



NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

THURSDAY, 16 JANUARY 2020 AT 4.00 PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Lisa Gallacher 02392 834056

Email: lisa.gallacher@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

If any member of the public wishing to attend the meeting has access requirements, please notify the contact named above.

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

Councillor Suzy Horton (Liberal Democrat)

Group Spokespersons

Councillor Tom Coles, Labour

Councillor Terry Norton, Conservative

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

Deputations by members of the public may be made on any item where a decision is going to be taken. The request should be made in writing to the contact officer (above) by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting, and must include the purpose of the deputation (for example, for or against the recommendations). Email requests are accepted.

AGENDA

- 1 **Apologies for absence**
- 2 **Declarations of Members' Interests**
- 3 **School Modernisation and Sufficiency Programme (Pages 5 - 12)**

Purpose of report

To provide an update on the progress of:

- Urgent school condition projects
- Mainstream school sufficiency schemes aimed at increasing school place capacity within the city

- Special school sufficiency schemes aimed at ensuring that schools can take children with more complex SEND.

RECOMMENDED

(1) It is recommended that the Cabinet Member notes the progress on the school modernisation "urgent condition" projects, the secondary school sufficiency projects and the special school sufficiency projects (as set out in the report and in Appendix A).

(2) It is recommended that the schemes agreed with the Lead Member since the last report are formally approved.

4 Education Portfolio Budget Monitoring Report for the Second Quarter 2019/20 (Pages 13 - 18)

Purpose of report

To inform the Cabinet Member of the projected financial position for the portfolio revenue cash limit and capital programme for the current financial year 2019/20. This report sets out the budget position and contributing factors to the projected spend within the portfolio as at the end of September 2019.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member notes the Education Portfolio forecast revenue and capital budget positions, as at the end of September 2019, together with the variance and pressure explanations.

5 Dedicated Schools Grant 2019-20 Quarter 2 budget monitoring (Pages 19 - 28)

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet Member of the projected revenue expenditure of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the current financial year 2019-20 as at the end of September 2019.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member:

- (1) Notes the forecast year-end budget position for the Dedicated Schools Grant as at 30 September 2019, together with the associated explanations contained within this report.
- (2) Approves the necessary adjustments to Dedicated Schools Grant to reflect:
 - Early years budgets and DSG income budget, to reflect the adjustment in grant funding due to pupil number changes, as set out in paragraphs 3.30 and 3.31.

6 Targeted Short Breaks (Pages 29 - 52)

Purpose of report

To inform the Cabinet Member for Education of the feedback from the

engagement activity carried out regarding the budget pressures to the Targeted Short Breaks and to recommend a way forward.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member for Education agrees to the steps below which will ensure that Personal Budgets in the form of Prepaid Cards, can continue to be provided to eligible families within the budget available:

- a) The value of pre-paid cards is set every year, dependent on the estimated number of applications.
- b) Pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package.
- c) Families will have to apply for a pre-paid card annually.

7 School Revenue Funding Arrangements 2020-2021 (Pages 53 - 88)

Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to:

- a. seek approval for the final stage submission to the Education and Funding Skills Agency (ESFA) by the 21 January, of the 2020-21 mainstream school revenue funding pro-forma for the Primary and Secondary phases.
- b. inform the Cabinet Member of the progress towards the initial determination of the schools budget (including individual schools budgets) for 2020-21 and to seek the necessary approvals and endorsements required.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member:

- a. Approve the proposed changes to the mainstream schools revenue funding formula as set out in section 7.
- b. Approve the school revenue funding pro-forma at Appendix 4 for submission to the ESFA on the 21 January 2020.
- c. Approve the budget to be held centrally for the payment of central licences negotiated nationally for all schools by the Secretary of State
- d. Approve the implementation of the disapplication requests as set out in Section 8
- e. Endorse the carry forward the final balance of the Schools Specific Contingency Fund from 2019-20 to 2020-21 to be used for the same purpose.

f. **Endorse the Growth Fund criteria for 2020-21 and secondary values as set out in Section 7 and Appendix 5.**

g. **Endorse the budgets to be held centrally, specifically:**

- **Schools Forum**
- **Admissions**
- **Duties retained by the local authority for all schools.**

8 Home to School Transport (Pages 89 - 104)

Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to outline the ongoing pressures on the home to school & college transport budget, which are becoming increasingly difficult to manage within the overall Education and Early Help budget, and the actions that are being taken to address them.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member:

- a) **Notes the scale of the budget pressure together with the remedial actions taken by the Education & Early Help Service over an extended period in order to contain overall costs as set out in sections 3 and 4 of the report;**
- b) **Notes the actions and plans that the Education & Early Help Service is undertaking in 2019/20 to address existing and future budget pressures as set out in section 5 of the report and in Appendix 3.**

Members of the public are permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting nor records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

Whilst every effort will be made to webcast this meeting, should technical or other difficulties occur, the meeting will continue without being webcast via the Council's website.

This meeting is webcast (videoed), viewable via the Council's livestream account at <https://livestream.com/accounts/14063785>

Agenda Item 3



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Title of meeting:	Education Decision Meeting
Decision maker	Cabinet Member for Education
Subject:	School Modernisation and Sufficiency Programme
Date of meeting:	16 th January 2020
Report from:	Alison Jeffery Director of Children, Families and Education
Report by:	Caroline Corcoran Head of Sufficiency, Participation and Resources - Education Service
Wards affected:	All Wards
Key decision (over £250k):	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the progress of:

- Urgent school condition projects
- Mainstream school sufficiency schemes aimed at increasing school place capacity within the city
- Special school sufficiency schemes aimed at ensuring that schools can take children with more complex SEND.

2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member notes the progress on the school modernisation "urgent condition" projects, the secondary school sufficiency projects and the special school sufficiency projects (as set out in the report and in Appendix A).

2.2 It is recommended that the schemes agreed with the Lead Member since the last report are formally approved.

3. School modernisation (urgent condition) projects

- 3.1 The urgent condition projects have been identified through Asset Management Plan meetings, condition surveys and recommendations by Education officers concerning the needs of specific pupils.
- 3.2 Funding for urgent condition projects was approved by the Council at the start of the financial year, plus a contingency allowance for urgent emerging works.
- 3.3 Five significant projects were identified for urgent works and the condition projects have been commissioned.
- 3.4 Completed condition projects have been removed from the progress dashboard.
- 3.5 Minor projects this quarter are:
 - Trafalgar school - disability access for school meals
 - The Lantern - exploratory report re roof leaks
 - Mayfield school - ground works
- 3.6 The progress of the individual projects is detailed in the Progress dashboard at [Appendix A](#).

4. Secondary sufficiency schemes

- 4.1 Detailed analysis and forecasting has confirmed that the number of pupils requiring secondary school places will continue to rise until 2024/25, placing pressure on school place capacity. In line with the forecast reduction in primary numbers, secondary numbers are forecast to fall from 2025/26, providing surplus capacity, but this position could alter if there was significant housing development in the intervening period. The position will be reviewed again next year.
- 4.2 Capacity is already increasing at Trafalgar School, Admiral Lord Nelson School, Charter Academy, The Portsmouth Academy, and St Edmund's School. The progress of current secondary individual schemes at Admiral Lord Nelson School, Charter Academy and The Portsmouth Academy are detailed in Appendix A, which has been updated.
- 4.3 There are consequential costs associated with the ESFA project to deliver the Wymering school for pupils with autism. The costs relate to relocating the play equipment and skate ramp on the site, and legal fees associated with resolving minor land issues. A budget is required, and this can be funded from the existing capital programme, where there is funding for provision of new school places.

- 4.4 Action is required to address a modest pressure on places in 2023/24 and 2024/25. Expansion plans will need to ensure that space can be used flexibly to account for future potential uses if secondary numbers fall and surplus capacity is available in future years. Options are being finalised for consideration.

5. Primary sufficiency schemes

- 5.1 Detailed analysis and forecasting has confirmed that the number of pupils requiring primary schools places is within the current capacity for the next four years. This is based on a range of demographic indicators. Further pressure on capacity could be driven by potential housing developments and the schemes will be closely monitored to assess progress. Taking account of the reduction in demand as indicated by demographic indicators and the slower progress with housing developments, no action is required in 2019/20 in relation to the sufficiency of primary school places. The position will be reviewed again next year.
- 5.2 The capital funding to support the change to deliver 30 hours early years provision was allocated to Rainbow Corner Nursery, Little Cherubz and St Swithun's Sunbeams.
- 5.3 Funding to support the amalgamation of Wimborne Infant and Wimborne Junior schools (expected to take place in September 2020) is requested. A modest budget to complete the following works is required to reconfigure a single entrance to the newly combined school, provide a covered walkway to provide for safe passage between the infant and junior schools and to remove partition walls and re-carpet in the hall and the library to make them larger and allow the school to function effectively as an amalgamated school.

6. Special school sufficiency schemes

- 6.1 The council has previously approved funding for special school provision sufficiency schemes. There is an increasing demand for SEND places.
- 6.2 The progress of individual projects, as detailed in Appendix A, has been updated. These projects were not targeted at increasing the number of places, but ensuring that the schools can take children with more complex SEND.
- 6.3 A Strategic SEND Review of Accommodation was completed in spring 2019 which assessed the physical capacity in current SEND provision. The Review confirmed increasing number of pupils with Special Education Needs and Disabilities, and a growing pressure on capacity coupled with limited potential to expand existing sites to accommodate demand. A range of potential solutions are being considered.

7. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 7.1 An equality impact assessment is not required for the overall programme as it is not possible to assess the protected characteristics reasonably, as described in the Equality Act 2010, across such a diverse range of capital works.
- 7.2 The implementation of the school modernisation programme (urgent condition) and the secondary sufficiency programme (phase 2) will not have a negative impact on any of the equality groups. The programme will improve access to schools for all equality groups, particularly with regard to those pupils who have learning difficulties and / or a disability.
- 7.3 Each individual capital project/scheme includes an equalities impact assessment.

8. Legal implications

- 8.1 The works within the projects/schemes identified are being undertaken in accordance with the council's statutory powers and duties and, in particular, the council:
- is required to provide school premises in respect of foundation or voluntary controlled schools under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Schedule 3
 - has an obligation to ensure that school premises are maintained to a prescribed standard in accordance with section 542 of the Education Act 1996 and the School Premises (England) Regulations 2012, made under that section.
 - has a statutory duty to provide sufficient schools for primary and secondary education in its area in accordance with section 14 of the Education Act 1996. The schools must be sufficient in number, character and equipment to provide for all pupils the opportunity of appropriate education. Local Authorities must also promote diversity and parental preference.

9. Finance comments

- 9.1 Financial monitoring of the capital programme is reported within the quarterly budget monitoring report on the January 2020 agenda.
- 9.2 For condition projects, schools will be expected to use their Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) allocations to support these key priorities, in keeping with government expectations for the use of this funding. The expected contributions from schools' will be based on the agreed contribution methodology.
- 9.3 Any ongoing revenue implications will be met by individual schools through their individual budgets which are funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

.....
Signed by:
Alison Jeffery
Director of Children, Families and Education

Appendix A: School Modernisation Programme - Live Projects Progress Dashboard

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Asset Management Plan files	Housing Property Services
Condition Survey Reports	Housing Property Services – Concerto database

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:

SCHOOLS MODERNISATION PROGRAMME - LIVE PROJECTS PROGRESS DASHBOARD

SCHOOL MODERNISATION - URGENT CONDITION PROJECTS 2019-20

School	Description of works	Stage 1: Feasibility	Stage 2: Design	Stage 3: Tender	Stage 4: Works commenced on site	Stage 5: Works due to be completed	Stage 5: Work complete	RAG rating Last Quarter	RAG rating This Quarter	Project variance (Comments about progress and any emerging risks to timescales or budget)
Copnor Primary	Replacement of heating distribution system Phase 2 - Pipework replacement	Completed	Completed	Tender approved	Spring 2020	Autumn 2020			G	
Fernhurst Junior	Gable repair - 4 No. gables	Completed	In progress		Spring 2020	Autumn 2020			G	Substantial scheme which requires longer period on site than summer holidays. Scheduled to maximise school holidays and minimise disruption to pupils
Wimborne Junior	External repair to masonry and stonework and pitched roof replacement	Completed	In progress		Spring 2020	Autumn 2020			G	Substantial scheme which requires longer period on site than summer holidays. Scheduled to maximise school holidays and minimise disruption to pupils
Southsea Infant	External repair to masonry and stonework and replacement of windows	Completed	In progress		Spring 2020	Autumn 2020			G	Substantial scheme which requires longer period on site than summer holidays. Scheduled to maximise school holidays and minimise disruption to pupils

Page 1 of 1

School	Description of works	Feasibility (RIBA Stage 1-2)	Developed Design (RIBA Stage 3)	Technical Design (RIBA Stage 4)	Works commence on site (RIBA Stage 5)	Works due to be completed (RIBA Stage 6)	Work complete (RIBA Stage 6)	RAG rating Last Quarter	RAG rating This Quarter	Project variance (Comments about progress and any emerging risks to timescales or budget)
Admiral Lord Nelson	New build extension and remodelling to accommodate future expansion of the school (+50 places per year group).	Feasibility design complete. Requirements agreed.	Completed - planning approval granted (delay affected programme for project)	Completed	On site	Sep-20		G	A	Timescales for this project are very tight. Issue regarding the academy's own works on the roof have delayed the PCC project. Contingency arrangements will be considered in due course, in case of further delay. Issues with the new surface for the car park are being examined.
Charter Academy	New build extension and remodelling to accommodate future expansion of the school from Published Admission Number of 120 to 180 (+60 places per year group).	Feasibility design complete. Requirements agreed.	Completed - planning approval granted	Completed	On site	Sep-20		G	G	Significant heavy rainfall has affected the seeding of a parking area and this is being re-seeded, and will need to be unused to allow the seeding to take. This loss of parking space is inconvenient for the school.

SCHOOLS MODERNISATION PROGRAMME - LIVE PROJECTS PROGRESS DASHBOARD

Portsmouth Academy	New build extension and remodelling to accommodate future expansion of the school from Published Admission Number of 192 to 250 (+58 places per year group).	Feasibility design complete. Requirements agreed.	Completed - planning approval granted	Completed	On site	Sep-20		G	G	A delay in the production of the steel frame has affected the timescale by 4 weeks. The contractor is confident that they can catch this time up before the end of the project.
--------------------	--	---	---------------------------------------	-----------	---------	--------	--	---	---	---

SPECIAL PROVISION SUFFICIENCY SCHEMES

School	Description of works	Feasibility (RIBA Stage 1-2)	Developed Design (RIBA Stage 3)	Technical Design (RIBA Stage 4)	Works commence on site (RIBA Stage 5)	Works due to be completed (RIBA Stage 6)	Work complete (RIBA Stage 6)	RAG rating Last Quarter	RAG rating This Quarter	Project variance (Comments about progress and any emerging risks to timescales or budget)
Redwood Park Academy	Re-modelling of school to provide places for pupils with more complex special educational needs & disabilities	Feasibility design complete. Requirements agreed.	Completed	Completed - tender approved	Nov-19	Summer 2020		G	G	
Cliffdale Academy (Early Years Reception area)	Re-modelling to provide Foundation Stage places for children with more complex special educational needs & disabilities	Feasibility design complete. Requirements agreed.	Completed		Summer 2020	Summer 2020		G	G	Timing agreed with the school to minimise disruption to pupils.



Title of Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Education
Date of Meeting:	16 th January 2020
Subject:	Education Portfolio Budget Monitoring Report for the Second Quarter 2019/20
Report from:	Chris Ward, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Budget & policy framework decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. To inform the Cabinet Member of the projected financial position for the portfolio revenue cash limit and capital programme for the current financial year 2019/20. This report sets out the budget position and contributing factors to the projected spend within the portfolio as at the end of September 2019.

2. Summary

- 2.1. The current forecast is for the total portfolio spending to be £366,700 in excess of the revenue budget provision. There are significant pressures on school transport that are currently partially offset by staffing savings from vacant posts, staff turnover and an operational underspend. The capital programme is currently forecasting a small underspend of £21,500 on the approved capital budget of £89.4m.

3 Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member notes the Education Portfolio forecast revenue and capital budget positions, as at the end of September 2019, together with the variance and pressure explanations.

4 Summary Position against Cash Limited Budget at the end of September 2019

- 4.1 The service commenced the year with a portfolio reserve of £218,000 against which there are approved and actioned commitments of £117,000. The remaining £102,000 is currently intended to contribute towards potential pressures during 2019/20. With the current forecast, this would leave a further £247,000 that would not be funded by reserves to be carried forward into the new financial year.
- 4.2 At the end of the second quarter an overspend of £367,000 is currently forecast for the financial year as shown in the table below.

Service Area	Current Budget	Current Forecast	Variation
	£000	£000	£000
Strategic Services	-81	-87	-6
School Improvement	707	708	1
Inclusion Support	3,797	4,216	419
Sufficiency, Participation & Resources	779	776	-3
Early Help and Prevention	227	165	-62
Total Education Directorate	5,430	5,779	349
PCMI	31	50	19
Community Learning	0	0	0
Youth & Play Shared Services with the HRA	76	74	-2
Total Education Portfolio	5,537	5,904	367

*Numbers are subject to rounding and may not add up exactly

This projected overspend is an increase of £30,000 compared to Quarter 1 and the forecast variances to budget are explained further below.

- 4.3 **Strategic Services** (£6,000 underspend): Staffing costs are currently projected to be slightly below budget.
- 4.4 **School Improvement** (£1,000 overspend): An overspend in the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) has been largely offset by underspends in the other areas to leave a small overspend.
- 4.5 **Inclusion Support** (£419,000 overspend): Home to school transport provides continues to be a budget pressures and the current forecast is for an overspend in the region of £312,000. This forecast has been updated to reflect the impact of new academic year contracts. The remaining overspend in this area relates to SEND services and Short Breaks.
- 4.6 **Sufficiency, Participation and Support** (£3,000 underspend): Vacancies within the service teams during the early part of the year have generated a budget underspend; most of these posts have now been recruited to. There is also a small operational underspend.
- 4.7 **Early Help and Prevention** (£62,000 underspend): this relates to staffing vacancies within the locality teams which are currently being recruited to.

- 4.8 **PCMI - Portsmouth Craft & Manufacturing Industry** (£19,000 overspend): Sales from PCMI Manufacturing have been less than budgeted for. The target for sales was reduced this year to reflect the services declining sales. Despite this more realistic sales target the Service is still unable to be sustainable without a Council subsidy.
- 4.9 **Youth & Play Shared Services with the HRA** (£2,000 underspend): there is a minor underspend in this area relating to staffing costs.

5 Capital Programme

- 5.1 Attached at Appendix 1 is the current capital budget monitoring position in respect of all schemes in the capital programme for Education, which was approved by Council in 12th February 2019.
- 5.2 Current spending at £59.5m is some £29.9m below approved funding for the schemes identified, reflecting the longer term nature of capital spending. At this stage, however, the forecast eventual spending levels suggest a possible small underspend of £21,500 against total approved funding of £89.4m. Comments related to the variations are noted on Appendix 1, and arrangements to re-align budgets and adjust spending plans are currently being considered.

6 Summary

- 6.1 The portfolio budget is currently forecast to overspend by £367,000, although the Portfolio reserve will partially mitigate this by £102,000. The most significant variation is transport provision, with some in year savings against staffing budgets reducing the forecast deficit position slightly. The service recognises that any overspends will need to be contained or carried forward and officers are working to identify where savings can be made.
- 6.2 The capital programme is broadly spending in line with approved funding levels with some relatively minor project spend variations, potentially requiring capital virements to be put in place.

7 Equality impact assessment (EIA)

- 7.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. There is no change to policy or service and through the budget review process equality impact assessments would be undertaken on an individual basis as required.

8 Legal comments

- 8.1 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

9 Director of Finance comments

9.1 Financial comments are contained within the body of the report.

.....
Chris Ward, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The information upon which this report has been based has been drawn from a variety of sources; however much of the information used is held in budget files prepared by the Children and Education Finance Team. Please contact Angela Mann, Finance Manager, if required.

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by the Cabinet on

.....
Signed by: Cabinet Member



Children and Education Capital Budgets						APPENDIX 1
Number	Scheme	Current Approved Budget	Actual spend to date	Manager Forecast Spend	Forecast Variance	Explanation
		£	£	£	£	
1	Primary Capital Programme	15,827,700	15,826,300	15,827,700	0	
2	Sufficiency Programme Phase One 2013- 2015	6,289,300	6,289,100	6,289,300	0	
3	Sufficiency Programme Phase Two 2015- 2017	11,024,900	10,640,200	11,095,500	70,600	
4	Secondary School Feasibility Study	97,700	97,600	97,700	0	
5	Temporary Accommodation	358,000	358,000	358,000	0	
6	Vanguard Centre	3,264,900	3,231,000	3,260,600	-4,400	
7	King Richard School Rebuild 900-1000 places	1,712,300	1,418,400	1,712,100	-200	
8	Portsmouth College Sufficiency Post 16	263,400	263,500	263,500	100	
9	Universal Infant Free School Meal Works	892,800	889,300	891,800	-1,000	
10	Universal Infant Free School Meal Provision	628,700	593,800	593,800	-34,900	
11	Salix	124,200	115,500	124,200	0	
12	Access SEN Pupils	290,600	290,600	292,100	1,500	
13	ALN Lift Repairs	42,200	41,100	41,100	-1,100	
14	St Edmunds St Provision	557,300	557,300	557,300	0	
15	Schools Conditions Projects - Modernisation	1,447,000	1,422,600	1,449,600	2,600	
16	School Condition Projects 2014-2016	2,781,100	2,726,500	2,781,100	0	
17	School Conditions Project 2016 - 17	981,400	869,500	956,400	-25,000	
18	Secondary School Places Expansion Phase (1)	1,643,000	1,651,800	1,693,000	50,000	
19	Special Education Needs - Building Alterations	3,191,600	2,457,900	3,203,800	12,200	
20	Schools Devolved Formula Capital 2016-17	4,343,800	3,219,600	4,343,800	0	
21	Sufficiency of Secondary School Places	5,517,500	1,387,000	5,193,300	-324,200	Final tender came in lower than expected
22	Future Secondary School Places Feasibility	304,500	157,100	88,300	-216,300	Expected to undertake 4 feasibility projects, 2 completed to date, currently reviewing requirements
23	School Condition 2017-18	954,300	683,800	918,200	-36,100	
24	Beacon View - Kitchen Block	45,000	39,700	45,200	200	
25	School Condition 2018-19	1,362,200	1,010,100	1,569,800	207,600	Increases due to further works identified on site and Tenders coming in higher than expected. Offset by underspends on previous years condition projects.
26	Sufficiency of School Places 2018-19	10,362,800	1,601,000	10,505,000	142,200	Additional costs at Admiral Lord Nelson re childcare facilities and Mayfield furniture and equipment.
27	Special School Places - Redwood Park	3,053,700	308,600	3,053,700	0	
28	Special School Places - Willows	400,000	121,800	400,000	0	
29	Milton Childcare Sufficiency	144,100	48,500	70,000	-74,100	Final costs expected to be lower than estimated. Approval to utilise funding to support childcare facilities at Admiral Lord Nelson project
30	Forest School - Community Accessible Education Centre	30,000	0	30,000	0	
31	30 Hours Delivery Support EY	10,000	0	10,000	0	
32	Maintained Schools Urgent Condition Work	2,564,700	110,100	2,740,500	175,800	Two years of condition funding, £931,000 allocated in 2019-20 and £809,000 held for use in 2020-21
33	Additional School Places - Design	1,037,600	879,200	1,073,700	36,100	
34	Additional School Places in Mainstream Schools - Design	250,000	71,400	295,800	45,800	
35	Additional Secondary Schools Places - St Edmunds Catholic School (GRANT)	650,000	200,000	650,000	0	
36	Additional School Places 2020/2021	6,908,000	0	6,908,000	0	
37	Wymering Site	70,000	16,700	82,000	12,000	
Income	Academy Income	-35,000	-60,900	-95,900	-60,900	
TOTALS		89,391,300	59,533,700	89,370,000	-21,500	



Title of meeting:	Cabinet Member for Education
Date of meeting:	16 January 2020
Subject:	Dedicated Schools Grant 2019-20 Quarter 2 budget monitoring
Report by:	Chris Ward, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet Member of the projected revenue expenditure of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the current financial year 2019-20 as at the end of September 2019.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member:

- 2.1. Notes the forecast year-end budget position for the Dedicated Schools Grant as at 30 September 2019, together with the associated explanations contained within this report.
- 2.2. Approves the necessary adjustments to Dedicated Schools Grant to reflect:
 - Early years budgets and DSG income budget, to reflect the adjustment in grant funding due to pupil number changes, as set out in paragraphs 3.30 and 3.31.

3. Background

- 3.1. The DSG is a ring-fenced grant for Education and can only be used for the purposes of the Schools Budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations.
- 3.2. The original DSG budget for the financial year 2019-20, was approved by the Cabinet Member for Education and endorsed by Schools Forum in January 2019. Further budget adjustments were agreed by the Cabinet Member and endorsed by Schools Forum in July 2019. This report

provides the Cabinet Member with the latest forecast estimate of the year-end outturn as at 30 September 2019.

3.3. Table 1 below sets out the forecast year-end financial position of the DSG budget as at 30 September 2019.

Table 1 - Dedicated Schools Grant				
	Original budget 2019-20 £000's	Revised Budget 2019-20 £000's	Projected outturn 2019-20 £000's	Projected over / (under) spend £000's
Income				
DSG Brought forward 2018-19	0	(3,138)	(3,138)	0
DSG and other specific grants	(72,309)	(70,263)	(70,263)	0
Total Income	(72,309)	(73,401)	(73,401)	0
Expenditure				
Primary ISB	28,753	26,672	26,493	(179)
Secondary ISB	11,680	11,680	11,680	0
Special school place funding	1,578	1,411	1,436	25
Inclusion Centre Place funding	302	307	307	0
Alternative provision place funding	1,090	1,090	1,090	0
Total Delegated	43,403	41,159	41,006	(153)
De-delegated and central budgets	1,580	1,746	1,421	(325)
Early Years	14,138	14,176	14,242	66
High Needs	13,189	13,652	14,432	780
Total Expenditure	72,309	70,734	71,101	367
DSG Carried forward	0	2,668	2,300	(367)

Academy conversions / school closures

3.4. There have not been any academy conversions since the quarter one report was communicated in July 2019. However, Willows Nursery closed on 30th August 2019 and Cliffdale Academy has expanded to accommodate the pupils. The revised budget, approved by Schools Forum and Cabinet Member in July 2019, reflects this change.

Individual schools budget

3.5. The budgets for the Diocese schools were overstated by £179,000 which related to the NNDR rates at the start of the financial year. The schools agreed to an adjustment of their allocations to correct their financial position and this was actioned in July 2019. An adjustment to the budget for the NNDR rates for the affected schools will be included in the schools budgets for the next financial year.

Special School places

- 3.6. The forecast overspend on Special School places is due to additional pupil placements over the commissioned place numbers at Mary Rose and Cliffdale, which were required to stop Out of City Placements needing to be made. It is assumed the places will continue until the end of the financial year, however, the forecast may be revised as further information becomes available.

De-delegated and Central Budgets

- 3.7. The growth fund allocations have been issued to all eligible schools and academies meeting the criteria for 2019-20. Three maintained schools and nine academies received growth funding for the financial year 2019-20 and no further payments are expected. This will result in a £319,000 underspend compared to budget. .

The remaining £6,000 underspend is due to DfE centrally negotiated licenses costs which were £6,000 less than the estimated budget.

Early Years Block

- 3.8. The nursery budget is forecast to overspend by a net £66,200. The second quarter's accounts contain the final summer term payments to early years' providers, and estimated payments for the autumn and spring terms.
- 3.9. Table 2 below provides a breakdown of the forecast overspend. There is an expected overspend for three and four year old place funding due to an increase in pupil numbers over the summer term and the growth contingency fund has been utilised in order to reduce the impact of the predicted overspend.
- 3.10 This forecast for the three and four year old universal hours also includes £100,000 relating to the estimated final balance determination following the closure of Willows Nursery. Should there be any change in the forecast figure once the value has been finalised, this will be reported in quarter three.
- 3.11 The additional costs for eligible three and four year old pupil premium have further contributed to the overspend as the summer term actuals reflect the increase in pupil numbers seen in the place funding, and estimates for autumn and spring are higher than previously projected and are in line with the increase in the place funding forecasts.

Table 2 Early Years Forecast			
	Total 2019-20		
	Budget 2019-20	Forecast	Variance (Under) / Over
	£	£	£
Two year olds	1,865,300	1,762,200	(103,100)
Two year old contingency growth fund	48,100	48,100	0
Three & four year olds universal hrs	7,924,200	8,121,500	197,300
Willows Nursery Closure Costs	0	100,000	100,000
Three and four year olds additional hours	3,236,800	3,239,600	2,800
Three & four year old contingency growth fund	153,200	0	(153,200)
Three & four year olds Pupil Premium	127,800	150,200	22,400
Total	13,424,400	13,490,600	66,200

High Needs Block

3.12 The summer term class lists for Special Schools, Inclusion Units and Alternative Provision (AP) settings across the City were fully validated and paid during the second quarter and estimated Element 3 payments for the autumn term have been paid to schools and included in the Quarter 2 forecasts. This included payments for 20 additional pupils at Mary Rose and Cliffdale for Children who started school in September 2019.

3.13 Table 3 below summarises the forecast outturn position for the high needs block, explanations for which are set out in the following paragraphs.

Table 3 - High Needs Budget	2019-20 Revised budget	Forecast Outturn as at 30 Sept 19	Forecast (under)/ overspend
	£	£	£
Element 3 Top up	9,653,000	9,969,200	316,200
Out of City providers	2,365,100	2,895,800	530,700
Permanent exclusion recharge	0	(67,300)	(67,300)
EYs Complex Needs Inclusion Fund	52,500	52,500	0
SEN support services	674,700	674,700	0
Medical Education	660,000	660,000	0
Outreach	186,900	186,900	0
Fair Access Protocol	60,000	60,000	0
Total High Needs Block	13,652,200	14,431,800	779,600

Element 3 Top-up

3.14 Table 4 below breaks down the forecast overspend position for the Element 3 Top up funding as at the end of September 2019.

Table 4 - Element 3 Top-up	2019-20 Revised budget	Forecast Out turn as at 30 Sept 19	Forecast (under)/over spend
	£	£	£
EHCP Mainstream	1,413,600	1,832,100	418,500
Element 3 Top Up Special Schools	6,258,700	6,151,900	(106,800)
Element 3 Top Up - Resource Units	215,100	210,800	(4,300)
Element 3 Top Up - AP	213,700	222,500	8,800
Post 16 Special Educational Needs	1,122,000	1,122,000	0
Element 3 Top Up - OLA School	429,900	429,900	0
Total Element 3 Top-up	9,653,000	9,969,200	316,200

- 3.15 The September 2019 in-take of Post 16 pupils will not be agreed and finalised with Colleges until after October 2019, when pupil destinations are confirmed. Therefore the forecast position will be updated in the third quarter following receipt of the final data which is expected to be available in December 2019.
- 3.16 In July 2019, the high needs allocation funding was adjusted through the Import/Export adjustment. This has provided an additional £213,000 which is included in the revised budget figure for Post 16 Special Educational Needs.
- 3.17 The forecast position for pupils at mainstream schools with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), is showing a predicted overspend of £418,500 due to an increase in both pupil numbers and average costs. The forecast position includes any changes to pupils with EHC Plans up to the end of September 2019 along with the expected growth over the remaining months of the academic year. The forecast also includes Communicator costs for the full year.
- 3.18 There has been a net increase of 31 mainstream pupils with EHCPs compared to the first quarter. The average cost per pupil has increased from £3,465 at the end of the first quarter to £3,537 at the end of quarter two.
- 3.19 The summer class lists have been received for the Alternative Provision and Resource Units resulting in a small net overspend of £4,500.

Out of City Placements

- 3.20 Out of City placements are split between:
- Independent and Specialist provision
 - Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS).
- 3.21 Table 5 below provides a breakdown of the forecast position for each element.

	Budget		Forecast position		Variance	
	£	Pupils	£	Pupils	£	Pupils
Independent & Specialist providers	2,337,700	36	2,836,100	46	498,400	10
CAMHS	27,400	7	59,700	10	32,300	3
Total	2,365,100	43	2,895,800	56	530,700	13

Independent and specialist provision

- 3.22 The budget is currently forecast to overspend by £498,400. This is due to an additional 10 pupils above the budgeted numbers for which funding is being paid. This represents an increase of five pupils from quarter 1. However, the average cost of these places has fallen by £3,257 reflecting the change in the level of need of some pupils in independent and specialist provisioned places.
- 3.23 Within Quarter 2 there was one new placement with a cost of £40,000, and two placements where costs were increased by £104,000. The overspend is partially offset by two pupils who turned 18 within the quarter, the responsibility for whom was transferred to Adult Social Care, and one pupil whose placement ceased which has helped to contribute to the £76,000 offsetting reduction.
- 3.24 The forecast includes some growth in numbers, with a projected cost of £418,500.

Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)

- 3.25 There are currently 10 Pupils where the authority is expecting to fund a CAMHS placement at an estimated total cost £59,700; this is £32,300 over budget. This is an increase of three pupils compared to seven reported in Quarter 1. The estimate is based on the average cost per pupil paid in 2018-19 of £6,900, compared to a budgeted cost of £3,900.

Permanent Exclusion Recharge

- 3.27 The credit of £67,300 represents the proportion of permanent exclusion income from schools where pupils have been placed in an alternative provision setting for a period of time before moving to a new mainstream placement. This is an annual contribution to the element 3 top-up costs.

Early Years Complex Needs Inclusion Fund

- 3.28 With the closure of Willows the number of early years high needs nursery places reduced. To support early years' pupils with high needs in mainstream nursery settings the early years complex needs fund was set

up. This was funded from a small saving from the closure of Willows and the use of the carry forward.

Grant funding

3.29 The DSG grant funding includes adjustments made for academy recoupment, high needs, early years and post 16 place recoupment. Table 5 sets out the adjustments to the funding blocks with the explanations detailed in the paragraphs below.

DSG Funding Blocks	March 19 allocation (excluding academies)	July 2019 allocation (excluding academies)	Revised DSG allocation (excluding academies)
	£,000	£,000	£,000
Schools Block	40,143	39,131	(1,012)
Central School Services Block	825	825	0
Early Years Block 2018-19	14,138	14,176	38
High Needs Block	16,207	16,372	165
Total DSG	71,313	70,504	(809)

3.30 The schools block figures above include the recoupment for Stamshaw Infants and Meredith Infants academy conversions which were not adjusted in the DSG allocations in April 2019, but have been reflected in the outturn figures for quarter 2 as presented in Table 1.

3.31 In July 2019, the DfE confirmed the final allocation of the 2019-20 early years block based on the January 2019 census data. This provided a net increase (£38,000) in funding due to an increase in the number of 3 and 4 year olds accessing the additional hours of nursery funding which was offset by a decrease in the number of 2 year olds accessing early education in the City.

Allocation Month	2019/20 PTE 3 & 4 Year Old Universal Hours	2019/20 PTE 3 & 4 Year Old Universal Hours	2019/20 PTE 2 Year Old Child Numbers
March 2019	3,275	1,171	677
July 2019	3,181	1,299	649
Change in Pupil Numbers	(94)	128	(28)

3.32 The majority of the increase in the high needs block allocation relates to the import/export pupil number changes. As part of the methodology for funding the local authority under the high needs block national funding formula the DfE adjusts for the net number of pupils placed in Portsmouth high needs settings by other local authorities compared to Portsmouth pupils placed in other local authority schools.

3.33 When the original allocation was received in March 2019 the Authority was a net exporter and as a consequence received a funding reduction of £33,000 based on the January 2018 school census and the 2017-18 individual learner record (ILR) submitted for post 16 pupils.

3.34 In July 2019 the allocation was updated for the January 2019 school census and the 2017-18 ILR return, this adjustment moved the authority from a net exporter to a net importer, increasing the funding by £213,000. As the additional funding relates to post 16 places this is recouped from us passed directly to the post 16 setting.

Carry forward balance

3.35 As at the 30 September 2019 the forecast carry forward has reduced to £2.3m from £2.6m reported in Quarter 1, which reflects the decisions made by Cabinet Member and endorsed by Schools Forum to use the brought forward balance to manage pressures in the high needs block.

4. Reasons for recommendations

4.1 It is recommended that Cabinet Member notes the contents of the report in respect of the financial forecast outturn for 2019-20 as at the end of the second quarter, 30 September 2019.

5. Equality impact assessment

5.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

6. Legal implications

6.1 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations contained within this report

7. Director of Finance's comments

7.1 Financial comments are contained within the body of the report

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

None

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The information upon which this report has been based has been drawn from a variety of sources: however much of the information used is held in budget files prepared by the children and Education Finance Team. Please contact Angela Mann, Finance Manager, if required.

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Title of Meeting:	Education Decision Meeting
Decision maker:	Cabinet Member for Education
Subject:	Targeted Short Breaks
Date of meeting:	16 th January 2020
Report from:	Alison Jeffery Director Children, Families and Education
Report by:	Julia Katherine Head of Inclusion, Education Service
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Budget & policy framework decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To inform the Cabinet Member for Education of the feedback from the engagement activity carried out regarding the budget pressures to the Targeted Short Breaks and to recommend a way forward.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Education agrees to the steps below which will ensure that Personal Budgets in the form of Prepaid Cards, can continue to be provided to eligible families within the budget available:
- a) **The value of pre-paid cards is set every year, dependent on the estimated number of applications.**
 - b) **Pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package.**
 - c) **Families will have to apply for a pre-paid card annually.**

3. Stakeholder Involvement

- 3.1 It was agreed at the Cabinet Meeting on the 24th July 2019 that due to budget pressures on the Targeted Short Breaks Budget a consultation

would take place with stakeholders in particular the allocation of the Prepaid Card.

- 3.2 Direct engagement with those families who are currently eligible for a Prepaid Card was undertaken to seek their views on a number of proposals aimed at ensuring this offer can still be provided, within the budget available.

4. Summary of Proposals

- 4.1 These were the proposals that were put forward in the letter to families currently receiving a pre-paid card, on which views were sought:
- 4.2 **The value of pre-paid cards is set every year**, dependent on the number of applications.
- 4.3 **All families eligible for a pre-paid card will also be given the option of a Family Card.** These cards, provided by the **Parenting Network** and worth £15, offer discounts on a range of leisure events and days out in the city.
- 4.4 **Pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package, for example at Beechside.** Families who access a package have an allocated social worker, who carries out a full assessment of their needs.
- 4.5 **Families will have to apply for a pre-paid card annually** to ensure that only those families who remain eligible continue to receive this offer.
- 4.6 **Pre-paid cards are topped up every 6 months** (i.e. annual payments are made in 2 instalments).

5. Engagement Activities

- 5.1 A letter/email was sent to 540 cardholders on the 18th September with a closing date of 11th October.
- 5.2 Following this, a co-production exercise took place at the Shaping Better Futures Together Meeting on the 12th November 2019. The exercise was to discuss the proposals and ways that the current offer might be allocated to ensure the budget did not overspend.

6. Results of responses

- 6.1 A total of 21 (3.88%) responses to the letter were received.

- 6.2 The summary of responses is contained in Appendix 1. Figures show that the majority of the respondents agreed to the proposals.
- 6.3 It should also be considered that the response rate was very low at 3.88%. It is likely that the majority of respondents do not have a strong opinion either way.

7. Reasons for recommendations

- 7.1 The significant increase of children with an Education, Health and Care Plan has subsequently seen an increase in children eligible for a Prepaid Card exerting pressure on the Targeted Short Breaks budget.
- 7.2 The aim of the proposals for changes to the way that the pre-paid cards are provided to families is to ensure that the targeted short breaks offer in its entirety can continue to be provided to families. In addition to pre-paid cards, the targeted short break offer also includes the: Specialist Holiday Playscheme, Inclusive Holiday Playscheme, Teenage Project, Teenage Holiday Scheme, Youth Hub and Gym Club.

8. Options considered and recommendations

- 8.1 A number of options were considered and the feedback has influenced the revised model for delivery of Prepaid Cards.
- 8.2 It is recommended that the proposal to set the value of pre-paid cards each year dependent on the estimated number of applications, is implemented. Applications will need to be received by the end of February each year to ensure that pre-paid cards can be issued in April. A second application date of October will enable consideration of applications from families who become eligible during the year. The value of the cards will be set based on known applications in February and an estimate for October, which will help to ensure that this additional support is delivered within the budget available.
- 8.3 In light of the feedback received from families, it is not recommended that all families eligible for a pre-paid card will also be given the option of a Family Card. Feedback has indicated that families would prefer to have the choice about how to use the funding available themselves.
- 8.4 It is recommended that the proposal that pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package, for example at Beechside, is implemented. Families who access a package have an allocated social worker, who carries out a full assessment of their needs. The value of these packages is much greater than the value of the pre-paid card. Avoiding duplication between specialist and targeted short breaks will mean that more families are able to access support overall.

- 8.5 It is recommended that families should apply for a pre-paid card annually to ensure that only those families who remain eligible continue to receive this offer.
- 8.6 As a result of the feedback received, it is not recommended that pre-paid cards are topped up every 6 months (i.e. annual payments are made in 2 instalments). A number of respondents expressed the view that the 2 instalments would prevent them from paying for the summer holiday playscheme. There would also be the additional time and resources required to provide the payments twice a year rather than once.

9. Summary and conclusion

- 9.1 As set out above, it is recommended that the recommendations are approved ready for implementation from April 2020.

10. Integrated impact assessment

- 10.1 An Integrated Impact Assessment has been completed.

11. Legal implications

- 11.1 The Cabinet Member for Education has the power to approve, reject or modify the recommendations in accordance with the authority detailed in the City Council's constitution.

12. Finance comments

- 12.1 Since the procedure for allocating and offering families a pre-paid card has been incorporated into the process of finalising an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) the take up has and will continue to increase. Even with current number of families eligible for a prepaid card the value of the payment needs to reduce in order to remain within the allocated budget. The recommendation that families should apply annually for a prepaid card and that the value of the prepaid card is subsequently set based on the estimated number of applications, will ensure the funding to eligible families is maximised whilst ensuring that the spending remains within the available budget.

Signed by: Alison Jeffery - Director of Children, Families and Education

Appendices:

Responses - grid and summary

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

Appendix 1

Short Breaks Prepaid Card Engagement Activities - Responses

Responses from Portsmouth City Council letter

Proposals	1.	2.	3.	4.	5
	Set the value of pre-paid cards every year	All families eligible for a pre-paid card will also be given the option of a Family Card	Card not available to those accessing a specialist short break package	Families will have to apply for a pre-paid card annually	Pre-paid cards are topped up every 6 months
Yes (agree)	9	7	7	6	6
No (disagree)	6	1	5	3	2
No comments	6	13	9	12	12

Comments from Portsmouth City Council letter

<p>I think most of the changes are fine however, I don't think the instalments will be very helpful. £125 every six months is not enough for a short break, it barely covers a day trip to a theme park. This year my son wasn't due back to school until 9th September, so we were able to go on a summer holiday for £300 and the prepaid card paid for this. If instalments were now enforced, this wouldn't be a possibility.</p>
<p>Those changes make sense to me as long as the goal posts for application do not change each year and remain clear. It is all about transparency - i.e. reminding families that they can apply for the £15 card as opposed to waiting to see if they know and do it off their own back. As a family, this feels as though families 'in the know' get the support. Having the support info buried on the local offer is not enough, it needs to be made explicit.</p> <p>Eg. If you are entitled to x, y and x, you are also entitled to a. Don't forget you can apply for a b card etc etc.</p>
<p>Hi, I am more than happy for the changes to take place as I feel the prep paid card has helped greatly in my circumstances and am grateful to receive any assistance available,</p>
<p>Many thanks for your email. I understand why the pre-paid card has to be lowered from £300 to £250 per year. However this will make the budget tighter for us to access playschemes as this is the money I use to pay for them. It may impact on the amount of support I can access.</p>
<p>Thanks for the email re proposed changes to the short breaks card. We have benefited from this for the last 2 years and use it to pay for social activities with Portsmouth Teenage Project and a weekly badminton court. Plus I think we paid for a session of archery and shooting over the summer at the Peter Ashley centre. It's a great help.</p> <p>Given that it's something we never expected and was just mentioned at a meeting that we'd be eligible, I don't have any comments about the reduction in amount, the payment twice yearly and the applying for it annually. It makes sense that you are trying to save cost where possible and make sure the people who need it are still eligible. The specialised short breaks doesn't affect us. The payment 6 monthly doesn't affect us either as we pay for things weekly or monthly (so we don't use it for one big activity).</p>

I'm just wondering whether the time you'll spend processing applications every year is worth the saving of reducing people no longer being eligible (as EHCPs in our experience hasn't changed over the years in level of support).
But that was my only thought.

We'd still be very happy if we got £250 a year split into 6 monthly and don't mind re-applying.

Thank you for your email informing us of your plans regarding the prepaid cards. We currently have some respite from Beechside, three nights per month, and we use our prepaid card to help with the cost of playscheme and school trips.

The card was presented to us as a replacement for the sitting service to allow us to choose services we would find most useful to us. The sum of £300 currently covers the cost of summer playscheme and contributes to the costs of school residential trips. If the amount we get is reduced we will have to consider whether we can send our daughter on residential trips with her school, trips which have given her huge benefits.

If the card is withdrawn from us because we already have three nights of respite during the summer holidays we would struggle to pay for playscheme at a cost of £20 a day. When our daughter goes to playscheme it helps her to have some structure to the week during the holidays, she goes two days a week and this also gives us a chance to spend some quality time with our other daughter and to have some time for ourselves to relax or get jobs done which cannot be done while caring for our daughter.

Without playscheme the holidays would be very difficult to manage, the three days at Beechside will not give any kind of structure as they are not regular and are spaced out over the month, if the weather is not good our daughter will be confined to the house as there are very few places we can take her which would not be overcrowded and expensive.

I like the idea of splitting the card payments in two and the £15 off card. I'm also happy with the 250 amount. I don't like the idea of reapplying every year though. It should stay as it automatically gets allocated to the children with an Education, Health and Care Plan.

Hi all these changes look great the only thing I can say is that most of the holiday playschemes and holiday clubs are more targeted towards the children that are on the autistic spectrum leaving not much options for those that are physically disabled. We enjoy using the card for family breaks/ activities we can enjoy together and cinema trips which is more suited to our family.

I'm really concerned about these changes you have mentioned. For example my daughter gets 2 nights at Beechside a month which I know costs a lot of money but I never used the pre-paid card for that anyways, I use it for Saturday club, (which is not funded by short breaks) & activities etc., which often cost more due to some children's needs.

I am now through no fault of my own a single parent! Before I had my daughter & before her autism was noticed I worked full time, since I was 16! I have no choice but to be her full time carer as there is very little to none childcare for children with severe needs!

Also how can you justify cutting the £300 our kids received last year on the pre-paid card to £250 if you are leaving out the kids who get Beechside or a carer? How does that even make sense?

You say with the amount "expected to claim" but I personally know of families that never even knew about these cards until another parent told them....& there will be many others still who do not know of them!!? This is caused by incompetent or badly trained professionals??

A lot of us parents would prefer to be able to work but as a majority of us are single parents due to stressful home lives due to our child's difficulties we are unable.

If you spoke to SEN parents more often you would also discover the majority of us are either severely depressed or already on high levels of antidepressants! With more & more cuts of funding for our kids this is only going to make things worse. Parents have to be at breaking point, on the edge of a nervous breakdown to be listened to & referred to a social worker!! This then even takes weeks to months for a first assessment & more months after for support to actually be put in place!! I say this from experience!

If our families fall apart & children have to go in care of some sort while parents recover how much will this cost Portsmouth or our government?? Especially as most of our kids need specialist care??

You do realise that £250 over a WHOLE year is £4.80 A WEEK!?? please do tell me what you can do with a child (a special needs one at that) for £4.80?? Even a cinema trip is £4.99 per person!

Our children deserve to have happy healthy parents/carers but with the system the way it is & the way it is going this looks to be an impossible outcome?

I look forward to your response to my thoughts & feelings on this issue.

I have read your email about your changes forthcoming for 2020 and I understand that but also you say that there are loads of applications .this is the first time I have ever applied for this as didn't even know about it and just about a year ago lost my partner and we have three children which is two teen girls and one Down syndrome boy of 7yrs.thought this be a good idea for us to do something together as I don't take my kids away as my boy is very hectic and being on my own now too is very hard .bit readying your coming changes made me think that perhaps you should put people in categories of applying for this who has had it before etc. as the funds won't stretch as you say in email. Anyway glad to hear from you guys have a good day .new application mum of three

Either option 1 or 5 I think seems to be good.

Many thanks for the e-mail update in regards to the Short Break Pre-paid Card.

We currently get issued a card to aid additional activities for my daughter, who is 7 years old, Autistic and non-verbal.

First of all, we would just like to say how great the Pre-paid Card scheme is and how much it has benefited our family, especially our daughter. It has meant she has been a lot more socially active, which, for someone of her condition, is extremely important.

In regards to the proposed changes, although we understand the increase in demand and the obvious constraints this will have on budgets, it's very disappointing to read that the credit limit is due to be reduced.

The majority of the card allowance is allocated to the 'Enable Ability' play-scheme which is held during all the major school holidays.

The balance usually covers an additional day out, which for us is at Paultons Park, a short car ride away from where we live.

At the new proposed £250 limit, this would only cover a small element of the play-scheme, especially if the plan is to split this total across 2 instalments.

This will obviously cause us issues, not only financially, but could mean we will have to reduce the amount of days our daughter can attend the scheme which she enjoys so much.

As stated above, the importance of her being able to socialise in different surroundings is very beneficial to her development. The fact that this could reduce is a major concern.

Also, as a family, we are currently undertaking the adoption process and have been matched with a 10 month old baby boy. Our daughter will experience quite a lot of change due to this so we were somewhat reliant on the scheme moving forward for her to enjoy days out.

Although we don't have an obvious answer for your budget constraints, if there is anyway the allowance currently received stays the same or, worst case, it gets only a minor reduction, we would urge you to consider it.

If you have any questions, or would like us to explain in more detail any of the points raised, please either reply to this e-mail or contact us on the below mobile number.

Once again, thank you for the e-mail and the time taken to read our response.

Thank you for your email earlier today. I am somewhat stunned and very disappointed that you are proposing to cut the funding amount on the Pre-paid card to families who greatly rely on it to have a much needed short break or family day out.

There has not been an increase in the amount allocated each year in the time that we've received it, so in real terms it's value has gone down every year as it is. The cost of living continues to rise and for those of us with disabled children as soon as you need to buy for "additional needs" etc, the cost will be higher anyway. I don't see my council tax bill being cut by 16% - that's increasing year on year funnily enough!!

There is a crisis in SEN funding nationally and DWP are making us jump through hoops to receive DLA even though my daughters care and mobility needs have not changed. DWP have no scruples in knocking her down a level so that we as a family have to cut back in other areas to ensure that she receives the treatments etc that she needs, as there is also a shortfall in Children's Health Funding in the Community. For instance, we have to fund my daughter to attend the Rainbow Centre on a Saturday ourselves, as appointments with Physios and Occupational Therapists are very hard to come by and this is giving her some much needed help and benefit! We also fund one to one swimming lessons at nearly £21 per half hour as she is very limited to what exercise she can do with her disabilities. I could go on.....

If my child is still in receipt of an EHCP then it is unlikely that her needs will have changed - she has lifelong disabilities! Therefore, it's going to make my life that bit more difficult if I have to reapply to yourselves every year. It's bad enough having to re-apply to Disability Living Allowance etc, while chasing appointments for my child and trying to work. Please don't give me something else to do!

I would like to know why Portsmouth City Council could not make cuts in other areas rather than those affecting disabled children.

I'm sure I won't be the only one who is somewhat dismayed by your proposals however thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond.

Thank you for your email, I am happy with the proposal and would like to ask if I could have some further information please.

I wasn't aware of any of the other facilities available. The shorts breaks card is something I only found out about due to a ehcp follow up meeting and I was asked if I was aware of short breaks.

If you could provide me with any details of the other activities available that would be great. Also how would I apply for the family card please.

Any information would be appreciated.

Although I understand that there are more and more children that are needing support financially from short breaks this has actually come as a blow to us as we do not access any of the groups but the money we receive is invaluable. So essentially we will just be £50 down. I think that the cut should be done on an individual basis depending on whether the young person is using the other services. So overall we are not happy with the decision.

Following your recent letter about proposed changes to the prepaid card, I am writing with my comments. Due to the same reason you are making these proposals the specialist playscheme we access is under pressure and we are already experiencing the effects of that and the increase in costs to the users. I use my prepaid card solely to fund holiday playscheme and Saturday Club and even without the changes being suggested I was thinking our access would be limited for financial reasons. My family would not qualify for a card next year if the changes went ahead as we have a social worker and my daughter uses Beechside. I was just thinking how we managed the long Summer holidays with the support we have in place but I'm not sure I would feel the same in the future if the new proposals are carried out.

I am writing this on behalf of Mrs ... (I am her husband) regarding your notification of the planned changes to the allocation of the Pre-Paid card. We have been asked to provide our 'views' on these 'planned' changes.

1. Your communication states that these are 'planned' changes and you want a view on them and yet the way that you have couched your email makes it appear that these changes are already going to go ahead. If this is the case it does not appear that our 'views' will carry any weight. Please confirm if these changes are going ahead or not.
2. As you have pointed out in your mail the Pre-Paid card was to allow people to access much needed services which they may not be otherwise able afford. If you take this card away then people will not be able to access these services which means that these will then be liable for closure due to poor attendance thereby saving more money from the budget. Whilst this would appear to be a cynical point of view it cannot be helped bearing in mind your comments on 'budget'.
3. Please could you confirm that this is a budget driven change due to less resources coming from central Govt.
4. It should be note that the council has certain statutory commitments that it should undertake and this gradual erosion of these services will warrant looking into from a legal standpoint.

Lastly we would like to point out that this pre-paid card can be a lifeline for the service it can buy purely from a 'giving the parent some much needed respite' viewpoint. It is disappointing that you are saying that you cannot have it and any other service to enjoy, such as Saturday club, as well. This is just cutting the provision of services to the very community that so desperately needs it.

We like the option below as there are families that aren't entitled to specialist short break packages and having the prepaid card really helps. And as the packages are greater in value than the card surely that should be enough and make it fairer for families that don't get that.

3. Pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package, for example at Beechside. Families who access a package have an allocated social worker, who carries out a full assessment of their needs. The value of these packages is much greater than the value of the pre-paid card

I have been asked for views on possible changes to the pre-paid card system. My son has had the benefit of this service for the past year (something we were totally unaware of before this).

We have used this service for family days out. My child would not attend play schemes etc as he can find it difficult to interact with children he doesn't know or settings that are unfamiliar. This service has been of great benefit to our son. We have taken him to venues and activities that we otherwise may not of been able to.

We feel that the first option the council are looking at would seem to be the most fair for my child and the other children that this service helps. Reducing the allocation to each child would seem the fairest option.

My child access' no other council run programmes and we claim no other benefits. It seems unfair to reduce such a service to some of the most vulnerable children.

Many thanks for the info of proposed changes to the Short Breaks initiative that my daughter currently receives.

I understand just how costly this service must be to run, it is indeed a wonderful benefit to allow families with children with Special Educational Needs to make some lovely memories together or try new things.

My only point of concern with the proposed changes would be having to apply every year for it.

At present the family unit is under constant strain in the hope that today will be "a good day." But the prospect of more timely form filling is not really a welcome one for myself.

With appointments, consultations, school issues, EHCP Reviews and anything else which can arise, it feels a little unfair that families, such as ours, will have another thing to complete on time.

I'm sure I am not alone in spending literally hours and hours on a yearly basis, completing forms. Time which I think is much better spent with my family and I am especially mindful of the extra needs of the children who deserve these Short Breaks cards can require.

Would the EHCP provide enough information necessary to determine whether it is likely that the child's condition will not improve in the next 2 years, therefore eliminating the need for yearly applications? After all, it is a comprehensive guide to the child's needs and outlines all the support needed.

Please know I am grateful for the service, but am concerned that it will be another job to "slip through the net."

I hope my comments are useful.

Thank you very much for your email.
I sincerely apologise for my late response.
I have no views and no questions about the proposal.
I appreciate the financial assistance of the Short Breaks Card.

Comments from Portsmouth Parent Voice Survey

Numbers have not been included as explained in 5.2 of the report.

This contributes to the wellbeing of the family, siblings in particular. Short breaks should be proportionate to the needs of the family, not the number of people applying. As children get older their needs may increase.
The family card is not of much use as those activities can already be accessed at a cheaper rate by asking for a concession (and providing the right evidence). Keeping it at one instalment will help families to book a proper weekend short break instead of just being able to pay for smaller activities.
It is a significant reduction
We desperately need to look at the eligibility criteria for families who don't meet criteria of having a full ehcp or specialist provision as there are disabled parents with siblings who are at crisis point as have no support from friends and family and families who have children in Mary Rose provision who are inundated with support. We need some way of supporting applications with supporting evidence from professionals when this is the case.

Comments from Shaping Better Futures Together Meeting discussion

Family card not useful to cardholders as activity providers offering a subsidy mainly aimed at under 5s.

Agreed with the annual allocation.

Balance of those who agreed and disagreed with the reduction in the amount.

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

Integrated impact assessment (IIA) form December 2019

www.portsmouth.gov.uk

The integrated impact assessment is a quick and easy screening process. It should:

- identify those policies, projects, services, functions or strategies that could impact positively or negatively on the following areas:
 - Communities and safety
 - Regeneration and culture
 - Environment and public space
 - Equality & diversity

Directorate:

Childrens Services and Education

Service, function:

Education, Inclusion

Title of policy, service, function, project or strategy (new or old) :

Short Breaks for Disabled Children

Type of policy, service, function, project or strategy:

- Existing
- New / proposed
- Changed

What is the aim of your policy, service, function, project or strategy?

The Breaks for Carers Regulations 2011 states that a local authority must provide so far as is as reasonably practicable, a range of services which is sufficient to assist carers to continue to provide care or to do so more effectively.

In particular, the local authority must provide, as appropriate, a range of -

- a) Provision which will enable disabled children to participate in educational and recreational activities;
- b) Provision of day-time care for disabled children in both their own homes and elsewhere, including befriending, sitting (for example where someone is commissioned to look after a child who for example cannot leave home) and sessional services;
- c) Provision of overnight care for disabled children in both their own homes and elsewhere; and
- d) Emergency care, for example, due to illness in the family. If the emergency relates to safeguarding concerns the guidance in Working Together must be followed.

The responsibilities described in c) and d) are delivered through the Children and Families Service as the specialist short break offer via Beechside short break respite provision.

The Portsmouth Targeted Short Breaks offer refers to a) open access recreational activities in the format of the Inclusive Holiday Playscheme, Teenage Holiday Programme, Teenage Project and the Portsmouth Autism Support Network activities (referred to as Targeted 1) and b) day time care in the format of the Specialist Holiday Playscheme and pre-paid cards (both referred to as Targeted 2).

Portsmouth commissions two contracts to ensure the provision of targeted short breaks for families with a child with a disability. These cover a) and b) as described above:

- The Targeted 1 Short Break contract providing recreational activities (a) has a value of £77,000 per year. The contract is due to end in March 2021.
- The Targeted 2 Short Break contract providing daytime care (b) for the delivery of the Specialist Holiday Playscheme has a value of £147,000 per year. Children's Social Care contribute £24,023, Education contribute £122,977. The contract is due to end in March 2020. The Targeted 2 offer also includes the option of a 'pre-paid card'.

Families of children with an EHCP and attending a special school or in receipt of full time support in a mainstream school, are entitled to a Personal Budget which is provided in the form of a pre-paid card. This can be used for any short break activities the parent feels best meets their child's and family's needs and is part of the Targeted 2 offer.

The funding allocated per family per year is currently £300. There is an expectation that this uptake will continue to increase as overall numbers of children with EHCPs has increased and there is greater awareness of the support available to families.

Due to budget pressures on the Targeted Short Breaks budget it was agreed that a consultation would take place with stakeholders in particular the allocation of the Prepaid Card to gather views on how we can continue to provide the Prepaid Card to an increasing number of families meeting the eligibility criteria.

Has any consultation has been undertaken for this proposal? What were the outcomes of the consultations? Has anything changed because of the consultation? Did this inform your proposal?

Direct engagement with those families who are currently eligible for a Prepaid Card was undertaken to seek their views the following proposals.

1. The value of pre-paid cards is set every year, dependent on the number of applications.
2. All families eligible for a pre-paid card will also be given the option of a Family Card. These cards, provided by the Parenting Network and worth £15, offer discounts on a range of leisure events and days out in the city.
3. Pre-paid cards are only available to those who are not already accessing a specialist short break package, for example at Beechside. Families who access a package have an allocated social worker, who carries out a full assessment of their needs.
4. Families will have to apply for a pre-paid card annually to ensure that only those families who remain eligible continue to receive

this offer.

5. Pre-paid cards are topped up every 6 months (i.e. annual payments are made in 2 installments).

Engagement activities took place in the format of letters and emails to cardholders and working with the Shaping Better Futures Together Parent Co-production Group. 540 letters and emails were sent and a total of 21 (3.88%) responses were received. The response rate was very low and it is likely that the majority of respondents did not have a strong opinion either way.

In light of the feedback received it is recommended that two of the proposals do not go ahead These are:

Proposal 2 - the option of a Family Card offering discounts on a range of leisure events and days out in the city. Feedback has indicated that families would prefer to have the choice about how to use the funding available themselves.

Proposal 5 - Pre-paid cards are topped up every 6 months.

A number of respondents expressed the view that the 2 instalments would prevent them from paying for the summer holiday playscheme. There would also be the additional time and resources required to provide the payments twice a year rather than once.

It is recommended that proposals 1, 3 and 4 are agreed.

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

A1-Crime - Will it make our city safer?



In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce crime, disorder, ASB and the fear of crime?
- How will it prevent the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances?
- How will it protect and support young people at risk of harm?
- How will it discourage re-offending?

If you want more information contact Lisa.Wills@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-spp-plan-2018-20.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How will you measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

A2-Housing - Will it provide good quality homes?



In thinking about this question:

- How will it increase good quality affordable housing, including social housing?
- How will it reduce the number of poor quality homes and accommodation?
- How will it produce well-insulated and sustainable buildings?
- How will it provide a mix of housing for different groups and needs?

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/psh-providing-affordable-housing-in-portsmouth-april-19.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

A3-Health - Will this help promote healthy, safe and independent living?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it improve physical and mental health?
- How will it improve quality of life?
- How will it encourage healthy lifestyle choices?
- How will it create healthy places? (Including workplaces)

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/psh-providing-affordable-housing-in-portsmouth-april-19.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

A4-Income deprivation and poverty-Will it consider income deprivation and reduce poverty?



In thinking about this question:

- How will it support those vulnerable to falling into poverty; e.g., single working age adults and lone parent households?
- How will it consider low-income communities, households and individuals?
- How will it support those unable to work?
- How will it support those with no educational qualifications?

If you want more information contact Mark.Sage@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-homelessness-strategy-2018-to-2023.pdf>
<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/health-and-care/health/joint-strategic-needs-assessment>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

A - Communities and safety	Yes	No
----------------------------	-----	----

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

A5-Equality & diversity - Will it have any positive/negative impacts on the protected characteristics?



In thinking about this question:

- How will it impact on the protected characteristics-Positive or negative impact (Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, Age, disability, race/ethnicity, Sexual orientation, gender reassignment, sex, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership,socio-economic)
- What mitigation has been put in place to lessen any impacts or barriers removed?
- How will it help promote equality for a specific protected characteristic?

If you want more information contact gina.perryman@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cmu-equality-strategy-2019-22-final.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

The reason the proposals are being made is to ensure that Prepaid Cards can still be provided within the budget available.

The proposals will ensure that:

1. an increased number of families can benefit from targeted short breaks
2. Personal Budgets can continue to be offered which provide choice and control for families
3. the amount of money per prepaid card allocated annually is enough to make a difference for families

We will seek feedback from all families receiving a prepaid card annually.

We will also seek feedback from all parents with a child with SEND through the annual survey.

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B1-Carbon emissions - Will it reduce carbon emissions?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
- How will it provide renewable sources of energy?
- How will it reduce the need for motorised vehicle travel?
- How will it encourage and support residents to reduce carbon emissions?

If you want more information contact Tristan.thorn@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cmu-sustainability-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B2-Energy use - Will it reduce energy use?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce water consumption?
- How will it reduce electricity consumption?
- How will it reduce gas consumption?
- How will it reduce the production of waste?

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/psh-providing-affordable-housing-in-portsmouth-april-19.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B3 - Climate change mitigation and flooding-Will it proactively mitigate against a changing climate and flooding ?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it minimise flood risk from both coastal and surface flooding in the future?
- How will it protect properties and buildings from flooding?
- How will it make local people aware of the risk from flooding?
- How will it mitigate for future changes in temperature and extreme weather events?

If you want more information contact Tristan.thorn@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/env-surface-water-management-plan-2019.pdf>
<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-flood-risk-management-plan.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B4-Natural environment-Will it ensure public spaces are greener, more sustainable and well-maintained?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it encourage biodiversity and protect habitats?
- How will it preserve natural sites?
- How will it conserve and enhance natural species?

If you want more information contact Daniel.Young@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy-dec-17.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Page 48

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B5-Air quality - Will it improve air quality?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce motor-vehicle traffic congestion?
- How will it reduce emissions of key pollutants?
- How will it discourage the idling of motor vehicles?
- How will it reduce reliance on private car use?

If you want more information contact Hayley.Trower@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/env-aq-air-quality-plan-outline-business-case.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

B - Environment and climate change

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B6-Transport - Will it improve road safety and transport for the whole community?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users over users of private vehicles?
- How will it be safe and comfortable for children and older people to cycle and walk in the area?
- How will it increase the proportion of journeys made using sustainable and active transport?
- How will it reduce the risk of traffic collisions, and near misses, with pedestrians and cyclists?

If you want more information contact Pam.Turton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/travel/local-transport-plan-3>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

B7-Waste management - Will it increase recycling and reduce the production of waste?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it reduce household waste and consumption?
- How will it increase recycling?
- How will it reduce industrial and construction waste?

If you want more information contact Steven.Russell@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/HampshireMineralsWastePlanADOPTED.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

C - Regeneration of our city

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

C1-Culture and heritage - Will it promote, protect and enhance our culture and heritage?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it protect areas of cultural value?
- How will it protect listed buildings?
- How will it encourage events and attractions?
- How will it make Portsmouth a city people want to live in?

If you want more information contact Claire.Looney@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/pln-portsmouth-plan-post-adoption.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

C - Regeneration of our city

Yes

No

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

C2-Employment and opportunities - Will it promote the development of a skilled workforce?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it improve qualifications and skills for local people?
- How will it reduce unemployment?
- How will it create high quality jobs?
- How will it improve earnings?

If you want more information contact Mark.Pembleton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-regeneration-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Is your policy, proposal relevant to the following questions?

C3 - Economy - Will it encourage businesses to invest in the city, support sustainable growth and regeneration?

In thinking about this question:

- How will it encourage the development of key industries?
- How will it improve the local economy?
- How will it create valuable employment opportunities for local people?
- How will it promote employment and growth to the city?

If you want more information contact Mark.Pembleton@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or go to:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-regeneration-strategy.pdf>

Please expand on the impact on these issues your proposal will have, and how you propose to mitigate any negative impacts?

How are you going to measure/check the impact of your proposal?

Q8 - Who was involved in the Integrated integrated assessment?

Fiona Donaldson - Short Breaks Officer

This IIA has been approved by:

Contact number:

Date:

Title of meeting: Cabinet Member

Date of meeting: 16 January 2020

Subject: School Revenue Funding Arrangements 2020-21

Report from: Alison Jeffery, Director of Children, Families and Education

Report by: Angela Mann, Finance Manager

Wards affected: All Wards

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

1.1. The purpose of this report is to:

- a. seek approval for the final stage submission to the Education and Funding Skills Agency (ESFA) by the 21 January, of the 2020-21 mainstream school revenue funding pro-forma for the Primary and Secondary phases.
- b. inform the Cabinet Member of the progress towards the initial determination of the schools budget (including individual schools budgets) for 2020-21 and to seek the necessary approvals and endorsements required.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member:

- a. **Approve the proposed changes to the mainstream schools revenue funding formula as set out in section 7.**
- b. **Approve the school revenue funding pro-forma at Appendix 4 for submission to the ESFA on the 21 January 2020.**
- c. **Approve the budget to be held centrally for the payment of central licences negotiated nationally for all schools by the Secretary of State**

- d. Approve the implementation of the disapplication requests as set out in Section 8
- e. Endorse the carry forward the final balance of the Schools Specific Contingency Fund from 2019-20 to 2020-21 to be used for the same purpose.
- f. Endorse the Growth Fund criteria for 2020-21 and secondary values as set out in Section 7 and Appendix 5.
- g. Endorse the budgets to be held centrally, specifically:
 - Schools Forum
 - Admissions
 - Duties retained by the local authority for all schools.

3. Background and Previous Decisions

- 3.1. The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring-fenced grant for education and can only be used for the purposes of the Schools Budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations.
- 3.2. It is anticipated that updated School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations will require each local authority, by no later than 29th February 2020, to:
 - a. Make an initial determination of its schools budget; and
 - b. Give notice of that determination to the governing bodies of the schools which it maintains.
- 3.1. This section outlines the progress to date in agreeing the School Funding Arrangements for 2020-21.
- 3.2. In May 2019 the authority consulted with schools regarding the direction of travel for the 2020-21 schools funding arrangements. This initial consultation was held without the benefit of any operational guidance issued by the Department for Education (DfE).
- 3.3. In the May consultation schools were asked for their feedback regarding the following proposals for the financial year 2020-21:
 - Moving primary schools to the national funding formula
 - Continuing to use the minimum pupil level as set by the DfE
 - Setting the minimum funding guarantee at zero percent
 - Consider the potential transfer of up to 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block.
- 3.4. The results of the consultation were taken to Schools Forum and Cabinet Member, in July 2019 and they indicated that schools were broadly in

favour of the proposals. However due to the lack of guidance from the DfE, Schools Forum and the Cabinet Member for Education were not asked to approve any specific recommendations. Instead they endorsed the proposal for the authority to develop the indicative Dedicated School Grant (DSG) budget for 2020-21 using the latest information on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), and would consult further with schools in the autumn term.

- 3.5. In the absence of guidance, the authority prepared a consultation with schools which provided detail on the anticipated high needs pressures and implications on the mainstream budgets.
- 3.6. On 3 September the Government announced additional funding nationally for mainstream schools and for pupils with SEND. The announcements for Education funding showed a year on year growth over a three year period, £2.6bn for 2020-21, £4.8bn for 2021-22 and £7.1bn for 2022-23. This included an additional £780m for High Needs in 2020-21 to support children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). Whilst further detail was released on 9 September, the impact on the funding received by Portsmouth was not clear.
- 3.7. The announcements also set out the Governments proposal to move all schools on to a hard national funding formula in the future along with the intention to implement mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels from 2020-21.
- 3.8. The authority decided to publish the consultation with schools on the morning of 12 September 2019, which closed on 30 September 2019. Following the closure of the consultation the DfE released the indicative 2020-21 DSG funding¹ for Portsmouth, along with details of the 2020-21 provisional National Funding Formula (NFF) factor funding values. As the results of the consultation with schools (Appendix 1) were inconclusive and the increase in funding was significant it was agreed to further engage with schools through two briefing sessions held on 22 and 23 of October. The briefing sessions updated schools on the expected funding for 2020-21 and the long term pressures on the high needs block, highlighting the authority's intention to work with schools to ensure pupils were supported within an inclusive environment and within the resources available. The consultation was re-opened until 25 October and schools were provided with an indicative budget share based on the new NFF factor values and an increased Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) of +1.84% per pupil on 31 October.
- 3.9. The results of the of the consultation along with proposals for the 2020-21 formula were taken to Schools Forum on 17 December 2019 and Schools Forum endorsed the following proposals:

¹ Based on October 2018 census data.

- a. To implement the National Funding Formula (NFF) for primary schools
 - b. To implement a minimum funding guarantee of between plus 0.5% and plus 1.84%
 - c. To retain the Schools Block at its given value i.e. no transfer to the High Needs Block.
 - d. To calculate initial funding allocations in accordance with unit values as shown in the tables at Appendix 3.
 - e. To adopt the Minimum Funding Levels (MFLs) as recommended by the Department for Education (DfE).
 - f. In addition, two disapplication requests, submitted to, and subsequently approved by, the ESFA, were agreed as being appropriate.
- 3.10. This report is intended to provide Cabinet Member with an overview of the main changes highlighted in the operational guide and of the results of the autumn consultation, school briefing sessions, the progress being made towards agreeing the Schools Funding arrangements locally for the financial year 2020-21 and seeks agreement regarding the mainstream funding formula for 2020-21 along with the growth fund criteria and central schools services funding.

4. Financial Context and Strategic Direction

- 4.1. As in previous years, the pressures on the High Needs budget continue to grow. During this financial year, as part of the regular budget monitoring reports, growing pressures have been highlighted in a range of areas, most noticeably on out of city placements and the Element 3 top-up funding paid to mainstream schools.
- 4.2. Financial modelling of the pressures identified that if the High Needs pressures continued to grow at the same percentage rates as in recent years the authority would be experiencing a £2m gap in high needs funding compared to 2019-20 funding, which could have to be met through the use of the schools block.
- 4.3. Whilst the increase in funding (set out in paragraph 3.6) for the following three financial years has been announced, how the funding will be allocated and the proportion that will directed to high needs has only been confirmed for 2020-21. The authority will continue to work with schools to ensure a move to a more inclusive city ensuring that the high needs funding is focused where it can make the greatest impact whilst remaining within the resources available.
- 4.4. The strategic direction, as set out in the SEND Strategy, remains a commitment to promote inclusion and improve the outcomes for children and young people aged 0-25 with SEND. In order to do this, we aim to ensure that there are in place a continuum of high quality support services that contribute towards removing barriers to achievement and

that children and young people's special educational needs are identified early so that a high quality and co-ordinated offer of support can be put in place.

- 4.5. The SEND Strategy states that we aim to ensure a continuum of high quality educational provision is in place so that children and young people with SEND can attend a local mainstream nursery, school or college wherever possible.
- 4.6. This means that we need to ensure mainstream providers have the resources, skills and competence to meet the needs of a wide range of children and young people with SEND. In addition, we want to commission high quality specialist provision so that children and young people can be successfully educated within the city.
- 4.7. In 2017/18 Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils undertook a joint SEND Strategic Review. A summary of the key findings that are pertinent to this paper are set out below: :
 - The number of EHCPs will increase, at a minimum, in line with population increases and increases in prevalence, but potentially also as a result of increased expectations and demand.
 - This increase is expected to be **most significant in the numbers of children with severe learning difficulties and complex** needs which has already put pressure on special school places.
 - The **need and demand for Special School places is predicted to increase** year on year due to increasing numbers of children and young people with severe and complex needs and autism and the increase in age of statutory protection
 - The review identified that there are children currently in special schools whose needs could be met in an inclusion centre or mainstream school, but additional support and resources for mainstream schools would be needed to achieve this.
- 4.8. These predictions have been further refined and confirmed by the SEN Place Planning Strategy 2018-2024. In the light of this, an SEND accommodation review was commissioned in 2019 to: review existing accommodation; consider how to physically organise the SEND provision on a city wide basis; and identify the need for additional accommodation and / or reconfiguration of existing accommodation.
- 4.9. Key recommendations from the review included:
 - **Inclusion centres** - additional places should be created by extending the capacity of existing facilities (Trafalgar, Milton Park and Portsdown) subject to feasibility work; and that new inclusion provision is considered if future opportunities become available

- **Alternative / SEMH provision (AP)** - capacity at Flying Bull Inclusion Centre is increased to meet the growing need (and to consider an extension to Year 6 on the Flying Bull site); and consideration be given to supporting internal AP provision in secondary mainstream schools
 - **Complex and Complex Plus** - a new 140 place school should be built on the former King Richard School (estimated cost of £20m); and that further work be undertaken to look at the commissioning of post 19 places
- 4.10. A second phase of work is now being undertaken building on these recommendations but looking at other alternatives in terms of the recommendation for a new special school due to the lack of capital funding available and taking into account the revenue implications and the increased pressure that would be placed on the High Needs Block of the DSG if a special school were to be built. The second phase of work is due to be completed later this year and will inform future capital works to support SEND places in the city.

5. Engagement with Schools

- 5.1. The authority consulted with schools in May 2019 regarding the move to the use of the National Fair Funding (NFF) formula for primary schools which would then bring them in line with secondary schools. Schools and Schools Forum endorsed the move to a primary NFF subject to affordability and Section 7 sets out the mainstream schools funding arrangements for 2020-21.
- 5.2. Due to the continued growth in high needs pressures a further consultation was held in the autumn term. The consultation provided schools with an explanation of the current and 2020-21 forecast position, an indication of the amount of funding required to cover the pressure, and how much this would equate to per pupil if the funding should be transferred from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. The consultation asked schools if they would support a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block and in light of the additional funding for SEND, their priorities as to how the additional resources should be used.
- 5.3. Following feedback from secondary schools that current funding methodology did not adequately support the secondary curriculum. The authority also took the opportunity to consult with schools regarding the increasing the growth fund budget to support basic need in the secondary sector.
- 5.4. Overall the authority received 30 responses to the consultation within the extended timescale, of which there were 29 (46.8%) schools, 20 Primary, six Secondary/all-through and three Special schools, in addition to the schools one Academy Trust responded separately to the schools in the

Trust. We received three responses from Multi Academy Trusts who responded on behalf of all schools in the Trust (a total of 14 schools), therefore their response has been counted according to the number of schools in the total numbers. A summary of the responses can be found in Appendix 1, a number of schools took the time to provide comments as part of their response and these were shared in full with Schools Forum on 17 December. A copy of these comments is available from the Children, Families and Education Finance team.

- 5.5. Not all schools answered every question in the consultation which has led to some questions not totalling to 30 responses. Of the 30 Schools that responded to the consultation seven schools chose not to prioritise how the additional SEND funding should be utilised and eight schools either did not complete or partially completed the prioritisation of the growth fund options.
- 5.6. Whilst the results of the consultation were inconclusive and did not provide a clear direction of travel for the authority, they have provided useful feedback which will help to inform further discussions with schools over the coming year.
- 5.7. The high needs funding allocation for 2020-21 will be sufficient to fund the pressures for 2020-21 and the proposals will be brought to the February 2020 Decision Meeting.
- 5.8. Whilst schools were not supportive of increasing the value of the growth fund through reducing the funding to all schools, additional funding received as part of the 2020-21 funding allocation has enabled the authority to propose an increase which is detailed in Section 7 below.

6. Dedicated Schools Grant

- 6.1. The determination of the 2020-21 Dedicated Schools Grant and Schools budgets is set out in Appendix 2.
- 6.2. On the 19 December 2019, the ESFA announced the Dedicated Schools Grant allocation for Portsmouth for 2020-21.
- 6.3. The overall DSG allocation includes the funding for both Maintained schools and Academies although Portsmouth City Council will only receive the funding for the Maintained schools as Academies receive this direct from the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA).
- 6.4. In October 2019 the DfE released the indicative funding for 2020-21 based on the National Funding Formula and the October 2018 census data. The funding allocation has been updated for the October 2019 census and reflects the growth in pupil numbers seen both in mainstream schools and high needs settings across the city. The table below sets out the funding allocation for 2019-20 and the provisional funding

allocation for 2020-21. Confirming that Portsmouth's allocation of the £2.6bn additional funding equates to £11.5m.

Block funding	2019-20 ²	2020-21	Variance	
	£	£	£	%
Schools Block	116,084,679	123,752,614	7,667,935	7%
Central School Services Block	825,483	856,419	30,936	4%
High Needs Block	21,174,134	24,759,016	3,584,882	17%
Early Years Block	14,175,471	14,415,543	240,072	2%
Total	152,259,767	163,783,592	11,523,825	8%

- 6.5. The authority has explored the option of transferring funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block and consulted with schools. However as long as growth continues within the current projections, the increase in funding will enable the authority to manage the forecast pressures for 2020-21 within the High Needs Block funding and without recourse to the Schools Block. Section 4 sets out the strategy for working with schools over the coming years to manage the pressure on the High Needs Block, promote inclusion and improve the outcomes for children and young people 0-25 with SEND.
- 6.6. The amount expected to be received directly by Portsmouth City Council is £73.2m, excluding funding for academies. The funding received directly will continue to change during the year as schools convert to Academy status, since they will receive their funding directly from the Education Funding Agency rather than from the Council. Table 2 below sets out the DSG funding allocation for 2020-21.

DSG Funding	2020-21			
	Indicative funding inc. Academies	Provisional funding inc. Academies	Academy impact	Provisional exc. Academies
	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
Schools Block	120,706	123,753	(82,808)	40,945
Central School Services Block	841	856	0	856
High Needs Block*	24,502	24,759	(7,585) ³	17,174
Early Years Block**	14,399	14,416	0	14,416
TOTAL	160,448	163,784	(90,393)	73,391

* This is a provisional allocation which will be updated later in the year for import/export.

** This is a provisional allocation which will be updated later in the year; it reflects the January 2019 census.

² As at November 2019

³ Assumes that the Harbour School will convert to academy status on 1 February 2020.

7. Schools Block - Mainstream School Revenue Funding Formula Changes 2019-20

- 7.1. The Schools Block covers the mainstream (maintained and academy) schools individual budgets and the growth fund. The DfE has advised that the percentage increases to the Schools Block will be measured against the 2019-20 baseline funding to local authorities (previously increases were measured against the 2017-18 baseline).
- 7.2. The 2020-21 policy document on the Schools Block funding to the local authority will allow for:
- A 4% increase to the NFF pupil led factors (with the exception of the Free School Meals factor). The provisional NFF factor values for 2020-21 are listed in Appendix 4.
 - A 4% increase to the Lump sum.
 - Minimum per pupil funding levels of £3,750 for Primary, £4,800 key stage three pupils, £5,300 key stage four pupils (totals £5,000 for secondary pupils). The Primary level will rise to £4,000 by 2021-22.
 - A minimum increase of 1.84% on the per pupil funding provided in 2019-20
 - An increase of 1.84% to the Free School Meals factor
 - An increase to the PFI factor in line with the retail price index.
 - They will remove the cap from local authority funding allocation (local authorities still have the ability to set a local cap on gains). Portsmouth currently does not implement the cap
 - There is no change to the methodology of funding Growth for local authorities, but the funding values will be increased by 4%
 - The teachers' pay grant and teachers' pension employer contributions grant will continue to be paid separately to the NFF for 2020-21.
- 7.3. It should be clarified that the above changes relate to the calculation of the schools block as a whole.
- 7.4. At the December 2019 meeting Schools Forum endorsed the mainstream formula factors and proposed unit values to be used in the 2020-21 school revenue funding formula, which followed on from consultation with schools in the summer term and autumn terms 2019.
- 7.5. For 2020-21 both primary and secondary mainstream schools will be funded using the NFF.
- 7.6. Analysis of the schools block allocation received by the authority has identified that the calculation of the NFF for all Portsmouth Schools has provided more funding than expected. This is due to a change in pupil characteristics and the inclusion of mobility factor funding due to a change in calculation methodology by the DfE. This combined with the

move to all schools to the NFF has allowed the authority greater flexibility to maximise the funding provided to mainstream schools in 2020-21.

- 7.7. The final proposed funding pro-forma for 2020-21 is attached at Appendix 4. The paragraphs below set out the proposed changes to the funding formula and their impact.

Minimum funding level per pupil

- 7.8. The mandatory minimum per pupil funding has been applied to both the primary and secondary formulae. This ensures that for each pupil the school will get at least the minimum rate per pupil.

Table 3 Minimum funding level per pupil		
Phase	MFL 2020-21	MFL 2020-21
Primary	£3,500	£3,750
Secondary	£4,800	£5,000
All-through	£4,042 ⁴	£4,271 ⁵
KS4 only schools	£5,100	£5,300

- 7.9. Following the application of the above rates a total of 4 primary schools received additional funding under the minimum per pupil funding.

Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)

- 7.10. In October 2019 the Secretary of State confirmed that the national funding formula would provide for a 1.84% per pupil increase in respect of each school between its 2019-20 baseline and 2020-21. An allocation was included in the schools block funding to the council for 2020-21 to accommodate this protection. The DfE has confirmed that local authorities should set a positive MFG of between plus 0.5% and plus 1.84%.

- 7.11. The authority has applied a positive MFG of 1.84% per pupil for 2020-21 11 primary and 2 secondary schools will receive additional funding.

Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

- 7.12. The authority's Schools Block funding allocation includes an area cost of adjustment which provides an uplift on the NFF formula factors of 1.01416 percent. In previous years due to the transitioning of the primary schools the funding provided as part of the ACA has been used to smooth the impact of the primary transition. For 2020-21 with all mainstream schools being funded on the NFF the authority has applied

⁴ It should be noted that this value is based on 6 primary and 5 secondary year groups.

⁵ It should be noted that this value is based on 7 primary and 5 secondary year groups.

the ACA uplift to the NFF factor values provided by the DfE to both primary and secondary schools. Appendix 3 sets out the NFF factor values and the values to be paid to schools in 2020-21.

Secondary schools

- 7.13. Secondary schools continue to be funded on the NFF unit values plus the ACA for 2020-21. Details are shown in Appendix 3.

Primary schools

- 7.14. The authority has implemented the NFF formula values plus the ACA for the 2020-21 primary mainstream funding formula. Details are shown in Appendix 3

Mobility

- 7.15. The mobility factor of the NFF has historically not been used by Portsmouth, additionally the DfE did not have a consistent basis of allocating funding due to the unreliability of the underlying data. This has meant that the NFF funding received by the authority in previous years did not include mobility funding.
- 7.16. For 2020-21 the DfE have used a formula to calculate the impact of mobility on schools nationally. The formula tracks individual pupils through censuses from the past three years and looks to see if the first record of a pupil is on either the spring or summer census, if they are, then the pupil is considered a mobile pupil. If the proportion of mobile pupils attending a school is above 6% the DfE allocates a per pupil amount to all pupils above the 6% value.
- 7.17. The use of this new methodology has provided additional funding to the authority, whilst this is still an optional factor, the use of the new funding methodology and the government's commitment to implementing a hard national funding formula would indicate that schools will receive funding through this factor in the future. Through implementing the factor the authority is able to pass additional funding to those schools where the number of mobile pupils is above the 6% baseline (16 primary and 4 secondary) providing an additional £114,936 to schools.
- 7.18. It is therefore proposed to implement this factor for 2020-21 as set out in Appendix 3.

Rates

- 7.19. In setting schools budgets for 2020-21, it has been necessary to amend the funding values in respect of the National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) factor, to reflect changes in rateable value, transitional relief or school reorganisation. The annual cost of NNDR for school properties

has decreased for 2020-21 due to a number of properties being revalued and transitional reliefs. Schools are funded for NNDR on an actual basis and the decrease in the funding requirement for 2020-21 amounts to £210,000.

Lump Sum

- 7.20. After applying the NFF values plus the area cost adjustment, the minimum per pupil funding, a positive MFG of plus 1.84% and the new mobility factor the authority had a surplus of schools block funding.
- 7.21. The authority has reviewed how best to utilise the remaining funding in a method that maximises the funding to schools in a fair and consistent manner but minimises any impact on the minimum funding guarantee in future years. As the lump sum value is deducted from both sides of the MFG calculation to ensure the comparison of the per pupil values are on a like for like basis, it is proposed to increase the lump sum paid to both primary and secondary schools from £116,020 (NFF value plus the area cost adjustment) to £136,770.

Financial cap on gains

- 7.22. No financial cap on gains has been imposed, which continues to allow all gaining schools to benefit fully from the move to the NFF.

Growth Fund

- 7.23. The current Growth Fund provides additional funding to support schools who have seen an increase in Published Admission Numbers (PAN) to support basic need in the City. This is based on a national formula on a lagged basis, which may or may not reflect Portsmouth's needs for the coming year (see Table 4 below). The local criteria for distributing this was consulted and endorsed by Schools Forum in the spring 2019 and approved by Cabinet Member in July 2019 for implementation from September 2019.

Table 4 - Growth funding per pupil rates		
	2019-20 rates	2020-21 rates
	£	£
Primary growth pupil	1,370	1,425
Secondary growth pupil	2,050	2,130
New school	65,000	67,600

- 7.24. The current primary funding rate is a lump sum based on the costs of a classroom teacher, plus a part time teaching assistant, contribution for educational equipment and an element for free school meals. The value is then multiplied by a factor of 1:1.34 for secondary settings to reflect the ratio of secondary funding compared to primary funding.

- 7.25. Whilst the current lump sum works for primary settings when the addition of a class has a more direct relationship to the requirement for an additional teacher. In secondary settings this is more complex due to the wider curriculum and the impact across a number of subjects.
- 7.26. Whilst the authority recognises the curriculum pressure in secondary schools, growth funding received by the authority is calculated at £2,130 per secondary pupil but is funding the equivalent of £2,660 per pupil. This has been affordable as the rest of the national formula has been more generous, but this could change in the future because the methodology used by the DfE to calculate Growth may not be consistent with where the actual growth occurs. For example growth in one school may be netted off by a reduction in other schools within the same area. Funding is predicted to reduce in future years in line with a forecast decrease in the primary population. To provide surety of funding for those schools undergoing growth in pupil numbers, the authority needs to ensure the long term sustainability of the Growth Fund in the context of a declining school population.
- 7.27. Following the receipt of the 2020-21 indicative funding allocation the authority notified schools that they would review the funding provided to secondary schools to see if it was possible to bring the value of the lump sum closer to the key stage three per pupil entitlement factor (£4,075).
- 7.28. The 2020-21 growth allocation within the Schools Block funding has provided funding of £1.3m. Of this a proportion has been used to support the implicit growth in primary pupil numbers in September 2020 at Mayfield funded through the School Budget Share.
- 7.29. The authority has financially modelled the expected future growth funding using the planned secondary school expansion programme to inform potential funding in 2021-22 onwards. To support the Growth funding received under the formula the authority also receives funding to cover the 5 month period (April to August) for academy schools in receipt of Growth funding, this is based on the growth funding by the authority to the eligible schools.
- 7.30. The "Schools revenue funding 2020 to 2021, Operational guide" and the subsequent government response to the "Implementing mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels" consultation clarify that the government expects all schools to receive at least the minimum funding levels per pupil. To ensure consistency with the mainstream formula it is therefore proposed to increase the secondary Growth funding lump sum to reflect the key stage 3 minimum funding level of £4,800 per pupil, this would equate to a lump £144,000 for a class of 30 pupils for a full academic year. This is £2,670 more per pupil than the amount funded through the growth formula.

7.31. For 2020-21 this provides an overall Growth Fund of £1.4m which covers the cost of all schools currently in receipt of Growth Funding, plus a contingency of £84,000 should there be an unexpected bulge year or should one of the current maintained schools receiving Growth funding decide to convert to academy status. This will provide a potential surplus within the 2020-21 growth fund. It is proposed to roll this surplus forward at the end of 2020-21 to support a potential deficit position in 2021-22. However as the roll forward of growth fund balances, could include the roll forward of a deficit balance, that would need to be recovered further consultation with schools is required and it is proposed that this is undertaken in the Spring 2020. Even with the roll forward of surplus balances there is a risk that the growth fund balance will go into deficit in 2024-25.

8. Disapplication requests

- 8.1. Each year, local authorities can submit disapplication requests to the ESFA, where strict adherence to the legislation as set out in the School and Early Years Finance (England) regulations (as amended each year), would generate perverse results for specific schools. The authority submitted two disapplication requests by the deadline of 11 October 2019 in respect of the operation of the minimum funding guarantee (MFG), as set out in the following paragraphs.
- 8.2. **Charter Academy:** Charter has historically enjoyed a high level of MFG protection, which dates back many years and was caused by a sudden and significant drop in pupils. The local formula at that time, in common with most other local formulae, provided "real term protection", which ensured that a school would receive at least 95% of the previous year's funding in cash terms. This funding was subsequently locked in by the MFG, which provides protection on a per pupil basis. As the pupil numbers at Charter have increased, so the MFG protection has grown.
- 8.3. Capital investment for Charter is needed to increase the capacity of the school to meet basic need; however the local authority could not sanction the capital investment if the increase in capacity would also increase the level of MFG support. The local authority has agreed a compromise with Charter, whereby only 600 pupils (2018-19 capacity) would continue to receive MFG protection and any new pupils above that level will receive appropriate pupil-led funding for that school, i.e. basic entitlement, deprivation, prior attainment funding etc. Official approval to this agreement has now been received from the DfE, but needs to be applied for annually.
- 8.4. **Mayfield School:** Mayfield is continuing to open new primary year groups as it moves towards becoming an all-through school. The MFG, in its pure form, uses the average per pupil funding from the previous year

as a baseline to calculate any protection due. Whilst the school is growing, the per-pupil average is skewed towards the existing secondary provision, which means that any additional primary age pupils would be artificially protected at the "whole school" rate. We have therefore requested that the MFG is amended to ensure that the school is funded appropriately for the age profile of its pupils. This is expected to be the final year of this request as the primary school is expected to have all years full from September 2020.

- 8.5. The authority received approval to dis-apply the regulations for 2020-21 for both of the above disapplication requests on 29 October 2019.

9. Central Schools Services Block

- 9.1. The Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) has seen a small increase in the per pupil funding value from £32.84 to £33.48 in addition to the increase due to pupil numbers.

- 9.2. The EFSA has agreed with the following agencies to continue to purchase a single national licence managed by them for all state funded schools in England:

- Christian Copyright Licensing International (CCLI);
- Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA);
- Education Recording Agency (ERA);
- Filmbank Distributions Ltd (for the PVSL);
- Mechanical Copyright Protection Society (MCPS);
- Motion Picture Licensing Company (MPLC);
- Newspaper Licensing Authority (NLA);
- Performing Rights Society (PRS);
- Phonographic Performance Limited (PPL); and
- Schools Printed Music Licence (SPML).

- 9.3. These licences are funded centrally and for 2020-21 the budget provision has been set at £123,800, a decrease of around £2,300, which is expected to meet the central charges from the DfE for the financial year.

- 9.4. Other proposed budget increases in the CSSB are £26,500 for the Admissions Service, reflecting the increase in the cost of the salaries, and £6,700 for the Education Support Grant retained duties, reflecting the increase in the number of pupils in the City.

- 9.5. It is proposed that the Schools Forum budget will remain at the same value as in previous years.

- 9.6. The overall budgeted expenditure within the CSSB is £856,400, which matches the authority's funding allocation for 2020-21.

10. Early Years

10.1. On the 31 October the DfE issued the hourly funding rates for 2, 3 & 4 year olds for 2020-21. This is expected to provide Portsmouth with an additional £0.2m funding to the early years block. The table below sets out the hourly funding rates for 2019-20 and 2020-21.

Table 5 Early Years Block funding Two, Three and Four Year old hourly rates			
	2019-20	2020-21	Variance
	£	£	£
Two year olds	5.43	5.51	0.08
Three and four year olds	4.69	4.77	0.08

10.2. The authority is currently out to consultation with early years settings regarding the additional funding and a proposal will be brought back to Schools Forum and Cabinet Member at the February 2020 meeting.

11. High Needs

11.1. For 2019-20 the authority was able to set a balanced budget due to the additional funding announced in December 2018. However as the financial year has progressed the high needs pressures have continued to grow, showing forecast expenditure at £805,000 above the funding available (as at September 2019).

11.2. In December 2019 the initial high needs block allocation is indicating an increase in High needs funding of approximately £3.6m. Although following the receipt of the import/export adjustment in July 2020 this is expected to decrease to £3.4m.

11.3. At the time of writing this report there are a number discussions in progress regarding the high needs budgets, including Inclusion Centre and Special School places, Solent Academies Trust Top-up values and proposals to support inclusion in mainstream schools. The proposed High Needs Block budget will be brought to the February Schools Forum.

12. Dedicated Schools Grant Balances

12.1. Current modelling suggests that the final carry forward balance from 2019-20 will be in the region of £2.5m. This includes the schools specific contingency of £141,800 which it is proposed is carried forward, to be used for the same purpose in 2020-21.

- 12.2. Any residual balance carried forward would be a one-off funding source and therefore should be used to support one-off expenditure items rather than recurrent expenditure.
- 12.3. The impact of the above proposals on the brought forward balance is set out in Table 5 below.

Table 5 - Estimated 2019-20 brought forward	£m
Estimated brought forward from 2019-20	2.500
Schools specific contingency (earmarked reserve)	(0.142)
Estimated DSG reserves	2.358

- 12.4. It is prudent to retain a healthy carry forward balance to support the potential financial risks and pressures arising in 2020-21. The potential balance will be around 1.9% of the total DSG funding for 2020-21, placing the authority potentially at risk of being unable to cover any unexpected cost pressures during 2020-21. The additional funding allocation, should help to improve the on-going sustainability of the high needs elements of the budget and this will be closely monitored and reported during 2020-21.

13. Reasons for recommendations

- 13.1. The recommendations within this report seek to allocate DSG resources appropriately and fairly, to provide the best possible outcomes for pupils in the City. They are consistent with the requirements that are anticipated will be contained within the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations. It is expected that Local Authorities will be required to make an initial determination of their schools' budget no later than the 29th February 2020.

14. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

- 14.1. This report and the proposals within form part of, and are consistent with, the national implementation of the schools and high needs national funding formula as directed by the Department of Education.
- 14.2. The DfE has conducted a full Equality Impact Assessment which can be found on their website⁶. The funding system does not seek to target funding by reference to particular protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, but instead targets funding to those groups which the evidence demonstrates face barriers to their educational achievement.

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-funding-formula-for-schools-and-high-needs-equalities-impact-assessment>

15. Legal comments

15.1. Although at the time of preparing this report these are yet to be published by central government, it is anticipated that updated School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations will require local authorities to make an initial determination of their Schools Budget by the 29th February 2020. The recommendations in this report have regards to officers understanding of the requirements to be contained in those updated regulations and in particular identify elements of the proposals in respect of which Cabinet Member specific approval or endorsement is required.

16. Head of Finance comments

16.1. Financial comments have been included within the body of this report.

.....
 Signed by: **Alison Jeffery, Director of Children, Families and Education**

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Autumn consultation 2020-21 results
- Appendix 2 - Dedicated Schools Grant, Schools Block and Central Schools Services Block 2020-21
- Appendix 3 - Funding formula factor rates 2020-21
- Appendix 4 - School funding pro forma 2020-21
- Appendix 5 - Growth Funding Criteria 2020-21

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
School revenue funding 2020 to 2021 - operational guide (updated December 2019)	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/831848/Schools_operational_guide_2020_to_2021.pdf
Schools Block national funding formula: technical note (October 2019)	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/844007/2020-21_NFF_schools_block_technical_note.pdf
High Needs funding 2020 to 2021 operational guide (updated October 2019)	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/837971/Operational_guide.pdf
The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations	www.legislation.gov.uk
School revenue funding working	Children, Families and Education Finance

Title of document	Location
papers	Team
Schools Funding Arrangements Autumn Consultation 2020-21	Children, Families and Education Finance Team

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by the Schools Forum.

.....
Signed by:

Appendix 1: 2020-21 School Funding Formula Stage 2 Consultation - Results

High Needs Funding Proposals			
Mainstream Education Health and Care plans			
1	Do you agree with the proposal to move to a banded funding system for pupils in mainstream schools with an EHCP as set out in section 3.4 from 1 September 2020?	Y = 11	N = 17
2	Agree to support the provision of EHCP in mainstream schools by transferring funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a minus -0.58% MFG adjustment at a cost of approximately £21.70 per pupil to provide £547,200 of funding to enable the continuation of an un-banded mainstream funding approach. Option 1 on Table 19 and Table B. Or: 	Y=0	N=19
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a minus -0.33% MFG adjustment at a cost of approximately £12.42 per pupil to provide £308,700 of funding to enable the implementation of a banded mainstream funding approach Option 1a on Table 19 and Table B. 	Y=18	N=10
Independent Specialist Provision			
3	Do you support the provision of education to pupils with highly complex needs at independent specialist provision through using a minus -0.30% MFG adjustment at a cost of £11.30 per pupil to transfer £284,100 of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. Option 2 in Table 19 and Table B.	Y=2	N=23
Special Schools - Element 3 Top-up			
4	Do you support the transfer of £694,700 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through the use of a minus - 0.75% MFG adjustment at a cost of approximately £27.76 per pupil? To fund the additional Element 3 Top-up costs due to the increased numbers and needs of pupils in special schools. Option 3 in Table 19 and on Table B.	Y=4	N=24
Solent Academies Trust - Element 3 Top-up			
5	Do you support the introduction of single banding funding rates which reflect the level of need of the child rather than the location of the child across the special schools within the Solent Academies Trust? By either :		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a weighted based on the current top-up values and at no extra cost to the authority. (Section 3.7.4 b) Or: 	Y=19	N=12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the funding to the Trust by developing a new banded system based on the current costs of the Trust. By transferring £335,300 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through the use of the minus -0.35% MFG at a cost of 	Y=3	N=25



	approximately £13.18 per pupil. Option 4c in Table 19 and on Table B. Or:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the funding to the Trust by developing a new banded system based on the Mary Rose Academy rates. By transferring £594,800 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through the use of the minus -0.63% MFG at a cost of approximately £23.48 per pupil. Option 4d in Table 19 and on Table B. 	Y=3	N=25
Special Schools - Place funding			
6	Do you support the transfer of £81,600 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through the use of a minus - 0.09% MFG at a cost of approximately £3.39 per pupil? Option 5 in Table 19 and Table B.	Y=6	N=18
Post 16 Colleges			
7	Do you support the transfer of £152,600 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block through the use of a minus - 0.16% MFG at a cost of approximately £6.02 per pupil? Option 6 in Table 19 and Table B.	Y=3	N=25
Transfer from the Early Years Block			
8	Do you support the transfer of £58,500 from the early years block to the High Needs Block through the reduction of the centrally retained funding as set out in Tables 11 and 12?	Y=18	N=8

Schools Block proposals			
Growth funding - Secondary Schools			
9	Which of the following proposals relating to changes to the Secondary lump sum payment of the growth fund do you support? Please rank in order of preference with 1 being your preferred choice and 4 being your least preferred choice.		
		Average score	Priority
	1. Do nothing, maintain current funding rate of £79,800 lump sum (section 4.2.2 1). Or:	2.00	1
	2. Use the basic per pupil entitlement to increase the lump sum to £115,900 and fund by using a minus -0.15% MFG at a cost of £5.65 per pupil (section 4.2.2 2). Or:	2.45	3
	3. Use an average per pupil rate to provide a secondary lump sum of £153,900 and fund by using a minus -0.34% MFG at a cost of £12.80 per pupil (section 4.2.2 3). Or:	2.73	4
	4. Increase the lump sum to £84,000, which remains within the affordability of the budget (section 4.2.2 4).	2.18	2

Prioritisation of additional funding		
<p>To help us focus the additional funding on those areas which reflect the priorities of the Schools in the City please put a number against each of the options below, with 1 being the most important and where the additional funding should be used first and 13 being the least important.</p>		
Options	Average score	Priority
Pupils at Mainstreams schools with EHCP - no banding	4.64	3
Pupils at Mainstreams schools with EHCP - with banding	2.50	1
Pupils in specialist independent provision (Out of City)	6.78	8
Special schools Element 3 Top-up (increased numbers and complexity)	8.10	10
Solent Academies Trust - Trust wide banding rates to reflect the needs of the child rather than the location - based on current banding rates	6.89	9
Solent Academies Trust - Trust wide banding rates to reflect the needs of the child rather than the location - based on increased banding rates	10.10	12
Solent Academies Trust - Trust wide banding rates to reflect the needs of the child rather than the location - based on Mary Rose banding rates	11.80	13
Additional special school places	4.45	2
Post 16 colleges additional places and associated Element 3 top-up	9.30	11
Early years complex needs inclusion fund	5.70	4
Growth funding - Secondary unit rate of £115,900 (funded by any increase in the school block)	5.70	4
Growth funding - Secondary unit rate of £153,900 (funded by any increase in the school block)	6.20	6
Growth funding - Secondary unit rate of £84,000 (funded by any increase in the school block)	6.44	7

Appendix 2 - Dedicated Schools Grant Original Budget 2020-21 (Schools Block and Central School Services Block)

	Approved 2019-20 Budget July 2019 (Inc. Academies)	Proposed Budget Revisions	2020-21 Schools Budget Jan 2020 (Inc. Academies)	2020-21 Schools Budget Jan 2020 (Exc. Academies)
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Schools Block				
Individual Schools Budgets (ISB)				
Primary	65,978	2,041	68,019	27,302
Secondary	49,453	5,181	54,634	12,543
Total ISB	115,431	7,221	122,653	39,845
De-Delegated and Central Budgets				
Growth Fund	754	649	1,403	1,403
De-delegated Budgets	142	(142)	0	0
Academy Conversions	25	(25)	0	0
Other Schools Block Sub Total	921	482	1,403	1,403
Total Schools Block	116,352	7,703	124,056	41,248
Central School Services Block				
Schools Forum	16	0	16	16
Admissions	307	26	333	333
Licences (negotiated by DfE)	126	(2)	124	124
ESG retained duties	377	7	384	384
Central School Services Block Total	826	31	856	856
Total Expenditure	117,178	7,734	124,912	42,104
Income				
Schools Block	(116,085)	(7,668)	(123,753)	(40,945)
Central Schools Services Block	(826)	(31)	(856)	(856)
DSG Income ²	(116,911)	(7,699)	(124,609)	(41,801)
One-off use of Carry Forward ¹	(142)	142	0	0
Academy conversions ³	(126)	(178)	(303)	(303)
Total Income	(117,178)	(7,735)	(124,913)	(42,104)

¹ Schools specific contingency

²2020-21 per ESFA allocations 19th December 2019

³ Includes reimbursement of Growth funding for Academy schools

Calculations are rounded to the nearest thousand therefore some columns may not add up to the total amount.

Appendix 3 - Formula Factor Funding rates 2020-21
Table A - Primary Factor funding rates

	PCC 2019-20 Rate	19/20 NFF Rate	PCC Consultation Proposed 2020-21(NFF) Rate	PCC Final proposed 2020-21 funding factor rates (NFF plus Area Cost Adjustment) ⁷
Factor	Primary	Primary	Primary	Primary
Minimum per pupil funding level	£3,500	£3,500	£3,750	£3,750
AWPU (Primary)	£2,782	£2,747	£2,857	£2,897
Free School Meals (FSM)	£440	£440	£450	£456
Free School Meals - Ever 6	£540	£540	£560	£568
IDACI Band F	£200	£200	£210	£213
IDACI Band E	£240	£240	£250	£254
IDACI Band D	£390	£360	£375	£380
IDACI Band C	£560	£390	£405	£411
IDACI Band B	£715	£420	£435	£441
IDACI Band A	£950	£575	£600	£609
EAL	£515	£515	£535	£543
Mobility	0	0	£875	£887
Prior Attainment	£1,050	£1,022	£1,065	£1,080
Lump Sum	£110,000	£110,000	£114,400	£136,770

Table B - Secondary Factor funding rates

	PCC 2019-20 (NFF) Rate	2020-21 (NFF) Rate	PCC Final proposed 2020-21 funding factor rates (NFF plus Area Cost Adjustment) ⁸
Factor	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
Minimum per pupil funding level	£4,600	£5,000	£5,000
AWPU KS3	£3,863	£4,018	£4,075
AWPU KS4	£4,386	£4,561	£4,626
Free School Meals (FSM)	£440	£450	£456
Free School Meals - Ever 6	£785	£815	£827
IDACI Band F	£290	£300	£304
IDACI Band E	£390	£405	£411
IDACI Band D	£515	£535	£543
IDACI Band C	£560	£580	£588
IDACI Band B	£600	£625	£634
IDACI Band A	£810	£840	£852
EAL	£1,385	£1,440	£1,460
Mobility	0	£1,250	£1,268
Prior Attainment	£1,550	£1,610	£1,633
Lump Sum	£110,000	£114,400	£136,770

⁷ Values are rounded to the nearest £1.00.

⁸ Values are rounded to the nearest £1.00.

Appendix 4: 2020-21 school Funding Proforma (see separate document)

Appendix 5: Growth funding criteria 2020-21

Centrally held funds to support Primary and Secondary Schools in 2020-21

Exceptional Growth Fund

Applies to: Maintained schools and Academies

Increasing Published Admission Number

Funding additional to the budget share will be allocated to schools that experience a planned increase in the Published Admission Number (PAN). The criteria (see below) to determine whether a school is eligible for funding for growth was agreed at schools forum in January 2020 for implementation from April 2020.

Criteria

Growth funding will be allocated to schools who meet the following criteria:

- *Funding will only be allocated when the growth (either permanently or as a bulge class) meets the basic need requirement of the local authority and the school is increasing both its Published Admission Number (PAN) and its planned intake of pupils in the current financial year (1 April to 31 March).*
- *And - The Deputy Director of Education formally approves to increase the capacity of a school.*
- *¹And - The planned growth in pupil numbers is a multiple of a complete half form entry, where a half form entry is equal to 15 pupils.*

1. It is acknowledged that some form entries may be below the full form number of 30 pupils e.g. 28 pupils. In these instances numbers will be rounded to the nearest eligible entry level.

What the growth fund covers

The additional pupils joining a school in September will be included in the October census. The census data is used to calculate the funding for the following financial year; which maintained schools receive from April. Therefore the growth fund finances the "gap" for maintained schools from September to March.

Academies are funded through the same local formula as maintained schools but receive their funding on an academic year basis, rather than the financial year basis of maintained schools.

Therefore academies will not receive their formula funding based on the October census until the following September. The growth fund for academies finances the "gap" from September up to the following August. The additional 5 months funding

for academies is paid by the Local Authority and reimbursed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency.

Methodology

The allocation from the growth fund to schools who meet the above criteria will be as follows:

The annual payment for approved growth for a full form entry of 30 pupils will be equal to a lump sum of £60,900 for Primary Schools and Academies and £144,000 for Secondary Schools and Academies.

Where a growth payment has been approved for a maintained or academy school the amount paid will be as follows:

Period September to March - maintained schools and academies

Payments for the period September to March will equate to 7/12ths of the annual amount as follows:

- £35,525 - Primary schools and academies
- £84,000 - Secondary schools and academies

Period April to August - academies only

Payments to academies for the period April to August will equate to 5/12ths of the annual amount as follows:

- £25,375 - Primary academies
- £60,000 - Secondary academies

Funding will be pro-rated for part form or multiples of full form entry, for example:

- The total sum above will be multiplied by 0.5 for a part form entry of 15 pupils
- For an increase of one and a half form entry (45 pupils) the total sum will be multiplied by 1.5
- Entry numbers falling under the half form or full form levels will be rounded to the nearest eligible entry level. Where form entries are less than 50% of the half form entry numbers these entries will not be eligible for growth funding.

A payment will be made for each year that the school is growing until the earliest of the following:

- The school reaches full capacity attributable to the increase in PAN approved by the Deputy Director of Education
- The Growth Fund criteria changes due to affordability
- There is a change in the funding formula as directed from the Education and Skills Funding Agency.

No allocation will be made to a school or academy where the school or academy:

- *Has surplus places and then takes additional children up to the PAN*
- *Admits over PAN at their own choice*
- *Admits extra pupils where those pupils have a reasonable alternative school place*
- *Increases the PAN of one year by reducing the PAN of another (e.g. increasing the PAN in year 7 by reducing the PAN in year 10)*
- *Is directed and/or requested to admit additional pupils as a result of errors, appeals, fair access protocol, SEN, LAC etc. as these numbers will be low on an individual school basis.*

Funding will not be allocated from this fund to a school which has received additional funding in the year, through its budget share as a result of an agreed variation in its pupil numbers.

***Example**

The maintained/academy primary school has been requested by the Local Authority to increase the PAN from a one and a half form entry (45 pupils) to a two form entry (60 pupils) from September 2020; this was approved by the Head of Sufficiency, Participation and Resources in October 2019.

Whilst the increase was agreed in 2019-20, the payment will be made in financial year 2020-21 as this is the year that the changes will come into effect.

The Increase in PAN is for half a form entry of 15 pupils therefore the payment will be pro-rated by 0.5.

For example the calculation would be: 7/12ths of £60,900 lump sum ($£60,900/12*7$) = £35,525

$£35,525 \times 0.5 = \mathbf{£17,763}$ payment to the school.

For an academy school they will receive an additional payment to cover the period April 2021 to August 2021, which would be calculated.

5/12ths of £60,900 lump sum ($£60,900/12*5$) = £25,375

$£25,375 \times 0.5 = \mathbf{£12,687}$ payment to the school.

**Example calculated using primary school rate*

Payment method

Where a maintained or academy school meets the criteria and the growth is known at the point of setting the budget for the financial year, payment will be made within 30 days of the beginning of the financial year which runs 1 April to 31 March

Where growth is identified during the financial year funding will be paid within 30 days of the receipt of the following notification:

- Maintained and Academy schools - PAN increases
Written approval to change the Published Admissions Number (PAN), by the Deputy Director of Education
- Maintained and Academy - Bulge classes:
the receipt by the Children's Finance team of the written confirmation from Deputy Director of Education that the Bulge class has materialised.

Applies to: Maintained schools and Academies

Increasing Age Range

Where a school is amending its age range, funding may be allocated from the 'Growth Fund' up to a maximum of £280,000, with the specific approval of schools forum, where the following criteria are met:

- The increased school places are required in order to meet basic need within the area and have been agreed with the Local Authority.
- The increased places relate to pre-16 pupils.
- The new school places are not within the schools current phase.
- A business case has been submitted by the school which sets out the expected set-up costs to be incurred.
- Any funding allocated would be to support the following areas of expenditure:
 - additional leadership team capacity
 - additional secretarial support
 - publicity, promotion and advertising of the new school
 - consultancy
 - curriculum costs
 - recruitment costs
 - other revenue costs related to set-up of the new school

If the above criteria are met, the funding would be allocated from the 'growth fund' in full to the school in a single funding period. The funding allocation would be calculated as £445 multiplied by the total number of additional places anticipated to be created in the school as a result of the change in the schools age range up to the maximum permitted.

Where a school is eligible for an allocation from the growth fund based on both the 'Increasing Published Admission Number' and the 'increased age range' criteria, then the school will only be eligible for an allocation from one of these mechanisms within the financial year.

School Specific Contingency

Applies to: Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools only

Purpose of the fund

The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations, permit the creation of a 'schools specific contingency' via the de-delegation of funding through the schools revenue funding formula. The contingency fund supports only Primary and Secondary maintained schools.

The purpose of the fund is to support maintained Primary and Secondary schools that have incurred expenditure, which it would be unreasonable to expect them to meet from the schools' budget share. This may include:

- schools in financial difficulty
- new, amalgamating or closing schools
- the writing-off of deficits of schools which are discontinued, excluding any associated costs or overheads
- other expenditure where the circumstances were unforeseen when initially determining the schools budget share.

Section 4 of the Scheme for Financing Schools continues to apply in respect of schools that are or are likely to be facing a deficit balance.

Criteria for accessing the fund

The fund is only available to maintained Primary and Secondary Schools in Portsmouth

Where as a result of exceptional expenditure or loss of income a school is experiencing financial difficulty, or has incurred other expenditure which it would be unreasonable to expect the school to meet from its budget share, then financial support will be considered for eligible schools where the following criteria are met:

- The costs or loss of income **must** have had a disproportionate effect on the schools budget.
- The costs or loss of income:
 - arose as a consequence of decisions by bodies outside of the control of the school or its governing body;
 - are exceptional in nature;
 - could not have been foreseen by the school or governing body.

- The governing body has taken steps to mitigate the impact, where possible.
- Additional costs for new, amalgamating or closing schools.

Criteria for new maintained schools:

Funding of costs in respect of the initial set-up of new maintained schools will be considered where a business case has been submitted by the school which sets out the expected costs to be incurred; and the following conditions are met:

- The increased school places are required in order to meet basic need within the area and have been agreed with the Local Authority.
- The increased places relate to pre-16 pupils.
- Any funding allocated would be to support the following areas of expenditure:
 - Initial leadership team capacity
 - Initial secretarial support
 - publicity, promotion and advertising of the new school
 - consultancy
 - curriculum costs
 - recruitment costs
 - other revenue costs related to set-up of the new school

One-off funding will be allocated based on the business case submitted, up to a maximum funding allocation of £445 multiplied by the total number of additional places anticipated to be created in the school.

Criteria for amalgamating schools:

Where two or more schools amalgamate, an amount equivalent to the closing balances of the previously maintained schools will be allocated to the new school.

Criteria for closing schools:

In the case of closing maintained schools, which are not amalgamating or converting to academy status under the Academies Act 2010, the contingency may fund additional costs where the school has insufficient balances and the costs are eligible to be funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Where a maintained school is discontinued, any remaining deficits balances may be charged against the contingency. Where it is necessary to use the contingency for this purpose it will be reported to the Schools Forum at the next scheduled meeting.

Decision Making Process

Where a school believes that their circumstances warrant support from the 'schools contingency fund', then the governing body should submit a request to the Finance Manager for Children, Families and Education.

The submission will be reviewed by the Deputy Director of Education and the Finance Manager for Children Families and Education. The level of the schools revenue and capital balances will also be considered as part of the review of any submission.

Any application which the Deputy Director of Education and the Finance Manager for Children Families and Education assess as meeting the above criteria, will be presented to the Schools Forum at the October and February meetings to make the final decision as to whether to provide financial support from the fund.

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

LA Name:	Portsmouth
LA Number:	851

Primary minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary (KS3 only) minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary (KS4 only) minimum per pupil funding level	Secondary minimum per pupil funding level	Disapplication number where alternative MPPF values are used
£3,750	£4,800.00	£5,300.00	£5,000.00	

Pupil Led Factors

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Reception uplift	No	Pupil Units		0.00		Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)		
	Description	Amount per pupil	Pupil Units	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)				Notional SEN (%)	
	Primary (Years R-6)	£2,897.46	16,277.00	£47,161,877	£87,204,977	38.78%	6.00%				
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£4,074.89	5,738.00	£23,381,747							
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£4,625.58	3,602.00	£16,661,353							
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	FSM	£456.37	£456.37	3,912.91	2,036.00	£2,714,915	£14,426,885	11.86%	20.00%	20.00%	
	FSM6	£567.93	£826.54	4,965.26	3,321.18	£5,565,007			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band F	£212.97	£304.25	2,681.42	1,422.57	£1,003,885			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band E	£253.54	£410.73	1,288.65	728.23	£625,833			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band D	£380.31	£542.58	1,981.10	991.31	£1,291,294			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band C	£410.73	£588.21	1,136.70	626.19	£835,217			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band B	£441.16	£633.85	1,800.81	989.24	£1,421,475			20.00%	20.00%	
	IDACI Band A	£608.50	£851.89	896.87	497.15	£969,260			20.00%	20.00%	
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	LAC X March 19			169.48		£0	£1,505,067	0.00%			
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	EAL 3 Primary	£542.58		1,858.49		£1,008,369			1.14%	0.00%	
	EAL 3 Secondary		£1,460.39		261.41	£381,762				0.00%	
5) Mobility	Pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£887.39	£1,267.70	99.52	21.00	£114,937		0.09%			
6) Prior attainment	Description	Weighting	Amount per pupil (primary or secondary respectively)	Percentage of eligible pupils	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)	
	Primary Low Attainment		£1,080.08	30.07%	4,894.47	£5,286,422	£9,095,472	7.48%	100.00%		
	Secondary low attainment (year 7)	64.53%		26.93%							
	Secondary low attainment (year 8)	63.59%		27.73%							
	Secondary low attainment (year 9)	58.05%	£1,632.80	25.11%	2,332.84	£3,809,050					100.00%
	Secondary low attainment (year 10)	48.02%		24.22%							
	Secondary low attainment (year 11)			20.45%							

Other Factors

Factor	Lump Sum per Primary School (£)	Lump Sum per Secondary School (£)	Lump Sum per Middle School (£)	Lump Sum per All-through School (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
7) Lump Sum	£136,770.00	£136,770.00			£8,069,430	6.64%	0.00%
8) Sparsity factor					£0	0.00%	

Please provide alternative distance and pupil number thresholds for the sparsity factor below. Please leave blank if you want to use the default thresholds. Also specify whether you want to use a tapered lump sum or the NFF weighting for any of the phases.

Distance threshold (miles)	Primary pupil number average year group threshold	Secondary pupil number average year group threshold	Middle school pupil number average year group threshold	All-through pupil number average year group threshold	Fixed, tapered or NFF sparsity primary lump sum?	Fixed
Primary distance threshold (miles)					Fixed, tapered or NFF sparsity primary lump sum?	Fixed
Secondary distance threshold (miles)					Fixed, tapered or NFF sparsity secondary lump sum?	Fixed
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)					Fixed, tapered or NFF sparsity middle school lump sum?	Fixed
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)					Fixed, tapered or NFF sparsity all-through lump sum?	Fixed

9) Fringe Payments	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
10) Split Sites	£0	0.00%	
11) Rates	£976,632	0.80%	
12) PFI funding	£163,993	0.13%	
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of ESFA)			
Circumstance	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY19-20	£0	0.00%	0.00%
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance3	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance4	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance5	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance6	£0	0.00%	
Exceptional Circumstance7	£0	0.00%	

Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding minimum per pupil funding level and MFG Funding Total)	£121,442,456	99.87%	
--	---------------------	---------------	--

14) Additional funding to meet minimum per pupil funding level	£164,134	0.13%	
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total)	£121,606,590	100.00%	

15) Minimum Funding Guarantee	1.84%	£1,046,295	
Where a value less than 0.5% or greater than 1.84% has been entered please provide the disapplication reference number authorising the value			
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)		No	
Capping Factor (%)		Scaling Factor (%)	
Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied		£0	
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling)	£1,046,295	0.84%	0.00%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula	£122,652,885		£17,213,148

High Needs threshold (only fill in if, exceptionally, a high needs threshold different from £6,000 has been approved)	£0.00
Additional funding from the high needs budget	£0.00
Growth fund (if applicable)	£1,403,166.56
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)	£0.00

Other Adjustment to 19-20 Budget Shares	£0
Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding)	£124,056,052
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement	71.71%
% Pupil Led Funding	92.29%
Primary: Secondary Ratio	1 : 1.33

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Title of meeting:	Education Cabinet
Subject:	Home to school & college transport budget pressures
Date of meeting:	16 January 2020
Report from:	Alison Jeffery Director of Children, Families and Education
Report by:	Mike Stoneman Deputy Director, Education and Early Help
Wards affected:	All Wards
Key decision (over £250k):	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline the ongoing pressures on the home to school & college transport budget, which are becoming increasingly difficult to manage within the overall Education and Early Help budget, and the actions that are being taken to address them.

2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member:

- a) Notes the scale of the budget pressure together with the remedial actions taken by the Education & Early Help Service over an extended period in order to contain overall costs as set out in sections 3 and 4 of the report;
- b) Note the actions and plans that the Education & Early Help Service is undertaking in 2019/20 to address existing and future budget pressures as set out in section 5 of the report and in Appendix 3.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Education Act 1996 places a duty on local authorities to provide free home to school transport for all eligible children, which includes children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and those living outside of statutory walking distance, as well as some children in receipt of free school meals and some Post-16 students.
- 3.2 Local authorities also have discretionary powers to go beyond their statutory duties and to provide transport for children who are not entitled to free transport. In doing so, they must consult with parents and must act

reasonably when determining their travel policy. Further information on eligibility criteria is shown at [Appendix 1](#).

- 3.3 The home to school & college transport budget has been the source of considerable budget pressure for many years and obligations have consistently outstripped the budget provision, as shown in [Table 1](#) below. It also shows that despite inflationary pressures, the average annual cost per pupil transported has only varied by less than 1% in four financial years.

Table 1: Home to school transport budget 2015/16 - 2019/20

	Budget	Actual	Overspend	%	Average annual cost per child transported
2015/16	£1,942,600	£2,103,360	£160,760	8%	£3,251
2016/17	£1,804,780 ¹	£2,011,867	£207,087	11%	£3,237
2017/18	£1,804,800	£2,181,192	£376,392	21%	£3,292
2018/19	£1,907,300	£2,181,895	£274,595	14%	£3,274
2019/20	£2,070,900				

- 3.4 The pressure on the home to school & college transport budget has come from an increase in numbers of pupils needing to be transported, as a result of the 2014 SEND Reforms. Nationally, the total national spend on home to school & college transport has increased by 6.5% between 2014/15 and 2017/18 from £1.02b to £1.08b and the proportion of councils that are overspending their home to school transport budgets has increased from 71% to 83%².
- 3.5 Over the years, the Education & Early Help Service has successfully striven to contain the transport overspend within the overall budget allocation. This has been managed by protecting the transport budget during savings rounds, by redirecting funding from other areas wherever possible, by using accumulated reserves to offset overspends at year end and by consulting on and implementing changes to the policy which has led to the removal of the majority of discretionary spending. Transport route management has also played a key part in ensuring effective use of resources. In the past two years, the following actions (as set out in [Table 2](#)) have been taken to help support the home to school budget, in addition to meeting corporate savings targets.

¹ The reduction in budget reflects expected savings following a review of eligibility criteria

² Understanding the drivers for rising demand and associated costs for home to school transport, LGA, ISOS and CCN Nov 2019

Table 2: Actions taken by the Education & Early Help Service to support the home to school & college transport budget

2018/19	£
Increase income target for EMAS service	23,300
Savings identified from Targeted short breaks underspend	25,000
Additional HTST budget from education savings	48,300
Maximise departmental inflation allowance	54,200
Total increase to HTST budget	102,500

2019/20	
Further reorganise School Improvement arrangements (in addition to the corporate saving of £20,000)	43,100
Redirect Pupil Premium grant funding to further support Virtual School Head	43,000
SEND team	12,500
Other education savings	8,400
Additional HTST budget from education savings	107,000
Maximise departmental inflation allowance	56,600
Total increase to HTST budget	163,000
Total	266,100

- 3.6 In May 2014, Portsmouth City Council introduced a revised home to school & college transport policy, following consultation with stakeholders, with the aim of ensuring effective use of funding whilst continuing to meet statutory duties. [Table 3](#) below shows that, despite the 73% increase in EHCPs since 2014/15, the increase in those being transported has increased by 25%, whilst discretionary numbers have fallen by 68%. Transport for exceptional circumstances has reduced considerably as a result of changes in policy. A breakdown of the current figures and examples of pupils that are given discretionary funding are given at [Appendix 2](#).

Table 3: Numbers of children transported

	EHCPs*	Statutory children transported	Exceptional circumstances (including 16-19)	19-25 year olds receiving transport assistance	Total
2014/15	955	419	266	0 or unknown	685
2015/16	1032	444	150	unknown	594
2016/17	1269	484	176	17	677
2017/18	1285	534	132	18	684
2018/19	1513	574	93	22	689
2019 (to date)	1650	524	84	19	627

*Pre 2018 includes statements of SEN

- 3.7 There are a number of reasons for the continuing pressure on the home to school & college transport budget. These include:
- Increased numbers of children who meet the eligibility criteria and therefore have a statutory entitlement to home to school transport assistance
 - Increasingly complex needs have led to a greater need for individual taxis and escorts to prevent other pupils on shared journeys being put at risk
 - Relocation of specialist provision e.g.
 - medical provision from Harbour@Milton to Harbour@Cosham has increased requirement for transport to the North of the City (4 students transported in 2016/17; 22 in 2018/19)
 - overall numbers of pupils requiring transport to The Harbour School have risen from 63 in 2015/16 to 138 in 2018/19 also in part due to the opening of the new vocational provision at the Vanguard Centre.
- 3.8 Despite these increasing challenges, Portsmouth is a low spender on home to school transport, both nationally and when compared to our statistical neighbours. [Table 4](#) below shows information extracted from the Section 251 benchmarking tables for 2018/19

Table 4: Home to School & College Transport - benchmarking data

2018-19 Budget LA Table (Net) £ per capita		Home to school transport
Statistical Neighbours (median)		£111
National Average (median)		£89
National Maximum		£254
National Minimum		£32
882	Southend-on-Sea	£74
851	Portsmouth	£82
874	Peterborough	£88
331	Coventry	£88
801	Bristol, City of	£93
852	Southampton	£95
831	Derby	£107
894	Telford and Wrekin	£107
373	Sheffield	£108
879	Plymouth	£118
837	Bournemouth	£162

4. Additional Burdens

- 4.1 Prior to September 2014 (when the SEND reforms came into force), the Education & Early Help Service had no involvement with young people over statutory school age. Since 2014 there has been an additional burden of requests for home to college transport for 19-25 year olds. Previously these

young people could have accessed college directly but the numbers have significantly increased.

- 4.2 Government guidance states that LAs have responsibility for promoting the effective participation in education and training for young people and gives authorities discretion to pay for transport for learners 16-19 and 19-25.
- 4.3 Discretionary transport for learners of statutory school age and the 16-19 age range is only awarded for those who can evidence that they have exceptional circumstances which means they need support with transport to access education e.g. very low income, difficult family circumstances, etc. These decisions are taken by Education in accordance with the published policy and criteria.
- 4.4 The requests for Post 19 are assessed and agreed by Adult Social Care in line with their statutory responsibilities, however, no funding has been made available to cover these discretionary awards of transport which last year totalled in excess of £100,000.

5. Current position

- 5.1 The Education & Early Help Service has prudently managed its budget, but despite this, the Service recorded a deficit of £120,000 for 2018/19, which it was able to fund by using brought forward reserves. The Portfolio reserve has now been reduced to £100,000, which will again be used to support the projected overspend in 2019/20, but this is likely to be the last year that the Service will have any surplus left to meet future budget pressures.
- 5.2 Officers continue to manage resources as efficiently as possible, but with the number of eligible pupils continuing to rise, and the increasing complexity of need, it is unlikely that the Service will have the ability to contain costs going forward if the offer continues as it is.

6. Actions and plans in 2019/20

- 6.1 The Education & Early Help Service, in partnership with the Transport Department, will continue to try to address and manage the home to school and college transport budget pressure. A detailed action plan has been developed which is set out in [Appendix 3](#). Key areas of work include:
 1. **Review of home to school transport policy** - no changes proposed to the main eligibility criteria, but there will be a focus on **privilege places** and whether any changes are needed
 2. **Review of types of transport offered and a move towards greater independence** as young people move through their schooling. This area of work will also explore the use of **personal budgets** and communications with parents about the options and how we encourage more independent travel where it is appropriate to do so. The approach the council is taking is supported by the recent report by ISOS which was commissioned by the LGA '*Understanding the drivers for rising demand and associated costs for home to school transport*'

3. **Regular reviews with parents and young people** about home to school transport e.g. as part of the EHCP Annual Review and detailed planning with **Redwood Park** on the introduction of a walking bus from Sept 2020 and **The Harbour School** to consider if some pupils could be moved to bus passes and travel training
 4. **Review of transport routes** (use of *Transy* route planning software) and **deployment of passenger assistants** who are employed by the council (of which there are currently 123).
 5. **Commissioning of transport providers** - appoint *adam* and move existing contracts on to the new system, broaden the market in order to introduce new providers and load onto the system all routes from Sept 2020 inviting tenders between June and August 2020.
- 6.2 If we are not able through these actions to change the offer sufficiently to contain costs within the current budget we will need to review options both within the Directorate and corporately. At present there are no options for redirecting resources which would not impact adversely on the delivery of important statutory Directorate functions.

7. Reasons for recommendations

- 7.1 The Education & Early Help Service has successfully managed the home to school and college budget pressures following the implementation of the SEND reforms which led to the growth in demand. No budget adjustment has been done to recognise this. It is also no longer possible to redirect funding from other budgets unless we cease to provide specific services. At present the Cabinet Member is invited to note actions being taken to change the offer, as described in paragraph 6.1 above. If these actions prove insufficient to contain costs, options for additional Directorate or corporate savings will need to be considered in order to redirect resources to discharge the school transport function.

8. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 8.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation contained within this report does not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. There is no proposal to change policy or the service to clients.

9. Legal implications

- 9.1 The Council has a duty to make such travel arrangements as they consider necessary to secure suitable home to school transport arrangements are made for eligible children in accordance with s.508B of the Education Act 1996. This relates to children of compulsory school age (5 - 16) and ensures transport is free. Section 508C of the Act gives the Council discretionary powers to make school travel arrangements for other children not covered by section 508B. Such transport does not have to be provided free of charge
- 9.2 In making those arrangements, regard must be had to the statutory guidance issued by the DfE. The current guidance is in the 2014 "Home to school

travel and transport guidance." The guidance recognises that it is for the individual LA to decide how they apply their discretion and that LAs will need to balance the demands for a range of discretionary travel against their budget priorities.

- 9.3 There are further provisions in s.509AA and s.509AB for young persons (aged 16 - 18), disabled persons and persons with learning difficulties, those continuing learners who started their programme of learning before their 19th birthday ("persons of sixth form age") and for young people with EHC Plans up to age 25 where they are continuing on a course started before their 19th birthday. LAs must prepare and publish an annual transport policy statement specifying the arrangements for the provision of transport or otherwise that the authority considers necessary for facilitating the attendance of such persons.
- 9.4 Additionally, LAs have a duty under s.508F and s.508G to make such arrangements for the provision of transport as they consider necessary in respect of adults aged 19 or over and relevant young adults with an EHC Plan in certain specified circumstances. These arrangements and those stated in paragraph 9.3 above must take into account the statutory guidance issued by the DfE "Post-16 Transport and Travel Support to Education and Training" January 2019.
- 9.5 In addition to the duties under the Education Act 1996, the LA has a general duty under the Education and Skills Act 2008 to encourage, enable and assist participation of young people with SEND up to the age of 25.

10. Finance comments

- 10.1 Financial implications are contained within the body of this report

.....
Signed by:
Alison Jeffery
Director of Children, Families and Education

Appendices:

- Appendix 1: Eligibility for free home to school transport
Appendix 2: Discretionary Awards 2014/15 - 2019 to date and case studies
Appendix 3: Home to school project plan to address current and future budget pressures

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Home to school travel and transport statutory guidance	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575323/Home_to_school_travel_and_transport_guidance.pdf
Post-16 transport and travel support to education and training statutory guidance	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/772913/Post16_transport_guidance.pdf
Home to school transport policy 2018	https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/schools/school-transport-and-travel
Section 251 benchmarking tables	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/section-251-2018-to-2019
Budget monitoring reports	Children, Families and Education Finance Team
LGA report 2019 Understanding the drivers for rising demand and associated costs for home to school transport	https://www.local.gov.uk/understanding-drivers-rising-demand-and-associated-costs-home-school-transport

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
 Signed by:

Appendix 1: Eligibility for free home to school transport

Local authorities have a duty to make transport arrangements as they consider necessary to facilitate attendance at school for all 'eligible' children (*DfE Home to school travel and transport guidance. Statutory guidance for local authorities. July 2014*). Children are 'eligible' for free home to school transport if they fall into one of the following categories:

1) Statutory walking distances eligibility

The Local Authority is required to provide free transport for all pupils of compulsory school age (5-16) if their nearest suitable school is:

- beyond 2 miles (if below the age of 8); or
- beyond 3 miles (if aged between 8 and 16)

2) Special educational needs, a disability or mobility problems eligibility

The Local Authority is required to make transport arrangements for all children who cannot reasonably be expected to walk to school because of their mobility problems or because of associated health and safety issues related to their special educational needs (SEN) or disability. Eligibility, for such children should be assessed on an individual basis to identify their particular transport requirements. Usual transport requirements (e.g. the statutory walking distances) should not be considered when assessing the transport needs of children eligible due to SEN and/or disability.

3) Unsafe route eligibility

The Local Authority is required to make transport arrangements for all children who cannot reasonably be expected to walk to the nearest suitable school because the nature of the route is deemed unsafe to walk.

4) Extended rights eligibility

The Local Authority is required to provide free transport where pupils are entitled to free school meals or their parents are in receipt of maximum Working Tax Credit if:

- The nearest suitable school is beyond 2 miles (for children over the age of 8 and under 11);
- The school is between 2 and 6 miles (if aged 11-16 and there are not three or more suitable nearer schools);
- The school is between 2 and 15 miles and is the nearest school preferred on the grounds of religion or belief (aged 11-16).

5) Discretionary eligibility

Local Authorities have discretionary powers to go beyond their statutory duties and provide transport for children who are not entitled to free transport. In these cases local authorities can make charges, paying none, part or all of the reasonable travel expenses.

6) Post 16

The policy for post 16 transport is different from that for compulsory school aged children (5-16). Although local authorities do not have to provide free or subsidised transport, when making their assessment of what is required, local authorities must act reasonably, taking into account all relevant matters, such as the needs of their population, the local transport infrastructure and the resources available.

Local authorities have a duty to publish an annual transport policy statement specifying the arrangements for the provision of transport to ensure that:

- learners of sixth form age are able to access the education and training of their choice
- if support for access is required, this will be assessed and provided where necessary

APPENDIX 2: Discretionary Awards 2014/15 - 2019 to date and case studies
Table 1: Discretionary Awards for Home to School and College Transport

	Early years	School age	16-19	Total
2014/15				266
2015/16				150
2016/17				176
2017/18	12	100	20	132
2018/19	9*	64	20	93
2019 (to date)	0	61	23	84

*other Willows pupils transported were of school age

Case Study A

Child B attends Cliffdale Special School. He had a statutory entitlement to home to school transport up until the age of 8 (children under 8 are eligible if they live more than 2 miles from school) however, this entitlement ceased as he lives under the 3 mile distance for eligibility for pupils over 8 years old (the family live 2.7 miles from school).

Both B and his mother suffer from the same genetic condition which impacts on their physical and learning abilities. Mother was in full time employment having worked hard to overcome her own additional needs. Father had been B's carer but having completed training he was looking for a job and would be unable to take B to and from school every day.

B would struggle physically to walk the distance to school. The parents considered the route unsafe for B to walk independently as he has limited awareness of stranger or road dangers and they reported that he could get lost going to the shop.

B was confident in the routine of getting the minibus to school and he would find a change to this difficult to cope with. The family were on limited income and so paying for a privilege place on the minibus, if one was available, would cause them significant hardship.

A discretionary award of transport was agreed following appeal.

Case Study B

Young person H was due to start at Portsmouth College (a Post 16 student). H has very challenging medical conditions which impact on her mobility and stamina. Her mother has been supporting her for 2 years to access school which significantly impacted on her own health and ability to work as she is a self-employed.

The only way H can access college is in a car/taxi as she wouldn't have the stamina to use other forms of public transport. She is very bright and aspires to go to university.

Mother is H's sole carer and indicated that she cannot carry on transporting H on top of all the other care she has to give and also trying to work. An application was being made for personal independent payments but this assessment had been delayed because of H's health and hospital admissions.

On appeal a discretionary award of transport was agreed for a period of 1 term to enable H to start to access college whilst her benefits were being assessed.

NB Discretionary awards of transport for Post 16s all require a contribution from parent/carer. (£200 per term or £165 per term for those of low income).

Appendix 3: Home to school project plan to address current and future budget pressures

	Decision/ area	Background	Scope for savings	Actions
1	Initial decision on eligibility for transport	<p>Home to school transport policy to be reviewed (by May 2020). No changes planned to main eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Possible change to privilege places - look at increasing price and/or making clearer that a child's access can be withdrawn at any time with 4 weeks' notice.</p>	Limited. Exceptional travel reduced from 266 to 84 over 5 years	<p>1a. January, review of who is using privilege places, and whether withdrawing any places could result in revised routes and immediate savings.</p> <p>1b. February/March revised text incorporated into new home to school transport policy.</p>
2	Type of transport offered initially	<p>Currently decision is made either for bus pass or "transport". Home to school transport then means minibus or taxi. Expectation amongst parents that home to school transport = bus/taxi.</p> <p>Concern that we don't have sufficient knowledge/information to decide what is an appropriate transport offer (health forms missing for some children, even where forms provided difficult to translate these into what a child needs in terms of transport).</p> <p>Personal budgets little used, and too low (based on distance) to encourage families to explore different options.</p> <p>Need to develop more options to encourage independence, increase environmental sustainability and reduce costs for some children e.g. travel training leading to walking/traveling by bus; walking bus for part of journey.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>2a. January/February - add new section(s) to revised draft transport policy about how transport may be provided, and the intention to move towards greater independence as the young person moves through their schooling.</p> <p>2b. Explore personal budgets and what flexibility we have to increase these/ use them differently (and how giving more money through personal budgets could affect benefit entitlement) and reflect this in new policy.</p> <p>2c. Consultation with parents' forums, schools and young people and review of best practice to identify additional travel options that can be used for groups of Portsmouth pupils.</p> <p>2d. New process put in place for deciding type of transport that a child needs (including consultation with the school) e.g. whether it needs to be door-to-door, whether they need an escort, how many other children they can travel with - by May 2020.</p> <p>2e. Review communication that goes to parents about travel decisions in line with new policy (May 2020 onwards).</p>

	Decision/area	Background	Scope for savings	Actions
3	Work to promote greater independence, including through annual review	<p>In theory annual review of EHCP includes review of transport arrangements, but in practice this rarely happens, and once a child is allocated to receive transport support this continues until the end of their compulsory education.</p> <p>Specific options for greater independence for key groups of pupils e.g. travel training + bus passes for Harbour School pupils, introduction of "walking bus" at Redwood Park.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>3a. Consider who/how we can introduce a meaningful review of the type of transport provided at regular intervals i.e. do we do this as part of annual review of EHCP, or is it a separate conversation at key moments e.g. when child's eligibility begins and then in Y3, Y6, Y8 and Y10? (Focusing on specific year groups would mean approx. 200 reviews/year)</p> <p>3b. Headline information about review process incorporated into new policy.</p> <p>3c. Reviews begin June 2020 starting with children moving to secondary school.</p> <p>3d. Review of best practice in more independent travel, including the consultation identified in 2c (Dec - March 2020)</p> <p>3e. Detailed planning with Redwood Park on introduction of walking bus from September 2020 (May-June 2020)</p> <p>3f Review with Harbour School of which pupils could be moved to bus passes and travel training, May 2020, travel training takes place June/July 2020.</p>
4	Route planning and deployment of passenger assistants	<p>Council runs 9 mini-buses with others commissioned from Pete's. Taxi services commissioned from 3 main providers (AMK, Pete's, Aqua), plus handful of very small operators.</p> <p>Same basic routes have been running for many years. Additional taxis commissioned/de-commissioned as needed by phoning one of the providers.</p>	Not yet known	<p>4a. update individual pupil information on Transys software (can only be completed after 2d)</p> <p>4b. Use Transys to generate "ideal" routes for children travelling from September 2020, which would then be sense checked by transport team before putting out to tender via <i>adam</i>.</p> <p>4c. Communication to parents where children's transport arrangements will be changing.</p>

	Decision/area	Background	Scope for savings	Actions
4	(cont) Route planning and deployment of passenger assistants	<p>Transys route planning software has been purchased but not yet used - information on this system not necessarily up to date.</p> <p>Service supported by 123 passenger assistants who are directly employed by council, significant turnover which affects service provided to children, many on zero hours contracts, have had limited training to deal with sometimes challenging behaviour, challenges with recruitment.</p>	Not yet known	<p>4d Passenger assistants to be consulted on how transport could be reviewed as part of spring review, including seeking views on new travel options</p> <p>4e New training developed for PAs and rolled out during summer term 2020.</p> <p>4f Review of PA role, number needed, balance between permanent and zero hours staff, possible new places for recruitment (university students, staff working in the special schools) - June 2020 onwards.</p>
5	Effective commissioning of transport	<p>Transport currently provided by council run mini-buses, commissioned mini-buses and taxis.</p> <p>Majority of routes are long-standing, with children moved on and off existing routes as they join and leave schools, and agreements based on rolling contracts.</p> <p>Where new transport is needed e.g. two children have been travelling happily together and then need to be separated to keep everyone safe this is organised by calling one of the taxi companies rather than through any formal procurement exercise.</p> <p>Very few routes have been commissioned via Intend with competition between providers.</p>	Not yet known	<p>5a. Complete due diligence and appropriate Gateway process to appoint <i>adam</i> for review work and to support transport commissioning for next two years (December).</p> <p>5b. Implementation period with <i>adam</i> with existing contracts being moved to system so existing providers can get used to new way of working (January - May 2020 with full implementation by 1 June 2020).</p> <p>5c. Routes from Sept 2020 uploaded onto system to commission June - August 2020.</p> <p>5d. Further work to increase market of providers e.g. encouraging smaller taxi companies onto system, looking at whether council/schools could cover more routes (Sept 2020 onwards).</p>

Key risks (draft)

Risk	Likelihood/Severity	Mitigation
Unable to attract additional providers into Portsmouth.	High likelihood (local traffic makes it unlikely providers outside the City will want to drive into City during rush hour for relatively short journeys.)	<i>adam</i> have told us confidently that they expect to be able to increase providers and have done it elsewhere. Proposed contract with <i>adam</i> for initial 2 years rather than 4 in case ongoing savings are not achieved.
Framework approach pushed costs up rather than down, because we don't have competition between providers on routes.	High if we cannot bring new providers into the market.	See above. Also, if costs do increase could look at increasing amount of transport provided directly by council or in partnership with schools.
Insufficient capacity within the transport team to deliver project.	Moderate likelihood, high severity if it occurs.	Transport team looking to re-structure to increase capacity. <i>Adam</i> bring Project management capacity.
Focus on this area creates significant backlash amongst parents and/ or special schools.	Possible changes to SEN transport are likely to cause concern to parents and possibly schools.	Clear communication strategy as part of the plan.