	

School 10 (305 pupils on roll)	£	Notes
What is the total MPPF guarantee for this school?	1,406,050	This is calculated as 305 pupils @ £4,610. £4,610 is the MPPF guarantee for primary schools in 2024/25
MPPF Test Result	FAIL	
What is the actual MPPF for the school?		
Basic entitlement	1,089,728	305 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)
FSM	26,040	
IDACI	20,067	
EAL	2,768	
Low Attainment	65,110	
Sparsity	0	
Lump Sum	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £441
Actual MPPF total	1,338,113	Actual MPPF is £4,387 (compared to £4,610 Minimum)
Difference between MPPF guarantee and actual MPPF total	67,937	The actual MPPF is below the guarantee of £4,610 so the school receives an uplift
Budget increase	19,536	This is an increase of 1.40%
Explained by:		
Increase in Basic entitlement	51,866	
Increase in FSM	2,595	
Decrease in IDACI	257	
Increase in EAL	47	
Increase in Low Attainment	835	
Increase in Lump Sum	6,400	
Increase in MPPF Uplift	525	
Supplementary Grant Mainstreamed	(42,989)	
TOTAL	19,536	

**Report to Hartlepool Schools' Forum 23 November 2023
From Amanda Whitehead (Assistant Director – Education)**

Item 4: Growth Fund Block Transfer Proposal 2024/25

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to outline the preferred option for use of growth funding in 2024/25. The growth fund sits within the Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- 1.2 A growth fund working group was established by Schools' Forum to review options for using the fund. The review was completed during autumn 2023.
- 1.3 Growth funding in 2024/25 has not yet been confirmed but estimates suggest a fund of circa £0.349m.

2. Background

- 2.1 Schools' Forum agreed a growth policy in 2019 once growth funding began to be received within the National Funding Formula (NFF).
- 2.2 The policy allowed for a disbursement of growth funding where the local authority had specifically asked for an increase in Pupil Admission Numbers (PAN). Two secondary schools have been benefiting from the growth fund for a 5 year period under the policy. The final payments to be made are in the current financial year, 2023/24.
- 2.3 The growth fund working group was tasked with a review of the current policy and also to assess options to use the fund for in-year pupil growth after the October census point.

3. Options Assessed

- 3.1 Schools had expressed concerns regarding the number of pupils who presented themselves after the October census. This census is used to calculate Individual School Budgets for the following funding period.
- 3.2 Models were created to look at movements in pupil numbers between the 3 census points (October, January and May) using historic data. The group was clear that any measurement of growth would need to use census point data as an independent measurement
- 3.3 DfE confirmed eligibility for growth funding can include the requirement for a new class or half class. Different tolerances were set within the models – firstly a tolerance of 15 pupils (below which no growth funding would be allocated) and secondly a tolerance based on percentage of school roll. Secondary schools were excluded from the modelling as they already come under the Managed Moves process where funding follows the child.
- 3.4 None of the models showed significant pupil growth above the tolerance between census points.

3.5 The group were also informed that the DfE had queried whether a block transfer using growth funding was being considered to fund any high needs shortfall. DfE had confirmed this was feasible should Schools' Forum agree to a block transfer.

4. Preferred Option

4.1 At their meeting on 18 October 2023, Schools' Forum received feedback from the work of the growth review group. At the same meeting, Forum reviewed future high needs block spending and initial proposals for a budget recovery plan.

4.2 As the models for in-year pupil growth did not demonstrate numbers above the tolerance that would need to be set, along with the recent discussion at Schools' Forum relating to the high needs block recovery plan, a block transfer in 2024/25 is being recommended.

4.3 This approach would be strongly supported by Council Officers.

4.4 As the value of the growth fund (estimated at £0.349m) is less than 0.5% of the total Schools Block, a block transfer to the high needs block could be approved by Schools' Forum and subsequently by Children's Services Committee without a disapplication to the Secretary of State.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Forum is asked to approve a block transfer from the Schools Block (growth funding) to the High Needs Block for 2024/25. The actual value of the growth fund will be confirmed in December 2023. Estimates suggest funding of £0.349m.

Please note: All Forum Members are eligible to vote on this recommendation.

Report to Hartlepool Schools' Forum 23 November 2023
From Danielle Swainston (Assistant Director – Joint Commissioning)

Item 5: High Needs Block 2024/25

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to present a range of proposals for the High Needs Block budget requirement for 2024/25 for onward decision by Children's Services Committee.
- 1.2 The budget proposals represent year one of a three year recovery plan to work towards a balanced budget position on High Needs Block spending by 2026/27.

2. Background

- 2.1 Schools' Forum are consulted on the proposed High Needs Block budget requirement each year for onward decision making by Children's Services Committee.
- 2.2 A budget shortfall of £2.147m was approved by Schools' Forum and ratified by Children's Services Committee for 2023/24.
- 2.3 Schools' Forum agreed to establish a High Needs recovery plan to bring spending back in line with funding within three years.

3. High Needs Block Funding 2024/25

- 3.1 The following table presents the high needs block allocation for 2024/25 published by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) on 17 July 2023.

High Needs Block	2024/25 Funding £m
DSG High Needs Block Allocation (before academy place funding is deducted)	19.352
Recoupment for academy funding	(3.330)
Net High Needs Funding 2024/25	16.022

- 3.2 There are several expected adjustments to the recoupment value of £3.330m shown in the table above. These are:
- Errors reported to ESFA and acknowledged in the import / export charge for 2023/24 that will carry forward into 2024/25 funding. The correction increases the net funding by £0.042m;
 - An increase of 8 places at Springwell School with effect from September 2024. This change will reduce net funding by £0.035m;
 - Recoupment for Grange Primary ARP places (21 places) following planned conversion of the school to academy status. This will reduce net funding by £0.126m. Please note this change is budget neutral as expenditure on local authority places will reduce by the same amount.

- 3.4 The revised High Needs funding (after recoupment) for 2024/25 after these adjustments is **£15.903m**.
- 3.5 Opening of the SEMH Free School in September 2024 will also impact High Needs funding in 2024/25. However, the overall impact is expected to net to nil. Core funding will increase as pupils are registered at the school and recoupment will increase to offset the increased funding as ESFA will pass place funding direct to Spark of Genius.

4. **2024/25 Budget Requirement Baseline**

- 4.1 The following table summarises the budget requirement for 2024/25 to 2026/27 should current budgets simply be rolled forward and increased for typical demand and price increases. In other words, this budget requirement ignores the need for a recovery plan. This budget amount provides a baseline from which savings can be established and recorded.

Budget Area	£m 2024/25	£m 2025/26	£m 2026/27
Special Schools	6.885	7.229	7.374
Independent Schools	5.368	5.636	5.749
IPS	2.557	2.685	2.739
ARPs	2.484	2.608	2.660
Post-16	2.109	2.214	2.259
Support Services	0.909	0.954	0.974
Exclusions and AP	0.942	0.989	1.009
Out of Area	0.672	0.706	0.720
HI/VI	0.205	0.215	0.220
Borrowing	0.075	0.075	0.075
TOTAL	22.206	23.313	23.777
Block Funding Estimate	19.352	20.265	20.670
Est Funding Gap	2.854	3.048	3.107

- 4.2 Under a separate item on this meeting agenda, Schools' Forum are considering a block transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2024/25 using the growth funding. There are currently no commitments on the growth fund in 2024/25.
- 4.3 Although growth funding for 2024/25 will not be confirmed until December 2023, ESFA issue a calculator for use by local authorities to estimate their growth funding amount. Having completed the calculator, growth funding of circa £0.349m is anticipated.
- 4.4 Should Schools' Forum (and subsequently Children's Services Committee) approve the block transfer, this would reduce the estimated funding gap from £2.854m to £2.505m.
- 4.5 To work towards recovery of High Needs spending to a balanced budget position by 2027/28, the funding gap in 2024/25 would need to be reduced by a further £0.505m. This would leave a further £1.000m of savings to be found in both financial year 2025/26 and 2026/27.

5. Recovery Plan Saving Proposals 2024/25

- 5.1 Schools' Forum began discussion on a High Needs Block Recovery Plan at their meeting on 18 October. From that discussion, a clear need to target Independent School Fees for recovery plan savings emerged. However, the level of savings required mean that other areas of spending must also be considered.
- 5.2 The following table outlines a range of budget proposals that could be implemented in 2024/25.

	BEST-CASE	MID-CASE	WORSE-CASE
Proposal 1: Independent School Fees	Restrict new placements to 3 only in 2024/25 £0.378m	Restrict new placements to 5 only in 2024/25 £0.227m	Restrict new placements to 7 only in 2024/25 £0.077m
Proposal 2: Out of Authority Placements	Restrict new placements to 3 only in 2024/25 £0.254m	Restrict new placements to 5 only in 2024/25 £0.220m	Restrict new placements to 7 only in 2024/25 £0.187m
Proposal 3: Uplift to IPS Ranges	Nil uplift to IPS top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.087m	2% uplift to IPS top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.044m	4% uplift to IPS top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.000m
Proposal 4: Uplift to ARP Ranges	Nil uplift to ARP top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.045m	2% uplift to ARP top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.023m	4% uplift to ARP top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.000m
Proposal 5: Uplift to Special School Cost Model	0.5% uplift to Cost Models in 2024/25 (as ISB MFG) £0.217m	2% uplift to IPS top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.158m	6% uplift to IPS top-up ranges in 2024/25 £0.000m
PLUS BLOCK TRANSFER (Growth Fund)	£0.349m	£0.349m	£0.349m
Potential Saving	£1.330m	£1.021m	£0.613m
TARGET £1.000m			

- 5.3 Further savings may be possible if transfer of pupils currently in an independent school placement, or Out of Authority placement are feasible to transfer to the new SEMH Free School in September 2024. However, as the opening date is not certain and the level of savings are not yet clear, such savings have not been included in these proposals at this stage.

6. Risks to Budget Planning 2024/25 and Beyond

- 6.1 There are a number of areas that may impact the budget estimates shown in the table at paragraph 4.1.
- 6.2 The numbers of pupils with SEND attending Kingsley School prompted the requirement for additional classroom space during 2022/23. Demountable accommodation under a hire agreement is in place and the cost is being funded from Council reserves. It is likely that additional accommodation will be needed longer term and the Council would look to fund a solution from capital funding. Reserves funding is only available for an agreed 2 year period. If a capital solution is not in place by summer 2024, ongoing hire costs would need to be funded from the high needs budget.
- 6.3 A business case is being prepared for an early year's SEND assessment centre as an extension to Springwell Special School.
- 6.4 Schools' Forum received a report at their meeting on 18 October 2023 from the Executive Head Teacher of Horizon School highlighting the need for a review of the operating model. Costs arising from the review are not yet known. It may be possible to link up with the SEND / AP Change Programme to test models and utilise funding.
- 6.5 The SEMH Free School opens in September 2024. Detailed work on transitioning existing placements to the new school has started. High Needs Block funding will reflect places at the Free School in 2024/25 and ESFA offer transitional funding as school places are filled. Actual funding and costs are not yet known with certainty.
- 6.6 Early Year's entitlements will increase significantly from 2024/25 – moving to a 2 Year Old offer for working parents and to a wider offer from children aged 9 months. It is likely that the expansion will highlight new volumes of children requiring SEND support. DfE have made clear that this need must fall on the high needs block.

7. Recommendations

- 7.1 Forum is asked to:
- Note the risks affecting future year budgets outlined at section 6 of this report;
 - Review the proposed High Needs Recovery Plan Block budget saving proposals for 2024/25 and to recommend the proposals to be taken forward within the budget requirement to Children's Services Committee for approval.

Please note: All Forum Members are eligible to vote on this recommendation.