

Date: Thursday, 18 September 2014

Time: 8.30 am

Venue: Shrewsbury Training and Development Centre, Racecourse Crescent,  
Monkmoor, Shrewsbury, SY2 5BP

Contact: Philip Wilson, Service Manager Business Support People  
Tel: 01743 254344  
Email: [phil.wilson@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:phil.wilson@shropshire.gov.uk)

## **SCHOOLS FORUM**

### **TO FOLLOW REPORT (S)**

- 5 School Funding Reforms 2015 - 2016 (Gwyneth Evans) (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 6 High Needs Funding (Chris Davies) (Pages 7 - 10)**
- 7 School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 Changes (Gwyneth Evans) (Pages 11 - 12)**
- 8 Review of Deficit Balances Protocol (Phil Wilson) (Pages 13 - 14)**
- 9 Dedicated Schools Grant 2014 - 2015 (Deborah Fern) (Pages 15 - 18)**

This page is intentionally left blank



## Schools Forum

Date: 18 September 2014

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Venue: Shrewsbury  
Training and Development  
Centre

Paper

# B

Public

## School Funding Reforms 2015-16

**Responsible Officer** Gwyneth Evans

e-mail: [gwyneth.evans@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:gwyneth.evans@shropshire.gov.uk) Tel: 01743 253875 Fax: 01743 254538

### Summary

Following significant reforms to school funding arrangements from April 2013 and further reforms from April 2014, the Government confirmed in July 2014 the next stage of reforms as it continues to move towards a national fair funding formula. The full detail of the latest reforms is available at

[www.gov.uk/government/publications/fairer-schools-funding-arrangements-for-2015-to-2016](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fairer-schools-funding-arrangements-for-2015-to-2016)

From April 2015 the least funded local authorities in England will receive additional Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding up to a nationally prescribed minimum funding level. As one of the lowest funded local authorities, Shropshire will benefit from this additional funding.

The Schools Forum Task & Finish Group on Sustainability has modelled and considered various options for allocating the additional funding to Shropshire schools from April 2015 and their recommendation is included within this report.

These latest reforms also include other changes to DSG funding arrangements which are included within this report.

As a reminder, whilst Schools Forum can recommend changes to the funding formula, including redistributions, decisions are made by the local authority.

### Recommendation

Schools Forum is requested to:

1. note the confirmation of additional funding for Shropshire schools from April 2015 and other changes required to DSG funding arrangements.
2. agree the recommendations proposed by the Task & Finish Group on the allocation of the additional funding through the local funding formula, as detailed in paragraphs 28, 30, 31 and 33.

## REPORT

### Background

1. In March 2014 the Government launched a consultation document setting out the next phase of school funding reforms for 5 to 16 year olds, aiming to begin to address the unfairness of the current funding system. The consultation document 'Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16' proposed allocating an additional £350m to schools in the least fairly funded local authorities in England in the 2015-16 financial year.
2. Shropshire Schools Forum submitted a response to the consultation which ran until 30 April 2014.
3. On 17 July 2014 the Government confirmed additional funding to the lowest funded local authorities in England and at the same time announced a number of further reforms to the schools funding system for 2015-16.

### Fairer Funding for Schools from April 2015

4. Following consultation, the Government confirmed the allocation of an additional £390m from April 2015. **Shropshire will receive an additional £297 per pupil in schools block funding within the DSG. Based on October 2013 census data this equates to an additional £10.37m, a 7.2% increase to the schools block.** Shropshire is the 4<sup>th</sup> highest gainer out of 69 local authorities in England receiving additional funding.
5. Through the additional £390m funding available, every local authority's allocation of funding will reflect a minimum basic per pupil amount and minimum amounts reflecting other pupil and school characteristics. The 2015-16 minimum funding levels (MFLs) are based on the average amounts that local authorities allocated to these characteristics in their local funding formulae in 2014-15.
6. The Fairer Schools Funding documentation makes it clear that local authorities will not be obliged to use all these factors in their local formulae in 2015-16 (with the exception of the basic per pupil amount and the deprivation factor, which are mandatory). Nor will a local authority that chooses to use any of these seven factors be obliged to set that factor at or above the MFL. Individual schools should not therefore expect that their funding will necessarily be at or above the minimum funding levels.

### Long Term Reform of High Needs and Early Years Funding

7. The Government acknowledges the concerns of many local authorities that the application of the MFL is only to the schools block unit of funding, rather than across the entire DSG, which also includes funding for high needs and early years pupils. However they have concluded that it would be wrong to alter the allocation of high needs and early years funding without sufficient evidence on how the need for funding varies between different areas.
8. To enable future reforms to the High Needs funding block within the DSG, the Government will begin research in the autumn with a view to consulting on the

way that high needs funding should be distributed, both from central government to local authorities and from local authorities to institutions.

9. It remains the Government's intention to achieve a fair distribution of early years funding through a national early years funding formula. Further work is required before a formulaic approach can be introduced. For 2015-16 additional funding for early years will be provided through a new early years' pupil premium.

### **Refinements to the Sparsity Factor**

10. From April 2014 a new sparsity factor was introduced in local funding formulae. The purpose of this factor is to enable local authorities to provide an additional sum to small schools serving sparsely populated areas where those schools may not be able to operate on the basis of per pupil funding alone.
11. Currently a sparsity distance is calculated for every school in England using the average distance (as the crow flies), for each pupil for whom the school is the closest, from their postcode to their second nearest school.
12. Current regulations allow sparsity funding to be allocated where a school has:
  - 150 or fewer pupils in primary or 600 or fewer pupils in secondary and all-through schools; and
  - a sparsity distance of 2 miles or more for primary and all-through schools and 3 miles or more for secondary schools.
13. Sparsity funding can be allocated on a fixed sum (up to a maximum of £100,000) or on a tapered basis.
14. From April 2015, local authorities will be required to use new average year group size thresholds in place of the number on roll criteria. For example the average year group threshold for primary schools will be 21.4 pupils (150 / 7 year groups). An infant school will therefore only be eligible for sparsity funding if it has less than 86 pupils (21.4 x 4 year groups).
15. As in 2014-15, these size and distance thresholds are maximum thresholds and a local authority will be free to choose to set lower thresholds. Lower thresholds were used in Shropshire's local formula in 2014-15.
16. From April 2015 local authorities will be able to make an application to the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to include an exceptional sparsity factor to allocate up to an additional £50,000 to small secondary schools where they have 350 pupils or fewer and a sparsity distance of 5 miles or more. Currently no Shropshire secondary school would qualify for this exceptional sparsity factor.

### **Simplifying the Administration of Academies Funding**

17. To simplify the funding system and to ensure all schools and academies will be funded on the same basis, from April 2015 funding for all schools including non-recoupment academies and free schools will be included in local authority DSG allocations. Local authorities will calculate funding for all academies and free schools through their local funding formula which will be recouped by the EFA

which has responsibility for funding academies and free schools. Any central DSG funding must be made available to all schools in the area on an equal basis, including former non-recoupment academies and free schools.

18. Shropshire has no non-recoupment academies and one free school.

### **Carbon Reduction Commitment**

19. The carbon reduction commitment (CRC) scheme is designed to reduce emissions in the public and private sectors by incentivising the uptake of cost-effective energy efficiency opportunities. In 2014-15 the Government removed schools from the main scheme and instead reduced each local authority's DSG in order to pay for schools' contribution to the CRC scheme. The deduction to each local authority's DSG was calculated on the basis of their spending in 2013-14 on CRC allowances for schools as declared on section 251 returns.
20. For 2015-16 the Government will revise this method and the deduction from the DSG will be made on a simple per pupil basis. Each local authority's DSG will be reduced by £7.51 per pupil. Based on October 2013 census data, this will result in a reduction of £262,242 (34,919 pupils x £7.51) from Shropshire's DSG. The reduction in 2014-15 based on 2013-14 spend was £267,000.

### **Changes to High Needs Funding for 2015-16**

21. The latest funding reforms include three changes to high needs funding arrangements for 2015-16.
22. Firstly, the high needs place numbers used for the academic year 2015/16 will be the published numbers for 2014/15. Local authorities and institutions will be able to identify significant changes in SEN places that require more place funding and submit an exceptional case application to the EFA for an increase to an institution's 2015/16 academic year place numbers. The template for applications must be submitted by 17 October 2014.
23. Secondly, from 2015/16 changes to the scale and nature of alternative provision will be met by local authorities, schools and academies within their existing funding. This will mean that local authorities and their schools bear the cost of any increase in alternative provision places for pupils who would otherwise be in mainstream schools but for the placement decisions they have made.
24. Thirdly, the Government is currently consulting on draft School and Early Years Finance Regulations that include an increase in the funding of alternative provision places from £8,000 to £10,000 per place per annum from September 2015. It will be expected that corresponding reductions in the top-up funding for alternative provision will take place so that the adjustment is cost neutral for local authorities and schools.

### **Recommendations from the Schools Forum Task & Finish Group**

25. The Shropshire Schools Forum Sustainability Task & Finish Group, advised and supported by Shropshire Council's administration Task & Finish Group, considered various models over the summer for distributing the additional funding fairly to Shropshire schools. As the confirmed additional DSG per pupil

funding level of £297 was not announced until the 17 July all modelling considered by the group was based on the originally proposed additional DSG per pupil funding value of £255. All modelling has been carried out based on October 2013 census data. Actual school funding allocations for 2015-16 will be based on October 2014 census data.

26. Further to the detailed consideration of various funding models, the Task & Finish Group agreed on 26 June 2014 to recommend to Schools Forum an increase to the current sparsity funding delivered to schools through the funding formula to a level that demonstrated a fair and appropriate allocation and to distribute remaining funding on a flat rate per pupil basis across all schools.

### **Sparsity Funding**

27. The group considered the Government's maximum sparsity threshold levels and concluded that the Government's distance thresholds of 2 or more miles for primary schools and 3 or more miles for secondary and all-through schools did not define a school as being sparse.
28. To ensure sparsity funding is targeted at Shropshire's sparse schools the Task & Finish Group **recommend that Shropshire's primary school sparsity distance measure remain at 3 or more miles and that Shropshire's secondary school sparsity distance measure remain at 9 or more miles.** This delivers sparsity funding to 10 primary schools based on October 2013 census data and one secondary school.
29. In 2013-14 the local authority successfully applied to the EFA to include an additional 4 Shropshire primary schools where the actual road travel distances significantly exceeded their sparsity distance using the crow flies measure and would not otherwise have been eligible. It is expected that these 4 primary schools will remain eligible for sparsity funding in 2015-16.
30. To achieve a fair and appropriate sparsity funding allocation level the group considered minimum school expenditure levels of small primary schools and the additional targeted sparsity funding that would be required to ensure sparse schools received funding to meet at least these minimum expenditure levels. On this basis the group **recommend increasing the funding to £50,000 on a tapered approach, from £30,000 in 2014-15, for relevant sparse primary schools.**
31. Based on analysis of current funding levels and expenditure requirements of the individual secondary school the group **recommend increasing sparsity funding to £100,000 on a flat rate approach, from £40,000 in 2014-15, for secondary schools.**
32. Based on October 2013 census data this increase to sparsity funding in secondary and primary schools costs an additional £198,800.

### **Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) Funding**

33. For fairness the Task & Finish Group **recommend that the remaining additional funding be distributed on a flat rate per pupil basis across all schools.** Any increase to the age weighted pupil unit (AWPU) funding within the

funding formula to schools will have a corresponding impact on the level of minimum funding guarantee (MFG) that a school attracts. As the AWPU increases, the MFG reduces. The release of MFG allows for more funding to be allocated through the AWPU.

34. The modelling considered by the Task & Finish Group based on the proposed additional DSG funding of £255 per pupil resulted in, after the changes to sparsity funding and recycling of MFG, an increase of £289.86 per pupil across all primary, secondary and all-through schools in Shropshire.
35. Based on the confirmed additional DSG funding of £297 per pupil the resulting AWPU increase would be £333.39.
36. There are two important points to note:
  - For many Shropshire schools new additional funding may either all, or in part, be offset by a corresponding reduction to their MFG protection funding initially;
  - the final AWPU value within schools 2015-16 budget share allocations will be determined after all 2015-16 DSG pressures, including high needs places and provision costs, are taken into account.





## Schools Forum

Date: 12 September 2014  
Time: 8.30 am  
Venue: Shrewsbury Training  
and Development  
Centre

Item

Public

Paper

C

### Responsible Officer

Chris Davies, Headteacher, Severndale Specialist Academy

email chris.davies@severndaleschool.co.uk

Tel: 01743 281600

## High Needs Funding

### 1. Summary

A chance to improve special schools funding.

### 2. Recommendation

To allocate a similar cash increase to the Special Schools top up funding as is being added to the AWPU from April 2015.

## REPORT

### 3. Background

Local management of Special Schools distributed a pot of money. This pot was cost based, not needs led. It was based on Shropshire's historical funding base, which as time has gone on we have all realised is one of the lowest bases in the country. There was also a seven point distribution method in place for allocating money.

An additional band was added when it was found that the level of need could not be met by the resource provided; for the most complex profoundly disabled, autistic spectrum disorder and complex challenging behaviour students. An exception was also made for pupils with extreme challenging behaviour in the form of a block grant.

### 4. Current System

A four band system, A-D is currently in place and the existing resource pot was distributed using this system, the needs led approach was not used to decide the size of the pot which is perfectly understandable, after the work undertaken by the group looking at mainstream needs led funding.

### 5. Pressures

Numbers of pupils at Severndale:  
1995 - 120 pupil places and 60 staff

2014 - 410 pupil places and 300+ staff

The number of students and staff are based across three sites; Monkmoor Campus, SCAT and Mary Webb School. Increased numbers have been reflected in other provisions and there has been a significant change in pupil needs across the sector.

The profile of pupils attending Severndale has significantly changed, we have evidence, both locally and nationally, and that the need has increased and continues to increase (stats from Barry Carpenter research).

As need increases we have found that staffing levels need to increase and as technology develops, we need to provide the technology for our students to access. Approximately 92% of Severndale's current budget is spent on staffing costs. For a student with ASD when the world does not coincide with their particular needs the student may become exceptionally violent, this requires 2:1 staffing for the majority of the day a cost of £29,200 and sometimes at 4:1 staffing for a significant period of time.

## **6. Technology**

The developments in technology increases communication and independence levels for our students. The latest technology is Eye Gaze computers, this is an eye-operated communication and control system that empowers students with disabilities to communicate and interact with the world. By looking at control keys or cells displayed on screen, a user can generate speech. We have a PMLD student who uses this equipment and it has allowed her to communicate at school and with her family. The cost of this technology with the software is £5924 per Eye Gaze computer.

## **7. Pupil Wellbeing**

Support has decreased forcing both Woodlands and Severndale to divert resources; Woodlands have employed a Pastoral Manager at a cost of £30,000. Severndale have employed Pupil Welfare Officer at a cost of £50,000, the impact of these appointments enables pupils to access education. It also helps their families to accept the system, ways of working, and help to reduce tension in the home.

## **8. Historical Context of Costs**

The above has all occurred whilst cuts in the education system have been managed. As a specialist provision we have been protected from many of the pressures at the cost sometimes, of the GSB. However there have been a number of occasions where we have had to accept our fair share of additional costs i.e. when a national pay award has been agreed and not funded, and pensions and national insurance costs have increases .

## **9. Working in a Co-operative Environment**

The purpose of the background information is to make the picture as clear as possible. We cost a great deal of money, but we also save a great deal. The

sector has been very proactive with the LA finding solutions, for example, reduce or stop the increase of out of county placements as a result saving significant sums of money.

We make grant applications to attract capital money to allow building work to occur, therefore creating additional places to meet demographic growth. The additional places available are reducing the need for extremely expensive specialist places.

The sector in Shropshire has worked extremely hard to support our colleagues in mainstream to meet the need, but we are all seeing a rise in pupil needs which is extremely expensive.

## **10. Diverting Funding**

We have all felt the impact of budget cuts to other essential services, and because we have the most vulnerable student's we have had to divert funds to meet the void that has been left. The Woodlands has had to divert £10,000 of their budget to fund school meals. We cannot allow pupils to go all day without food; it may be the only meal some of the pupils have. Five years Severdale had a maximum of five tube feeds; this number is now 20 with a reduction in nursing hours. Therefore we have had to employ additional staff to meet this need at a cost of £100,000.

Health and social care used to provide services in schools to meet the needs of vulnerable pupils and their families. The concentration of such needs is greater due to the concentration of needs in the sector. It is evident that pupils and their families are going into crisis, as a result of changing criteria to access a service. Educational establishments therefore have to divert resources to support pupils and their families; this allows the pupils to access education.

We used to have conversations about how headroom in budgets would be used to meet priorities, this conversation has not occurred for many years. The 2015-16 financial year, is the first year such a conversation can happen. A great deal of work has already been put into the process of how such money will be delivered into schools. The news that a greater percentage of money will be delivered, dependant on the October pupil census, is exceptionally welcome.

From the special sector I am asking that all pupils are treated the same, with regards to the uplift. If the AWPU uplift is £250, the uplift to the banded top up figure is £250, if its £230 then so be it.

The total cost to the additional pot would be approximately £150,000 from an estimated total of £10.4 million. Committing this money would not have a detrimental impact on mainstream but would have a significant impact on offsetting some of the additional pressures being experienced by the sector.

Thank you for taking the time to read this report I will be at forum to answer questions. In the meantime if you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Schools Forum

Date: 18 September 2014

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Venue: Shrewsbury  
Training and Development  
Centre

Paper

# D

Public

## School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 Changes

**Responsible Officer** Gwyneth Evans

e-mail: [gwyneth.evans@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:gwyneth.evans@shropshire.gov.uk) Tel: 01743 253875 Fax: 01743 254538

### Summary

In August the Department for Education (DfE) published a consultation document seeking views on proposed changes to the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations. The proposed changes will come into force in January 2015 and shall be applied to the financial year 2015-16.

The full consultation document is attached to this report.

### Recommendation

Schools Forum is invited to respond to the consultation.

## REPORT

### Proposed Changes to the School and Early Years Finance Regulations

1. The DfE published a consultation document on proposed changes to the School and Early Years Finance Regulations to make them relevant to the 2015-16 financial year.
2. A number of amendments have been made to take account of the new provisions relating to special educational needs in the Children and Families Act 2014. Some other changes are as a result of the fairer schools funding arrangements for 2015-16.
3. The details of the proposed changes to the regulations, as published by the DfE, are attached to this report.
4. Responses must be submitted by 17 October 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank



	<u>Item</u>	<u>Paper</u>
<b>Schools Forum</b> Date: 18 September 2014 Time: 8.30 am Venue: Shrewsbury Training and Development Centre, Monkmoor, Shrewsbury		<b>E</b>

## REVIEW OF DEFICIT BALANCES PROTOCOL

**Responsible Officer** Phil Wilson

e-mail: phil.wilson@shropshire.gov.uk

Tel: (01743) 254344 Fax (01743) 254538

### Summary

At their meeting on 20 June 2013, Schools Forum considered and supported a revised protocol for the planning and management of a deficit school budget. This was based on a review of the previous protocol undertaken by a Task & Finish Group drawn from the membership of Schools Forum.

An issue that is not adequately covered in the revised protocol relates to the management of deficit balances at the point a school becomes a sponsored academy, with Government guidelines requiring the deficit to remain with the local authority.

It is therefore proposed that the Task & Finish Group on Deficit School Balances is re-established and tasked with reviewing the protocol to address the planning and management of deficit balances at the point of conversion to sponsored academy.

### Recommendation

That Schools Forum re-establish the Task & Finish Group on Deficit School Balances to review the existing protocol to specifically address the issue of deficit balances for schools becoming sponsored academies.

## REPORT

1. In December 2012 Schools Forum considered a paper that showed schools deficit balances increasing in size and number. They requested that a review be undertaken and set up a Task & Finish Group to undertake the work. The group reported back to Forum on 20 June 2013 and the revised protocol they drew up was considered and adopted.

2. An issue has emerged subsequent to this decision that requires a further update to the protocol. It relates to schools which are being sponsored to become academies. Government regulations on sponsored academies with a deficit on conversion stipulate that the deficit remains with the local authority. Recent conversions to sponsor academy have seen the local authority having to pick up such deficits.
3. The local authority's approach in these situations has been to minimise the financial impact to schools in the local authority by challenging rigorously the level of expenditure at the school prior to conversion and negotiating with the sponsoring Academy Trust an agreed split of the remaining deficit balance. With the possibility in the future other schools will be under consideration as potential sponsored academies, there is a need for clear and robust processes to ensure that the wider financial interests of schools remaining in the authority are protected and that any deficits at the point of conversion are kept to the minimum possible level. These processes would come into effect when a school is judged to be at risk as well as at the point of conversion to sponsored academy.
4. Schools Forum are requested to agree to the re-establishment of the Task & Finish Group on Schools in Deficit to update the existing protocol to specifically address the issue of deficit balances for schools becoming sponsored academies. It is anticipated that the group may only require one meeting – at most two – and that a report will be brought back to Forum on 27 November 2014.





**Schools Forum**  
 Date: 18 September 2014  
 Time: 8:30 am  
 Venue: Shrewsbury Training and Development Centre

Item  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
Public

Paper  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
**F**

## DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2014-15

**Responsible Officer** Deborah Fern  
 e-mail: deborah.fern@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: (01743) 258942

### Summary

This report confirms the adjusted Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation for Shropshire for 2014-15 and the monitoring position as at August 2014.

### Recommendation

This report is for information only.

## REPORT

### Budget 2014-15

Since the DSG allocation for 2014-15 was reported at Schools Forum on 19 June 2014 there have been several adjustments to the total value of DSG which has seen reduced it from £178.336m to £138.626m. The main change relates to the academy funding being removed and paid directly to the converting schools.

	<b>£m</b>
Total DSG reported 19 June 2014	178.336
Academies Recoupment (including conversions to 31 August 2014)	-35.139
SEN Recoupment	-4.168
Early Years Recoupment	-0.403
<b>Revised DSG 2014-15</b>	<b>138.626</b>

## **Central DSG Monitoring 2014-15**

The overall outturn against centrally retained DSG is forecast to be £641k in surplus at the end of August 2014. The forecast is a prudent estimate based on the fact that the autumn and spring term charges have still to be confirmed.

### **Main reasons for a variation from budget of greater than £100k:**

#### **Line 1.2.1 – Top Up Funding – Maintained Providers**

An underspend of £281k is currently forecast. This area is less predictable than other areas and therefore has included what is considered to be a prudent estimate when forecasting changes to statements during the autumn and spring terms.

#### **Line 1.4.1 - Contribution to Combined Budgets**

Services and contracts within this area have been reviewed and savings of £179k have been realised.

**CENTRALLY RETAINED DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT FUNDING PERIOD (2014-15)**

No:	Description	2014/15 Latest Budget	2014/15 Outturn	Variance
1.01	Individual Schools Budget - Early Years PVI's	6,358,390	6,358,390	0
<b>DEDELEGATED ITEMS</b>				
1.1.1	Contingencies	87,840	143,464	55,624
1.1.2	Behaviour Support Services			
1.1.3	Support to UPEG and bilingual learners			
1.1.4	Free school meals eligibility			
1.1.5	Insurance	26,210	26,210	0
1.1.6	Museum and Library Services			
1.1.7	Licences/subscriptions			
1.1.8	Staff costs Maternity supply cover	455,120	455,120	0
1.1.8a	Staff costs Trade Union Duties	64,860	41,157	-23,703
<b>HIGH NEEDS BUDGET</b>				
1.2.1	Top Up funding - Maintained Providers	5,937,950	5,657,182	-280,768
1.2.2	Top Up funding - Academies & Free Schools	4,146,580	4,074,607	-71,973
1.2.3	Top Up funding - Independent Providers	5,660,670	5,666,257	5,587
1.2.4	Other AP Provision	179,550	172,615	-6,935
1.2.5	SEN Support Services	1,571,680	1,546,814	-24,866
1.2.6	Support for Inclusion	331,790	271,792	-59,998
1.2.7	Hospital Education Services	105,190	105,190	0
1.2.8	Special Schools and PRUs in financial difficulty			0
1.2.9	PFI and BSF costs at special schools			
1.2.10	Direct Payments (SEN and Disability)			
<b>EARLY YEARS BUDGET</b>				
1.3.1	Central Expenditure on children under 5	471,240	471,240	0
<b>CENTRAL PROVISION WITHIN SCHOOLS BUDGET</b>				
1.4.1	Contribution to combined budgets	1,341,860	1,162,850	-179,010
1.4.2	Schools Admissions	279,200	259,945	-19,255
1.4.3	Servicing of Schools Forums	11,000	11,000	0
1.4.4	Termination of employment costs	1,091,400	1,054,886	-36,514
1.4.5	Carbon reduction commitment allowances			
1.4.6	Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA)	609,770	609,771	1
1.4.7	Prudential Borrowing Costs	298,150	298,150	0
1.4.8	Fees to independent schools without SEN			
1.4.9	Equal Pay - Back Pay			
1.4.10	Pupil growth / Infant Class sizes			
1.4.11	SEN Transport			
1.4.12	Exceptions agreed by Secretary of State	112,690	112,689	-1
<b>14.6.1</b>	<b>TOTAL CENTRALLY RETAINED</b>	<b>29,141,140</b>	<b>28,499,329</b>	<b>-641,811</b>
	Individual School Budgets	109,485,220		
	<b>Total DSG Budget</b>	<b>138,626,360</b>		

De-delegated -NOR> 10% contingency payments confirmed to date

Central DSG Balance b/f from 13/14	-1,480,058
Recouped High Needs 13/14	767,000
Recouped Early Years 13/14	235,000
EY trf to capital	142,538
Central DSG Revised surplus 13/14	-335,520

This page is intentionally left blank