

# Schools Forum

## PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING

Wednesday, 25th September,  
2024  
at 4.00 pm

Virtual Meetings - Virtual meeting

This meeting is open to the public

LEAD OFFICER  
Clodagh Freeston

Email: [SchoolsForum.Admin@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:SchoolsForum.Admin@southampton.gov.uk)

CONTACT  
Maria McKay

Tel: 023 8083 3899  
Email: [maria.mckay@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:maria.mckay@southampton.gov.uk)

## AGENDA

### **1 APOLOGIES AND CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP**

To note any apologies and changes to membership and to elect a new Chair for the remainder of the academic year 2024/25.

### **2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2024 and to deal with any matters arising.

### **3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the Localism Act 2011, and the Council's Code of Conduct, Members to disclose any personal or pecuniary interests in any matter included on the agenda for this meeting.

NOTE: Members are reminded that, where applicable, they must complete the appropriate form recording details of any such interests and hand it to the Democratic Support Officer.

### **4 STANDING ITEM: LA UPDATE ON DFE/ESFA FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS (STEVE WADE)** (Pages 5 - 10)

To consider an update on any DFE/ESFA funding announcements.

### **5 SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY (STEVE WADE)** (Pages 11 - 16)

To receive a report on schools in financial difficulty.

### **6 SEND UPDATE (JUNO HOLLYHOCK)** (Pages 17 - 20)

To receive an update on Dingley's Promise, Cluster Funding, Special Schools banding.

### **7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS AND CLOSING REMARKS AND DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

To consider any additional items and note the date of forthcoming meetings:

Date: Wednesday 4 December 2024

Time: 3:45pm for 4:00pm start

Venue: Virtual

Future Meetings: Wednesday 15 January 2025, Wednesday 02 April 2025.

Tuesday, 17 September 2024

Service Lead, Education and Early Help

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 2

## SCHOOLS FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 July 2024

<b><u>In attendance</u></b>	
<b><u>Chair and Vice Chair</u></b>	
John Draper	Headteacher – Swaythling Primary
Harry Kutty	Headteacher – Cantell
<b><u>Primary Schools</u></b>	
Peter Howard	Headteacher – Fairisle Junior
PK Macbride	Primary Governor – Bannister
<b><u>Secondary Schools</u></b>	
Jim Henderson	Headteacher Woodlands Community College
Roger Peplow	Governor St Georges
<b><u>Academy</u></b>	
Sean Preston	Hamwic Trust
<b><u>Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)</u></b>	
Debbie McKenzie	
<b><u>Nursery</u></b>	
<b><u>Special Schools</u></b>	
<b><u>Non-Schools</u></b>	
Rob Sanders	Diocese of Winchester
<b><u>Observers</u></b>	
Councillor Winning	Cabinet Member for Children and Learning
<b><u>SCC Officers</u></b>	
Steve Wade	Finance Business Partner
Clodagh Freeston	Head of Education and Learning - Education
Juno Hollyhock	Service Manager - Special Educational Needs and Disability
Robert Henderson	Executive Director – Wellbeing (Children and Learning)
Darrin Hunter	Early Years Manager
<b><u>Apologies</u></b>	
Mike Adams	Headteacher – Bitterne Manor Primary School

1. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2024 be noted and approved as a correct record.

2. **STANDING ITEM: LA UPDATE ON DFE/ESFA FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Forum considered the briefing paper of the Finance Business Partner, giving an update on DFE/ESFA funding, particularly focusing on 2023/24 schools balances, 2023/24 Outturn DSG update and 2024/25 unallocated balance.

The Forum noted that the paper contained an indication of decisions which it would be asked to consider at the next meeting. It expressed the view that information should always be provided to the Forum in a manner to ensure that any decisions could be made with adequate time and information to fully consider all options.

The Forum noted that the Local Authority was responsible for managing surplus balances in maintained schools and that the costs of items such as Schools Licences and Schools Admissions were already allowed for in the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB).

In response to questions, the Forum was advised that a balance could be left in the CSSB and carried forward to be used to give schools more than the national funding formula in 2025-2026, say limited to 10% either way of that formula.

In response to questions, the Forum was advised that if £245m were to be allocated to three Headteacher Conference Groups then everyone should be able to benefit and they could hold the necessary detailed discussions with input from the Local Authority that would not be practical for the Forum.

It was agreed that the Finance Business Partner would bring to the next meeting of the Forum in September 2024 two papers on deficit funding and options for allocation of the surplus. The papers would set out all of the options and any restrictions on how money for schools in deficit can be spent together with a draft of an amended Scheme for Financing Schools so that the Forum could vote on how to proceed.

The Executive Director – Wellbeing (Children and Learning) confirmed to the Forum that the Local Authority expected all schools with budget deficits to have a recovery plan and that such plans would be reviewed to ensure they were viable. Valentine Primary School faced academisation and any deficit would need to be paid off but it was hoped that a local solution would be realised instead.

### 3. **SURPLUS FUNDING**

The Forum noted that in previous meetings that the topic of growth funding had been included in the agenda. It had since been identified that the Department for Education criteria to qualify as growth funding had not been met so this would be considered a surplus going forward. As such this would be carried forward to the next meeting.

### 4. **RELEASE OF FUNDS FROM THE CENTRAL SCHOOL SERVICES BLOCK**

The Forum was concerned that having noted at the previous meeting that a proposed restructure of the Education Service had been agreed there now appeared to be a further restructure in progress and consideration would need to be given as to whether the Forum would be willing to authorise release of the next tranche of ring-fenced funds.

The Executive Director – Wellbeing (Children and Learning) advised the Forum that he would welcome a formalised method of receiving feedback about the quality of the Education Service through the Forum or the Headteacher Conference Groups. The restructure had been driven by the Local Authority's financial position and need to address historic overspends and there had been a number of changes of post and removal of the post of Head of Education. The focus would always be to support schools to deliver the best education, improve attendance and reduce exclusions.

There was a need to improve educational outcomes and deal with deprivation to narrow attainment gaps and get all children ready for skilled jobs within the city. There would be efforts to achieve a consensus about adopting the Education Partnership model. There would be a challenge to attempt to return SEND provision to mainstream schools.

There would be a general focus on transformation within the Local Authority and there was a hope that change could be driven in the next year. While the pace of change might cause some concern the Education Service intended to work collaboratively with schools, look at co-production and evaluate marketing strategies. Creation of a new post of an interim Director for Transformation of Education would increase the capacity of the Service to work with schools and could be in place by September 2024.

The Forum was concerned about possible lack of transparency about how large transfers from the CSSB would be used to top up funding shortfalls in that process and how those funds were originally intended to be used. Schools in deficit might question whether they should receive those funds instead. It was noted that in the past there had been mixed messages from the Local Authority.

Councillor Winning, the Cabinet member for Children and Learning, acknowledged that the pace of change was rapid but that it was agreed that the culture must be right and it was acknowledged that services required improvement.

In answer to a question the Forum was advised that the money being requested under this item of the agenda was separate and additional to the transfer of funds for School Licences and School Admissions previously discussed at item 4. This transfer would fund existing services.

The Forum noted that past education budgets for Admissions had not been reviewed for several years and pressures from increasing costs of staff and appeals copyrights had increased in the meantime.

The Forum agreed that given it was now difficult to ascertain how monies were spent in the past in the future there would be a need for openness and it was agreed that the Executive Director would provide the next meeting with a presentation covering the education budget, DSG, general fund, income, statutory responsibilities and how the money allocated by the Forum was to be used.

5. **HIGH NEEDS BLOCK**

The Forum considered the briefing paper of the Interim Head of SEND on 2024-25 High Needs Block Funding and Cluster Model Progress.

In answer to a question she advised that the number of children having to go outside the city had reduced but was still higher than planned. There were still insufficient special school places. Early intervention would keep children of the EHCP pathway so they could remain in mainstream education. All existing EHCP funding remained associated with the child in question and would go to the school.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS AND CLOSING REMARKS AND DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

John Draper announced that it was his intention at the next meeting to resign as Chair of the Schools Forum and asked all members to consider whether they would wish to stand for that role. He reflected that the members of the Forum now worked more collegiately and there was a better understanding of financial matters. Schools as a group seemed to be in a better place than before and he looked forward to receiving further information in the autumn.

The Forum expressed thanks to John Draper for his service as Chair over a number of years.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2024 at 4pm.

## BRIEFING PAPER

---

**SUBJECT:** LA UPDATE ON DFE/ESFA FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS  
**DATE:** 25 September 2024  
**RECIPIENT:** School's Forum

---

### SUMMARY:

1. Core schools budget grant (CSBG)
2. Central Services Block
3. High Needs Block
4. Use of surplus funds

### BACKGROUND and BRIEFING DETAILS:

#### Core schools budget grant

1. In July the DFE announced additional funding through CSBG to support schools with costs in 2024/25 financial year, in particular following confirmation of the 2024 teacher pay award.
2. The funding through the CSBG covers the 7 month period from September 2024 to March 2025. The funding allocations are expected to be announced in September.
3. The DFE will pay the grant in November 2024 for local authorities and December 2024 for academies.

#### Central Services Block

4. Funding for the Central School Services Block (CSSB) for 2024/25 reduced by a further £0.050M. The cumulative reduction increasing from £0.186M to £0.236M. In January 2024 Schools Forum agreed to a block transfer of £0.220M to avoid a reduction in the level of provision of Education support services.
5. The revised funding for the central school services is summarised below

Description of Movement	Sum of Movement (£M)
Central school services allocation	1.610
Block Transfer from schools block	0.220
<b>Central school services block funding</b>	<b>1.830</b>

# BRIEFING PAPER

6. The budget for the schools admissions and the schools copyright licences are held within the CSSB.

<b>Service</b>	<b>£M</b>
Admissions	0.422
Schools Copyright Licences	0.152
<b>Central Schools Services Block</b>	<b>0.574</b>

7. The Admissions service and Schools Copyright licences are directly allocated against the CSSB grant. In addition to this contributions from CSSB are made to the Early Help service within social care and the Education Service as summarised in the following table

<b>Allocation of CSSB Resource</b>	<b>£M</b>
Admissions	0.422
Schools Copyright Licences	0.152
Contribution to Early Help	0.504
Contribution to Education Services	0.752
<b>Total allocation</b>	<b>1.830</b>

8. The net budget for the Education Services are listed in the following table

<b>Education Service Team</b>	<b>Net Budget £M</b>
Virtual School	0.000
Standards & School Improvement	0.329
Music Service	0.001
Education Psychologists.	0.811
Statutory EWO's	0.484
Southampton Language Service	0.025
Inclusion Management	0.426
Young Carers Service	0.050
Post 16 Education	0.274
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.400</b>

9. A review of the Admissions budget shows a small pressure of £0.006M which is mostly due to the estimated impact of the pay award. It should be noted that this estimate is based on the latest offer but that is yet to be agreed. There is a pressure of £0.011M regarding the schools copyright licences (this pressure has reduced as a credit note was issued due to an overcharge)

# BRIEFING PAPER

## High Needs Block

10. The High Needs Block allocation, after deductions for academies recoupment is £40.355M. The planned spend is outlined in the table below with a contingent sum of £1.2M set aside to reduce the DSG deficit

<b>Service</b>	<b>£M</b>
Language Intervention Team	0.083
Early Years Teachers/SENCO	0.385
Portage.	0.301
Pupils with EHCP's	5.985
Early Years Sen Funding	1.116
OLA Special School Placements	0.655
Specialist Teacher Advisors	0.557
Payments to colleges re EHCPs	1.115
Education Placements	5.179
Special School Funding	20.597
Outreach Funding	0.376
Pupil Referral Unit	2.130
Newlands RBD	0.347
Hospital Outreach	0.250
Contingency / deficit reduction	1.279
<b>Total Allocation</b>	<b>40.355</b>

## Unallocated Funds

11. The unallocated balance of £0.375M discussed briefly at the previous meeting.
12. Further advice has been sought from the DFE regarding this scenario. The only expenditure that could be incurred that complies with the DSG regulations would need to be related to the retained duties of the local authority (that apply to both maintained schools and academies). Value added strategic work would not therefore be compliant with the DSG regulations.
13. In-year reallocations to schools cannot be made as these do not comply with the annually made school finance regulations.
14. Any unused balance will be allocated to the reserve at the end of the financial year. The reserve depends on whether there is an in-year underspend or overspend on the DSG budget overall.
15. Given the value of the DSG deficit £7.105M and the risk that the current statutory override is not extended beyond March 2026 the strong recommendation is that the unallocated funds are used to reduce the deficit.

# BRIEFING PAPER

<b>Further Information Available From:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	Steve Wade
	<b>E-mail:</b>	Steve.Wade@Southampton.gov.uk



This page is intentionally left blank

---

**SUBJECT:** SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY GRANT  
**DATE:** 25 September 2024  
**RECIPIENT:** School's Forum – For Information

---

1. Fourteen schools have carried forward a deficit into the new financial year. The total deficit being £4.90M.

	Deficit £M	Number
<b>Primary</b>	3.47	12
<b>Special</b>	1.43	2
<b>Total</b>	4.90	14

2. The local authority has been allocated additional funding (£559,332) to support maintained schools which find themselves in financial difficulty. Local Authorities have been given flexibility regarding the use of the grant. The following guidelines have been provided:
  - a) Section 6.7 of the guidance on the DFE schemes for financing schools allows for local authorities to pay cash sums towards elimination of a deficit balance. This is designed for circumstances where it is not reasonable to expect the school to eliminate the whole of the deficit from its own future resources. Such cash sums can be charged to the dedicated schools grant (DSG) only where they form part of a contingency fund approved by maintained school members of the schools forum under Regulation 11(5) of, and paragraph 51 of Schedule 2 to, the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2023.
  - b) The DFE expect funding to be allocated on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the severity of the school's position and prioritising those in greatest need. Local authorities should report to their schools forum on how they are using the money.
  - c) Local authorities may wish to associate such conditions with the payment of money out of the sum that it may receive from the £20 million of additional funding. This could include mandating the use of some of the department's resource management tools and services, such as a School Resource Management Adviser (SRMA).
  - d) This funding can be used to support maintained primary, middle, secondary and all-through schools, maintained special schools, pupil referral units, and maintained nursery schools.
3. There are 7 schools with a deficit balance greater than £0.3M, where their combined deficits represent over 80% of the total. Given the size of the deficits it is recommended

that the funding is used to target these schools, pro-rated by the deficit balance, subject to the following conditions.

- a. The school produces a Deficit Recovery Plan (DRP) and submits quarterly monitoring to schools finance. The DRP is refreshed with each budget update;
- b. Where necessary the school makes use of the DFE's SRMA

<b>School</b>	<b>Deficit Balance £M</b>	<b>Compared to Core funding (%)</b>
Compass Pupil referral unit	1.138	67%
Hardmoor Early Years Centre	0.705	70%
Valentine Primary School	0.550	17%
Mansbridge Primary	0.478	41%
Mason Moor Primary	0.469	37%
Shirley Warren Primary	0.421	19%
Townhill Junior	0.340	24%
Polygon	0.290	18%
St Marks School	0.267	5%
Fairisle Infant	0.064	5%
Bitterne Manor Primary	0.062	6%
Oakwood Primary	0.052	3%
St Mary's Primary	0.042	1%
Highfield Primary	0.022	1%

**Compass School** is located on a site with five other entities. The complexity to the site means that premises related costs have not been apportioned to relevant users appropriately. A proportion of the deficit relates to business rates (approx. £0.3M).

The deficit at **Hardmoor Early Years Centre** accumulated during Covid when the number of children was reduced. The nursery is reducing the deficit by c£0.1M annually.

There has been long standing financial difficulty at **Valentine Primary School**. The school has had a recent change in leadership and standards are now improving. This has resulted in the academy order being revoked. To note some additional costs have been incurred to improve standards in the school following an Ofsted inspection.

The deficits at **Mansbridge Primary** and **Shirley Warren Primary** have accumulated over the last 4 years. A DRP has been agreed with Shirley Warren.

**Mason Moor Primary** has incurred additional costs to improve standards, a DRP has been agreed.

**Townhill Junior School** has experienced reduced funding from a reduction in pupil numbers arising from the demolition of nearby flats.

4. An extract from the scheme for financing schools of the school balances policy is shown as appendix to this report.

## 5.8 School Balances

- 5.8.1 Schools will carry forward any overspending or underspending from one year to the next.
- 5.8.2 When a school closes, any balances held will revert to the Local Authority. However, the funding formula will allow additional payments to be made to new schools to reflect the balances held by preceding schools (where appropriate).
- 5.8.3 Where a school converts to academy status under section 4(1)(a) of the Academies Act 2010, the balance will transfer to the academy.
- 5.8.4 The Local Authority recognises that schools may wish to carry forward a surplus balance to allow for future variations in funding or unforeseen expenditure requirements. However, the Local Authority is committed to keeping the level of school balances to a minimum, in order to ensure that available resources are effectively targeted at the needs of pupils currently in Southampton schools.

Surplus balances held by schools as permitted under this scheme are subject to the following restrictions:

Primary schools, Special schools and Pupil Referral units may carry forward up to 10% of the current year school budget share as general balances. Secondary schools can carry forward up to 8%. Anything above this is an “excess surplus” balance.

There are three allowable purposes for which excess surplus balances can be used:

- As a revenue contribution to capital projects within a time limited maximum two year period.
- To maintain a reserve to fund staffing levels in the short / medium term due to a verified dip in pupil numbers.
- To provide reasonable and proportionate resources to fund the impact of major changes in Government policy on the curriculum for multiple subject areas. Any decisions to retain surplus balances for this reason will be subject to review by the Local Authority.

Schools may lose their excess surplus balances if:

- They do not inform the Local Authority of the governing body decision before 31 May that there are proposals to use any excess surplus balances and that those proposals have been approved and included in the minutes by the appropriate governing body or Sub-Committee by this time.
- The proposals do not relate to one of the allowable purposes for the use of surplus balances.
- The Utilisation of Balances Pro-forma is incomplete.
- The intended use of the balance was on a capital project, which has not materialised at the end of the time limited two year period.

Extensions to the deadline for submission of proposals for the use of the excess surplus balance will need to be agreed with the Local Authority.

Excess surplus balances removed from schools will be added to a schools surplus fund for redistribution.

5.8.5 The procedure to obtain approval to carry forward excess surplus balances is as follows:

- Schools should complete a proposal for utilisation of their surplus fund and return to the Schools Finance team by the 31 May for consideration and approval. This form must include detailed plans and objectives. Relevant minutes at the governing body or sub-committee meeting must be attached detailing the decisions agreeing to spend the surplus balances and retained for a period of two years. An example is attached at Annex C.
- The Schools Finance Team will monitor the balances and remove the excess as detailed above if the Utilisation of surplus fund does not comply with the revised principles of the scheme. The Schools Finance Team will ask for a breakdown and evidence of expenditure plans.
- It is the intention that excess surplus balances will be removed in the summer term of the following financial year if the spend does not materialise within the timescale detailed.

5.8.6 Funds deriving from sources other than the Local Authority will be taken into account in this calculation if paid into the budget share account of the school, whether under provisions in this scheme or otherwise. Funds held in relation to a school's exercise of powers under s.27 of the Education Act 2002 (community facilities) will not be taken into account unless added to the budget share surplus by the school as permitted by the Local Authority.

## 5.9 Deficit Budget Policy

The Local Authority may not write off the deficit balance of a school.

Schools should not plan for a year end deficit budget when submitting budget plans at the start of the year i.e. expenditure exceeding funding and income for the year plus any balances brought forward from the previous year. Schools that submit deficit plans will be required to provide a deficit recovery plan to bring the budget back into balance within three years.

The authority may intervene if a school is unable to set a balanced budget, by identifying the action a school could take and ultimately by

suspending delegation. Any unplanned deficit incurred during the year would be a first call on the following year's budget; the school would need to include the deficit in its balanced budget plan for the following year. Schools that incur unplanned deficits in successive years would be treated the same as schools submitting deficit plans and the authority would need to intervene.

**The deficit recovery plan** When a school first becomes aware of a potential deficit it should follow the procedures in Annex D in order to obtain the Local Authority's approval for a licensed deficit. A summary of the steps are:

Step 1 Preparation

Step 2 Notify the Local Authority with supporting documentation

Step 3 Initial meetings with the Local Authority schools finance team.

Step 4 Submit a deficit recovery plan. This becomes the formal application for a licensed deficit.

Step 5 Monitoring. The requirements and monitoring which the school will need to follow.

**Issue of a Notice of Concern** The Local Authority may issue a Notice of Concern to the governing body of any school it maintains, where in the opinion of the Service lead for Education and Learning, the school has failed to comply with any provisions of the scheme, and / or where actions need to be taken to safeguard the financial position of the local authority or the school.

---

**SUBJECT:** Dingley's Promise, Cluster Funding, Special Schools bandings

**DATE:** 25<sup>th</sup> September 2024

**RECIPIENT:** Schools' Forum

---

## **SUMMARY:**

The Schools' Forum is asked to note:

1. The exemption to procurement for Dingley's Promise contract extension
2. Progress on the mainstream cluster funding programme
3. Update on the special schools banding review

### **Dingley's Promise**

Dingley's Promise is a specialist early years intervention and setting for children with SEND.

The benefit to the High Needs Block of an intervention such as Dingley's is that it provides specialist and targeted early intervention that enables children to experience the benefits of a specialist setting but also transition effectively to a mainstream provision without, necessarily, the need for an EHCP. If children can thrive in mainstream then the cost to the High Needs Block is substantially reduced.

The service commenced in Southampton in March 2023 and was initially contracted for a period of two years.

Owing to a slow start related to the vacation of the premises by the original leaseholder, and the transfer of staff, the setting didn't start to operate to capacity until September 2023.

There has only been one full academic year to-date and we are only just beginning to see children transition back into a mainstream setting through the Entry Exit Pathway (EEP) which is a feature of this provision.

As a result we will be applying for an extension to summer 2027 to enable cohorts of children to transition and to see how effective the pathway back into mainstream has been. In addition this will give us a chance to review the summer and outreach activity which is also a key part of the delivery.

The total cost of the exemption would be for £747,419 from March 2025 to August 2027. The aim is for Dingley's to support 50 children in the course of a year. If only 5 of these were able to transition to mainstream successfully each year instead of requiring specialist independent provision then the potential saving (after the full annual cost of Dingley's and based on c£85k per place for an independent specialist provision) is c£222k p.a.

In reality this will be a mixed economy, some will transition and be fine, some may still require interventions later, some may still require an EHCP. Some may be able to

access city specialist or resourced provisions but, overall, the trajectory is a positive one for the High Needs Block.

It's worth noting that the EEP is a bespoke feature of the Dingley's Promise offer and is not able to be replicated by another provider as it is protected as intellectual property.

### **Mainstream Cluster Funding programme**

Following the update given to Schools Forum in July, we have now appointed Amanda Talbot-Jones to support further exploration of the cluster funding model in the autumn and spring terms.

Amanda will specifically focus on communication with schools regarding their views on the concept, the proposed construct of the clusters and the consideration of re-aligning these with existing schools' clusters.

Amanda will also review the results of the SENDCo capacity audit to see what issues may be being flagged there in terms of the deliverability of the proposed model.

Depending on Amanda's findings, a decision will need to be taken with a view to either rolling out a pilot phase of a cluster funding model or accepting that this model is not one that is right for Southampton at this current time in which case progress will be suspended and new approaches considered to improving outcomes for children with SEND in the city.

We are currently exploring the potential for an interim grant opportunity for schools to apply for the funding that would otherwise have been used for the cluster programme this financial year. We are currently at the point of consulting with other LAs who have undertaken this approach to see if it is worth exploring further.

### **Special Schools banding review**

A review and update of the top-up bandings for special schools was commenced in Southampton a couple of years ago but was suspended owing to the announcement within the Government's SEND and AP Improvement Plan that there would be a national funding formula (NFF).

Our special schools are struggling with out-dated bandings that do not reflect current need and this is getting worse over time.

We sought advice from our DfE adviser, Mark McCurrie, who suggested that we go ahead as it was unlikely that the NFF would see any significant progress in the next 12 months and it was important that we met need locally.

To this end Dawn Slattery (EP Service), Kirsty Relton (Strategic Lead for SEND) and Juno Hollyhock (Interim Head of SEND) will be working with the special school heads to review progress made so far and test the original proposed models in the two schools that had not done this previously by October half term, alongside testing the financial modelling and impact of the changes.

One key aspect of the financial modelling will be ensuring that schools do not lose out on the Minimum Funding Guarantee. As the financial envelope has not increased,

any school dropping in funding is still entitled to the MFG for next financial year and so we will have to be mindful of this.

The new proposals offer six different bands not three which gives more scope to respond to individual need. In addition the band follows the child rather than being assigned to a school which is a more child-centred approach.

One issue which is currently out with the special heads for consultation is how we adopt the final score for a child once they have been assessed across the six domains – the proposal is that we adopt a modal approach to this.

Once the first phase is complete, we would look to see how this work might impact mainstream schools, resourced provisions and alternative provisions.

<b>Further Information Available From:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	Juno Hollyhock Interim Head of SEND
	<b>E-mail:</b>	Juno.Hollyhock@southampton.gov.uk

