



Rutland County Council

Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 758307 DX28340 Oakham

Ladies and Gentlemen,

A meeting of the **SCHOOLS' FORUM** will be held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP on **Thursday, 18th January, 2018** commencing at 4.00 pm when it is hoped you will be able to attend.

Yours faithfully

Helen Briggs
Chief Executive

Recording of Council Meetings: Any member of the public may film, audio-record, take photographs and use social media to report the proceedings of any meeting that is open to the public. A protocol on this facility is available at www.rutland.gov.uk/my-council/have-your-say/

A G E N D A

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr Carl Smith (Chair)

1) MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Schools' Forum held on 21 September 2017

2) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Regulations, Members are invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have and the nature of those interests in respect of items on this Agenda and/or indicate if Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to them.

3) PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

To receive any petitions, deputations and questions received from Members of the Public in accordance with the provisions of Procedure Rule 217.

The total time allowed for this item shall be 30 minutes. Petitions, declarations and questions shall be dealt with in the order in which they are received. Questions may also be submitted at short notice by giving a written copy to the

Committee Administrator 15 minutes before the start of the meeting.

The total time allowed for questions at short notice is 15 minutes out of the total time of 30 minutes. Any petitions, deputations and questions that have been submitted with prior formal notice will take precedence over questions submitted at short notice. Any questions that are not considered within the time limit shall receive a written response after the meeting and be the subject of a report to the next meeting.

4) SCHOOLS' FORUM VACANCIES AND REPRESENTATION

To receive a paper from Ms Gill Curtis: DECISION TO BE MADE
(Pages 5 - 12)

5) FUNDING UPDATE: INFORMATION ONLY

To receive the following update:

Schools Budget 2017/18 Latest Forecast

(Document to follow)

6) SCHOOLS' FUNDING CONSULTATION OUTCOME 2018/19

To receive a paper from Ms Dawn Greaves: DECISION TO BE MADE
(Pages 13 - 16)

7) ALTERNATIVE USE OF HIGH NEEDS FUNDING

To receive a paper from Mr Kevin Quinn: INFORMATION ONLY
(Pages 17 - 22)

8) EYFS WORKING PARTY

Verbal Update: INFORMATION ONLY

9) SCHOOLS' FORUM SCHEDULE FORWARD PLAN

To receive a paper from Ms Gill Curtis: DECISION TO BE MADE
(Pages 23 - 24)

10) ANY URGENT BUSINESS

11) DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 15 March 2018
4.00-5.00pm in the Council Chamber, RCC, Catmose

Proposed Agenda Items:

---oOo---

DISTRIBUTION

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS' FORUM:

	Representing	Term of office
Mr C Smith (Apologies)	Secondary Academies	Nov 2015 - present
Mrs S Milner (Chair - in the absence of Mr C Smith)	Primary Academy Trusts	Nov 2015 - present
Mr S Cox	SEN Headteacher	Nov 2015 - present
Mrs M Darlington	PVI	Nov 2015 - present
Mr B Gale	Trade Union	Nov 2015 - present
Mr R Gooding	Primary Academy Trusts	Nov 2015 - present
Ms S Hearth	Secondary Academies	Sept 2016 - present
Vacancy	Non-Academy Primary	
Mr R Shore	Post 16 provision	Nov 2015 - present
Mr S Williams	Secondary Academies	Nov 2015 - present
Mr J Woodhead	Diocese	Nov 2015 - present
Vacancy	Secondary Academies	

OFFICERS:

Dr T O'Neill	Ms G Curtis
Mrs C Snodin	Ms D Greaves

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Wilby

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS' FORUM MEETING

18th January 2018

Schools Forum Membership and Vacancies

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Schools Forum to:

- review the current membership split to ensure it still accurately reflects the local profile
- agree processes for the appointment to the vacant positions arising from three resignations from Rutland Schools Forum.

1.2 It is a requirement that each local authority (LA) maintains a Schools Forum to provide strategic direction for the funding of schools in the local authority and support services in relation to school funding arrangements. The Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012 govern the composition, constitution and procedures of the Schools Forum. The Schools Forum in Rutland operates in accordance with an agreed constitution and is made up of school, non-school and observer members.

1.3 Schools Forum Operational and Good Practice Guide (September 2017) states that:

- It is good practice for local authorities to ensure that the needs and interests of all the pupils in the local authority are adequately represented by the members of a schools forum.
- Schools members must be elected. It's good practice to ensure that a vacancy amongst a represented group would be filled by a nominee elected according to a process that has been determined by all those represented in that group, for example, community primary school headteachers, or secondary academy governors, ensuring that everyone represented has had the opportunity to stand for election and/or vote in such an election.
- The process must be restricted to the group in question. A headteachers phase group could only vote as a whole for headteacher members if the voting excluded academies, because academies members form a separate group.
- It's not appropriate for a single person to be elected to represent more than one group or sub-group concurrently; they can stand for election from either group but can be appointed to represent only one of those groups.
- The purpose of ensuring that each group or sub-group is responsible for their election process is to guarantee that there is a transparent and representative process by which members of Schools Forums are nominated to represent their constituents.

1.4 There is no maximum or minimum size of a Schools Forum. Schools Forums must have 'schools members', 'academies member(s)' and 'non-schools members'. School and academies membership together, must number at least two thirds of the total membership.

1.5 Where a local authority maintains one or more special schools the Schools Forum must have at least one schools member from that sector.

1.6 As a minimum, there must be at least one representative of headteachers and one representative of governors among the schools members. Headteachers can be represented by other senior members of staff within their school. Governors can include interim executive members of an interim executive board. The sub-groups don't have to be of equal size.

1.7 Whatever the membership structure of schools members on a Schools Forum, the important issue is that it should reflect most effectively the profile of education provision across the local authority to ensure that there isn't an in-built bias towards any one phase or group

2 Reviewing Membership

2.1 Schools Forum regulations recommend that the number of representatives for each phase should be proportionate to the ratio of pupils in each phase.

2.2 The membership structure of the Schools Forum should ensure there is sufficient representation of each type of schools member in each group to ensure that debate within the schools forum is balanced and representative. As a minimum, there must be at least one representative of headteachers and one representative of governors among the schools members

2.3 Appendix A provides details of pupil numbers by phase and status as at October 2017 which is summarised as:

Phase	Academy	Maintained	Total
Primary	2018	804	2822
Secondary	2492	0	2492
Total	4510	804	5314

Phase	Academy	Maintained	Total
Primary	38%	15%	53%
Secondary	47%	0%	47%
Total	85%	15%	100%

2.4 Appendix B details the current Rutland Schools Forum membership and the % split, summarised in table below. This assumes vacant post will be replaced like for like.

Phase	Academy	Maintained	Total
Primary	2	1+1*	4
Secondary	4	0	4
Total	6	2	100%

*Mr S Cox special school maintained representative; nursery provision so should this be included in primary?

Phase	Academy	Maintained	Total
Primary	25%	25%	50%
Secondary	50%	0%	50%
Total	75%	25%	100%

2.5 When considering the limitations of percentages, the balance between maintained primary, maintained secondary and academies members appears to be broadly proportionate to the pupil numbers in each category

2.6 Schools Forum is asked to consider if this membership arrangement is still appropriate.

2.7 A summary of the structure of schools forums can be found at

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/417331/Schools_forums_structure.pdf

3 Vacancies

3.1 We have received the following resignations from Schools Forum:

- Mrs A Rawlins - primary maintained (school governor)
- Ms S Hearth – secondary academy (governor)
- Mrs J Turner – secondary academy (head teacher)

3.2 Should Schools Forum agree the proposed membership detailed in 2.4 the following appointments will be required :

- The appointment of one primary member
- The appointment of two secondary members

There is no requirement for academies members to be split into primary and secondary sub-groups. However, local authorities may wish to encourage academies to consider the pupil proportions across all academies when electing their representatives.

- 3.3 To be eligible for election as a representative, the nominated person(s) must, at the date of the election, be either a:
- headteacher
 - member of the school's senior leadership team
 - a representative from the governing board
- 3.4 Academies members must be elected by the proprietor bodies of the academies in the local authority's area, and they are probably best placed to determine the process. Academies members are there to represent the proprietor bodies of academies and are, therefore, not necessarily restricted to principals, senior staff or governors
- 3.5 Where there is at least one school in a particular category, there must be at least one representative for that group on the forum. In maintained schools, governors and headteachers (or their representatives) should elect their representatives by the appropriate phase. Academy trusts should elect academy members in their local authority area. Members of schools forum should consider the needs of the whole of the educational community, rather than using their position on a schools forum to advance their own sectional or specific interests
- 3.6 When nominating and electing members, the process must be restricted to the group in question. Academy members must be separately elected and designated from maintained school representatives. There is no requirement for academies members to be split into primary and secondary sub-groups. However, the local authority may wish to encourage academies to consider the pupil proportions across all academies when electing their representatives.
- 3.7 Currently, there are no vacancies within the non-school membership of Rutland Schools Forum. However, should a vacancy arise, the local authority must consider representation from the Church of England and Roman Catholic dioceses situated in the local authority's area; and, where there are schools or academies in the area with a different religious character, the appropriate faith group, should be represented on the schools forum. Non-schools members may number no more than a third of a schools forum's total membership

4 Recording the Composition of Schools Forums

- 4.1 Each local authority must make a written record of the composition of its schools forum detailing the numbers of schools members and by which group or sub-group they were elected, the number of academies members and the number of non-schools members, their terms of office, how they were chosen and whom they represent. This record should also indicate the term of office for schools and academies members.
- 4.2 It is recommended that this information is published on the schools forum website so schools and wider stakeholders can easily find who their representatives are.

5 Recommended Actions:

- 5.1 Schools Forum is asked to:
- Review the current membership arrangement, including the total number of members, to ensure these continue to accurately reflect the profile of education provision across the local authority; if not, what changes are proposed? How will Diocesan representation be achieved to reflect Roman Catholic schools
 - Agree the process for nominating and electing members to Schools Forum, ensuring compliance with Education and Skills Funding Agency Schools Forum - operational and good practice guide (September 2017)
 - Agree that elections will take place in the spring term, immediately following this review, to fill the current vacancies

- Agree length of office and how this will be implemented; what is length of term of office and how this will apply to those already in Schools Forum

APPENDIX A - Current pupil numbers for various types of school

Schools	NoR (at October 2017)	Date of Conversion
Maintained – Primary		
EMPINGHAM (VC) C of E Primary	64	N/A
EXTON & GREETHAM (VC) C of E Primary (<i>Academy Order for 01/02/18</i>)	48	TBC
GREAT CASTERTON (VC) C of E Primary	96	N/A
OAKHAM (VC) C of E Primary	257	N/A
UPPINGHAM (VC) C of E Primary	170	N/A
ST MARY AND ST JOHN (VA) C of E Primary	169	N/A
Maintained – Primary TOTAL	804	
Academy – Primary		
BROOKE HILL Primary	304	01/09/11
CATMOSE Primary	210	01/05/12
COTTESMORE Primary	176	01/10/16
EDITH WESTON Primary	77	01/02/16
LEIGHFIELD Primary	191	01/04/13
KETTON C of E Primary	191	01/10/14
LANGHAM C of E Primary	210	01/07/13
RYHALL C of E Primary	174	01/10/14
ST NICHOLAS C of E Primary	155	01/10/14
WHISSENDINE C of E Primary	193	01/10/14
ENGLISH MARTYRS Catholic Voluntary Primary	137	01/05/13
Academy – Primary TOTAL	2018	
Primary TOTAL	2822	
Academy – Secondary		
CATMOSE College	955	01/04/11
UPPINGHAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE	913	01/04/11
CASTERTON COLLEGE	624	01/09/11
Academy – Secondary TOTAL	2492	

APPENDIX B – Current membership including vacancies

School Membership		Name
Maintained Primary		Vacancy (was Mrs A Rawlins; governor)
Academies	Primary Academies	Mrs S Milner
		Mr R Gooding
	Secondary Academies	Mr C Smith
		Mr S Williams
		Vacancy (was Ms S Hearth; governor)
	Vacancy (was Mrs J Turner)	
Maintained special schools		Mr S Cox*
Non-School Membership		Name
C of E Diocese		Mr J Woodhead
EYFS Private Voluntary and Independent Sector (PVI)		Mrs M Darlington
Post 16 provision		Mr R Shore
Professional Association		Mr B Gale

* It's not appropriate for a single person to be elected to represent more than one group or sub-group concurrently therefore Mr Cox cannot also represent Primary maintained schools

NB:

Representatives from schools and academies make up the schools forum. There is also some representation from non-school organisations, such as nursery and 16-19 education providers. The purpose of non-schools members is to bring greater breadth of discussion to schools forum meetings and ensure that stakeholders and partners other than schools are represented.

APPENDIX C - Induction of new members

- Schools Forum Operational and Good Practice Guide (September 2017) recommends that when new members join the schools forum, appropriate induction materials should be provided. These might include material relating to the operation of the schools forum together with background information about the local and national school funding arrangements. Typically, they might comprise:
 - ✓ the constitution of the schools forum
 - ✓ a list of members including contact details and their terms of office
 - ✓ any locally agreed terms of reference explaining the relationship between the schools forum and the local authority
 - ✓ copies of minutes of previous meetings
 - ✓ the programme of schools forum meetings for the year
 - ✓ the local schools forum web address
 - ✓ the Operational and Good Practice Guide, suitably supplemented by any relevant local material
- In Rutland, all new members will be offered a 'buddy' who is an experienced member of Schools Forum nominated to offer support and guidance during the early stages of membership

The forum acts in a consultative role for:

- changes to the local funding formula (the local authority makes the final decision)
- proposed changes to the operation of the minimum funding guarantee
- changes to or new contracts affecting schools (school meals, for example)
- arrangements for pupils with special educational needs, in pupil referral units, and in early years provision

The forum decides:

- how much funding may be retained by the local authority within the dedicated schools grant (for example, providing an admissions service, or providing additional funding for growing schools)
- any proposed carry forward of deficits on central spend from one year to the next
- proposals to de-delegate funding from maintained primary and secondary schools (for example, for staff supply cover, insurance, behaviour support)
- changes to the scheme of financial management

This page is intentionally left blank



Rutland
County Council

Rutland County Council

Catmose

Oakham

Rutland

LE15 6HP

Consultation on School Funding Formula

1. Responses from Schools

Out of a possible 20 schools, the Council has received 8 responses in total with 6 completing the consultation documentation and 2 schools responding via email.

The responses received have been reviewed and are summarised below. For each question asked, the Council has considered the responses and has indicated the action it intends to take.

PART A: Schools Funding Formula

Question Asked:

1. Do you think we should use the National Formula or the Local Formula for allocating funding in 2018/19 and 2019/20?

Responses:

Out of the 8 responses received, 7 were in favour of the Council using the National Formula with the final response suggesting that the Council should use the one that best supported all schools in Rutland.

Proposal:

Based on the responses received it is the intention of the Council to follow the National Formula as much as possible. It is not possible to match the National Formula completely due to a number of factors (as discussed at a recent workshop run by the ESFA) as follows:

- The National Formula excluded the mobility factor out of the calculations for the minimum per pupil funding (as only those authorities previously using this factor will be receiving funding for it). However, those authorities who receive this funding will have to include it in the MFG calculations.
- If local authorities receive notification from the DfE (in December) of Free Schools due to open in their area, then these schools have to be included in the funding formula.
- If a local authority wishes to transfer funding to the High Needs Block or to top slice it to set up a Growth/Falling Rolls fund, then the National Formula cannot be implemented fully.
- The way that the ESFA capped gains in their indicative figures published will not be the same way that a local authority will use to cap gains. The ESFA were not expecting local authorities to consider implementing the National Formula and have been surprised by how many are considering it.

Question Asked:

2. If we use a local funding formula, in principle, do you think we should use FSM as well as “ever 6” FSM ?

If Yes, should we fund it by reducing AWPU or reducing the “ever 6” FSM rate?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 4 were in favour of using both factors, 2 were against and 2 did not respond. Out of the 4 in favour of using both factors the vote was split 50:50 between reducing AWPU and reducing the “ever 6” FSM rate.

Proposal:

As the Council proposes to move (as far as is possible) to the National Formula, both of these factors will be incorporated into the new formula. The rates used for each factor will be those used in the National Formula.

Question Asked:

3. If we use a local funding formula, in principle, do you think that we should remove the looked after children factor?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 1 was in favour of removing the factor and 4 were against it.

Proposal:

Whilst the majority of responses were in favour of keeping this factor under a local funding formula, the National Formula no longer provides funding for this factor as the funding has been used to increase the Pupil Premium. Therefore, as the Council is planning to match the National Formula, then this factor will no longer be used.

Question Asked:

4. Do you think we should reduce the minimum funding guarantee from minus 1.5%?

If yes, what level of MFG should we set?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 3 were in favour of reducing the MFG, 2 were against and 1 felt they had insufficient information to make a valid judgement.

Proposal:

The National Formula (as proposed by the ESFA) guaranteed schools a minimum per pupil increase of 0.5%. At the time of publishing the consultation document, this was not an option available to local authorities and was therefore not consulted on. At a recent workshop hosted by the ESFA, they confirmed that the new proforma to be published in December, will allow for an MFG of plus 0.5%

As the Council is proposing to match the National Formula as far as possible, it is our intention to set the MFG as close to plus 0.5% as possible.

PART B: High Needs Funding

Question Asked:

5. Do you think we should transfer funding from the schools block to the High Needs block?

If yes, should we transfer the maximum of 0.5%?

If yes, should we transfer the funding from the lump sum or AWPU?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 4 agreed that the maximum of 0.5% should be transferred to the High Needs block, 2 were against transferring funds and 2 were undecided as to whether the transfer was required. Out of the 4 in agreement, 3 approved of the funding being transferred from the lump sum and 1 from AWPU.

The 2 undecided wanted more information on why this is necessary and wanted to know whether the funding would be given back to schools if it was not required. They were also asking if the local authority could reduce the following years schools block if there was an overspend rather than transferring funding up front.

Proposal:

Whilst the Council would wish to ensure that as much funding goes to schools as is possible, it also needs to make sure that there are sufficient funds to meet the cost of High Needs placements.

In 2015/16, the DSG had £552k in reserves (from previous years) and this was distributed to schools as agreed with Schools Forum. In 2016/17, a further £275k of underspend from 2015/16 DSG funding was redistributed to schools. However, in 2016/17, the High Needs block was overspent and this has been charged to schools in 2017/18 (in agreement with Schools Forum) due to there no longer being reserves to use to offset this overspend. In 2017/18, the current forecast is that the High Needs block will overspend by £99.4k.

Whilst costs of High Needs is increasing (with more pupils being identified as high needs by schools with a corresponding increase in exclusions) the funding being received is cash limited and therefore, unless more work is done to ensure that pupils are retained within mainstream settings and that full use is made of the DSP units, the overspend is likely to continue increasing.

By transferring the funding (which is only approved for one year), the Council is seeking to ensure that there is less uncertainty for schools over the likelihood of having to fund future overspends, as well as giving the schools and the Council more time to review high needs provision within the County to look to reduce overall costs. Therefore, the Council is proposing the transfer of the maximum 0.5% from the schools block to the high needs block for 2018/19.

If there is an overspend in 2018/19, then it is proposed that this will be recovered from the 2019/20 schools block allocation by top slicing this allocation prior to distribution to schools. If there is an underspend, then this can either be retained to support future overspends in High Needs or distributed to schools as part of the 2019/20 allocation.

PART C: Growth/Falling Roles

Question Asked:

6. Should the Council look to introduce a growth fund for 2018/19 to support schools with increased pupil numbers?
7. If yes, should the Council base funding on AWPU (Option 1) or lump sum plus salary costs (Option 2)?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 6 did not agree that the Council should set up a growth fund and only 2 thought that the Council should. Therefore only two responders expressed a preference for what the funding should be based on with one vote for each option.

Proposal:

The Council does not propose to introduce a Growth Fund at this stage.

Question Asked:

8. Should the Council look to introduce a falling rolls fund for 2018/19 to support schools with reductions in pupil numbers?
9. If yes, should the Council base funding on Option 1 or Option 2?

Responses:

Out of 8 responses, 5 did not agree that the Council should set up a growth fund and only 3 thought that the Council should. Out of the 3 in favour of a fund, one preferred option 1 and the other 2 preferred option 2.

Proposal:

The Council does not propose to introduce a Falling Roll Fund at this stage.



SCHOOLS' FORUM MEETING

18 January 2018

SEND Early Support Fund

1. Purpose

To consult with members of School Forum on the introduction of an Early Support Fund within the DSG High Needs funding block to support children with Special Educational Need and or Disabilities (SEND).

2. Background

A child or young person has special educational needs where a learning difficulty or disability calls for special educational provision which is different or above that normally provided to children of the same age.

As per the SEND Code of Practice 2015 schools provide additional provision to meet the needs of children with SEND and are responsible for funding any additional support up to the nationally prescribed threshold of the first £6,000 (Element 2 funding).

Where the cost of special education provision is above this level the Local Authority provides top up funding through the DSG High Needs funding block (Element 3). Access to this top up funding has historically been secured through requests for Education Health and Care Plans by schools.

Budget Pressure

Due to increasing demand for specialist provision the High Needs funding block was overspent in the 2016/17 financial year and, as of January 2018, the block is projected to be £130,000 overspent in this financial year. The main contributor to the funding pressures are for special school provision and out of county school placements.

Analysis

Analysis of the use of High Needs funding and School Census data has highlighted that;

- The levels of EHCPs are lower in primary education than secondary and there is a significant increase in the volume of children receiving an EHCP after transition in year 7 and 8.

- There is a high proportion of children educated out of County in high cost placements at Secondary school age and this has risen significantly since 2013/14.
- Funding per pupil is higher at secondary school age than at primary school age.
- Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and Social Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) account for the highest volume of need amongst children and young people, and placements for young people identified with SEMH are among the most expensive.

The data suggests that children and young people with SEND are not necessarily accessing the right level of support as needs emerge which may be contributing to their needs escalating as they transition from primary to secondary school stage.

The differences between school environments in the different Phases may enable the needs of children with SEND to be better managed within existing resources at primary stage but consequently may not prepare children for effective transition when their needs become exposed to a different learning environment.

Accessing funding to support children through Education Health and Care assessment is a lengthy process, requiring 20 week assessment period which could, due to resources, prevent schools from applying for EHC assessments until the needs of children have escalated.

The potential delay in timely intervention may be contributing to an escalation in difficulties and an increase in children and young people's needs not being met in mainstream education locally, contributing to the rise in costly out of County placements.

3. Project Proposal – Early Support Fund (ESF)

It is proposed that a portion of funding, £100,000 in 2018/19, is ring fenced from the High Needs block and made available to primary schools without application for EHC assessments.

It is proposed that the fund would be available, in the main, for primary provisions to support effective transitions.

Funding for children in early years is currently in place through a small Inclusion Fund within the High Needs funding block available to support children with lower or emerging SEND aged 3-4 accessing free entitlement. This fund is a statutory requirement as outlined within the EFA early years funding formula and levels should be set in consultation with early year's settings. At present the level of funding available in the fund is relatively small, representing just 1.3% of the overall budget. Therefore it is proposed early years settings can access the ESF if the existing Inclusion Fund is spent.

Purpose

The purpose of the fund is to;

1. Provide an earlier opportunity for schools to access funding to help reduce the barriers to learning for children who have SEND but do not necessarily require, at that stage, an EHC assessment or plan.
2. Facilitate timely and effective early identification and support for children in mainstream education settings.
3. Secure short term (one academic year) additional support above Element 2 thresholds to prevent the escalation of a child/young person's needs and to maintain or enhance their educational progress.
4. Facilitate innovative approaches to inclusion and provide alternative options to lengthy statutory assessment.

Outcomes

1. The needs of children are met at an earlier stage which has a positive impact on their long term learning outcomes, enabling children to remain and thrive in mainstream education.
2. Children and young people experience timely and effective transitions between the stages of their learning, particular in the early years to reception and primary to secondary transition phases.
3. There is a reduction in the number of children and young people going through unnecessary statutory EHC assessment.
4. A reduction in mediation, tribunals and associated costs as needs are met earlier.

Eligibility Criteria and Funding Use

Appendix A sets out the proposed eligibility criteria for the fund. It is proposed that the fund is available to education settings in Rutland (maintained, non-maintained & Academies) to provide additional support for children/young people who have/may have SEND who are resident in Rutland and of primary school age.

Implementation

If approved it is proposed that the ESF will go live in April 2018 for a one year trial. The impact of the programme will be measured during this period for consideration ahead of year two and will include a review of uptake, costs and quantitative and qualitative impact measures at a case level.

4. Considerations

The fund aims to prevent the escalation of needs and thereby reduce the volume of children who can no longer be educated in mainstream education within County. The ESF proposal is part of a range of work streams within the SEND aimed at improving early support and life chances for children and young people with SEND in Rutland.

If the fund works as proposed the County should see a reduction in high cost placements, which may reduce the pressure on the DSG High Needs funding block.

The funding will be taken from a budget already predicted to overspend. If the pressures continue at present levels this fund will add additional costs.

The benefits of the fund are not likely to be realised in the immediate term and will require longer term investment.

5. Recommendations

1. Members note the proposal for the fund and provide feedback on content, including the eligibility criteria set out in appendix A.
2. Members approve the principle of the fund with a view to trialling the fund for one year.

Report prepared by;

Kevin Quinn
Service Manager Early Intervention & Inclusion
Rutland County Council
11th January 2018

Appendix A – Early Support Fund Eligibility Criteria and Funding Use

Eligibility Criteria:

1. Available to education settings in Rutland (maintained, non-maintained & Academies) to provide additional support for children/young people who have SEND who are resident in Rutland and of primary school age.
2. Available to support a child/young person who is already receiving SEN support and associated Element 2 funding up to 15 hours.
3. Supporting evidence from the education setting highlights the SEN support (use of 15 hours) and progress which has been made and that additional resource will enhance this progress or prevent further negative impacts on learning.
4. The needs of the child/young person have been assessed (EHA, SEN Support, EP) and as such are clearly known and have been responded to by the education setting.
5. It has been identified that with additional resource the child could be maintained in their education setting and would help to prepare for their transition in education.
6. There is a clear plan in place for the child/young person that will support their transition in education and aid their educational outcomes.
7. Schools must include the views of children/young people and parents/carers when making an application to ensure all views are represented.
8. The fund is not applicable for children who have previously received ESF funding where little or no progress was achieved.

Use of funding

The level of funding available will be determined by the individual needs of the child and therefore no funding threshold will be applied. However schools will be expected to clearly articulate the additional support and associated costs which should be at a level as to not warrant an EHC assessment.

The fund is available for short term interventions and is not designed to replace on-going support which would likely necessitate an EHC assessment. Allocations will be for one year from the date of approval. Funding is available in following years if appropriate to meet needs which can be increased or decreased depending on the levels of progress made.

Funding can only be used to provide additional educational support to children and young people in a mainstream setting. This could include access to additional teacher or TA support, therapeutic intervention, behaviour support or associated programmes etc.

The funding cannot be used for the purchase of equipment or similar adaptations which would be expected as part of reasonable adjustments required by an education setting under the equality act.

The fund is allocated to pupils and schools must notify the Local Authority if a pupil leaves. The funding cannot be transferred to other pupils and pro rata reimbursements to the Local Authority will be required.



SCHOOLS' FORUM MEETING

18th January 2018

Schools Forum Schedule and Forward Plan - draft

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Schools Forum to consider and agree the proposed schedule of topics for future Schools Forum meetings.
- 1.2 Please note these items are shown for indicative purposes and it may be necessary in time to move the agenda items shown to alternative Forum dates. Items may be added to the agenda as necessary as they arise in due course
- 1.3 All meetings are currently planned to be held at Rutland County Council Offices.
- 1.4 In addition to the full Schools Forum meetings it is envisaged that some items will continue to be discussed in detail in working sub groups that will subsequently report their recommendations back to the full Forum for consideration.
- 1.5 A summary of the powers and responsibilities of schools forums is outlined in the ESFA document – Schools forum powers and responsibilities September 2017
- 1.6 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schools-forums-operational-and-good-practice-guide-2015>
- 1.7
- 1.8 The proposed meetings schedule is set out below:

Schools Forum Meeting	Description	Type	Lead
Regular and Administrative Agenda Items	Apologies	N/A	Chair
	Minutes and actions from previous meeting	N/A	Chair
	Declarations of interest	N/A	Chair
	Petitions, deputations and questions	N/A	Chair
	DSG updates and monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School budgets • High needs • Early Years 	Information	S Della Rocca
	DfE/ ESFA funding announcements	Information	S Della Rocca
	Review of Forward Plan and dates of next meeting	Decision	Chair
21/09/17	Outcome of annual review of Schools Forum constitution and working practices	Decision	G Curtis
	LA contingency fund	Information	S Della Rocca
	Funding update – Schools Budget 2017-18 forecast; School Funding Formula review	Information	S Della Rocca
	Update – school improvement commissioned programmes	Information	G Curtis
18/01/18	Finance – 17/18 funding update	Information	S Della Rocca
	Finance – 18/19 School Funding Formula	Decision	S Della Rocca

	consultation outcome; LA Contingency Fund consultation outcomes		
	Alternative use of High Needs Funding	Information	K Quinn
	EYFS Working Party – verbal update	Information	Chair of Work Party
15/03/18			
28/06/18			
	Annual review of Schools Forum membership	Decision	G Curtis
20/09/18	Annual review of Schools Forum constitution and working practices	Decision	G Curtis
	Funding update – Schools Budget 2018-19 forecast; School Funding Formula review	Information	S Della Rocca

2 Recommendations

2.1 Forum are asked to:

- review the proposed dates for future Schools Forum meetings and agree to the schedule
- consider items on the forward plan and determine if there are any other items the Forum would wish to add at this stage
- agree to include review of schedule as standing agenda item
- consider if schedule should be located on website