

AGENDA



SCHOOLS FORUM

Date : Thursday 13th July 2017

Time : 4.30pm

Place : Badminton Road Offices, Ground Floor, Room 0012

Distribution

Members of the Committee

Rhona Allgood
Dave Baker
Mark Dee
Mark Freeman
Kim Garland
Elizabeth Gibbons
John Goff
Geoff Howell
Liz Jardine
Emma Jarman

Keith Lawrence (Chair)
Louise Leader
Jim Lott
Sarah Lovell
Lisa Parker
Ann Reed (sub)
Max Reed
Peter Smart
Susie Weaver
Bernice Webber
Adrian Vye

Appropriate Officers

Peter Murphy
Mustafa Salih
Helean Hughes

Councillors

Jon Hunt
Trevor Jones

Peter Murphy, Director for Children, Adults and Health, Badminton Road Offices, Yate, South Gloucestershire, BS37 5AF

Telephone (01454) 863253 E-mail peter.murphy@southglos.gov.uk

Enquiries to : Mustafa Salih, Interim Head of Financial Management and Business Support, Telephone (01454) 862548 or E-mail mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk

Public Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO:

- Attend all Council, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be dealt with would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
 - Inspect agendas and public reports five days before the date of the meeting.
 - Inspect agendas, reports and minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees for up to six years following a meeting.

 - Inspect background papers used to prepare public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report.
 - Have access to the public register of names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
 - Have a reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Committees and Sub-Committees.
 - Have access to a list setting out the decision making powers the Council has delegated to their officers and the title of those officers.
 - Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access. There is a charge of 15p for each side of A4, subject to a minimum charge of £4.
 - For further information about this agenda or how the Council works please contact Martin Dear, Telephone (01454) 863197 or e-mail mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk
 - Also see our website www.southglos.gov.uk
-

EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

In the event of a fire alarm, fire drill or other emergency, signalled by a continuously ringing bell, please leave from the room via the signs marked "Exit".

OTHER LANGUAGES AND FORMATS

This information can be made available in other languages, in large print, Braille or on audio tape. Please phone (01454) 868686 if you need any of these or any other help to access Council services.

AGENDA

1	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	5 mins
2	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	5 mins
3	EVACUATION PROCESS	5 mins
4	ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT	5 mins
5	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 MAY 2017	5 mins
6	UPDATE ON DSG DEFICIT RECOVERY PLAN	20 mins
7	STRATEGIC SEND PUPIL PLACE PLANNING	20 mins
8	INTEGRA VERBAL UPDATE	10 mins
9	DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND THE SCHOOLS FORUM WORK PROGRAMME 2017	5 mins
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	5 mins

SCHOOLS FORUM
Thursday 11th May 2017
Badminton Road Offices

PRESENT:

Dave Baker	Executive Headteacher, Olympus/Ridings Academy Trust
Nicky Edwards	NCN Ltd, Early Years Provision
Kim Garland	Headteacher, Brimsham Green School
John Goff	Governor, New Horizons Learning Centre
Clare Haughton	Manager, Page Park Pre-School
Trevor Jones	Councillor
Louise Leader	Headteacher, Pathways Learning Centre
Jim Lott	Governor, The Tynings Primary School
Sarah Lovell	Finance Director, Cabot Learning Federation
Lisa Parker	Headteacher, Warmley Park School
Adrian Vye	Headteacher, St Michael's Primary, Winterbourne

Officers:

Mustafa Salih – Head of Financial Management and Business Support
 Helean Hughes – Acting Head of Education, Learning & Skills & Virtual Headteacher
 Sonya Miller – Head of Integrated Children's Services
 Suzanna Hinnell – Managing Director, Integra
 Kate East – SEN Consultant
 Davina Gibbon – Corporate Finance

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jim Lott was elected as Acting Chair in Keith Lawrence's absence

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Attendees were welcomed by the Acting Chair.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Emma Jarman, Elizabeth Gibbons, Mark Dee, Keith Lawrence (Chair), Ann Reed, Max Reed, Bernice Webber, Jon Hunt and Liz Jardine

4. EVACUATION PROCESS

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
 13 July 2017

5. ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT

None

6. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2 MARCH 2017

Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true record

7. UPDATE ON HIGH NEEDS WORKING GROUP

Mustafa Salih presented the update.

Indications are that the 2016/17 DSG overspend will be £1m less than anticipated. MS will present an updated deficit plan at the next meeting. The council is still pursuing a campaign over low level of funding. March letter requested an urgent meeting with SoS but there has been no written response. MS highlighted the high priority areas in the Action Plan.

High Needs Group has looked at mainstream top up funding and high incidence funding and a funding model has been developed based on proposals (Appendix B).

Proposal is to trial a ready reckoner system for mainstream top up funding from September 2017 for new assessments. The intention is to make the system simpler and more transparent. Schools funding will be protected while the model is being trialled with the intention that a final model will be introduced in 2018/19.

Mainstream top up funding proposal to remove 0-105 unit element of funding over a two year period. High Incidence funding has been reviewed and the proposal is to increase the threshold from 1.3% to the national average for SEN pupils in mainstream schools of 2.8%. This will be phased in over a three year period. Both proposals shown in Appendix C.

Sonya Miller raised an issue where excluded primary pupils are potentially to be placed in out of authority provision which will not necessarily meet the needs of the pupil and is at high cost to the authority. Permanently excluded pupils are placed in Pathways Learning Centre but there is not a system of primary managed moves as there is in the secondary sector. Helean Hughes commented that any proposals to change the current model would need to be presented to Primary Heads Exec.

Members drew attention to the issue of lack of capacity where primary pupils could be placed. This will be partly met by Pegasus School coming on line and reviewing capacity at an existing special school, however this will not meet immediate needs and will take time to come on stream.

Mark Freeman raised the issue of a mechanism for the accountability of panels. SM suggested that challenge could be in the form of a headteacher on MARP. SM agreed to take this issue forward and consider and identify a proposed way to ensure greater input and understanding by schools in panel placement decisions.

Members of the Schools Forum raised a number of issues and concerns

- “Double counting” first 0-105 units. Dave Baker shared modelling work undertaken by Julia Anwar and raised concern that matrix funding rates had changed from April 2017 after academies had set their budgets. Mustafa Salih stated that the funding rates had been agreed from April 2017 as part of measures to reduce the DSG overspend and could not be changed but would take into consideration that academy financial year are September to August in any future funding changes
- Clearer identification of notional SEN £6k in formula required
- Quality of provision in schools; are the schools getting the correct level of funding and are they using this funding in the best way
- Some secondary schools will be receiving significantly less funding under the mainstream top and high incidence funding proposals
- Need to assurance that spending forecast are robust and as accurate as possible and the recovery plan is updated to reflect spending changes
- Schools need to be made aware of future funding changes and how this would impact on their funding so that they can plan ahead.
- Care needs to be take when communication with schools so that undue anxiety is not raised regarding funding reductions.
- We do not yet know the outcome of the NFF proposals and the effect this will have on school funding

Schools Forum noted the report but added that more information was needed before a formal view could be made

8. WORK PROGRAMME

Traded Services Update to be added to the 13th July meeting

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Schools Forum Resignation: Dave Baker reported that Paul Tanner had resigned. He also reported that following on from the last meeting he had shared Schools Forum vacancies with Academy governors.

Schools Business Rate: Mustafa Salih reported that schools business rates are funded on actual cost. However where the funding allocation differs from the charge the current methodology is to correct funding in the following year. This will change to in year adjustments for/from 2017/18.

The meeting closed at 18.04

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

UPDATE ON DSG DEFICIT RECOVERY PLAN

Purpose of Report

1. To update the Schools Forum on the latest update of the agreed DSG Deficit Recovery plan in light of the final outturn for 2016/17.

Policy

2. Local Authorities must distribute funding to their maintained schools using a formula which accords with the regulations made by the Secretary of State, and enables the calculation of a budget share for each maintained school. The financial controls within which delegation works are set out in the Scheme for the Financing of Schools.
3. The Schools Forum has a key responsibility to act as a consultative body with the local Authority on the strategic financial management of the Schools Budget and the DSG. A key priority in this area is to take decisions that ensure sound financial management of the Schools Budget.

Background

4. This report sets out the latest position and any proposed actions to resolve the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget deficit that has increased over the last 2 years.

DSG Overspend and Deficit Recovery Plan

5. In 2015/16 the Schools Budget, which is 100% funded by the ring-fenced DSG overspent by £1.2m and during the development of the DSG Deficit Recovery Plan the cumulative overspend was forecast to reach £7.7m by the end of March 2016/17.
6. To bring the DSG back into balance a consultation with all Schools and the Schools Forum resulted in the following DSG Deficit Recovery Plan being approved by the Schools Forum and the Council, as set out in Table 1:

Table 1

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
DSG Budget	188,077	189,359	190,650	191,949	193,258	194,575

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

In-Year DSG Expenditure	189,581	195,878	195,878	193,878	191,878	189,878
Reduction in Expenditure - Target			-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,814
Net Expenditure	189,581	195,878	193,878	191,878	189,878	187,064
In-Year Over(+)/Under(-) spend	1,504	6,519	3,228	-71	-3,380	-7,511
Opening DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under(-) spend	-289	1,215	7,734	10,962	10,891	7,511
Closing DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under(-) spend	1,215	7,734	10,962	10,891	7,511	0

7. At the time of agreeing the Deficit Recovery Plan the forecast outturn for 2016/17 financial year was an overspend of £7.734m. The final outturn has now been finalised and the positive news is that we are now £1.246m ahead of the Plan. This demonstrates that a number of measures put in place by the Council are starting to have a positive impact. Nevertheless, the deficit remains very large and all actions necessary to successfully deliver the DSG Deficit Recovery plan will continue to be a high priority.
8. Table 2 identifies the key expenditure variances between the original forecasts for 2016/17 and the actual outturn.

Table 2: 2016/17 Comparison of Actual to Original Forecast

	Original Forecast Over(+)/Under(-)Spend	Actual Outturn Over(+)/Under(-)Spend	Movement
	£000	£000	£000
Statement Support	1,329	1,204	-125
Post 16	2,792	1,216	-1,576
Independent/Non-Maintained	1,021	1,140	119
Special Schools/Resources Bases	917	1,281	364
	6,059	4,841	-1,218
The Grange	1,675	1,647	-28
	7,734	6,488	-1,246

9. Table 2 also shows that the DSG overspend is fairly evenly distributed across the key areas of SEND expenditure.

10. Feeding the 2016/17 actual outturn into the current DSG Deficit Recovery Plan results in the position set out in Table 3:

Table 3: Original DSG Deficit Recovery Plan Adjusted for 2016/17 Actual Outturn

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
DSG Budget	188,077	189,180	190,650	191,949	193,258	194,575
In-Year DSG Expenditure	189,581	194,453	195,878	193,878	191,878	189,878
Reduction in Expenditure - Target			-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,783
Net Expenditure	189,581	194,453	193,878	191,878	189,878	187,095
In-Year Over(+)/Under(-) spend	1,504	5,273	3,228	-71	-3,380	-7,480
Opening DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under(-) spend	-289	1,215	6,488	9,716	9,645	6,265
Closing DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under (-) spend	1,215	6,488	9,716	9,645	6,265	-1,215

11. Table 3 shows that the DSG would be in surplus by £1.215m by the end of 2020/21 all things remaining equal.

12. Moving to a position where the DSG has a surplus which can act as a contingency for ongoing pressures would be an advantageous and financially prudent objective in its own right. This objective needs to be balanced by another important objective of minimising funding turbulence for Schools. The High Needs Working Group was therefore consulted on the following 2 examples which show options for allocating that potential surplus earlier into the DSG deficit recovery plan and thus reduce the planned savings targets:

Example 1: Recast DSG Deficit Recovery Plan Adjusted for 2016/17 Actual Outturn

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
DSG Budget	188,077	189,180	190,650	191,949	193,258	194,575
In-Year DSG Expenditure	189,581	194,453	195,878	193,878	191,878	189,878
Reduction in Expenditure - Target			-1,400	-1,385	-2,000	-2,783
Net Expenditure	189,581	194,453	194,478	192,493	189,878	187,095
In-Year Over(+)/Under(-) spend	1,504	5,273	3,828	544	-3,380	-7,480

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

Example 2: Recast DSG Deficit Recovery Plan Adjusted for 2016/17 Actual Outturn

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
DSG Budget	188,077	189,180	190,650	191,949	193,258	194,575
In-Year DSG Expenditure	189,581	194,453	195,878	193,878	191,878	189,878
Reduction in Expenditure - Target			-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-1,568
Net Expenditure	189,581	194,453	193,878	191,878	189,878	188,310
In-Year Over(+)/Under(-) spend	1,504	5,273	3,228	-71	-3,380	-6,265
Opening DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under(-) spend	-289	1,215	6,488	9,716	9,645	6,265
Closing DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under (-) spend	1,215	6,488	9,716	9,645	6,265	0
Opening DSG Reserve Over(+)/ Under(-) spend	-289	1,215	6,488	10,316	10,860	7,480
Closing DSG Reserve Over(+)/Under (-) spend	1,215	6,488	10,316	10,860	7,480	0

13. Example 1 front loads the benefit of the potential surplus into 2017/18 and 2018/19 while example 2 adjusts the final year's savings target thus releasing the benefit into the final year.

14. The High Needs Working Group was not in favour of example 1 as Schools had already committed to budget plans for 2017/18 and to a large extent 2018/19 and so thought schools would not welcome having to adjust those plans. In addition, there still remains large pressures around SEND expenditure and one year's favourable position could easily get overtaken by next year's pressures. Another key consideration would be any announcements regarding Fairer Funding proposals due from the Government. Based on these considerations the High Needs Working Group's favoured continuing with the current DSG Deficit Recovery Plan subject to further regular reviews taking into account any key developments.

15. The next phase in reviewing and adjusting the DSG Deficit Recovery Plan would be through the consultation process with the Schools Forum at its December and January meetings to set the 2018/19 Schools Budget. It is anticipated that there would at that stage be information regarding the introduction of Fairer Funding.

Campaigning for Fairer Funding

16. South Gloucestershire's DSG funding is currently the sixth lowest in England and is of major concern to the Council and no doubt to Schools. This relatively low level of funding has increased the pressure on the DSG and the Council is taking every action it can to raise this matter with central government. The Council is an active member of the F40 campaign group that represents the 40 lowest DSG funded local authorities. This group has been active in making the case for extra funding for LAs like South Gloucestershire.
17. The Leader of the Council has written to the Secretary of State for Education and/or the Minister of State for School Standards on 3 separate occasions and copies of these were presented to the Forum at its last meeting.
18. Since then a further letter has been sent to the Secretary of State for Education from the Council's Chief Executive and a copy of that letter is attached as Appendix A.
19. The Council will continue to take every opportunity to press for Fairer Funding for South Gloucestershire Schools.

School Balances

20. The 2016/17 outturn position also captures the position on Maintained School Balances and this shows that aggregate School Balances have reduced from £5.873m at the start of 2016/17 to £5.363m at the end of 2016/17. Of even greater concern is that the budget plans received from schools forecast that Maintained School Balances will reduce by £3.156m over 2017/18. The forecasts also show that the aggregate level of balances will be a deficit of £2.23m by the end of 2018/19.
21. To some extent it is quite probable that Schools have built over pessimistic assumptions into those forecasts and the actuals may not materialise to be as problematic as that. Nevertheless, the pressure facing Schools is quite real and of significant concern. Fairer Funding may improve that situation but may also take a number of years for any additional funding to drip into the system with sufficient strength to turnaround such a sharp predicted decline in School balances. It is prudent to expect a number of Schools to have major challenges in maintaining balanced budgets over that short to medium term period.
22. The Council wants to do all it can to support Schools in this period and is working across the Council to put in place support and intervention measures to assist Schools. To support this intervention initiative additional capacity is required within the Council to coordinate measures and to also work directly with Schools supporting them to identify measures to maintain a balanced budget in the long term. The Council no longer has access to the Education Services Grant which was mainstreamed into the DSG and is therefore requesting that £30k is set aside from the Schools in Financial Difficulty

budget of £300k agreed at a previous Schools Forum. As this is centrally retained funding then Academies would also be able to access this support and advice as appropriate.

Financial Implications

23. The School Finance Regulations set out the arrangements which Local Authorities must follow when allocating the DSG funding to schools.
24. As the support for schools and other pupil related services expenditure is funded by the dedicated schools budget there is no charge to the Council Budget. Hence there is no charge to the Council Tax payer.
25. The DSG is forecast to overspend in 2016/17 and 2017/18. Any overspend will need to be recovered from future year DSG funding.

Legal Implications

26. There is a legal requirement for the local authority to:
 - submit the final school pro-formas and underlying data to the Education Funding Agency by the 20 January 2018.
 - confirm with schools their budget allocations for 2018/2019 by 28 February 2018.
27. The Chief Financial Officer, after the end of the financial year, must confirm to the DfE that the grant conditions have been met.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The Schools Forum is asked to note this report and consider the possible direction of travel for re-casting the DSG Deficit Recovery plan.
- b. The Schools Forum is asked to approve the setting aside of £30k from the Schools in Financial Difficulty Budget to support the development of intervention measures to support Schools with deficit budgets.

Author

Mustafa Salih, Head of Financial Management and Business Support
Tel: 01454 863197

APPENDIX A

The Rt Hon Justine Greening
Secretary of State for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
20 Great Smith Street
LONDON SW1P 3BT

Date: 3 July 2017
Your Ref:
Our Ref: AD/jpm/school funding - south
gloucestershire
Tel: Josie Matthews (01454) 863851
E-mail: amanda.deeks@southglos.gov.uk

Dear Secretary of State for Education

SCHOOL FUNDING IN SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This letter follows on from a number of letters that have already been submitted by the Leader of South Gloucestershire Council regarding the alarming financial position of schools within South Gloucestershire. Those letters date back to 10 October 2016 in an original letter addressed to you and proceed up to a letter sent to the Rt Hon Nick Gibb MP, Minister of State for School Standards dated 22 March 2017. The letters document and set out the strong case for additional funding for Schools in South Gloucestershire, arising from the current position of having the sixth lowest funded schools in the Country. The last letter asked for an urgent meeting between the Leader of the Council and the Minister of State for School Standards but we are still to hear back regarding a possible meeting. **I would, therefore, like to request again an urgent meeting with yourself, which would also include the Leader of the Council and relevant Council Cabinet Members to discuss the very difficult financial situation South Gloucestershire Schools are facing and the strong case for significant additional and urgent funding.**

That case has developed to a more worryingly degree in recent months as the Council has received the latest information from our Schools regarding their budget planning over the next 3 years. This shows a concerning picture of the majority of schools running down all of their reserves and moving into deficit by the end of 2019/20. I want to stress that this situation is not due to a lack of strong financial management from our schools as they are used to running very efficient organisations necessitated by their low funding position. Their budget planning includes many initiatives to identify further efficiencies including staffing reductions, new income generation schemes, smarter procurement and many other measures. The combination of pupil growth, rising AEN/SEND costs, National Insurance increases, pension cost increases and other inflationary pressures mean that their current financial situation simply becomes unsustainable. The Department for Education has up to now concluded that schools nationally need to save 8% or £3bn over the short term. This situation very much links to the published report of the

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

Public Accounts Committee dated 27 March 2017 which reached the following conclusions:

- i) The Department for Education does not understand the pressures that schools are already under.
- ii) Nor does it have the necessary arrangements in place to identify and therefore act, if the actions schools take to make efficiency savings threaten the quality of educational attainment and educational outcomes.
- iii) In calculating the £3bn of required efficiency savings, the DfE has not assessed the impact of the cost pressures that the government is placing on schools, in particular the withdrawal of the Education Services Grant.
- iv) Schools are now facing similar pressures to other sectors but the department does not seem to be learning from this experience, in particular from how over-ambitious efficiency targets in the NHS proved counter-productive.

These conclusions support what many schools are experiencing at first hand that the need for new and additional funding for Schools, particularly in the lowest funded Local Authorities, has reached a real tipping point. Any delay in supporting these Schools risks inflicting lasting damage on the education and therefore life chances of the current generation of children and young people in our schools.

Recent announcements from the Prime Minister and indeed yourself to press ahead with moves to a Fairer Funding model are very welcome. The Council has been open in its support and appreciation for the current Government continuing to grasp the mettle of this difficult issue and press ahead despite many voices of disapproval.

I would also like to echo your well considered and thoughtful assessment at the start of the consultation process that this review of school funding “represented a once in a generation opportunity” to put School funding on a new and fair basis. The Council in its response to the second consultation set out views to ensure that opportunity was not missed, but also had to regretfully conclude that the proposals as they stood at that time did not match that aspiration. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss in the requested meeting our continuing concerns regarding the consultation proposals, which can be summarised as follows:

1. A fair funding formula must be evidence based and must not rely on past averages.

A once in a generation opportunity to establish a Fair Funding system for schools must be based on first principles of ascertaining the true costs of running a school and then funding at that level. Basing the new formula on averaging existing funding allocations completely falls short of this aspiration. In this regard I welcome some of the interesting and compelling models that have been developed by various interested stakeholders. For example, the independent Education specialists Susan fielding and Sam Ellis (available here: <http://schoolfinancespecialists.com/A%20core%20funding%20level%20for%20schools%20%20Conclusions.pdf>) and also the modelling done by the F40 Group. I am sure that your officials are well aware of these models which establish the true costs of running various types of Schools and assess the level of funding required. Both models arrive at a similar conclusion that current proposed funding levels as set out in the National Funding Formula proposals mean that basic educational provision is likely to be underfunded by over £2bn.

2. Fair funding requires additional investment.

I note and welcome current Government announcements that suggest no Schools will lose as a result of the move to Fairer Funding and that an extra £4bn will go into School Budgets by 2022. The Institute for Fiscal Studies has, however, recently concluded that this would still amount to a 2.8% real terms cut in spending per pupil between 2017-18 and 2021-22. Once this is added to previous shortfalls in funding settlements this makes a real terms cut to per pupil spending of around 7% over the six years 2015-16 to 2021-22. Schools require transparent and urgent clarity on the level of resources going into the school funding system.

3. Any funding floor locks in historical unfairness

The first consultation regarding a national funding formula had as a principle that the funding system should be fair, citing in the case for change that the system would ensure that a pupil would attract the same amount of funding to his or her school no matter where they are in the country, and that gains and losses would be phased over time so that schools would be guaranteed not to lose more than a certain percentage of their per pupil budget every year. The case for change also showed that there are authorities with higher proportions of pupils with additional need funded below authorities with lower numbers of pupils with additional needs. A fixed floor of the type proposed is likely to leave this position unchanged and a formula with a hard floor cannot be considered fair. The amount of time taken for the lowest funded schools to catch up to the floor of

those being artificially protected will mean that those schools that the formula has identified as needing resources will not see them for many years.

4. The pupil premium should be mainstreamed.

The Pupil Premium is in effect double funding some pupils, and it should be added to mainstream school funding. By incorporating it into the formula it will make the funding for deprived pupils much more transparent in line with the principles of a new national formula.

5. There should be future safeguards built in to the formula arrangements.

A national funding formula is provided with the aim of ensuring that schools are equally funded and that pupils in schools in different parts of the country with the same characteristics receive the same funding. Maintained schools will, under the proposals as they stand, receive the funding intended for them. However, academies funding is paid to the academy trust, and those with a number of schools will then have the discretion to top-slice the funding (or allocate central costs) at a rate at their discretion or redistribute it amongst their schools. Safeguards are required to ensure that all schools are treated equally and have access to the same funding.

Once a fair national formula has been agreed and is in place there should be safeguards for any future changes to the formula so that, for example, formula adjustments are supported by a majority of schools following a national consultation process.

A national process will be required for a national formula given that the local role of school forums will no longer be in place. It is important that a national formula is not changed too frequently and ideally needs to be removed from annual political interference. For example, a formal national five-year review process may be required.

6. There must be a mechanism for consulting on the management of growth and inflationary pressures on the formula.

Schools Forums were introduced specifically because the DfE recognised in 2002 that LAs had control of significant sums of money and the mechanism for distributing it, without direct school involvement. Throughout the year, LAs discuss with their Forum potential changes in their local formula to take account of pressures or changes in requirements upon schools and to improve distribution amongst schools. Schools have the opportunity to be part of the Forum and to work with the LA. There is not currently any indication of how schools will be involved in the national funding formula in the future to ensure that they do not lose this participation right.

7. A Soft Formula Rather than a Hard Formula i.e. there should continue to be some flexibility at a local level. A 'one size fits all formula' will not adequately fit 22,000+ schools. Schools are far from homogenous and local circumstances need to be considered. This is particularly true of schoolled circumstances (i.e. the need to pay rent, or the dis-economies of repairs to a listed building). Using a new Fairer Funding Formula to determine resources going to schools in a local authority, while leaving flexibility for the Schools Forum to approve variations, would eliminate this unhelpful rigidity in the proposed system.

8. Small schools

The national funding formula must provide adequate funding for necessary small schools that are essential in many rural parts of the country. Such schools suffer from significant diseconomies of scale and, in order not to disadvantage schoolchildren, require a higher level of funding for fixed costs. Given such schools are necessary they must be funded properly for a period of years. The government's presumption against closure of such small schools should be revised to include criteria for national funding provision

9. Flexibility to move funding between blocks.

The original DSG allowed funding to be flexibly used in a local area to meet local priorities and pressures. The creation of the three blocks has stifled some of that movement, but the ring fencing of the Schools Block will leave the High Needs Block very susceptible to the actions of schools without the ability to address them. The High Needs Block is intended to support the most vulnerable pupils in schools and yet it is being strongly constrained. We can see some reasoning why the Early Years Block might be separated, but to prohibit movement between the High Needs Block and School Block is leaving the system open to highly detrimental consequences.

10. There must be clarity of governance (i.e. local authority and MATs)

In order to make changes to funding, local authorities are required to consult their Schools Forum and will in future be required to consult all schools on some matters and have a majority of schools (not a majority of schools responding) agree to the change. The proposals remove the influence of the Schools Forum and the loss of the expertise and skills that body brings to School Funding matters is a regrettable retrograde step and should be considered again.

Finally, I cannot stress enough how urgent the need for Fairer Funding is and any delays in extra funding reaching South Gloucestershire Schools is likely to have long lasting and irreversible negative consequences for children and young

people in our Schools. I therefore look forward to hearing back from you at the earliest opportunity to arrange the requested meeting. Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amanda Deeks". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Amanda Deeks
Chief Executive

STRATEGIC SEND PUPIL PLACE PLANNING

Purpose of Report

1. To update the Schools Forum on the data analysis undertaken to date relating to forward projections of SEND pupil numbers as part of the work of the schools forum high needs working group.

Background

2. A clear picture of current and future demand for high needs school places is required in order to plan the future requirement for places and their associated cost. This forward picture of demand, provision and expenditure requirements will be a key component underpinning the Local Authority's SEND Strategy which is about to be updated.
3. This reports provides an analysis of the current cohort of C&YP with an EHCP (or statement) and an initial indication of the likely numbers of pupils with high needs in future years. It also summarises the key assumptions used in this analysis.
4. The analysis is based on the cohort of C&YP as of 22 May 2017 (a total of 1641 individuals).
5. The assumptions used within the analysis are outlined in appendix 1.

Current Cohort

6. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the current cohort of C&YP with an EHCP (or statement) by primary need category which shows that ASD is the highest prevalence primary need (at 26.6%).

Table 1 – split of primary need

Primary Need*	Description	Number of individuals	% total Primary need
ASD	Autistic spectrum disorder	436	26.6%
SLCN	Speech, language & communication needs	298	18.2%
MLD	Moderate learning difficulty	251	15.3%
SEMH	Social, emotional, mental health	243	14.8%
SLD	Severe learning difficulty	138	8.4%
PD	Physical disability	135	8.2%
HI	Hearing impairment	51	3.1%
PMLD	Profound and multiple learning difficulty	27	1.7%
VI	Visual impairment	24	1.5%
SPLD	Specific learning difficulty	21	1.3%
OTH	Other difficulty/disability	13	0.8%
MSI	Multi-sensory impairment	4	0.2%
Grand Total		1641	100%

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

7. The next two tables provide the current split of provision type (table 2) and year group (table 3) for each primary need category.

Table 2 – primary need by provision type

Provision type	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
Alternative provision	7		1			1		8					17
Educated at home	8		6			1		3	2	2			22
FE college	56	10	49			8		32	27	9	3	1	195
Independent school	4		3			3		8	1	1	4	1	25
Independent special school	38	6	1		1	5	6	5	4	6	2	1	75
Independent specialist college	15		8			5		2	4	11	1		46
Mainstream	139	17	93		9	55		102	167	8	8	11	609
OLA Mainstream	7	1	6			4		7	5	1		1	32
OLA Special school	5	5	1	1		7	4	10		2			35
Other	4		3	1	1	1		7		1		1	19
Pre-school	5		1		1	7			13	3			30
PRU			1										1
Resource Base	56	12	2			12		4	31			5	122
SG special	92		76	2	1	26	17	52	44	94	3	3	410
Secure Unit								3					3
Grand Total	436	51	251	4	13	135	27	243	298	138	21	24	1641

Table 3 – primary need by year group

Year group	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
-2	1			1		4	1		2	2			11
-1	5		1		1	6			13	4		1	31
0	28	3	7		1	2		6	30	3		2	82
1	26	3	2		2	4	1	10	29	6	1	1	85
2	20	4	5			8	2	13	26	11		2	91
3	21	2	11	1	1	12	2	9	17	5	1	3	85
4	24	5	17		3	5		11	25	12			102
5	24	6	16			16	3	14	17	11	2		109
6	27	3	26			8	2	19	13	9	1	1	109
7	25	3	12		2	5	1	24	22	7	3	1	105
8	25	2	18		1	10		18	26	9	3		112
9	32	3	17	1		15	1	26	13	7	1	4	120
10	23	1	19		1	11		21	13	6	1	2	98
11	47	3	28		1	6	4	21	22	1	3	2	138
12	34	3	24	1		3	3	20	11	7	2	3	111
13	36	2	23			8	2	21	11	9	2		114

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

14	22	3	16			3	2	5	4	10		1	66
15	9	3	5			3	3	3	1	7	1		35
16	5	1	1			4			1	6			18
17	2		3			2				5			12
18		1						2				1	4
19									1	1			2
20									1				1
Grand Total	436	51	251	4	13	135	27	243	298	138	21	24	1641

8. The total annual DSG cost associated with this cohort in 2017/18 is provided below. Social care and health costs associated with the cohort have not yet undergone detailed scrutiny and so are not included.

LA DSG annual costs	£21,971,784
Place led funding	£5,310,000
Total DSG costs	£27,281,784

9. The current average DSG cost per service user (DSG and place led funding) per category of need and type of provision is summarised in table 4 overleaf.

Table 4 - Average DSG costs per placement by provision and category of need (DSG costs + place led funding*)

	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Total
Alternative Provision	£5,743					£13,650		£10,538					£7,976
Educated at home	£5,498									£760			£2,068
FE college	£4,243	£6,358	£4,188			£5,230		£3,730	£3,707	£4,447	£4,376	£4,635	£4,233
Independent school	£26,505		£12,245			£14,174		£67,178	£17,580	£14,582	£15,858	£14,122	£33,297
Independent special school	£66,702	£44,072	£57,136		£88,954	£46,726	£63,659	£83,801	£55,748	£73,148	£22,365	£68,939	£63,405
Independent specialist college	£49,545		£52,590			£69,224		£54,693	£44,183	£61,188	£47,472		£54,601
Mainstream	£8,848	£8,889	£7,687		£7,677	£9,475		£7,313	£7,973	£7,937	£3,534	£12,088	£8,191
OLA Mainstream	£4,535	£9,500	£5,377			£10,614		£3,653	£4,149	£13,123		£9,167	£5,768
OLA Special school	£11,091	£21,022	£10,811	£31,356		£29,459	£25,933	£15,533		£27,922			£20,681
Other			£8,169					£7,982					£4,231
Pre-school	£4,572		£5,358		£3,572	£5,154			£4,259	£3,810			£4,489
PRU													£0
Resource Base	£25,115	£21,919	£22,204			£35,441		£31,235	£19,165			£33,365	£24,795
SG special	£23,703		£17,010	£17,566	£24,156	£22,035	£23,754	£28,630	£18,509	£20,365	£16,997	£33,756	£21,657
Secure Unit								£37,781					£37,781
Total	£19,868	£16,799	£11,334	£16,622	£14,290	£18,384	£32,945	£16,399	£11,186	£23,379	£11,811	£20,747	£16,625

* note that place led funding is included for SG provisions but not for independent and OLA provisions

10. The projected number SEND places that will be available within South Gloucestershire special schools and resource bases (including specialist units) in September 2017 (and September 2018 – yet to be confirmed) is provided in table 5.

Table 5 – projected places available in schools

Location*	Number places Sept 2017	Number places Sept 18 (tbc - under discussion)
Abbeywood Community School	25	25
Blackhorse Primary School	22	22
Brimsham Green Secondary School	14	14
Charborough Road Primary School	20	20
Chipping Sodbury Secondary School	10	12
Culverhill School	135	135
Emersons Green Primary School	14	14
Hanham Woods Academy	25	25
Lyde Green School	4	8
New Horizons Learning Centre	50	50
New Siblands School	120	120
Pegasus School	30	60
Warmley Park School	140	140
Yate International Academy	12	12
Total	621	657

*1. Does not include a few places used on a short term basis at Pathways Learning Centre as this is a provision for children and young people who have medical needs, have been permanently excluded and/or have an EHCP where specialist provision is being sought.

*2. The DFE have accepted an Expression of Interest from the LA for another special school but this is not currently included in the table

11. Tables 6 and 7 provide a breakdown of primary need allocation to each of the South Gloucestershire special schools and resource bases (including specialist units). Table 6 provides the projected percentage of primary need allocation at each of the locations and table 7 translates this into expected pupil numbers by primary need at each location from September 2017.

Table 6 – projected percentage of primary need allocation at each location from September 2017

School	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI
Abbeywood Community School	60%								40%			
Blackhorse Primary School	100%											
Brimsham Green Secondary School					30%	70%						
Charborough Road Primary School	20%								80%			
Chipping Sodbury Secondary School	100%											
Culverhill School	13%		51%	1%		8%		2%	22%	2%	2%	1%
Emersons Green Primary School						70%						30%
Hanham Woods Academy	60%								40%			
Lyde Green School										100%		
New Horizons Learning Centre								100%				
New Siblands School	30%		4%			11%	4%		6%	45%		
Pegasus School	100%											
Warmley Park School	30%		10%	1%		2%	11%		9%	35%		2%
Yate International Academy		100%										

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

Table 7 - expected pupil numbers by primary need at each location from Sept 2017

School*	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Total places Sep 17
Abbeywood Community School	15								10				25
Blackhorse Primary School	22												22
Brimsham Green Secondary School					4	10							14
Charborough Road Primary School	4								16				20
Chipping Sodbury Secondary School	10												10
Culverhill School	17		69	1		10		2	29	2	2	1	135
Emersons Green Primary School						10						4	14
Hanham Woods Academy	15								10				25
Lyde Green School										4			4
New Horizons Learning Centre								50					50
New Siblands School	36		4			13	4		8	55			120
Pegasus School	30												30
Warmley Park School	42		14	1		3	15		13	49		2	140
Yate International Academy		12											12
Total	192	12	87	2	4	47	19	52	85	110	2	8	621

*1. Does not include a few places used on a short term basis at Pathways Learning Centre as this is a provision for children and young people who have medical needs, have been permanently excluded and/or have an EHCP where specialist provision is being sought

*2. The DFE have accepted an Expression of Interest from the LA for another special school but this is not currently included in the table

12. Assuming the current cohort prevalence % of C&YP with an EHCP (or statement) (3.7%) increases at a similar rate as previous years (0.1% increase per year), the existing proportion of primary need categorisation and the population growth data used within all schools place planning, table 8 provides the projected total future number of SEND pupils by primary need category for the next 10 years.

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

13. This data is then analysed at a lower level to provide the projected number of SEND pupils by primary need category for the next 10 years for mainstream schools (table 9), special schools (table 10), resource bases (table 11), independent schools (table 12), out of authority schools (table 13), further education settings (table 14), preschool settings (table 15) and other settings (table 16). This analysis currently assumes that the proportion of C&YP within each setting reflects the existing allocation to settings (as outlined in table 2).

Table 8 – total predicted SEND pupils (all settings) by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total	% increase
2016	3.7%	436	51	251	4	13	135	27	243	298	138	21	24	1641	
2017	3.8%	444	52	256	4	13	137	27	247	303	140	21	24	1671	2%
2018	3.9%	463	54	267	4	14	143	29	258	317	147	22	26	1744	4%
2019	4.0%	483	57	278	4	14	150	30	269	330	153	23	27	1819	4%
2020	4.1%	503	59	290	5	15	156	31	281	344	159	24	28	1894	4%
2021	4.2%	524	61	301	5	16	162	32	292	358	166	25	29	1971	4%
2022	4.3%	542	63	312	5	16	168	34	302	370	172	26	30	2040	4%
2023	4.4%	559	65	322	5	17	173	35	312	382	177	27	31	2105	3%
2024	4.5%	576	67	332	5	17	178	36	321	394	182	28	32	2169	3%
2025	4.6%	593	69	341	5	18	184	37	331	405	188	29	33	2233	3%
Total increase (2016-2025)														36%	

Table 9 – predicted SEND pupils in mainstream schools by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	139	17	93	0	9	55	0	102	167	8	8	11	609
2017	3.8%	142	17	95	0	9	56	0	104	170	8	8	11	620
2018	3.9%	148	18	99	0	10	58	0	108	177	9	9	12	647
2019	4.0%	154	19	103	0	10	61	0	113	185	9	9	12	675
2020	4.1%	160	20	107	0	10	63	0	118	193	9	9	13	703
2021	4.2%	167	20	112	0	11	66	0	123	201	10	10	13	731
2022	4.3%	173	21	116	0	11	68	0	127	208	10	10	14	757
2023	4.4%	178	22	119	0	12	71	0	131	214	10	10	14	781
2024	4.5%	184	22	123	0	12	73	0	135	221	11	11	15	805
2025	4.6%	189	23	127	0	12	75	0	139	227	11	11	15	829

Table 10 – predicted number of pupils in special schools (including SG special schools, PRU, secure unit) by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	92	0	76	2	1	26	17	52	44	94	3	3	410
2017	3.8%	94	0	78	2	1	26	17	56	45	96	3	3	421
2018	3.9%	98	0	82	2	1	28	18	58	47	100	3	3	440
2019	4.0%	102	0	85	2	1	29	19	61	49	104	3	3	459
2020	4.1%	106	0	89	2	1	30	20	63	51	109	3	3	478
2021	4.2%	110	0	92	2	1	31	20	66	53	113	4	4	497

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

2022	4.3%	114	0	96	2	1	32	21	68	55	117	4	4	515
2023	4.4%	118	0	99	3	1	33	22	71	56	121	4	4	531
2024	4.5%	122	0	102	3	1	34	22	73	58	124	4	4	547
2025	4.6%	125	0	105	3	1	35	23	75	60	128	4	4	563

Table 11 – predicted number of pupils in resource bases by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	56	12	2	0	0	12	0	4	31	0	0	5	122
2017	3.8%	57	12	2	0	0	12	0	4	32	0	0	5	124
2018	3.9%	60	13	2	0	0	13	0	4	33	0	0	5	130
2019	4.0%	62	13	2	0	0	13	0	4	34	0	0	6	135
2020	4.1%	65	14	2	0	0	14	0	5	36	0	0	6	141
2021	4.2%	67	14	2	0	0	14	0	5	37	0	0	6	147
2022	4.3%	70	15	2	0	0	15	0	5	39	0	0	6	152
2023	4.4%	72	15	3	0	0	15	0	5	40	0	0	6	157
2024	4.5%	74	16	3	0	0	16	0	5	41	0	0	7	161
2025	4.6%	76	16	3	0	0	16	0	5	42	0	0	7	166

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

Table 12 – predicted number of pupils in Independent schools (school, special, specialist college) by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	57	6	12	0	1	13	6	15	9	18	7	2	146
2017	3.8%	58	6	12	0	1	13	6	15	9	18	7	2	149
2018	3.9%	61	6	13	0	1	14	6	16	10	19	7	2	155
2019	4.0%	63	7	13	0	1	14	7	17	10	20	8	2	162
2020	4.1%	66	7	14	0	1	15	7	17	10	21	8	2	169
2021	4.2%	68	7	14	0	1	16	7	18	11	22	8	2	175
2022	4.3%	71	7	15	0	1	16	7	19	11	22	9	2	181
2023	4.4%	73	8	15	0	1	17	8	19	12	23	9	3	187
2024	4.5%	75	8	16	0	1	17	8	20	12	24	9	3	193
2025	4.6%	78	8	16	0	1	18	8	20	12	24	10	3	199

Table 13 - predicted number of pupils in Out of Authority schools (mainstream/special) by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	12	6	7	1	0	11	4	17	5	3	0	1	67
2017	3.8%	12	6	7	1	0	11	4	17	5	3	0	1	68
2018	3.9%	13	6	7	1	0	12	4	18	5	3	0	1	71
2019	4.0%	13	7	8	1	0	12	4	19	6	3	0	1	74
2020	4.1%	14	7	8	1	0	13	5	20	6	3	0	1	77

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

2021	4.2%	14	7	8	1	0	13	5	20	6	4	0	1	80
2022	4.3%	15	7	9	1	0	14	5	21	6	4	0	1	83
2023	4.4%	15	8	9	1	0	14	5	22	6	4	0	1	86
2024	4.5%	16	8	9	1	0	15	5	22	7	4	0	1	89
2025	4.6%	16	8	10	1	0	15	5	23	7	4	0	1	91

Table 14 - predicted number of pupils in Further Education settings by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	56	10	49	0	0	8	0	32	27	9	3	1	195
2017	3.8%	57	10	50	0	0	8	0	33	27	9	3	1	199
2018	3.9%	60	11	52	0	0	9	0	34	29	10	3	1	207
2019	4.0%	62	11	54	0	0	9	0	35	30	10	3	1	216
2020	4.1%	65	12	57	0	0	9	0	37	31	10	3	1	225
2021	4.2%	67	12	59	0	0	10	0	38	32	11	4	1	234
2022	4.3%	70	12	61	0	0	10	0	40	34	11	4	1	242
2023	4.4%	72	13	63	0	0	10	0	41	35	12	4	1	250
2024	4.5%	74	13	65	0	0	11	0	42	36	12	4	1	258
2025	4.6%	76	14	67	0	0	11	0	44	37	12	4	1	265

Table 15 - predicted number of pupils in pre-school settings by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	5	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	13	3	0	0	30
2017	3.8%	5	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	13	3	0	0	31
2018	3.9%	5	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	14	3	0	0	32
2019	4.0%	6	0	1	0	1	8	0	0	14	3	0	0	33
2020	4.1%	6	0	1	0	1	8	0	0	15	3	0	0	35
2021	4.2%	6	0	1	0	1	8	0	0	16	4	0	0	36
2022	4.3%	6	0	1	0	1	9	0	0	16	4	0	0	37
2023	4.4%	6	0	1	0	1	9	0	0	17	4	0	0	38
2024	4.5%	7	0	1	0	1	9	0	0	17	4	0	0	40
2025	4.6%	7	0	1	0	1	10	0	0	18	4	0	0	41

Table 16 - predicted number of pupils in other settings (Alternative Provision, Educated at home, Other, PRU, Secure Unit) by primary need

Year	Assumed SEND prevalence in school population	ASD	HI	MLD	MSI	OTH	PD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	SLD	SPLD	VI	Grand Total
2016	3.7%	19	0	11	1	1	3	0	21	2	3	0	1	62
2017	3.8%	19	0	11	1	1	3	0	21	2	3	0	1	63
2018	3.9%	20	0	12	1	1	3	0	22	2	3	0	1	66
2019	4.0%	21	0	12	1	1	3	0	23	2	3	0	1	69
2020	4.1%	22	0	13	1	1	3	0	24	2	3	0	1	72

Department for Children, Adults and Health – Schools Forum
13 July 2017

2021	4.2%	23	0	13	1	1	4	0	25	2	4	0	1	74
2022	4.3%	24	0	14	1	1	4	0	26	2	4	0	1	77
2023	4.4%	24	0	14	1	1	4	0	27	3	4	0	1	80
2024	4.5%	25	0	15	1	1	4	0	28	3	4	0	1	82
2025	4.6%	26	0	15	1	1	4	0	29	3	4	0	1	84

Requested input from Schools Forum

14. Discussion about validity of assumptions – e.g. should we build in an assumption to reduce OOA placements in favour of local options?
15. Discussion about what additional data / analysis would be useful to the group

Next Steps

16. Confirm assumptions used for future predictions, particularly:
 - a. prevalence of SEND C&YP in future years (assumption 5)
 - b. allocation of existing allocation of primary need by provision type within the prediction of pupil numbers in future years (assumption 6)
17. Analysis of future pupil numbers by nursery, primary, secondary and post 16.
18. Determination of future requirement of pupil places by provision type thus developing a detailed provision plan setting out when and what type of provision will need to be developed to match the identified demand.
19. Analysis of cost implications of pupil / provision / primary need future predictions. This would be fed into the DSG Deficit Recovery Plan to ensure it remains up to date and accurate and thus assist in the forward planning of the DSG

KEY ASSUMPTIONS USED WITHIN DATA ANALYSIS

1. Primary need reflects DfE statutory categories
2. Analysis uses only the primary need categorisation for an individual
3. The analysis is based on the cohort of C&YP as of 22 May 2017 (a total of 1641 individuals).
4. Global projection of pupil numbers (Global2016) in South Gloucestershire submitted as part of SCAP return to DfE used as the basis for predicted pupil numbers.
5. Assume the existing level of SEND prevalence (3.7% May 2017) is increased by 0.1% per year for the next 10 years within the global pupil population for future years' predictions. Additionally assume a small increase (10 per year) is applied from 2017 to 2020 to account for additional growth in numbers of YP aged 19-25 during that period.
6. Assumes the existing allocation of primary need by provision type (as of May 2017 as per table 2) within the prediction of pupil numbers by provision type in future years.
7. Table 6 provides the assumed allocation of primary need category by location (special schools and resource bases)
8. Sept 17 planned provision data assumed no increase unless already advised. Forecast data will be used to inform future requirement for additional places.

INTEGRA – VERBAL UPDATE

13 th July 2017 Room 0012 Ground Floor	14 th September 2017 Room 0012 Ground Floor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing for 2018/19 (if known) • DSG Deficit Recovery Plan • Provisional Outturn 2016/17 (including school balances) • Strategic SEND Pupil Place Planning • Integra – Verbal Update • Schools Forum Membership • Date of future meetings and the Work Programme 2017/18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DfE Consultation on School Funding 2018/19 • Allocation of Schools Block Growth Funding • 1st Budget Monitor 2017/18 • Education Commission Update • Traded Services Update

Provisional Dates:

Thursdays at 4.30pm in Room 0012, Badminton Road Offices

7th December 2017

18th January 2018

1st March 2018

10th May 2018

12th July 2018

ANY OTHER BUSINESS