

## Schools Forum Question Responses

The information below is in response to a number of questions raised in relation to the 2016-17 Dedicated Schools Grant Outturn Report and Revised Budget 2017-18 at Schools Forum on 19 July 2017.

### 4.7 Special School Place Funding

**Question:** *Mary Rose were already commissioned for 140 places for September 2016, so unsure why this was in excess of the agreed commissioned places? Our place allocation is 132 plus 6 for Craneswater so additional 8 places were for the same as the previous year. This will be the same for 2017-18 so has the 2017-18 budget taken this in to account?*

The table below set out the Commissioned and actual places for both Mary Rose and Cliffdale for 2016-17: -

| Table 1<br>Special school place funding | Total     |           |       |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------|
|   | Mary Rose | Cliffdale | Total |
| Number of commissioned places           | 132       | 104       | 236   |
| Number of actual places                 | 139.0     | 115.4     | 254.4 |
| Additional places utilised              | 7.0       | 11.4      | 18.4  |
| Budgeted additional places              | 4.7       | 12.0      | 16.7  |
| Variance                                | 2.3       | -0.6      | 1.7   |

The place funding for Mary Rose and Cliffdale comprises, agreed commissioned numbers (132 and 104 respectively) and additional places. The variance of £18,000 reported in the July report, related to the difference between the budgeted additional places and the actual pupils as highlighted above. For 2017-18, the additional places are budgeted at 7 and 12 respectively and currently we are forecasting £10,000 variance as explained in agenda item 5.

### 4.19 - Element 3 Top Up Funding

**Question:** *Element 3 top up funding was less than budgeted for leading to an underspend for the financial year, although doesn't state by how much. Are you able to provide this figure?*

The tables below set out the pupil numbers and financial position of the Element 3 expenditure at the end of 2016-17:

| <b>Table 2</b><br><b>Element 3 Top-up outturn position</b> | <b>Variance</b><br><b>(£)</b> |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Element 3 Top Up - Special Schools                         | (813,864)                     |
| Element 3 Top Up - Resource Units                          | (19,564)                      |
| Element 3 Top Up - Alternative Provision                   | (155,129)                     |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>(988,558)</b>              |

The underspend in the element 3 top-up funding budgets are as highlighted above and were used to offset the financial pressures experienced across the other areas of the high needs budgets. For 2017-18, it is expected that the underspend in the Element 3 funding will be less due to a reallocation of funding to other budgets as part of the budget setting process as well as potential band creep, etc. Any potential underspend in this budget is already expected to be required to support the continued pressures in other high needs areas.

#### **4.20 - Alternative Provision and Resourced Centres**

**Question:** *Underspend in respect of Alternative Provision and Resourced centres but doesn't say by how much? Are you able to provide this figure?*

Table 2 sets out the under-spend for both Alternative Provision settings and resource units. The majority of the underspend relates to the AP unit at Flying Bull. This is explained in more detail below.

**Question:** *What is the extent of overcapacity in AP and resourced units (point 4.20) and what is the cost of this overcapacity? I am assuming that there is a cost even if the places aren't taken up as the authority pays for the place (10k?).*

Place funding at £10,000 is provided to both AP and resource units for the agreed commissioned places.

Element 3 top-up funding is paid only when a pupil attends the setting. Where Portsmouth City Council places a pupil they are responsible for the top-up funding. Where another local authority or school places a pupil they are responsible for paying the top-up funding.

The underspend in 2016-17 related to the AP unit at Flying Bull (£73,639). Whilst the unit was full for the majority of the year, the pupils were not placed by the City Council, therefore we need to utilise the Element 3 funding that had been budgeted for. For 2017-18 the element 3 top-up budget was reduced to provide for only 8

pupils being placed by the authority releasing funding to offset pressures in the high needs block, this is expected to be reduced further in 2018-19 to reflect the pupils anticipated to be placed by the authority.

Additionally there was an underspend in 2016-17, due to the Authority not placing as many pupils as budgeted for at the Harbour School (£81,469). Again, we continue to monitor the budget requirements in this area.

***Question:*** *How well is the spending on the high needs being monitored and what are the forecasts for this block looking like for 18-19?*

The high needs budgets are monitored on a monthly basis and reported to the Education Senior Leadership Team, with quarterly reporting to both Cabinet Member and Schools Forum. As highlighted within the July report, the outturn reported for 2016-17 was in line with expectations reported throughout the year.

Work is underway to quantify the potential financial pressures within the high needs areas for both 2017-18 and 2018-19; as part of the early work on the budget setting processes. This work is being updated based on the recent September intake of pupils, as well as the forecast pupil information from the SEN Team.