

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# HARINGEY SCHOOLS FORUM

Thursday, 5th December, 2019, 3.45 pm - Haringey Education Partnership Training Room, Hornsey School for Girls, Inderwick Road, London, N8 9JF

### AGENDA

**1. CHAIR'S WELCOME**

**2. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Clerk to report.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations are only required where an individual member of the Forum has a pecuniary interest in an item on the agenda.

**4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 17 OCTOBER 2019 (PAGES 1 - 6)**

**5. MATTERS ARISING**

**6. DEDICATED SCHOOLS BUDGET MODELLING FOR 2020-21 AND CENTRAL SCHOOLS SERVICES BLOCK ALLOCATION FOR 2020-21 (PAGES 7 - 16)**

- To propose the process to all Haringey schools on the 2019/20 schools funding formula.
- To consult Schools Forum on planned expenditure through the Central School Services Block.

**7. HIGH NEEDS BLOCK OPTIONS APPRAISAL (PAGES 17 - 30)**

To explore options that could be taken by the borough to reduce the spend in the high needs block.

**8. EARLY HELP AND PREVENTATIVE SERVICES UPDATE (VERBAL REPORT)**

**9. WORK PLAN 2019-20 (PAGES 31 - 32)**

To inform the forum of the updated work plan for the 2019-20 academic year and provide members with an opportunity to add additional items.

**10. UPDATE FROM WORKING PARTIES (PAGES 33 - 50)**

- Early Years Working Group ( attached)
- High Needs Sub Group (if any)

**11. INFORMATION ITEMS (IF ANY)**

**12. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

**13. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 16 January 2020
- 27 February 2020
- 25 June 2020

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING  
THURSDAY 17 OCTOBER 2019 AT 4pm**

**School Members**

**Headteachers**

**Special (1)**

Martin Doyle (Riverside)

**Nursery Schools (1)**

\*Peter Catling (Woodlands Park)

Mary Gardiner (West Green)

Vacancy

**Primary (7)**

(A)Stephen McNicholas (St John Vianney)

(A)Paul Murphy (Lancasterian)

Emma Murray (Seven Sisters)

Linda Sarr (Risley Avenue)

\*Will Wawn (Bounds Green)

**Secondary (2)**

\*Andy Webster (Park View)

Tony Hartney (Gladesmore)

**Primary Academy (1)**

Sharon Easton (St Pauls & All Hallows)

**Secondary Academies (2)**

\*Gerry Robinson (Woodside)

Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)

**Alternative Provision (1)**

\*Patricia Davies

**Governors**

**Special (1)**

Jean Brown (The Vale)

**Nursery Centres (1)**

Melian Mansfield (Pembury)

Laura Butterfield (Coldfall)

**Primary (7)**

Hannah D'Aguiar (Chestnuts Primary)

John Keever (Seven Sisters)

Jenny Thomas (Lordship Lane)

Julie Davies (Tiverton)

Vacancy

**Secondary (2)**

\*Johanna Hinshelwood (Hornsey Girls)

Vacancy

Sylvia Dobie (Park View)

**Primary Academy (1)**

Vacancy

**Secondary Academies (3)**

\*Noreen Graham (Woodside)

Vacancy

**Non-School Members**

**Non-Executive Councillor**

(A)Cllr Daniel Stone

**Trade Union Representative**

(A)Pat Forward

**Professional Association Representative**

\*Ed Harlow

**Faith Schools**

\*Geraldine Gallagher

**14-19 Partnership**

\*Kurt Hintz

**Early Years Providers**

Susan Tudor-Hart

**Observers**

**Cabinet Member for CYPS**

Cllr Zena Brabazon

**Also Attending**

**LBH Director of Children's Services**

\*Ann Graham

**Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership (HEP)**

James Page

**LBH Assistant Director, Schools & Learning**

Eveleen Riordan

**LBH Head of SEN & Disability**

\*Vikki Monk-Myer

**LBH Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help & Culture**

\*Ngozi Anuforo

**LBH Head of Audit & Risk Management**

Minesh Jani/\*Jerry Barton

**LBH Head of Finance & Business Partners**

Paul Durrant

**LBH Finance Business Partner (Schools & Learning)**

Muhammad Ali

**LBH Service Improvement Manager**

\*Karen Oellermann

**Lead for Governor Services (HEP)**

Carolyn Banks

**HEP Clerk (Minutes)**

Felicity Baird

(A) = Apologies given

\* = Asterisk denotes absence

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT / DECISION	ACTION ASSIGNED TO
<b>1.</b>	<b>CHAIR'S WELCOME</b>	
1.1	The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR</b>	
2.1	CB invited nominations for Chair. TH was nominated and agreed to Chair the Schools Forum for a further year, which was unanimously approved by the membership.	
2.2	The Chair invited nominations for Vice Chair. LB accepted a nomination as Vice Chair, and membership unanimously approved her appointment.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b>	
3.1	Apologies were received in advance from Paul Murphy; Pat Forward; Cllr Stone; Stephen McNicholas, and were noted by the Forum.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
4.1	There were none.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 28 FEBRUARY 2019 &amp; INQUORATE MEETING OF 11 JULY 2019</b>	
5.1	The Minutes of 28 February were approved.	
5.2	The Minutes of 11 July were approved.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
6.1	[Minutes of 28 Feb] It was noted that a member had discussed ratios of funding taken from the Early Years Block (EYB) to support the High Needs Block (HNB), and that it had been asked if anything could be done to support the Early Years funding.	Ali Muhammed to report on HNB and EY at the December meeting
6.2	A member queried why no information regarding surplus/reserves had not been given, noting that they would like reserves to remain in the EY block	The Local Authority (LA) to look at ensuring info re surplus/reserves is provided prior to the December meeting
6.3	[Minutes of 11 July] LB declared an interest as she was Chair of the Tuition Service. LB advised that there had been significant delays with the AP review. As a consequence the Tuition Service was buckling under the strain and this was impacting on vulnerable children in Haringey. ER stated that progress was being made and that a meeting with Primary Headteachers had taken place. Updates to the Director of Children's Services and Cllr ZB were being given.	(Agenda item at next meeting) Update on progress with review of alternative provision.
<b>7.</b>	<b>FORUM MEMBERSHIP</b>	
7.1	CB noted that the Forum's membership was agreed until 2020, but that there remained a requirement for a regular review of membership, for the purposes of ensuring the right balance between Academy and maintained schools. It was agreed that the current split of academy / maintained schools for	

	headteacher representation on the Forum should remain unchanged but the number of places for governors from the secondary sector be changed so that there are three academy places and 2 maintained sector places. . It was noted that there was a need to fill current vacancies.	
7.2	It was queried whether only 1 EY member should be present in the membership was correct, and whether this could be looked at as part of review. This was noted.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>DEDICATED SCHOOLS BUDGET STRATEGY 2019-20 &amp; 2020-21</b>	
8.1	The Forum received a presentation from Kristian Bugnosen, Principal Accountant. It was reported that there were 2 changes in funding for 2020-21; an uplift of 1.84%, in line with inflation. It was noted that for Haringey, there was a need to determine whether this was minimum or per pupil funding. All current figures were indicative.	
8.2	Almost £8M was to be released for the HNB. The LA was proposing to keep the transfer. Q: What is the basis for keeping to 2.5% for the HNB? What is the rationale behind this not being increased? A: The Forum can suggest it being increased. Figures are currently indicative and the LA is trying to be prudent with the available funding.	
8.3	The LA asked the Forum to consider splitting the site funding for EYB as there was an underspend	
8.4	It was reported that there was an overspend of £7M, including a £2.2M carry-forward from 2018-19, and that a deficit recovery plan would have to be produced. The Head of SEND was currently working with the Early Years Commissioner, examining possible solutions. It was reported that the LA's intention was to bring a method statement to the next School Forum meeting	Bring a method statement regarding overspend to next meeting
8.5	Q: Did a consultation take place regarding how to mute a deficit? Could it be met from LA reserves? A: The latest best practice guidance stated that general council funding should not cross over with DSG.	
8.6	An almost £7M increase for the HNB was reported. ER noted that the alternative provision review may contribute to reducing the deficit; it would allow children with autism to remain within the borough. A member noted that it appeared as though EYB was pitted against schools, which should not be the case, as it was regarding the poorest children in need.	
8.7	An update on financial management support for schools in financial difficulty was given. Q: Is the dedicated in-house finance officer for schools being recruited to a permanent post? A: The LA can only recruit for the period of time that the School Forum commits the money, so only a 2-year fixed term post can be recruited to. The post is funded by the DSG, not the LA. JP reported that meetings with School Business Managers (SBM) had been very well received. The Chair noted that that SBMs were more informed, which was a positive development.	

8.8	The Chair asked for views on the recommendations in the DSG – should it remain the same for 2020-21? The Forum deliberated. It was agreed that without SFA figures, it was difficult to take a decision. Once the figures were available, modelling could be undertaken and options reviewed. It was agreed that the same schools allocated formula should be adhered to and 0.25% - 0.5% should be looked at in the next meeting to see how it affects schools.	Review schools allocated formula at next meeting
8.9	The Forum agreed that £60k should be granted to Pembury House – the source of funds to be confirmed. It was further agreed this should be revisited at the next meeting.	Review funding source of £60k to Pembury House
8.10	It was noted that the Forum had requested the LA brought a proposal for a redistribution of the £914k surplus generated from the rates refund, and how this could be distributed in 2019-20. Members discussed whether a significant proportion of the HNB deficit should be plugged. The Chair suggested the Forum adhere to the LA's proposal for the distribution of the £914k, but noted that a decision was not required now. The forum agree to use £100k to fund post for School Finance Adviser for the two years. It also agreed HNB transfer is not permitted rather funding is kept in schools budget for schools in financial difficulty	
<b>9.</b>	<b>EDUCATION WELFARE – UPDATE</b>	
9.1	It was reported that following the last meeting, a Working Group had been set up. Feedback on work undertaken since January was given. The group would focus on 3 key areas: a 3-tiered offer to schools (non-maintained schools that do not buy into the EWS services; maintained schools that do not buy EWS services; all schools that buy EWS services. This would be covered by a differentiated pricing structure).	
9.2	It was reported that schools had experienced issues with families taking children out of school during term time. The LA's Fixed Penalty Notice had been amended to covering 6 sessions absent in 6 weeks, and had been in place since 1 <sup>st</sup> September. From this date to the time of reporting, the LA had issued twice as many Notices as were issued during the whole of 2018. Attendance was reported to be approximately 96% for primaries and 95% for secondaries nationally.	
9.3	The Forum heard how, as part of making the service more accountable, an end of year assessment of the Education Welfare Officer could be undertaken by school staff, to help drive improvements in the service provided to schools. It was hoped that this would improve the capacity of the service, address absences, allow more free support for non-trading maintained schools. The 3-year plan was outlined to members.	
9.4	Q: Regarding pupils taking holiday during term time – is there data to say if this is steady or is increasing? A: This has been steady over time, but is dependent on how the school codes these absences. Primary schools tend to code that these are holiday absences, whilst Secondary schools do not. We would expect that if that decreased, we would see an increase in absence due to 'illness'.	

	It was noted that there had been some concerns that vulnerable families may be targeted disproportionately. When the LA is requested to issue a Penalty Notice, the request comes from the school. The Headteacher and LA work together and if it is felt that a family is vulnerable, the Notice would not be issued. It was confirmed that Penalty Notices could be withdrawn if needed.	
9.5	It was reported that there was a 27% increase in families choosing to home-educate their children in Haringey. There was currently a caseload of approximately 250 children who were home-schooled. It was noted that difficulties emerged when families did not engage with the Education Welfare Service (EWS). Home visits and other interventions are undertaken if families want to remove their child from school.	
9.6	The Chair recommended in principle that the School Forum funded the EWS for the 3 years as considered by the Forum in January 2019 to give security and stability to the team and allow it to be able to plan effectively. <i>It was noted that this could not be agreed; due to members leaving the meeting early, the meeting was not quorate at this stage</i>	Recommend that funding for EWS for t 3 years be agreed in principle.
<b>10.</b>	<b>WORK PLAN 2019-20</b>	
10.1	To be reported at next meeting.	
<b>11.</b>	<b>UPDATE FROM WORKING PARTIES (EARLY YEARS WORKING GROUP &amp; HIGH NEEDS SUB GROUP)</b>	
11.1	<u>Early Years Working Group</u> Papers would come to the December meeting.	
11.2	<u>High Needs Sub Group</u> The Group wanted clarity from the HNB Committee on how it has decreased expenditure.	
<b>12.</b>	<b>INFORMATION ITEMS</b>	
12.1	None.	
<b>13.</b>	<b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>	
13.1	None.	
<b>14.</b>	<b>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b>	
	5 December 2019; 16 January 2020; 27 February 2020; 25 June 2020.	
	There was no further business, therefore the meeting closed at 6:06pm.	

This page is intentionally left blank



**Agenda Item  
6**



**Report Status**

For information/note   
 For consultation & views   
 For decision

**Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

**Report Title: Dedicated Schools Budget Modelling for 2020-21 and Central Schools Services Block allocation for 2020-21**

**Author:**

Paul Durrant  
 Head of Finance & Business Partnering  
 Email: [Paul.durrant@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.durrant@haringey.gov.uk)

Muhammad Ali  
 Schools Finance Business Partner  
 Telephone: 020 8489 4491  
 Email: [Muhammad.Ali@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Muhammad.Ali@haringey.gov.uk)

Kristian Bugnosen  
 Principal Accountant (DSG)  
 Telephone: 020 8489 4491  
 Email: [Kristian.bugnosen@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Kristian.bugnosen@haringey.gov.uk)

**Purpose:**

1. To propose the process to all Haringey schools on the 2019/20 schools funding formula
2. To consult Schools Forum on planned expenditure through the Central School Services Block

**Recommendations:**

1. Preferable model for 2020-21 DSG allocation
2. Consultation with schools with the proposed modelling
3. Central School Services Block Budget breakdown for 2020-21

**1 Introduction.**

- 1.1 In July 2017, DfE announced the introduction of the national funding formula (NFF) which was supported by additional investment in 2018-19 and 2019-20. The additional funding over the last two years, has enabled the council to maintain per-pupil spending on the schools and high needs blocks.
- 1.2 The paper sets out a summary analysis of DSG's four blocks' financial position for the financial year 2019-20 and the strategy for DSG formula for Schools Budget Share allocations for the financial year 2020-21.
- 1.3 The report also provides information for changes in the minimum funding level for schools and additional funding for High Needs Block for 2020-21.
- 1.4 The policy document which sets out the background and principles of the new National Funding Formula for schools can be found at:  
  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/648532/national\\_funding\\_formula\\_for\\_schools\\_and\\_high\\_needs-Policy\\_document.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/648532/national_funding_formula_for_schools_and_high_needs-Policy_document.pdf)
- 1.5 The DSG is currently divided into four notional blocks:
  - Schools,
  - High Needs,
  - Early Years, and
  - Central School Services Block.
- 1.6 The 'soft' formula was originally planned for 2018-19 and 2019-20 only, with a 'hard' formula, without local input, to be implemented in 2020-21. However, the DfE has announced that there will be no changes for 2020-21.
- 1.7 The DfE has not committed to the future arrangements, but the expectation is that a 'hard' NFF will be introduced – i.e. without a local formula applied - from 2021-22. (although "soft" formula may continue for another year, subject to DfE confirmation).

## **2 Changes in funding level for 2020-21.**

- 2.1 Planned changes to minimum school funding for 2020-21
- 2.2 There has been a significant commitment for 2020-21. The per pupil funding a school received has gone up with the rise in inflation rate of 1.8%.
- 2.3 The Chancellor announced: “the government will ensure that per pupil funding for all schools can rise in line with inflation (1.8%)” and “for schools already on their National Funding Formula allocation, the per pupil values in the formula will increase by at least 4%” in cash terms.
- 2.4 An increase in the minimum funding that primary and secondary schools receive per pupil.

- 2.5 The government announced an increase in 2020-21 from the current minimum per pupil amount of £3,500 to £3,750 in primary schools, and from £4,800 to £5,000 in secondary schools, with a further increase in the primary school's minimum to £4,000 in 2021-22.
- 2.6 It is not clear if this is the AWPU of Minimum Funding Guarantee amounts. The table below illustrates any indicative financial impacts on Haringey Schools funding:

2020-21	Government Increase Per Pupil.	LBH Current Per Pupil (19-20)	Difference	Impact
MFG - Primary	3,750	5,342	(1,592)	No change.
MFG - Secondary	5,000	6,877	(1,877)	No change.

2021-22	Government Increase Per Pupil.	LBH Current Per Pupil (19-20)	Difference	Impact
MFG - Primary	4,000	5,342	(1,342)	No change.
MFG - Secondary	5,000	6,877	(1,877)	No change.

- 2.7 To re-iterate these figures are indicative but in MFG terms Haringey Schools are already funded at a higher rate. An update will be provided at next School's Forum once further ESFA guidance has been provided.
- 2.8 The government has also announced additional £700 million extra for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in 2020-21.

### **3 Schools DGS formula 2020-21**

- 3.1 The consultation in November 2018 with all maintained and academy schools, Schools Forum agreed the following principles for the local funding formula in 2019-2020
- (a) Growth Fund to estimate at £922k
  - (b) The transfer 0.25% out of the Schools Block into the High Needs Block
  - (c) Set the MFG at +0.2% per pupil

An agreement from School's forum is sought to keep this in methodology – \* but with the Growth Fund recalculated based on current needs. This will be presented at next School's Forum once Admission data has been provided.

- 3.2 In December, each local authority received an email which provided details of how to access their Authority Proforma Tool (APT). The December APT will be populated with schools block data for 2020 to 2021, primarily drawn from the October 2019 schools census.
- 3.3 Authority Proforma tool is the mechanism by which ESFA provide the schools block dataset to local authorities but local authorities will submit APT in January 2020 following schools forum approval.

## 3.4 Since last School's Forum School's Finance took the following actions:

- Re-instated the NFF Working Group. The previous membership was Will Wawn (Bounds Green), Mike McKenzie (Heartlands Academy) and Tony Hartney (Gladesmore Community School). Martin Doyle (Riverside) and Eveleen Riordan (AD School's and Learning have also attended a presentation on workings.
- School's Finance created Models for nine different scenarios.
- Presented out-comes of models to the Working group.

These models are for illustrative purposes to aid in decision making of agreeing the 2020-21 formula. The actual funding may differ from these allocations once we have received the final APT from the ESFA. Which is expected in the first week of December.

For each "model" the following have been entered into the ESFA APT tool:

- October 2018 Census figures.
- MFG rate.
- Capping factor.

MFG and Capping have to be fixed for both Primary and Secondary at the same level. The modelling will change these factors based on last School's Forum Proposals.

The APT tool limits the range for MFG to be between 0.5% and 1.84%. The maximum Capping of 1.84% has been applied in all scenarios. To ensure School's gain maximum funding levels for 2020-21.

The only local factors used in the formula is the adjustable factors are Business Rates. The latest rates from Rates Team have been used.

## 3.5 Nine Separate models were produced and there are two models that are being put to the forum for consideration. The criteria is to aim for a maximum devolvement to Schools via the formula.

Please review Appendix 1 – For the details.

## 3.6 The consultation of the funding formula will start on 13th of December after the General Election up to the 20th of December. All Head Teachers and Governors will be sent a link via e-mail to register their intentions.

The questions to be consulted are:

### a) Agreement to set 2020/21 School's Budget using either:

Model 1 Version 3 - MFG set at 0.74% and capping at 1.84%, with no HNB Block Transfer. Maximum has been devolved to Schools via the formula.

or

Model 2 Version 1 – MFG set at 0.54% and capping at 0.70%, with 0.25% devolved to HNB Block.

### b) Consideration to top slice Education Welfare Budget to ensure all School's including Academies share the cost of the Education Welfare Service. Currently

Academies don't pay for this. Based on consultation decision this will be factored in to the formula.

- 3.7 NFF Formula Hard vs Soft: ESFA extended the soft formula approach to prepare schools and authorities for the move to hard funding. The hard formula funding was to be implemented this year.
- 3.8 Haringey is as close to the hard formula as possible with Business rates the only local factors used in 2018-19 (subsequently used in 2019-20 as part of the request to maintain last year's base formula). Schools should then be able to plan accordingly any future issues.
- 3.9 Where schools have split sites and are eligible for split site funding of £60k in the DSG formula. Nurseries with split sites do not receive this funding. It is proposed to ensure fairness across all mainstream settings a similar split site funding is provided to nurseries. (In Haringey there is only a single Nursery with a split site).

## **4 Central School Services Block**

- 4.1 The Central School Services Block will fund local authorities for the statutory duties that they hold for both maintained schools and academies. Provisional NFF CSSB funding in 2020/21 is based on the following factors:
  - a) LA level pupil numbers - these are 2019-20 pupil numbers. These will be updated using the October 2019 school census when we allocate funding to LAs in 2020-21;
  - b) actual historic commitments funding, equivalent to the 2019-20 funding which was based on spending levels reported by LAs in the 2018-19 baselines exercise.
- 4.2 The Central School Services Block will fund local authorities for the statutory duties that they hold for both maintained schools and academies. It brings together:
  - c) funding for ongoing responsibilities, such as admissions, previously top-sliced by each local authority from its Schools Block allocation;
  - d) funding previously allocated through the retained duties element of the education services grant (ESG); and
  - e) residual funding for historic commitments, previously top-sliced by the local authority from the Schools Block.
- 4.3 Funding for ongoing responsibilities to local authorities using a simple formula, which distributes 90% of funding according to a per-pupil factor and 10% of funding according to a deprivation factor. Both elements will be adjusted for area costs.
- 4.4 The transition to the formula for ongoing responsibilities will be gradual – with gains and losses capped each year so that the formula is affordable, and the transition is manageable. A protection will continue in 2020-21 to ensure that limits reductions to 2.5%

per-pupil a year. The level of gains will be set annually and will depend on the precise composition of the Central School Services Block in each year.

- 4.5 Funding for historic commitments will be based on the actual cost of the commitment. Funding will reduce as commitments cease. There will therefore be no protection for historic commitments in the Central School Services Block.
- 4.6 Haringey's provisional Central School Services Block allocations for 2020-21 is £2.950m. This is made up of an actual per-pupil rate of £87.11 for ongoing responsibilities, based on the Central School Services Block national formula and an actual fixed cash amount for historic commitments, based on authorities' historic spend.
- 4.7 The published provisional allocations use the October 2018 pupil count to calculate the provisional total for ongoing responsibilities. In December, final allocations will be calculated by multiplying the actual per pupil rate by the October 2019 pupil count.
- 4.8 Provisionally Haringey's Central School Services Block has lost £76k in 2020-20. This is the maximum loss, capped at 2.5%.
- 4.9 The allocation for each individual budget line has been given below for agreement with the Schools Forum but can ultimately determine how the Central School Services Block funding is allocated. The operational guide also sets out restrictions on how the Council can spend the allocation, whilst giving the Council flexibility to move money from Central School Services Block into other blocks if desired.

**Agenda Item  
6**



**Report Status**

For information/note   
For consultation & views  
For decision

**Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

**Report Title: Dedicated Schools Budget Modelling for 2020-21 and Central Schools Services Block allocation for 2020-21**

**Author:**

Kristian Bugnosen  
Principal Accountant (DSG)  
Telephone: 020 8489 4491  
Email: [Kristian.bugnosen@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Kristian.bugnosen@haringey.gov.uk)

Muhammad Ali  
Schools Finance Business Partner  
Telephone: 020 8489 4491  
Email: [Muhammad.Ali@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Muhammad.Ali@haringey.gov.uk)

**Purpose:**

1. To illustrate the process to all Haringey schools on the 2019/20 schools funding formula
2. To demonstrate the outcomes of the funding modelling work as requested at the last School's Forum.

**Summary Table Explanation. How to read and interpret the tables.**

These models are for illustrative purposes to seek agreement on formula.

October Census 2018 and latest Business Rates have been used in the APT Tool – The MFG and Capping rates have been adjusted accordingly.

Model 1: SEN Block Transfer 0%	V1	V2	V3	Key	Notes
Block Transfer SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Ai)	Represents the Haringey School's Forum agreed variables to influence the formula in %s.
MFG	0.68%	0.70%	0.74%	Aii)	
Capping Factor	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%	Aiii)	
Schools Block Before Recoupment	198,445,350	198,445,350	198,445,350	B)	School's Block Before Recoupment as taken from ESFA.
Less Total School Allocation	196,691,839	196,720,900	196,779,023	C)	Total School's Allocation as calculated on APT *Individual School's Allocation will be presented in the main APT tool.
<b>Remaining</b>	<b>1,753,511</b>	<b>1,724,450</b>	<b>1,666,327</b>	<b>D) = B) - C)</b>	The difference represents the remaining DSG after Individual Schools Budgets allocated out.
Block Transfer - SEN - 0%	0	0	0	E)	The formula is B) x Ai) - "School's Block before Recoupment" x "Block Transfer to SEN"
Growth (0.47%)	932,693	932,693	932,693	F)	The formula is B) x "0.47%" - "School's Block before Recoupment" x "Agreed Growth"
De-Delegation	417,743	417,743	417,743	G)	Taken from APT.
Schools In Financial Difficulty	179,000	179,000	179,000	H)	School's Forum Agreed Contribution.
TU Representation	135,000	135,000	135,000	I)	School's Forum Agreed Contribution.
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>	<b>J) = E) + F) + G) + H) + I)</b>	The total adjustments represent the makeup of the remaining DSG after Individual Schools Budgets allocated out.
<b>Total retained</b>	<b>89,075</b>	<b>60,014</b>	<b>1,891</b>	<b>K) = D) - J)</b>	This details retained total once all variables ( A)s + J)s ) are in put into the Formula. This determines decision making.
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Keep</b>	<b>L)</b>	Highlight the option that maximises devolvement to Schools. (Aim for 0.00 retention).



## Model 1 – The funding formula has NO High Needs Block Transfer

Model 1: SEN Block Transfer 0%	V1	V2	V3
Block Transfer SEN	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MFG	0.68%	0.70%	0.74%
Capping Factor	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%
Schools Block Before recoupment	198,445,350	198,445,350	198,445,350
Less Total School Allocation	196,691,839	196,720,900	196,779,023
<b>Remaining</b>	<b>1,753,511</b>	<b>1,724,450</b>	<b>1,666,327</b>
Block Transfer - SEN - 0%	0	0	0
Growth (0.47%)	932,693	932,693	932,693
De-Delegation	417,743	417,743	417,743
Schools In Financial Difficulty	179,000	179,000	179,000
TU Representation	135,000	135,000	135,000
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>	<b>1,664,436</b>
<b>Total retained</b>	<b>89,075</b>	<b>60,014</b>	<b>1,891</b>
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Keep</b>

## Model 2 - The funding formula has 0.25% High Needs Block Transfer

Model 2: SEN Block Transfer 0.25%	Version 1	Version 2	Version 3
Block Transfer High Needs	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%
MFG	0.50%	0.54%	0.60%
Capping Factor	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
Schools Block Before recoupment	198,445,350	198,445,350	198,445,350
Less Total School Allocation	196,230,519	196,278,996	196,369,023
<b>Remaining</b>	<b>2,214,831</b>	<b>2,166,354</b>	<b>2,076,327</b>
Block Transfer - SEN - 0.25%	496,113	496,113	496,113
Growth (0.47%)	932,693	932,693	932,693
De-Delegation	417,743	417,743	417,743
Schools In Financial Difficulty	179,000	179,000	179,000
TU Representation	135,000	135,000	135,000
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>2,160,549</b>	<b>2,160,549</b>	<b>2,160,549</b>
<b>Total retained</b>	<b>54,282</b>	<b>5,805</b>	<b>(84,222)</b>
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Keep</b>	<b>Reject</b>

## Model 3 - The funding formula has 0.5% High Needs Block Transfer

<b>Model 3: Block Transfer - SEN - 0.5%</b>	<b>Model 1</b>	<b>Model 2</b>	<b>Model 3</b>
Block Transfer SEN	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
MFG	0.50%	0.60%	0.70%
Capping Factor	0.50%	0.50%	0.50%
Schools Block Before recoupment	198,445,350	198,445,350	198,445,350
Less Total School Allocation	196,146,458	196,284,963	196,437,073
<b>Remaining</b>	<b>2,298,892</b>	<b>2,160,387</b>	<b>2,008,277</b>
Block Transfer - SEN - 0.5%	992,227	992,227	992,227
Growth (0.47%)	932,693	932,693	932,693
De-Delegation	417,743	417,743	417,743
Schools In Financial Difficulty	179,000	179,000	179,000
TU Representation	135,000	135,000	135,000
<b>Total Adjustments</b>	<b>2,656,662</b>	<b>2,656,662</b>	<b>2,656,662</b>
<b>Total retained</b>	<b>(357,771)</b>	<b>(496,275)</b>	<b>(648,385)</b>
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Reject</b>

**Agenda Item  
7**

**Commissioning Unit**

**Report to High Needs Block –**

**Report Status**

For information/note x  
For consultation & views  
For decision

**Report Title: High Needs Block Options Appraisal**

**Author: Vikki Monk-Meyer Head of Service SEN and Disability**

The purpose of this paper is to:

Explore all actions that could be taken by the borough to reduce the spend in the high needs block

**Recommendations:**

1. To note current financial position and comparative success of strategies implemented to date on spend
2. To note the significance of assuring appropriate pathways are in place for children with complex and challenging behaviours, both on quality of outcomes and on financial impact
3. Forum to note the co-dependency of current strategies and their impact on the High Needs Block Budget e.g. Alternative Provisions Review, Place planning review, Early Help Strategy and Young People at Risk Strategy

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. The purpose of the paper is to explore all options available to the borough to address the continued significant pressure on the high needs block budget
- 1.2. Forum are asked to note the co-dependencies of different strategies and their influence on high needs spend
- 1.3. The forum are asked to agree actions that will go forward for consultation to schools and families

## 2.0 Current High Needs Block position

- 2.1 Despite work done to manage the budget, the budget is forecast to close in April 2020 in a 5.7 million deficit position.
- 2.2 The current budget holds back 300K of the money received from the 0.25% (490K) transfer from the schools' block, which has not be allocated against the high needs block. The original intention was to create an exceptional needs/early intervention fund which can be accessed by schools for children without an EHCP.
- 2.3 Work was done between the schools and LA to establish a mechanism to support the implementation of this fund, however since this time other factors have occurred which mean this action may need to be re-evaluated. This will be explored later in the paper under 'Alternative Provisions review'.
- 2.4 To date, the overall strategy is to use local school and college places to the maximum, and encourage children to choose school places locally for their education at key transition points e.g. reception, secondary and post 11 transfer.
- 2.5 To do this the borough has worked closely with local special schools to re-designate, or design school offers which meet children's needs and are attractive to families
- 2.6 The budget in April 2020 is due to be uplifted by circa 2.4 million after top slice for school places, however this would mean the budget will still not be enough to cover current trajectory of spend.

## 3.0 Pressures on the budget

3.1 The key pressures on the budget remain the same:

- a) Significant yearly increases in the children who require and Educational Health and Care Plan as a result of the increased age range (0-25 years)
- b) Increased use of special school places with more costly packages for children with increasingly complex needs.
- c) Increased costs for children to whom we have a new duty (hospital admission).

- d) A rise in need for residential therapeutic places linked to those with mental health needs associated with Social Emotional Mental Health/Autism.
- e) Increasing use of Independent School places with increased transport costs due to lack of local capacity.
- f) High cost residential places for young people over 18 years

#### **4.0 In-borough Specialist Provision – Increased local capacity.**

4.1 Special Schools places have increased to meet local and future need. 4.2. Schools have increased their place to meet need as outlined below:

<b>Setting</b>	<b>Places 2015</b>	<b>Places 2019</b>
The Vale	99	106
Blanche Nevile	70	68
The Brook	100	110
Riverside (Including Learning Centre)	120	140
The Grove	42 (was Heartlands Unit)	65
Haringey 6 <sup>th</sup> form	55	70 (Entry and Foundation)
Mulberry	18	18
West Green	8	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>585</b>

Of note is that 15 of Riverside places and 14 of The Grove places are for 16 - 19 year olds, and have been a significant contribution to our post 16 offer.

4.3 In 2021 The Grove School expands again to 85 places and then to 104 places in 2022. No other schools are planned to expand after this time.

4.4 These new school places are funded through the differences between the out of borough costs of placing children, and the comparative cost of funding The Grove. This strategy will only be affective if the special school places are not overused e.g. special school places are only offered to those who most need it, and there is not a drift toward statutory interventions for those pupils who are vulnerable and might otherwise be receiving services with an EHC in local schools or potentially at SEN support level.

4.5 Locally there are also increasing costs around the use of alternative provision and SEMH provision to meet the needs of children with complex and challenging behaviour. This pathway will be the key focus for development over 2020 to 2021.

4.6 Haringey is a borough with high numbers of NEET and unknown pupils post year 11. A large proportion of these pupils are vulnerable and have been at SEN support level.

4.7 Haringey rates low in the national return in this area, and therefore there are indications that the engagement of pupils at SEN support in further education is a challenge. This could be considered in the current work on Early Help strategy and the alternative provisions pathway.

4.8 To address this, the borough's strategy on sufficiency of specialist places needs to be widened, to one that ensures there is sufficiency of college courses in borough for those young people requiring technically and vocational courses, as these are potentially pupil's at SEN support level.

4.9 The tracking and monitoring of these young people attendance is critical to addressing increasing the resilience of the young people in the borough, and a key component of the Young People at Risk Strategy. Currently some of these young people are coming back to education into colleges and requiring high needs top up. Not addressing this pathway will continue to build pressure on the high needs block.

## 5 Budget areas and comments

HNB Cost Centre	Budget 2018-19	Out-turn 2018-19	2018-19 Variance	Budget 2019-20	Projected Out-turn 2019-20	2019-20 Adjusted Variance	2018-19 Out-turn vs 2019-20 Projected
E41234 Alternative Prov Commissioning	1,197,000	1,176,263	-20,737	1,197,000	1,197,000	0	-20,737
E41235 In Year Fair Access Panel	338,000	487,938	149,938	338,000	338,000	0	149,938
E41239 Visual Impairment Provision	177,000	198,546	21,546	177,000	177,000	0	21,546
E41241 Language Support Team	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E41247 Hearing Impairment Team	162,700	162,970	270	162,700	162,700	0	270
E41254 Autism Support Team	410,000	423,638	13,638	426,000	426,000	0	-2,363
E41240 SEN Strategy Manager	110,000	112,717	2,717	110,000	110,000	0	2,717
E41243 SEN - Admin Team	182,500	196,005	13,505	182,500	182,500	0	13,505
E41246 SEN Portage Service	160,000	213,517	53,517	206,000	206,000	0	7,517
E41250 LOVAAS	30,000	1,335	-28,665	0	0	0	1,335
E41251 Speech & Language Therapy	442,000	545,365	103,365	522,000	547,000	25,000	-1,635
E41252 Parent Partnership (Markfield)	98,900	95,352	-3,548	96,000	96,000	0	-648
E41260 Independent & Voluntary Schools	5,717,653	6,968,416	1,250,763	3,500,000	6,900,000	3,400,000	68,416

E41282 Special Schools Place Funding	4,360,000	4,340,000	-20,000	4,480,000	4,480,000	0	-140,000
E41283 Special Schools Top Up	7,392,185	8,541,103	1,148,918	9,544,450	10,972,413	1,427,963	2,431,310
E41284 Mainstream Schools Top Up	4,668,135	5,431,748	763,613	5,254,000	5,115,207	-138,793	316,541
E41285 Special Units Top Up	835,000	939,965	104,965	388,000	311,298	-76,702	628,667
E41286 Higher Education Top Up	2,415,000	3,651,154	1,236,154	2,100,000	3,249,068	1,149,068	402,086
E41287 SEN contingency	1,300,000	1,299,580	-420	1,300,000	1,274,523	-25,477	25,057
E41288 High Needs in Early Years	366,282	371,824	5,542	366,282	366,282	0	5,542
E42012 Locality Team - Central	406,500	407,463	963	406,500	406,500	0	963
E42013 Locality Team - East	396,500	397,663	1,163	396,500	396,500	0	1,163
E42014 Locality Team - West	427,000	428,445	1,445	427,000	427,000	0	1,445
<b>Totals</b>	<b>31,592,355</b>	<b>36,391,006</b>	<b>4,798,651</b>	<b>31,579,932</b>	<b>37,340,992</b>	<b>5,761,060</b>	<b>-949,986</b>

5.1 Key areas of concern continue to be the independent and voluntary school line and special schools. Further analysis is below.

5.2 There were two main areas of focus for this financial year to address the over spend. These were to create in borough special school places, which are more cost effective than out borough, and to review the plans for young people over 16 years to facilitate better access to local courses.

5.4 As can be seen from the table above, the actual spend on out borough places and services is not reducing, although it has a lower budget than last year and the numbers of the children in the settings is not increasing significantly. This is explored more in point 7.

5.5 Spend on increased in borough special school places is increasing significantly, although spend on mainstream is predicated to reduce, despite rising EHC numbers.

5.6 The spend on post 16 is reducing significantly, although the numbers of young people in post 16 college places is not reducing. This has therefore been an effective strategy.

## 6. Option Appraisal on budget areas and themes

6.1 The areas of potential cost reduction are explored with action and likely impact.

	Area	Action	Likely Impact
--	------	--------	---------------

1.	Review special school places to ensure best use	Review demand based on category of need, decommission and re-commission if needed. Place planning report required yearly	Better use of resourcing, unlikely to reduce costs overall, requests for places continues to rise with increased EHC rates, however will prevent costs continuing to rise.
2.	Review special schools top up rates to ensure resourcing meets needs	Compare special schools top up rates across each school setting compared to cost of running school	May adjust rates across settings however unlikely to reduce overall costs, rates comparable or lower than neighbouring boroughs
3.	Review mainstream schools top up rates	Compare top up rates to EHC levels and cost of delivery	Already compensating for lower than average top up rates with SEN contingency payments. Top up rates increased in 2018. May cause further move to special schools
4.	Review non statutory payments to schools	400K SEN contingency 900k secondary contingency	Contingency balances top up rates being low – could move to M/S top up rate (no net gain but more transparent budgeting for schools)  Secondary contingency could return to the block on arrival of hard funding formula 2021
5.	Review non statutory contributions to other services, or change delivery models to contribute more directly to 'stay local' agenda	Reduce contributions to:  Transport Early Help	All services contribute to the management of children with SEND.  Some services are over spending even with contribution from the HNB  Transport is subject to an external review



			and this may release cost savings to allow this to occur.  Can services be more aligned with 'stay local' agenda e.g. vulnerable children in Early Years and family support in later years.
6.	Review joint funding with partners - specifically for education post 19 years	Analyse all provisions for those over 19 years still in education.	Would create pressure elsewhere, however funding would be fairer in terms of growth of this cohort of YP
7.	Review delivery for support in Early Years to ensure strengths are utilised and funding is used most effectively	Review how early interventions are most effectively delivered	Likely to be future area of investment rather than reduction.
8.	Keep costs of placements under review	Maintain contracts list for independent settings and how costs are calculated. Review individual costs and uplifts requested.	May lead to cost savings and prevent future uplifts being unreasonable

Whilst all of the above actions may potentially initially contain spend, some actions may actually increase spend in the medium term e.g. reduction in local special and mainstream school top up, may lead to the commissioning of more out borough school places.

## 7. Comments on budget area of key concern:

7.1 Independent and out borough spend continues despite increased in borough capacity. The use of independent and out borough places are summarised below:

Year	Special Independent (Day)		Special Independent (Residential)		Total by Year
	In	Out	In	Out	
2019	6	94	0	15	114
2018	10	96	0	11	116
2016	8	81	0	16	105

2015	11	67	0	23	101
2014	10	62	0	27	99

Whilst the numbers of school places commissioned have increased, they have not increased significantly given the rise in the number of children with EHC plans, indicating that the locally commissioned places are meeting the rising needs in the main.

Whilst the increase in spend is based on numbers of special school and college places funded, it is also on the additional support needed to meet needs in special and mainstream school.

7.2 The table below summarises the use of this budget and demonstrates the areas of increasing pressure. As can be seen, whilst there continues to be spend on day and residential school places, there is a rising need for additional support into schools, currently commissioned from private providers.

#### **Independent and Out Borough School place costs and support E41260**

<b>Area of spend E41240</b>	<b>Net amount (pre joint funding)</b>
Independent day school fees	4,536,270.66
Residential school fees	2,709,022.10
Additional support into independent schools	684,937.71
Personal budget/home Educated (bespoke)	141,025.74
Tuition – agency into settings or at home	112,582.74
Post 16 alternative provision	103,830.00
Outreach support - private provider	48,557.95
Hospital tuition - no EHC plan	38,512.50
Grand Total before joint funding applied	8,443,910.41

7.3 Tuition through agency, and private providers of AP amounts to £261,969. This is a spend on alternative provisions not previously exposed. Spend on AP is therefore higher than previously stated.

7.5 Of the independent school places commissioned, there are 94 children in independent and out borough private settings. Of these this includes 22

primary, 50 secondary and 22 post 16. This also includes Charedi community schools.

7.6 Of those children in the out-borough places there are key cohorts of children using these places. Of the 934 children with an EHC who have a primary need of ASD, 37 are in independent settings (4%). Of the 274 children with a primary needs of SEMH, 31 are in independent settings (14%).

7.7 Costs per setting are increasing however as uplifts requests continue from the providers. SEND are working with commissioning to challenge these costs.

7.8 The additional support costs for children in the independent schools should be reviewed as the schools are already receiving high private fees.

7.9 There are some emerging trends that need to have a standard response to ensure that budgets are fair e.g. Families choosing to home educate where the LA is providing budgets in the form of a direct payment (as per the Code of Practice) should have a fixed budget based on special school top up rates to enable them to decide on how to appropriately implement the EHC plan for their child.

## **8.0 Different ways of working:**

### **8.1 Early Intervention Funding**

Part of the 0.25% transfer from the school's block was held back to establish an Early Intervention fund as a prevention of escalation and to reduce the need for high cost placements due to behaviour needs e.g. a different way of managing low level SEND needs with highly challenging behaviour to allow statutory assessments to take place or resolve difficulties. This approach has not been implemented as yet due to an anticipated piece of work needed around the new alternative provisions model.

**8.2** Alternative Provisions review is ongoing to outline the best use of high needs funding for young people with Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH). Part of this review is to define the Tuition Centre and The Octagon's core offer as part of the provisions to meet needs local. For this to be successful the following is being considered as part of the AP review:

- Increased skill set at primary and secondary to meet needs
- Support that is collaboratively delivered at home and at school e.g. family support aswell as teaching support
- Potentially early intervention support for those at school action may still be needed
- Alternative provisions that provide short term interventions based in schools where young people return to their original school e.g. nurture

units. These are base funded by the LA with top up but children stay on their original school role

- More specialist interventions from an SEMH type provision.

Given the costs of the above pathways, current provision needs to be re-designed. This has meant that places have been highlighted as to be re-designated for alternative use in Sept 2020, and this has been shared with the current provider and the ESFA. No financial changes have been made as yet, however this will mean that the place costs will be brought back to the block in Sept 2020 and can be used to fund alternative pathways.

8.3 There may be a period of time in 2020 whereby young people using the current provision need to have their needs met in a different way pending the opening of the new range of provisions. Work is being done with finance to cost out the re-modelling of the provisions and where the young peoples needs should be met in the meantime. The cost of returned places from special schools, and the originally identified 300K from the schools block transfer, may need to be used as part of this model.

8.5 The rough costs of new provisions are £1,425,000 for 2 x 25 place Alternative Unit Provision. and £925,000 for a 20 place SEMH therapeutic provision. This will allow financial support for outreach, training and support from within the current financial envelope and also provide flexibility in terms of provision of a range of alternative pathways to be funded.

8.6 As a part of the offer on new pathways, work has started on the skill set for managing challenging behaviours as outlined including Positive Behaviour Approaches. The CCG has commissioned training in positive behavioural support (PBS) to reduce the need for high cost placements due to behaviour needs, as part of this work in the mental health trailblazer pathway.

8.7 The cohort will initially be those young people with Complex Learning Disabilities and Autism and highly challenging behaviour (transforming care approaches). Key to this being successful is the role of family support.

## **9.0 Development of the Early Intervention and Early Help offer 0-19 years**

9.1 The role of the Early Help offer to reduce the need for statutory support is applicable to children in early years whose needs may otherwise escalate and require statutory interventions, and also those young people at SEN support and with EHC plans, who may form part of the Young People at Risk or alternative provisions pathway, whose needs cannot be managed locally without advice and support at home.

9.2 Consideration needs to be given to how Early Years and school settings can be facilitated to support the pathway as part of the Early Help offer.

9.3 Given the recent statistics on the young people who may vulnerable young people at SEN support level cohort who are not currently in education

employment and training, or their education is unknown, additional actions are needed around tracking and monitoring these young people, to ensure that they remain in education.

9.4 Consideration needs to be given to funding the tracking and monitoring of the success of pupils who initially need to move to local level 1 and 2 college courses, potentially from the schools' block transfer.

9.5 Place planning sufficiency could be extended to include vocational/technical courses at local colleges, to prevent overuse of special school places for young people who might not otherwise need the specialist approaches.

## **10.0 SEND capital grant**

10.1 There has been an allocation capital funding to meet the needs of children with SEND, which can be used for both school places and provision to enhance accessibility for children/young people with SEND.

10.2 The current actions are published on the Local Offer and are summarised below:

<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/children-and-families/local-offer/about-local-offer/send-local-offer-review-and-action-plan>

10.3 Actions around the use of the capital grant include:

- Ensuring capacity for setting providing Supported Internships and employment support.
- Developing the offer for children who are more able academically with Autism or SEMH
- Ensuring nurseries can meet children's complex needs
- Ensuring respite provision is properly accessible
- Ensuring that Haringey's 'Universal Offer' has the necessary accessibility to meet needs e.g. local leisure opportunities

## **11.0 Conclusion**

Analysis of the spend in the budget shows the following trends:

11.1 Strategies to bring children locally are having some impact on the budget, however special school places are still costing more than the budget available

11.2 The best use of resources and investing in local college places is having the most effective impact on the spend comparing 2018 outturn with predicted outturn for 2019. Although the budget was set at a lower level, the spend is decreasing compared to last year.

11.2 There continues to be a need for specialist additional support at school and at home to keep children locally, and this is now driving the spend on the

independent budget line e.g. specialist teaching, tuition for children out of school.

11.3 Place planning for local needs should be broadened to include technical as well as specialist college courses

11.4 Increasing the range of support in the early years and school age at the Early Help level is needed to reduce the statutory support provided for both education and social care. The 'stay local' agenda will not work in isolation to reduce the spend.

## 12.0 Actions

Action	Anticipated Outcome
Review school fees for best value	Reduce costs
Use money released from de-commissioning of school places to fund new pathways of support for children (SEMH)	Increased consistency of pathways and better value for money
Review partner agency contribution to complex cases	More realistic view of outcomes for young person and true cost across agencies demonstrated
Further detail on place planning to commission and de-commission special school and college places needed	Better use of local recourse and more cost effective strategies
Further standardisation of some growing areas of spend e.g. private tuition costs	Better use of local recourse and more cost effective strategies, better budget prediction
Increased use of skill mix, outreach support and training resources to meet needs at a lower cost	Better use of local recourse and more cost effective strategies – meeting needs locally at a lower cost

Vikki Monk-Meyer  
HoS Nov 2019

**Agenda Item****7****Commissioning Unit****Report to High Needs Block –****Report Status**For information/note x  
For consultation & views  
For decision**Report Title: High Needs Block Options Appraisal Appendix 1****Author: Vikki Monk-Meyer Head of Service SEN and Disability**

The purpose of this paper is to:

Outline actions already taken to manage pressures on the HNB

The following is a summary of actions taken to reduce pressure on the High Needs block from 2017 to 2019, and the financial implications of each action:

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Financial Impact</b>
<b>17-18</b>	<b>Reduced SEND advisory teacher staffing, changed staff roles and introduced skill mix</b>	<b>£275,000</b>
<b>17-18</b>	<b>Reduced contribution to Early Help</b>	<b>£120,000</b>
<b>17-18</b>	<b>Reduced Contribution to transport</b>	<b>£225,000</b>
<b>17-18</b>	<b>Reviewed contracts to commissioned services e.g. statement writer and SENDIASS</b>	<b>£6,0000</b>
<b>17-18</b>	<b>Introduced secondary contingency to support stay local agenda</b>	<b>Reduced special school places at secondary transfer - not costed</b>

<b>18-19</b>	<b>Reduced SEN Contingency payments and adjusted methodology</b>	<b>£100,000</b>
<b>18-19</b>	<b>Insourced visual impairment service delivery</b>	<b>£24,000</b>
<b>18-19</b>	<b>Reviewed oncosts for HNB funded staff</b>	<b>£130,000</b>
<b>18-19</b>	<b>Traded services for schools</b>	<b>£16,000</b>
<b>19-20</b>	<b>Reviewed independent school contracts for additional charges</b>	<b>£23,000</b>
<b>19-20</b>	<b>Reviewed college top up requests (cost avoidance)</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>19-20</b>	<b>Brought back to borough YP who was attending high cost placement</b>	<b>£174,000</b>
<b>19-20</b>	<b>Reviewed and ceased EHC plans for YP ready to move to alternative support locally</b>	<b>Ongoing £60,000</b>
<b>19-20</b>	<b>School place planning review</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>

**Vikki Monk-Meyer**  
**Head of Service SEND**  
**Nov 2019**



**Agenda Item  
9**



**Report Status**

For information/ note   
 For consultation & views   
 For decision

**Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 5th December 2019**

**Report Title: Schools Forum Work Plan 2019-20 Academic Year.**

**Author:**

Muhammad Ali,  
 Interim DSG Accountant  
**Telephone: 020 8489 4491**  
 Email: Muhammad.Ali@haringey.gov.uk

**Purpose: To inform the Forum of the updated work plan for the 2019-20 academic year and provide members with an opportunity to add additional items.**

**Recommendations:**

**That the updated work plan for the 2019-20 academic year is noted.**

**1. Schools Forum**

- 1.1. It is good practice for Schools Forum to maintain a work plan so that members ensure that key issues are considered in a robust and timely way.
- 1.2. Members of the Forum are asked to consider whether there are any additional issues that should be added to the work plan for the next Academic Year.
- 1.3. This work plan will be included on the agenda for each future meeting so that members are able to review progress and make appropriate updates.

## **Haringey Schools Forum - Work Plan Academic Year 2019-20**

### January 2020.

- Update on Dedicated Schools Budget Strategy 2019-20.
- Funding Formula 2020-21.
- Arrangements for the use of Pupil Referral Units and the Education of Children otherwise than at school
- Restructure Scrutiny Panel
- Growth Fund.
- High Needs Block.
- Early Help and Preventative services update.
- Updates from working parties.

### February 2020.

- Scheme for Financing Schools.
- Update on Dedicated Schools Budget Strategy 2020-21.
- The Schools Internal Audit Programme.
- Update from working parties.

### June 2020.

- Dedicated Schools Budget Outturn 2018-19
- Outcome of Internal Audit Programme 2018-19
- Forum Membership
- Update from working parties



**Agenda Item  
10**

**Report Status**

For information/note            x   
 For consultation & views         
 For decision                       

**Paper for Schools Forum Early Years Working Group (EYWG) Meeting –  
4<sup>th</sup> October 2019 (updated)**

**Report Title:** Update on the DSG Early Block Budget and delivery of the  
Early Years Free Entitlement

**Authors:**

**Ngozi Anuforo, Head of Early Help Commissioning & Culture**

Contact: 0208 489 4681 Email: [Ngozi.anuforo@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Ngozi.anuforo@haringey.gov.uk)

**Purpose:** To provide School Forum with an overview of the current  
financial picture for 2019-20 and highlight key aspects of the  
expenditure.

**Recommendation:**

1. That Schools Forum agrees the recommendation of the Early Years working group that the additional 8 pence per hour uplift to the Haringey funded rate from April 2020, is added to the current base rate of £4.99 paid to providers as part of Haringey's EYFF.

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This paper seeks to provide early years working group members with an overview of the early years block funding within DSG for 2019-20 and update the group on the financial position at the midway point within the current financial year.

## **2. Early Years Block Funding**

- 2.1 The Early Years Block is provided for the Council to meet its statutory duties under the Childcare Act 2006 and is expected to fund:
- The Free Early Education Entitlement for all three and four year olds through an Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF)
  - The free entitlement for eligible two year olds
  - The Early Years Pupil Premium
  - Access for disabled children
  - Support for maintained Nursery Schools
- 2.2 In addition to delivering the early years free entitlement, it is mandated that all local authorities have in place an Early Years Inclusion Fund to support 3 & 4-year-old children, with special educational needs, below the threshold for ECHPs, to access their free entitlement. Amongst the few budgets and services provided directly from the high needs block for children without an EHCP, the Early Years Inclusion Fund, is now provided as part of the Council meeting its statutory obligations.

## **3. Closing position for Early Years DSG 2018-19**

- 3.1 The Dedicated Schools Budget (DSG) is broken down into four blocks for budget setting purposes, which are Schools, Central, Early Years and SEND. However, in terms of corporate reporting the Council, in partnership with the Schools Forum, is required to view the financial position of the grant in its totality. Therefore, there is an overarching requirement to balance whole budget in each financial year. This means that any year end surpluses or deficits are aggregated into a single sum to be carried forward into the subsequent financial year.
- 3.2 The Early Years DSG opening reserves balance for 2018/19 was £1.65m. This followed an LA decision to deploy £1.34m at the close of 2017/18 to mitigate pressures in the HNB. A subsequent decision was agreed with Schools Forum that 2018/19 carry forward overspend balances in the HNB would be settled utilising underspends available in

other blocks. To this end, amounts of £1.1m from the EY Block and £0.8m from the Schools Block were transferred to the HNB carry forward overspend. This left the EY Block with an initial reserves balance of £0.55m for 2018/19.

- 3.3 During 2018/19, an underspend of £0.71m accumulated across the block but largely attributed to underspend in the extended 15-hour budget line (funding for the 30-hour offer). This element of underspend was generated due to 2018-2019 take up of the 30-hour increasing steadily but not yet being at full participation. There was also a drop in 2-year-old participation numbers that contributed to this underspend profile. This meant that at the end of 2018/19, the closing reserve balance was £1.26m.
- 3.4 Options for the utility of this closing reserves balance were not proposed to the DSG early years working group based on the presumption that the principle of deploying DSG block underspends to support pressures in the HNB had been established, and that as a consequence, there would be no available funds current financial year. This was considering what was known at the time about the existing and projected deficit balance for the HNB. In keeping with the approach agreed with Schools Forum, the balance of £1.26m has been transferred to the HNB 2019/20 carry forward overspend.
- 3.5 Early Years Working Group members suggested that rather than maintain the principle of deploying DSG block underspends to support pressures in the HNB as on-going, the opportunity to review this each year should be the stance taken and this would enable consideration to be given to other demands on the DSG resources by Schools Forum.
- 3.6 Further to this, during a discussion at the February DSG early years working group meeting, about the dip in 2 year olds numbers at January census , it was highlighted that there was likely to be claw-back from DfE that would need to be accommodated within this financial year. Since that meeting, DfE confirmed that an amount of **£528,281** would be clawed back due to the 2018-19 underspend. This has been applied to the 2019/20 early years DSG allocation for the delivery of two-year-old places.

#### **4. Early Years DSG Budget Profile for 2019-20**

- 4.1 At the start of the 2019-20 financial year, the early years DSG budget profile reflected budget allocations notified to Haringey Council by DfE in December 2018. The total allocation at that time was indicative, and subject to adjustment by DfE following their review of the early years and schools census submissions for January 2019.
- 4.2 Any adjustments to Early Years DSG allocations are applied by DfE between August and September of the same year as a particular

January census and represent DfE reaching a final position on the Council's budget allocation for the previous year.

Our indicative allocations for 2019-20 were as follows:

**Table 1:** Haringey's Indicative DSG Early Years Block Allocation for 2019-20

Funding Stream	2019-20 Indicative Allocation (£m)
3 & 4 YO Universal Free Entitlement (15hr)	12.558
3 & 4 YO Extended Free Entitlement (Additional 15hrs)	3.551
2YO Offer	2.745
Early Years Pupil Premium	0.131
Disability Access Fund	0.060
Maintained Nursery Schools	1.236
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.282</b>

- 4.3 The census that determines Haringey Council's allocation for the early years element of DSG is the one that takes place in January each year. During census week, a count of the number of pupils taking up a free entitlement place across all the ages is captured along with pupil level data, including whether they have special educational needs. All providers of the free early education entitlement are required to submit information based on those pupils attending their setting during the census week.
- 4.4 An initial review of the information gathered and submitted as part of the census exercise undertaken in January 2019, indicated that there had been increased numbers of children accessing the three and four-year-old entitlement. The census also indicated a reduction in the number of eligible two-year-old children taking up a free early education place.
- 4.5 Returning to information shared with the EYWG earlier in the year, **Table 2** below shows the change profile from January 2018 to 2019:

	January 2019	January 2018	% variance

Total number of funded 2-year olds	490	564	-13.1
Total number of funded 3-year olds (Universal)	1302	1211	+ 7.5
Total number of funded 3-year olds (Extended hrs)	442	381	+ 16.0
Total number of funded 4-year olds (Universal)	446	422	+ 5.7
Total number of funded 4-year olds (Extended hrs)	165	132	+ 25.0

\*Data taken from the Early Years Census (excludes School data)

- 4.6 In August 2019, Haringey's 2019-20 early years allocations within DSG were revised by DfE to reflect our January 2019 census and a final 2018-19 budget. As a consequence, the overall budget has reduced from £20.25m to £20.09m. The final allocations for 2019-20 are now as follows:

**Table 3:** Haringey's Final DSG Early Years Block Allocation for 2019-20

Funding Stream	2019-20 Final Allocation (£m)
3 & 4 YO Universal Free Entitlement (15hr)	12.586
3 & 4 YO Extended Free Entitlement (Additional 15hrs)	3.872
2YO Offer	2.217
Early Years Pupil Premium	0.107
Disability Access Fund	0.060
Maintained Nursery Schools	1.248
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.089</b>

- 4.7 In summary, there has been an increase in our allocation for the universal 15-hour free entitlement, due to an increase in pupil numbers. We believe that this increase in participation has been influenced by the extended, 30-hour offer being taken up by more children.

- 4.8 There has also been an increase in our allocation for the delivery of the extended free entitlement for three- and four-year olds (the 30-hour offer), due to an increase in pupil numbers.
- 4.9 Our allocation of funding for the two-year-old free entitlement has been reduced by 18%. This reflects the lower numbers of children participating in the programme and is perhaps reflective of the downward trajectory we are continuing to see in the number of eligible children. This pattern of declining numbers of eligible children has remained unchanged since the introduction of this particular entitlement. The table below reflects the changing profile over the years.

**Table 4:** Haringey's changing eligibility profile since 2013.

<b>Academic year</b>	<b>DfE/DWP Estimate for potentially eligible children</b>
2013-14	891
2014-15	1790
2015-16	1710
2016-17	1620
2017-18	1500
2018-19	1442
2019-20	1341

- 4.10 The Department for Education's (DfE) estimations for the number of eligible children for this borough have continued to change since the offer was introduced. Data about potentially eligible children is provided to local authorities by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) on a termly basis, as a minimum. There has been a decrease nationally for participation in the two-year-old offer from 72% to 68% and published data shows our statistical neighbours have all experienced a fall in take up rates.
- 4.11 Finally, our allocation for the Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) has been reduced by 32% from £0.158m to £0.107m. Numbers of children for which this is claimed continue to be relatively low. Concern remains as to whether this is a reflection of provider difficulties in engaging parents in providing the required information or whether this is a reflection in the wider reduction in free school meal eligibility. A recent survey of providers generated a low return and therefore we will need to continue work to understand how the volume of eligible children amongst early years providers in Haringey. The declining numbers, and subsequent funding, suggest that we need to identify new approaches to ensure we are able to maximise the benefit to children.



## 5. Changes to Early Years Block Funding for 2020-21

- 5.1 In November 2019, Haringey Council received confirmation that its funding rate for the 2, 3 and 4-year-old free entitlement, will be changing from April 2020. This follows announcements from Government about increased national funding for education, of which the early years education sector would receive an additional £66m.
- 5.2 As a consequence, from April 2020, the rate Haringey Council is set to receive for the delivery of the 2-year-old free entitlement will increase from £5.66 per hour to £5.74. The funding rate received by the Council for the 3 and 4-year-old free entitlement – both universal and extended offer – will increase from £5.66 to £5.74. Whilst this is a welcome change, queries have been raised by members of the working group, and some of the national early years sector representative bodies, as to how the DfE have calculated the new funding rates and determined the differing allocations across local authorities.
- 5.3 The change to the funding rate for the delivery of the 3 and 4-year-old free entitlement should lead to a change in the current early years funding formula (EYFF) in Haringey from April 2020. **Table 5** below sets out the current breakdown and deployment of the LA funding rate.

**Table 5. Universal Base Rate for Haringey 2019-20**

	<u>£/hr</u>
LA hourly funding rate 2019-20 (£/h)	5.66
Less: LA centrally retained funding (5%)	(0.29)
	<hr/> 5.37 <hr/>
Less: Supplements	(0.38)
Universal base rate	<hr/> <b>4.99</b> <hr/>

- 5.4 Given the timescales until the implementation of the new funding rate, and the recognised financial pressures on the early years sector, across the diverse range of provision, the Early Years working group is

recommending to Schools Forum that the additional 8 pence per hour is added to the current base rate of £4.99 paid to providers as part of Haringey's EYFF. This will increase the base rate Haringey pay providers of the 3 and 4-year-old free entitlement to £5.07. **Table 6** below illustrates the revised distribution of the LA funded rate proposed for 2020-21.

**Table 6. Universal Base Rate for Haringey 2020-21**

	<u>£/hr</u>
LA hourly funding rate 2020-21 (£/h)	5.74
Less: LA centrally retained funding (5%)	(0.29)
	<hr/> 5.45 <hr/>
Less: Supplements	(0.38)
Universal base rate	<hr/> <b>5.07</b> <hr/>

- 5.5 It should be noted that in the run up to the forthcoming general election in December, all the main political parties have proposed increases to the resourcing of early education and education in general. To this end, detailed policy decisions from central government and any implications for the DSG funding beyond April 2020 are unknown. It is the view of early years working group members that there is likely to be a need to undertake a proper review of Haringey's EYFF in time for the start of the financial year commencing April 2021.

## 6. Free Entitlement Participation

- 6.1 At this point in the year, increasing participation in the free early education offer remains a key priority. Whilst we have seen a steady increase in the take up of the 3 and 4-year-old offer, the decline in participation by eligible 2-year olds continues.
- 6.2 Current participation levels are outlined in **Appendix 1**.
- 6.3. During the Autumn term, a campaign will be triggered to raise the profile of the free entitlement and keep momentum in our efforts to ensure that more children are able to benefit from the offers. We will be seeking to increase participation numbers by the beginning of the spring term. From a budget perspective, maximising take-up will have the biggest effect on the levels of DSG funding allocated to Haringey Council. It should be noted that increasing the number of children in place at the time of the census in January 2020, will likely contribute to a positive adjustment to the Early Years Budget allocation for the 2019-2020 financial year – if this can be achieved, increased levels of funding will be realised by the autumn of the subsequent financial year.
- 6.4 A range of actions are being, or will be, undertaken to support this. These include:

6.4.1 Two-year-old Free Entitlement

- Work in partnership with DfE on a Behavioural Insights Project – focus on the development of 2-year-old programme material and messaging that contribute to behaviour changes.
- Use of the DWP list to contact all potentially eligible families.
- Parent Champions programme.
- Piloting of a ‘Golden Ticket’ promotion - using data from Haringey’s Welfare Benefits Team to target and encourage eligible to take-up direct from their chosen childcare application process.
- All children centres ensuring they outreach to Health Visitor clinics.
- Children Centres delivering targeted outreach as part of the Connected Communities - targeting families and children from migrant communities and supporting participation in the offer.
- Rolling programme of briefing and training sessions for outreach and admin staff at customer services, children’s centres, health visitors, job centre and employment support staff, social workers to ensure consistent, clear messages and processes around offer.
- Information surgeries and support for on the spot applications at Tottenham and Wood Green Job Centre Plus centres with Parent Champion Volunteers.
- Haringey’s Volunteer Community Peer Networkers project (GLA funded). This is a pilot project working with Fathers. Working on a peer to peer basis within targeted communities (Somali – Turkish – Kurdish) to raise awareness of and take up in FF2s

- Development of free early learning promotional video in community languages.

#### 6.4.2 Census

- **Census data:**  
An area that appears to need some attention is the SEN information. Further analysis to check the robustness of this information and test these figures against other data held about children with SEN in early education.
- **Communications Plan:**  
Target information about the census and the importance of it. Development of a communications plan aimed at Governors, Business Managers, SEN Coordinators, Head Teachers, PVI's and childminders.
- **Guidance:**  
Continue guidance to settings to support them with completion of the census. Work will be undertaken to improve current guidance further to improve the quality of the census information provided and response rates.
- **Census Cycle;**  
Exploration of a model in which a termly census is being completed by all providers of free early education. Currently, only schools submit census information on a termly cycle. Look at how we can transition to a universal termly census utilising existing systems and processes as a framework to improve the rigour of the January early years census exercise and ensure we are able to estimate expenditure and DSG grant income more accurately.

### 7. **Tracking Activity and Expenditure**

- 7.1 Given the variable nature of patterns of take up of the two-year-old offer, officers will continue to review take-up on a termly basis, analyse census information and reconcile expenditure accordingly.
- 7.2 A forecasting tool has been developed by Finance Colleagues to enable more robust approach to anticipating and monitoring expenditure. This will underpin projections about spend going forward and will highlight more explicitly any emerging overspend and underspends.
- 7.3 Moving forward, budget position reports will be considered regularly at early years working group meetings. Key points within the year will be April (Summer term) , October (Autumn term) , and March (Spring term).







## Schools Forum Early Years Working Group

4th October 2019 at 10am. Held at Alex House

Name	Designation/ Representation
Melian Mansfield (MM)	<b>CHAIR.</b> Chair of Pembury House
Ngozi Anuforo (NA)	Head of Early Help Commissioning
Gladys Baah-Okyere (GBO)	PVI Settings Rep
Luisa Bellavita (LB)	PVI Settings Rep
+ Cllr Zena Brabazon (ZB)	Lead Member for the Children Service
+ Peter Catling (PC)	Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children Centre
+ Duwan Farquharson (DF)	Willow
+ Mary Gardiner (MG)	Primary Head Rep
Nick Hewlett (NH)	Principal Advisor for Early Years
+ Emma Murray (EM)	Primary Head Rep
+ Karyn Parker (KP)	Childminders
+ Elizabeth Rarieya (ER)	Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children Centre
Susan Tudor-Hart (STH)	School Forum PVI Settings Rep
+ Melanie Widnall (MW)	Principal Advisor for Early Years
Christine Yianni (CY)	Childcare Sufficiency Manager
Sarah Hargreaves (SH)	Clerk

+ denotes absence

### 1. **Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.  
 1.2 Apologies were noted from Mary Gardiner, Peter Catling, Cllr Zena Brabazon and Emma Murray.

### 2. **Minutes of the meeting of 1st July 2019**

- 2.1 The minutes were **agreed**, signed and returned to Ngozi for safe keeping.  
 2.2 Members asked that action points be listed at the end of the minutes. **Action Clerk**

### **Matters arising**

- 2.3 Pt 1.3 NH said that there are no childminders interested in becoming the Rep currently. It was suggested that actions are still shared with childminders so that they know what is happening. **Action NH**
- 2.4 Pt 2.3 NH has looked into the Tottenham Foundation funding for tools. It is not straightforward as a particular project needs to be applied for. Individual settings can apply; he will inform them. **Action NH**
- 2.5 Pt 2.4 MM is still to write to the LGA regarding two year old funding. **Action MM**
- 2.6 Pt 3.1. It was **agreed** that each group should feed back whatever information is relevant so that there is two-way communication between officers, schools, PVI settings. Information sharing will be put as an agenda item on the PVI Forum. Funding is the main issue for many settings. School numbers are low and several places are closing their after school provision. There are staff shortages, the minimum wage is increasing, rents

are increasing and the repairs undertaken by landlords are decreasing. Members asked why LBH is spending money on consultants when there is no money for settings. There have already been cuts made and the changing demographics are known.

2.6.1 Staff shortages are being exasperated by Brexit concerns. Agencies are going abroad to obtain staff.

2.7 The details on rents paid by settings to the borough are being collated for Cllr Brabazon.

**Action NA**

### 3. Early Years Block Budget: Update

3.1 Ngozi circulated her paper for the next School Forum meeting.

3.2 Conversations are being held about planning for the budget for next year.

3.3 The Census shows that the number of 2-year olds is reducing. Funding, currently £2.7m, is based on last year's number of children. There is likely to be an adjustment and hence a clawback later in the year by the DfE. (see pt 3.6). It is anticipated that £528,281 will be re-claimed due to the 2018-19 underspend. There is currently an underspend of £700,000 on 2's and the extended 30 hours places.

3.3.1 It was clarified that the previous monies have already been transferred to the HNB. It was agreed by School Forum in 2017/18 that any reserves in the EY or Schools Block should go towards the HNB overspend.

3.3.2 *Members said that they remain unhappy about this.* NA said that their concerns could be logged but it had been a corporate decision.

3.3.3 MM said that she had written to Zena Etheridge (the CEO) and to School Forum but had received no replies. She suggested that settings could write to their MPs.

3.3.4 It was noted that it can be hard to get EY issues discussed at School Forum, which concentrates more on schools. It is not clear if SF members are aware as to how this decision had been made.

3.4 It was noted that with the clawback it is hard to know the full financial position. It would be useful to have the figures before transfers have been made. HNB deficits are a national issue; the government needs to know the size of the problem; if LAs are propping up the budgets the size of the pressure is being masked. *Members asked if more funding could be made available from the School Block.* NA said that this was unlikely as school budgets are also very tight.

3.5 *Members asked that the paperwork associated with 3.4 (transfer of funds) be re-circulated to members.* **Action NA**

3.5.1 It was noted that due to the lack of funding more settings were declining to take 2-year olds.

3.6 3-year-old take up has increased due to families taking up the 30-hour offer. The 30-hour offer has also supported schools in filling vacant places (especially in the afternoons). There has been a reduction in this year's DfE funding allocation due to a decline in EYPP and 2-year-old participation numbers as noted above. DAF and maintained nursery school funding remains the same.

3.7 An announcement is expected from the DfE on an extra £66m funding for EY nationally. Details on how it will be allocated and what it can be used for are awaited. It is anticipated that it will be for the 2's and 3's and available from April 2020.

3.8 Settings explained that their costs are likely to increase by around 10% due to the increase in the minimum wage and pension contributions.

3.9 Members expressed concern that if children are not in settings by the time they are two years old, then EHCP assessments are not started and often they are left until the child is in school. The more children that are in settings results in a higher overall funding pot and so the 5% the LA can retain also increases.

3.10 The number of eligible 2-year olds on the DWP list is reducing. This term it stands at 1097. (Figures from the DWP). Eligibility is affected by changing benefit rules and families now not meeting the criteria. More working families are taking up the 30-hour places.



- 3.10.1 Members felt that the leaflets which say that families “maybe” getting the 15-hour funding leads some to think that they will definitely get it. Some parents don’t have access to be able to apply on-line. There is a DfE project on behavioural insights looking at how to reach people, however, the messages do not always reach people. The semantics of language are important and different people hear information differently.
- 3.11 It was noted that there has been a dip in the number of 2-year-old applications. *Members asked Ngozi to ask parents what the issues were for them. It was additionally felt that settings should have paper versions of the application forms available for those parents without internet access.*

**Action NA**

- 3.12 PVI settings need to be made aware to sign post families to children centres. They are more likely to know how they can help families apply. Health Visitors and JCP have also been briefed on how children’s centres can support families to apply.
- 3.13 It was felt that some parents are not taking up the offer of day care as the times offered are not what they need.
- 3.14 The “Golden Ticket” approach is being used in conjunction with the welfare benefits team to pre-identify relevant families so that they don’t need to go through the whole application process. This is also used with children within the social care system. It is seen to be a good way to track children. The response rate is being monitored.
- 3.15 Reps. from the different types of settings were asked to get their colleagues to respond to the Census. It was felt that an email to settings was needed, in addition to access via the Portal. It was noted that the LA has the statutory power to cut funding to settings which do not respond. Although this hasn’t been implemented to date, it could be kept as an option.
- 3.15.1 Members said that there was some confusion around the annual census data deadline and the deadline for submitting actual headcount data. Ngozi said that going forward there will be an alignment of the data collection which will give better real time data. *Members asked if the cut off date will be the same this year?* It will. Once there is a single collection point for data it may be possible to penalise those who do not respond.
- 3.16 In the future there will need to be more robust conversations on budget plans, especially with SBMs, to support them to understand the way funding is allocated and paid.
- 3.16.1 It was noted that when children move from nursery to school, once the child is recorded as being on the school roll, they are not eligible for nursery funding. This means that if the school has staggered admission times parents have to pay for anytime(s) that they are still using the nursery for. The school is receiving the full funding but is not taking the child full-time. Some schools have agreed not to take the funding until the Oct 12<sup>th</sup> deadline.

**Action NA****4. Free entitlement - overview**

- 4.1 The take of the 30-hour offer is good. There are many 4-year olds in schools.
- 4.2 *Members asked why there are less 4-year olds in the analysis report than 3’s.* The team will look at the raw data used to form the report and bring this back to the group.
- 4.3 There are 237 children coming in from other boroughs, to settings throughout the borough. It is not known how many Haringey children attend settings elsewhere.
- 4.3.1 Some children who apply to two boroughs are identified through the annual census.
- 4.4 The two-year-old take-up is reducing. The national take-up of 2-year-old places and 15-hour free entitlement is 68%; LB Haringey is 47%.
- 4.4.1 Of the 346 children who received ‘Free For Two’s’ funding, 28% of them went on to receive the 30 hours funding, showing that more families are going into work
- 4.5 There will be a meeting with Ellika McAuley regarding SEND children with sector reps. Nick said that he has met with Ellika regarding Early Support places; in particular eligibility and capacity to respond and how this will be reported to School Forum. It was **agreed** that a follow up meeting is needed. There needs to be clarify for parents as to what they can spend the funding on. It is not clear as to whether the funding will be administered in the same way as Pupil Premium.
- 4.5.1 *Members asked if the lack of take-up had been analysed by ethnic background.* The data shows that a higher proportion of children taking up the two-year-old offer are from black

African and Caribbean communities, whilst this picture changes when we look at the take up profile for the universal offer for 3 year olds. Take up data has also been analysed for the London Mayor Project which is supporting work to increase take up by children of Somali, Turkish and Kurdish families. *Members asked that take-up be tracked against under achievement in schools.* Although it was noted that care needs to be taken as to how information is presented as assumptions can be made.

4.6 Ngozi will update her report. Any further comments to be sent to her. **Action All**

5. **DfE Updates: 2-year-old programme – extended eligibility, Cross-borough forum in Haringey**

5.1 Those 2-year olds who have no resources to public funds or are unaccompanied or where the child has 'settled status' but the parents don't, may be included in future wider criteria; NA to forward the details. Many of these children will already be known to services.

**Action NA**

6. **Childcare Sufficiency Update: Provider Surveys on Deprivation and Early Years Pupil Premium**

6.1 **Provider Surveys:** There has been a low response rate, so the returns are not representative of all providers. 14 have been received from PVI settings and 8 from schools. Reps were asked to chase their colleagues. (There are around 125 settings delivering the entitlement and 40 childminders).

**Action Sector Reps**

6.1.2 It would be useful to know how many children access FSM during the school lunch time and paid for by EYPP.

7. **AOB**

7.1 It is unclear as to where the strategy worked on earlier in the year is now. An additional meeting will be arranged to discuss it.

8. **Dates for future meetings**

8.1 7<sup>th</sup> November at 2.30pm (strategy meeting) and 20th November at 10.30am.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending.  
There being no further business the meeting closed at **12.05pm**.

**Signed:**

**Date:**

## Actions Log from the minutes

Item	Action	By Whom
2.3	To share actions from the minutes with childminders	NH
2.4	To think about projects which could be put forward for Tottenham Foundation funds	NH
2.4	To inform settings that they can apply for Tottenham Foundation funds themselves	NH
2.5	To write to the LGA about concerns around the 2-year-old funding	MM
2.7	To collate the details on rents paid by settings using LBH premises	NA
3.5	To circulate the paperwork on the previous transfer of EYF money to the HNB to members	NA
3.11	To ask parents what issues concern them which leads them to not taking up their 2-year-old entitlement	NA
4.6	To provide any further comments to Ngozi on her report.	All
5.1	To circulate the details on the possible widening of the criteria for 2-year-old funding	NA
6.1	To chase settings to return their provider surveys	Sector Reprs

This page is intentionally left blank