

Schools Forum 1st October 2018

Local Area Proposals for Achieving and Maintaining a Balanced Higher Needs Budget

Context

The Higher Needs Recovery Group met on the 5th September 2018 to consider the options available to both maintain and achieve a balanced Higher Needs budget.

The Group considered the content of the report attached and made some recommendations to Officers regarding additional modelling of options. These are included in the revised report attached.

The Higher Needs Recovery Group make the following recommendations to School Forum:-

Peer to Peer Challenge	Recommended
Fair Access Protocol	Recommended
Providing Independent Advice to Parents	Recommended
Providing training and information to Governors	Recommended
Exclusion Recovery Process	Agreed by School Forum
Recovering Funding for MTS/EHE/Assessment Placements	Recommended subject to legal clarification
Reducing costs of commissioned places	Recommended
Creating alternative provision	Recommended
Reviewing Parents for EHCP threshold	Recommended
Element 3 Reduction	Additional modelling requested
Special School Reduction	Additional time to model options requests
Virement Application	Additional modelling request

Recommendations

It is requested that School Forum consider each of the recommendations of the Higher Needs Recovery Group and form an agreed plan of actions to begin to meet the budget deficit.

Rachael Williams

**Local Area Proposals for Achieving and Maintaining a
Balanced Higher Needs Budget**

1 Current Position

- 1.1 Torbay's High Needs Budget is facing severe financial pressure that needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. In 2017/2018 the whole Schools Budget was overspent by just under £1 million (£983,000) but the High Needs Budget within this was overspent by more than £1.4 million, with savings elsewhere (primarily Early Years).
- 1.2 The virement of 0.5% from the Schools Block in 2018/2019 had reduced this pressure from 2017/2018 to £614,000. However, given the pressure is increasing in 2018/2019 due to rising numbers of pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) and increased costs, there is a need to find a long-term solutions to the pressures.
- 1.3 There is no Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserve. The carry forward pressure from 2017/2018 places the reserve in a negative position of £614,000. Given the local authorities overall financial position, especially the increasing social care pressures, there is little if no scope to make available any corporate funding to alleviate High Needs pressures. There is equally no basis for the local authority to occur the costs that sit within the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 1.4 The analysis of Torbay's High Needs Budget shows that, whilst there are some noticeable differences with other authorities in terms of headline figures (Appendix 1 – Demand Data), the underlying local issues are very similar to the national picture. However, it is evident that Torbay's starting position of a comparatively high number of High Needs pupils, and consequently high cost, is a big contributory factor a worsening financial position. (Appendix 2 – Overall financial position paper)
- 1.5 The trajectory outturn position of 2018/2019 demonstrates that the Higher Needs budget pressure could be as much as £2.4 million at the end of the financial year.
- 1.6 At the request of School Forum, a High Needs Recovery Group (HNRG) was established to consider ways in which to reduce these pressures. The group made up of system leaders across education, health and social care have considered in detail the demands that are leading to the increased spend. At the May 2018 HNRG meeting it was agreed that an approach to include both work to change the factors contributing to demand and cost and a virement application to deal with the deficit position should be adopted. The following paper sets out a proposed approach.

2 Strengthening an inclusive and accountable culture

- 2.1 In 2016 the Local Authority commissioned an independent consultant to undertake an audit of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) practice in all schools. This audit demonstrated that there was significant good practice within schools and areas for all schools to consider for future developments. The audit demonstrated that the systems and processes used varied significantly across all institutions and good practice was often isolated to one school, one multi academy trust or an individual year group.
- 2.2 SEND casework officers report that there is a varying offer across schools and a differing approach to the work that will be offered and conducted for children with identified SEND needs.
- 2.3 Work between the community of schools and Local Authority to bring forward a change in approach has strengthened the offer in some schools i.e. Thrive, Autism Champions and Attachment training. However there remains a significant difference in the approach, financial commitment, tolerance and levels of inclusivity that are seen across schools.
- 2.4 This difference in approach is notable in relation to demand for alternative placements and both fixed term and permanent exclusions. The following chart shows Torbay against comparator authorities.

	Primary			Secondary			Special			All		
	Permanent exclusion rate (1)	Fixed period exclusion rate (2)	One or more fixed period exclusion rate (3)	Permanent exclusion rate (1)	Fixed period exclusion rate (2)	One or more fixed period exclusion rate (3)	Permanent exclusion rate (1)	Fixed period exclusion rate (2)	One or more fixed period exclusion rate (3)	Permanent exclusion rate (1)	Fixed period exclusion rate (2)	One or more fixed period exclusion rate (3)
ENGLAND (4)	0.03	1.37	0.62	0.20	9.40	4.62	0.07	13.03	5.09	0.10	4.76	2.29
SOUTH WEST (4)	0.04	1.69	0.71	0.19	9.40	4.49	0.10	17.55	6.54	0.10	5.14	2.38
Devon	0.07	1.57	0.71	0.22	7.63	3.60	0.36	14.91	5.87	0.14	4.16	1.93
Plymouth	0.02	0.70	0.34	0.09	8.22	4.40	x	20.25	8.79	0.05	4.27	2.23
Redcar and Cleveland	0.00	0.49	0.18	0.15	29.52	9.34	0.00	20.11	7.24	0.06	11.60	3.70
Blackpool	0.00	1.70	0.88	0.59	19.17	9.40	0.00	2.84	2.07	0.22	7.99	3.96
North East Lincolnshire	0.04	1.77	0.99	0.41	17.20	7.56	0.00	10.97	4.08	0.17	7.41	3.37
Rotherham	0.03	1.70	0.71	0.12	17.17	6.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	8.03	2.92
Telford and Wrekin	0.02	3.11	1.10	0.08	28.18	7.75	0.00	17.69	5.77	0.04	13.16	3.78
Southend-on-Sea	0.00	0.73	0.37	0.13	10.93	4.55	0.00	5.06	3.75	0.07	5.34	2.29
Isle of Wight	0.00	1.36	0.61	0.06	12.16	5.36	0.00	8.65	3.81	0.04	6.11	2.70
Statistical Neighbour Average	0.01	1.55	0.69	0.22	19.19	7.15	0.00	9.33	3.82	0.10	8.52	3.25
Torbay	0.03	2.41	1.08	0.33	9.63	5.20		16.86	8.43	0.16	5.94	3.07

Census Data – Exclusions 2016/2017

2.5 Step One – Strengthening an Inclusive and Accountable Culture

Peer to Peer Challenge

Governing Bodies and School Leaders are delegated funds to ensure that they can meet the duties listed in the SEN code of practice. These duties include making provision for and meeting the needs of pupils at the earliest level of need. Evidence gathered through the request for statutory assessment process and permanent exclusion paperwork demonstrates that whilst some schools provide a significant level of resources and access to professional assessment prior to seeking an

alternative provision or EHC plan, others can give little or no evidence of interventions leading up to the request for support.

The current mechanisms in place do not facilitate the opportunity for the sharing of practice or discussion of provision at the lowest level of need. The pupil is only discussed when either a request for statutory assessment is received or a request for an alternative placement is passed through the Pupil Referral Panel. Whilst the Local Authority can challenge individual school decisions on the allocation of resources, this is often at the point of no return for the individual pupil.

As subject experts, School Leaders across the system need to hold one another to account on these matters and both offer challenge and support to each other on how to best meet needs.

For this reason the Local Authority will facilitate a peer challenge approach, with delegated personnel attending a meeting to discuss pupils and provision required. The peer challenge group will draw on good evidence based practice, work to the agreed behaviour thresholds and ensure that quality first teaching and provision is made available to pupils in line with the agreed local protocol. Attendees will need to be able to hold each other to account and have the necessary delegated authority to agree to budget allocation within their schools.

With a successful peer challenge network in place only those pupils with complex needs will be discussed at Pupil Referral Panel after a significant period of intervention. This will limit the number of pupils that require a bespoke arrangement.

Fair Access Protocols

In the diverse provider market of Schools, there is emerging evidence that some schools are accepting a disproportionate amount of pupils who have complex needs above others. This is causing significant strain on particular schools or year groups within schools and is not providing the best possible start for the child or young person to succeed.

The Local Authority in consultation with schools has revisited the Fair Access Protocols and agreed a set of measures to ensure equality across the system can be assured and measured.

This includes a 3% admittance rate above the October census per year group, per school. This will ensure that all schools can be considered and approached for the placement of a child or young person that meet the criteria for fair access.

In its implementation the Local Authority needs to act with greater oversight of this process, encourage reintegration across the system and ensure that all schools adhere to the local Fair Access Protocol.

Providing independent advice to parents

For many children and young people the route to alternative provision is through permanent exclusion. The decision to permanently exclude is not a decision that is taken lightly by any school and it has to be considered that the majority of decisions are taken in the context that it is felt to be a necessary step for the child or young person. However the threshold for permanent exclusion varies considerably across schools and is largely driven by the behaviour policy adopted by the school. There is a variability in the way that schools apply good practice guidance such as ACPO (drug advice for schools) and within some schools the interpretation of this policy is dealt with differently for each child. The appropriateness of re-integration provision for children subject to fixed term exclusions is also another considerable factor.

For many parents this is a difficult time and one where relationships between the school and family can be strained, due to many factors. At the point of an exclusion it is important to support the family to understand the decision, work to secure education provision and ensure that the family understands their right of appeal.

Currently an independent advice and support service is not available to all families that do not meet the criteria for SENDIAS services. To ensure that parents are fully supported and informed of their right to appeal, access to independent support should be provided.

The estimated cost of providing this provision would be £20,000 per year.

Providing Training and Information to Governors

An unintended consequence of the Government's strong focus on school standards has led to school environments and practices that can result in disadvantaged children being disproportionately excluded or off rolled. In exercising their duties governors should be mindful of this agenda and ensure that all groups of pupils are considered in their decision making and accountability measures.

To support governors in providing both the challenge and support to the senior leaders of their schools it would be advisable to provide appropriate focused training on inclusion, equipping governors with the necessary questions to fulfil their role.

The previous SEND audit conducted on all schools in 2016, supported senior leaders and governing bodies to be reflective and evaluative of current practice in relation to SEND. This audit also provided a valuable mechanism for school feedback to the local authority SEN team, with many actions being taken forward collectively through the SEND network.

To ensure that schools receive appropriate support and challenge it would be advisable to offer schools a further audit opportunity, this would enable a reflection on what has been achieved since 2016 and offer a further review of current practice. In addition the review could be used to ensure that there is information gathered on the element 2 funding that is received by schools, further strengthening the opportunity for equity across the school system.

The estimated cost of providing this provision would be £30,000 per year.

3. **Step Two – Ensuring children and young people have access to alternative and bespoke provision.**

For some pupils who can't attend mainstream school for a variety of reasons, such as school exclusion, behaviour issues, short or long term illness or school refusal, there needs to be access to alternative and bespoke provision.

Torbay commissions a range of alternative provision both within the geographical boundary and in the neighbouring authority. The demand for this provision is above the numbers currently commissioned by the Local Authority.

The Local Authority discharges its duty for permanently excluded students through alternative provision provided by Mayfield – Chestnut Centre for the Primary Phase and Catch 22 Multi Academy Trust – Burton Academy for secondary students.

Students unable to receive suitable education due to illness are provided for through the work of the Medical Tuition Service and its Hospital School.

The Cost of Alternative Provision

£1.21 million was spent on commissioned secondary AP and assessment top ups in 2017/18

This is the cost of commissioned Alternative Provision at Burton Academy

£120,000 was spent on commissioned primary AP and assessment top ups in 2017/18 excluding outreach services

As Mayfield Chestnut is a combined SEMH/AP provision it is not possible to arrive at an absolute figure. Using Burton as indicative this is the cost of 7 exclusion places.



£610,000 - base funding for 55 places at Burton and 6 at Chestnut

As more children are excluded to Alternative Provision this cost is increasing. (£490,000 in new exclusions in 2017/18 should they remain for a year)

£147,904 - cost of transporting students to Burton, Chestnut and the Medical Tuition Service.

90% of this cost was on taxis to all three services.



Exclusion Recovery Process

School Forum have already taken proactive steps to consider the recoupment mechanism applied across all schools that permanently exclude a pupil. In June 2018, a decision was taken to adjust the recoupment mechanism to include Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). Although this will not recover significant additional funds it ensures that the funding follows the pupil to the maximum amount possible.

Recovering funding from schools for pupils moving to bespoke, alternative provision or those selecting to become electively home educated

The Local Authority currently recovers no funds from schools where a pupil moves to a bespoke or alternative provision. The funding attracted for the pupil remains with the school where the child was originally registered on the school census. The lack of recovery of funds results in the higher needs block covering the full cost of the new place.

To ensure that the funding received follows the child and the cost to the higher needs block is reduced it would be appropriate to charge schools for this provision. This could equally apply to children coming of a school roll to be educated at home. This funding could be brought back into the central block to be used across the system.

The table below demonstrates the potential funds that could be recovered back into the higher needs budget:

	Unit Value to recover £		No. of pupils	Potential Cost Recovery £	Note
Medical Tuition Service	6,000		30	180,000	1
Assessment places at Alternative Provision	6,500		15	97,500	1
Elective Home Education (from May)	9,360	X 80%	30	205,920	2
Elective Home Education (from Oct)	9,360	X 80%	30	112,320	2
Elective Home Education (from Jan)	9,360	X 80%	30	56,160	2
Total recovery of funds from schools				651,900	

Notes:

1 – This would be a yearly charge as long as the pupil remains on the school census.

2 – The unit value of £9,360 has been calculated using secondary unit values of £4,600 minimum per pupil funding, £573 EAL, £1,988 FSM, £1,264 Low Attainment and £935 Pupil Premium. This is the same charge as excluded pupils and would be pro-rata. The 80% assumes that not all pupils will attract all these elements of funding.

Reviewing the cost and availability of alternative commissioned placements

For both pre 16 and post 16 independent placements, fees are based on agreement between the authority and the provider. Torbay currently has over 30 pupils in pre-16 places, costing about £1.4 million and about 50 in post 16 places, costing over £1.1 million.

The Local Authority has a number of actions in place to consider the increasing cost pressures and value for money of such provisions. These include:

- Post 16 working group and panel to ensure required outcomes are achieved and value for money is obtained, by strengthening accountability measures.

- Reviewing existing arrangements, including joint funding (social care and health).
- Consideration of capping commissioned place numbers.

For bespoke arrangements and packages, the SEND casework officers take the responsibility to negotiate and agree fees with providers. The caseworkers have a good understanding of the individual needs and relative costs to support those needs and do have success in managing down costs. However, the Local Authority needs to move towards having a dedicated resource for agreeing placement costs and the commissioning of places.

Current arrangements are commissioned on a spot purchase system, learning from other authorities, Torbay needs to negotiate a block contract arrangement with provider institutions that could deliver significant savings through agreed efficiencies.

The following table demonstrates the levels of savings that could be achieved against the current spend:

	Current Spend £	Pupil Numbers	10% reduction £	20% reduction £
On track	930,000	21	93,000	186,000
School for Inspiring Talents	250,000	5	25,000	50,000
Eat that Frog	300,000	25	30,000	60,000
Oakwood Court College	186,000	5	18,600	37,200
Robert Own Communities	50,000	3	5,000	10,000
Emma Walton Riviera Tuition	78,000	17	7,800	15,600
Evolve Psychotherapy	30,000	8	3,000	6,000
Adelong Outdoor Education	17,000	4	1,700	3,400
YMCA (excluding MTS)	38,000	7	3,800	7,600
Totals	1,879,000		187,900	375,800

Creating alternative provision within the local area

There are currently five area- based resource provisions in Torbay. The top up funding provided to these provisions demonstrates good value for money, when compared to externally commissioned placements. A sixth resourced provision is opening in September 2018 at Paignton Community and Sports Academy (PCSA), with potential savings in excess of £100k per annum.

Analysis of the cohort taught within externally commissioned placements, demonstrates that there is a need to prioritise the development of primary SEHM provision, for excluded primary aged pupils. Two multi academy trusts have approached the local authority with a proposal to offer an enhanced resource base.

Working with these providers there is the potential to create six placements, relieving the pressure on Mayfield – Chestnut and enabling the school to become a specialist SEMH provision. This would reduce the reliance of the Local Authority on using additional packages that are bespoke and costly. This could potentially reduce the budget by £80,000 per year.

On the 13th August 2018, the Department for Education opened an opportunity for Local Authorities to apply to open a special or alternative provision free school. The suggested criteria for a successful application would require a cross border application, the Local Authority is engaged with neighbouring authorities to work on a bid that could offer an alternative solution to meet need, including the potential for a post sixteen offer. Due to the timing of the announcement it is unknown at this stage what savings could be achieved through a successful application.

Ensuring an appropriate contribution and investment in services from Health and Social Care

Many of the children and young people require additional support that is beyond the remit of an education provision. For a significant cohort of SEN pupils there is a need for either or both, social care and health support. The code of practice for SEN is starting to embed a stronger understanding of a joint and co-ordinated plan. Work conducted by the Local Area is strengthening initial systems and processes, but there is still lots of work to do to achieve a holistic assessment and plan for children when appropriate.

Work needs to continue with the professional bodies across the partnership to ensure that children and young people are in receipt of a co-ordinated plan, and where appropriate this needs to be funded across all agencies.

Initial work conducted on joint placement funding has ensured that the joint funded placements are within the set budget and are reducing in cost from an education perspective.

To build on this good work a joint funding panel has been established with Health, Social Care and Education. This panel will discuss complex cases and agree a proportionate share of costs for any significant package of support. The first panel meets in September 2018.

4 Ensuring the right children, achieve the right level of support, at the right cost

Request for Statutory Assessment and Issuing of Education Health and Care Plan

Torbay historically and currently has a higher proportion of children and young people with Education Health and Care Plans. The local authority also has a relatively low number of tribunal cases and requests for mediation. This may be an accurate reflection of the high number of pupils with complex needs or could be attributed to an application of thresholds that differs from other authorities or to a lack of challenge to support needs without the need for an EHCP.

Plymouth the partner authority for Torbay has not experienced the significant increase in requests for statutory assessment since the introduction of the code in 2014, nor have they issued an increased number of EHCP's. The current refusal rate for Plymouth is 40% of all requests.

To ensure accurate application of threshold, it is proposed that Torbay uses the partner relationship with Plymouth to test EHCP thresholds, inviting Plymouth colleagues to be a member of the panel.

A reduction in the issuing of EHC plans would result in the reduction of future spend and bring us further in line with statistical comparators.

Element 3 (Top up)

The EFSA's operational guide sets out how the top up funding system works, in addition to the core funding. This guides places emphasis on local authorities working with all providers to ensure that there are clear processes for allocating top up funding.

For mainstream schools the guide states that 'Top up funding rates . . . should reflect the needs of the individual and the cost of meeting those needs.' They should be 'on a consistent and fair basis'. Funding may also be provided where a school has a disproportionate number of pupils with a particular type of SEND. Further, the guide states 'Local authorities should have a formula or other method, based on experience of distributing additional funding to their schools and academies. In all cases the distribution methodology should be simple and transparent, and devised so that additional funds are targeted only to a minority of schools which have particular difficulties because of their disproportionate number of High Needs or SEND pupils or their characteristics'.

In theory, this means that there are four main options (with variants) for a top up system:

- An all in, flat cash value e.g. reach a tipping point and get a fixed sum. This is highly dependent on local culture, e.g. if all schools agree to accept potential for gains and losses in relatively equal measures across time.
- A banding threshold system, dependent on determining local qualitative/quantitative criteria to measure the child's needs against;
- A real terms "costed" model- for example if you apply specific quantified advice about what special education provision the child requires, you can cost this out £ for £. However this could prove expensive and raise expectations.
- A highly delegated model, where you ensure fair spread of the element 3 factor across all schools and the LA doesn't need to attach any monies to an EHC plan because all schools are financed and required to deliver a suite of SEN provisions. This is could be a risky option but if planned and implemented well, the payoff is that it could encourage localism, spreads the load and could be achieved within the Higher Needs Budget.

Most authorities' formula have some mechanism that converts assessed need into a value, whether a point scoring system on an individual basis or a banding system. Most authorities are reviewing, or have already reviewed, their approaches in light of budget pressures and are adjusting them by any one or a combination of:

- Completely reviewing the assessment process
- Reducing the number of bands
- Reducing the values applied to bands
- Restricting the overall top up budget and applying that pro rata across all schools – whether on assessed need or historical factors or simply on the individual schools budget.

Torbay's process is administratively time consuming. This includes a detailed assessment of criteria (55 in total) within four main characteristics (cognition and learning, communications and interaction, behaviour and emotional & social development, sensory, physical and or medical.) For each criterion a score within a set range is allocated. This is then added up, multiplied by 39 (weeks), and then multiplied by £4,075 to arrive at a value for additional support required. If this value is above £6,000 then this is provided as a top-up. This approach serves well to arrive at individuals' needs, however it can be made more efficient.

Torbay needs to review its detailed assessment process and associated values applied to an individual pupil level, as one of main sources of potential savings to deal with the deficit and maintain a balanced budget into the future.

The work to review the assessment process and revisit the Education Health and Care Plans during an annual review process, would result in limited savings within the financial year. For this reason it is proposed to undertake a two-step process to bring initial savings and then create a model fit for the future.

The first step would be to reduce the EHCP funding for element 3 (over £6K) by 15%. This would result in a reduction of £259,064 within the financial year. The following table indicates the amounts of funds that could be removed and the impact on an individual school budget.

At the request of the Higher Needs Recovery Group, this has been modelled based on two options. Option 1 starting with an April implementation and Option 2 with a September implementation. For the purposes of savings the amount has been maintained.

Schools Forum 1/10/18													
15% reduction in EHCP Funding for Element 3 (over £6k) as at June 18													
Option 1 - shows implementation from April													
Option 2 - shows implementation from Sept													
Both options generate £259k													
School No	School Name	Allocation above £6k	5/12ths allocation from Apr - Aug	7/12ths allocation from Sept - Mar	Option 1 15% Reduction from April	Option 1 Revised allocation	Option 1 Monthly Payment	Option 2 No Reduction from April	Option 2 25.71% reduction from Sept	Option 2 Revised allocation	Option 2 Monthly Payment Apr - Aug	Option 2 Monthly Payment Sept - Mar	
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
PRIMARY SCHOOLS													
2407	Furzeham Primary	6,580	2,742	3,838	987	5,593	466	0	987	5,593	548	407	
2434	Curledge Street Academy	93,148	38,812	54,336	13,972	79,176	6,598	0	13,972	79,176	7,762	5,766	
2438	Oldway Primary	63,912	26,630	37,282	9,587	54,325	4,527	0	9,587	54,325	5,326	3,956	
2439	White Rock Primary School	86,500	35,625	49,875	12,825	72,675	6,066	0	12,825	72,675	7,125	5,293	
2453	Cockington Primary School	79,176	32,990	46,186	11,876	67,300	5,608	0	11,876	67,300	6,598	4,901	
2454	Ellacombe Academy	32,188	13,412	18,776	4,828	27,360	2,280	0	4,828	27,360	2,682	1,993	
2455	Homelands Primary School	37,668	15,695	21,973	5,650	32,018	2,668	0	5,650	32,018	3,139	2,332	
2456	St. Margaret's Academy	37,908	15,795	22,113	5,686	32,222	2,685	0	5,686	32,222	3,159	2,347	
2460	Watcombe Primary School	49,708	20,712	28,996	7,456	42,252	3,521	0	7,456	42,252	4,142	3,077	
2464	Preston Primary School	45,788	19,078	26,710	6,868	38,920	3,243	0	6,868	38,920	3,816	2,834	
2468	Shiphay Learning Academy	55,656	23,190	32,466	8,348	47,308	3,942	0	8,348	47,308	4,638	3,445	
2469	Sherwell Valley Primary School	54,076	22,532	31,544	8,111	45,965	3,830	0	8,111	45,965	4,506	3,348	
2473	Roselands	48,344	20,143	28,201	7,252	41,092	3,424	0	7,252	41,092	4,029	2,993	
2474	Barton Hill Academy	43,388	18,078	25,310	6,508	36,880	3,073	0	6,508	36,880	3,616	2,686	
3103	Brixham C of E Primary School	45,940	19,142	26,798	6,891	39,049	3,254	0	6,891	39,049	3,828	2,844	
3119	Isham Academy	7,436	3,098	4,338	1,115	6,321	527	0	1,115	6,321	620	460	
3120	Upton St. James Primary	12,992	5,413	7,579	1,949	11,043	920	0	1,949	11,043	1,083	804	
3121	Warberry	29,184	12,160	17,024	4,378	24,806	2,067	0	4,378	24,806	2,432	1,807	
3600	Galmpton C of E Primary School	17,332	7,222	10,110	2,600	14,732	1,228	0	2,600	14,732	1,444	1,073	
3601	St. Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary School	13,960	5,817	8,143	2,094	11,866	989	0	2,094	11,866	1,163	864	
3613	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary	21,952	9,147	12,805	3,293	18,659	1,555	0	3,293	18,659	1,829	1,359	
3614	Queensway Catholic Primary School	26,124	10,885	15,239	3,919	22,205	1,850	0	3,919	22,205	2,177	1,617	
3615	All Saints Babbacombe C of E Primary School	19,180	7,992	11,188	2,877	16,303	1,359	0	2,877	16,303	1,598	1,187	
3616	St. Marychurch C of E Primary School	36,812	15,338	21,474	5,522	31,290	2,608	0	5,522	31,290	3,068	2,279	
3617	Priory Roman Catholic Primary School	43,936	18,307	25,629	6,590	37,346	3,112	0	6,590	37,346	3,661	2,720	
3618	Torre C of E Primary School	66,088	27,537	38,551	9,913	56,175	4,681	0	9,913	56,175	5,507	4,091	
3619	Collaton St. Mary C of E Primary School	4,672	1,947	2,725	701	3,971	331	0	701	3,971	389	289	
3751	Eden Park Primary Academy	14,148	5,895	8,253	2,122	12,026	1,002	0	2,122	12,026	1,179	876	
3752	Kings Ash Academy	96,744	40,310	56,434	14,512	82,232	6,853	0	14,512	82,232	8,062	5,989	
5200	Hayes School	17,492	7,288	10,204	2,624	14,868	1,239	0	2,624	14,868	1,458	1,083	
	Total Primary	1,207,032	502,930	704,102	181,055	1,025,977	85,498	0	181,055	1,025,977	100,586	74,721	
SECONDARY SCHOOLS													
4114	Torquay Grammar School for Girls	12,484	5,202	7,282	1,873	10,611	884	0	1,873	10,611	1,040	773	
4115	Torquay Academy	76,616	31,923	44,693	11,492	65,124	5,427	0	11,492	65,124	6,385	4,743	
4116	Churston Ferrers Academy	23,636	9,848	13,788	3,545	20,091	1,674	0	3,545	20,091	1,970	1,463	
4117	The Spires	122,252	50,938	71,314	18,338	103,914	8,660	0	18,338	103,914	10,188	7,568	
4118	Brixham College	74,728	31,137	43,591	11,209	63,519	5,293	0	11,209	63,519	6,227	4,626	
4119	Paignton Community & Sports Academy	188,592	78,580	110,012	28,289	160,303	13,359	0	28,289	160,303	15,716	11,675	
4601	St Cuthbert Mayne Joint Catholic and C of E School	18,248	7,603	10,645	2,737	15,511	1,293	0	2,737	15,511	1,521	1,130	
5401	Torquay Boys' Grammar School	3,504	1,460	2,044	526	2,978	248	0	526	2,978	292	217	
	Total Secondary	520,060	216,692	303,368	78,009	442,051	36,838	0	78,009	442,051	43,338	32,194	
	Totals Primary & Secondary	1,727,092	719,622	1,007,470	259,064	1,468,028	122,336	0	259,064	1,468,028	143,924	106,915	

The second step, of reviewing the assessment process will need to take place over the next 3 months in consultation with the schools forum. This could include the approach of introducing a banding system that aligns with the budget available or moving to a highly delegated model where all schools are expected to meet need from the initial budget delegated.

The second step could work to reduce the EHCP funding for element 3 (over £6k) to the allocated budget set through the higher needs funding formula.

To achieve this there would need to be a dedicated working party and an implementation plan that would potentially result in a panel decision process, creating shared accountability.

Special Schools

Special schools are protected in line with the minimum funding guarantee for mainstream schools (0.5% and -1.5% limits), within certain parameters.

Torbay and the majority of Local Authorities delegate funds to special schools through a banded system based on the pupil's needs. It is recognised that average values per pupil in other authorities appear to be higher than those allocated in Torbay. For example Wigan Council's top up is about £10,000 per pupil compared with Torbay's at about £7,000 per pupil. The comparator statistics show Torbay as the 2nd highest per capita (0-19) compared with Wigan at 10th highest (out of 11) in the group. This reflects the relative number of pupils with EHCPs.

Despite Torbay being a relatively low spender per pupil for these top ups, with a total spend of about £4.3 million, this has to be considered as a potentially area of saving to achieve a balanced budget and maintain the position in the future.

Similar to mainstream schools, there are variants as to how any savings could be achieved by reviewing the bands applied. This would need to be done by reviewing the mix of pupils' needs and relative values that needs to be applied. As with mainstream schools it is possible to apply a limit to the total budget (and therefore payment) for top ups.

To achieve this the Local Authority would need to work with school forum and special school representatives to review the banding system, associated weighting to be applied and the unit costs. In a similar approach to element 3 top ups this would need to be achieved ready for implementation in the next financial year, as a first interim step to achieve initial savings. It is proposed that a 1% reduction funding is applied to Special Schools.

This is modelled in the following chart.

SCHOOLS FORUM 1/10/18														
SPECIAL SCHOOL PER PUPIL FUNDING														
REDUCTIONS IN BUDGET TOP-UP VALUES FOR 19/20 COMPARED WITH CURRENT 18/19 TOP-UP VALUES AGREED BY SCHOOLS FORUM IN MARCH 18														
							Current Funding Position				With 1% increase in initial funding			
	Initial Top-up per pupil	Current Top-up per pupil	Initial Top-up with 1% increase in funding	Number of Places Jan 18	Number of Pupils Jan 18	Initial Funding Position	Place Funding	Pupil Funding	Total Funding	Increase agreed by Forum	Place Funding	Pupil Funding	Total Funding	Reduction in Funding
	£	£	£				£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Combe Pafford														
Autism	4,726	5,132	4,926	38	54	635,204	380,000	277,128	657,128	21,924	380,000	266,002	646,002	11,126
BESD 1	5,240	5,690	5,462	19	21	300,040	190,000	119,490	309,490	9,450	190,000	114,696	304,696	4,794
SLD	5,127	5,567	5,344	2	6	50,762	20,000	33,402	53,402	2,640	20,000	32,064	52,064	1,338
Hearing	5,014	5,444	5,226	2	2	30,028	20,000	10,888	30,888	860	20,000	10,452	30,452	436
MLD 1	507	551	528	63	47	653,829	630,000	25,897	655,897	2,068	630,000	24,837	654,837	1,060
MLD 2	1,291	1,402	1,346	53	41	582,931	530,000	57,482	587,482	4,551	530,000	55,171	585,171	2,311
MLD 3	2,337	2,538	2,436	27	27	333,099	270,000	68,526	338,526	5,427	270,000	65,769	335,769	2,757
PD	4,726	5,132	4,926	9	13	151,438	90,000	66,716	156,716	5,278	90,000	64,038	154,038	2,678
SpecLD	2,281	2,477	2,378	4	2	44,562	40,000	4,954	44,954	392	40,000	4,755	44,755	199
SLCN	4,575	4,968	4,769	32	35	480,125	320,000	173,880	493,880	13,755	320,000	166,900	486,900	6,980
Visual	7,858	8,532	8,190	3	1	37,858	30,000	8,532	38,532	674	30,000	8,190	38,190	342
Totals				252	249	3,299,876	2,520,000	846,895	3,366,895	67,019	2,520,000	812,875	3,332,875	34,020
Mayfield & Chestnut														
PMLD	12,046	12,606	12,305	52	49	1,110,254	520,000	617,694	1,137,694	27,440	520,000	602,941	1,122,941	14,753
BESD1 - Chestnut	10,592	11,085	10,820	32	33	669,536	320,000	365,805	685,805	16,269	320,000	357,049	677,049	8,756
SLD	6,452	6,752	6,591	146	151	2,434,252	1,460,000	1,019,552	2,479,552	45,300	1,460,000	995,192	2,455,192	24,360
Totals				230	233	4,214,042	2,300,000	2,003,051	4,303,051	89,009	2,300,000	1,955,182	4,255,182	47,869
Burton & Brunel														
Brunel - SEMH	13,000	13,480	13,236	56	54	1,262,000	560,000	727,920	1,287,920	25,920	560,000	714,742	1,274,742	13,178
Burton - Alternative Provision	9,500	9,850	9,672	50	63	1,098,500	500,000	620,550	1,120,550	22,050	500,000	609,363	1,109,363	11,187
Totals				106	117	2,360,500	1,060,000	1,348,470	2,408,470	47,970	1,060,000	1,324,105	2,384,105	24,365
Special School Totals				588	599	9,874,418	5,880,000	4,198,416	10,078,416	203,998	5,880,000	4,092,162	9,972,162	106,254

5. Managing the historic and expected deficit

The measures listed in this report will create a marked shift to bring about significant cost reductions alongside increasing accountability and inclusive practice. This will begin to address the driving factors that lead to demand led costs and help to ensure mechanisms are in place to only allocate resources that are within the delegated higher needs budget.

The proposals listed within the report identified a number of options that could be implemented. These are summarised below to demonstrate the recovery savings that could be achieved if all options were implemented and achieved.

	£m
Recovery of Funds from schools where pupil moves to alternative provision	£0.6m
Renegotiation of Commissioned Placement costs	£0.2m
Creating Alternative provision in Local Area	£0.1m
Reduce Element 3 Top Up by 15%	£0.3m
Special School Funding	£0.1m
Total if all Options Implemented and Achieved	£1.3m

The options above recover just over 50% of the shortfall predicted for 2018/2019. Unless other options are introduced a disapplication request to DfE will be required. In Torbay to recover a value of £1.1m is a disapplication percentage of 1.36%. All the disapplication options shown would include the 0.5% allowed by Schools Forum.

	Disapplication Required	
	£m	%
To achieve a balanced budget for 2019/20		
Options above accepted	1.1	1.5
Options not accepted	2.4	3.3
To recover 18/19 and prior year deficit	3.0	4.1
If Options accepted:		
To achieve balanced budget for 19/20 and recover deficit over:		
Two years – 19/20 and 20/21 (£1.1m+£1.5m)	2.6	3.5
Three years – 19/20, 20/21 and 21/22 (£1.1m+£1m)	2.1	2.9
If Options not accepted:		
To achieve balanced budget for 19/20 and recover deficit over:		
Two years – 19/20 and 20/21 (£2.4m+£1.5m)	3.9	5.3
Three years – 19/20, 20/21 and 21/22 (£2.4m+£1.0m)	3.4	4.6

Disapplication request to transfer funds from Schools Block to Higher Needs Block

The Local Authority recommends that the Schools Forum seek a virement of £1.1 m (1.45%) for 2019/20.

The following tables demonstrate the impact of a virement application of 1.45% on individual school budgets.

The first chart demonstrates the virement of funds against the proposed allocation method agreed at School Forum and previously shared with schools. This model enables the minimum per pupil levels to be maintained.

The second chart demonstrates the virement of funds using the method agreed at School Forum but with the removal of the minimum per pupil level funding.

On both charts we have provided an indication of what schools might receive from £1.1 million growth in the DSG (if the virement of £1.1 million is approved) against the potential growth of £2.2 million (if no virement was approved). The final column shows the difference in the funding given to each school.

In both charts the funding ratio for primary and secondary has been maintained in line with the regulatory guidance.

Chart 1

Schools Forum 1/10/18

Comparison between 18/19 allocations and the potential impact on schools in 19/20 if £1.1m of the Schools Block growth was not allocated

£1.1m would require a 1.45% disapplication request

These allocations ensure a minimum per pupil funding of £3,500 for Primary & £4,800 for Secondary for 19/20

DfE No.	School Name	18/19	18/19	19/20	19/20	19/20	19/20	19/20	19/20	19/20
		Allocation	Allocation	Potential	Potential	£1.1m growth	Potential	Potential	£2.2m growth	Potential
			Formula	with £1.1m	school would	Formula	with £2.2m	school would	Formula	wouldn't receive
			or	DSG Growth	receive with	or	DSG Growth	receive with	or	with £1.1m
		£	MFG	£	£1.1m growth	MFG	£	£2.2m growth	MFG	Disapplication
					£					£
2407	Furzeham Primary and Nursery School	1,027,474	Formula	1,055,470	27,995	Formula	1,073,712	46,238	Formula	18,242
2434	Curledge Street Academy	1,633,389	Formula	1,633,389	0	MFG	1,673,278	39,889	Formula	39,889
2438	Oldway Primary School	2,106,385	Formula	2,229,500	123,115	Formula	2,229,500	123,115	Formula	0
2439	White Rock Primary School	1,864,299	Formula	1,904,000	39,701	Formula	1,919,757	55,458	Formula	15,757
2453	Cockington Primary School	2,163,842	Formula	2,165,365	1,523	Formula	2,221,453	57,611	Formula	56,088
2454	Ellacombe Academy	1,521,644	MFG	1,521,644	0	MFG	1,521,644	0	MFG	0
2455	Homelands Primary School	915,215	Formula	935,335	20,120	Formula	957,849	42,634	Formula	22,514
2456	St. Margaret's Academy	1,557,456	Formula	1,575,447	17,991	Formula	1,616,596	59,140	Formula	41,149
2460	Watcombe Primary School	879,666	Formula	879,666	0	MFG	898,954	19,288	Formula	19,288
2464	Preston Primary School	1,129,564	Formula	1,129,981	418	Formula	1,141,310	11,746	Formula	11,329
2468	Shiphay Learning Academy	1,454,300	Formula	1,473,500	19,200	Formula	1,473,500	19,200	Formula	0
2469	Sherwell Valley Primary School	2,228,882	Formula	2,257,500	28,618	Formula	2,257,500	28,618	Formula	0
2473	Roselands Primary School	1,128,860	Formula	1,136,072	7,212	Formula	1,157,360	28,500	Formula	21,288
2474	Barton Hill Academy	2,688,176	MFG	2,688,176	0	MFG	2,688,176	0	MFG	0
3103	Brixham C of E Primary School	802,830	Formula	843,845	41,014	Formula	861,331	58,500	Formula	17,486
3119	Ilsham Academy	633,271	Formula	650,906	17,635	Formula	660,228	26,957	Formula	9,322
3120	Upton St. James Primary	486,836	Formula	495,245	8,409	Formula	510,250	23,414	Formula	15,004
3121	Warberry C of E Primary School	1,444,544	Formula	1,458,229	13,685	Formula	1,490,671	46,127	Formula	32,442
3600	Galmpton C of E Primary School	767,660	Formula	779,820	12,160	Formula	786,764	19,104	Formula	6,944
3601	St. Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary School	500,509	Formula	517,605	17,096	Formula	525,947	25,438	Formula	8,343
3613	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary and Nursery School	848,805	Formula	852,700	3,895	Formula	873,958	25,152	Formula	21,258
3614	Our Lady of the Angels Catholic Primary School	715,042	Formula	719,299	4,257	Formula	735,091	20,049	Formula	15,792
3615	All Saints Babbacombe C of E Primary School	798,873	Formula	812,657	13,784	Formula	830,469	31,596	Formula	17,812
3616	St. Marychurch C of E Primary School	1,178,286	Formula	1,189,962	11,676	Formula	1,217,691	39,405	Formula	27,730
3617	Priory Roman Catholic Primary School	690,786	Formula	702,593	11,807	Formula	718,881	28,095	Formula	16,288
3618	Torre C of E Primary School	1,131,574	Formula	1,149,400	17,826	Formula	1,177,386	45,812	Formula	27,986
3619	Collaton St. Mary C of E Primary School	781,353	Formula	804,169	22,816	Formula	822,120	40,767	Formula	17,950
3751	Eden Park Primary Academy	1,463,714	MFG	1,488,177	24,463	Formula	1,519,587	55,873	Formula	31,410
3752	Kings Ash Academy	1,624,081	Formula	1,624,081	0	MFG	1,654,679	30,598	Formula	30,598
5200	Hayes School	1,620,952	Formula	1,620,952	0	MFG	1,665,155	44,203	Formula	44,203
	TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS	37,788,268		38,294,684	506,415		38,880,795	1,092,527		586,112
4114	Torquay Grammar School for Girls	3,275,200	Formula	3,417,600	142,400	Formula	3,417,600	142,400	Formula	0
4115	Torquay Academy	5,761,229	Formula	5,788,960	27,731	Formula	5,911,117	149,888	Formula	122,157
4116	Churston Ferrers Academy	3,394,800	Formula	3,542,400	147,600	Formula	3,542,400	147,600	Formula	0
4117	The Spires College	4,034,549	Formula	4,053,384	18,835	Formula	4,140,443	105,894	Formula	87,059
4118	Brixham Academy	4,794,562	Formula	4,840,246	45,684	Formula	4,923,201	128,639	Formula	82,955
4119	Paignton Community & Sports Academy	6,688,803	Formula	6,715,168	26,365	Formula	6,850,872	162,069	Formula	135,704
4601	St Cuthbert Mayne Joint Catholic and C of E School	3,955,483	Formula	3,982,438	26,955	Formula	4,068,469	112,985	Formula	86,031
5401	Torquay Boys' Academy	3,634,000	Formula	3,792,000	158,000	Formula	3,792,000	158,000	Formula	-0
	TOTAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS	35,538,626		36,132,195	593,569		36,646,102	1,107,476		513,907
	TOTAL PRIMARY & SECONDARY	73,326,895		74,426,879	1,099,984		75,526,898	2,200,003		1,100,019
	PRIMARY AVERAGE PER PUPIL	3,849		3,901			3,961			
	SECONDARY AVERAGE PER PUPIL	4,973		5,056			5,128			
	PRIMARY:SECONDARY RATIO	1.29		1.30			1.29			

Assumptions						
Pupil numbers for 18/19 & 19/20 are the same.						
Allocations for PFI, Split Sites & Rates for 18/19 & 19/20 are the same.						
The minimum funding guarantee has been set at 0%						
The unit values used for the allocations are:						
	Primary	Primary	Primary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
	18/19	19/20	19/20	18/19	19/20	19/20
		£1.1m	£2.2m		£1.1m	£2.2m
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS1 & 2	2,806.18	2,776.59	2,776.59			
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS3				3,862.65	3,862.65	3,862.65
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS4				4,386.81	4,386.81	4,386.81
Lump Sum	85,000	98,000	98,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
FSM	1,301.24	1,106.05	1,236.18	1,988.03	1,491.02	1,988.03
FSM - Ever 6	0	0	0	0	0	0
IDACI - Band A (score between 0.5 & 1.0)	966	893.14	1,080.66	642.42	802.55	852.57
IDACI - Band B (score between 0.4 & 0.5)	805	646.76	782.54	535.35	687.9	730.77
IDACI - Band C (score between 0.35 & 0.4)	644	600.56	726.65	428.28	573.25	608.98
IDACI - Band D (score between 0.3 & 0.35)	483	554.36	670.75	321.21	458.6	487.18
IDACI - Band E (score between 0.25 & 0.3)	322	369.58	447.17	214.14	343.95	365.39
IDACI - Band F (score between 0.2 & 0.25)	0	307.98	372.64	0	229.3	243.59
Prior attainment	631.11	631.11	631.11	1,264.08	1,264.08	1,264.08
EAL	642.07	642.07	642.07	573	573	573
Minimum per pupil funding	3,300	3,500	3,500	4,600	4,800	4,800

Chart 2

Schools Forum 1/10/18

Comparison between 18/19 allocations and the potential impact on schools in 19/20 if £1.1m of the Schools Block growth was not allocated

£1.1m would require a 1.45% disapplication request

These allocations do NOT ensure a minimum per pupil funding of £3,500 for Primary & £4,800 for Secondary for 19/20

DfE No.	School Name	18/19 Allocation	18/19 Allocation Formula or MFG	19/20 Potential Allocation with £1.1m DSG Growth	19/20 Potential growth school would receive with £1.1m growth	19/20 £1.1m growth Formula or MFG	19/20 Potential Allocation with £2.2m DSG Growth	19/20 Potential growth school would receive with £2.2m growth	19/20 £2.2m growth Formula or MFG	19/20 Funding School wouldn't receive with £1.1m Disapplication
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
2407	Furzeham Primary and Nursery School	1,027,474	Formula	1,060,675	33,201	Formula	1,079,247	51,773	Formula	18,572
2434	Curledge Street Academy	1,633,389	Formula	1,641,605	8,216	Formula	1,679,217	45,829	Formula	37,613
2438	Oldway Primary School	2,106,385	Formula	2,129,710	23,325	Formula	2,161,889	55,504	Formula	32,179
2439	White Rock Primary School	1,864,299	Formula	1,896,319	32,019	Formula	1,931,886	67,586	Formula	35,567
2453	Cockington Primary School	2,163,842	Formula	2,182,282	18,440	Formula	2,229,684	65,842	Formula	47,402
2454	Ellacombe Academy	1,521,644	MFG	1,521,644	0	MFG	1,521,644	0	MFG	0
2455	Homelands Primary School	915,215	Formula	941,451	26,236	Formula	960,916	45,701	Formula	19,465
2456	St. Margaret's Academy	1,557,456	Formula	1,585,207	27,751	Formula	1,623,819	66,363	Formula	38,612
2460	Watcombe Primary School	879,666	Formula	879,666	0	MFG	900,950	21,284	Formula	21,284
2464	Preston Primary School	1,129,564	Formula	1,135,187	5,623	Formula	1,148,206	18,642	Formula	13,019
2468	Shiphay Learning Academy	1,454,300	Formula	1,459,759	5,459	Formula	1,475,366	21,066	Formula	15,607
2469	Sherwell Valley Primary School	2,228,882	Formula	2,228,882	0	MFG	2,257,548	28,666	Formula	28,666
2473	Roselands Primary School	1,128,860	Formula	1,142,058	13,198	Formula	1,163,541	34,681	Formula	21,482
2474	Barton Hill Academy	2,688,176	MFG	2,688,176	0	MFG	2,688,176	0	MFG	0
3103	Brixham C of E Primary School	802,830	Formula	848,269	45,439	Formula	865,392	62,561	Formula	17,122
3119	Ilsham Academy	633,271	Formula	652,598	19,327	Formula	664,531	31,260	Formula	11,933
3120	Upton St. James Primary	486,836	Formula	499,930	13,094	Formula	510,896	24,060	Formula	10,966
3121	Warberry C of E Primary School	1,444,544	Formula	1,466,167	21,623	Formula	1,498,332	53,788	Formula	32,165
3600	Galmpton C of E Primary School	767,660	Formula	781,902	14,242	Formula	792,203	24,543	Formula	10,301
3601	St. Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary School	500,509	Formula	519,947	19,438	Formula	528,416	27,907	Formula	8,469
3613	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary and Nursery School	848,805	Formula	858,946	10,141	Formula	876,960	28,155	Formula	18,014
3614	Our Lady of the Angels Catholic Primary School	715,042	Formula	722,552	7,510	Formula	738,584	23,542	Formula	16,031
3615	All Saints Babbacombe C of E Primary School	798,873	Formula	816,951	18,078	Formula	834,358	35,485	Formula	17,407
3616	St. Marychurch C of E Primary School	1,178,286	Formula	1,197,249	18,963	Formula	1,223,161	44,875	Formula	25,913
3617	Priory Roman Catholic Primary School	690,786	Formula	707,017	16,232	Formula	721,492	30,707	Formula	14,475
3618	Torre C of E Primary School	1,131,574	Formula	1,154,605	23,031	Formula	1,183,542	51,968	Formula	28,937
3619	Collaton St. Mary C of E Primary School	781,353	Formula	805,861	24,508	Formula	827,429	46,076	Formula	21,568
3751	Eden Park Primary Academy	1,463,714	MFG	1,498,978	35,264	Formula	1,525,756	62,042	Formula	26,779
3752	Kings Ash Academy	1,624,081	Formula	1,624,081	0	MFG	1,652,975	28,894	Formula	28,894
5200	Hayes School	1,620,952	Formula	1,632,378	11,425	Formula	1,670,917	49,965	Formula	38,539
	TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS	37,788,268		38,280,051	491,783		38,937,032	1,148,764		656,981
4114	Torquay Grammar School for Girls	3,275,200	Formula	3,275,200	0	MFG	3,275,200	0	MFG	0
4115	Torquay Academy	5,761,229	Formula	5,897,914	136,685	Formula	6,012,020	250,791	Formula	114,106
4116	Churston Ferrers Academy	3,394,800	Formula	3,394,800	0	MFG	3,394,800	0	MFG	0
4117	The Spires College	4,034,549	Formula	4,131,649	97,099	Formula	4,207,658	173,109	Formula	76,009
4118	Brixham Academy	4,794,562	Formula	4,915,991	121,430	Formula	4,978,300	183,738	Formula	62,308
4119	Paignton Community & Sports Academy	6,688,803	Formula	6,837,893	149,090	Formula	6,950,063	261,260	Formula	112,170
4601	St Cuthbert Mayne Joint Catholic and C of E School	3,955,483	Formula	4,059,393	103,910	Formula	4,137,827	182,343	Formula	78,434
5401	Torquay Boys' Academy	3,634,000	Formula	3,634,000	0	MFG	3,634,000	0	MFG	0
	TOTAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS	35,538,626		36,146,841	608,214		36,589,868	1,051,242		443,027
	TOTAL PRIMARY & SECONDARY	73,326,895		74,426,892	1,099,997		75,526,900	2,200,005		1,100,009
	PRIMARY AVERAGE PER PUPIL	3,849		3,899			3,966			
	SECONDARY AVERAGE PER PUPIL	4,973		5,058			5,120			
	PRIMARY:SECONDARY RATIO	1.29		1.30			1.29			

Note of caution - these allocations will change when Oct 18 census data is used and also any changes to unit values and process changes which the ESFA may implement for 19/20.

Assumptions						
Pupil numbers for 18/19 & 19/20 are the same.						
Allocations for PFI, Split Sites & Rates for 18/19 & 19/20 are the same.						
The minimum funding guarantee has been set at 0%						
The unit values used for the allocations are:						
	Primary	Primary	Primary	Secondary	Secondary	Secondary
	18/19	19/20	19/20	18/19	19/20	19/20
		£1.1m	£2.2m		£1.1m	£2.2m
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS1 & 2	2,806.18	2,776.59	2,806.18			
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS3				3,862.65	3,862.65	3,862.65
Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) - KS4				4,386.81	4,386.81	4,386.81
Lump Sum	85,000	98,000	98,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
FSM	1,301.24	1,236.18	1,171.12	1,988.03	1,988.03	1,988.03
FSM - Ever 6	0	0	0	0	0	0
IDACI - Band A (score between 0.5 & 1.0)	966	893.14	1,080.66	642.42	822.22	1084.48
IDACI - Band B (score between 0.4 & 0.5)	805	646.76	782.54	535.35	704.76	929.55
IDACI - Band C (score between 0.35 & 0.4)	644	600.56	726.65	428.28	587.3	774.63
IDACI - Band D (score between 0.3 & 0.35)	483	554.36	670.75	321.21	469.84	619.7
IDACI - Band E (score between 0.25 & 0.3)	322	369.58	447.17	214.14	352.38	464.78
IDACI - Band F (score between 0.2 & 0.25)	0	307.98	372.64	0	234.92	309.85
Prior attainment	631.11	631.11	631.11	1,264.08	1,264.08	1,264.08
EAL	642.07	642.07	642.07	573	573	573

Next steps

It is recognised that the proposals are not without significant risk and consultation on agreed next steps would need to be mindful of the concerns identified and impact. Where possible the Local Authority has accessed legal advice, but it should be recognised that some proposals are only being initiated across local areas, so the landscape remains untested.

In preparing any documentation for wider consultation the Local Authority would prepare an equality impact assessment and ensure this is made available.

To ensure that we are able to take appropriate next steps, it is proposed that the timetable below is followed. If the decision was taken to submit a virement application this is built into the timetable.

5 th September	Higher Needs Recovery Group Meeting
1 st October	Exceptional School Forum (1 – 3pm)
5 th October	Consultation launched
TBC	Parental consultation
11 th October	School Forum Meeting (normal)
11 th October	Briefing for all school leaders and governors
16 th November	Consultation closes
16 th – 30 th November	Consultation feedback review
30 th November	Disapplication deadline with DfE
16 th January	Amended disapplication deadline with DfE