

---

---

# SCHOOLS' FORUM

Thursday 7 December 2023 – 10am

Conference Suite, CETL

---

---

## *A G E N D A*

- |    |   |                    |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Apologies   | Chair              |
| 2. | Minutes from Schools' Forum meeting on 23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2023 and Matters Arising | Chair              |
| 3. | Indicative Schools Block Budget Models 2024/25 (D)  | Amanda Whitehead   |
| 4. | High Needs Block 2024/25 (I)  | Danielle Swainston |
| 5. | Any Other Business –  |                    |
|    | • SEMH Free School Impact of Delay (V)  | Sandra Shears      |
|    | • Use of SEMH Funding (V)   | Danielle Swainston |

Date and Time of Next Forum Meeting – Thursday  
15 February 2024, 10am CETL Conference Suite

<b>Schools' Forum Meeting</b> <b>23 November 2023</b>
--

**Attendees:****Members**

Carole Bradley (CB) (Academy Primary)  
 Chris Connor (CC) (Maintained Primary)  
 Sara Crawshaw (SC) (RC Diocese)  
 Tracey Gibson (TG) (Academy – Secondary)  
 John Hardy (JH) (Academy – Primary)  
 Louise Robson (LR) (Academy – Special)  
 Emma Rutherford (ER) (Horizon School)  
 Chris Simmons (CS) (Academy Trustee)  
 Mark Tilling (Chair) (Maintained Secondary)  
 Dave Turner (DT) (Primary)  
 Lee Walker (Academy – Primary)  
 Zoe Westley (ZW) (Academy – Special)  
 Vicki Wilson (VW) (CoE Diocese)  
 Leanne Yates (LY) (Maintained Primary)

**Local Authority Officers**

Stacy Kirton (SK) – Children's Finance (observer only)

Sandra Shears (SSh) - Children's Finance

Fiona Stobbs (FS) – Senior Advisor Inclusion / SEND

Jo Stubbs (JS) - Administrator

Danielle Swainston (DS) – Assistant Director Joint Commissioning

Jane Watt (JW) - Children's Finance

Amanda Whitehead (AW) – Assistant Director Education

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>1 Apologies -</b></p> <p>Apologies were submitted by the following and accepted by Forum:</p> <p>Lisa Grieg (Academy – Special) – Louise Robson attending            Phil Pritchard (Academy – Primary)            Toni Ray (Early Years)            Jane Reid (16-19 Sector)            Sue Sharpe (Primary)</p>	
<p><b>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting – 18 October 2023 – and Matters Arising</b></p> <p>Schools Forum Membership Update – there had been no expressions of interest from maintained school governors to date.</p>	

	<p>CB confirmed that the proposal for CS to continue in his role as an academy representative would be raised at the next Academy Trust meeting.</p> <p>Trade Union Facility Time Update – SSh confirmed that all schools had now signed up for this.</p> <p>Updates on the free school and independent school placement would be brought to Forum as soon as possible.</p> <p>Minutes confirmed</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Indicative Schools Block Budget Update 2024/25</b></p> <p>JWa advised members that a revised draft Authority Proforma Tool (APT) had been released in October. This was used to model and set individual school budgets. A local Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) could be set to a maximum of 0.5% for 2024/25 and based on the October 2022 census this was affordable without the implementation of a cap. However this might change when October 2023 pupil numbers and characteristics were reflected in the formula at which point it was possible that a cap might be required.</p> <p>ESFA had amended the National Funding Formula in 2023/24 meaning the Sparsity factor was now mandatory and authorities were obliged to allocate a minimum of 10% of the NFF factor to eligible schools. Two Hartlepool schools were eligible for this funding. In addition 1 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 might change following the October 2023 census.</p> <p>The Chair noted that sparsity was now an exception to fully following the NFF. proposing to allocate 20% of the required sparsity amount. JW advised that the working assumption had been to mirror the approach in 2023/24 and allocate the minimum sparsity amount in line with gradual transition to the NFF. CB queried the appropriateness of this approach as it could be deemed that the schools concerned had a true requirement for the full sparsity funding. Members asked that officers show the impact of 50% and 100% sparsity budget, noting the difference this could make to the affected schools.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the report be noted</li> <li>• That the application of a maximum 0.5% MFG be approved with the application of an appropriate cap to make this affordable for 2023/24 ISBs.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That indicative ISB modelling be carried out using 50% and 100% sparsity figures for affected schools.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Fund Block Transfer Proposal 2024/25</b></p> <p>At the previous meeting members had discussed whether the growth funding should be transferred to the high needs block. This proposal emerged following the production of models for in-year pupil growth that did not demonstrate numbers above the tolerance that would need to be set for a growth disbursement policy. A block transfer for 2024/25 of the estimated growth funding of £0.349m was recommended. This could be approved by Schools Forum and Children’s Services Committee without a disapplication to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The Chair advised that Sue Sharpe (Maintained Primary) had expressed her disappointment at the proposal and whilst she recognised the rationale for the proposal, did not feel able to support it. DT commented that efforts had been made to assist SS but unfortunately, the census point data had not shown the level of growth to enable a new process to proceed. . CB queried whether the monies transferred could be ringfenced for children with specific needs but was told this would not be feasible.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>That a block transfer from the Schools Block (growth funding) to the High Needs Block for 2024/24 be approved.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>High Needs Block 2024/25</b></p> <p>Schools Forum were consulted annually on High Needs block budget requirements with their comments put forward to Children’s Service Committee where the final decision would be made. A budget shortfall of £2.147m had been approved for 2023/24 and Forum had agreed to establish a 3-year High Needs recovery plan to bring spending back in line with funding. Figures showed a potential budget requirement of £22.206m in 2024/25 with available funding of £19.352m – an estimated funding gap of £2.854m. Without action this gap would only increase in the following years. The block transfer from the growth fund to the High Needs Block agreed previously by Forum would help to plug this gap but more would be needed. A range of recovery plan savings proposals were detailed within the report – aimed at target savings of £1m in the first year. Risks to budget planning were also given – including a need for additional classroom space and possible delays to the free school opening.</p> <p>Members acknowledged the need to cut budgets at this time and expressed an appreciation for the situation currently faced by the local authority. However they felt they were already overstretched financially.</p>	

	<p>Staffing costs were rising due to the increased number of challenging pupils and they were also finding it difficult to recruit staff on this basis. They referred to the suggested cap on new independent school placements, querying what would happen when this cap was reached. DS acknowledged that Hartlepool schools accommodating these children would receive less funding than external providers but this would help toward cost saving. Too many Hartlepool children were going out of town and this needed to reduce as much as possible. This situation was happening across the country since austerity when early intervention had been cut back.</p> <p>SC queried why more was not made of the positive work carried out around children supported by schools.</p> <p>DT requested that an additional budget proposal be included regards savings that could be recouped when the free school opens. DS advised that 55 places were expected to be available, phased in from 2025.</p> <p>CS felt it would not be possible to reduce the current overspend to zero over the next 3 years and the local authority needed to acknowledge this. He called on political representatives from Hartlepool and other local authorities to come together and make representations to government. Councils had a responsibility to deliver for their young people and this situation would only get worse next year. DS assured members that the local authority was doing all it could to lobby government but they were not in enough deficit to trigger monetary assistance.</p> <p>JH commented that previously attitudes in the community had impacted positively on schools however this had since changed. He understood the budget issues being faced by the Council but felt the Forum could not support the recommended cuts.</p> <p>CB felt the suggested savings were unrealistic and would break the system and could not morally support them.</p> <p>DT felt that some of the proposed savings could be beneficial. However he did not support a reduction in the amounts coming into individual schools. JW advised that members could mix and match the suggested budget proposals and were not expected to choose all of one range of savings</p> <p>TG acknowledged the comments from members and the impact cuts would have on children but felt they could not spend money they did not have. LR challenged Forum members on whether nil support to any of the budget proposals could be considered a reckless approach in this case. DT noted that there had been no lack of support from Forum for SEND and High Needs Block in the past and they could not be accused of burying their head in the sand.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Members as a whole acknowledged the position being faced by the local authority in terms of budgets however they felt that morally they could not support cuts which they felt would impact on vulnerable children. The Chair queried whether members wished to vote on this now or wait until the next meeting for further information regards the forthcoming free school. Members preferred to make a decision on this item at this time. Officers would then forward their comments to Committee. The Forum’s Children’s Services representatives indicated they would all be happy to represent the Forum at that time.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the risks affecting future year budgets outlined at Section 6 of the report be noted</li> <li>• That the proposed High Needs Recovery Plan block budget savings proposals be reviewed</li> <li>• That the proposals to be taken forward within the budget requirement to Children’s Services Committee be recognised but</li> <li>• That Forum need to express that they are concerned that such disinvestment would mean that some of the budget proposals do not meet the educational needs of our children</li> </ul>	
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Date and Time of Next Forum Meeting – Wednesday 7 December, CETL Conference Suite</b></p>	

## OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LOG

Meeting	Description	Owner
01/03/23	Develop 3 year recovery plan for High Needs Block spending	Schools Forum
18/10/23	Indicate potential saving opportunities lost linked to the delay of the SEMH Free School opening	Sandra Shears
18/10/23	Provide case studies for pupils placed in Independent Schools (SEMH information previously provided)	Danielle Swainston

Financial Year 2023/24: Children’s Services Committee – Log of Schools’ Forum Recommendations and Committee Decisions

Last Updated: 5 December 2023

Committee Date	Report	Recommendation and Decision Details
14/11/23	Dedicated Schools Grant (Former Education Services Grant rate per pupil) – Disapplication Request	The Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Agreed the 2024/25 funding rate at £60 per pupil/place.</li> <li>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 2024/25.</li> <li>c) Noted this will be the eighth consecutive year the local authority has applied for disapplication and that the previous seven applications have been successful.</li> <li>d)</li> </ul>
		a)



**Report to Hartlepool Schools' Forum 7 December 2023  
From Amanda Whitehead – Assistant Director Education**

**Item 3: Indicative Schools Block Budget Models 2024/25**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide further budget models to Schools' Forum that affect the Sparsity factor within the National Funding Formula (NFF) for 2024/25.
- 1.2 Local Authorities continue to have discretion over the allocation of certain NFF factors, although discretion is increasingly limited as government transitions to the "hard formula".

**2. Background**

- 2.1 Hartlepool follows the NFF hard formula and was an early adopter.
- 2.2 A new allocation for the Sparsity factor was received at a later stage of the confirmed NFF for 2023/24. Until this point, Hartlepool had not benefited from the Sparsity factor but a change in calculation by DfE prompted the new allocation.
- 2.3 Two primary schools within Hartlepool are eligible for the Sparsity funding.
- 2.4 To comply with the rules concerning transition to the "hard" NFF, a minimum allocation of 10% of the Sparsity funding factor was mandatory for 2023/24.
- 2.5 Therefore, Individual School Budgets (ISBs) for 2023/24 included a 10% allocation of the Sparsity factor for the two eligible primary schools. The minimum allocation for 2024/25 increased to circa 25%.

**3. Indicative ISB Modelling for 2024/25**

- 3.1 In considering indicative ISBs for 2024/25 at their meeting on 23 November 2023, Schools' Forum recognised that use of the Sparsity factor has become an exception to Hartlepool's adoption of the NFF.
- 3.2 To consider this further, Schools' Forum requested budget models to illustrate options available for use of the Sparsity factor. To support this decision, the following models have been provided:
  1. Apply the sparsity factor at the minimum level allowable within the transition to NFF regulations (model already presented to Forum on 23 November and repeated here as Appendix A)
  2. Apply the sparsity factor at 50% (Appendix B)
  3. Apply the full 100% sparsity factor (Appendix C)
- 3.3 On the basis of October 2022 census pupil numbers and characteristics, the models suggest that allocation of the sparsity factor up to 100% is affordable without a cap. This is because the 2 primary schools concerned receive a greater sparsity allocation but this is fully offset by a reduction in their MFG.

- 3.4 The worked examples that were presented to Forum on 23 November 2023 have also been provided but only for the example school affected by the sparsity factor. These are shown at Appendix D to show the differences for each sparsity factor option.

#### **4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 Forum is asked to
- Note the contents of the report;
  - Agree the preferred option for application of the Sparsity factor in 2024/25.

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

**Please note: A cap may still be required once data is refreshed for the October 2023 census count and pupil characteristics.**

**All Forum Members are eligible to vote.**

## APPENDIX A: Indicative ISBs 2024/25 (Based on October 2022 Census) – Minimum Allowable Sparsity Factor

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%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>80,337,438</b>	<b>135,049</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80,472,487</b>	<b>79,222,468</b>	<b>1,250,019</b>		

## Appendix B: Indicative ISBs 2024/25 (Based on October 2022 Census) – 50% Sparsity Factor

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	500,613	24,361	0	524,974	523,157	1,817	0.35%	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	527,530	41,218	0	568,748	566,637	2,111	0.37%	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%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>80,352,502</b>	<b>119,910</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80,472,412</b>	<b>79,222,468</b>	<b>1,249,944</b>		

## Appendix C: Indicative ISBs 2024/25 (Based on October 2022 Census) – 100% Sparsity Factor (in line with NFF)

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	523,788	1,070	0	524,858	523,157	1,701	0.33%	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	534,482	34,231	0	568,714	566,637	2,077	0.37%	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%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>80,382,629</b>	<b>89,632</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80,472,261</b>	<b>79,222,468</b>	<b>1,249,793</b>		

## Appendix D: Worked Example for School 24 (for each Sparsity option)

	As Appendix A - Sparsity at Minimum Allowed		As Appendix B - Sparsity at 50%		As Appendix C - Sparsity at 100%	
School 24 (90 pupils on roll)	£	Notes	£	Notes	£	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	414,900	This is calculated as 90 pupils @ £4,610. £4,610 is the MPPF guarantee for primary schools in 2024/25	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	<b>PASS</b>		<b>PASS</b>		<b>PASS</b>	
What is the actual MPPF for the school?						
Basic entitlement	321,559	90 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)	321,559	90 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)	321,559	90 pupils @ AWPU (plus CSSB Tfr + Excess)
FSM	30,300		30,300		30,300	
IDACI	6,055		6,055		6,055	
EAL	699		699		699	
Low Attainment	24,570		24,570		24,570	
Sparsity	3,476		6,952		13,905	
Lump Sum	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £1,493	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £1,493	134,400	Lump sum per pupil is £1,493
Actual MPPF total	521,059	Actual MPPF is £5,790 (compared to £4,610 Minimum)	524,535	Actual MPPF is £5,828 (compared to £4,610 Minimum)	531,487	Actual MPPF is £5,905 (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	(109,635)	A negative figure here means the school is above the £4,610 MPPF so does not receive an uplift	(116,587)	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%	2,111	This is an increase of 0.38%	2,077	This is an increase of 0.37%
<b>Explained by:</b>						
Increase in Basic entitlement	15,305		15,305		15,305	
Increase in FSM	3,075		3,075		3,075	
Increase in IDACI	85		85		85	
Increase in EAL	12		12		12	
Increase in Low Attainment	315		315		315	
Increase in Sparsity	1,820		5,296		12,249	
Increase in Lump Sum	6,400		6,400		6,400	
Supplementary Grant Mainstreamed	(17,820)		(17,820)		(17,820)	
Decrease in MFG	(7,063)		(10,557)		(17,544)	
TOTAL	2,129		2,111		2,077	

**Report to Hartlepool Schools' Forum 7 December 2023**  
**From Danielle Swainston (Assistant Director – Joint Commissioning)**

**Item 4: High Needs Block 2024/25**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to follow up the discussion at Schools' Forum on 23 November 2023 relating to High Needs Block budget proposals for 2024/25.
- 1.2 The report confirms the budget proposals that will be taken to Children's Services Committee for approval by Members.

**2. Background**

- 2.1 Schools' Forum were consulted on a number of budget proposals for 2024/25 as part of the High Needs recovery plan to bring spending back in line with funding within the next three years.
- 2.2 Having reviewed the proposals, Schools' Forum recognised the need for proposals to be taken forward within the budget requirement to Children's Services Committee but expressed their concern that such disinvestment would mean that the proposals do not meet the educational needs of Hartlepool children and were not happy to accept any of the proposals.
- 2.3 Council Officers will propose the High Needs Block budget for 2024/25 for approval by Children's Services Committee at their meeting on 19 March 2024.

**3. High Needs Block Budget Proposals 2024/25**

- 3.1 In order to bring spending back in line with available High Needs Block funding, expenditure needs to reduce by circa £1m in 2024/25 and a further £1m in both 2025/26 and 2026/27.
- 3.2 At their meeting on 23 November 2023, Schools' Forum agreed that a transfer of growth funding (anticipated to be £0.349m) should be made to the High Needs Block.
- 3.3 Following discussion at Schools' Forum on 23 November 2023, Officers are proposing to take forward the following list of recovery plan options to Children's Services Committee. The list is presented to Schools' Forum for information only.

Proposal	Potential Budget Gap Reduction £m
Aim to limit new independent school placements to 5 places (budget assumption was 7 places)	£0.227
Aim to limit new Out of Area school placements to 5 places (but assumption was 7 places)	£0.220
Uplift IPS top-up ranges by 3% (budget assumption was 4%)	£0.022
Uplift ARP top-up ranges by 3% (budget assumption was 4%)	£0.012
Uplift Special School cost models by 3% (budget assumption was 6%)	£0.119
<b>Total Proposals</b>	<b>£0.600</b>

- 3.4 Should Children's Services Committee agree to the proposals above, when combined with the growth fund transfer, the 2024/25 budget gap would reduce from its current level of £2.854m to £1.905m.
- 3.5 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.

#### **4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 Forum is asked to note the contents of the report.