

School Forum

17 January 2023

6.00 pm at the

Cheam High School, Chatsworth Rd, Cheam, Sutton SM3 8PW



To all members of the School Forum:-

Member	Role
--------	------

Academy Representation (A)	
Bec Allott	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Jamie Bean	Academy Secondary School
Richard Booth	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Nathan Cole	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Peter Naudi	Academy Secondary Headteacher
Phillip Hedger	Academy Primary Headteacher
Sharon Roberts	Academy Primary Headteacher
James Kearns	Academy Special School Headteacher
Vacancy	Academy Primary Governor
Emma Bradshaw	Academy Pupil Referral Unit (shared)

Maintained School Representation (B)	
Vacancy	Maintained Secondary School Governor
Jenny Sims	Chair; Maintained Primary School Governor
Havard Spring	Maintained Primary School Headteacher
Emma Walford	Maintained Nursery School Headteacher
Bev Williamson	Sutton Tuition and Reintegration Service (shared)

*Enquiries to: Matthew Stickley, Clerk londongovernanceltd@gmail.com
Copies of reports are available in large print on request*

Other Representation (C)	
Vicki Bell	Early Years Provider
Jason Pemberton-Billing	14-19 Provider
Sue Smith	Sutton Teachers Committee
Andrew Theobald	Vice Chair; Archdiocese of Southwark
Vacancy	Diocese of Southwark

Observers (D)	
Councillor Rob Beck	Vice Chair of the People Committee
Councillor Jane Pascoe	Opposition Spokesperson for the People Committee

Matthew Stickley
Clerk
12 January 2023

A G E N D A

1 Welcome and Introductions

2 Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Quorum: two fifths of total membership.

3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting 1 - 4

4 Urgent Business and Other Matters

The Chair will advise of any item to be considered urgently. The forum may also raise matters not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

5 Revenue Report 5 - 10

6 Draft DSG Budget 2023-24 11 - 42

7 Preventing School Exclusions 43 - 52

8 Early Years Funding Formulae Update 53 - 62

9 Capital Report 63 - 70

10 Proposed dates of future meetings 2023-26 71 - 72

11 Confidential Session

The forum may resolve to consider an item in confidential session.

This page is intentionally left blank

1: Welcome and Introductions

The Chair, Jenny Sims, welcomed those present.

2A: Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Jamie Bean, Richard Booth, Emma Bradhsaw Councillor Jane Pascoe, Jason Pemberton-Billing, Sharon Roberts, Emma Walford, and Bev Williamson.

At the invitation of the Chair, the Clerk informed the Forum of the resignation of Dr Mary Howard from the Schools Forum. The Clerk conveyed Dr Howard's appreciation to colleagues and officers for her time spent as a member of the Forum and that she had found it to be a positive experience of partnership working across the borough and school sectors. The Chair advised that she would write to Dr Howard on behalf of the Forum.

The Forum noted that Dr Howard's resignation created a third vacancy and that officers would continue to seek to fill the vacancies (academy, maintained secondary, and Anglican diocesan) with suitable candidates.

2B: Declarations of Interest

The Vice Chair, Andrew Theobald, advised that he had resigned as a director from Sutton Community Transport.

3: Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 June 2022 be agreed as an accurate record.

4: Urgent Business and Other Matters

There was no urgent business.

5: Revenue Report and 2021/22 Outturn

The Strategic Finance Business Partner introduced the report.

The Forum noted that the report presented the month six (September 2022) position and agreed that the recommendation to note the position would reflect this.

The Forum noted that an overspend on IT software was due to a lack of clarity with its invoicing and that a £390,000 drawdown from reserves was due to the SENCO (Special Educational Needs Coordinator) Cluster funding.

The Forum agreed that modelling of different values as part of the Minimum Funding Guarantee 2023/24 should be presented to the next meeting of the Forum. The Forum agreed that power should be delegated to officers to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee level for 2023-24 of up to 1% but that any increase beyond this level should not be agreed

until the Schools Forum had been consulted and that an update on the level set should be returned to the Forum at its next meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. To note the latest position on the DSG for 202/23, as at September (month 6).
2. To agree the Minimum Funding Guarantee level for 2023/24.

6: Discretionary Schools Grant (DSG) Deficit Statutory Override Consultation

The Strategic Finance Business Partner introduced the report.

The Forum noted Sutton Council's overall financial position and that the council was facing a gap of £4.7m in its reserves at the time.

RESOLVED: To note the details of the consultation, the LA's response and the possible impact of any potential outcomes.

7: Early Years National Funding Formulae Consultation

The Early Years Commissioning Manager introduced the report.

The forum noted that the outcome of the Department for Education consultation was expected to be published before the December meeting of the Forum. The Forum discussed proposed changes in hourly rates and the impact the new charges would have on the 66 group settings in the borough. The Forum discussed whether the additional funding should be reserved for the settings which were seeing increased pension costs or whether it should also support settings with broader costs such as those arising through inflation.

The Forum agreed that officers should model the increased costs and report this to the next meeting of the Forum.

RESOLVED:

1. To note the national consultation on the Early Years National Funding Formula and the likely impact it will have in Sutton.
2. To note the indicative increase in hourly rates allocated to the Local Authority that will be passed on to Early Years providers in the Borough via the local funding formula.
3. To agree the options upon which to consult with the sector in relation to how the Teacher Pay and Pensions Grants should be distributed in the local area (currently provided for schools and maintained nurseries only) and the criteria upon which a 'quality supplement' could be defined

8: School Improvement and Monitoring Grant and Core Statutory Duties

The Acting Strategic Lead for Education introduced the report.

The Forum noted that schools generally understood and accepted the position outlined in the report.

RESOLVED: To agree to de-delegate funding as set out in Appendix B (to be updated when January 2023 census data is known). For de-delegation to be agreed annually at Schools Forum as part of the normal budget setting process.

9: Exclusion Funding (Complex In-Year Admissions Fund)

The Head of Pupil Based Commissioning introduced the report.

The Forum discussed whether the Vulnerable Pupils Panel had been consulted on how the funding should be spent. The Forum also discussed the various matrices used

The recommendation of the report only applied to maintained schools and so it was only maintained school representatives who were eligible to vote. The Forum questioned what exactly the £113,243 forecast for option two would entail. Officers confirmed the discussion had provided sufficient steer on the next steps.

RESOLVED: To consider the options listed and/or suggest alternatives.

10: Capital Report

The Acting Head of Pupil Based Commissioning introduced the report.

The Forum noted that the new Carew Academy Free School site was unlikely to open before September 2024. The Forum discussed the window for special project capital fund submissions to be made and requested that consideration be given to extending these windows. In response, officers confirmed that submission windows ran biannually.

RESOLVED: To note the summary of developments against the primary, secondary and special expansion programmes.

The meeting ended at 19:45.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title	Revenue Report
Meeting	Schools Forum
Date	17 January 2023
Chair	Jenny Sims
Report Author(s)	Carol Worne, Strategic Finance Business Partner, Sutton Council
Open/Exempt	Open

1. Summary

- 1.1. This report provides an update on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) since the last meeting of the Forum.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. To note the latest position on the DSG for 2022/23, as at November 2022 (month 8).
- 2.2. To note the decision regarding a disapplication request to include the rental cost for Nonsuch Primary School in the 2023/24 DSG Schools Block Allocation.

3. Background

- 3.1. Spending decisions on the DSG were agreed by the Schools Forum in February 2022 for the financial year 2022/23. This report refers to issues that have arisen since the last meeting on 11 October 2022 and provides details of the latest DSG budget for 2022/23.

4. DSG Budget 2022/23

- 4.1. The latest DSG allocation for 2022/23 is £112.547m after recoupment for academies and high needs place funding provision of £133.324m and £7.668m respectively.
- 4.2. Attached, at Appendix A, is a breakdown of the DSG for 2022/23 and the variance as at November 2022 (month 8). The highlighted areas in the high needs block indicate the SEN budget.
- 4.3. The DSG is currently forecasting an overspend, as at month 8, of £621k. There is a forecast £721k overspend in the High Needs Block and a forecast £100k underspend in Early Years. The projection includes an allowance for future placements based on current placement costs projected to March 2023, with a net increase of 17 EHCP learners per month, at an average annual cost of £15k per learner.
- 4.4. The current in-year forecast overspend will be offset by the cumulative surplus balance on the DSG. The 2023/24 brought forward balance was £1.367m, of which £497k was drawn

back into the 2022/23 budget, as it was committed at year end, for SENCo Cluster Groups (£390k) and Statutory Exclusions (£107k), this leaves a balance of £0.870m, assuming the drawdown values are fully spent.

- 4.5. The current reported overspend on therapies for 2022/23 is largely related to the growth in EHCPs in the Borough (circa £400k) as well as the cost of delivery for therapies (circa £330k). In relation to the latter, Cost of Living Increases (COLI) were provided to Cognus staff in December and following national union negotiations across the various different contracts that Cognus provide e.g. NHS. COLI payments were backdated to April 2022 and equates to a £270k of the £330k overspend. The remaining overspend largely relates to the growth in EHCPs in the Borough which have increased from 2,000 at the start of the financial year to 2,074 as of November.

5. Disapplication Request - Nonsuch Primary School

- 5.1. Since 2001, Sutton has held a lease for land owned by Surrey County Council, for Nonsuch Primary School. There has been an approved disapplication for an Exceptional Circumstance in place for several years, to permit the annual rental value to be included as funding to the School as part of their Individual School Budget. This rent value has then been recouped by Sutton and paid to Surrey. This practice was in place until May 2021, when the lease expired.
- 5.2. Now that Nonsuch Primary School is a Foundation School, it is no longer the obligation of Sutton to renew the lease, this process has to be undertaken directly between the School and Surrey County Council, and, to date, remains unresolved. Sutton has continued with the above practice of collecting rent, as there is no logical alternative, and has been accruing the monthly rent, which will be paid over to Surrey at the end of the financial year. Legal advice has been sought on the issue of Sutton paying rent against a non-existent lease and the advice is that this should no longer happen, so from 2023/24 the funding will be given to the school on a monthly basis and they will be responsible for paying it over to Surrey or accruing in their accounts.
- 5.3. Sutton is still required to fund the rent, and for 2023/24 the DfE has asked for a new disapplication request to be made. A minuted approval by School's Forum is required by the DfE in order for the Secretary of State to make the final approval for inclusion.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. This report highlights DSG issues that have arisen since the last meeting of the Forum.

7. Influence on the Council's Corporate Core Values and Objectives

- 7.1. One of the core values is partnership working. Setting the budget for the Dedicated Schools Grant, and considering related issues, is an important part of the budget process that fully involves schools as partners and particularly recognises the important role of the Schools' Forum.

8. Appendix

Appendix Letter	Appendix Title
A	DSG latest budget position 2022/23 – month 8

This page is intentionally left blank

Description	Draft Budget	Latest Budget	Forecast	Variance	Commentary
	£	£	£	£	£
Schools Block					
Primary Maintained Funding	36,798,100	37,281,000	37,281,000	0	Core funding for maintained primary schools (NFF)
Primary Growth	40,900	108,400	108,400	0	Growth funding relating to primary schools
Secondary Maintained Funding	12,752,400	12,847,800	12,847,800	0	Core funding for maintained secondary schools (NFF)
Secondary Growth	280,400	280,400	280,400	0	Growth funding relating to secondary schools
Growth balance	120,700	154,900	154,900	0	Growth fund balance for FAP and additional EAL payments
Total - Schools Block	49,992,500	50,672,500	50,672,500	0	
Central School Services Block					
Historic Commitments					
Contribution to combined budgets	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	Funding to social care - LSCB
Early Retirement Costs (pensions)	480,000	480,200	480,200	0	Costs of school staff that retired early (historical)
Depreciation of non current assets	218,200	218,200	218,200	0	Borrowing re: Opportunity Bases in 2012
Ongoing Functions				0	
Admissions Services	345,700	345,700	345,700	0	Costs of the schools admission service (Cognus)
Schools Forum Costs	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	Costs of Schools Forum including meetings, staffing support etc...
Independent School Fees (non SEN)	150,000	150,000	150,000	0	Contributions to fees for LAC pupils attending independent schools
Copyright Licenses	184,400	184,400	184,400	0	Fees set by Copyright Licensing Authority for all schools (paid centrally)
DSG Contribution to LBS Central Provision	614,900	614,900	614,900	0	Contribution from the DSG to support central provision in the LA
Total - CSSB	2,024,200	2,024,400	2,024,400	0	
High Needs					
Early Years Place Funding (Dragonflies)	110,800	110,800	110,800	0	Lump sum paid to Thomas Wall for Dragonflies base
EY top up funding (mainstream settings)	70,000	70,000	70,000	0	Top up for individual pupils in mainstream EY settings
Portage Service	229,200	249,200	249,200	0	Playwise Service (a CIC) who provide portage (home-visiting educational services) for pre-school children with SEND and their families.
Primary mainstream	2,358,100	2,315,100	2,315,100	0	Top up for individual pupils (legacy) and additional support contracts
Primary base maintained - place funding	578,000	572,000	572,000	0	Place funding for maintained opportunity bases
Primary base - all schools	2,658,200	2,658,700	2,658,700	0	Additional Place and top up funding for maintained and academy opportunity bases
Primary - OLA	420,100	434,400	434,400	0	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Secondary Mainstream	994,100	906,100	906,100	0	Top up for individual pupils (legacy) and additional support contracts
Secondary base - place and top up funding	1,182,500	1,183,000	1,183,000	0	Additional Place and top up funding for maintained and academy opportunity bases
Secondary - OLA	389,100	378,700	378,700	0	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Special School - maintained	1,804,200	1,820,900	1,820,900	0	Place and pay and pension grant funding
Special School - maintained	3,389,200	3,415,500	3,415,500	0	Top up and top up individual funding
Special School - academies	348,100	348,100	348,100	0	Pay and pension grant funding
Special School - academies	4,946,900	4,946,900	4,946,900	0	Top up, top up individual and place extra funding
Special School - OLA	1,848,500	1,875,000	1,875,000	0	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Non maintained Independent Provision	6,920,400	6,920,400	6,920,400	0	Non maintained or independent fees - including specialist and AP provision and allowance for future placements
Allowance for Future Placements	2,498,100	2,259,800	2,559,800	300,000	to cover future costs of placements and EHCPs
Alternative Provision - Limes	1,323,200	1,351,800	1,351,800	0	Place, top up, year 11 and pay and pension grant funding
Alternative Provision - Limes	783,600	803,600	803,600	0	Top up individual and place extra funding
Alternative Provision - STARS	1,238,300	1,239,500	1,239,500	0	Place, top up and pay and pension grant funding
Alternative Provision - STARS	83,400	83,400	83,400	0	Top up individual funding
Hospital Provision - STARS	266,300	281,500	281,500	0	Lump sum paid to STARS for children educated in hospital
Targeted Youth Service	110,000	110,000	110,000	0	Contribution to Targeted Youth Services to support preventative work
Mainstream College	1,118,000	1,118,000	1,118,000	0	Placement costs related to mainstream college placements for pupils with an EHCP
Specialist College	2,704,000	2,704,000	2,704,000	0	Placement costs related to specialist college placements for pupils with an EHCP
Therapies (Cognus)	3,213,500	3,213,500	3,613,500	340,000	Therapies provided to individual pupils (mainstream/base/special schools) by Cognus
Therapies (Non-Cognus)	230,000	230,000	230,000	0	Therapies provided to individual pupils (mainstream/base/special schools) by other suppliers
SEN Travel Assistance	690,000	690,000	690,000	0	Contribution to SEN transport including travel training
Contribution to SW support for education	272,700	272,700	272,700	0	Contribution to Children's Social Care for safeguarding leads, Early Help services etc.
Cluster Group Expenses	217,000	217,000	298,000	81,000	SenCo Salary costs and Backfill payments, software licence costs
Other Expenses	85,000	85,000	85,000	0	External and internal legal expenses and costs of equipment
Cognus Ltd - High Needs Services	1,803,300	1,803,300	1,803,300	0	Commissioning Agreement - HN consultancy services
Total - High Needs Block	44,883,800	44,667,900	45,448,900	721,000	
Early Years Block					
Early Years - 3 & 4 Year olds	13,349,800	13,294,800	13,194,800	(100,000)	Core funding to schools, PVI, nurseries to deliver 3 & 4 yr old free entitlement (EY NFF)
Early Years - 2 Year olds	1,165,800	1,212,300	1,212,300	0	Core funding to schools, PVI, nurseries to deliver 2 yr old free entitlement (EY)
Early Years - central expenses	161,000	165,000	165,000	0	Central provision - EYFE Manager and Predicable Needs funding
Cognus Ltd - Early Years Foundation	510,400	510,400	510,400	0	Central provision transferred to Cognus to provide EY advisory services
Total - Early Years	15,187,000	15,182,500	15,082,500	(100,000)	
Total DSG	112,087,500	112,547,300	113,228,300	621,000	
DSG Reserve			(1,367,993)		
SENCo Cluster Groups			390,000		Unspent 2021/22 allocations carried forward to 2022/23
Clawback - Exclusions			107,195		Statutory (£90k) and non-statutory (£17k) exclusion funding recouped in financial year 2021/22
Total - DSG Reserve			(870,798)	(249,798)	Balance less forecast overspend

This page is intentionally left blank

ENCLOSURE 6	
Report Title	Revenue Report - 2023/24 Budget
Meeting	Schools Forum
Date	17 January 2022
Chair	Jenny Sims
Report Author(s)	Kieran Holliday, Acting Strategic Lead for Education Jack Cutler, Acting Head of Pupil Based Commissioning Carol Worne, Strategic Finance Business Partner, Sutton Council
Open/Exempt	Open

1. The 2023/24 DSG allocation for Sutton is £273m, (this does not include the Schools Block Supplementary Grant). After the deduction of 2023/24 NNDR (£1.5m) High Needs Deduction (£7.6m) and Academy Recoupment (£142.8m), the latest net DSG position is £121m.
2. In addition to the allocations announced by the Government, the autumn statement announced that nationally, mainstream schools would receive an additional £2.3bn in 2023/24 over 2022/23. Following the removal of the Health & Social Care levy, the net figure is £2bn and this is a two year settlement - e.g. the funding will cover two years but all the funding will be provided in year one. This grant is called the Mainstream Schools Additional Grant (MSAG) and will be paid separately to individual school budgets. Sutton will pass through the full values to schools. In 2024/25 this grant will be added to the base budget from within the schools block.
3. As part of the additional funding that has been announced, an additional £400m will be invested into the national High Needs block. This is included in the 2023/24 DSG funding allocation for distribution as normal.
4. The additional funding in Sutton is as follows:

Schools Block	£6.7m
High Needs Block	£2.4m
5. The draft DSG budget for 2023/24 is attached at Appendix A. Following funding announcements by the Government on 16th December officers are working through the implications of the announcements including modelling through the Authority Proforma Tool (APT) therefore the figures in Appendix A remain subject to change.
6. A final budget will be presented at the February Schools Forum, however in order to assist the preparation of the final budget, Schools Forum is asked to:
 - Approve the proposed growth funding; £565k - see paragraph 9 below (subject to final modelling in the APT)
 - Approve funding for places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils - no change from 2022/23 (£150k - see draft budget in Appendix A)
 - Approve the proposed funding for the admissions service (£349k same value as last year with 0.8% uplift - see draft budget in Appendix A)
 - Approve the costs of servicing of Schools Forum - £16k - no change from 2022/23 - see draft budget in Appendix A)

- Approve the contribution to responsibilities that local authorities hold for all schools - £627k - (Central Provision), see Appendix C for breakdown;
- Approve the contribution to combined budgets (LSCP) -£15k same as last year (see draft budget in Appendix A)
- Approve the historic commitments (Termination of Employment Costs and Prudential Borrowing); see Appendix D for breakdown
- Approve the transfer of up to £200k from the Schools Block to the CSSB for 2023/24 (estimate at this stage only - see draft budget Appendix A)
- To note the National Funding Formula Factors for 2023/24 (see Appendix E).
- To advise on the options available for distributing the additional funding that will be available in the High Needs Block in 2023/24 and 2024/25

Schools Block

7. The Schools Block allocation for 2023/24, is £197.3m (22/23 £189.4m). The minimum per pupil funding levels are:

	22/23	23/24	Increase
	£	£	%
Primary	4,265	4,405	3.28%
Secondary	5,525	5,715	3.44%

8. In order to model the impact of the financial announcements that have been made, officers are working on the APT Proforma in order to finalise the Schools Block budget for 2023/24. As part of this exercise we have modelled the Minimum Funding Guarantee that we must pass on to mainstream schools at 0.0% and 0.5%. This is a requirement of Local Authorities unless they wish to seek disapplication. Based on this range, there is no change when either of these percentages are applied as no school requires protection at this level. Therefore we are not currently expecting to have to fund any MFG payments in 2023/24. This is largely because schools in Sutton moved onto the NFF quickly and from the first year possible.
9. Growth funding policy is set out in Appendix B. Based on the known additional places that are planned for 2023/24 and based on the existing growth funding policy, the expected spend in 2023/24 is £565k. The current draft budget shows a growth deficit of £286k, based on the draft APT - to be confirmed.
10. The growth allocation has been confirmed in the NFF allocation however the available funding to support growth will be affected by the modelling work being undertaken through the APT. For the purposes of setting a budget for next year officers would recommend that there are no changes to the existing policy set out in Appendix B and a further update will be provided in February on the growth balance once this has been calculated.

Early Years Block

11. The 2023/24 Early Years Block funding is £16.3m (2022/23 £15.2m). This block is not included in the autumn statement announcement, and will be reduced by the Health & Social Care levy uplift that was applied in 2022/23.

High Needs Block

High Needs allocations 2023/24

12. Almost every Local Authority in the country is grappling with cost pressures in the high needs block for a variety of different reasons (increasing EHCPs as a result of demographic growth, increasing EHCPs for other reasons, increasing complexity of SEND needs etc...). The national deficit on the high needs block is now estimated to be about £2.3bn.
13. The DfE announced at the end of December funding allocations for 2023 to 2024 for the High Needs Block. Sutton will receive £55.3m through the High Needs National Funding Formula and a further £2.4m from the additional high needs funding announced in the autumn statement. This increases Sutton's total high needs allocation to £57.6m. After deductions of £7.67m which fund places in academies, the total high needs block budget for Sutton is £49.96m in 2023/24

2023/24 High Needs Budget Baseline position

14. Pupil level data and costs for each pupil that the LA is responsible for has been compiled (as at the end of October 2022 based on the 2,050 EHC Plans that are currently maintained by the Local Authority as the base position. We make the following assumptions:
 - a. Statutory age pupils at non-transitional points will continue in the same placements at the same costs.
 - b. Statutory age pupils that will transition in the financial year 2023/24 it has been assumed a transition to a similar type of provision (Primary Base to Secondary Base, Primary Special to Secondary Special, additional support in Primary Mainstream to additional support in Secondary Mainstream, etc)
 - c. Post-16 learners are assessed on an individual basis based on current/previous provision, level of support needed, placement history, etc, utilising average costs for predicted destinations;
 - d. An allowance for additional EHC plans has been assumed for March 2023 at about 17 per month (based on historical trends - this is NOT a target or threshold figure) and built into the base budget for 2023/24, based on an average costs of an EHC plan at £15k (full year effect);
 - e. In addition, an allowance for future EHC plans throughout 2023/24 has been estimated (circa £2.3m) which would allow for approximately circa 17 additional plans to be agreed each month throughout the year.
 - f. It is assumed that the number of EHCP holders leaving Borough, and EHCP holders moving into Borough will be roughly equal (as was the case in 2019-20, prior to COVID).
 - g. There will be a 3% inflationary increase on top ups for OLA placements.
15. There are a number of assumptions built into the methodology above. Whilst it is reasonable to assume the costs of additional EHC plans agreed throughout the year will be at an average cost (£15k), this might be an underestimate if the additional plans are disproportionately represented in certain placement types (e.g. specialist college placements). Equally, the above assumptions assume that additional plans join the system in a regular and even way throughout the year.
16. Based on known costs and the assumptions above, the following estimated baseline expenditure in the High Needs Block is £47.1m against a confirmed allocation of £49.96m. We therefore estimate that there is £2.8m that can be used to support funding requirements from the DfE which are conditions of grant as well as wider pressures in the system. These include:
 - Local Authorities are required to ensure that special schools receive a minimum funding guarantee of 3% on total funding allocations for special schools between 2021/22 and 2023/24 (applicable to their combined place and top-up funding on a per pupil basis, assuming the number and type of places remains the same). The DfE have set this to achieve broad equivalence with the MFG for mainstream schools over the same period.

- In addition to the above, Local Authorities are required to pass on an additional 3.4% per place in 2023/24, based on the place funding of £10,000 per place, plus the average top-up funding they pay for a pupil placement in the financial year 2022/2023.
- If and how to support mainstream schools with the increasing costs of support staff associated with supporting pupils with EHCPs
- Inflationary pressures in the Non Maintained and Independent sector
- Increasing demand for Alternative Provision to support growing numbers of pupils that are permanently excluded from school
- Increasing demand for Alternative Provision arising from pupils who are suffering with anxiety, emotional based school avoidance (EBSA)
- Increasing demand on the costs of therapies associated with the EHCP plans

17. Whilst it is ultimately the Local Authority that is responsible for the High Needs Block (with proposals to bring any deficits onto the balance sheet of LAs from 2023/34), it can only manage this budget effectively if there is a strong sense of common ownership with the schools community (where ultimately the budget is spent). The High Needs Operational Guidance states that “spending decisions are most effective when there is a strong partnership between the local authority and the institutions providing education in the local area”. With this in mind, the sections below are set out in order to elicit the views of Schools Forum on how some of the pressures should be funded.

Special Schools and Opportunity Base Top Ups - applying the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) of 3% 2021/22 over 2023/24

18. In setting top up rates for specialist provision the Local Authority must meet the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) protection for maintained special schools and special academies in 2023 to 2024 as a condition of grant. This is set at a 3% increase over 2021/22 funding. This applies to the total income a school receives, not just the value of the top up. Technically the MFG only applies to special schools, however for comparison we have presented information for mainstream schools that have an opportunity base in the same way. Arguably, there is a case for opportunity bases to receive similar levels of funding protection/enhancement as special schools, though this is not a requirement.
19. From September 2022, the LA introduced a new funding model for Special Schools and Opportunity Bases which came into effect from September 2022. The revised funding model provided an additional £0.85m of funding for specialist provision in total across the Borough (full year effect). For those that gained from the introduction of the model, the average like for like gain on the total budget for those settings was 9% from 2021/22 to 2022/23 though this varies from 1.64% to 31.3% for different settings (see Appendix F taken from Schools Forum papers 22 February 2022).
20. Therefore for the vast majority of settings, the Local Authority will have already met the Minimum Funding Guarantee of 3% over 2021/22. However, following the review of top ups in the local area there were some schools that were due to see a reduction in funding over time (or at least for their allocations to remain cash flat given the previous requirement was for local authorities to ensure a MFG of 0%). Now that the MFG has been set at 3% in 2023/24 over 2021/22 those settings will need to see their top ups increased to reflect the MFG as per the high needs conditions of grant unless the Local Authority were to disapply to the Secretary of State.
21. The table in Appendix H provides the top up values for settings in 2021/22 (column d), the revised top ups that were put in place from September 2022 (column g) and the % increase in funding over 2021/22 (including top up and place funding - column i). The figures that have been used are based on the numbers of Sutton funded pupils on roll in schools as of January 2022 and the top up values provide the average value where schools have different funding bands.
22. Where the funding model derived a reduction in funding for a setting their top up value has remained the same to satisfy the previous operational guidance that special schools should be protected by an

MFG of 0%. The baseline position in the table (columns j-l) shows what the top ups for each setting would need to be to ensure that every setting has received at least a 3% increase over their top up and place funding in 2021/22. For the majority this results in no change, however there is an uplift for Carew, Link and Wandle as indicated in the table (based on January 2022 NOR). Indicatively this will cost £156k next year.

23. The Local Authority could disapply to avoid the 3% uplift for those schools above but this has not been recommended based on previous discussions with schools forum about how we should approach the MFG.

Additional High Needs Funding Special Schools and Opportunity Base Top Ups

24. Based on the guidance provided by the DfE at the end of December with respect to the additional funding announced in the autumn statement, Local authorities must allocate an increase of 3.4% on the 2022/23 place funding and top up funding that schools receive in 2023/24. This additional funding for special schools must be excluded for the purpose of applying the 3% minimum funding guarantee for 2023 to 2024. Put another way, the 3.4% must be applied in addition to anything that is provided through the MFG unless there is a case for the Local Authority to disapply.
25. There is nothing in the guidance that indicates that the value of place funding will change and therefore it would seem that the uplift in funding will need to be delivered through a change to the top up value for each setting. Given the way the minimum funding guarantee works for specialist provision it can reasonably be assumed that the additional funding will need to be baselined into future financial years. Therefore what is agreed for schools now will represent the 'new baseline'.
26. Top ups are currently calculated via a funding methodology that was introduced in September 2022. A copy of the funding templates for both Opportunity Bases and Special Schools is included in Appendix G1 and G2 for reference. The funding models calculate the value of the top up for each setting by calculating what is needed to deliver the commissioned provision e.g. teaching ratios, hours of support as well as leadership costs as set out in each commissioning agreement.
27. Providing an uplift of 3.4% in 2023/24 through for specialist settings can be delivered in a number of different ways. Broadly speaking having delivered the MFG of 3% we could then deliver the 3.4% by either (i) uplifting the top up values outside of the funding model to generate an equivalent rate that would ensure that each setting sees a 3.4% increase on their 2022/23 funding total funding across both place and top up funding or (ii) we could input into the funding mode the new NJC9 rates and new M6 teacher rates for 2022 on the basis that this would deliver at least, or more, than the 3.4% uplift for all schools. The table below provides some commentary on the relative benefits of each option.

Option	Notes
<p>Option 1a - deliver the 3.4% by increasing the value of the top up outside of the funding model to generate an equivalent rate that would ensure that each setting sees a 3.4% increase on their 2022/23 funding total funding across both place and top up funding (unless seeking disapplication).</p> <p>Option 1b - deliver the 3.4% by increasing the value of the funding factors in the model to the new 2022/23 rates for M6 and NJC9 (keeping other funding factors the same). We would then cap the total additional funding gain any setting can make to 3.4% using an affordability factor. Where the model doesn't deliver a 3.4% increase then the lower figure will be used.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would complicate and potentially undermine the existing funding model as it would move the methodology away from funding recognised pay scale points (e.g. for staffing) • Would make future financial planning more difficult when considering MFG and any other conditions of grant • This would ensure that the funding model uses the latest pay scale rates but but would then adjust the top up values based on what can be afforded / set as a condition of grant by the Government. • This makes future financial modelling more straightforward
<p>Option 2 - Input into the funding mode the new NJC9 rates and new M6 teacher rates for 2022 on the basis that this would deliver at least, or more, than the 3.4% uplift for all schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguably the most methodologically sound option because it updates the model with the latest staffing rates+ • Would deliver in excess of the 3.4% MFG for most settings and is therefore an expensive option

28. An initial analysis of the above options is included in Appendix H. It is important to note that the 'comparative income including place funding for NOR' in the table provides a comparative analysis of the additional funding that would be generated for each setting based on the Sutton numbers on roll as of January 2022 NOT the total allocation that a school will receive. Columns p and s provide an indicative increase in funding for each option. Given that place and numbers on roll will change over time these figures are indicative only. The financial impact on Sutton in terms of what the changes will cost will also vary as the numbers of Sutton pupils funding in these settings are updated but they provide a relatively strong proxy upon which to consider. The table currently identifies that Option 1(a,b) would cost about £589k and Option 2 would cost just over £1m. Given that option 2 is methodologically more sound, it is recommended that we proceed with option 2 however subject to views from Schools Forum it may be necessary to consider capping gains to make the proposals more affordable.

Disapplication

29. Whilst the table indicates that the MFG protection of 3% will be applied when comparing allocations between 2021/22 and 2023/24 it is questionable whether the 3.4% should be applied to those schools that were due to see a reduction in their funding from the revised funding model introduced in September 2022.
30. The DfE guidance in relation to the additional funding states that Local authorities can request a disapplication and seek approval to use different data or a different calculations that gives a lower increase if there is an error in a specific school's data or a school's circumstances will be different (based on for example a local area commissioning review). The table in Appendix H has been

developed on the basis that all schools *should* see the 3% MFG increase against the 2021/22 rates ('the baseline position') irrespective of whether the funding model would provide that increase.

However, the table currently shows that schools only receiving a further 3.4% increase on top ups (or above) for those schools where the model delivers that level of increase based on the methodology.

31. This seems a reasonable approach otherwise there would be no practical way of transitioning schools from their historical top up to the new top up that is generated by the new funding model. On this basis, and according to the DfE conditions of grant we would need to seek a disapplication from the DfE/ESFA for the schools where the rows are shaded (e.g. Carew Academy, Link Primary, Link Secondary, Wandle)

32. Schools Forum is asked for their views on the following questions on the above:

- Are there further options that we should consider?
- Is it right that we provide 3.4% uplifts (in any of the options above) for mainstream opportunity bases given that the operational guidance provided by the DfE only applies to special schools? (and given that some uplift will already be provided to mainstream schools with opportunity through the NFF?)
- Do you agree that we should provide all schools with the MFG of 3% against their 2021/22 income rather than seek disapplication for those schools that would otherwise receive a lower amount through the new funding model
- On the basis the MFG of 3% is provided against 2021/22 do you agree that we should disapply to the DfE/ESFA for those schools that would not ordinarily have received the 3.4% through the funding model?
- Any other views?

Alternative Provision Top Ups

33. Alternative provision settings are funded in a different way in Sutton to Special schools and bases. The options above therefore would not apply in the same way but arguably the principles should apply equally. Therefore as a minimum the LA would expect for (i) AP providers to receive in 2023/24 at least the minimum funding guarantee that special schools and opportunity bases receive (3% over 2021/22) and (ii) a 3.4% uplift on their 2022/23 allocations against both place and top up funding. The table below sets out what the impact of this would be.

	2021/22	2022/23	2022/23	2023/24 - Place and Top Up					
	Place and Top Up	Place and Top Up	% Uplift	To meet 3% MFG 21/22 to 23/24		Additional 3.4% increase on 22/23		Total 23/24 Funding	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	+£'000	+	+£'000	+	£'000	+
Limes	3,260	3,350	2.75%	8	3.00%	114	3.40%	3,471	3.64%
STARS	1,238	1,262	1.93%	13	3.00%	43	3.40%	1,318	4.45%
Total	4,497	4,611	2.53%	21	3.00%	157	3.40%	4,789	3.86%

34. Schools Forum is asked for their views on the following questions on the above:

- Does it make sense to provide the same uplift for AP as other specialist provision? E.g. provide the 3% MFG calculation with the 3.4% uplift from there?

Hourly rates paid to Mainstream settings to fund support staff

35. Currently the Local Authority pays the following hourly rates for support staff in mainstream schools at a rate of £15.05 (this was increased by 3% on the previous year 2021/22, however with inflationary pressures on schools and with recruitment challenges in schools for support staff there is a case to consider funding these pressures. Arguably there is a case for adding in 3.4% to the hourly rates paid for support staff to make this commensurate with increases in the specialist sector. The figures below calculate the estimated cost of this option together with what different percentage uplifts would cost (based on the current EHCP caseload) by way of comparison.

Uplift	rate	additional cost
add 2%	15.35	£ 81,450
add 3%	15.50	£ 122,174
<i>add 3.4%</i>	<i>15.56</i>	<i>£ 138,463</i>
add 4%	15.65	£ 162,900
add 5%	15.80	£ 203,625
add 6%	15.95	£ 244,350

36. Schools Forum is asked for their views on the following questions on the above:

- Does it make sense to provide the same uplift for the rate that is paid on support staff in mainstream schools for pupils with EHCPs? E.g. 3.4%?

Inflationary Pressures in the NMI sector

37. Currently there is no allowance for an uplift in the costs of non maintained and independent provision. The LA has no control over these costs but it is sensible to budget on an assumption that costs will be increasing by at least the same value that the Government have indicated that special schools will receive from 2022/23 to 2023/24. The likely cost of this is set out below based on existing pupils attending NMI provision (3.4% would be equivalent to 246k).

2% = £145k

3% = £217k

5% = £361k

Therapies

38. The current reported overspend on therapies for 2022/23 is £330k against the £3.2m budget allocation. Much of this overspend relates to the Cost of Living Increases (COLI) provided to Cognus staff in December and following national union negotiations across the various different contracts that Cognus provide e.g. NHS. COLI payments were backdated to April 2022 and equates to a £270k pressure on the costs of delivery. The remaining overspend largely relates to the growth in EHCPs in the Borough which have increased from 2,000 at the start of the financial year to 2,074 as of November.

39. It is highly likely that at least this level of spend will be incurred in 2023/24 given that this figure is derived from the required provision within each child's EHCP that the LA is responsible for. A wider review has been underway in relation to how the local area delivers therapies but this is unlikely to have an impact on the next financial year and particularly in a context of growing numbers of EHC plans.
40. Mitigation is in place to try and manage spend including moving more staff from temporary to permanent contracts, seeking to increase traded income where possible to reinvest, reviewing and removing any areas of over delivery such as equipment. Given the budget for 2022/23 was not increased and given the COLI payments provided this year it would be sensible to budget 350k for the budget next year.

Other pressures

41. There are a number of other pressures that officers are aware of / have been raised with officers in the system where funding allocations could be considered but where proposals have not yet been developed or decisions made:
- Additional AP provision - to meet the costs of rising exclusions as well as the costs of pupils with medical needs that are not attending STARs but are not receiving suitable education - (unspecified)
 - Funding to cover the costs of very high needs pupils that join mainstream schools but are awaiting Education, Health and Care Needs Assessment / specialist placements (where it is clear EHCP will be needed - unspecified)
 - As a local area we need to be mindful that new ASD provision 'Sutton Free School 2' is expected to be delivered for September 2024 (subject to DfE delivery timescales) so whilst this will affect the following financial year 2024/25 some level of financial planning for this provision would be prudent where possible.

Summary

42. The table below brings together the above funding pressures against the estimated available funding:

Area	Estimate
MFG for special schools and bases where applicable	£159k
Increases in top up for Bases and Special Schools	Up to £1m subject to any gains cap
Increases on top ups for Alternative Provision	£178k (based on 3.4%)
Increases on hourly rates for support staff in mainstream school	£139k
Increases on Therapies	£350k
Other pressures	unspecified
Total	£1.8m

Next steps

43. Schools Forum is asked to consider whether the proposals above are reasonable and if there are any other options that should be considered. Depending on the value of the unspecified financial pressures the above would allow for a small budget contingency for the 2023/24 financial year which would appear sensible to retain - particularly given that the Government has been clear that there will be no further uplifts to the high needs block for the foreseeable future.
44. Following discussion and feedback at Schools Forum on 17 January 2023 final proposals will be developed and a final DSG budget presented at the February Schools Forum meeting.

Enc 6 - Appendix A - DSG Draft Budget 2023/24 - 20230117

Description	Latest Budget 2022/23	Forecast 2022/23	Draft Budget 2023/24	Change	Commentary
	£	£	£		£
Schools Block					
Primary Maintained Funding	37,281,000	37,281,000	38,871,400	1,590,400	Core funding for maintained primary schools
Secondary Maintained Funding	12,847,800	12,847,800	13,542,500	694,700	Core funding for maintained secondary schools
De-delegation			50,800	50,800	De-delegated budget for School Improvement
Primary Growth	108,400	108,400	144,500	36,100	Growth funding relating to primary schools
Secondary Growth	280,400	280,400	420,000	139,600	Growth funding relating to secondary schools
Potential Tfr to CSSB			182,200	182,200	
Growth balance	154,900	154,900	(286,300)	(441,200)	Growth fund balance for FAP and additional EAL payments (potential £101,800 to be recredited - awaiting ESFA outcome)
Total - Schools Block	50,672,500	50,672,500	52,925,100	2,252,600	
Central School Services Block					
Historic Commitments					
Contribution to combined budgets	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	Funding to social care - LSCB
Early Retirement Costs (pensions)	480,200	480,200	475,600	(4,600)	Costs of school staff that retired early (historical)
Depreciation of non current assets	218,200	218,200	218,200	0	Borrowing re: Opportunity Bases in 2012
Ongoing Functions			0	0	
Admissions Services	345,700	345,700	348,500	2,800	Costs of the schools admission service (Cognus)
Schools Forum Costs	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	Costs of Schools Forum including meetings, staffing support etc...
Independent School Fees (non SEN)	150,000	150,000	150,000	0	Contributions to fees for LAC pupils attending independent schools
Copyright Licenses	184,400	184,400	184,400	0	Fees set by Copyright Licensing Authority for all schools (paid centrally)
DSG Contribution to LBS Central Provision	614,900	614,900	627,100	12,200	Contribution from the DSG to support central provision in the LA
Transfer from Schools Block			(182,200)	(182,200)	Contribution from Schools Block to balance (potential £101,800 to be recredited - awaiting ESFA outcome)
Total - CSSB	2,024,400	2,024,400	1,852,600	(171,800)	
High Needs					
Early Years Place Funding (Dragonflies)	110,800	110,800	191,000	80,200	Lump sum paid to Thomas Wall for Dragonflies base
EY top up funding (mainstream settings)	70,000	70,000	100,000	30,000	Top up for individual pupils in mainstream EY settings

Enc 6 - Appendix A - DSG Draft Budget 2023/24 - 20230117

Description	Latest Budget 2022/23	Forecast 2022/23	Draft Budget 2023/24	Change	Commentary
	£	£	£		£
Portage Service	249,200	249,200	249,200	0	Playwise Service (a CIC) who provide portage (home-visiting educational services) for pre-school children with SEND and their families.
Primary mainstream	2,315,100	2,315,100	2,430,000	114,900	Top up for individual pupils (legacy) and additional support contracts
Primary base maintained - place funding	572,000	572,000	572,000	0	Place funding for maintained opportunity bases
Primary base - all schools	2,658,700	2,658,700	2,550,000	(108,700)	Additional Place and top up funding for maintained and academy opportunity bases
Primary - OLA	434,400	434,400	525,000	90,600	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Secondary Mainstream	906,100	906,100	1,250,000	343,900	Top up for individual pupils (legacy) and additional support contracts
Secondary base - place and top up funding	1,183,000	1,183,000	1,300,000	117,000	Additional Place and top up funding for maintained and academy opportunity bases
Secondary - OLA	378,700	378,700	451,500	72,800	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Special School - maintained	1,820,900	1,820,900	1,888,500	67,600	Place and pay and pension grant funding
Special School - maintained	3,415,500	3,415,500	3,450,000	34,500	Top up and top up individual funding
Special School - academies	348,100	348,100	356,700	8,600	Pay and pension grant funding
Special School - academies	4,946,900	4,946,900	5,343,800	396,900	Top up, top up individual and place extra funding
Special School - OLA	1,875,000	1,875,000	1,995,000	120,000	Top-up funding for Sutton pupils in OLA schools
Non maintained Independent Provision	6,920,400	6,920,400	7,250,000	329,600	Non maintained or independent fees - including specialist and AP provision and allowance for future placements
Allowance for Future Placements	2,259,800	2,559,800	2,346,000	86,200	to cover future costs of placements and EHCPs
Alternative Provision - Limes	1,351,800	1,351,800	1,350,700	(1,100)	Place, top up, year 11 and pay and pension grant funding
Alternative Provision - Limes	803,600	803,600	803,600	0	Top up individual and place extra funding
Alternative Provision - STARS	1,239,500	1,239,500	1,236,900	(2,600)	Place, top up and pay and pension grant funding
Alternative Provision - STARS	83,400	83,400	82,400	(1,000)	Top up individual funding
Hospital Provision - STARS	281,500	281,500	281,500	0	Lump sum paid to STARS for children educated in hospital
Targeted Youth Service	110,000	110,000	110,000	0	Contribution to Targeted Youth Services to support preventative work
Mainstream College	1,118,000	1,118,000	1,200,000	82,000	Placement costs related to mainstream college placements for pupils with an EHCP
Specialist College	2,704,000	2,704,000	2,704,000	0	Placement costs related to specialist college placements for pupils with an EHCP
Therapies (Cognus)	3,213,500	3,213,500	3,213,500	0	Therapies provided to individual pupils (mainstream/base/special schools) by Cognus
Therapies (Non-Cognus)	230,000	230,000	310,000	80,000	Therapies provided to individual pupils (mainstream/base/special schools) by other suppliers

Enc 6 - Appendix A - DSG Draft Budget 2023/24 - 20230117

Description	Latest Budget 2022/23	Forecast 2022/23	Draft Budget 2023/24	Change	Commentary
	£	£	£		£
SEN Travel Assistance	690,000	690,000	690,000	0	Contribution to SEN transport including travel training
Contribution to SW support for education	272,700	272,700	272,700	0	Contribution to Children's Social Care for safeguarding leads, Early Help services etc...
Cluster Group Expenses	217,000	298,000	270,000	53,000	SenCo Salary costs and Backfill payments, software licence costs
Graduated response funding (Cluster Funding)	0	390,000	390,000	390,000	External and internal legal expenses and costs of equipment
Other Expenses	85,000	85,000	85,000	0	Commissioning Agreement - HN consultancy services
Cognus Ltd - High Needs Services	1,803,300	1,803,300	1,947,600	144,300	
2023/24 update TBC			2,762,100	2,762,100	
Total - High Needs Block	44,667,900	45,438,900	49,958,700	5,290,800	
Early Years Block					
Early Years - 3 & 4 Year olds	13,294,800	13,294,800	13,294,800	0	Core funding to schools, PVI, nurseries to deliver 3 & 4 yr old free entitlement (EY)
Early Years - 2 Year olds	1,212,300	1,212,300	1,212,300	0	Core funding to schools, PVI, nurseries to deliver 2 yr old free entitlement (EY NFF)
Early Years - central expenses	165,000	165,000	165,000	0	Central provision - EYFE Manager and Predicable Needs funding
Cognus Ltd - Early Years Foundation	510,400	510,400	510,400	0	Central provision transferred to Cognus to provide EY advisory services
2023/24 update TBC			1,105,500	1,105,500	
Total - Early Years	15,182,500	15,182,500	16,288,000	1,105,500	
Total DSG	112,547,300	113,318,300	121,024,400	8,477,100	
DSG Reserve		(1,367,993)			
SENCo Cluster Groups		390,000		0	Unspent 2021/22 allocations carried forward to 2022/23
Clawback - Exclusions		107,195		0	Statutory (£90k) and non-statutory (£17k) exclusion funding recouped in financial year 2021/22
Total - DSG Reserve		(870,798)			

SEN budget 2023/24

This page is intentionally left blank

Growth Funding Policy - 2022/23

Bulge Classes commissioned prior to the start of the academic year

- 1.1. In February 2017 it was agreed that all growth in schools would be funded on the following basis:
 - £57,800 in the initial year the additional class opened
 - £28,900 in the subsequent year
 - No funding in further years.
 - The additional places must have been requested by the local authority to meet basic needs for school places.
- 1.2. This has subsequently been increased to reflect rising costs to £57,800 in year 1 and £28,900 in year two.
- 1.3. This would mean that if a school agrees to open a bulge class into year 3 for September 2022, the school would receive £57.8k for 2022/23 and £28.9k for 2023/24, when the bulge moves into year 4. For 2024/25 and 2025/26, when the bulge moves into years 5 and 6 respectively, the school would receive no additional funding under the current policy, in addition to the funding they would receive through the usual dedicated school grant budget (National Funding Formula) allocation process, based on the number of pupils on roll in the Autumn census.

Bulge classes commissioned 'in year'

- 1.4. Where a school opens a bulge class in year, or into a non- main entry admission year, the school will receive the following funding for growth:
 - First year of opening £57,800.
 - 2nd year allocation - the higher of $(30 - \text{Number on roll as per Autumn census in that year}) \times £57,800$ or 28,900
 - Each subsequent year the bulge class remains in the school:
 $(30 - \text{Number on roll as per Autumn census in that year}) \times £57,800$
- 1.5. This would essentially guarantee a school funding of at least £57,800 per year, although the reality is a school will receive more than that. For example:

A Primary school has 19 pupils in the class as per census day. Each of these 19 pupils attracts funding at a rate of £4,265 per pupil via the National Funding Formula (NFF). In addition, the school will also receive $(30-19)/30 \times £57,800$. The total funding the school would receive for that class would be:

NFF allocation: £81,035

Growth fund allocation: £21,193

In this example, the school would receive funding for each year the bulge is in place at the school as follows:

Year bulge is in school	NFF funding	Growth Funding
First year	£81,035	£57,800
Second year	£81,035	£28,900
Subsequent years	£81,035	£21,193

Enc 6 - Appendix C - DSG Contribution to LA Responsibilities 2023/24 - 20221213

	2022/23 £	2023/24 £	Change £	Comments
Education welfare service				
School Attendance	107,900	107,900	-	
Asset management				
Capital Planning (60%)	76,000	76,000	-	
Statutory/ Regulatory duties				
Training and Governance	31,000	31,000	-	
Director of People's - 48% Childrens, 38% education	62,500	62,500	-	
Academies costs	21,900	21,900	-	
ICT costs re:schools	2,500	2,500	-	
Servelec contract (Cognus)	152,400	164,600	12,200	0.8% increase
AD for Education & SEND (50%)	77,000	77,000	-	
Education Development Lead (50%)	36,200	36,200	-	
SACRE	8,300	8,300	-	
Finance (50%)	39,200	39,200	-	
Total	614,900	627,100	12,200	

This page is intentionally left blank

Enc 6 - Appendix D - 2023/24 Historic Commitments 20221213

Prudential Borrowing Costs - Summary of charges to DSG 2019/2020 TO 2024/25

	2019/20	2020/21	2020/21	2021/22	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
	Actual	Budget	Actual	Actual	Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<u>Prudential Borrowing</u>								
Greenwrythe Opp Base	96,238	96,238	96,238	96,238	96,238	96,238	96,238	96,238
Glenthorne ASD Unit	32,605	32,605	32,605	32,605	32,605	32,605	32,605	32,605
Stanley Park ASD unit	89,335	89,335	89,335	89,335	89,335	89,335	89,335	89,335
	218,178	218,178	218,178	218,178	218,178	218,178	218,178	218,178

Termination of Employment Costs 2022-23

Account(T)	Latest Budget	Actuals to September pyts	Forecast	Forecast Total
Annual Compensation Payments - Early Retirements	249,700	131,032	131,032	262,064
Annual Compensation Payments - Early Retirements	223,700	103,335	103,335	206,670
Annual Compensation Payments - Early Retirements	6,800	3,443	3,443	6,886
	480,200	237,810	237,810	475,619
Average monthly payments - CSSB Primary	21,839			
Average monthly payments - CSSB Secondary	17,222			
Average monthly payments - CSSB Special	574			

This page is intentionally left blank

Enc 6 - Appendix E - NFF 2023/24 - SCHOOLS FORMULA FUNDING FACTORS

			Unit Funding before ACA 2022/23 £	Unit Funding including ACA*(1.10042) 2022/23 £	Unit Funding before ACA 2023/24 £	Unit Funding including ACA* 2023/24 £	Increase before ACA 23/24 v 22/23 £	Increase before ACA 23/24 v 22/23 %	Increase incl. ACA 23/24 v 22/23 £	Increase incl. ACA 23/24 v 22/23 %
PUPIL LED										
BASIC ENTITLEMENT	COMPULSORY	Primary	3,217	3,540	3,394	3,740	177	5.5%	200	5.6%
Per pupil funding		Secondary KS3	4,536	4,992	4,785	5,272	249	5.5%	281	5.6%
		Secondary KS4	5,112	5,625	5,393	5,942	281	5.5%	317	5.6%
DEPRIVATION FUNDING	COMPULSORY	Primary	470	517	480	529	10	2.1%	12	2.3%
Number of pupils eligible for Free School Meals		Secondary	470	517	480	529	10	2.1%	12	2.3%
Number of pupils eligible for Free School Meals 6		Primary	590	649	705	777	115	19.5%	128	19.6%
Number of pupils eligible for Free School Meals 6		Secondary	865	952	1,030	1,135	165	19.1%	183	19.2%
Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)		Primary A	640	704	670	738	30	4.7%	34	4.8%
Bands A to F (A = Highest, F = lowest)		Primary F	220	242	230	253	10	4.5%	11	4.7%
		Secondary A	890	979	930	1,025	40	4.5%	45	4.6%
		Secondary F	320	352	335	369	15	4.7%	17	4.8%
LOW PRIOR ATTAINMENT (LPA)	COMPULSORY	Primary	1,130	1,243	1,155	1,273	25	2.2%	29	2.3%
Uses Early Years Foundation Profile (EYFSP) and Key Stage 2 (KS2) attainment data		Secondary	1,710	1,882	1,750	1,928	40	2.3%	47	2.5%
ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE		Primary	565	622	580	639	15	2.7%	17	2.8%
Number of pupils that have entered state education in England during the last 3 years, whose first language is not English		Secondary	1,530	1,684	1,565	1,724	35	2.3%	41	2.4%
MOBILITY	COMPULSORY	Primary	925	1,018	945	1,041	20	2.2%	23	2.3%
A pupil who in the last 3 years indicates an entry date which is not typical		Secondary	1,330	1,464	1,360	1,499	30	2.3%	35	2.4%
SCHOOL LED, INCLUDING LOCAL PREMISES FACTORS										
LUMP SUM	COMPULSORY		121,300	133,481	128,000	141,039	6,700	5.5%	7,558	5.7%
A lump sum for each school										
SPARSITY	COMPULSORY	Primary		60,523						
The maximum sparsity values in the 2023 to 2024 NFF are £56,300 for primary schools and £81,900 for secondary, middle and all-through schools.		Secondary		88,034						
There is some flexibility in the design of the factor, which can be done through the APT.										
RATES	OPTIONAL									
Schools National Non-Domestic Rates										
SPLIT SITE	OPTIONAL									
Schools based on more than one site										
RENT	OPTIONAL									
School rented from another authority										
Minimum Per Pupil Funding Levels										
Primary				4,265		4,405			140	3.3%
KS3				5,321		5,503			182	3.4%
KS4				5,831		6,033			202	3.5%

This page is intentionally left blank

Enc 6 - Appendix F- Comparative Analysis of funding increases (based on 2021/22 pupil numbers)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
School	Current Top Up Value	Current equivalent Top Up value with additional payments included	Current Total Income received by School (based on spring 2022 data - full year effect)	Based on the following numbers of <u>Sutton</u> funded pupils	Proposed Top Up Value from agree methodology from September 2022	Proposed equivalent funding that would be received by the school using new method	Based on the following numbers of <u>Sutton</u> funded pupils	Like for like <u>indicative</u> comparison of new method against current method based on Spring 2022 funding data	% increase including place funding
Green Wrythe	£14,218	£17,836	£927,473	52	£18,805	£977,841	52	£50,368	3.48%
Bandon Hill Oakfield	£14,218	£16,883	£ 709,079	42	£18,805	£789,785	42	£80,716	7.15%
Sherwood Park	£16,687	£23,148	£ 3,101,863	69	£20,568	£3,256,734	69	£154,871	3.5%
Sherwood Hill	£16,687			65	£28,039		65		
Carew Skills for FE	£5,413	£5,413	£ 2,158,802	176	£7,914	£2,222,352	28	£63,549	1.62%
Carew Skills for Work	£10,292	£10,292			£11,824		113		
	£14,679	£14,679			£18,616		35		
Carew Skills for Life	£18,741	£18,741							
	£25,709	£25,709							
Link Primary - Explorers*	£20,563	£30,598	£ 856,744	28	£14,811	£542,119	17	-£314,625	-28%

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Link Primary - Engagers and Discoverers*					£26,169		11		
Link Secondary - Guided and independent Learners*	£19,849	£24,696	£ 765,588	31	£14,741	£559,053	22	-£206,535	-19%
Link Secondary - Supported Learners*					£25,803		9		
Wandle	£16,534	£18,905	£ 794,016	42	£17,980	£755,142	42	-£38,874	-3.2%
Avenue	£7,558	£9,761	£ 274,087	29	£11,041	£320,192	29	£46,105	8.2%
Foresters	£7,558	£8,603	£ 361,348	43	£11,041	£471,419	43	£113,420	14.3%
Oaks Aqua	£7,558	£13,134	£ 750,248	15	£7,845	£731,690	15	-£18,558	-1.4%
Oaks Ignis	£14,219			43	£14,279		43		
Glenthorne	£7,558	£7,558	£ 143,605	19	£7,845	£149,061	19	£5,456	1.64%
Muschamp	£2,121	£2,690	£ 110,275	41	£4,358	£178,677	41	£68,392	13.2%
Greenshaw*	£2,121	£2,121	£ 48,806	22	£5,420	£124,665	22	£75,859	31.3%
Cheam PEP*	£8,293	£8,293	£ 58,048	7	£10,158	£71,106	7	£13,058	10.2%
TOTALS			£11,059,982			£11,731,775			

The figures in this table represent a snapshot in time based on spring 2022 financial data.

This page is intentionally left blank

11% of Minimum per pupil funding shown as Notional SEN allowance for bases. Primary £460; Secondary £596	89% of NFF attracted by base children	11% of NFF minimum Notional SEN for base	Calculated funding from High Needs	Calculated Funding Needed from top up for Sutton pupils	Formulae calculated top up funding (per pupil)	Name of School / cohort	Commissioned places	Sutton Pupils	PREMISES supplement: would not apply to some bases ie where predominately using mainstream facilities equivalent as NFF income covers this.	Leadership and Management time: additional costs over and above those already built into the NFF that comes in from the students allocated to the base	Therapist allowance - £0 where therapy provided from Cognus	Therapist allowance	Teacher ratio for teaching across the week. This is for 8 children so put 1 for average class size 8; put 1.33 if average class 6; put 0.8 if average class 10; put 0 if mainstream class	Extra teacher numbers (above basic entitlement in NFF)	Extra teacher funding at average M6	Teacher SEN allowances number	Teacher SEN allowances funding - funded at SEN 1	Support staff ratio funding - on average hours for 8 students to provide support/intervention provision per week	Extra Support staff numbers enhanced by 5% to give cover/flexibility	Extra Support staff funding - funded at NJC scale 9
					n/a	Distinct classes - highly adapted curriculum	£6,000		£500	£3,000					£55,699		£3,149		33	£24,672
£460	£0	£0	£0	£0	#DIV/0!				£0	£0	£0	£0		0.000	£0	0.00	£0		0.0	£0

Instructions

1. Create a copy of this document and save to a local folder
2. Review the [Explanatory Note](#) that accompanies this funding model here
3. If you have any questions please contact sendspend@sutton.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CALCULATED FUNDING	Calculated Funding Needed from top up for Sutton pupils	FORMULAE CALCULATED TOP UP FUNDING per pupil	NAME OF SCHOOL	Commis sioned places	Sutton Pupils	BASIC ENTITLEMENT FUNDING ON PLACES	FLEXIBLE FUNDING or Notional SEN	SMALL SCHOOL supplement proportion for Sutton places	PREMISES supplement: per child over and above mainstream for extra rooms	PREMISES HIGH running cost: special facilities only for very few sites/schools.	Leadership and Management (over and above that contained in "mainstream"	Therapist Allowance (£0 if delivered by Cognus)	Therapist allowanc e	Teacher ratio for teaching across the week. This is for 8 children so put 1 for average class size 8; put 1.33 if average class 6; put 0.8 if average class 10; put 0 if mainstream class	Extra teacher numbers (above basic entitlement at 1 to 30) assuming M6	Extra teacher funding on M6	Teacher SEN allowanc es number - assuming	Teacher SEN allowances funding - on SEN 1 ...	Support staff hours - gives the hours per group of 8 students for support or interventions per week etc	Support staff numbers (where 1 staff is 33 hours 195 days) enhanced by 5% to allow cover and flexibility	Support staff funding - NJC 9
n/a	n/a	n/a	Highly Specialist	£10,000	n/a	£4,270	£528	£84,000	£500		£3,500					£55,699		£3,149		33	£24,672
#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	Special School	0	0	£0	£0	#DIV/0!	£0		£0	£0	£0		0.0	£0	0.0	£0		0.0	£0
n/a	n/a	n/a	Highly Specialist	£10,000	n/a	£4,270	£528	£84,000	£500		£5,000					£55,699		£3,149		33	£24,672
#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	Special School	0	0	£0	£0	#DIV/0!	£0		£0	£0	£0		0.0	£0	0.0	£0		0.0	£0

- Instructions
- Average across cohort 1 and 2

#DIV/0!
1. Create a copy of this document and save to a local folder

2. Review the [Explanatory Note](#) that accompanies this funding model here

3. If you have any questions please contact sendspend@sutton.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

Enclosure 7

Report Title	Preventing School Exclusion
Meeting	Schools Forum
Meeting Date	13 December 2022
Chair	Jenny Sims
Report Author(s)	Laura Noulton (Service Manager, Early Help & Integrated Youth Justice Service) Angela Killalea (Head of Service, Children's Services) Helen Gasparelli (Head of Inclusion, Cognus)

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides a summary of the work undertaken and the outcomes achieved from 1 December 2021 - 30 November 2022 delivered by the Early Help and Integrated Youth Justice Service (EHYJS) to prevent permanent exclusion from mainstream education. EHYJS currently receives funding to the amount of £110,000 from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to deliver intervention to reduce permanent exclusions.
- 1.2 The report will then go on to provide an overview of the current exclusion picture in Sutton and the funding currently available to the local area as a result of the exclusion monies that schools are invoiced for following a permanent exclusion.
- 1.3 A variety of options to further prevent school suspensions and exclusions will be outlined for the Schools Forum to consider and identify preferences for further exploration and resourcing. These options have been gathered as a result of consultation with both primary and secondary VPP Chairs, Sutton Primary Headteachers Group and via the Secondary Vulnerable Pupil Panel and could potentially address both immediate and longer term needs.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 To continue to commission the EHYJS edge of exclusion support for pupils next year from the DSG, based on the same amount of £110,000.
- 2.2 To consider the other exclusion prevention support options presented and identify preferences that could be implemented over the coming months to tackle the increasing exclusion rates in the Borough.
- 2.3 To consider the options presented and identify preferences that could be explored further to address future need and may form part of the Local Area Inclusion Strategy that is being developed.

3 Intervention delivered by EHIYJS

Edge of Exclusion work

- 3.1 All edge-of-exclusion (EoE) cases are supported on a one-to-one basis and may also attend the Turnaround project which is run by Limes to prevent young people coming to the PRU. Each referral received from Secondary VPP is allocated a Specialist Support Worker who will engage and work with the child and family. Work takes place in the school and/or at home or the community. Intervention focuses on the needs identified in the referral but can often include working on risk factors occurring in the home and with friends.
- 3.2 The service uses restorative practice and seeks to mediate and restore positive relationships between the child, their parents and school. All staff are also trained in trauma-informed practice which allows practitioners to recognise traumatic events in the child's history, and support the child to expand their coping strategies and improve their emotional and mental wellbeing.
- 3.3 This year there were 2 dedicated Specialist Support Workers who supported EoE cases, unlike previous years when cases were allocated across the team. Schools have shared that they prefer having dedicated workers because this supports relationships between the school and staff and the workers can be based in the school more.
- 3.4 The data below shows the outcomes in relation to EoE work over the last four years:

Year	Students referred to TYS	Total Excluded from mainstream	Students excluded within 4 weeks of intervention beginning	Students excluded within 3 months of intervention beginning
Dec 18-Nov 19	35	13 (37%)	6	7
Dec 19-Nov 20	23*	4 (17%)	2	2
Dec 20-Nov 21	29	4 (13.7%)	1	0
Dec 21-Nov 22	17	1 (5.8%)	1	0

*Referral numbers impacted by covid

- 3.5 The numbers referred this year for support from Secondary VPP were down on previous years. Speaking with the Chair of the Secondary VPP, it has been suggested that there were some mixed messages about the service's capacity to accept new referrals. There has

recently been a change in the Team Manager attending VPP, which will hopefully eliminate any confusion going forward.

- 3.6 Whilst recognising that it is impossible to predict if all 16 students who weren't excluded, would have definitely gone on to be excluded, working on the assumption that they did and with a baseline cost of £17,500 per student, the EoE work this year equates to a cost avoidance of £280,000.
- 3.7 For the one child who was permanently excluded, this took place one week after being referred and no intervention had officially started. Achieving positive outcomes often relies on the worker's ability to rapidly build a professional, consistent and trusted relationship with the child and their parents/carers. However, it can often take between 4-8 weeks for the child to open up and be able to talk about their feelings and experiences. Hence the earlier the referral can be made, the more likely successful outcomes will be. In line with the [Graduated Response](#), the service encourages schools to use this resource earlier on in the process of supporting students.
- 3.8 Having consulted with schools and professionals, if the £110,000 grant is continued in 2023-24, the service would propose to continue to have two dedicated Specialist Support Workers supporting children identified as at risk of exclusion. The service would commit to supporting up to 40 children over the course of the 12 months. Caseloads would be capped to 10 children per worker, to allow for intensive support, at home and in school to address the issues impacting on the child's behaviour. Referrals would continue to be accepted via Secondary VPP and the child could expect to receive up to 6 months of intervention.

Year 6 Transition Project

- 3.9 Part of the commissioned work includes delivering a Year 6 Transition Project, working with primary schools (via Primary VPP) to identify students who may struggle with managing their behaviour in secondary school. The young people referred are identified as being at high risk of permanent exclusion in future school years. This project is delivered from May through to November to build relationships with the young person, their family and the school to enable them to manage and cope with the changes. As part of the intervention, parents and carers were included in the case formulation. Each young person is also screened to see if they need a Speech and Language assessment, which is shared with the school in the hope it will further inform them of the child's needs.
- 3.10 This year **the service received 38 referrals; 22 were accepted onto the programme and offered support.** The other 16 were either not suitable, lived out of borough or were attending an out of borough school.
- 3.11 A face to face programme is delivered to the children two days a week over four weeks of the summer holidays. This programme covered topics such as:
- Managing emotions and anger
 - Why education?
 - Organisation skills
 - Positive relationships

- What makes a good friend?
- Future planning
- Online safety
- Fears, hopes and wants in secondary school

- 3.12 As can be seen from the table below, all of this year's cohort are all still in mainstream education and have nearly completed their first term successfully. From last year's cohort, 1 has gone on to be permanently excluded from mainstream education.

Young people worked with on the Transition Project Summer 2021	Number still in mainstream Nov 2021	Number still in mainstream Nov 2022
20	20	19

- 3.13 Immediate impact of the programme is measured using both Warwick Scaling methods and a Pre and Post Transition Questionnaires which enabled us to measure impact, both prior to the transition programme and then after the young people had completed their first term. The outcome of the questionnaire results were that each child scored themselves higher in the post questionnaire in terms of how they were feeling, confidence levels in going to high school and how to manage their emotions.
- 3.14 The service would be proposing to discontinue the Yr 6 Transition Project in 2023-24. This is on account of many schools delivering their own summer transition programmes and it being felt there is a level of duplication, which sometimes contributes to the wrong children being referred to the EHIYJS programme. By discontinuing this project the two dedicated Specialist Support Workers would have increased capacity to support those identified via Secondary VPP as edge of exclusion and where the greatest needs are currently.

4 Current Exclusion Picture in Sutton

- 4.1 Sutton's rates of exclusions have remained fairly consistent between 2018-2021, and below the national average. However, during the pandemic Sutton's rates of exclusions did not drop in line with our statistical neighbours.
- 4.2 Locally collected data for Academic Year 2021-2022 estimates that our rate of exclusion was 0.28% and increasing (DfE published data will not be available until July 2023). This is representative of 23 permanent exclusions being recorded in 2020-2021 compared to 50 in 2021-2022. For the current academic year 2022-2023 YTD we have received 33 exclusions, just under 70% of last year's total number of exclusions.
- 4.3 Feedback from schools regarding the reasons underlying the rising rates of exclusion suggests a complex picture that will not be easily resolved. There is recognition of the impact that covid has had on certain cohorts of children, particularly those that didn't have the opportunity to experience 'normal' transitions, such as those transitioning from Year 6 to Year 7, because they were at home. The impact that covid has had on children's emotional

and mental health needs is also identified, as is the impact of difficulties accessing support services for these needs (e.g. increased waiting times). Pressures attributed to increasing school numbers and complex SEND students in mainstream schools, is also adding additional stress to the classroom and teachers' capacity to provide the necessary support to children with challenging behaviour.

- 4.4 It is recognised that a dual approach is needed: supporting children and young people in the here and now to prevent further increases to the exclusion rate and thinking strategically about future needs and how the local area can better support younger pupils earlier on.

	Sutton	Sutton	Sutton	Sutton*	Sutton*
Year	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023 YTD
Number of Exclusions Secondary	25	26	23	45	30
Rate of Exclusion Secondary	0.13%	0.14%	0.11%	0.28%	0.18%
Number of Exclusions Primary	3	3	5	5	2
Rate of Exclusion Primary	0.02%	0.02%	0.03%	0.03%	0.01%
Number of Exclusions Special	0	0	0	0	1
Rate of Exclusion Special	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%
Number of Suspensions Secondary	865	723	1,084		
Rate of Suspension Secondary	4.47%	3.92%	5.28%		
Number of Suspension Primary	230	157	164		
Rate of Suspension Primary	1.21%	0.79	0.86%		
Number of Suspension Special	273	91	115		
Rate of Suspension Special	53.42%	16.25	19.26%		
Total Exclusion	28	29	28	50	33
Total Suspension	1,368	971	1,363	0	0

Data is DfE published data permanent exclusions and suspensions

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-exclusions>

* data is local data year to date, pending release of DfE cleansed data released in July annually and 1 year in arrears

* rate is calculated using the 2021 on roll pupil numbers for statutory school age pupils in Sutton - this is an indicator of the rate, this will not be the rate published by the DfE

5 Funding allocation

- 5.1 Following a permanent exclusion, schools receive a termly flat rate invoice comprising:
- 1) Statutory elements (AWPU) that include a basic entitlement, and additional educational needs factors such as Free School Meals, English as an Additional Language
 - 2) An additional locally agreed amount to Limes that includes Pupil Premium (where the money follows the child/young person).
- 5.2 The Local Authority claims the pro-rata exclusion monies and the balance is transferred to Limes College to provide additional services to excluded pupils beyond their education.
- 5.3 The table below illustrates the statutory and non-statutory exclusions money.

	Number of Exclusions	£ Exclusion invoices to schools	Non Statutory elements to Limes	Initial Total in LBS £	Statutory Funding £	Non Statutory Funding £	Statutory Funding Paid to Schools (PEX placements) £	Statutory Funding Repaid to Schools (after review) £	Final Total in LBS £	Final Total in LBS - Statutory £	Final Total in LBS - Non-Statutory £
22/23 C/F plus YTD position	47	(303,636)	82,575	(221,060)	(186,752)	(34,309)	6,767	26,423	(187,870)	(179,985)	(7,886)

- 5.4 Currently there is £179,985 within the statutory pot as at the end of Summer term 2022, of which £90,021 was carried forward from financial year 22/23. There will be an increase to this funding as a result of the statutory elements for the YTD exclusions for the current academic year are yet to all be processed and received.

6 Exclusion Support Options available

- 6.1 There is an opportunity to consider how the local area may wish to use the available statutory funding elements differently to tackle immediate need and also in the longer term. In considering the options the following should be borne in mind:
- Statutory elements of the exclusion funding should follow the child into their permanent setting if excluded and placed back in mainstream within the same financial year. If the child is not returned to school at the end of the financial year the money will no longer follow the child. Provision needs to be made to ensure that should a pupil return to a permanent school (mainstream or special) that funding is available.
 - The Education and Skills Funding Agency have confirmed that unused funding returns back to reserves at year end. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserves can be used in line with funding regulations and Schools Forum approvals in line with the guidance. DSG reserves are not ring fenced by block at year end.

Option 1: Maintaining the complex in year admissions fund

- 6.2 Recognising that numbers of in-year admissions remain high, primarily through the Hong Kong Resettlement Scheme and a smaller number from Ukraine schemes, we propose that a modest level of funding, £10,000, (assuming we may allocate the fund to 17 complex cases a year) is ring fenced to continue to support children and young people with complex life circumstances. To be reviewed at the end of the academic year for usage and impact.

Cost: £10,000

Option 2: EHIYJS workers attached to schools

- 6.3 Building on the positive results seen with the Edge of Exclusion work currently delivered by EHIYJS, the service could double the number of dedicated Specialist Support Workers to four and attach these workers to specific schools. Each worker would support two secondary schools, thereby offering dedicated support to eight secondary schools in the borough. This would in some way replicate the Social Workers in School model that has been piloted in Sutton over the last few years.

Referrals for 1:1 keywork support would still need to go via Secondary VPP for recording and allocation purposes, however each Worker could meet with a school lead/s weekly to discuss any cases of concern and offer advice/guidance as required. Work would be both in school and delivered at home, as per the current offer. The work would support both the child and parent, however requests for whole family support (i.e. including support to siblings) would still require schools to make referrals via CFCS so that safeguarding checks and threshold decisions can be made.

Further management capacity would be required to support these additional workers and time for recruitment would need to be factored in, if this option was approved.

Cost: £142,500 (+£110,000 DSG)

Option 3: Turnaround Plus

- 6.4 Turnaround Plus builds on an existing model of intervention and support provided by Limes College. The Plus model would meet the complex needs of pupils that need more intensive work and that are edge of exclusion.

Through a 6-week intervention programme, consisting of 3 half days in an offsite setting, currently proposed use of the Sutton Family Centre, pupils would receive screeners to identify any underlying SEN needs, they would receive targeted support/mentoring from experienced staff, and group work to address the challenging behaviours that are leading to exclusion. The aim would be to support pupils to have an improved understanding of self, have strategies in place to self-regulate, to communicate in alternative ways and to recognise and minimise the behaviours that have led to suspension and sanctions.

This programme would support 30 secondary age pupils per year, specifically targeting key Stage 3 pupils.

Cost £53,237 per annum

Option 4: Paving the Way (PTW)

- 6.5 PTW is an early intervention service that supports children with a range of needs including social communication, attention and concentration differences, and anxiety. They provide holistic support that may include a range of assessments to identify root cause to behaviour differences, 121 support for the child, at-home support, group work and the provision of strategies to support the child in all settings.

PTW outcomes demonstrate that 94% of pupils make progress as a result of the intervention, 66% of pupils have improved self-esteem, 61% have improved behaviour, 55% are better able to manage school and learning and 53% have strategies that are helping to improve attention and concentration. Improvements in these areas supports improved behaviour in school.

PTW ensures that children and families are on the right pathways to support them now and in the future. Increasing PTW capacity by 1 FTE, would enable the behaviour specialist to support 40 primary age children per year.

Cost £47,000

Option 5: Voluntary & Community Sector

- 6.6 There is a rich voluntary and community sector who offer services that deliver sustainable outcomes and who are able to flex and adapt models of delivery to meet the needs of pupils. We would like to connect with providers within the sector to explore opportunities for working with them in the prevention of school exclusion in Sutton, with a view to commissioning work. Examples of available services include:

[MAPS Mentoring](#) Provide a family approach support programme. They help young people aged 10 - 21 and their families, who are experiencing complex and challenging life circumstances, those at risk of exclusion or at risk of involvement in criminal activity. They support feelings of low self-esteem, reduced aspirations, risk taking behaviour, as well as emotional and mental health issues. The volunteer mentor offers the young person a safe space to talk, supports them in engaging in positive activities within the community, as well as providing a chance to set realistic goals. Taking a holistic approach, parents, schools and families, including siblings, will also benefit with help to grow healthy relationships, become resilient and follow positive pathways.

[Unique Talent](#) CIC provide support to pupils aged 12-24 both in the community and within schools. They have a focus on gang and youth offending prevention. They support some of the hardest to reach young people to reach their potential. They provide mentoring to deter pupils from negative lifestyles and raise aspirations and support education goals.

[Gloves not Gunz](#) GnG could deliver boxing personal development sessions to secondary school students. The 1.5hr session would include 45 minutes of physical activity (non-contact boxing) followed by 45 minutes of personal development workshop in which they would deliver an informal education programme covering hot topics such as - managing emotions, healthy relationships, consequential thinking, CSE, county lines, gang awareness, negative peer associations, mental & physical wellbeing, etc. They could also design a more bespoke programme if requested. Three members of staff (2 sport coaches and a youth worker) would run the session and staff are fully insured and have all the necessary equipment. A venue would need sourcing but could potentially be delivered at the Quad or at venues provided by schools.

Cost: £200 per session, reduced to £375 if 2 sessions were delivered each week.

If interested, further exploratory work would need to take place to firm up offers and consider other potential VCS providers.

Option 6: Preparation for secondary school

- 6.7 Supporting pupils in year 5 and 6 pupils with complex needs in preparedness for secondary school. A programme supporting the pupil and parent/carers with readiness activities, identification of needs through screeners as appropriate. Work may be 121 or group work and will continue into the first term of year 7. Preparation work through joint professional and TAF meetings will take place between the primary and secondary school to raise awareness of the pupil and family needs, share strategies, identify required support and work with the identified secondary school to ensure support is in place from day one enabling an effective transition.

Recommendation would be for this to be a joint project between Cognus early intervention inclusion services and EHIYJS.

Further exploratory work is required to determine costs and capacity.

Option 7: Early Intervention in Primary School

- 6.8 Prevention of exclusion needs to start early, being aware of behaviour differences and tackling behaviour challenges at an earlier stage can prevent exclusion later in a pupil's school life. A programme could be developed that supports alternatives to exclusion that include:
- Provision of therapeutic intervention such as drama or art therapy
 - Supporting managed moves to be effective and remove barriers that may prevent them from taking place such as the provision of transport, EP assessment etc
 - Support following mental health screenings, to support the pupils in schools, trauma support

Further exploratory work is required to determine costs and capacity.

Option 8: STARS ReThink It Project

- 6.9 This project works with parents/carers and their children in a small group, supporting them to manage anxiety and improve school attendance. Pupils between year 4 and year 7 and are pupils within the London Borough of Sutton are eligible for support. Further exploratory work is required to determine costs and capacity.

7 Conclusion

In summary, there are a multitude of factors impacting upon the current exclusion rate and the local area has a duty to respond to address these worrying concerns. Any plan to address permanent exclusion requires both immediate and long term solutions and to this end, a range of potential support options have been presented following consultation with key stakeholders. Schools Forum are asked to indicate the options which they would prefer are taken forward now, and in the longer term, as part of the Local Area Inclusion Strategy. Once these preferences have been identified, further scoping work will take place to finalise arrangements and confirm resourcing.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title	Early Years National Funding Formulae Consultation - update report
Meeting	Schools Forum
Meeting Date	13 December 2022
Chair	Jenny Sims
Report Author(s)	Laura Byrnes, Early Years Pupil Commissioning Manager
Open/Exempt	Open

1. Summary

- 1.1. On 11 October 2022, the Schools Forum received a report relating to the Department for Education's (DfE) Early Years National funding Formulae (EYNFF) Consultation and the potential impact of the proposals for Sutton's local funding arrangements.
- 1.2. The majority of the proposed changes to the national funding formula are advantageous for Sutton, as funding levels increase. However, a challenging element of the proposals is the distribution of the Teacher's pay and pensions grants that are proposed to be factored into the Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) and where Local Authorities are 'strongly encouraged' to distribute via a quality supplement in their local funding formulas. This is challenging because the Teachers Pay and Pensions grant is intended to be paid to settings that have staff on Teachers Pay and Pensions contracts and therefore this will not apply to all settings that might be eligible for the quality supplement in the EYNFF.
- 1.3. [The early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers' operational guide 2022 to 2023](#) is expected to be amended, to reflect changes in the expectation on how the quality supplement should be applied. However, there were no examples provided in the consultation on what the change would be.
- 1.4. Schools Forum requested an updated report to be shared at the December meeting to include further analysis of the options available for the distribution of a quality supplement and the financial impact those options would have.
- 1.5. It is expected that the DfE will announce the outcome of the consultation in the autumn term. At the time of writing this report, no announcement has been made, recent communication from the DfE is that this would be available by the time the DSG indicative budget is published in December.
- 1.6. The absence of the announcement on the DfE consultation, significantly reduces the amount of time available to consult on any changes to the local funding formula and to finalise a budget for the new financial year.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. To review and discuss the options for the quality supplement criteria in Appendix A that have been developed based on current DfE guidance.
- 2.2. To note the updated operational guidance is not yet available to provide clarity on the application of the quality supplement.
- 2.3. To agree to proceed with either option 2 or 3 'in principle' (pending any guidance which negates one or both of these options) and to consult with the early years sector early in the new year..

3. Background

- 3.1. [The early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers operational guide 2022 to 2023](#) section 5.1, currently states that:

'Funding supplements are amounts of funding paid to providers in addition to the base rate to reflect local needs or policy objectives. When using supplements, local authorities should adhere to the following principles:

- *the use of supplements should be transparent and fair and should be open to all providers which meet the eligibility criteria*
- *supplements should be used to channel additional funding to providers and local authorities should not use them to reduce funding rates for providers that do not meet the eligibility criteria*
- *local authorities should not distinguish between the universal 15 hours entitlement and the additional 15 hours for working parents; any supplement should apply equally to both entitlements.*

And in relation to the Quality (discretionary) supplement the guidance states it is to be used: ***'To support workforce qualifications, or system leadership (supporting high-quality providers leading other providers in the local area).***

Any system leadership supplement should be open and transparent in terms of the process for choosing the 'leaders', the funding arrangements, and the support to be provided. Providers must not be forced to attend training unless they have achieved less than 'good' in an Ofsted inspection report and the training has been identified in the Ofsted report. This is prohibited by the local authority (duty to secure early years provision free of charge) Regulations 2014 (regulation 8)(2)) and the childcare (early years provision free of charge) (extended entitlement) Regulations 2016 (regulation 38(2)). Further details can be found at section A4b of the [early education and childcare: statutory guidance](#).

The supplement can only be used to cover the cost of providing the system leadership; no one should benefit financially outside of it, either those supporting or those being supported. Only costs of service provision should be met.

- 3.2. The DfE consultation proposal included an update to the content in the operational guide regarding the quality supplement. There was no example provided as part of

the consultation. However, as part of the engagement with local authorities, the DfE has encouraged local authorities to consider using the quality supplement to take account of additional pressures that some providers might face, from, for example, the need to pay employer contributions to the teachers' pension scheme. Local authorities are also encouraged to take into account the fact that the Maintained Nursery School element of the TPPG funding has been rolled into MNS supplementary funding (calculated on the free entitlement universal hours only) when deciding how best to use the quality supplement.

- 3.3. More recent (unofficial) communication from the DfE, has indicated that the operational guidance is likely to be amended to provide direction to distribute the supplement to settings with teaching contracts. However at the time of writing this had not been confirmed.
- 3.4. Sutton does not currently have a quality supplement in its local formula. Any change to the formula will require a consultation with early years providers and the school's forum - however, the final decision sits with the local authority.
- 3.5. The proposed DfE national funding formula calculates the TPPG factor at 11p per hour for all hours claimed at Spring Census 2022, this equates to £261,830
- 3.6. The information collated on the Early Years Census pertaining to Staff, includes the number of staff that holds each of the Early Years qualifications. It does not collate information regarding pension schemes, wages or any other HR information.
- 3.7. The introduction of a quality supplement using the TPPG allocation will not impact the base rate increase to all providers.

4. Quality supplement options

- 4.1. Three options have been prepared for discussion with the forum, details of each option and associated benefits and challenges are provided in [Appendix A](#). These options have been prepared based on the current DfE guidelines for the quality supplement.
- 4.2. Calculations used in the options paper are based on the most recent Census return and the level of Teacher Pay and Pensions Grant (TPPG) funding allocated in the DfE consultation documents.
- 4.3. The TPPG factor in the proposed EYNFF will be less than the existing levels of funding allocated to schools for the TPG and TPECG in 2022/23.
- 4.4. The universal hours delivered at the two Maintained Nursery schools have been omitted in the financial illustrations as the TPPG factor is included in Maintained Nursery School Supplement allocation.
- 4.5. All early years funding allocations, including supplements, are based on take-up and are allocated on a termly basis, therefore, funding allocated to schools and settings can vary each term.

- 4.6. A conscious decision was made not to include an option on system leadership as it was deemed unviable at this stage, as no data is collected or any system in place that would fully demonstrate that a system leadership approach is being delivered.
- 4.7. Additionally, an option to not create a quality supplement and increase the hourly rate has not been provided, as a quality supplement is strongly encouraged and not to do so would disincentivise providers to invest in quality.
- 4.8. In the DfE proposed changes, Sutton receives an increase in funding in 23/24 it is expected that some of this increase should offset/ contribute to the increase in the expenditure costs that all settings experience, including staffing costs.

5. Recommended option

- 5.1. If there is flexibility on the qualifications that will attract the quality supplement the recommended option by Officers is option 3. Arguably, the benefits set out in Appendix A, outweigh the challenges and it is most consistent with the DfE guidance. A summary of the rationale for concluding that option 3 is the recommended option is as follows.
- it is consistent with the current guidance on distributing the early years funding
 - it incentivises all settings to maintain or improve quality.
 - supports the workforce with wages that reflect a person's qualification and retention with less, highly qualified staff leaving the sector.
 - support the levelling up agenda ensuring that funding is fair and accessible to all settings that deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage and the free childcare and education entitlements, regardless of provider type.
 - ensure sustainability and sufficiency of childcare for the borough.
- 5.2. In the event that the guidance is updated to reference that only settings with Teachers should attract the supplement, then option 2, arrears to be the option that would minimise the impact for schools and incentivise PVI settings to invest in highly qualified staff as well as comply with the principles provided in the current guidance (shown in 3.1) regarding the use of any supplements in the local formulas.
- 5.3. This option is recommended to inform consultation with the early years sector on which the council would develop a quality supplement and the eligibility criteria.

Appendix A:

Early Years Funding Formula 23/24 Quality Supplement options paper.

1. If the DfE proposes to include a factor in the budget for previous Teachers Pay and Pensions Grant into the early years funding formula, local authorities are strongly encouraged to distribute this factor using a local quality supplement in its local formula.
2. The financial modelling used by the DfE in the recent consultation identifies the TPPG factor of £261,830 (11p per hour) this amount has been used to support the following options
3. The amount used for the TPPG Factor is less than the amount schools received via the TPECG and TPG in 2022/23 by about £29 per pupil, if this allocation was removed from the formula and allocated directly to schools - based on the pupil numbers collected at the January 2022 census.
4. The universal hours / Part-time equivalents in the two maintained Nursery schools have been omitted as the TPPG a factor for these settings is included in the separate Maintained Nursery Supplement.
5. To implement a Quality supplement into the local formula, the local authority would need to establish the eligibility criteria for the supplement and consult with the sector about the change to the funding formula.
6. The following options set out the possible criteria that could be used for the quality supplement and refer to the [DfE guidance: local authority funding of providers operational guide 2022 to 2023](#)

Option	Description of the Quality Supplement eligibility criteria	Quality supplement per hour	Quality supplement p.a. per pupil	Benefits	Challenges
1	<p>School Settings only -</p> <p>This would only be available to schools setting based.</p> <p>As information regarding pension schemes is not held by the Council for PVI settings it is assumed they do not access a teacher's pension scheme</p> <p>This option assumes all schools have QTS leading the nursery and are signed up to a pension scheme (there are some flexibilities for Academy schools).</p> <p>Calculations based on 1554 PTE children in Schools $(£261,830/1554 = £168/570 \text{ hours} = £0.30)$</p>	£0.30	£168	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools receive the entire allocation Supporting the rising costs associated with Teachers' pay and pensions in a similar way as they do now. It is assumed all schools would employ QTS therefore they would be expected to be eligible within the awaited updated guidance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option is not coherent with the DfE guidance on the use of supplements in a local formula or the use of a quality supplement, as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not available to all settings It is not based on Workforce qualification or system leadership. The annual allocation is £29 less than what schools received in 22/23 for the comparable grants PVI settings are unable to access the supplement There is no incentive for highly qualified staff to remain in the PVI sector, exacerbating the existing Workforce crisis. Does not support levelling up, in terms of sector-wide quality and funding.- the intention behind passporting all funding via a formula in the same way it has already done so for schools.
2	<p>Early years settings that employ staff with a Qualified Teacher Status.</p> <p>Based on the Early Years Census 2022, 16</p>	£0.27	£155	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliant with the current DfE guidance of the use of supplements - to be available to all settings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council does not hold information regarding pension schemes for the PVI sector and it would not be appropriate to obtain this information

Option	Description of the Quality Supplement eligibility criteria	Quality supplement per hour	Quality supplement p.a. per pupil	Benefits	Challenges
	<p>PVI settings along with Schools would attract the quality Supplement</p> <p>Calculation based on the number of PTE children in school settings and the 16 PVI settings (1555+133) and dividing the TPPG factor with the number of hours</p> <p>$\text{£}261,830 / 1687 = \text{£}155 / 570 \text{ hours} = \text{£}0.27$</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliant with guidance on the uses of the quality supplement to support workforce qualifications and with expected updated guidance PVI sector is incentivised to hire highly qualified staff or invest in workforce qualifications that will raise quality, and improve children's outcomes and children's readiness for school. Additional funding to PVI settings that employ high-quality/qualified staff will support workforce recruitment and retention. Supports levelling up through high-quality provision available to parents in the childcare setting they choose Provide additional funding to PVI sector to increase wages 	<p>-, therefore, criteria based on the participation in teachers' pension scheme is not possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools would receive £43 per child less compared with the TPG and TPECG's in 2022/23 All Early years settings experience high levels of expenditure in varying ways. Demands for the quality supplement may rise each year, which will impact the funding available to each provider
3	Early years settings that employ staff with the following qualifications Qualified Teacher Status, Early Years Teacher	£0.24	£136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliant with the current DfE guidance of the use of supplements - to be available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council does not hold information regarding pension schemes for the PVI sector and it would not be

Option	Description of the Quality Supplement eligibility criteria	Quality supplement per hour	Quality supplement p.a. per pupil	Benefits	Challenges
	<p>Status and Early Years Professional Status</p> <p>All Qualifications are Level 6 and the EU Equivalent qualifications - staff can operate at ratio of 1:13</p> <p>The EYT replaces the EYPS, staff with EYPS would be more experienced staff.</p> <p>All schools and 41 PVI settings would be eligible for the quality supplement</p> <p>The total number of PTE is 1929 and the same calculation as in the options above to calculate the per hour and p.a supplement.</p> <p>DFE list of qualifications</p>			<p>to all settings including Childminders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliant with guidance on the uses of the quality supplement to support workforce qualifications. • PVI sector is incentivised to hire highly qualified staff or invest in workforce qualifications that will raise quality, and improve children's outcomes and children's readiness for school. • Support workforce recruitment and retention. • Supports levelling up through high-quality provision available to parents in the childcare setting they choose • Supports the local authority's Sufficiency duty. • Provide additional funding to the PVI sector to increase wages and other expenditure costs. • The qualifications are EY equivalents, thus providing mutual respect for staff qualification across the 	<p>appropriate to obtain this information -, therefore, criteria based on the participation of teachers' pension scheme is not possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools would receive £43 per child less compared with the TPG and TECPG's in 2022/23 • Demands for the quality supplement may rise each year, which will impact the funding available to each provider

Option	Description of the Quality Supplement eligibility criteria	Quality supplement per hour	Quality supplement p.a. per pupil	Benefits	Challenges
				<p>different provider types.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Early years settings experience high levels of expenditure in varying ways. More settings being able to attract additional funding will support settings to be sustainable. 	

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title	Capital Report
Meeting	Schools Forum
Meeting Date	December 2022
Chair	Jenny Sims
Report Author(s)	Jack Cutler, Acting Head of Pupil Based Commissioning
Open/Exempt	Open

1. Summary

- 1.1. This report provides an update on capital funding and further information on pupil place planning and any capital implications arising.

2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1. To note the summary of developments against the primary, secondary and special expansion programmes.

3. Background and Key Information

- 3.1. This report provides a brief update on the capital implications of decisions made to ensure a sufficiency of school places for the forthcoming year.

Basic Need Capital

- 3.2. The overall expansion programme costs (below) have been adjusted to reflect the latest position but remain similar to those last reported to Schools Forum in February.

	Previous estimate (Sep '22) £m	Current estimate (Dec '22) £m
Primary expansions	81.0	81.0
Secondary expansions	94.5	94.7
SEN expansions	13.2	13.4

Capital Maintenance Programme

- 3.3. The programme for 2022-23 has been progressed over the summer.
- 3.4. The 2022-23 capital maintenance programme was approved by the Schools Forum in February - and ratification was received from the People Committee in March 2022. The programme was predicated on a conservative estimated allocation of £750K. The ESFA announced capital maintenance allocations in March 2022. The LA has received an allocation of £851,573. This is in line with the enhanced funding rate that the ESFA increased

School Condition Allocation (SCA) funding by for 2021/22, and so it appears this higher allocation rate will apply to annual funding allocations.

- 3.5. There is an unallocated contingency sum of £150k remaining to cover any emergency condition issues that may arise during the winter months, and a budget of £150k set aside to contribute towards substantial building repair/ replacement projects anticipated to be required within the next 5 years period.
- 3.6. LA maintained schools were invited on 3rd October to submit applications for the 2023/24 capital maintenance programme, which was agreed by the Asset Management Panel in December 2022. A copy of this programme can be found in Appendix A. The programme will be ratified by the People Committee in February 2023.

Secondary Programme

- 3.7. The following additional places were agreed for September 2022; these schools have already offered these places.
- Glenthorne High School - 43 places
 - Carshalton Boys - 30 places
 - Carshalton Girls - 30 places
 - Cheam High School - 20 places
 - Oaks Park High School - 50 places
 - Overton Grange High School - 30 places
- Total - 203 places**
- 3.8. Pupil numbers in secondary schools continue to rise; pupils numbers in year 7 are forecast to peak in 2023/24, before starting to fall back again. However, numbers are not forecast to reduce back to levels that can be accommodated within current school PANs until 2028/29.
- 3.9. Due to the relatively low level of surplus places in Sutton, higher than usual levels on in-year applications is placing pressure on a number of year groups, in particular the current year 7 year group. Whilst we anticipate that schools will continue to admit over-numbers where they are able to do so, it may be that in the future the LA requests a school to open a bulge class to release some of the pressure resulting from pupil number growth resulting from these in-year admission.
- 3.10. It has been identified that along with the additional 263 places that have already been agreed across existing Sutton Secondary Schools for September 2023,

Primary Programme

- 3.11. Officers continue to plan for permanent reductions in primary places and are working with primary schools across the Local Area to consider options based on a variety of different factors including where pupils live, where birth rates have fallen most significantly, parental preferences and the location of delivered and planned housing developments..

- 3.12. Despite the above, the significant pressure for in-year places that was seen last year continues into 2022/23, and in particular over the summer holiday period. The level of in year applications is particularly high in the primary phase compared with levels pre 2022/23. These pressures are in large as a result of families arriving in the local area through overseas resettlement schemes, for which Sutton is proving to be a popular destination for families to relocate, no doubt in part due to the very high standard of state education our schools have to offer.
- 3.13. These pressures are particularly acute in years 3 and 6, where the area has vacancies remaining in only a few schools that are not necessarily located a reasonable distance from the residential addresses of children seeking an in-year school place.
- 3.14. Whilst it has been possible to allocate school places to year 2 via making central offers, it has been necessary to open a further additional 'bulge' class into year 5 at the Avenue Primary School, year 3 at Avenue Primary School and year 2 at Devonshire Primary school. The schools will receive the usual level of growth funding support for opening a 'bulge class', which is £58k in the first year and £29k in the second year, as well as reasonable capital funding to support the additional furniture and ICT resources required for this.

SEND Programme

- 3.15. Since 2021/8 the government has made specific SEND Capital funding allocations to support the development and provisioning of SEND places, and community infrastructure and support for SEND pupils. In March 2022, the government announced further allocations of £4.6m for 2022-23 and £3.2m for 2023-24.
- 3.16. To date £1.97m has been allocated from the Special Provision Capital Fund (SPCF) to support SEND projects, with £7.4m remaining unallocated, to be distributed through future funding allocations and LA managed central projects.
- 3.17. A further application round (round 4) for this fund was opened on Monday 3rd October and closed on 31st October, although late submissions have also been considered. Decisions on the funding will be taken by the co-opted asset management plan steering group in mid January 2023.
- 3.18. The new 'Carew Academy' free school (the school is currently located at Carew Manor) to be built on the Sheen Way site still continues to be progressed by the DfE. This project doesn't deliver any additional places at the school (beyond those already on roll at the school). The DfE are currently working on the next stages of the project (pre construction). This school is expected to open in new accommodation for September 2023.

4. Implications

- 4.1. The Council's capital budgets have been updated to reflect committed expenditure.

This page is intentionally left blank

	B/fwd from 2022/23	£165,000			
	Estimated 2023/24 allocation	£850,000			
	<i>Estimated emergency winter works/ reserves contribution to c/fwd to 2023/24</i>	<i>£228,043</i>			
Provisional programme					
School Name	DESCRIPTION OF DEFECT – (This must have a value of at least 50% of your school's Devolved Formula Capital annual allocation)	Requested Funding	Agreed Funding	Match funding	Notes
Robin Hood Junior	1.Studio Car Park – excavation, new sub-base and tarmac required to whole area 2.Staff Car Park – resurfacing required to first third of the area	£36,200	£36,200		
STARS	The school is in danger of failure due to inadequate drainage	£125,000	£30,000		Approve £25k- £30k for downwater pipe replacement only
High View Primary School	Windows and External doors no longer watertight/weatherproof	£22,890	£22,890		approve subject to school contribution or explanation why there cannot be one, and condition report.
Muschamp Primary School	Phase 2 and 3 for the roof works. This has now become an ongoing issue with severe leaks all around the school, we feel that we are unable to wait for phases to be done separately. We have damaged ceilings around the whole school and are constantly calling roofers out to do temporary fixes that do not last. Classrooms have been unusable at times and the school kitchen has also been out of action due to leaks. We have to cook offsite. Some of the classrooms that have leaks do have asbestos in so this is an extra concern. This also includes funds to reinstate damage areas internally.	£150,000	£150,000		
Muschamp School	Toilet block is very old and needs replacing. The area is not pleasant and the block is tucked away from site so often gets damaged or vandalised by pupils. It is extremely cold as it is old and is an attachment to the building.	£60,000	£30,000	£30,000	Expect 50% match funding
Muschamp Primary School	Rotten and broken fence needs replacing and a gate installed so that Base and nursery can share the outside area.	£10,000	£10,000		Review at SPCF in January - support for the school to have this.
Muschamp Primary School	We have a drainage problem underneath both sets of trampolines that are in our base gardens which makes them unusable. They are full of fly larvae.	£15,000	£15,000		
Muschamp Primary School	Very old and not fit for purpose CCTV around the school. It has reached the end of life and needs replacing. New systems allow you to access cameras via your phone so instant access makes it more secure.	£10,000	£9,000	10% school cont	Approve, with a contribution.
Muschamp Primary School	Security alarm is extremely old and we have to spend lots of money on repairs. We often get complaints from neighbours that the alarm is going off during the night for no reason. We only have sensors around the school but nothing on doors or windows.	£10,000	£9,000	10% school cont	Approve, with a contribution.

Muschamp Primary School	External doors need renewing in KS2 block, staffroom, early years corridor, main reception and Base entrance. They do not close properly and are easy to force open. We had an intruder on site yesterday and despite the door magnet being on, the intruder managed to pull hard and open the main entrance doors allowing him to get into the school.	£20,000	£20,000		
Muschamp Primary School	unsecure fencing between carpark and KS1 playground	£7,750	£7,750		
Nonsuch Primary	Repair to damaged playground equipment and Early Years Canopy.	£2,080	£2,080	£2,080	Noted this match funding was offered by the school
Nonsuch Primary School	Installation of Inventory safeguarding system. We still have a paper sign in a nd out system to our school. I think that we are the onnly Sutton school who does not have this system in place and it clearly is a valuable resource in keeping all our pupils and staff safe. I would like to request support for the full amount of purchase and installation of this system.	£4,184	£4,184		
High View Primary School	Flat Roof in Admin Corridor of school	£115,000	£115,000		
Beddington Infants School	Prevent further deterioration of the buildings	£5,000	£5,000	5000	Match funding, request more information on whether still having water ingress.
Beddington Infants School	Life expired toilets that are difficult to clean and maintain and get parts for	£140,000	£140,000	Affordable contri	Support, with a school contribution from DFC.
High View Primary School	Fire doors not closing properly	£17,000	£17,000		approve subject to receipt of survey
High View Primary School	Internal Fire Doors not compliant	£68,853	£68,853		must see the documentation - and fund urgent recommended elements of this. Only fund the dangerous elements.
Culvers House Primary School	Inefficient Fire protection Sprinkler system	£200,000	£40,000		If sprinkler system not needed, which is expected to be the case, fire safety system is. recommendation is to support alternative fire safety measures.
Robin Hood Junior School	1. Studio Car Park – excavation, new sub-base and tarmac required to whole area 2. Staff Car Park – resurfacing required to first third of the area 3. Main Playground – investigation and resurfacing works required to a section of the playground	£40,200	£5,000		Approve the c£5k for the 3rd part - main playground above 1 & 2 already approved.
Devonshire Primary School	Toilet blocks that are very old and in a poor state of repair. There are 2 sets of KS2 boys and 2 sets of KS2 girls toilets that are in need of updating. The ground floor adult toilets also require updating. The proposal would be to replace the toilets and to increase the number of toilets to help accommodate the bulge class.	£100,000	£50,000	£50,000	Expect a school contribution of 50% - subject to school providing a condition survey to show they are end of life, and photos.

	Total value of provision 2023/24 approved funding		£786,957		
Projects not approved					
School Name	DESCRIPTION OF DEFECT – (This must have a value of at least 50% of your school’s Devolved Formula Capital annual allocation)	Requested Funding		Match funding	Notes
Nonsuch Primary	Large cracks in exterior render likely to cause dampness if not repaired and maintained.	£45,000			More information needed - condition report due
Beddington Infants School	Other Building Issues that would significantly impact on the day to day running of the school	£15,000			Fully fund the toilets rather than fund this project
Beddington Infants School	Lack of shading for children and rain protection when outdoors (the school champions outdoor learning).	£22,000			Fully fund the toilets rather than fund this project

This page is intentionally left blank



Proposed dates of future meetings 2023-26

Meetings of the People Committee are subject to the approval of Council on Monday 16 January 2023¹.

Meetings of the Schools Forum may be agreed by the Schools Forum on Tuesday 17 January 2023 subject to the proposed calendar of meetings having been agreed by Council on Monday 16 January 2023.

The fourth date of Schools Forum and People Committee meetings in the 2023 - 2024 and 2025 - 2026 municipal years is earlier than in 2024 - 2025 to comply with the pre-election period publicity requirements of Sutton Council

Municipal Year	Schools Forum	People Committee
2023 – 2024	Tuesday 11 July 2023 Tuesday 17 October 2023 Tuesday 16 January 2024 Tuesday 12 March 2024	Thursday 15 June 2023 Thursday 28 September 2023 Thursday 7 December 2023 Thursday 22 February 2024
2024 - 2025	Tuesday 9 July 2024 Tuesday 15 October 2024 Tuesday 14 January 2025 Tuesday 22 April 2025	Thursday 13 June 2024 Thursday 26 September 2024 Thursday 5 December 2024 Thursday 13 March 2025
2025 - 2026	Tuesday 8 July 2025 Tuesday 14 October 2025 Tuesday 13 January 2026 Tuesday 10 March 2025	Thursday 12 June 2025 Thursday 25 September 2025 Thursday 4 December 2025 Thursday 26 February 2026

¹ <https://moderngov.sutton.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=146&MId=5789&Ver=4>

This page is intentionally left blank