

ITEM 6

Pupil Premium Grant – census date change impact

Schools Forum – 26 April 2021

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is asked to:

To note the potential impact of pupil premium grant allocations in 2021/22 onwards as a result of the change in the census date

Members of Forum allowed to vote: - All school and academy members are able to vote. Only early years representatives from the non schools members are able to vote. Non-school members even if represented by school staff are not eligible to vote.

1. Background

- 1.1** Maintained schools in England get additional funding to assist in improving the attainment of their disadvantaged pupils through the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG). The Department for Education (DfE) evidence shows that children from disadvantaged backgrounds, generally face extra challenges in reaching their potential at school and often do not perform as well as their peers, hence the use of the deprivation factor to calculate the PPG.
 - 1.2** The allocations for schools are based on the number of pupils they have in the following groups; free school meals (FSM or FSM6); looked-after and previously looked after children.
 - 1.3** Eligible schools include all mainstream infant, primary, middle, junior, secondary and all-through schools serving children aged 5 to 16; schools for children with special educational needs or disabilities and pupil referral units (PRUs)
 - 1.4** The DfE announced that the rates for the PPG would remain unchanged for the financial year 2021 to 2022 at £1,345 for primary age pupils or £995 for secondary.
 - 1.5** However for mainstream schools from April 2021 the allocations will be calculated based on the number of eligible pupils recorded by schools in their census in the October 2020 (autumn census) rather than January 2021 (spring census) as was used in prior years.
 - 1.6** PRU's and AP providers will not be impacted and will continue to be funded based on their January census data as the DfE accept the October census is not representative of the number pupils in PRU across a full academic year.
- 2. Change in census date impact on pupil numbers**

2.1 Table 1 below shows the increase in pupil numbers claiming FSM over the four census periods reviewed autumn 2019 to spring 2021. There has been a steady increase in the eligible pupil numbers since the pandemic as is evidence by the increase of over 4% of the total pupil count becoming eligible for FSM despite the decrease in total pupil count for the same periods.

Table 1: The number of pupils registered for FSM

Period	Pupil Count (C&M)	FSM Eligible Count	Not FSM Count	Movement	FSM Eligible %	Not FSM Eligible %
Spring 2021	56,511	15,426	41,085	726	27%	73%
Autumn 2020	56,756	14,700	42,056	1,402	26%	74%
Spring 2020	57,019	13,298	43,721	433	23%	77%
Autumn 2019	57,001	12,865	44,136		23%	77%

2.2 Table 2 shows a breakdown of the number of eligible pupils by school type. By using the earlier census period the primary and secondary schools are most impacted by the change with 644 of the 726 increase eligible pupils coming from these two school types.

Table 2: FSM Eligible Count by school type

Period	Total	Primary schools	Secondary schools	Pupil referral*	All through	Special schools
Spring 2021	15,426	8,901	5,234	58	693	540
Autumn 2020	14,700	8,469	5,022	45	640	524
Spring 2020	13,298	7,913	4,305	70	558	452
Autumn 2019	12,865	7,611	4,226	55	545	428

*included for purposes of showing the full student count

3. Change in census date financial impact

3.1 Table 3 below sets out the amounts of PPG that schools would be funded based on the FSM pupil count from the autumn census. The impact of rolling back for primary schools is a reduction of 432 pupils and for secondary schools 212 pupil reduction.

3.2 Table 4 assumes the standard rate of PPG (£1,345 primary & £995 secondary) and making no assumptions for any variables around LAC etc where additional grant is attributed there is a shortfall of £792k for primary and secondary schools in Croydon in the 2021/22 year allocation as a result of the changes to the period used on which to calculate PPG

Table 3 Potential PPG based on census data pupil count

Period	Primary schools pupil no's	Total PPG	Secondary schools pupil no's	Total PPG
Spring 2021	8,901	£11,971,845	5,234	£5,207,830
Autumn 2020	8,469	£11,390,805	5,022	£4,996,890
Spring 2020	7,913	£10,642,985	4,305	£4,283,475
Autumn 2019	7,611	£10,236,795	4,226	£4,204,870

Table 4 Potential lost grant income by school type as a result of the changes

Period	Total funding £
Primary schools	581,040
Secondary schools	210,940
Total	791,980

Recommendation: that Schools Forum note the potential impact of pupil premium grant allocations in 2021/22 onwards as a result of the change in the census date

ITEM 7

Early Years Budget – 2021/2022

Schools Forum – 26 April 2021

Schools Forum members are asked to:

1. Note the 2021/22 Early Years budget
2. Agree to the methodology for the distribution of the supplementary funding to Maintained Nursery Schools

Members of Forum allowed to vote: - All school and academy members are able to vote. Only early years representatives from the non schools members are able to vote. Non-school members even if represented by school staff are not eligible to vote.

1. Budget allocation

The Department for Education (DfE) announced the early years block allocation for 2021/22 on 17 December 2020, as set out in Table 1. Updates to the hourly rates, as outlined by the ESFA, are detailed in Tables 2.

Table 1: Early Years Updated Budget 2020/21

Reference	Details	Budget 2020/21	Budget 2021/22	Movement	Percentage split of 3/4YO Base Rate
Ref 1	Universal Entitlement	17,609,524	17,812,320	202,796	93.50%
Ref 4	Additional 15 hours	6,377,431	6,450,876	73,445	
Ref 3	Providers allocation	23,986,955	24,263,196	276,241	
Ref 2	Deprivation 1.5% (IMD)	384,817	389,249	4,432	1.50%
Ref 3	95% Pass Through Rate	24,371,772	24,652,445	280,673	
Ref 5	EY Central- Top slice (5%)	1,282,725	1,297,497	14,772	5%
Ref 6	2 Year Old Child Hours	3,300,592	3,346,594	46,002	
Ref 7	Maintained Nursery Supplement (MNS)	536,405	536,405	0	
Ref 8	Pupil Premium Grant	153,126	153,126	0	
Ref 9	Disability Access Fund	111,930	122,385	10,455	
Ref 10	Total (In-Year Funding)	29,756,550	30,108,452	351,902	100%

Tables 2: Budget Movement

	2020/21	2021/22	
Universal entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds	Current total	Current total	Movement
Hourly rate from the early years national funding formula	£5.21	£5.27	£0.06
Number for universal entitlement funding (part-time equivalent)	6,491.25	6,491.25	0.00
Hours entitled per week	15	15	0
Weeks entitled per year	38	38	0
Total initial funding allocation for universal entitlement for 3&4YO	£19,277,066	£19,499,066	£222,000

	2020/21	2021/22	
Additional 15 hours	Current total	Current total	Movement
Hourly rate from the early years national funding formula	£5.21	£5.27	£0.06
Number for additional 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of 3 and 4 year olds (part-time equivalent)	2,147.50	2,147.50	0.00
Hours entitled per week	15	15	0
Weeks entitled per year	38	38	0
Total initial funding allocation for additional 15 hours entitlement for eligible working parents of 3 and 4 year olds	£6,377,431	£6,450,876	£73,445

	2020/21	2021/22	
2 year old child hours	Current total	Current total	Movement
Hourly rate for 2 year old entitlement	£5.74	£5.82	£0.08
Number for 2 year old entitlement (part-time equivalent)	1,008.80	1,008.80	0.00
Hours entitled per week	15	15	0
Weeks entitled per year	38	38	0
Total initial funding allocation for 2 year old entitlement	£3,300,592	£3,346,594	£46,002

Supplementary funding to Maintained Nursery Schools

3.1 The initial allocation of the Maintained Nursery schools (MNS) budget has remained the same as the 2020/21 budget **£536,405**. However we are expecting this to be reduced once the final allocation is announced and potentially by as

much as 20% given the reduction in actual pupil numbers across the settings. Therefore with this indicative allocation, the options below are to set out the methodology, noting that the actual funding received by the maintained nursery schools will be adjusted accordingly. The intention is for the payment of this funding to be made termly in advance in line with the schools block funding.

3.2 There are two options for the distribution of the funding which will require a decision. Table 4 sets out the amounts that apply for each of the two options.

Option 1 Distribute based on an equal apportionment between the 5 nurseries.

Option 2 Distribute based on the number of funded children as per the census data – pupil numbers rather than the forecast which is overstated in some instances

Table 4: Distribution of MNS supplementary funding

School	Option 1	Option 2	Pupil numbers	Pupil numbers
	£	£	Per census	(forecast)
Crosfield	107,281	164,206	90	95
Purley	107,281	60,209	33	69
Selhurst	107,281	93,050	51	56
Thornton Heath	107,281	87,576	48	114
Tunstall	107,281	131,364	72	93
Total	536,405	536,405	294*	427

* As per the latest schools returns (February 2021) & what the MNS funding will be based on

3.3 The funding amounts are an indicative allocation which is subject to change in line with the actual census data therefore the amounts in table 4 above are not a guarantee of the funding the school will received. The decision is to determine the methodology for distribution.

Schools Forum members are asked to:

1. Note the 2021/22 Early Years budget
2. Agree to the methodology for the distribution of the supplementary funding to Maintained Nursery Schools

ITEM 8

Expansion of the Locality SEND Support Project

Schools Forum – 26 April 2021

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is asked to:-

1. Note the outcomes for the early adopter project
2. Approve the two phase expansion of the project

Members of Forum allowed to vote: - All school and academy members are able to vote. Only early years representatives from non schools members are able to vote. Non-school members even if represented by school staff are not eligible to vote

1. Introduction

1.1 Locality SEND Support (LSS) is now well in to the first academic year of its early adopter programme. The original intention was that the project, if successful, would be rolled out Borough-wide from the 2021-2022 academic year. The early adopter project is now well established and in the first term has demonstrated substantial impact by supporting 136 pupils so far. A full evaluation can only take place at the end of the 2020/21 academic year, however if the project is to be expanded from September 2021 then decisions must be made and budgets set imminently. This proposal sets out to demonstrate the impact and successes of the project so far and to make costed proposals for a two phase expansion roll-out:

- a) **Phase 1** - Increase from four localities to six localities from September 2021
- b) **Phase 2** - Increase from six localities to eight localities from September 2022 which would cover all Croydon mainstream schools.

1.2 Following approval by Croydon School's forum it was agreed to embark on an early adopter pilot to trial a localities based structure for managing youngsters with special educational needs and disabilities in mainstream schools. The project was initiated following a consultation report by Peter Gray which examined a similar project which had been up and running for some years in Nottinghamshire County Council. The early adopter project named 'Locality SEND Support' is running for one academic year from September 2020 to August 2021. The principle of the project was as follows:

- a) The LA will distribute a finite sum of money (based on historical EHCP spend) to each of four pilot Localities, to directly support SEND students, help administer the initiative and to develop good practice;
- b) Each of the pilot Localities will decide how best to spend this resource to support the predictable needs of SEND students in their schools;
- c) Pilot schools are aware that the budget is fixed and finite;
- d) Any applications for EHCPs made during the period of this pilot would be made in the knowledge that such plans would be issued without central resource attached;
- e) Instead, there will be a project budget for High Level (Exceptional) Needs across all four Localities which is again fixed and finite;
- f) An additional Inclusion development grant will be made for each locality to help tackle SEND priorities in their area;
- g) The project is administered by a Consultant lead and Area SEND leads for each locality;

- h) Resources awarded by localities would get to pupils within one month rather than the 20 week period required by the EHCP process;

1.3 Planning for the project started in 2019 with a working group that met regularly at Meridian High School. Draft Localities were proposed and Headteachers were invited to several meetings including a large planning meeting at Norbury Manor Business and Enterprise College to establish interest. Four localities were chosen as a result of this project:

- a) Coulsdon
- b) New Addington
- c) Selsdon
- d) Thornton Heath

1.4 Meetings were held with Headteachers from all schools in the localities. Some schools declined to take part as early adopters for a variety of reasonable reasons but expressed an interest in joining-in any future expansion. Figure 1. shows the final list of schools selected to be early adopter LSS schools

1.5 Early adopter localities and schools

Early Adopter Localities and Schools

Coulsdon

Oasis Academy Coulsdon
 Coulsdon Church of England Primary
 Chipstead Valley Primary
 Oasis Academy Byron
 Woodcote Primary
 Woodcote High School
 Smitham Primary & Nursery
 St Aidan's Catholic Primary School
 New Valley Primary School
 Keston Primary

Selsdon

Gilbert Scott Primary School
 The Quest Academy
 Courtwood Primary School
 Forestdale Primary School
 Greenvale Primary School
 Selsdon Primary School & Nursery
 Gresham Primary
 Atwood Primary Academy

Thornton Heath

NMBEC
 KAPS
 Gonville Primary
 Winterbourne Infants & Nursery School
 Winterbourne Girls
 Winterbourne Boys
 St. Joseph's College
 Norbury Manor Primary

New Addington

Applegarth Academy
 Tudor Academy
 Rowdown Academy
 Meridian High School
 Castle Hill Academy
 Good Shepherd Catholic School
 Fairchildes Primary

1.6 The following graphic shows the time-line of events leading up to the establishment of the project

Time-line of work carried out so far

Date	Activity
October 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-boarding of schools to the project
November 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to Nottinghamshire to look at good practice. Meetings with Locality Heads
December 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conference with Locality heads at NMBEC
January 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final localities confirmed
March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment process for Area SEND Leads Keran Currie & Sonal Desai appointed
August 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keran Currie & Sonal Desai commence work Development of criteria for Locality SEND support resources and funding completed and distributed.
September 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive meetings with Health, Education and other services to explain Locality SEND Support in Early Adopter schools Meetings held with Headteachers & SENDCos from all localities to ensure Early Adopter schools are fully on-board with the Locality SEND Support initiative
October 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms of Reference agreed for all localities First round of locality forums held
November 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools send out parental information on the project Meetings with parental forums to explain the project

January 2021



2 How funding is allocated

- 2.1 The Individual schools will continue to support SEND students through the notional SEND formula in their base budget (£6000). The area SEND Leads have spent a considerable time supporting SENDCos with this.
- 2.2 Beyond the notional funding, local additional resources can be awarded to help support a pupil's predictable needs, this is administered at Locality SEND Forums held monthly and chaired by Sonal or Keran. Funding is taken from each local budget which averages around £137,000 per locality.
- 2.3 Children with exceptional needs will be referred to the next SAG/ERP panel. This is where higher needs block funding may be awarded from a combined budget of £235,000 across all four localities.
- 2.4 In addition, each locality has inclusion development funding of £75,000 for funding general SEND priorities in their locality.

3 Details of allocations in the Autumn term 2020

- 3.1 The following tables (figures III, IV and V) show pupils supported and resource allocations in the early adopter schools made between 1st September and 31st December 2020. All schools have received purchase orders in order for them to be able to invoice for this resource at their earliest convenience. It's been really good to see that the students referred to the High Needs (SAG/ERP) panel have all been awarded resources ahead of formal assessment for EHCPs. This has enabled these youngsters to get the additional help they need much earlier than in the previous system.

Table 1: Overview of support across the localities

Locality	Students supported informally through SENDCo Forums	Pupils awarded with financial resources from Locality Funds	Pupils awarded with financial resources from Higher Needs Funds
Coulsdon	32	4	2
New Addington	31	3	2
Selsdon	27	3	3
Thornton Heath	25	2	2

A total number of 137 students have been supported in the first term of the early adopters' project.

Table 2: Locality funding for predictable needs to 31st March 2021

LAN 9008					
Budget	Coulsdon	N.Add.	Selsdon	T.Heath	Total budget
	£117,648	£176,616	£115,498	£138,411	£548,173
09/11/2020			£2,000		
11/11/2020	£8,000				
07/12/2020			£6,309		
07/12/2020			£1,845		
08/12/2020				£2,600	
08/12/2020				£3,466	
09/12/2020		£8,000			
09/12/2020		£4,000			
09/12/2020		£2,000			
09/12/2020	£2,500				
09/12/2020	£5,034				
09/12/2020	£5,615				
18/01/2021			£5,280		
18/01/2021			£5,280		
19/01/2021				£6,650	
19/01/2021				£6,650	
19/01/2021				£6,650	
19/01/2021				£6,650	
19/01/2021				£6,650	
20/01/2021		£5,333			
20/01/2021		£1,500			
20/01/2021		£4,666			
22/02/2021			£6,408		
22/02/2021			£4,158		
23/02/2021				£6,000	
23/02/2021				£3,000	
23/02/2021				£3,000	
23/02/2021				£3,000	
23/02/2021				£3,000	
23/02/2021				£3,241	
24/02/2021		£1,500			
24/02/2021		£4,040			
24/02/2021		£1,500			
24/02/2021		£600			
24/02/2021		£3,504			
24/02/2021		£3,504			
24/02/2021		£3,504			
24/02/2021	£4,694				
24/02/2021	£1,660				
24/02/2021	£4,696				
24/02/2021	£2,820				
15/03/2021			£950		
15/03/2021			£1,200		
16/03/2021				£2,700	
16/03/2021				£2,700	
16/03/2021				£7,000	
16/03/2021				£4,992	
16/03/2021				£4,475	
17/03/2021		£1,781			
17/03/2021		£3,148			
17/03/2021		£2,376			
17/03/2021		£2,376			
17/03/2021	£4,644				
17/03/2021	£1,300				
Spent	£40,963	£53,332	£33,430	£82,424	Total Remaining Budget

Table 3: High Needs Block Funding and Inclusion Development Funding across the localities to 31st March 2021

A: High level needs

HLN 9009					
	Coulsdon	N.Add.	Selsdon	T.Heath	Total Budget
					£234,932
17/11/2020			£8,246		
30/11/2020			5200		
30/11/2020				£7,203	
30/11/2020		£3,533			
30/11/2020	£5,200				
15/12/2020				£3,533	
15/12/2020		£5,200			
15/12/2020			£5,200		
15/12/2020	£2,600				
Spent	£7,800	£8,733	£18,646	£10,736	Total Remaining Budget £189,017
Awards					
Month	School	Student	Year Group	Payment.	Account Cod Locality
17/11/2020	Forestdale		Yr1	£8,246	9009 Selsdon
30/11/2020	Attwood		Yr1	£5,200	9009 Selsdon
30/11/2020	WINS		YrR	£7,203	9009 TH
30/11/2020	Meridian		Yr8	£3,533	9009 NA
30/11/2020	New valley		Yr1	£5,200	9009 Coulsdon
15/12/2020	NMPS		Yr2	£3,533	9009 TH
15/12/2020	Good Shep		Yr6	£5,200	9009 NA
15/12/2020	Gilbert Sc		Yr4	£5,200	9009 Selsdon
15/12/2020	St Aidan's		YrR	£2,600	9009 Coulsdon

There were no High needs funding applications in January and February 2021

B: Inclusion development Funding.

IDF 9007

	Coulsdon	N.Add.	Selsdon	T.Heath	Total Budget	
	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£300,000	
Mar-21	£900	£900	£900	£900		SALT tutorials
Mar-21	£10,800	£6,750	£8,100	£6,750		SALT assessments
Mar-21	£5,200	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600		Secondary school screeners
Mar-21	£2,250	£1,575	£1,800	£1,800		EP consultations
Mar-21	£2,500	£1,750	£2,000	£2,000		Embracing Social Diversity Consultation/INSET

Spent	£21,650	£13,575	£15,400	£14,050	Total remaining
Remaining	£53,350	£61,425	£59,600	£60,950	£235,325

4 Evaluation of the project so far

4.1 Following the successful implementation of Locality SEND Support over the first two terms of the 2020/2021 academic year, the project has been evaluated against the following criteria:

A. Identification of SEND

- i. Two Area SEND Leads (ASLs) work closely with school SENDCOs to identify emerging need in both primary and secondary mainstream settings. School SENDCOs regularly and often approach the ASLs to discuss cases. The local knowledge of the ASLs with respect to the schools in their localities is invaluable in moderating the level of need. ASLs can and do give advice on how to use notional SEND funding to support these youngsters. They will also recommend if a case needs to be presented at the monthly locality SENDCO forums. Area SEND Leads also work closely with SENDCOs in schools to identify additional strategies and interventions for pupils on school SEND Support registers. (Evidenced by Locality funding for predictable needs table)
- ii. LSS monthly SENDCO Forum meetings allow the sharing of good practice and challenge. Meetings have a collaborative nature focusing on identifying SEND and ensuring support and provision is provided to schools. Cases that have not been dealt with informally are presented to the Forum and subjected to peer to peer support and challenge. Input from outside professionals and headteacher attendance ensures that identification is moderated across schools. (Evidenced by outcome forms from Forum meetings)
- iii. Outcomes from the Forum range from offering further advice and support, sharing good practice and the awarding of resources to allow a particular time-limited intervention to help meet a youngster's need. (Evidenced by outcome forms from Forum meetings)
- iv. Regular communications with the community in which each locality serves, including parent/carers, teachers and professionals ensure that all stakeholders are fully informed of how need is identified and the graduated approach in the LSS programme.
- v. All Schools have completed a SEND audit which have been discussed and identify areas of strengths and development. Gaps in provision are addressed through training sessions during Forum meetings or by commissioning additional services such as SALT and EP provision. (Evidenced by analysis document of SEND audits)
- vi. We are striving to be more involved and communicative with parental groups to ensure their understanding of the rationale of the LSS project in terms of identifying and meeting need. In order to achieve this, we have collaborated with local parent groups such as PIP and SENDIASS through webinars. Parents were grateful for their questions being answered and for their concerns being addressed. (Evidenced by PowerPoint slides from webinars)
- vii. We have continued to inform all services supporting children and young people about the LSS objectives. These colleagues now understand that, early intervention and rapid response to meet the needs of the young people without the immediate need to consider EHCNAs are integral to the LSS project

B. Assessment and meeting needs

- i. Area SEND Leads are providing strategic support for individual schools and are promoting joint working through the Locality SENDCO Forum. Pupils are presented at the forums and their needs assessed by the SENDCOs, Headteachers and professionals present. Immediate resource or advice is given to address and meet the need with funding getting to schools within 30 days. (Evidenced by Locality funding for predictable needs table)
- ii. Thorough assessment of need at locality level and early completion of paperwork ensure that if the pupil has to be assessed for an EHCP the process can begin in a timely manner.
- iii. The flexibility of the LSS project enables youngsters to receive funding whilst waiting for an EHP assessment enabling their needs to be met as soon as possible and before the situation deteriorates. (Evidenced by the Needs Block Funding table)
- iv. Work has begun with the Early Years team to consider the scope of a further roll out of Locality Send Support to consider EYS children.
- v. Discussions have begun with Specialist Provisions to consider a centralised outreach programme through LSS
- vi. The project budget is fixed, so there is a need keep focused on the most needy cases and use resources wisely. Analysis shows that the funding has been distributed equitably between the localities and there is sufficient budget left for supporting expected demand for pupils in the summer term. The project has had a significant positive effect on the reduction in Croydon's High needs overspend. (Evidenced by Locality funding for predictable needs table)

- vii. Other agencies and professionals now join the Forum meetings to ensure a multi-disciplinary approach to meeting the needs of children and young people with the most complex needs. These pupils are well supported by e.g. Virtual school, SALT and EP and health services.
- viii. We have continued to inform all services supporting children and young people about the LSS objectives. These colleagues now understand that, early intervention and rapid response to meet the needs of the young people without the immediate to consider EHCNAs are integral to the LSS project.
- ix. Area SEND leads have worked with HTs and SENDCos to develop a package of support to enable schools to provide services which they currently consider to be their top priorities to meet SEND needs within their schools. Complimentary services requested are SALT, EP, and ASD/ Behaviour outreach (Embracing Social Diversity) which have been made available since March 2021. (Evidenced by the Inclusion Development Grant funding table)

C. Improving outcomes

- i. Area SEND Leads have spent time supporting new and individual SENDCos in their roles in order to improve outcomes for young people with SEND. Support includes CPD for SENDCos and TAs, provision of material and resources, liaising with members of the SEND team to expedite or verify SEND outcomes for pupils and supporting with parent communication. (evidenced by outcome forms for schools & parents)
- ii. Area SEND Leads are actively taking part in the SEND transformation working parties and parental forums across the LA to ensure good communication and to guarantee that the project objectives and outcomes are shared with all professionals and stakeholders in a timely manner. (evidenced by minutes of working groups)
- iii. Participating schools have, in the main, been fair and equitable with regard to improving outcomes for youngsters with SEND within their locality. No school or locality have dominated spending and schools understand that they are responsible for all SEND youngsters in their area. (Evidenced by Locality funding for predictable needs table)
- iv. The NHS SALT service and LSS project are working together to roll –out the Oracy Project: 'Let's Get Talking' within 20 locality schools focusing on better universal and targeted approaches to meeting young peoples' SALT needs and improving outcomes within schools. This project is delivered by the SALT Therapy assistants who are currently training identified school staff to run the project with young people in their own setting. This is in addition to the schools allocated SALT provision. (Evidenced by training records)
- v. A package of support has been rolled-out to enable schools to provide services which they currently consider to be their top priorities to meet SEND needs within their schools. Complimentary services such as SALT, EP, and ASD/ Behaviour outreach are improving outcomes since March 2021. (Evidenced by the Inclusion Development Grant funding table)
- vi. Evidence of improving outcomes by providing timely and appropriate local support for pupils with emerging special needs can be seen by a significant drop in the number of pupils requiring EHCP assessment. This figure has **reduced by 47%** since the project commenced. (Evidenced by EHCP assessment data)
- vii. Testimonials from SENDCos, Parents and Headteachers are evidence of improved outcomes for SEND students attending schools participating in the LSS project. (evidenced by stakeholder comments)

D. Comments from stakeholders, Headteachers, parents and SENDCos

D1: Headteachers:

- i. "The Area SEND Leads' work has been excellent. They have struck the right balance between support and challenge and have been able to work really quickly in building up a super rapport with a wide range of schools and SENDCos, all of differencing experiences and competencies"
- ii. "Our school have been part of the SEN inclusion pilot from the beginning. We are already seeing the benefits of having the opportunity to discuss our pupils' needs with like-minded colleagues. The oversight of our locality lead has been particularly helpful in supporting us through the process and supporting us around how we can best meet the needs of our pupils.. Panel meetings have provided the school with support, suitable challenge, as well as

the resource to support individuals within our school. These pupils may not have been in a position to receive the support quite as promptly if using the previous process of requesting support. We are grateful to have been part of the programme thus far and look forward to being part of it in the future."

- iii. "The Area SEND Leads have done some super strategic work in terms of holding various 1 to 1s with SENDCOs and carried out the audits- this is probably the first time such an overview has been gained as to provision etc. across the locality. Good support & challenge has been provided as well as a mine of useful information and good suggestions for when SENDCOs are 'stuck'. The strong networking within the locality and the amount of engagement and collaboration has been great and I'm sure this has made the SENDCOs feel supported and part of something bigger."
- iv. "The biggest positive of the SEN localities pilot has been that it has given my SENDCO a network of highly skilled peers to share strategies with. As a one form entry school, (where our SENDCO has historically worked predominantly in isolation) the sharing of knowledge and strategies has been just as powerful as the acquisition of funding. Having an expert lead SENDCO, with the knowledge and ability to signpost previously untapped resources and strategies has also been invaluable."
- v. "Benefit- 'Individual student funding has been accessible without an EHCP"
- vi. "We were awarded immediate financial support for a child with complex needs from the locality SEND funding"
- vii. "Access to necessary financial resources for individual children much more straight forward"
- viii. "Ability to speak with colleagues from different school settings to get support and advice."

D2: Parents

- i. "I think this is a good project and fully support the initiative going forward, thank you."
- ii. "This has undoubtedly given us a real chance of specialist treatment in what seems to be a narrow availability of treatment which would otherwise be out of our reach, but could literally be life changing and determine our child's future. It has also given us hope and much needed support in such a stressful and emotional time."
- iii. "By having 1-1 supporting my child and helping to engage in the lessons at a level he can cope with. And giving him time to complete a task to help him interact with other children and learn to play as a group"
- iv. "I feel this will help enable him to progress on positively for his future goals."
- v. "To continue doing what they are doing, with the effort and resources not only that they already have, but if needed and especially when quite specific - additionally sourced."

D3: SENDCOs

- i. "The structure of the locality forum allows schools to access additional support and funding for pupils in a much more efficient and effective way, getting resources into school quickly so that SEN pupils have the tools they need to thrive."
- ii. "This new approach allows SENDCOs to be creative, innovative and dynamic when planning strategically to meet the whole SEN school needs while also personalising provision for individuals."
- iii. "I feel the locality has allowed us to be creative with how we approach and use funding, looking at the needs of children as a whole rather than on an individual basis."
- iv. "As a new SENDCO it has been nice having regular meetings with other schools and SENDCO's as well as experienced professionals."
- v. "The forum has been a positive experience so far...hearing cases from other schools, sharing practice and the secondary transfer opportunities are going to be invaluable."

D4: Challenges and EBI's

- i. Localities are financially responsible for the SEND pupils in their schools and have no further recourse to LA SEND funding even if an EHCP is issued.
- ii. Budgets given to Localities are realistic, but fixed. To avoid overspends, these funds must be managed in accordance with needs.
- iii. Some SENDCos have been concerned that the paperwork required ahead of Locality forums impacts on workload. The Area SEND leads are mindful of this and will support when needed.
- iv. Parents and parent groups of pupils already in possession of EHCPs feared that these would be withdrawn at the next review. However the LA is responsible for the continuing support of pupils awarded EHCPs before the project commenced.
- v. Some professionals at monthly forum meetings have suggested there can be a lack of challenge between SENDCos when making resourcing decisions. As a result the challenge provided by the Headteacher present as well as the Area SEND Lead and LSS Consultant Lead who attend the meetings has been stepped up.
- vi. There have been concerns raised by SAG and ERP panels that the project is inconsistent with the traditional way of doing things and is creating a two tier system. There is some truth in this because of the innovative ways of working within the project. However once all schools are on-board this inconsistency will even out.
- vii. There were initial concerns that some schools might dominate their Localities and obtain more than their fair share of funding. Careful monitoring has shown this not to be the case.
- viii. Parental groups worried that pupils would lose out if they had a resource awarded by the Locality and subsequently moved to a school outside of that Locality.
- ix. In the early stages of the early adopter project there were concerns about communication with parents to enable them to fully understand how the project works. Work is ongoing to improve this.
- x. There were some early delays to receiving funding due to the spending control panel and payment systems. These have been mainly overcome.
- xi. There were GDPR concerns regarding discussing sensitive cases and sharing information. An updated privacy notice has now been agreed.
- xii. Some schools are frustrated that we are unable to support pupils who live out of borough. Although financial support is not available, advice and support from the Area SEND Leads is still forthcoming.

5 Financial benefits

5.3 Early data is showing that the project is having a significant effect in reducing the number of EHCPs in early adopter schools. The table below shows the number of agreed assessments for EHCPs during the months of September to February for the last three academic years.

Table 4:

	Coulsdon	Selsdon	Thornton Heath	New Addington	Totals
2018/2019 Sept – Feb	2 for Chipstead 1 for Byron 1 for New Valley 1 for Keston = 5	12 for Gilbert Scott 1 for Forestdale 2 for Atwood = 15	3 for Kensington Avenue 15 for Winterbourne I&NS 1 for Winterbourne JGS = 19	1 for Tudor Academy 1 for Rowdown 1 for Castle Hill 2 for Fairchildes = 5	44
2019/2020 Sept – Feb	1 from Oasis Academy Coulsdon 2 from Coulsdon C of E Primary 1 from Chipstead 2 from Woodcote Primary 1 from Woodcote High 2 from New Valley Primary 2 from Keston Primary = 11	1 from Forestdale Primary 4 from Atwood Primary = 5	1 from NMBEC 1 for Gonville Academy 1 from Winterbourne I&NS 3 from Norbury Manor Primary = 6	5 for Tudor Academy 1 for Rowdown Primary 3 for Meridian High School 1 for Castle Hill 3 for Fairchildes = 13	35
2020/2021 Sept – Feb	1 for Oasis Academy Coulsdon 1 for Smitham Primary 1 for St Aidan's 1 for New Valley = 4	1 for Gilbert Scott 2 for the Quest Academy 1 for Gresham Primary 1 for Atwood Primary = 5	1 for NMBEC 1 for Kensington Avenue 1 for Winterbourne I&NS 1 for Winterbourne JGS = 4	2 for Applegarth Academy 3 for Tudor Academy 1 for Rowdown Primary 1 for Meridian High School 1 for Fairchildes = 8	21

Average of 2018/2019 & 2019/2020 = 40 Number for 2020/2021 = 21

Decrease = 19

Figure VI. shows that EHCP assessments have dropped by 47% since the project was initiated

5.2 Financial data submitted to the ESFA demonstrating the impact of the DSG recovery Plan (of which LSS is a key strategy) shows that expenditure on both EHCPs and placing students in private sector settings is decreasing. This has led to a reduction in the overall deficit.

Table 5: Showing a decrease in the High Needs Overspend since the 2020/2021 academic year

High Needs Overspend	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
	£'m	£'m	£'m	£'m
Financial Year 2018/19	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.6
Financial Year 2019/20*	6.7	6.6	7.1	6.7
Financial Year 2020/21	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5**

*exc Schools Block transfer

**P10 forecast

5.3 This table shows the impact of the DSG recovery plan, including LSS on reducing the overspend on High Needs pupils and is in line with the decrease in EHCP assessments for LSS early adopter localities outlined in figure VI.

5.4 The positive impacts of the LSS outlined above, in terms of the number of students who have benefitted from the project, testimonials from stakeholders, the case studies and the financial benefits demonstrate beyond question that there is a significant case for expanding the project across the London Borough of Croydon. The proposal for such an expansion is outlined in section 6 below.

6 Proposal for expansion from September 2021 onwards

6.1 There are **two** phases for expansion of the project proposed:

- a) **Phase 1** - Increase from four localities to six localities from September 2021
- b) **Phase 2** - Increase from six localities to eight localities from September 2022 which would cover all Croydon mainstream schools.

6.2 In order to cost these two phases all Croydon mainstream schools have been allocated to one of eight localities. The proposed locality structure would be as follows (Key: *Existing locality **Proposed Locality)

- a) Coulsdon*
- b) New Addington*
- c) Selsdon*
- d) Thornton Heath*
- e) Central Croydon**
- f) Norwood**
- g) Purley**
- h) Shirley**

The allocation of schools to these localities is shown in tables 6 & 7 below

7 Proposed LSS Localities for roll-out from September 2021

Table 6 Expansion of existing Localities

Key *Secondary Schools. Additional schools in the locality rolled out from September 2021

<u>Coulsdon: 14 Schools</u>	<u>Selsdon: 10 Schools</u>	<u>New Addington: 7 Schools</u>	<u>Thornton Heath 16 Schools</u>
Area SEND lead SD	Area SEND Lead SD	Area SEND Lead KC	Area SEND Lead KC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Oasis Academy Coulsdon • Coulsdon Church of England Primary • Chipstead Valley Primary • Oasis Academy Byron • Woodcote Primary • *Woodcote High School • Smitham Primary & Nursery • St Aidan's Catholic Primary School • New Valley Primary School • Keston Primary • Beaumont Primary School • Harris Primary Academy Kenley • The Hayes Primary • Kenley Primary School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gilbert Scott Primary School • The Quest Academy • Courtwood Primary School • Forestdale Primary School • Greenvale Primary School • Selsdon Primary School & Nursery • Gresham Primary • Atwood Primary Academy • Ridgeway Primary School • *Riddlesdown Collegiate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applegarth Academy • Tudor Academy • Rowdown Academy • *Meridian High School • Castle Hill Academy • Good Shepherd Catholic School • Fairchildes Primary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *NMBEC • KAPS • Gonville Primary • Winterbourne Infants & Nursery School • Winterbourne Girls • Winterbourne Boys • *St. Joseph's College • Norbury Manor Primary • West Thornton Primary Academy • Paxton Academy • Ecclesbourne Primary Academy • Chestnut Park Primary • St Cyprian's Greek Orthodox Primary School • Downs view Primary School • *The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy

Table 7 New localities

Central Croydon: 15 schools	Norwood: 18 schools	Purley: 15 Schools	<u>Shirley: 17 Schools</u>
Area SEND Lead SD	Area SEND Lead TBA	Area SEND Lead TBA	Area SEND Lead KC
Roll-out Phase 1 September 2021	Roll-out Phase 2 September 2022	Roll-out Phase 2 September 2022	Roll-out Phase 1 September 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crescent Primary School • Broadmead Primary Academy • Elmwood Infant School • Elmwood Junior School • Heathfield Academy • The Woodside Academy • Davidson Academy • The Robert Fitzroy Academy • ARK Oval Primary Academy • St Mary's RC Infant School • St Mary's RC Junior School • *St Mary's RC High School • *Harris Invictus Academy • Kingsley Primary Academy • *ARK Blake Academy • Brit School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Virgo Fidelis Covent RC Senior School) • St Joseph's RC Infant School • St Joseph's RC Junior School • Rockmount Primary School • *Harris Academy South Norwood • All Saints C of E Primary School • *Harris City Academy Crystal Palace • Cypress Primary School • David Livingstone Academy • St James the Great RC Primary School • Beulah Junior School • Beulah Nursery and Infant Academy • Whitehorse Manor Infant Academy • Whitehorse Manor Junior Academy • St Chad's RC Primary School • Heavers Farm Primary and Nursery School • St Mark's C of E Primary School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Minster Junior School • The Minster Nursery and Infant School • Krishna Avanti Primary • Howard Primary School • Harris Primary Academy Purley Way • Harris Primary Academy Haling Park • Aerodrome Primary Academy • Regina Coeli RC Primary School • St Peter's Primary School • Purley Oaks Primary School • Margaret Roper RC Primary School • Christ Church C of E Primary School • *Thomas More RC School • *Harris Academy Purley • *Coombe Wood School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Norwood Primary Academy • Oasis Academy Ryelands • St Thomas Becket RC Primary School • Park Hill Infant School • Park Hill Junior School • Orchard Way Primary School • Harris Academy Benson • St John's C of E Primary School • Forest Primary Academy • *Archbishop Tenison's C of E High School • Monks Orchard Primary and Nursery School • *Oasis Academy Arena • Oasis Academy Shirley Park • *Shirley High School Performance Arts College • *Orchard Park High School • *Coloma Covent RC Girls' School

8 Leadership of the widened project

8.1 The leadership of the project would vary slightly from phase 1 to phase 2 to allow for capacity.

- a) **Phase 1 - From September 2021** - It is proposed that the two existing Area SEND Leads expand their working time from 0.6 to 1.0 fte each. This will allow them to take on one additional locality each and look after the expanded existing locality areas. (see allocations in the table above) The consultant LSS Lead will need to increase in fte from 0.3 to 0.4 but can be reduced to a term time only contract (38 weeks)
- b) **Phase 2 – from September 2022** – Once phase 2 is in operation the two existing Area SEND Leads will not have the capacity to manage eight localities. From September 2022 it is proposed

that a part-time assistant Area SEND Lead would need to be recruited (0.3 fte) to support with the capacity required to lead the additional localities on-boarded in September 2022 (Norwood & Purley). The consultant LSS Lead will need to increase in fte from 0.4 to 0.6 in September 2022 but can remain a term time only contract (38 weeks).

- 8.2 This phasing would provide cost effective leadership of the expanded LSS project without increasing the Croydon LA headcount until September 2022. The current Leadership of the Area SEND Leads has been widely praised by many stakeholders. Headteachers especially have said that they don't want any potential expansion to impact on the good relationships already established with school SENDCOs and the ability for them to have to have frequent contact with the Area SEND leads. This day-to-day support has been valued by school SENDCOs.

9 Budget for the expanded project

- 9.1 **Existing budget.** The costs of the early adopters' project in 2020-2021 were as follows:

Table 8

Locality Cluster	Coulsdon 10 schools	Selsdon 8 schools	New Addington 7 schools	Thornton Heath 7 schools	Total
Inclusion Development Funding*	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£300,000
Locality Additional Needs Funding *20%* new money premium	£117,648	£115,498	£176,616	£138,411	£548,173
High Level Needs Funding *20%* new money premium	£234,932.00				£234,932
Locality Network Funding (leadership) Inc. locality SEN lead and SENDCo cover*	£35,000	£35,000	£35,000	£35,000	£140,000
Existing budget			New Money		
Grand total £1,223,105			New Money total £596,620		

- 9.2 The formula used to generate the budget for the early adopter schools and localities, was based on historic SEND costings for each locality. The average costs for issuing new ECHPs over the last three years was calculated and a premium of 20% was added. This was then split into 70% for Predictable needs, which was allocated to each locality and 30% for Higher (exceptional needs) which was kept in a central pot for all early adopter schools to bid for.
- 9.3 In order to cost both expansion options (A and B) the same calculation was carried out for all mainstream schools in Croydon over the academic years 2017-2018, 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. The spreadsheet showing this calculation can be seen in Appendix 1 (attached to this document). The spreadsheet has also allocated each school to one of the eight proposed localities. These historic figures have been applied to cost each of the options in the following tables:
- 9.4 Locality SEND Support – Phase 1 Budget (partial expansion to 6 localities from September 2021)

Table 9

Locality Cluster	Coulsdon 14 schools	Selsdon 10 schools	New Addington 7 schools	Thornton Heath 16 schools	Central Croydon 15 Schools	Shirley 17 Schools	Totals
Inclusion Development Funding (£600k)	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£450,000
Locality Additional Needs Funding(predictable needs)*	£217,629	£234,163	£152,398	£306,678	£290,821	£365,033	£1,566,722
Higher needs Funding (Exceptional needs)*	£93,269	£100,355	£65,314	£131,434	£124,637	£156,443	£671,452
Leadership funding (see figure IX)	£41,822	£41,822	£41,822	£41,822	£41,822	£41,822	£250,930
SENDCo cover (see figure IX)	£7,000	£5,000	£3,500	£8,000	£7,500	£8,500	£39,500

*includes funding premium of £447,635

Grand total £2,978,604

New Money total £1,188,065

Table 10

Locality SEND Support – Phase 2 Budget (full expansion to 8 localities from September 2022)

Locality Cluster	Coulsdon 14 schools	Selsdon 10 schools	New Addington 7 schools	Thornton Heath 16 schools	Central Croydon 15 Schools	Norwood 18 schools	Purley 15 schools	Shirley 17 Schools	Totals
Inclusion Development Funding (£600k)	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£600,000
Locality Additional Needs Funding(predictable needs)*	£217,629	£234,163	£152,398	£306,678	£290,821	£276,784	£258,311	£365,033	£2,101,817
Higher needs Funding (Exceptional needs)*	£93,269	£100,355	£65,314	£131,434	£124,637	£118,622	£110,705	£156,443	£900,779
Leadership funding (see figure IX)	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£38,849	£310,795
SENDCo cover (See figure IX)	£7,000	£5,000	£3,500	£8,000	£7,500	£9,000	£7,500	£8,500	£56,000

*includes funding premium of £500,443

Grand total £3,969,391

New Money total £1,467,23

10 Leadership Budget

Table 11

	Phase 1 (2021)	Phase2 (2022)
Area SEND Leads (L26) 2 X £81,372	£162,744	£162,744
Consultant Lead	£38,000	£57,000

Assistant Area SEND Leads M6+ TLR2 (0.6 fte)	£0	£28,892
25% On-costs	£50,186	£62,159
Total	£250,930	£310,795
SENDCO Cover for meetings (£50 X 10 meetings)	£39,500	£56,000
Grand total	£287,430	£366,795

11. Summary

11.1 The budget costs of the Phased rollout in terms of total costs and transformation funding required (new money) are as follows:

Table 12 – summary of costs

Scheme	Total cost of the project	Transformation funding (TF) required	TF for 21/22 financial year
Existing pilot 2020-2021	£1,223,105	£596,620	£248,592
Phase 1 2021-2022	£2,978,604	£1,188,065	£693,038
Phase 2 2022 - 2023	£3,969,391	£1,467,238	
Total			£941,630

11.2 When considering the cost of expansion of the project it is important to consider the following factors:

- Funding for Locality additional needs and for higher needs is based on historical SEND spend and is not new money
- In order to pump prime the project a “transformation” premium of 20% was added on to the historical spend. For any expansion, consideration could be to be given to any decision to maintain the 20% premium, reduce it to 10% or remove the premium entirely.
- Again in order to facilitate the project an Inclusion Development Grant of £75,000 per locality was awarded. Decisions could be made about the sustainability of this grant.
- Consideration needs to be given to subsequent years 'costs for each locality as the calculations are all based on new EHCPs and not existing ones.
- The original proposal set aside £600K for inclusion development across groups of schools and implemented from September 2021 across all Croydon mainstream schools (assuming engagement in cluster/locality group partnership work).

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is asked to:-

- Note the outcomes for the early adopter project
- Approve the two phase expansion of the project

Mark Southworth

Locality SEND Support Consultant Lead
19 April 2021

EARLY YEARS WORKING PARTY

Tuesday 23 February 2021

Via Microsoft Teams

Attendees:		
Theresa Staunton (TS) Chair	PVI representative on Schools Forum	√
Gill Bates (GB)	Best Start EY Market & Sufficiency Manager	√
Denise Bushay (DB)	Schools Places & Admissions Head of Service	X
Roger Capham (RC)	Director PACE Academy Trust	X
Paula Carter (PC)	Gingerbread Corner	√
Jane Charman (JC)	Head Teacher, Park Hill Infants	X
Shelley Davies (SD)	Director of Education	X
Orlagh Guarnori (OG)	Local Authority Finance Manager	√
Polly Jones (PJ)	Head of Purley Nursery	X
Chris Marchant (CM)	Goslings Pre-School	X
Linda O'Callaghan (LOC)	St Mary's Infant School	X
Yetty Osonaike (YO)	Alpha Day Nursery	X
Asim Saleem (AS)	Local Authority Accountant	√
Jaqi Stevenson (JS)	Executive HT, Federation of Crosfield & Selhurst Nursery Schools & Children's Centres	√
John Voytal (JV)	Local Authority Finance Manager	X
G. Truss	Note Taker	√

MEMBERS ATTENDING THIS MEETING HAVE BEEN MADE AWARE IT IS BEING RECORDED AND THAT THE RECORDING WILL BE DELETED ONCE MINUTES ARE TRANSCRIBED

1	Apologies and welcome	
	Apologies received from Shelley Davies, Denise Bushay, Jane Charman, Polly James, Chris Marchant, Linda O'Callaghan, Yetty Osonaike and John Voytal. Roger Capham had IT difficulties and could not join the meeting.	
2	Minutes and actions	
	The minutes were agreed. Update on Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still working on SEN query providing breakdown on 5% top slice. Once finalised it will be circulated to group ahead of next meeting. • OG updated on November payment, funds were paid and have reverted to previous procedure i.e. included within monthly EY payments. • Update on collection of Covid-19 data. All PVI settings are open. Covid adjustment has been processed. An email was sent to settings who may be in deficit, to give them advance warning that their spring adjustment may be a return. There has been significant less pupil numbers this term. • Best Start paper will be presented at next meeting. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) to be given next meeting from Chris Marchant; JS also attends when possible and next meeting is 25th Feb. Underspend of DAF – to be discussed in Sufficiency paper. <p>ACTION: Arrange a meeting for 23 March 2021 – GB</p>	
3	Covid 19/Funding update	SD/DB
	To be presented at next Early Years Working Party meeting.	
4	Finance update	OG/AS
	<p>AS presented Excel spreadsheet on Year To Date Actuals. However figures will change as not all autumn payments are included nor Spring childminders as they do not set predictive budgets so the predicted underspend will decrease. In addition the top slice should include the extended hours.</p> <p>Q1: TS asked if the autumn term funding included the Covid-19 adjustment.</p> <p>A1: AS said no these are just the autumn figures and did not include Covid-19 adjustments.</p> <p>TS: Pupil numbers for spring will be down. The top slice has already been allocated and may need to be revised downwards. Another underspend in DAF is likely, as expected.</p> <p>Q2: PC asked if there would be a Covid adjustment for the spring term</p> <p>A2: GB said there would not be any Covid adjustment – it was back to 'business as usual'. Nurseries also have to be mindful that similar to autumn there will be a spring return adjustment.</p> <p>TS said the government has requested settings to be open but there is no provision to support early years - we are a forgotten section. Croydon relies on the PVI and maintained nursery schools to meet their sufficiency duties.</p> <p>GB asked if a finance paper could be circulated as although a report is shared on screen during the meeting there is no actual document circulated which can be saved alongside the minutes.</p> <p>A budget paper will go to Schools Forum. Please could this be forwarded to Gill Bates so they can accompany the minutes when they are circulated.</p> <p>ACTION: Finance paper to be forward to Gill Bates for inclusion with minutes.</p> <p>Table 1: Early Years Updated Budget 2020/21 spread sheet was put on screen.</p> <p>Table 2: Budget Movement Illustrated the increase of the new hourly rate based on the Early Years national funding formula for 2, 3, 4 year olds.</p> <p>Table 4: Distribution of MHS supplementary funding gives 2 options for the distribution of supplementary funding for maintained nursery schools.</p>	

	<p>OG said the indicative budget for maintained nursery schools was released in December and remains the same at £536,405 The Early Years working group needs to decide on the distribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 distribution based on an equal apportionment between the 5 nurseries • Option 2 distribution based on the number of funded children as per the census data. <p>Using option 2 we will have to further discuss on what pupil data we take. In 20/21 the distribution used Spring 20 pupil numbers.</p> <p>OG This is an indicative budget. We are asking for an agreement on the methodology on how it will be distribution rather than the amount. Once agreement on methodology has been reached we will be in a position to distribute the final allocation quickly. However this allocation is based on children attending and all five maintained nurseries have seen a fall in numbers therefore the likelihood is that the supplement will reduce.</p> <p>ACTION: Bring this back in EY March meeting with indicative figures as currently MNS have 427 children i.e. down by 108 or 20%</p>	
6	Sufficiency update	GB
	<p>The government has publicised new hourly funding rates for 2021/22 for 2 and 3YO children - 2YO now £5.82, up from £5.74 and 3YO now £5.27 up from £5.21.</p> <p>Whilst the new 2 YO rate does not require a decision from this working party a decision has to be on the 3YO rate as the rate is top sliced by 5% Historically 1.5% was held back for a deprivation uplift for those children who would qualify, distribution was based on children on roll in December and using post codes. Last year the deprivation funding was shared out based to all children in receipt of EYPP. This is an effective way of distribution as settings will know which children should receive it and they should be able to use this money to close the gap. Last year was not a normal year due to Covid-19 and it was difficult to gauge how effective it has been. More PVI settings are claiming EYPP and by extension deprivation.</p> <p>Traditionally EYPP was predominately paid out to school sector as they could discharge duties easier than settings in terms of what had been done with the money. This is a more effective methodology. The drawback with this new method is reliant on selecting a deprivation amount which will come within budget at end of year but we will not know the total number of children to claim for. We are underspent this year but this underspend should be passed out to the market, pro rata, at the end of spring term.</p> <p>TS said due to lack of information we should support the current methodology as there is not enough information to gauge whether effective. Next year we will have 2 years' worth of data to look at.</p> <p>Q24 TS asked how much deprivation had been spent so far.</p> <p>A4: GB said £172,670.70 has been spent but there is another term to go.</p>	

GB added the numbers continue to raise. The new rate for 3YO is £5.27 and the options are:

£5.27 x 93.5% = £4.93 and a deprivation pot of £389,249 or
£5.27 x 93.75% = £4.94 and a deprivation pot of £324,374 or
£5.27 x 94% = £4.95 and a deprivation pot of £259,499

PC: said that last year was so unusual that any figures we have will be irrelevant it may be best to stick with 1.5%

JS: said she would agree. Last year this subject was discussed in depth but this year we do not have enough evidence to change the amount. Let's stay at 1.5%. Thank you Gill for providing different models and options for us to consider.

GB: the 6p increase we had in the early rate will be passed on in its entirety we will now go to £4.93 – which will send a positive message.

Q5: TS asked if we process the whole 6p onto the hourly rate do we have to take some of the 6p - will some of that go in the 5%?

A5: GB said the rate is £5.27 we have to pass 95% out to the sector. We are passing 93.5 % out and keeping the 1.5% back for deprivation and if not all spent then it will be shared out at the end – therefore it will all be passed, this is our duty to pass on 95%.we don't need to worry about top slice at this stage.

Q6: TS asked in the budget for next year the increase reflects the 6p - is there any way of setting the early years' top slice at slightly less than 5%. The minimum we have to pass is 95% is there any room for us getting more than 95% this year, other boroughs don't take the full 5% this is a finance question as we automatically set the budget deducting 5%.

A6: OG said the guidance informs us that we must passport through 95% and 5% is held back and used to fund other activities – if at any point the 5% has not been utilised it goes back and can be used to be distributed to the settings. So far all of the 5% has been accounted for. With the reduced numbers the 5% top slice will be lower and therefore less funding will be available for central services.

TS: Finance information is key. There has already been a change to Best Start and we need to know what the impact will be in terms of the 5% as this is no longer a commissioned service.

GB said those questions should be addressed in the paper on Best Start. We pay £329K for Best Start and as this service has now come in-house, it is currently unclear if there is really any saving but we need further information. We need to know the plan going forward but it is understood that it is 'business as usual' up to March 2021.

The indicative budget is based on July figures. Census figures are not finalised but the numbers are down for 2YO and also our 3 and 4YOs. We need to be mindful when we set our own internal budget there will be less money coming in July as the numbers of children will shrink.

Decision: The majority voted for £4.93 rate.

Disability Access Fund (DAF) underspend

We are still awaiting clarity on the DAF underspend of £50,430 offer. This is 2019/20 money and it should not be held for another year due to non-agreement on its disbursement. As this is Early Years DAF money a new suggestion is that a Covid payment could be made to SEN children who have received funding from April 2020 through to now. If this money was divided between everyone in the market place there would be no benefit to SEN children therefore the solution is to offer this as a Covid SEN Uplift for SEN children. There will be another DAF underspend in 20/21 therefore 19/20 really needs to be distributed.

TS: just to qualify, the EYWG originally proposed using the 19/20 DAF underspend to support inclusion work but the impact of Covid-19 delayed this. Then the Early Years High Needs team made a request to use the DAF money for equipment, wheelchair repairs etc. but this should be met by ordinarily available High Needs budget. They also proposed offering additional support to specialist EY settings, maintained nursery schools and PVI's due to the additional demands around PPE and extra support needed for children with SEND to access during the pandemic. Unfortunately this sector has not been able to access the government grant offered to schools to meet these additional cost and as such reducing these costs would be an acceptable use of the DAF underspend.

PC: I am in agreement – if it were given to all children and not just SEN children it would have limited impact but if going only to SEN children will have a positive impact on the right children.

OG: it is using the old financial year funds which we need to disperse so we do not run the risk of it becoming a bigger pot which will get swallowed up into something else.

JS: I am in agreement – good way forward. There will be some children who are eligible for DAF but their cognitive development is in line with expectations and they should be included.

DECISION:

The Chair looks to process this once we get figures. There are some children who get DAF money but don't get SEN, they should also be included.

To date High Needs payments have been made to approximately 100 children but more are expected in March and there have been 33 claims for DAF so the amount per child will be around £400.

Funding Sheets on SharePoint

Confirmation is required from the meeting that they can all access the funding sheets on SharePoint. It was emphasised it is the settings responsibility to look at their funding spread sheets on a monthly basis so they know what monies they are getting.

	<p>Following a technical issue in the system in February funding has got mixed up and may lead to future confusion. It is the responsibility of each provider to check their funding spread sheets and they should log into the new system to check the breakdown of their payment.</p> <p>PC: I have not logged on the link and access the funding sheet but I am aware of how much money I should get. The original link and has expired and cannot access it. I will contact the council to get access.</p>	
7	Early Years SEND Team update (termly, so expected in March)	SEND
8	Any other business	All
	<p>PC asked about the Spring Term adjustment – is there any way Croydon can support the settings by not clawing everything back at the same time.</p> <p>GB: said it would be very difficult as when payments are set up and paid out it is difficult to modify amounts on a monthly basis.</p> <p>OG said there are consequences for school nurseries setting a deficit budget and a 5 year business plan is needed. We have a SMRA appointed by the DfE who could go in to nurseries and review and make adjustments and recommendation with them on where cuts could be made. A deficit budget is not for the faint hearted.</p> <p>TS said if payment is not recouped right away then we run the risk of settings closing without making the payment and other settings would have to cover the non-payment. We do try to get all working money out to the settings and we have to hope the children will come back. We are at the end of the 3 year birth growth rate.</p> <p>TS said that nurseries will be Flow Tested from 22 March to PVI but childminders are not included.</p> <p>MEETING FINISHED AT 11.22AM</p>	
AGREED ACTIONS		
	SEN query providing breakdown on 5% top slice. Paper to be circulated to group ahead of next meeting.	Orlagh Guarnori
	Best Start paper will be presented at next meeting	Denise Bushay
	Meeting in March to be arranged	Gill Bates
	Feedback from All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) to be given next meeting	Chris Marchant
	Presented finance spreadsheet to be forward for inclusion with minutes.	Asim Saleem
	Paper with pupil numbers for MNS so distribution of supplementary funding can be agreed for 21/22; this is needed for Schools Forum	Gill Bates & Asim Saleem

2020/21 meeting dates:

All meetings run on Tuesdays from 10.00 a.m. till 12.00 p.m. and will be via Microsoft Teams until such time as Bernard Weatherill House is fully open.

23rd March 2021 (new!); 25th May 2021 and 6th July 2021

Schools Block Working Group

Minutes of Meeting

Date: Tuesday 9 February 2021
Venue: VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
Time: 10am – 12 noon

Please note the recording of this meeting will be deleted once minutes are processed.

Invited:

Vivienne Esparon (**VE**) Forestdale Primary School
 Orlagh Guarnori (**OG**) LBC Finance Manager
 Soumick Dey (**SD**) Riddlesdown
 Markie Hayden (**MH**) Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College
 Leonie Fernandes (**LF**)
 Tyrone Myton (**TM**)

Chair: Patrick Shields (**PS**), St Mary's High School
Vice Chair: Sharon Oliver, (**SO**) Governor, Orchard Way Primary Sch.

Note-taker: G. Truss

Apologies: Ashana Graham, Dave Winters, Tina Price, Clare Wingrave,

Agenda Number	Title
1:	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2:	Minutes of Meeting held on 17 November /2020 and update actions The minutes were agreed, with amendment to highlighted incorrect spelling. Update on Actions from last meeting completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report on placements of KS4 pupils funded from the Growth fund -previous paper circulated. • Dedicated Schools Grant 2020/21 Split Site Factor: Check the schools original papers for eligibility and whether they meet the criteria.
3:	Schools Block Growth Fund: Funding of Key Stage 4 Pupils. Discussion with Ashana Graham, Education Commissioning & Quality Assurance manager. (Previous year's report attached – for information)

	<p>Due to technical difficulties Ashana Graham could not join meeting. The paper presented to Schools Forum on 9/12/2020 has been previously circulated as requested by the Chair.</p>
<p>4:</p>	<p>Schools Resource Management Advisor (SMRA) - Update</p> <p>OG informed meeting that Croydon is using the SMRA officer provided free by the DFE. He has started reviewing the 5 LBC schools in deficit. The reports should be completed by Easter when they will be brought back to this group for review; with the view of whether we want someone else to do a summary report. Funding has been set aside for Croydon to use their own SMRA.</p> <p>Q1: PS asked if the SMRA is funded by the DFE what is the remit for Schools Block and Schools Forum have over them? The reason we needed to allocate the £50K in the first instance was to facilitate Forum having a vehicle to access this information.</p> <p>A1: OG said in 2020 the DFE were running this pilot. Croydon took up the opportunity and felt it was very useful to have a SMRA review. Going forward funding was requested to provide the LBC's own SMRA to review schools in deficit. This year the DFE opened the scheme again for a free SMRA to reviews schools and 5 were selected in Croydon; therefore we have not had to use this set aside funding. The DFE commission the reports which, in the first instance will go back to the DFE and will then be shared with the LA. The report would be shared with Schools Block for review and it would be for this group to decide whether they felt the report was sufficient or whether they wanted to commission their own summary review of those reports This way we are ensuring we are giving good scrutiny and getting it back to Schools Block which was the ideal and original aim.</p> <p>PS: I understood there were concerns of the high levels of deficit balance in some schools and the LA needed the support of Forum to challenge some of the balances at an earlier point in order to escalate process. A year later I do not think we are aware of who is in deficit or the size of the financial deficit of some schools or we have added to supporting the LA to challenge schools who are in deficit. I don't see how we can do this if we have not commissioned the papers ourselves?</p> <p>Q2: MH: do we know who the 5 schools are?</p> <p>A2: PS: at the moment we do not know.</p> <p>Q3: SO: Last year there were a number of schools in deficit which the DFE were looking at and also schools which the LA were looking at – it seems to me that we are doubling we ng up on this process? What is the difference?</p> <p>A3: OG: last year the DFE ran the pilot and we put forward 2 schools which were Virgo Fidelis and Archbishop Tenison. The SMRA wrote reports one for LA to recommend changes we make and one report on</p>

each of the schools – 3 reports. Croydon felt this was a useful exercise, we approached Schools Block and then Schools Forum to fund our own SMRA type review of other schools in Croydon who are in deficit which we felt needed scrutiny. The DFE opened the SMRA scheme again and we put forward 5 schools.

The question is how we ensure we bring back the reports to Schools Block and use this group to support the LA in encouraging these schools to take actions on the recommendations in the report. If we commissioned our own SMRA Schools Block working group would then have the right to challenge the schools and go back to the schools for an update on the progress they have made.

If we bring back to Schools Block the SMRAs review of the 5 schools and then either see if a further review of those schools was needed or see going forward what actions should be taken.

Ultimately the schools are using DSG schools block income if they are spending beyond their means they put this grant at risk. Schools Block working group does have the right to challenge how this funding is used and that is what we are looking to do - putting more scrutiny around it. It would be useful to see on a regular basis the outturn position of schools in deficit and to view this information either termly or on a quarterly basis As it is dedicated schools grant block funding and this is what this Schools Block working group is here to review and it is within that right to review it.

Q4: SO asked if the school is in deficit where do they would get their money from, the LA does not lend them the money how does it work – where does the money come from.

A4: OG said there is no facility for the LA to lend funds to schools. If schools have a cash flow issue the LA can do a cash advance whereby funds are advanced now and deducted from their next terms funding. I.e. schools run on an overdraft facility.

PS: said two schools have closed with significantly more than £10k which the LA will have to cover.

OG: St Andrew's has closed and last week Virgo Fidelis has been called into Cabinet and the agreement was given to close the school. Both schools were in deficit, both schools liabilities will then come back to the general fund of the LA.

Q5: TM asked if we are getting companies in to help schools who have a deficit budget, they don't have money due to lack of children – are there enough children in Croydon to fill the schools within Croydon? – if not enough children no school will have enough funds to support their curriculum

A5: PS said he don't believe the schools mentioned are under roll. To my knowledge Archbishop Tenison was fully subscribed.

OG: said there is more than just falling role numbers which were issues in schools. This is a company coming in funded by the DFE their review looks at across the board looking at all areas

TM said just to clarify the population of children in Croydon there are enough schools to fill PAN (Published Admission numbers)

OG: It would be best to ask Denise Bushay about this – we can bring back to this group to look across the admissions within the different areas in Croydon.

Q6: SO asked what was the amounts of deficit these schools were in?

A6: OG said they varied – 2 nursery schools are in 6 figure deficit with a combined £300K, a secondary school – Thomas More – although in deficit they have in the past used other funds to offset the deficit but these funds are depleting and there is the potential for the deficit to grow. The Primary school's deficit is £50K some work has been done to reduce it, but the worry is the work is not sufficient and the underlying issues are still not resolved and these issued could continue to grow.

I will bring back the SMRA report as a summary to this meeting.

PS: said if the SMRA have already presented reports – should we have them already and if there is remit for this group to oversee the DFG should we not be getting a report on all the schools who have overspent and not just a small group based on some selection process.

OG: We do have report on 2 schools done which can be shared. This year's not avail able. We should bring the quarterly outturn summaries to this group. Add this as a standing agenda item. This group should also look at schools holding high balances.

ACTION: Summary of SMRA report to be brought to meeting.

ACTION: bring back quarterly returns – look at future timetable to fit in with school returns and these meetings.

PS: it might be good to get clarity on the financial reporting of academies and maintained schools. Do we need to be clear on the remit on academies versus maintained schools etc.?

We should return to the Terms of Reference for the Forum and for this working party on what the remit is.

OG: Academies do not report to LA as they get funding direct from the SFA and report directly to them. The liability of the LA is to Maintained schools and therefore they are the only reports I can bring.

PS said it would be useful for the next meeting if we had the most recent quarterly outturn to see if that leads to other lines of enquiries

Q7: MH: asked if the LA had approached the diocese because in her experience funding, money and getting support from the diocese can be difficult. The religious schools appear to be having financial issues.

A7: OG: there is engagement with the diocese and Shelley Davies as Director of Education has those meeting.

PS said it was a mind field of complexity, the Church of England diocese is different from the Catholic diocese. Virgo Fidelis is run by a religious order.

Place Planning does play a significant factor. This is not a new issue but it continues to effect all of us coming up to 1/3/2021 re financial struggles on the horizon. It would be good for the next meeting to bring a paper on place planning. This paper to cover the following remit.

- The number of places
- in every year group
- birth trends in every year group
- Number of empty places
- The percentage of empty places
- Geographically around the LA – by school in order to check high concentration.
- Summary of admissions – start to finish – including how decision are made and what authority LA do or do not have

St Mary's have struggled with admissions and so did St Andrews; Harris Arena and Arc Blake and Coombe wood have impacted on their numbers. The impact on the overall budget is clear schools that are under roll become the 'sink' schools and then APU provision budget and FAP budgets escalate – but if we got place planning right we could save money and put it back into the class room.

This is a huge issue. What else would you like included in the paper from Denise?

TM: I think PANs is an issue. If you have PANs reflective of the schools around then there is enough children to go around but if you got PANs that are significant higher of schools that can take 180 /240 it does mean that schools will be unable to attract those children. School. Coombe Wood - although not in direct competition as they have feeder primary schools -they will take children from a school close to someone else who will take a school close to someone else!

If the PANs are reflective – has this working group got any control over this?

PS: schools make their decision and I don't think the LA has much control of this we can ask Denise to make a queasy of the admissions authorities – we are our local admissions authorises in some respect. We can ask

for a summary of admissions start to finish, which include how decision get made and what authority the LA do or do not have.

SO: this has been a problem especially with academies/free schools. Parents were able to get free schools if they had strong cases. This has not taken into consideration any neighbouring schools which it would effect.

It would be interesting to know if there was any planned building work near of any of these school which might have an effect.

Primary schools because of their bulge classes they have increased their PAN - are Secondary schools thinking about reducing their PAN? The schools will still have their building maintenance to support plus heating etc., it is harder for secondary schools to reduce their PAN

PS: Reducing PAN will have a significant impact – it would be different for each school. The reality is if you have a relatively appropriate surplus across the board then no school should individually miss out that much. Historically the LA was sitting at 13% surplus across Croydon for Year 7. It would be interesting to get those figures for now.

St Mary's has reduced their PAN to stabilise the budget although the school has capacity for an extra 2 forms of students all the way through. Although those numbers will not be reflected in the PAN but they are reflected in the capacity across the LA. This has had to be done primarily because of the proximity of Oasis and Ark Blake Academy which has forced this, there were place at St Mary but within ½ mile there was a school with an extra 360 places.

There is no logic to support this especially with the number of schools closing.

SO: said that Brexit which will affect the number of children coming into Croydon.

SP: they say it will – it might be interesting to a paper on that – not sure if it would be possible to get numbers of immigration/movement around the borough.

OG; said she will ask her colleagues **ACTION:**

SD: The falling school roll is one part of finance issues for schools – over staffing can also be just as significant in some schools. It would be worth looking at a paper around admissions and how many schools not filled across the borough. We have to work out why we want this paper and what we will do with this information If we want to drill down we should also look at the population of young people and how many children are there and what we may expect to see of the population of children in Croydon over the next 5/10 years in the future.

We need to be clear what we want –not just dwell on admissions issues but not to get away from core issue of school finances.

PS: in some respect we know there is a trend that schools who are under roll often end up closing with significant balances which fall onto the LA to pick up which means this money is not available to go back into other services for schools.

The reason for this paper is to see where the problems may be arising and this information will certainly give a more forensic analysis taking into account the 25% of primary population who leave Croydon at the end of their primary school –this departure had not been previously taken on board by Place Planning. There is probably an element – based on projections which have indicated a support for increasing places across the LA and yet the reality on the ground is some schools are becoming empty and some schools have closed which will increase tension within the budget which will then lead to further problems and big deficits. If as a LA we can gather evidence to lobby against government creating more new free schools. That might help the existing estate to stay within its financial means. The evidence appears to be that the free schools are putting financial pressure on other schools due to Place Planning. We need to be clear and focus on what is the reason for asking and how it links to the financial remit of the group.

TM: I think one issue in schools is over-staffing – some schools have not got that right. I would want to know from Croydon a clearer picture on how many children currently in a Croydon primary schools who are actually Croydon residents and not from out of borough and how many children move on out of Croydon. At one point there was a bulge in primary schools coming through.

I feel it is about working together – to ensure that schools stay established and stay open. This is what I think Schools Forum is about – otherwise it will become a ‘fist’ fight between individual schools to draw in pupils to so they can stay open. Either we accept it and say schools will have to fight to get children into their schools at the expense of other schools. I don’t think this should be sugar coated. Schools around the Ark Blake Academy and Coombe Wood area will have to be honest about that.

MH: as part of this report we should note how many children who are not in school right now. There are schools that have spaces but they are not in school – perhaps we can get this information.

PS: this is relevant and vital information. We do need to bear in mind the financial landscape and try to overcome those issues.

VE: it is a wider issue in terms as it is parental choice of where their children go – if parents are given a choice of 6 schools – how can we challenge this. It would have to come from government to say you have 3 schools in your local area and you will have to choice from one of them – that’s not going to happen

PS: the government do have guidance on how many surplus places there should be - the issue is we are not confidence we are sticking to it.

	<p>Possible too much choice – the landscape is acknowledging this is the environment we are in. We need to look to see how we mitigate the financial application of that from the DFG and the financial implications.</p> <p>SO: Children out of school should be under FAP.</p> <p>PS: this is straying beyond finance. If we ask Denise to present the paper incorporating the additional information we have asked for. This will help direct the conversation. Admissions is a topic which gets peoples passions raised. Any more questions we may ask Denise? This has been a very fruitful conversation. For next meeting we will have the regular outturn first set in next meeting from all schools. Invite Denise' to present paper. We are looking at this for partnership and individual school impact but also stick to the Schools Block Terms of Reference and if people could look at them before the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: Request paper from Denise Bushay (Head of Service School Place Planning and Admissions) on Place Planning incorporating the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of places • in every year group • birth trends in every year group • Number of empty places • The percentage of empty places • Geographically around the LA – by school in order to check high concentration. • Summary of admissions – start to finish – including how decision are made and what authority LA do or do not have <p>DECISION: Q2 and Q3 Outturn to be a standard agenda item on Schools Block First set from all schools</p> <p>ACTION; Schools Forum and Schools Block Terms of Reference to be circulated to working group.</p>
5:	DSG Review of Schools Balances
	<p>OG presented paper on DSG : Review of Schools' Balances:</p> <p>As per the Schemes for Financing Schools section 4.2 there are restrictions on the levels of surplus balances which schools are allowed to carry forward.</p> <p>In summary the Local Authority can propose to deduct from the current year's budget share an amount equal to the excess balance, where the balance is in excess of the allowed maximum levels of 4% for secondary</p>

	<p>schools and 6% for nursery/primary/special schools. Claw back only carried out if school is over limit for 2 consecutive years.</p> <p>At Quarter 2 7 schools have balances over allowed maximum limit and Table 1 lists them therefore the recommendation is not to claw back as non on them have breached over 2 consecutive years.</p> <p>Recommendation Schools Block working group are asked to note the review of the schools with high balances as at Quarter 2 2020/21 as not further action is required.</p> <p>DECISION Schools Block note this review.</p>
6:	<p>Any Other Business: There was no other business and the meeting finished at 11.06am.</p>

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY 11 MAY 2021

AGREED ACTIONS

Agenda Item	ACTION:	By Whom
4:	<p>Summary of SMRA report to be brought to meeting. Bring back quarterly returns – look at future timetable to fit in with school returns and these meetings.</p>	<p>Orlagh Guarnori</p> <p>Orlagh Guarnori/Business Support</p>
4:	<p>Request paper from Denise Bushay on Place Planning paper to apprise the meeting on the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of school places in every year group • birth trends in every year group • Number of empty places and the percentage of empty places • Geographically around the LA – by school in order to check high concentration. • Summary of admissions – start to finish – including how decision are made and what authority LA do or do not have 	<p>Business Support to forward request to Denise Bushay</p>
4:	<p>Schools Forum and Schools Block Terms of Reference to be circulated to working group.</p>	<p>Business Support</p>
4:	<p>Obtain numbers of immigration/movement around the borough of children of school age.</p>	<p>Orlagh Guarnori</p>

**Schools Forum
High Needs Working Group
Minutes**

Date Wednesday 3 March 2021

Time: 10:00am - 11.55 am

Venue: via Zoom

The Meeting was recorded and deleted once transcribed.

	<p>Invited</p> <p>Kathy Roberts (KR) Head of 0-25 SEN Services Orlagh Guarnori (OG) Finance Manager for LB Croydon Charles Quaye, (CQ) Principal Accountant Jenny Adamson (JA) Head teacher Saffron Valley Collegiate Theresa Staunton (TS) Early Years Lorraine Slee (LS) Head teacher Red Gates School Keran Currie (KC) Area SEND Lead Mark Southworth (MS) Borough Lead SEND Support Project Sonal Desai (SD) SEND Locality Support Group Jonathan Driscoll (JD) Lead, Performance & Data for LB Croydon Marion Hampton (MH) Inclusion Advisor for LB Croydon Judith Lunnon (JL) School Improvement Advisor/Link Advisor for Special Schools Roger Capham (RC) PACE Academy Trust Pam Sokhi (PS) Early Years Inclusion and Intervention Team Manager Marion Hampton (MH) Improvement Advisor- School SEND Support</p> <p>Apologies</p> <p>Jolyon Roberts, Chair of Schools Forum David Cooper, SEN Business Relations Manager for SEN at LB Croydon Helene Greenidge, John Ruskin College Sarah Bailey, Virtual School Head teacher for Look After Children Jaqi Stephenson, Head of Selhurst Nursery & Children's Centre</p> <p>Chair: Nicholas Dry (ND) Head teacher St Nicholas School Vice Chair Rob Veale (RV) Head teacher Atwood Primary</p> <p>Notes: G. Truss & Heather Beck</p>	
		Lead
1:	<p>Welcome and Introductions Nick Dry went through virtual meeting protocol. Welcomed to Pam Sokhi, Early Years Inclusion lead and Sonal Desai and Keran Currie both Area SEND Locality Support Group</p>	Nick Dry
2:	<p>Minutes of high Needs meeting held on 06.01.2021.</p>	Nick Dry
	<p>The meeting went through the minutes and they were agreed. There will be an update on Item 7 in today's meeting.</p>	

	Agenda Item 10 Annual Reviews – moved to next meeting Post16 moved to next meeting	
3:	High Needs Draft Budget	Orlagh Guarnori
	<p>The High Needs Working Group is asked to note the draft budget allocation for 2021/22 DSG High Needs Block.</p> <p>The allocations were issued in December 2020. There is an increase of £6.6M but this includes Teachers Pay and Teachers Pension grant allocation. Table 1 entitled High Needs Block provision allocation 2021/22 lists the 24 key spend elements which make up the budget.</p> <p>The budget reflects the SEND strategy and forms part of the DSG management plan. The SEND Board was established to oversee the strategy to ensure the needs of children and young people were met whilst Croydon progressed to a balanced budget position.</p> <p>Table 2 proposes the budget for 2021/22, reflecting the SEND strategy. Included within it is the funding level previously established for the EHCP pupils in mainstream schools/academies which reflects the position we are currently in.</p> <p>EHCP plans have been issued and going forward will need be funded; the cluster groups are working well but EHCPs will still be issued and will still need funding and the budget has to reflect this.</p> <p>The SEN strategy is split between line 15 and 16. Originally we had this cluster provision set up in one cost area and we are trying to merge it; as it stands we have split it according to the old financial year set up so this group recognise it.</p> <p>The management plan indicates that we are recommending to bring the reporting to this group on a quarterly basis so it will be more obvious where the savings of the Inclusion Support SEND strategy are and how we are meeting that target.</p> <p>We have built into the budget finance for the existing and expanding clusters. Second key element is Special Schools Funding Review. This Review needs further intelligence in order to present a robust report therefore Table 2 figures are based on current financial arrangements which will maintain funding levels and will remain in place for this financial year until the Review is actioned and implemented.</p> <p>Q1: ND asked what has been included in the increase for the funding for special schools.</p> <p>A1: OG it has been previously agreed to increase the funding for special schools previously on a 1 and a 2 year arrangement. Financial arrangement for 2021/22 has been built into the special schools funding budget – it looks like a budget increase but we have reflected on the actual spend. We must set a budget which is balanced, in the past we have shaved areas of the budget to bring it back to a balance – this is more reflection of the actual spend in order to get back to a balanced balance</p> <p>Q2: NG asked if this included places at Addington Valley Academy (AVA)?</p> <p>A2: CQ said yes this is why it has increased.</p>	

	<p>Q3: ND asked is the additional expanded places at St Nick's – which is part of long term plan - is this included?</p> <p>A3: OG said no not at the moment we have had to take into consideration the existing spend, we have added-in the AVA spend but have not included the further proposed ones until we have stronger working reports. Included within the budget are other areas of increase and it could be reflected later. This is revised going through the year and this is a draft budget report.</p> <p>Q4: JL said this is linked to what Mark Southworth has said is a wider piece of work - can I ask is Chaffinch Brook getting any funding for an outreach offer?</p> <p>A4: OG: asked if she could respond outside of meeting as she did not have this information to hand.</p> <p>Q5: ND asked if SEN strategy 15 and 16 both applied to Mark's project?</p> <p>A5: OG said it is 15, 16 and 24 split across the key elements as this is traditionally how we have presented it in the budget. In year 1 we did not want to put it all into one line. We will bring back to the group the new reporting tool and summarise it up. For the purposes of this meeting though it was important to give a draft budget in the format the working party are familiar with.</p> <p>Q6: JA said in line 11 the figures are different – is this a typo? Also it is different to the figure we are normally used to seeing. Astrid will be in contact with you to check whether this includes the rental for one of our premises.</p> <p>A6: OG said we will be in contact with Astrid.</p> <p>Q7: ND said a bit more work to be done on the draft budget – will it be going to Schools Forum?</p> <p>A7: OG said it will go to Schools Forum. It is a proposed budget. Croydon must set a balanced budget, we are aware that our expenditure has been higher than our income and there will be lines where the budget may look less then we know will be the true spend. Just to highlight Line 17 supplementary teachers' pay grant is included it would have previously come through as a grant – at the moment it is sitting at £1M but again that line will change as it will be pass ported directly out to schools.</p>	
	<p>Dedicated School Grant Management Plan: Recovery Plan : Report to GPAC</p>	<p>Orlagh Guarnori</p>
	<p>ND said the High Needs process has already been discussed and the paper will lay out the process.</p> <p>OG informed the meeting that this report will go to Croydon's GPAC meeting on Thursday evening (4/3/2021). This report sets out the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) management plan that addresses the planned recovery of the DSG deficit specifically within the High Needs Block in line with the Special Educational Needs</p>	

The DfE have set out a new DSG deficit management plan template to be updated and presented to Schools Forum on a termly basis. Finance will bring back to this group the formatted management plan so it will become familiar.

We have a SEND Strategy Board who have reviewed the management plan and the SEN strategy – which is made up predominantly from the localities work incorporated into management plan.

Table 1 High Needs Overspends: demonstrates how the strategy has started and the impact it is having. In financial year 2020/21 although a significant figure it does show the recovery plan is working

Table 2: Overview of Croydon Deficit Recovery Plan

We are still showing an increase in our expenditure. By 2023/24 it shows we have demonstrated our expenditure will have reduced to match our income – evidencing a balanced position which is the requirement of the DfE and the management plan.

It still incorporates the ongoing support for the EHCPs which are in currently in place and a budget for new EHCPs to be continued and also for the cluster groups to expand and the inclusion pilot to roll out.

The table also shows the Schools Block transfers –in the years going forward there is no assumption that this will be made, however it may be that the cluster group will be supported by Schools Block but this is for discussion in the future.

The paper also discusses the governance of how this is reviewed. The joined up working with the various working parties and the regular contact with the DFA and DfE.

Further discussion on the strategy and who is involved and the risks which Croydon continue to have. Legislation can change, It is felt this is a robust strategy and plan.

Q8: ND asked Croydon is still carrying a significant cumulative deficit – where does this sit?

A8: OG said currently within the Council's balance sheet we have the DSG deficit brought forward. The DfE guidance for the next 3 years says it is ring fenced - it does not required the council to offset it against its current reserves. It remains on the balance sheets and rolls forward; it comes to an in-year balance position in the year 2023/24. We will continue to have that cumulative deficit.

Q9: ND said within schools you are required to reduce your balance over years by having a deficit recover plan – but the DFE are not requiring that at the moment?

A9: OG. The requirement is to show an in-year balanced position. Going forward ensuring our expenditure not only meet the needs of the service but if there is any savings to be gained that it offsetting that deficit Plan. The Deficit Recover Plan and this management plan does not take into account any significant increase in income. Income will increase in future

	<p>years at a modest rate and there is no allowance for any significant increase; but should there be it would be used in the future to offset any deficit position rolling forward.</p> <p>OG informed meeting that she had attended a London Council review meeting on a consultation on the High Needs NFF formula this week – some of the proposals put forward reflects historic factors which is a major element of high needs funding. London boroughs are looking to increase the historical spend factor to reflect what the actuals are and to use base line data from 2018/19 which will significantly impact Croydon’s allocation and have a positive impact on our income however it is not built into this.</p> <p>KR: Thanked Orlagh. There are a number of approaches Croydon are taking to help to manage to the in-year position such as reviews of Croydon’s out of borough placements, looking at the development of CHRIS capacity within borough and planned growth of St Nicks. There is also rigorous control around high complex placements and the spending around that. The detail is in the paper.</p>	
4:	Special School Funding Review: Implementation & Progress:	Kathy Roberts
	Slides were previously circulated.	
5:	Early Years SEND Budget Spend	Pam Sokhi
	<p>The purpose of this paper is to note the Early Years SEND spend and To consider the increased demand and future sustainability of support for the sector with increased funding for Early Years.</p> <p>Following restructure in 2018 the Setting Support team and Portage Team came together to become the Early Years and Intervention Team; which is funded from High Needs and Early Years block. The local authority have a duty of care to provide advice and practical support to early years. The team are responsible for responding to requests for an additional need for all children not just those with an ECHCP.</p> <p>The referrals are only from the PVI’s and health it does not include children on the SEN register, in school nurseries and maintained nursery classes. The figures will need to be worked on to see how many children are registered in schools and maintained nursery schools.</p> <p>554 Referrals were received by the team between April 2020 and February 2021 and the Special Educational Needs Inclusion Fund (SENIF) received 162 referrals of which 92 were awarded. Out of 127 requests 102 children were placed in specialist reception provision. 15 of those children had complex high needs. Croydon is above the national average and referral rate is increasing. The number of children with complex needs has also increased.</p>	

In response to increasing demands the roles and responsibility of the team has evolved to meet these demands – up to 60%. Another report would need to be presented to fully gauge the wider impact to the service of the increase in referrals from Health, children with complex needs plus Covid-19 etc. Although there has been an increase in referrals the funding resources have remained the same

In 2019 The Early Years SEND team were successful in their application for a licence to be a training hub for the Autism Education Trust programme, 602 practitioners have accessed the course. The yearly licence is £2344. Due to the number of people we have trained we have received a loyalty bonus for this year so instead of spending £2300 on the licence it has been reduced to £314.

The team invested in an in-house Regional Makaton trainer the financial outlay in 2020 was £2000. 449 people have been trained. We have rolled it out to the sector and not charged them. The costs going forward will be only for the manuals. This will be funded from the workforce development allocation.

The EYSEND early years block finance allocation is £188,822 which includes the salaries of 3 inclusive key workers. A further £41,322 was allocated for workforce development. We only spent £5144. which includes AET licence and Makaton training.

The total spend to date this financial year for the SENIF is £188,815
More settings are aware that there is funding available and pressure has increased on the budget for support across the board and for complex needs.

There is an under spend on our DAF allocation of £60,430 which Finance are aware of and a paper has been submitted with recommendations for the underspend and it is ongoing.

This brings to the table of early years and the cost and increase in demand has to factor in going forward.

TS said thanks Pam for this paper and wished to add some additional information in terms of the DAF underspend. Following an Early Years working group meeting, and taking into account the recommendations for the spend Finance have now distributed £423.78p to 118 SEN early years children in the early years PVI and maintained nursery schools. This money will help with the effects of Covid. So the 19/20 DAF underspend has now been spent. There were other recommendations for spending this underspend mentioned in the paper but these should be funded through the ordinary High Needs budget.

This year 20/21 we will have an under spend of £90K in the DAF budget as the number of children has dropped to 34 and we will be working with Pam's team again to utilise the money.

There is a huge increase in the number of early year's children who need high needs support but our budget allocation this year shows only a slight increased. Pam has highlighting the massive increase in the amount of children under 5 who needs support.

KR: said we need to look at the priorities when we do get any underspend so we can target the whole system effectively. The growing pressure is recognised and the need to work on an early year's strategy which has a seamless approach.

Q: PS asked which children were targeted and had received this funding as a SEN team they were not aware of it.

A: TS it went to all the children who are SEN – this is the DAF spend from 19/20 – last year's budget.

Q: ND; asked if the early years working group will be involved in the budget and looking at the pressures for next year – is that right?.

A: OG; said the early years budget has been set for next year and it is an indicative budget for early years based on census data. The figure does change as there is movement in pupils. We have noted that the pupil numbers were showing approximately a 20% decrease from last year therefore the funding will decrease - as will the 5% top slice. But we are awaiting from DFE pupil numbers and final allocation.

ND: this is a difficult thing to measure and Covid has muddled this as many children have not been attending schools/nurseries therefore the identification of children with SEN has not been picked up in early years. Alongside this the population increase bulge has moved on so there may be a decrease in numbers.

TS: agreed there will be a decrease in numbers. But we are seeing an increase in numbers of children who need support in the current year as they will also need support going forward.

Some of the funding supporting early year's high needs which supports Pam's team comes from the 5% budget. If the funding for 3 and 4 years olds drops the 5% budget drops - therefore the funding used to help support the early years high needs team may not be available that is why we need to look at high needs budget to see how that will carry on supporting this work..

PS said this support from the early years SEND team is not only for children with high needs but all children with additional needs and includes universal and targeted support. This is where the early years review will be important. The number of children when looking at the referrals are at targeted level not high needs.

KR said this is why the full review is needed and an early year's strategy to pull it all together, to achieve an agreed plan.

TS: if the 5% budget is cut and there is a 20% drop in 3 and 4 years old the actually amount of money to support the team will automatically drop whether universal or high needs– the actually money transferred across which is a percentage of £26M because we will not have the amount of children – this is a massive drop.

CQ: said he wanted to assure every one there is 2 double funding £1.1M from the High Needs block to support early years children that will not change it could go up. The 5% might change slightly as it is based on 3 and 4 years

	<p>old. Any slight change can be offset by that movement by the high needs budget. Discussions should be had In-house.</p> <p>KR: said Shelley Davis is calling a strategic review meeting around this subject and is looking in more detail at the design and what the funding model will look like to support it.</p> <p>Q: KC: said we are all affected by the pandemic, and those children coming in to mainstream nurseries with unknown high needs is a concern What is the level of support that the mainstream nurseries might receive in the coming years - giving the unknown?</p> <p>A: JL: it is a joint response across difference teams. There is an ongoing piece of work working across teams. A number of teams are involved and a key element will be working with special schools and developing the outreach. Giving reception teachers as much support as we can. We are beginning to plan and adapt a curriculum for children as some may come in with lower development levels and thinking of support for children with quite complex needs.</p> <p>If anyone wishes to be part of this please let me know.</p>	
6:	AVA Update – verbal update	Kathy Roberts
	<p>KR informed the meeting that there was 'Topping Out' ceremony for AVA held last week and it was great to celebrate the fact that the permanent build was on track.</p> <p>Last year there were 21 children in school which has helped to manage this in-year spend within High Needs.</p> <p>We are on target for 80 places this September 2021 and on target for 22/23 for the school to be at full capacity. It is moving forward positively.</p> <p>ND: the Special Schools review – there is disappointment that it cannot be actioned from April 2021.</p> <p>LS: said the schools met all the deadlines requested and we really hoped that the local authority would follow through and it was disappointed to learn that the work was not going to be of much use at the present time. We are unsure whether we will have to redo the data. I have been struggling to find out whether the funding going forward would include the extra money granted at Schools Forum, but I have learnt today from Finance that this will be going ahead.</p> <p>We have been unable to look at our budget plan for the next financial year and now we have little time to work on it. The feed-back from the moderation groups involved is they have been disappointed.</p> <p>KR said this has not been an in-vain exercise. The information which has come forward, the work done within our schools with the moderation; the moderation meetings and our cross moderation meetings are in the power point and you can see the levels of activities were valuable. At the last cross moderation meeting we tried to model the budget but there were some weakness in our analyse. We did not want to push forward just because of time and produce something that was not up to speck. We realised we needed to spend time to get it right. We will be doing this in this</p>	

	<p>spring/summer term. We hope to have a framework for the next financial year and you will be part of this and help us with this modelling activity. We can only apologise but as was said in the email there were variations and the audit tool. We came up with a profile for each school and bands but when we tried to apply it we realised there were still some questions to be answer.</p> <p>Q: LS: asked would the moderation exercise have to be done in the light of your finding?</p> <p>A: KR said not fully redone but there may be questions or checks we will have to get back to you for clarification for ourselves. Some schools did not complete all the sections. The (i) Section gave confusing information in the system about what (i) indicated and what additional financial factors those weightings carried but we need to move away. But we need to know the impact on this when we do move away. We are in a different place and hopefully we can now get some clarification around this information and build on a solid framework going forward.</p> <p>JL: said she thought the amount of effort the schools put in was admirable; it was a huge piece of work and they used their own time to go through the paperwork. The disappointment and frustration was shared. Looking at what one of the things Peter talked about when we started was that there might be significant turbulence. I think it was a very informative and an enlighten approach. The expertise shared and network across the schools was empowering.</p> <p>ND: said the work has not been wasted. The process has led to a lot of new developments in the way we do things. The special schools need to know the budget to work with. We are inundated with referrals - they will require additional classes and evolution of numbers not just for reception class but across the school and this takes planning. and the sooner we understand what budgets we have we will be in a position to prepare for September.</p>	
7:	LSS Phased Expansion Proposal 2021	Mark Southworth
	<p>Following on from the document previously circulated a shorter power point presentation entitled 'Locality SEND Support in Mainstream Schools - Proposal to expand the plan from September 2021' was presented to the High Needs Working Party.</p> <p>It is proposed that following the success of the pilot, the plan which is part of the budget deficit recovery plan, will move forward in two phases. Phase 1 from September 2021 and phase 2 of expansion from September 2022. There are currently four groups in the pilot; Coulsdon, Selsdon, Thornton Heath and New Addington. A mixture of primary and secondary schools who really wanted to be part of the project and could see the advantages. In the larger document previously circulated there is good evidence demonstrated through case studies of the impact of the pilot with quotes and figures from head teachers, SENCO, parents and figures of students who have been supported (up to 31/1/2021). One underlying theme of this pilot was to reduce of the numbers of EHCPs issued. We must stress that schools in the locality are responsible for the</p>	

funding of any EHCPs actually written. If eventually a child does need an EHCP they can still be applied for but it must be emphasised the budget comes from the schools localities. We think we have reduced the number of EHCPs applied for and will be getting the figures for a comparison soon. Each locality receives an inclusion development funding grant and following discussion currently this money will be used for 3 things– additional Speech and Language support and assessment; additional EP time and additional behaviour support, including autism support.

The Locality Additional Needs Funding is not new budget/money. When the budget was put together the cost of funding EHCPs issued in the last 3 years in each locality was calculated, 20% was added as an incentive to join the scheme. It was split 70-30 into locality additional/predictable needs with a different amount for Higher Needs funding. High Needs will be across all the localities. Each locality is responsible for their own predictable needs budget. Between the localities they will put forward children who need higher level of support to get high needs funding. Leadership funding which covers the cost of employing the Area SEN leads and costs for transport/administrators Total cost £1,223,105 of which £596,620 is new money.

Phase 1 will now increase from 4 to 6 localities – September 2021, we feel this is manageable in the first year and we will not need to increase our current staff.

Phase 2 will increase from 6 localities to 8 by September 2022 and this will cover all Croydon mainstream schools. We would need to look at additional staff appointments. Additional schools that have been added to the existing clusters which have been kept within their geographical areas.

In Phase 1 the proposed roll out of cluster groups with the increased number of schools in each area are Coulsdon with 14 schools; New Addington with 7 schools; Selsdon with a total of 10 schools; Thornton Heath with 16 schools within its cluster.

The new localities are Central Croydon, Norwood, Purley, Shirley. Central Croydon has 15 schools and Shirley has 17 schools.

Phase 2 will bring in the Norwood cluster with 18 schools and the Purley cluster comprising of 15 schools. This does not include special schools.

Phase 1 budget covers the academic year Sept 2021- Sept 2022. As with the schools in the pilot scheme the 6 localities each have a standing budget of £75K, plus funding achieved by working out the cost of the number of EHCPs each school would have received over the last 3 years averaged out and split 70/30 to get locality funding and high needs funding plus the Funding Premium.

In the main paper LSS Phased Expansion Proposal-Feb2021 there is more detail. Grand total is £3M from Sept 21/22 but this is not all new money – the locality and high needs funding is based on what the schools would have received in EHCPs funding. The new money total £1.188.65 for Sept 21/22 (adding Funding Premium) The funding for the pilot scheme up to September 2021 has already been budgeted for.

Phase 2 Budget full expansion to 8 localities from September 2022 onwards will give an overall total of £3,969,391. But new money is £1,467,23M.

Summary page gives the budget costs of the phased rollout for existing pilot 2020-21, phase 1 (2021-22) and phase 2 (2022-23) total costs £941,630.

Final part of the summary covers points to consider for the future of the project.

Consideration should be given to the costs of subsequent years.

- Should the 20% remain or be reduced.
- Should the Inclusion Development Grant be a one off?
- Existing EHCPs have to be funded – transfer funding to fund localities in future years – but as we progress there should be a reduction in EHCPs.

ND: thank you for the summary. It is complicated the way it is funded. There are to key questions for this group

Q1 do we feel this project merits expansion - I am clear that it is part of our strategy and its effectiveness has been demonstrated.

Q2: the numbers are complicated –is the required funding for the financial year set it into the High Needs budget?

A2: OG said Funding has been incorporated. Within the High Needs budget paper we do have the inclusion SEND strategy sufficient funds within our current budget. The ongoing support the HN strategy – the level of funding remains.

For the next 2 years our expenditure is greater than our income so we will continue to be in a deficit position. But as this strategy rolls out it will lead to less EHCPs as the support will be given to the schools directly, so that part of the budget will decrease.

We will still have the ongoing funding for the clusters. But overall we will see a reduction in expenditure to bring us back to a balance budget. It is costed within the new budget.

ND – basically this is costed into the new budget if we agree we have to recommend it to the Schools Forum.

PS: My concern is quite significant spend for these schools and the budget allocated to Early Years in terms of the support the settings will get. Looking at staffing costs for the school as compared to Early years it concerns me as we as a team do not support within the schools but we administer the funding for the Early Years. There is no support or challenge, we basically do paper work exercise going forward. Is there any consideration for these cluster schools to be included in the support from the early adopters? So that the schools will have the support and challenge not just being able to submit paperwork for funding and there is no follow up? Sonal and Keran have been to funding panels and they have seen some of the difficulties we have with funding. Looking at those figures in comparison the rise in SEN levels in early years is considerable but funding has not been reviewed.

MS: said a lot of the success of the project so far is about working together with SENCOs and the challenges which includes the early years.

	<p>SD: echoing what has been said – when early years are in the mainstream schools who have nurseries we have unofficially supported those through your work Pam and then discussed with SENCOs how we can support. The issue is that they are not part of the project but those children will come into Reception in the following year and we will then have more in-depth conversation and funding may be applied. There is a discussion which could be had if a mainstream school has a nursery who is responsible and does it work?</p> <p>TS: said she agreed with Pam but early years is not just about the schools. The majority of children entering Reception classes come from the PVI and independent sector. An email has been sent to Mark to find out when early years would be included in this project.</p> <p>KR: said she was thrilled with the impact that the pilot is having at such an early stage. The evaluations are coming forwarded and it is a fundamental strategy for our recover plan. This gives a 360 degree view at everything we are doing. Around SEND and early years needs to be a part of that. Croydon needs a complete review of its early year’s strategy which we can all sign up to and being part of the inclusion work would come under that umbrella. It is a priority we have started discussing but it is the timing of it. A different environment is being created and a potential transmission issue between early years and mainstream inclusion. We need to ensure the strategy we address as we go forward.</p> <p>MS: happy to discuss how early years could be integrated into the budget – there are separate budgets but there is no reason why they cannot be amalgamated to get a more seamless transmission between early years and Reception. In the same way a lot of work is being done within the clusters with the transition between primary and secondary school. There is scope for joint working.</p> <p>ND: The future of the project is about making it the core approach to support SEN and inclusion in Croydon and the project will evolve and early years will be involved. There is the issue of how Health services work in future if this is going to be part of the core business, especially Speech and Language service which is a priority of the early years and should be part of the approach.</p> <p>DECISION: There were no objections to the expansion proposals going forward.</p>	
8:	Data on SEN in Croydon	Jonathan Driscoll
	<p>This document is a large, informative and comprehensive data document. It was presented at the SEND strategic board and it would be of interest for this group to know the process and the accountability for this data and where it goes.</p> <p>The team produces this data on a monthly basis and it is shared with the SEND forum, the Strategic Board and this group.</p>	

	<p>The document is a high level dash board collection of data/information from Health, education and social care which shows where we are with SEND in Croydon.</p> <p>The data covers overviews on what is going well and things to do better also the changes between present and previous months, The local information from our Capita One, from Health's systems and social care data and how we are progressing.</p> <p>There is published data on academic year basis on where we are with different indicators.</p> <p>The data is trying to highlight the key things which we improve/ need to work on.</p> <p>There is a section of finance - High Needs growth funding – we need to add more around KPIs and will be discussing this with Finance.</p> <p>There are areas we are weak on and we will be adding more social care data and will work with social care colleagues and more health information to improve.</p> <p>If you thing there is other date you want to see included please email me directly.</p> <p>ND said it is an extremely detailed piece of work and a useful tool for this group to have to address some of the issues within the high needs block.</p>	
9:	Annual Reviews – addressing timescales	David Cooper
	Paper moved to next meeting	
10:	DofE Consultation on Revised High Needs National Formula	Orlagh Guarnori
	<p>The DFE are basically deciding in the short term high needs budget will be based on the historically spend.</p> <p>OG: the consultation is planning to use 2017/18 and Croydon are proposing 2018/19. Finance will work up a set of answer we propose to submit from the LA and it will be shared with the High Needs group. One thing to respond on is the proxy factors used. If they are looking to change what these proxy factors are now is the time as a group to input on that. Low prior attainment is one and some other key issues the severity of need being another useful proxy faction to be recognised within the high needs funding formula</p> <p>ND: this is a public consultation. It has been an ongoing long term 'can which has been kicked down the road' by the DFE and it is still only an interim proposal. But the disparity between the allocations of different authorities based on historical factors and what the needs are in different local authorities has increased and this consultation really does not go all the way to address this.</p>	
11:	Date of Next meeting	
	<p>Revised date of next meeting: TBC.</p> <p>Duration of future meeting to be 2 hours.</p> <p>THE MEETING FINISHED AT 11.55AM. 03/03/2021</p>	

