

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCHOOLS FUNDING FORUM
CEME**

22 February 2018 (8.30 - 10.50 am)

Present:

Representative Groups

Teachers: Margy Bushell, Primary
Kirsten Cooper, Primary
Malcolm Drakes, Primary
Nigel Emes, Primary
Vicky Fackler, Special Academy
Simon London, Academy
Michael Nunn, Primary
Keith Williams, Academy
Governors: Bernard Gilley, Primary

**Non-School
Representatives:** Joanna Wilkinson, Early Years/PVI Sector

Trade Unions: John McGill, NASUWT

In Attendance: Mark Vickers, CEO Olive Academy Trust

44 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS OR OBSERVERS

Apologies for absence were received from Emma Allen (Special Maintained), David Denchfield (Primary Academy), Bill Edgar (Secondary Maintained), Gary Pocock (Special Academy), Jan Taylor (Primary Maintained), John McKernan (Academy Governor), Maria Thompson (Post 16), John Delaney (NUT) and John Giles (UNISON). An apology for absence was also received from Trevor Cook, Assistant Director, Education.

Michael Nunn was in attendance as a substitute for Jan Taylor (Primary Maintained) and Vicky Fackler was in attendance as a substitute for Gary Pocock (Special Academy).

John McGill was in attendance representing NASUWT and would continue to attend until a replacement for Keith Passingham had been confirmed.

Mark Vickers, Chief Executive Officer, Olive AP Academy Trust and Penelope Denny, Head of Behaviour Support and Traveller Support, were in attendance in respect of Agenda Item No. 4, Olive AP Academy – Funding Arrangements.

45 TO AGREE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 14TH DECEMBER 2017

The minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on the 14 December 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

- Minute No. 38, Early Years Funding 2018-19 refers: Heading of table on page 3 to be amended to read 'No. of schools/providers responding'.

46 MATTERS ARISING

The following matters arose from the minutes of the previous meeting:

- Minute No. 39, High Needs Strategy 2017-22 refers: The Strategic Finance Manager explained that £800,000 of capital grant funding was available from the DfE for the next three years for SEND provision and the Local Authority must set out a business case for its release. However, expenditure on increased provision was restricted for use at good and outstanding providers only although all providers could benefit from improvements. The LA has earmarked £100,000 from the grant to establish a small grants programme and providers would be invited to bid for grants up to £10,000, to improve their provision and facilities for special educational needs.
- Minute No. 40, Schools and High Needs Funding 2018-19 refers: Members were informed that schools would receive notification of their 2018/19 budgets by the 28 February 2018.

47 OLIVE AP ACADEMY - FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

The Local Authority had received a request from the Olive AP Academy to increase the total number of places commissioned by the Local Authority on behalf of secondary schools and to introduce a two tier funding approach that would increase the funding allocated for a proportion of the places funded. Mr Mark Vickers, Chief Executive Officer, Olive AP Academy Trust presented a report which requested the Forum consider the proposals from the Olive AP Academy for additional funding.

Members were provided a background to the Academy in order to put the request into context. It was explained that the academy's site in Havering opened on 1 September 2016, after its predecessor, Manor Green College, had been in special measures. The school had inherited poor quality teaching and the Academy was keen to ensure an inclusive continual provision, with much work having been undertaken to ensure that the accommodation was fit for purpose and the staffing restructure had led to stronger staffing at the academy. The building was being reconfigured, with works planned to commence in April 2018, which would significantly improve the quality of provision for the children.

Mr Vickers presented the rationale for ensuring that the academy was adequately funded to be able to take full advantage of the opportunities being created by the emerging partnerships between Olive Academies, Havering Borough Council and Havering schools.

The Published Admission Number for the academy's Havering site was 64, with the number on roll currently at 59. In response to questioning, members were advised that if the number on roll were to reach 64, further discussions around funding would be needed as the academy would no longer be able to run intervention groups if the number of permanent exclusions continued to rise.

The current funding arrangements for the Olive AP Academy were as follows:

Key Stage	Places	Per place	Per pupil	Total charge	Total funding
KS3	24	£10,000	£8,000	£18,000	£432,000
KS4	40	£10,000	£8,000	£18,000	£720,000
Total	64				£1,152,000

A document detailing benchmarked local authority top-up levels of funding was circulated at the meeting, as below:

Outer London Borough	Top up per pupil	OA Havering top up per pupil	Difference
M	£12,096	£8,000	£-4,096
B	£16,800	£8,000	£-8,800
H	£18,000 to £22,000	£8,000	£-12,000
B	£18,000	£8,000	£-10,000
H	£18,000	£8,000	£-10,000
	£20,000	£8,000	£-12,000
S	£24,000	£8,000	£-16,000
Average	£18,414	£8,000	£-10,414

Mr Vickers expressed concern that the current pupil numbers and funding formula were severely limiting the capacity of the academy to be able to play its full part in the continuum of inclusion provision for Havering's pupils, and the agreed published admission number also restricted the academy's financial capacity. Furthermore, Mr Vickers expressed the concerns of the Trust Board as to whether it would be possible to continue to run the academy without an increase in either, or both, pupil number and local authority top up funding in its current financial position.

It was explained that the minimum additional income required for 64 pupils in order for the academy to function and make a significant impact to staffing, was £321,453. It was proposed that an increase in the published admission number be phased in, with an increase to 74 from 2018 and to 84

in 2019. The staged dates were designed to allow the academy time to recruit and train the additional staff required to run the programmes. Mr Vickers proposed a two tier funding arrangement within which 34 of the 64 places would be funded at £17,455, in order to meet the complex needs of these pupils.

The impact of improved links with schools was questioned, upon which it explained that the academy operated an intervention programme to prepare pupils to re-enter mainstream school, in order to prevent permanent exclusion. The increased funding would enable academy staff to support pupils into mainstream schools.

Members were advised that if the funding proposal were agreed, that the Olive AP Academy would be a 'good' provision by September 2018, and this would be possible due to the small scale of the provision, the right staff in place and the academy's experience in moving quickly. Since academy conversion, accountability structures had been established and the Academy Advisory Board had scrutinised the level of monitoring and standards while attempting to work within the existing levels of funding.

Of those that had responded to a short survey, the view of the borough's secondary schools were mainly supportive of the proposal, with one school against.

Members discussed the high cost to schools and the borough were there to be no, or insufficient in-borough provision.

Concern was raised by some members that the early years inclusion system was not working for children as it did not address the potential of permanent exclusion in later years and transition into mainstream schools. In terms of the primary school model and early help workers, this was felt to have been the most effective on parents taking on responsibilities.

Members raised concern regarding the low level of attendance at the Olive Academy and questioned at what point attendance would be challenged, as for some pupils with up to 60% absence, additional funding would have no impact. In response, it was explained that the Trust would use the funding to work with parents and the Family Intervention Worker.

The success criteria was questioned, upon which it was explained that the academy would be assessed and monitored twice a year by serving Ofsted Inspectors, alongside monitoring and scrutinization by the Trust. Members wanted to see increased pupil outcomes as a success criterion.

During debate, members highlighted that some schools were more likely to exclude rather than deploy other strategies sometimes due to demographical differences. Concern was expressed that if the published admission number of Olive AP Academy were to increase to 74, this could lead to a potential risk of places being filled unnecessarily.

It was explained that the local authority's funding for the following year had already been committed, with sufficient flexibility to meet the full £321k requested. Members discussed the option of agreeing lesser funding than proposed, if they were mindful to agree to any funding. The Strategic Finance Manager was requested to liaise further with Mr Vickers on the amount of minimal funding which would be acceptable to all parties.

48 **SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS WITH HIGHER NUMBERS OF PUPILS WITH EHC PLANS**

The Strategic Finance Manager presented a report which requested members consider options to target additional funding to support schools that have disproportionately high numbers of pupils with Educational Health Care Plans on their school roll.

The high needs operational guide for 2018-19 published by the ESFA included guidance on the allocation of high needs funding to mainstream schools and academies. The operational guidance and funding regulations allowed local authorities to allocate additional funding to schools where there were a disproportionate number of pupils with a particular type of SEND.

A document detailing the Funding to schools with disproportionate number of high needs pupils was circulated at the meeting. An explanation of the current funding arrangement and options available were provided. The differing needs in parts of the borough were highlighted and the importance of Educational Health Care plan applications being approved as soon as possible. Concern was raised that some private early year providers steer away from accepting children with special educational needs as no funding was available.

Currently, additional funding was based on the calculation of a school's notional SEN funding and if less than the number of pupils on roll with EHCPs x £6,000, then the difference in the two amounts was allocated to the school. A continuation of this arrangement was proposed as option A.

Option B provided additional funding to schools that had numbers of pupils with EHCPs on roll of 10 or more (primary) and 15 or more (secondary).

Option C calculated schools' percentage of pupils with EHCPs compared to the borough average and also the funding per pupil that schools received through the funding formula. For schools with above average per pupil funding, additional High Needs funding was allocated only where per pupil funding (above the borough average) was less than the cost of meeting the first £6,000 of support for the pupil with EHCPs above the borough average. For schools with funding below the borough average, additional High Needs funding was allocated for pupils with EHCPs above the average scaled down, the closer the schools per pupil funding to the borough average.

The Forum resolved to agree to Option C for the allocation of additional funding to schools with a disproportionate number of pupils with Educational Health Care Plans from the High Needs Block.

49 PUPIL GROWTH FUND CRITERIA 2018-19

The Strategic Finance Manager presented a report which requested members agree the criteria for the allocation of funding from the Pupil Growth Fund in the 2018-19 financial year.

The £2.7m held centrally was to meet the following costs based on DFE operational guidance:

- (i) Planned growth in schools and academies through an increase in PAN or a bulge class
- (ii) Places in bulge classes that were unfilled at the October census date for schools that had committed additional teaching and other costs
- (iii) Capacity held in a school by the LA for future growth that is not already funded through Falling Rolls criteria
- (iv) The requirement to meet infant class size regulations
- (v) An additional needs supplement for growing schools

The Forum agreed the proposed criteria for allocation of the Pupil Growth Fund in 2018-19.

50 FALLING ROLLS CRITERIA 2018-19

The Strategic Finance Manager presented a report which set out the proposal for funding Good and Outstanding schools through the Falling Rolls Fund for the 2018-19 financial year.

The allocation in Havering was £0.4 million and the proposed formula was as follows:

$(\text{PAN} \times 85\%) \text{ minus Yr R/Yr 7 pupil numbers (October census)} \times 90\%$
AWPU

Plus

$(\text{PAN} \times 85\%) \text{ minus Yr 1/Yr 8 pupil numbers (October census)} \times 50\%$
AWPU

The Forum agreed the criteria for allocation of funding to schools in 2018-19 from the falling rolls fund, as proposed.

It was clarified that funding agreed through this criteria would continue for the rest of the financial year even if an OFSTED report was published with a judgement of less than good after the date of the LA funding decisions.

51 **NEXT MEETINGS**

Future meetings had been arranged as follows:

22nd March

10th May

7th June

5th July

52 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business raised.