

DATE & TIME OF MEETING:	Wednesday, 16 November 2016 @ 2pm
VENUE:	The Mowbray Suite, Golden Lion Hotel, Northallerton DL7 8PP
Please confirm attendance by e-mail to <u>deborah.wilbor@northyorks.gov.uk</u> or telephone 01609 532727.	

Important information for those attending:

Declaration of Interests

Members of the Education Partnership who have an interest in an agenda item beyond the generality of the group they represent are required to declare the existence and nature of that interest to the Chair prior to the start of the meeting. *Further information can be found in paragraph 13 of the constitution of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership*.

Voting

Voting on proposals in relation to the school and early years funding formulae may only be undertaken by (i) those listed as "Schools' Members" on the Membership page of this agenda and (ii) the Early Years representative.

Where a phase-related de-delegation proposal requires a vote, only schools' members representing schools within that phase may vote.

All members are entitled to vote on proposals other than those relating to the funding formulae.

Observers cannot vote on any proposal brought before the Education Partnership.

Voting requirements will be clearly identified in the agenda item.

Information only reports

Reports marked for information only will not, under normal circumstances, be presented to the Education Partnership. Any comments or questions arising from the report should be directed to the Clerk who will either (i) seek a response from the author or (ii) request their attendance in order to respond directly to the members of the Education Partnership.

General Public

Meetings of the Education Partnership are public meetings

The Chair will request that any members of the public leave the meeting for items marked as confidential and which involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local government Act 1972.

Further information can be found in paragraph 11 of the constitution of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership.



Agenda

Part 1: Procedural

ltem	Title	Lead
1.1	Welcome and apologies	Chair
1.2	Membership update	Chair
1.3	Minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising	Chair
1.4	Notification of other urgent business	Chair

Part 2: School Organisation

Item	Title	Lead
2.1	Schools that Work for Everyone	Carolyn Bird
2.2	Implications of the Education White Paper in North Yorkshire	Carolyn Bird

Part 3: School Improvement

Item	Title	Lead
3.1	Improvement Partnerships Boards:	Jill Hodges
	i) Early Years	
	ii) Primary	
	iii) Secondary	
	iv) Special	
3.2	Opportunity Areas	Pete Dwyer
3.3	Scarborough Pledge	Pete Dwyer

Part 4: School Funding

ltem	Title	Lead
4.1	School Funding 2017-18	Anton Hodge/Sally Dunn
4.2	Early Years Funding 2017-18	Anton Hodge/Sally Dunn/Andrea Sedgewick
4.3	High Needs Funding 2017-18	Anton Hodge
4.4	Traded Services Panel (SmartSolutions Customer Reference Group) (verbal update)	lan Yapp



Part 5: Future Agendas

2017 Proposed Meeting Dates (to be agreed)	
26 Jan 2017	
9 Mar 2017	
25 May 2017	
14 Sept 2017	
19 Oct 2017	



Membership

Schools Members	(29)		
Headteachers (16)			
Primary	Tammy Cooper	Ruswarp CoE VC Primary School	Jan 2020
Primary	lan Clennan	Selby Community Primary School	Dec 2017
Primary	Rachel Wells	West Heslerton CE Primary School	Dec 2017
Primary	lan Yapp	Riverside Community Primary School	Jan 2018
Primary	David Barber	Hambleton CoE Primary School	Aug 2019
Primary	Robert Campbell	Leeming RAF Community Primary School	May 2020
Primary	Jillian Baker	Barlby Community Primary School	May 2020
Primary	Vacancy		
Secondary (Chair)	Carl Sugden	King James's School	Nov 2016
Secondary	Mark McCandless	Ryedale School	May 2018
Secondary (IP Chair)	Rob Pritchard	St John Fisher Catholic High School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Vacancy		
Secondary	Vacancy		
Secondary	Vacancy		
Special	Marianne Best	Welburn Hall	Sept 2020
Nursery	Jane Pepper	Childhaven Nursery	Aug 2019
School Governors (8))		
Primary	Ken Blackwood	Appleton Wiske Primary School	Oct 2019
Primary	Jim Martin	Newby and Scalby Primary School	Nov 2017
Primary	Geoff Archer	Applegarth Primary School	Apr 2019
Primary	Vacancy		
Primary	Vacancy		
Secondary	Gerry Price	Bedale High School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Rosemary Rees	Settle College	Nov 2016
Secondary	Vacancy		
Academy Representa	atives (4)		
Secondary	Vacancy		
Secondary	John Barker	Skipton Girls' High School	Dec 2017



Special	Annette Fearn	The Woodlands Special School	Aug 2019
PRS	Catherine Farrell	The Grove Academy	Aug 2019

Pupil Referral Servic	e Representative (1)		
PRS	Les Bell	Selby PRS	Oct 2018

Non-Schools Members (6)			
Early Years	Gill Hunton	Osmotherley Pre-School	Aug 2019
RC Diocese	Vacancy		
CoE Diocese	Vacancy		
Unison	Stella Smethurst		Dec 2016
Teachers Unions	Chris Head		Dec 2019
16-19 Providers	Debra Forsythe-Conroy	Harrogate College	Aug 2018

Observers (4)		
County Councillor	Arthur Barker	Lead Member for schools, 16-19 year old education and early years provision
County Councillor	Janet Sanderson	Lead Member for children's services, special needs, youth justice, youth service and adult education
EFA Observer	Keith Howkins	Education Funding Agency
	Chris Payne	Teachers' Association
	Wendy Ripley	Chair – Primary Improvement Partnership
	Wendy Jemison	Lead Adviser (SEN)

Vacancy Update:

Primary headteachers - 1

Secondary headteachers – 3

Special headteacher - 1

Primary governor - 2

Secondary governor - 1

Non-schools vacancies - 3.



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015	
Title of report:	Minutes of the Education Partnership – 16 September 2015	
Type of report: Delete as required	For information only	
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	The minutes of the previous meeting of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership are presented for approval.	
Budget / Risk implications:	N/A	
Recommendations:	The minutes are approved as an accurate record.	
Voting requirements:	N/A	
Appendices: To be attached	N/A	
Report originator and contact	Jayne Laver – Clerk to the NYEP	
details:	Tel: 01609 534416	
	E-mail: jayne.laver@northyorks.gov.uk	
Presenting officer: If not the originator	N/A	



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

PRESENT:

Chair:	Carl Sugden						
Primary Headteachers:	David Barber, Tammy Cooper, Ian Clennan & Ian Yapp						
Secondary Headteachers:	Michele Costello, Mark McCandless, Rob Pritchard & Sue Whelan						
Nursery headteacher:	Jane Pepper						
Special Headteacher:	Hanne Barton						
Pupil Referral Service:	Les Bell						
Academies:	John Barker & Andrew Cummings						
Governors:	Primary: Geoff Archer, Ken Blackwood, Helen Flynn & Jim Martin Secondary: Denise Powley, Gerry Price & Rosemary Rees						
Early Years Providers:	Gill Hunton						
16-19 Providers:	Josie Guinness						
Diocesan Representatives:	-						
Trade Unions:	-						
Observers:	County Councillors Arthur Barker and Janet Sanderson Chris Head						
In Attendance:	Michael Cotton, Helen Coulthard, Pete Dwyer, Anton Hodge, Jill Hodges, Jane le Sage, Jayne Laver & Wendy Ripley (Primary IP Chair)						
Apologies:	Rachel Wells, Annette Fearn, Stella Smethurst						

647: WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing new members David Barber, Sue Whelan and Gill Hunton. County Councillor Janet Sanderson was welcomed to her first meeting of the Partnership as the new Lead Member for Children's Services, Special Needs, Youth Justice,



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

Youth Service and Adult Education. The Partnership was introduced to Jane le Sage, the new Assistant Director for Inclusion, and Wendy Ripley, the recently appointed Chair of the Primary Improvement Partnership.

648: MEMBERSHIP OF THE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

The Chair advised the Partnership that there remained a number of vacancies: primary headteachers (3), secondary headteachers (1), the PRS Academy (1) and non-school representatives (3).

649: MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Item 638: spelling correction *"Purpose of report: to provide details of the school sixth for<u>m</u> allocations for the 2015/16 academic year."*

RESOLVED –

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2015 were approved as an accurate record.

650: MATTERS ARISING

Item 638: With regard to the request made for further reports in relation to post-16 destinations and demographic changes, Pete Dwyer advised that a national review of FE and sixth form college (excluding schools) provision is underway, driven by ministers who are seeking larger, more specialist and financially sustainable institutions going forward. This should link to local discussion.

Item 641: Gerry Price queried progress on the commissioning of a piece of work to look at recruitment and retention of staff in the county's schools. Pete Dwyer advised that reviews were being undertaken in some areas and that the improvement partnerships could pick this up as a potential barrier to school improvement so a discussion with the chairs was required.

651: NOTIFICATION OF OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no notifications of other urgent business for consideration.

652: SCHOOL FUNDING 2016-17

Report prepared by: Anton Hodge (Assistant Director – Strategic Resources) and Helen Coulthard (Head of Finance for Schools and Projects).

Purpose of report: to set out the current financial position of the Schools Budget including the overall position on individual school balances; to highlight the LA's work towards achieving a more equitable funding of schools across the county and the financial pressures expected in the future; to seek



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

advice on seeking an exception from April 2016 for all schools with unreasonable costs (water hygiene) and to note that work continues on the High Needs and Early Years blocks.

Anton Hodge advised that a DfE funding consultation for 2017-18 and beyond may be expected by Christmas.

A lengthy discussion ensued about the exception to the formula. A feasibility study has been commissioned further to consideration of the work required and other potential options. Concerns were raised that this had been discussed at the previous meeting and a vote taken not to support the proposal to apply for an in-year change in relation to a school converting to academy status. It was clarified that the role of the Partnership is to fund all schools including academies and that this request is to consider an exception for all schools, not just the school which has since converted to academy status. It was also clarified that the de-delegated funding that would have been used for this work is allocated to academies and, therefore, the academy concerned has received some funding albeit not the full £21k required to undertake the work required. Anton Hodge confirmed that the academy could apply to the EFA for funds to change the water system and that they are aware of this and have indicated that they will make an application.

Anton Hodge advised that the figures provided in reports to the Partnership differ to those in the DfE's technical note as they cover four blocks which the LA translates into three. The report presented in January shows how this split is done.

With regard to split sites, Jim Martin expressed the view that off-site sports sites should be included given the teaching and learning time lost to travel. Helen Coulthard advised that the factor is specific to schools on more than one site.

Ian Clennan requested that a consistent approach be applied to the naming of ethnic minority funding.

RESOLVED –

The Partnership:

- i. Noted the 2014-15 outturn position on the schools budget and individual school balances;
- ii. Noted that a more detailed report on school balances will be presented to the Partnership in October;
- iii. Noted the current 2015-16 budget position;
- iv. Noted the arising cost pressures;
- v. Noted the national funding issues;
- vi. Agreed that no major proposals for change in 2016-17 be made, that the deprivation calculation used be reviewed and that the Minimum Funding Guarantee be considered as part of the strategic review of school organisation;

15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

- vii. Did not endorse the requesting of a LA wide exceptional factor for water hygiene costs by two thirds of the voting membership;
- viii. Agreed that analysis is undertaken on split site costs for the October meeting; and
- ix. Noted the current position on High Needs and early Years and that further work is to be undertaken.

653: FALLING ROLLS AND PUPIL GROWTH REVIEW

Report prepared by: Jayne Laver (Accountant – Integrated Finance)

Purpose of report: To summarise the review of both contingency funds following a full year of implementation.

<u>Falling Rolls</u> – discussion centred on the proposal to consider a school's balance where it had reached 15% in the previous financial year. Jim Martin felt that 15% was too high particularly when the majority of schools are diligent in the management of their balances. Ken Blackwood questioned whether, if there was a shortfall in the fund, balances just short of 15% should be used.

<u>Pupil Growth</u> – In response to Jim Martin, Helen Coulthard advised that the wording of "an average of about 30" recognises the imbalance between year groups in a primary school particularly where there are bulge classes rather than expecting a school to manage with classes well in excess of 30. Helen Flynn questioned whether schools had been asked about the TA position. Helen Coulthard advised that TA numbers vary from school to school and that a school would not necessarily use the Pupil Growth funding to recruit additional TA support but could use it as they saw fit.

RESOLVED -

The Partnership endorsed the following Falling Rolls recommendations:

- i. That the views of Education and Skills will be sought as to whether or not the falling roll will create a substantial disruption to the education provision at the school;
- ii. To reduce the secondary reduction threshold of 25% to 15% in line with the primary threshold;
- iii. To revise the re-growth criterion to be applied to 50% of the overall reduction over the previous three years;
- iv. The introduction of the consideration of the school's balance should it reach at least 15% in the previous financial year;
- v. That any funding allocated be acknowledged as a contribution towards the management of the temporary fall in pupil numbers; and
- vi. The contribution be 25% of the calculated amount.

The Partnership endorsed the following Falling Rolls recommendations:

i. Not to change the methodology for class expansion to meet basic need but to categorise this for the Primary phase only;



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

- ii. To reduce the funding allocation for primary class expansion to £25k per additional class;
- iii. Not to change the criterion for in year pupil increases;
- iv. Not to change the criterion for new schools but to undertake a review once the Selby new school project has been completed;
- v. Not to introduce a separate set of criteria for service schools but to apply the criterion for class expansion to meet basic need (primary) and secondary growth; and
- vi. To introduce the proposed set of criteria for growth in secondary schools.

654: TRADED SEERVICES UPDATE

Report prepared by: Bryony Clark - SmartsSolutions

Purpose of report: a synopsis of the meeting of the Traded Services Panel held on 16 June 2015.

RESOLVED –

That the Partnership noted the contents of the report.

655: <u>PRESENTATION – SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY</u> <u>STRATEGY REVIEW FINAL REPORT OF THE ISOS PARTNERSHIP</u>

Report prepared by: Isos Partnership presented by Michael Cotton (SEND Implementation Manager)

Purpose of report: to present the findings of the commissioned diagnostic review to inform a new SEND strategic approach in North Yorkshire.

Gill Hunton advised that she had received a call from an organisation called family Action who having been funded by DfE was researching the challenges of inclusion by contacting all provision in the county with a view to producing case studies. The LA was not aware of this and will look into it.

RESOLVED –

That the Partnership noted the contents of the report.

656: PROVISIONAL SCHOOL OUTCOMES 2015 – EARLY INDICATIONS

Report prepared by: Jill Hodges (Assistant Director – Education and Skills)

Purpose of report: to provide an early indication of school outcomes, including academies, in 2015 which will be used to support strategic planning.

The Chair said that the expected progress in secondary should be treated with caution as the KS2 boycott in 2010 has affected this cohort. Ian Clennan noted that the grammar, punctuation and spelling indicator was currently excluded from the floor standards.



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

Hanne Barton asked if there had been any analysis of special schools undertaken. Given the funding levels allocated to special schools, Ms Barton felt it important that the Partnership should see the outcomes of the special schools. Jill Hodges advised that each IP chair will report to the Partnership in future.

In response to Ken Blackwood's question, Jill Hodges advised that a request for termly key stage outcome data from all schools has been introduced and the lead adviser will analyse the data to identify those schools at risk of underperforming and the nature and success of interventions put in place. Schools had been asked for progress data at the end of the summer term to enable analysis but only 75% of school replied.

lan Yapp asked whether conversations had been had regarding the expectations for future cohorts.

David Barber questioned how, in terms of the Pupil Premium when higher and lower funded schools do well in general, the smaller schools in the middle group are being supported. Jill Hodges advised that the analysis undertaken enabled the identification of best practice and how schools can work together more effectively.

In response to a question from Gerry price around Ofsted outcomes and key stage outcomes, Jill Hodges explained the information given was for official Ofsted judgements which may have been given two or three years ago whereas the key stage outcomes were from summer 2015 and so current, therefore there could be a mismatch.

RESOLVED -

That the Partnership noted the contents of the report.

657: PEER REVIEW

Report prepared by: Jill Hodges (Assistant Director – Education and Skills)

Purpose of report: to share the ADCS letter regarding the findings of the Peer Challenge activity in the region.

Pete Dwyer thanked everyone for their involvement in the review and advised that three day events will be taking place on collaboration.

RESOLVED -

That the Partnership noted the contents of the report.

658: TASK AND FINISH GROUP REQUEST

The Key, a national organisation, has approached the LA with a proposal to offer advice and support to all school leaders and governors in the county. Pete Dwyer is seeking volunteers to form a task and finish group to consider



15 October 2015 - Item 1.3

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 16 September 2015

the proposal and associated costs from The Key and then make a recommendation to the Partnership.

659: DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

2015 North Yorkshire Education Partnership Meeting Dates Thursday 15 October 2015 North Yorkshire Education Partnership Meeting Dates To be proposed at the October meeting.

Jayne Laver

17 September 2015



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015
Title of report:	Proposed Meeting Dates 2016
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	To propose the following dates for the North Yorkshire Education Partnership to meet during 2016.
Budget / Risk implications:	N/A
Recommendations:	That the Partnership agree the proposed dates.
Voting requirements:	Schools and non-schools
Appendices: To be attached	N/A
Report originator and contact details:	Jayne Laver – Clerk to the NYEP Tel: 01609 534416 E-mail: jayne.laver@northyorks.gov.uk
Presenting officer: If not the originator	



15 October 2015 - Item 1.5

Proposed Meeting Dates 2016

The following dates are proposed for meetings of the Education Partnership Board in 2016:

- 1. Thursday 28 January
- 2. Wednesday 9 March
- 3. Thursday 26 May
- 4. Thursday 15 September
- 5. Thursday 20 October
- Venue:The Grand Meeting Room, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AETime:13:00/14:00 to 16:30

PETE DWYER Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



Early Years Improvement Partnership

Summary

The Early Years Improvement Partnership brings together representatives from the maintained (schools), private and voluntary sector to approve and monitor progress of the Early Years Improvement Plan, review outcomes for pupils at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage (end of the reception year), review outcomes of Ofsted inspections for Childminders, Early Years Providers and for Early Years within school inspections, and identify appropriate sources of support.

The EYIP has the additional function of serving as a consultative body regarding the implementation of policy changes with respect to Early Years and issues relating to funding which are brought to the Education Partnership for approval. The current issue which is of concern to all involved in early years is the proposal to introduce 30 hours of free early education and childcare for children of working parents from 2017, with "early implementation" from September 2016.

End of key stage results and analysis:

North Yorkshire is broadly in line with the national average for the percentage of children achieving a good level of development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile at the end of Reception.

% children achieving a good level of development	North Yorkshire	National	Difference
2014	60.9	60.2	+0.7
2015	66.5	66.1	+0.4
Change	+5.6	+5.9	

Comparison with other LAs for the percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development in 2014:

National	Rank 57	out of 150
Yorkshire and Humberside	Rank 6	out of 15
Statistical neighbours	Rank 7	out of 11
U		



North Yorkshire outcomes for disadvantaged and SEN pupils placed the county in the bottom third of LAs in 2014.

Detailed analysis of "the gap" between pupils eligible for the Early Years Pupil premium and their peers is currently being carried out and will be reported to the next EYIP. This will include identification of pockets where the where the "gap" is significant.

2015 outcomes for comparison with other LAs will be available by mid October, and for pupils grouped by characteristic by late November.

Ofsted outcomes

The percentage of settings and childminders judged to be good or outstanding by Ofsted are consistently above the national average. The most recently published data which provides a national comparator shows that:-87% of settings were good or outstanding, 7% above national.

84% of settings were good of outstanding, 7% above national.

84% of childminders were good or outstanding, 4% above national.

There have been no published Ofsted outcomes during the first weeks of the academic year.

Priorities of the Improvement Partnership for 15-16

The over-arching aim is to improve outcomes for all children throughout the Early Years Foundation Stage and to increase the number of good or outstanding providers, including schools, settings and childminders.

Priorities of the Early Years Improvement Partnership Plan:

To build capacity for consistent pedagogical leadership throughout the sector and the county, by investing in high quality training for Early Years Lead teachers and practitioners, Childminder champions, Specialist leaders of education and CYPS staff.



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (i)

Report from the Early Years Improvement Partnership

To use that increased capacity to support the development of strong reflective practice within clusters in localities, recognising the diversity of communities and provision across the County.

To articulate a shared vision to focus on learning at all levels, from babies with their treasure baskets, toddlers in the sand pit through to strategic leaders developing new ways of joint working, by focussing on the development of the characteristics of effective learning (engagement, motivation and thinking.) To make purposeful use of data to ensure that resources are targeted to meet

identified needs and that impact can be measured.

Key activity, resources and impact.

Key activity for this financial year:

Increase the number of Early Years Lead Teachers and Practitioners, with regard to the geographic distribution and/or capacity to travel.

Commission training for Lead Teachers, Practitioners, SLEs, Childminder Champions and CYPS staff in "Pedagogical Mediation" (Centre for Research in Early Childhood).

To offer training focussed on "getting to good" and "good to outstanding".

Commission training in use of the "ECERS-E" scales (Early Childhood Rating Scale Curricular extension) as precursor to developing use of the SSTEW scales (Sustained Shared Thinking and Emotional Wellbeing) Lead practitioners will the be able to support schools and settings for self-evaluation and improvement planning

Distribute funding to "closing the gap" clusters led by Early Years advisers to focus on activity identified through local data analysis, with the aim of addressing specific needs, closing the gap between the attainment of children eligible for the Early Years Pupil Premium and their peers.

Resources:

Systems and protocols for allocating the budget are being developed and will be applied at the next meeting of the EYIP. Allocation to date includes:



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (i)

Report from the Early Years Improvement Partnership

Maintaining the Early Years lead teacher and practitioners	£50,000
Pedagogical mediation training	£15,000
Good –outstanding /getting to good	£ 4,000
(tbc depending on venue costs)	
Closing the gap locality projects	£ 4,200
Impact:	
The impact will be evaluated with regard to pupil and Ofstee	d outcomes, feedback
from participants at training events and in relation to the stra	ategic aims of the
partnership.	-



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (ii)

Report from the Primary Improvement Partnership

Primary Improvement Partnership

Summary

The first meeting took place on 16th September 2015 at County Hall.

All board members committed to maintaining trust and confidentiality; to work on behalf of all primary-aged children in North Yorkshire and to support the improvement of every primary school.

Work has commenced on the first draft of the improvement plan for discussion at the next meeting on 21st October.

Priorities for action from the 2015 performance information for schools include: Mathematics and EGPS at KS2

Phonics in KS1

Outcomes and progress of vulnerable groups; particularly SEN and FSM6 Outcomes for more able pupils at the end of KS2

The Board will also be looking at the impact of the new Ofsted inspection framework. Task and finish groups have been set up to examine the format of the network meetings for headteachers and how we use support plans in Requires Improvement schools.

The refreshed school improvement strategy and levels of support for schools was discussed. Priority 1,2 and 3 schools will be looked at in detail on 21.10.15. A budgetary plan will also be looked at on 21.10.15.

End of key stage results and analysis

Phonics:

% Working at expected level	North Yorkshire	National	Difference	North Yorkshire	National	Difference
	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1 & 2 combined	Year 1 & 2 combined	Year 1 & 2 combined
2014	71	74	-3	88	89	-1
2015	73	77	-4	89	90	-1

2015 comparison with other LAs for the percentage of pupils working at the expected level in Phonics at the end of year 1:

National	130 (103 at end of year 2)	out of 150
Yorkshire and Humberside	10	out of 15
Statistical neighbours	11	out of 11



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (ii)

Report from the Primary Improvement Partnership

Key stage 1:

	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
Tests	% r	eading	j 2+	%	writing	g 2+	% ma	% mathematics 2+		%	science	2+
2014	90	90	=	89	86	+3	93	92	+1	93	91	+2
2015	91	90	+1	89	88	+1	94	93	+1	94	91	+3

Key stage 2:

North Yorkshire attainment in the headline figure of reading, writing and mathematics level 4+ combined (RWM 4+) has improved by 2 percentage points, but remains slightly below the national average. Expected progress is in line with national for reading and writing, but 3 percentage points below average in mathematics.

	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
Tests	%	RWM	4+	% Reading 4+		% mathematics 4+			% EGPS 4+			
2014	77	78	-1	88	88	=	84	85	-1	74	76	-2
2015	79	80	-1	89	89	=	85	87	-2	76	80	-4

	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	
	% rea	ding 2+	levels	% wr	iting 2+	levels	% mathematics 2+			
	of progress			0	f progre	SS	levels of progress			
2014	91	91	=	93	93	=	88	89	-1	
2015	91	91	=	94	94	=	87	90	-3	

Comparison with other LAs for the percentage of pupils attaining RWM 4+.

National	89	out of 150
Yorkshire and Humberside	4	out of 15
Statistical neighbours	8	out of 11

From 2016, the new national standard will be broadly equivalent to 'a good level 4' or RWM 4b+. Without an increase in the proportion of pupils who end key stage 2 with higher attainment this will present a significant challenge to schools in North Yorkshire. Outcomes for RWM 4b+ were 2 percentage points below national in both 2014 and 2015. Likewise, outcomes at RWM 5+ were below average. These results were limited largely by mathematics, although the percentage of pupils attaining Writing at level 5+ was also 1 percentage point below average.

	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
Tests	%	RWM 4	4b+	C	% RWM 5+		% Reading 4b+			% mathematics 4b+		
2014	65	67	-2	23	24	-1	74	76	-2	73	76	-3
2015	67	69	-2	23	24	-1	80	80	=	74	77	-3

Key stage 2 – closing the gap

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils have again improved, leading to an increase of 9 percentage points from to 54% to 63% over the last three years. Because outcomes for other pupils have improved at a slower rate, the gap has narrowed by 4 percentage points in the same period, from 24% to 20%.



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (ii)

Report from the Primary Improvement Partnership

% RWM 4+	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
Keypas figures	FSM6	FSM6	FSM6	Other	Other	Other	Gap	Gap	Gap
2014	60	67	-7	81	83	-2	21	16	5% wider
2015	63			83			20		

Significant changes to accountability measures and statutory assessment arrangements – both tests and teacher assessment - at key stages 1 and 2

In summer 2016, statutory assessment returns will not be based on national curriculum levels. Instead, test results at both key stage 1 and 2 will be reported as new scaled scores, with 100 representing the national standard. Interim teacher assessment arrangements for 2015/16 require teachers to return one of three judgments (at/below/working at greater depth) for aspects which are included in the accountability measures; reading, writing and mathematics at key stage 1 and writing at key stage 2.

In summer 2016, some schools will participate in a pilot phonics recheck for year 3 pupils who were not working at the expected standard by the end of year 2.

Ofsted outcomes (1.9.15 and 1.10.15)

The new Ofsted single inspection framework came into effect from September 2015, with inspections commencing on 23rd September. There have been no published inspection reports for primary schools in North Yorkshire this academic year.

1	85	85
9.5	85	85
5	0	0
9.14	1.9.15	1.10.15
)	84	84
7	84	84
	0	0
). 	5).14	.5 85 5 0 9.14 1.9.15 84 84



Priorities of the Improvement Partnership for 15-16

To be confirmed at the next meeting on 21.10.15.

Key activity, resources and impact Improvement Plan to be confirmed at the next meeting on 21.10.15.

PETE DWYER Corporate Director - Children & Young People's Service



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015			
Title of report:	Secondary Improvement Partnership			
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision / discussion / information only			
Executive summary: Including reason for submission				
Budget / Risk implications:				
Recommendations:				
Voting requirements:	Schools members only / Schools and non-schools			
Appendices: To be attached				
Report originator and contact	Mr R Pritchard			
details:	Headteacher, St John Fisher Catholic High School			
	Harrogate			
Presenting officer: If not the originator				



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iii)

Report from the Secondary Improvement Partnership

Secondary Improvement Partnership

Summary

The Secondary Improvement Partnership Board brings together representatives from secondary schools from five broad areas of the county, including both maintained and academy schools, and the LA. Following a detailed analysis of the challenges currently facing secondary schools in North Yorkshire, the identified priorities and actions are focused on addressing barriers to improvement in both the short and the longer term. Crucially there is an urgent need to build the capacity for increasing school to school support at all levels, but particularly at leadership level.

End of key stage results and analysis (include comparisons with other LAs, statistical neighbours, national, improvements, decline).

Key stage 4: The national averages are not public until 15th October, but it is likely that North Yorkshire will maintain the historic position of being within the top 25% of LAs for the percentage of students attaining 5 GCSEs A*-C including English and mathematics.

2015 results are taken from the DfE performance tables checking exercise and are expected to improve following the inclusion of remarks and amendments by schools. 2014 results are from validated DfE performance tables.

	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
First	Ŭ	% 5 A*CE	М	% English 3+ levels of			% maths 3+ levels of		
entry				progress			progress		
2014	61.0	56.6	+4.4	69.8	71.6	-1.8	68.3	65.5	+2.8
2015	61.2			70.9			71.9		

Provisional outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in North Yorkshire have improved for both attainment and progress, with the result that gaps between these pupils and others have narrowed.



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iii)

Report from the Secondary Improvement Partnership

The provisional attainment gap has narrowed by 3% from 33% to 30%. Indicative national data for 2015 suggests that this will mean North Yorkshire's gap will have improved from 6% wider than the national to less than 3% wider than the national.

% 5A*CEM	NY	Nat	Diff	NY	Nat	Diff
First entry	Disadvantaged	Disadvantaged		Other	Other	
2014	33.3	36.5	-3.2	66.4	64	-2.6
2015	36			66.3		

Key stage 5: The national averages are not public until 15th October, but it is likely that North Yorkshire will retain the historic position of being within the top 20% of LAs for the points per entry at A level and other academic qualifications.

Points per entry (Academic)	North Yorkshire	National	Difference	
2014	214.8	211.3	+3.5	
2015	213.6			

Significant changes to accountability measures at both key stages are influencing the way schools are considering examination entries and achievement.

From 2016 the key measure of school performance will be Progress 8 - based on progress across 8 subjects, with an emphasis on the traditional academic subjects of English, mathematics, science, humanities and modern foreign languages.

From 2016 post-16 accountability measures will be more clearly split between A level and vocational, and more prominence will be given to destinations, retention and post-16 resits of English and mathematics for pupils who did not attain at least grade C at the end of year 11.

Ofsted outcomes (01.09.14 to 01.10.15) Ofsted outcomes (1.9.15 and 1.10.15)



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iii)

Report from the Secondary Improvement Partnership

The new Ofsted single inspection framework came into effect from September 2015, with inspections commencing on 23rd September. There have been no inspections of secondary schools in North Yorkshire this academic year.

Secondary % schools good or outstanding	1.9.14	1.9.15	1.10.15
National	71	75	74
North Yorkshire	68	75	75
Difference	-3	0	+1
Secondary % pupils in good or outstanding	1.9.14	1.9.15	1.10.15
National	75	77	78
North Yorkshire	76	80	81
Difference	+1	+3	+3

Priorities of the Improvement Partnership for 15-16

1. Ensure all secondary schools are good schools

2. Develop leadership capacity, including governance, to promote improvement in secondary schools

3. Develop a recruitment strategy for secondary schools in the LA

5. Close the gap between disadvantaged students and their peers

Key activity, resources and impact

1.

-Allocate targeted support, to a maximum of 15k each, to secondary schools that have had two Ofsted inspection judgements of Requiring Improvement, with a focus on actions to bring about rapid improvement

-Develop QA processes that will ensure support/ funding has rapid impact and is value for money.

-Ensure that subject network meetings (excluding English, Maths and Science provided by the LA) are co-ordinated and meet regularly in areas of the county

- Support the recruitment of a Lead Practitioner for English to work across the secondary schools in the Selby area.

Commission independent research into specific factors that lead to underperformance in North Yorkshire secondary schools

2.

-Members of the Secondary IP Board to meet with Teaching School Alliances (within and beyond North Yorkshire) to assess the capacity to support leadership at all levels in secondary schools across the county

-Allocate funding to up to 5 good and outstanding schools, to develop leadership capacity that can be released to other schools from September 2016

- Support leadership challenges in secondary schools 2015/16 through the appointment of a consultant leader, hosted in one school, who will work across schools facing leadership challenges



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iii)

Report from the Secondary Improvement Partnership

-Provide targeted mentoring and coaching to newly appointed headteachers, particularly headteachers facing challenging circumstances -Provide support to identified governing bodies

3.

-Work with NYCC Recruitment to produce a 'Teachers Working in North Yorkshire' website -Part fund a post for one year within NYCC Recruitment, to focus on improving the breadth and quality of recruitment to North Yorkshire secondary schools: attending national recruitment events at universities, SCITTs etc; recruit in other areas of the UK eg Northern Ireland; work with individual secondary schools giving advice on recruitment practices; oversee the North Yorkshire website.

4.

-Identify and disseminate best practice from North Yorkshire and neighbouring LAs -Use national performance data to pair schools in similar circumstances Align Secondary IP funding with cohort 3 of Wrea Head Trust

Resources

1.

Support for identified schools Maximum 75k Lead Practitioner English 25k (ask for match funding from schools) Subject Network meetings (excluding English and Maths provided by LA) 15k Research : underperforming schools 10k

2.

-Develop leadership capacity 75k

- Appoint a consultant leader 65k (recoup a proportion from schools)

-Support for new headteachers – 10k

-Support for governing bodies - 1200

3.
-Part fund a recruitment post – 25k
-Website – 5k

4.

-Good practice visits to other Las 1k -Pairing schools – 5k -Align with Wrea Head Trust Cohort 3

Impact

Draft school to school support protocols have been developed, to be approved by the Secondary Improvement Partnership Board. These clarify expectations, roles and responsibilities, timescales and impact measures to be used when quality assuring the impact of school to school support. Further details to be included in the next report.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director - Children and Young People's Service



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iv)

Report from the Special School Improvement Partnership

EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP MEETING ON THURSDAY 15TH October 2015

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP

SUMMARY

The Special School Improvement Partnership has recently being established and has met on one occasion. The Chair of the Partnership has yet to be secured although it is hoped that this will be resolved in the near future.

END OK KEY STAGE RESULTS

The information below provides aggregated information regarding the performance of children attending the 10 special schools in North Yorkshire.

Context

Pupils in 9 LA maintained and 1 academy special schools:

Early Years (N1, N2 and R):	25
Primary (Years 1- 6):	197
Secondary (Years 7-11):	360
Post-16 (Years 12-14):	114
Total pupil numbers:	696

The numbers of pupils on roll varies with 70 pupils as average. Two schools are noticeably larger than most: Mowbray School (150) and Forest School (110). Forest Moor is currently the smallest with 23 pupils on roll.

All special schools have pupils at the end of key stage 2 and key stage 4. 6 have pupils in EYFS, key stage 1 and post-16. Only Brooklands, The Dales School, Springhead and Springwater have pupils of all ages from EYFS to post-16.

Early Years Foundation Stage Profile:

% achieving a good level of	National all	North Yorkshire all	North Yorkshire special	North Yorkshire P scales at Special Schools
development 2015	66.1	66.5	0 (out of 15 pupils)	n/a

Key stage 1:

Results were submitted for 20 pupils, from 6 schools. None of the pupils were assessed as being at level 2 or above in any of reading, writing, mathematics or science. P scale results are illustrated below but it should be noted that P scales are not available in all subjects and hence the numbers do not always tally.



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iv)

Report from the Special School Improvement Partnership

2015 Number of pupils in 6 schools combined	P1i-P3ii	P4-P5	P6-P8
English	5	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	1	n/a	n/a
Reading	n/a	11	3
Writing	n/a	13	1
Number	n/a	9	3
Science	12	6	1

Key stage 2:

Results were submitted for 55 children in 10 schools. Only 3 schools had pupils who were assessed as working within the national curriculum: Brompton Hall, Forest Moor and Mowbray.

2015 Number of pupils in 10 schools combined	P1i- P3ii	P4-P5	P6-P8	Below level of test	L2 test	L3 test	L4 test
English	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	2	n/a	n/a	47	1	6	
Reading	n/a	10	21	52		1	1
Writing	n/a	14	16	0	7	7	
Number	n/a	7	21				
Science	7	6	15				

Key stage 4

Confirmed results are yet available for 2015.

In 2014, 95 students were recorded at the end of Year 11. Students from 4 schools are recorded as achieving at least one GCSE A*-G result: Brompton Hall, Forest, Forest Moor and Mowbray Schools.

GCSE results were only available for 3 of those 95 young people, two achieved C+ in mathematics, 1 achieved C+ in English. No students achieved 5 or more GCSE level qualifications.

New assessments

Summer 2015 was the last year in which national curriculum levels could be awarded. From 2016 the "national standard" will be increased to become similar to



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iv)

Report from the Special School Improvement Partnership

the old level 4b. This means that no pupils in North Yorkshire special schools would have met the national standard if it had applied in 2015.

From 2016 pupils will be awarded scaled scores from tests. A score of 100 will denote the "national standard", in scale which is likely to range between 70 and 130. As with national curriculum levels, many pupils in special schools will not be working within this range. New interim teacher assessment judgements for 2016 at key stage 1 and 2 will identify pupils to be working below/ at/at greater depth within the national standard.

In July 2015, the DfE announced the establishment of an expert group on the assessment of pupils working below the level of the national curriculum (check name of group) and their report is awaited. Early in the academic year 2014/15 it appeared that P scales would continue for use in the future but until the expert group reports there is no certainty about whether or not this is still the case.



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iv)

Report from the Special School Improvement Partnership

Ofsted outcomes (1.9.15 and 1.10.15)

The new Ofsted single inspection framework came into effect from September 2015, with inspections commencing on 23rd September. There have been no published inspection reports for special schools in North Yorkshire this academic year.

Of the 10 maintained special schools, 40% are deemed outstanding, 50% are good and 10% requires improvement.

North Yorkshire LA has responsibility for 10 special schools, but because Ofsted also include Breckenbrough and Springhill the Ofsted outcomes are given for 12 schools as illustrated below.

Special % schools good or outstanding	1.9.14	1.3.15	1.9.15	1.10.15
National	90	89	n/a	n/a
North Yorkshire	92	92 (Forest Moor Inadequate)	92 (Forest Moor RI)	92 (Forest Moor RI)
Difference	+2	+3		
Special % pupils in good or outstanding schools	1.9.14	1.9.15		1.10.15
National	91	92	n/a	n/a
North Yorkshire	98	98	98	98
Difference	+7	+6		



15 October 2015 - Item 2.1 (iv)

Report from the Special School Improvement Partnership

PRIORITIES FOR THE IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP FOR 2015/16

The following areas have been identified as areas for further development in 2015/16

- Sharing of good practice for Self Evaluation and School Development Plans
- Development of a frame work for Challenge Reviews based on current practice in Teaching Alliances
- Develop a registered skills set across the specialist sector to promote capacity building across the sector.
- Audit of professional groups attended by colleagues in special schools and impact
- Professional development of middle leaders and succession planning
- Development of an agreed CPD offer across special schools
- Development of joint lesson observations across the specialist sector

Key Activity, Resource and Impact

Further discussions will; be held at the next meeting in November to develop a comprehensive plan for delivery

Report author: Hanne Barton, Head teacher of the Dales



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015
Title of report:	Report from the Task and Finish Group
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	At the meeting of the Education Partnership in September, The Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Services reported that The Key, a national organisation, had approached the LA with a proposal to offer a website providing information and advice to all school leaders and governors in the county.
	It was agreed that this proposal would be investigated further and that a "task and finish group" would meet with The Key, in a "Discovery Session" to consider the proposal and associated costs and then make a recommendation to the Partnership at its meeting in October.
	This paper seeks endorsement from the Partnership to undertake a procurement exercise and to agree to meet the costs of any product chosen
Budget / Risk implications:	Estimated cost of approximately £250k per annum, with potential short term use of reserves to fund this.
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposals.
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	
Report originator and contact details:	Anton Hodge – Assistant Director
	anton.hodge@northyorks.gov.uk
	01609 532118
Presenting officer: If not the originator	



Report from the Task and Finish Group

1 <u>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT</u>

1.1 This paper provides feedback from a Task and Finish Group with reference to a possible procurement and asks the Partnership to endorse its findings.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Education Partnership in September, The Corporate Director Children and Young People's Services reported that The Key, a national organisation, had approached the LA with a proposal to offer information to all school leaders and governors in the county.
- 2.2 It was agreed that this proposal would be investigated further and that a "task and finish group" would meet with The Key, in a "Discovery Session" to consider the proposal and associated costs and then make a recommendation to the Partnership at its meeting in October.

3 PROGRESS

- 3.1 A meeting was held, with the Key, as part of a procurement discovery session. This was attended by officers and a number of members from the Education Partnership.
- 3.2 It was made clear that the discovery session was being held to look at the principle of buying into such a product and was not around a decision about The Key itself. Such a decision can only be made in line with procurement legislation and this is explained further below. The session would view The Key as being an example of the capabilities of such a product.
- 3.3 Overall, the view of the meeting was that the product has much to recommend itself. It is essentially a one-stop information service that provides school leaders with guidance, insight and instant answers to their questions on all aspects of school leadership and management. With reference to the demonstration by The Key, this information is not in the main produced by the company; it is generally information that is already publicly available. The benefit however of the "one-stop shop" is that it saves time in schools.
- 3.4 The approach by The Key had led to some discussion about how schools in North Yorkshire might benefit from a combined order thus reducing the price paid to The Key or any alternative provider.
- 3.5 It is anticipated that the cost of buying a licence for all schools in North Yorkshire would be in the region of around £250k per annum, although this might be reduced if a guarantee was given for a longer period of time, for example three years.
- 3.6 There are a number of options for funding this, should schools decide to go with such an offer.
- 3.7 Ultimately the cost would have to be picked up through the Schools Budget either individually or through the centrally-managed component, although this would be subject to permission from the Education Partnership and would have to replace a current budget. This is because the amount of funding in the centrally-retained DSG cannot be increased.
- 3.8 Initially however it would be possible to fund the cost for, say, one year from the DSG Reserve and this would give the Partnership some time to evaluate whichever



15 October 2015 - Item 2.3

Report from the Task and Finish Group

product was chosen. It would also be possible to sign an agreement for three years with a break clause after one year should schools choose not to continue with the agreement.

3.9 Such an agreement would include academies as well as LA-maintained schools as both the historic reserve and DSG covers al schools. Colleges who wished to be part of the arrangement, and who are not funded by the DSG, would need to be contribute to the cost.

4 <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

- 4.1 The Education Partnership is asked to recommend that:
 - a. an exercise takes place to procure such a product on behalf of all maintained schools in North Yorkshire (i.e. both LA-maintained and Academies). This exercise will include some members of the Partnership and no final decision will be taken without the agreement of the Chair of The Partnership
 - b. funding from reserves is agreed for the first year of any contract
 - c. funding for subsequent years and the source of this will be agreed, once final costs are known and before any contract is signed
 - d. any agreement includes the ability to review after one year and subsequent authorisation if funding for the chosen product will be dependent on that

PETE DWYER Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service


Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015
Title of report:	School Organisation Update
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	The attached information is a position statement on school organisation as at October 2015.
Budget / Risk implications:	
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposals.
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	
Report originator and contact details:	Suzanne Firth, Strategic Planning Manager suzanne.firth@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 533294
Presenting officer: If not the originator	



School Organisation Update

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The attached information is a position statement on school organisation as at October 2015.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The main aim of school organisation work is to ensure an appropriate number of high quality sustainable school places for all North Yorkshire children, meeting parental preference whenever possible.
- 2.2 School organisation work encompasses all aspects of planning, reviewing and restructuring educational provision. It includes the planning and provision of additional school places, the closure of schools or removal of surplus capacity and the bringing together of schools into federations or amalgamations with the purpose of improving standards or creating sustainable educational structures.
- 2.3 It is undertaken within an increasingly complex framework of County Council policies and national regulation and is driven by a range of policies and issues at national and local level. Increased numbers of Academies and other forms of provision have significantly increased the complexity of place planning.

3 PRINCIPLES

- 3.1 Drawing from the conclusions reached by the 2014 School Improvement Commission and the priorities identified in Young and Yorkshire, the 2014-2017 CYPS plan, and informed by the recent peer review on the School Improvement service it may be helpful to lay out the key principles which underpin school organisation work in North Yorkshire.
 - The aim to have all pupils attending a good or outstanding school or setting;
 - An expectation that all schools will be working in partnership with other schools;
 - A recognition of the importance of schools to community life, particularly in rural areas, but also an acknowledgement that it is not always right to retain schools where they cannot sustainably deliver a high quality of education;
 - An acknowledgement that the viability of schools should relate not only to their financial sustainability but also the need to ensure that schools can offer both the required breadth of curriculum and the social experiences which children need;
 - An acknowledgement that removing transitions between different organisations can benefit learners through continuity and familiarity;
 - A recognition of the importance of strong school leadership and governance in creating strong stable schools;
 - A recognition of the importance of being able to recruit and retain the best teachers and leaders;
 - A respect for the diversity of provision and for parental choice;
 - An open approach to new models of delivery;



School Organisation Update

4 CURRENT CONTEXT

- 4.1 North Yorkshire faces an unprecedented situation with a growing primary school population largely concentrated in towns combined with some rural parts of the County where numbers are still declining. In the coming years the growth in pupil numbers will feed into the secondary sector which is currently facing in many places its lowest pupil rolls for a decade. Post 16 numbers will continue to decline for the next couple of years.
- 4.2 This volatile demographic position means that at the same time as implementing a programme of school expansions and opening new school sites it is necessary to address the challenges faced by a significant number of very small schools, both primary and secondary.
- 4.3 The current school funding arrangements are likely to be challenging for all schools in coming years and there will need to be a proactive approach to creating sustainable structures in areas where schools are struggling with combinations of low numbers, challenging finances, difficulties recruiting and retaining staff and governors and declining educational standards.
- 4.4 A further challenge is created through the increasing fragmentation of the system with many schools considering academy conversion or being encouraged to convert if considered to be failing or coasting. A number of schools in North Yorkshire are now in or actively considering joining Multi Academy Trusts. Planning and making changes to the pattern of provision in this context is complex. Increasingly making changes to provision involves negotiation with autonomous governing bodies.

5 CREATING ADDITIONAL PLACES

- 5.1 The total number of primary applications for entry into Reception in September 2015 was 6456, almost 10% higher than last year's cohort of 5,909. In spite of growing pupil numbers, this year 94% of parents or carers of primary age children secured their first school preference in North Yorkshire. This is the same as last year and is a higher proportion than most other places in the country. Almost 98% of all applicants were allocated a place at one of their preferred schools. At the time of writing all children in North Yorkshire had received the offer of a place for September. This demonstrates that place planning to date has been successful in ensuring the availability of school places.
- 5.2 However, one of the key strategic issues which will continue to affect school organisation in North Yorkshire over the next few years will be the growth in demand for primary school places as a result of population growth, housing development and major army re-basing plans. We will only be able to continue to meet our statutory duty to provide sufficient places if we continue to invest in expanding schools or building new ones.
- 5.3 A £58m capital investment programme was approved by the Executive on 30 September 2014 which will provide up to 1,700 additional places.
- 5.4 There are 23 capital projects in development at present which are on track to deliver a total of 1,665 additional places by September 2017. This includes the development of two new school sites and some major expansions, as well as some smaller scale



School Organisation Update

school expansions. One, at Staynor Hall in Selby, will be the first wholly new sponsored academy to be built in North Yorkshire but others are likely to follow in Northallerton, Thirsk, Harrogate, Catterick and Norton.

- 5.5 There are a further 21 potential projects identified where initial options and feasibility assessments are being undertaken. This includes a number of further new school sites arising from major housing and some large scale expansions. A further £1.04m of Basic Need funding has been allocated to North Yorkshire for 2017/18. It is intended during the Autumn term to review the programme and to roll it forward for a further year. Approval will be sought from members in due course to future investments. Priorities are likely to exceed the current availability of capital funding.
- 5.6 Executive Members have been briefed on the particular volatility of provision in the Catterick area where a review of primary provision has been initiated. Other hotspots are Harrogate town, Knaresborough and Norton/Malton.
- 5.7 Table 1 below provides an updated summary of places required up to September 2018 by primary planning area which shows where the key areas of growth are in North Yorkshire. The position is being monitored closely as it is very sensitive to the speed with which particular housing developments advance. The level of planning applications for new housing has reached an unprecedented level compared to recent years. Multiple negotiations are in train to secure developer contributions through s106 or Community Infrastructure Levy funding. CIL creates a risk that contributions to education infrastructure will be more difficult to secure in future than has been the case in the past.

Table 1: Forecast of potential shortfalls in primary school places to September 2018.



15 October 2015 - Item 3.1

School Organisation Update

		By Sept	By Sept	By Sept	By Sept
		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
8151301	, ,	46	83	110	118
8151302		10	38	39	66
	Bedale Outer Area				
8151304	Boroughbridge				
	Boroughbridge Outer Area				
8151306	Catterick Garrison		3	54	125
8151307	Catterick Outer Area				
8151308	Easingwold		6	29	58
8151309	Easingwold Outer Area				
8151310	Filey				
8151311	Filey Outer Area				
8151312	Harrogate Outer Area				
8151313	Harrogate Urban Central				
8151314	Harrogate Urban East	51	70	91	133
8151315	Harrogate Urban West	177	219	262	301
8151316	Knaresborough	62	76	101	134
8151317	Knaresborough Outer Area				
	Malton & Norton	53	119	160	204
	Malton & Norton Outer Area				
8151320		33	36	39	39
	Nidderdale Outer Area		-	-	
	North Craven Outer Area				
	North Ryedale		7	25	57
	North Ryedale Outer Area		-		
	Northallerton		37	78	127
	Northallerton Outer Area				
	Pateley Bridge				
8151328				37	74
	Ripon Outer Area				, ,
	Scarborough Central				
	Scarborough North	83	108	153	199
	Scarborough Outer Area	05	100	155	155
	Scarborough South				
8151334			67	130	179
		21	43	64	83
	Selby Outer Area North	21	43	04	63
	Selby Outer Area South		6	20	24
8151337		62	6	20	24
	Sherburn	62	120	166	192
	Sherburn Outer Area				5
8151340	-				11
	Skipton Outer Area				
	South Craven				14
	South Craven Outer Area				21
	Stokesley				
	Stokesley Outer Area				
	Swaledale				
	Swaledale Outer Area				
	Tadcaster				
	Tadcaster Outer Area	1	4	8	18
8151350	Thirsk	3	60	83	123
8151351	Thirsk Outer Area				
	Wensleydale				
8151353	Wensleydale Outer Area				
8151354	Whitby				
8151355	Whitby Outer Area				
	Shortfall of places	602	1102	1649	2305
	Planning areas	12	18	19	23

5.8 In time this growth will feed through into secondary school places. At present the only two areas showing potential shortfalls are Knaresborough and Boroughbridge both of which attract students from neighbouring catchment areas in significant



School Organisation Update

numbers. The position will continue to be monitored and where additional secondary places are required discussions will be initiated with schools and academies about expansion.

5.9 The position in Harrogate will be affected by the rebuilding of Harrogate High School on a significantly smaller footprint with a reduced capacity. The ability of Academies to admit above their admission number and to expand their size and/or age range will impact on the number of places available as will any government approved provision such as UTCs, studio schools or free schools.

6. CHALLENGES FACING SMALL SCHOOLS

- 6.1 North Yorkshire has a relatively high number of small schools compared to other local authorities. This has long been identified as one of the 'wicked issues' affecting the organisation of education in this area and was picked up again recently as a theme in the peer review of the school improvement service.
- 6.2 There are a number of very small primary schools (those with fewer than 50 pupils) with declining rolls which continue to be monitored in terms of viability. In the past few years there have been a small number of closures of small primary schools. The County Council has a long history of supporting small schools and will continue to do so where schools are of high quality and where they are necessary to ensure the availability of accessible school places. However, sometimes a school closure is unavoidable and may represent the most appropriate solution to declining numbers and budgets impacting on educational quality. For example, there is a proposal, currently the subject of statutory consultation, to close Farnley Voluntary Aided Church of England School.
- 6.3 The challenges facing small schools are a combination of low pupil rolls, financial viability, difficulties recruiting headteachers and variable educational standards. These factors interact with each other. It is often the schools experiencing a combination of these challenges which are the most vulnerable.
- 6.4 This is not only a challenge for small primary schools but also for smaller secondary schools. Funding arrangements are creating a particular challenge for small sixth forms.

7. FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

- 7.1 Officers have previously identified around 50 small schools facing financial challenges largely as a result of their low numbers. A number of these were facing deficit balances within the next two years and some were only avoiding that position because of sparsity funding and the effect of the minimum funding guarantee.
- 7.2 Having recently reviewed the position of these schools it can be seen that:
 - one school has since closed
 - four schools are still either currently in a deficit position or are likely to be so by March 2016.
 - a further eleven schools are likely to be in a deficit position by March 2017
 - a further ten will be in deficit by March 2018.



School Organisation Update

- Of the original group of schools 21 will retain a positive balance during the period to March 2018 although there are six of these that are relying on high levels of minimum funding guarantee.
- 7.3 In addition to this there are a further 17 very small schools (those with less than 36 pupils) which were not included in the original evaluation which are now likely to be in a deficit position by March 2018. Many of these are schools which were previously maintaining a positive financial position through having large balances even in the face of very low rolls.
- 7.4 Not all very small school schools have faced immediate financial difficulties. A number have been protected from a deficit position as a result of the minimum funding guarantee and/or the operation of the sparsity factor. Others have been relying on revenue balances carried forward acting as a buffer. However some of these balances are now reaching the point of exhaustion and these schools will face deficits in the coming years.
- 7.5 These schools will need, with the support of the local authority, to seek solutions to their financial vulnerability. Governors will need to consider carefully how they can balance the books through reducing costs. In some cases the local authority and/or governors may conclude that a school should close. In other cases it could be that creating larger more sustainable structures which can benefit from economies of scale could be an appropriate solution.

8. QUALITY OF SMALLER SCHOOLS

- 8.1 Of the 54 'very small' schools in North Yorkshire (those with rolls at or below 35 pupils) nine of them (17%) are outstanding and 35 (65%) are good. Many small schools are offering a good quality of education even in the face of low numbers and challenged finances. There is, however, considerable variability between them in terms of KS2 results. Solutions for small schools therefore need to take account of the quality of what is on offer now and whether that is likely to continue to be the case in the future.
- 8.2 The concern is always that as numbers reduce alongside budgets the school's ability to deliver a broad educational and social experience for children diminishes. Schools with poor Ofsted judgements or below average outcomes may rapidly become unpopular with parents, creating a downward spiral of falling rolls, reducing budgets and a struggle to retain good leaders and to make improvements. This spiral can operate in the reverse direction when standards are seen to improve.

9. SUPPORTING COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS

9.1 Experience with the first wave of collaborations between schools is indicating that informal collaborations which retain individual governing bodies at each school are unlikely to be a long term means of sustaining small schools. They create a significant challenge for shared Headteachers accountable to multiple governing bodies. Federation or other structural solutions are now viewed as a more secure and sustainable structure for small schools and are being encouraged as a starting rather than an end point for discussions between schools.





School Organisation Update

- 9.2 Where schools want or need to collaborate with others there is support available from the local authority in the form of guidance and toolkits to help governors and school leaders explore these options. Local Authority officers help to broker these discussions and to advise on collaboration and federation processes.
- 9.3 The Strategic Planning section within CYPS is the first point of contact on all school organisation issues and as a result of increased activity in this area has recruited an additional Strategic Planning Officer to ensure that this and other school organisation work can continue to be prioritised over the next few years. Officers from the Education and Skills team, HR, Governors' Support team and Finance are also significantly involved in this work and these teams have been similarly strengthened as restructuring has taken place to support schools with their collaboration work.
- 9.4 A series of Partnership Events took place in September with a particular focus on small rural primary schools to ensure the school leaders are aware of the advice and support available to them in considering structural change. These events were supported by speakers both from within North Yorkshire and beyond from school leaders involved in successful collaborations within a variety of different models. The learning from these events is being considered with a view to sharing it more widely with those schools that were unable to attend.
- 9.5 In the last few years there have been a number of Federation proposals where groups of two or three schools have consulted upon formal federation. In many cases this was the formalisation of earlier collaboration and shared leadership agreements.
- 9.6 The particular challenges faced by small sixth forms means that there may need to be creative collaborative structures to ensure the sustainability of Post 16 provision. A number of such discussions are now taking place.

10. REMOVING TRANSITIONS

- 10.1 There has been a longstanding recognition that transitions between educational establishments can result in dips in educational attainment. As a result schools which do not offer the full primary or secondary age range have been vulnerable in terms of their outcomes and Ofsted judgements.
- 10.2 In the last two years a number of school amalgamations have been undertaken including the amalgamation of three pairs of infant and junior schools in Scarborough (Gladstone Road, Barrowcliff and Braeburn) and the amalgamation of secondary middle/upper schools in Whitby and Northallerton. These have predominantly been a response to school standards issues but exacerbated by financial issues, pupil numbers and leadership concerns.
- 10.3 There are 15 remaining infant and junior schools where standards are being monitored and where amalgamation may be an appropriate response to issues at these schools.



School Organisation Update

11. SPECIAL SCHOOLS

- 11.1 The review of services for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities will lead in time to a review to the pattern of school provision which may involve structural change. This might also encompass a review of the enhanced mainstream provisions as well as special schools and pupil referral services.
- 11.2 There are signs that pupil numbers in special schools are starting to grow which may have an impact on accommodation. No Basic Need funding is available from government to address shortfalls in special school accommodation so this would have to be locally resourced.

12. ACADEMY CONVERSION

- 12.1 The majority of North Yorkshire schools remain maintained by the local authority. The local authority works with all schools regardless of category to ensure the statutory duty for the provision of school places is met and to ensure that the quality of school places is good or outstanding. Support is also given to new providers to ensure the smooth integration of new provision with existing e.g. Scarborough UTC.
- 12.2 As at 1 August 2015 there were 25 Academies in North Yorkshire (10 secondary, 13 primary, 1 special and 1 alternative provision) with a further four which were expected to convert by October 2015. We are aware of a further small number of schools at various stages of considering conversion. Increasingly these conversions are in the form of multi-academy trusts (MATs). This reflects a growing national view that standalone convertors are more vulnerable due to their isolation.
- 12.3 New legislation is being brought forward by the DfE in the form of the Education and Adoption Bill which would allow rapid intervention by the Secretary of State into schools which are considered to be coasting. As yet this term has not been fully defined but is expected to reflect a school's performance over a number of years. This is likely to see a considerable number of further academy conversions unless sound local solutions are identified quickly to address poor performance.
- 12.4 However, recent experience has shown that there is a shortage of strong sponsors and on occasions those that are available are reluctant to take on schools which they consider to be unviable leaving the local authority continuing to need to take strategic decisions with schools about their future.

13 <u>Recommendations</u>

13.1 The Partnership is asked to note the contents of this report.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015
Title of report:	School Funding 2016-17
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	Changes are proposed for 2016/17 to the split site factor and pre-opening costs for a new primary school. It is also proposed to continue to weight the results from the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile when calculating the prior attainment funding for primary schools.
Budget / Risk implications:	
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposals.
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	
Report originator and contact details:	Helen Coulthard – Head of Finance Schools and Projects helen.coulthard@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 532102
Presenting officer: If not the originator	



School Funding 2016-17

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The paper on School Funding 2016/17, presented to the Partnership at the last meeting, identified two areas that were to be subject to further work and proposals brought back to this meeting for a decision. The two areas are split site funding and primary prior attainment data.
- 1.2 A third area relating to the pre-opening costs for the new school at Staynor Hall has been identified since the last meeting and a proposal to amend the funding criteria is included in this report.

2 SPLIT SITE FACTOR

- 2.1 A Split Site factor was incorporated into North Yorkshire's school funding formula for 2015-16. The criteria to qualify for this factor are:
 - Sites are separated by a public highway OR
 - Sites are more than 200 metres apart via the shortest walking route between the closest access entrances
 - Classroom teaching and learning must take place on all sites
 - Separate sixth forms, early years provision or sports facilities are not eligible
 - Federated schools who each receive individual school budget shares are not eligible
 - The creation of any new split site school will require prior agreement with the LA to ensure it is unavoidable in delivering core education
- 2.2 For schools meeting the above criteria the funding is £50k for a primary school and £100k for a secondary school.
- 2.3 The rationale for the funding is based on a school operating on two sites, we now have a secondary school operating on three sites and therefore need to consider how the split site factor should operate for a school operating on more than two sites.
- 2.4 For another site to be considered eligible for the split site factor it must still meet the criteria set out in 2.1.
- 2.5 Table 1 shows the results of the cost analysis undertaken with the school operating on three sites.

	Current Allocation	Comments re relevance to a 3 rd site	Proposed allocation for a 3 rd site
Loss of teaching time/leadership time	£50k	The lost teaching time and leadership time does not automatically increase with the addition of a 3 rd site. An analysis of the cost	£0k

Table 1



15 October 2015 - Item 4.1

School Funding 2016-17

		implications on teaching time concluded that £50k is a sufficient contribution towards these costs across all 3 sites	
Additional admin & reception	£20k	3 receptions and associated admin duties	£20k
Additional kitchen	£15k	3 kitchens, additional costs re MSA, kitchen supervisors and economies of scale	£15k
Additional caretaking/site manager	£10k	Operating with 4 caretakers, 2 site managers and 3 cleaning supervisors	£10k
Miscellaneous costs	£5k	Includes additional office equipment, waste collection, 2 libraries etc	£5k
TOTAL	£100k		£50k

- 2.6 As well as undertaking the above analysis we reviewed other Local Authorities' split site factors. Some Local Authorities have included a criteria for schools operating on more than two sites, although the majority have not. For those other Local Authorities that have, the methodology used, ranged from allocating the same lump sum value again for an additional site to values ranging from 75% 25% of the original lump sum.
- 2.7 It is therefore proposed that for a school operating on more than two sites, for each additional site, 50% of the full lump sum is allocated. If this were to be introduced for 2016/17 financial year there would be no additional overall cost associated with the split site factor as one of the secondary schools currently in receipt of the split site lump sum will be operating on one site during 2016/17 and will therefore not be eligible. The net saving for 2016/17 would be £50k.

3. PRIOR ATTAINMENT - PRIMARY

3.1 For 2014/15 and 2015/16 financial years, it was agreed to apply a weighting to the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP). Due to concerns over the robustness of the new EYFSP introduced in Summer 2013, the DfE allowed Local Authorities to weight the Summer 2013 and 2014 data. The new EYFSP identified significantly more children compared to previous years, as not achieving a good level of development. The weighting allowed the number of children counted under the new profile to be adjusted to a level more closely representing the number of children eligible under the old profile.



School Funding 2016-17

3.2 Summer 2015 is the third year of the new EYFSP. 50% of children in Primary schools have now been assessed under the new framework and 50% under the old framework. There still remains a significant variance between the number of children assessed as not reaching a good level of development under the new EYFSP compared to the old profile, albeit the gap is reducing as demonstrated in Table 2 below.

Table 2

	% children in NY not achieving the required level of good development (EY)
Average Summer 2010 – 2012	18%
Summer 2013	56%
Summer 2014	39%
Summer 2015	33%

3.3 If we chose to apply a weighting, this has to be applied to all schools and for all years that the new EYFSP has been in use i.e. September 2013 – 2015. Table 3 summarises the impact of the different options that are available.

Table 3

Options	Value per child not meeting the required level for good development	Total amount to be distributed for Primary Prior Attainment	Comments
Do not weight the results from Summer 2013, 2014, 2015	£300 – funding rate per child reduced to ensure the total amount distributed remains the same	£3.9M (same level as 2015- 16)	This creates some significant turbulence for individual schools, particularly schools where their results have not fluctuated as a result of introducing the new EYFSP. It also disadvantages Junior schools and benefits Infant



15 October 2015 - Item 4.1

School Funding 2016-17

			schools. The largest loss for any individual school is £33k and the largest gain is £12k.
Do not weight the results from Summer 2013,2014,2015	£509 as per current funding level for 2015/16	£6.6M	Local and national evidence shows that there hasn't been a significant decrease in children's attainment at EYFS and that the difference is due entirely to the assessment methodology. Therefore there is no evidence to support an increase of £2.7M funding for this factor.
Weight the results from Summer 2013, 2014, 2015	£509 as per current funding level for 2015/16	£3.9M	This continues the methodology adopted in previous financial years and generates the least turbulence for individual schools. It recognises that there continues to be a significant variance between the outcomes under the old and new EYFS assessment. The largest loss for any individual school is £14k and the largest gain is £6k.

3.4 It is recommended that for 2016-17 we continue to weight the results from the new EYFSP and keep the amount per pupil not achieving a good level of development at £509. The EYFSP will be replaced by a new early years baseline from Summer 2016 and this will necessitate a further review of this factor for 2017-18.

4 PRE OPENING COSTS FOR A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL

- 4.1 The Local Authority is responsible for funding the pre- opening costs associated with any new school built to meet basic need requirements, including academies. The methodology for how this funding is calculated is part of the Pupil Growth Funding criteria and has to be approved by both the Education Partnership and the DfE.
- 4.2 The Schools Forum approved the criteria for pre-opening costs in September 2014. This was based on the limited research we had been able to do with other Local



15 October 2015 - Item 4.1

School Funding 2016-17

Authorities and was our best estimate at the time of a reasonable allocation. The agreed amount was £50k and was intended to cover the cost of a Headteacher, Business Manager, Site Manager and administrator for the term prior to opening.

- 4.3 The Local Authority has been working extensively with Ebor Academy Trust who is the sponsor of the new primary school at Staynor Hall which is due to open in September 2016. This has allowed us to explore in more detail the associated costs of opening a new school and whilst we have on the whole agreed that the preopening costs originally identified are valid we have identified a gap in our current allocation.
- 4.4 There is currently no allocation for any teaching time prior to the school opening to do lesson planning and set up teaching environments. It is therefore proposed to increase the allocation for pre-opening costs for a new primary school to £60k. It is noted that Ebor Academy Trust feel that this amount is still unlikely to cover all the pre-opening costs they will incur.
- 4.5 Further information we have been able to obtain from other Local Authorities over the last 12 months, shows that an equivalent allocation of £60k is being used by two other Local Authorities in the Yorkshire and Humberside region.

5 <u>Recommendations</u>

- 5.1 The Partnership is asked:
 - To agree the revision of the split site factor for 2016/17 to incorporate an element for schools operating on more than two sites as set out 2.7
 - To agree that for 2016/17 we weight the EYFSP results for September 13, 14 and 15 and keep the amount per pupil for children not achieving a good level of development as £509.
 - To agree that the amount allocated for pre-opening costs for a new primary school is increased to £60k for 2016/17.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015
Title of report:	School Balances 2014-15
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	The review summarises the position of school balances as at 31st March 2015.
	It compares school balances as at 31st March 2015 with the previous year and summarises the movement in revenue balances between years and between types and sizes of school.
	The position of schools which exceeded the balances control limit and those schools which had a negative revenue balance as at 31st March 2015 are identified.
	Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide a detailed breakdown of the balances position of every maintained school in North Yorkshire.
Budget / Risk implications:	None
Recommendations:	The Partnership is asked to note the position of school balances as at 31st March 2015.
	The Partnership is asked to consider the position of the 3 schools that have exceeded the Balances Control Limit as set out in Appendix 1 and agree the appropriate action to be taken.
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	Appendix 1 – Balance Control Mechanism
Report originator and contact details:	Helen Coulthard – Head of Finance Schools and Projects
	helen.coulthard@northyorks.gov.uk
	Nick Reast – Accounting Technician
	Nick.reast@northyorks.gov.uk
Presenting officer: If not the originator	Helen Coulthard



School Balances 2014-15

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT AND SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper provides information relating to school balances as at **3**1.03.15.
- 1.2 As part of the DfE Consistent Financial Reporting Arrangements all schools are required to analyse their financial year end LMS Balances over 5 different areas. The table below sets out school balances as at March 2015 and March 2014 analysed over the different categories defined by the DfE and also sets out the movement in balances between the two financial years. Whilst this provides a useful overall summary of school balances, the remainder of this report concentrates on Revenue Balances only (Committed, Uncommitted and Community Focused School revenue balances).

<u>Schools</u>

	March 2014	March 2015	Movement
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Committed Revenue Balance	2,425	1,680	- 745
	2,120	1,000	1 10
Uncommitted Revenue			
Balance	25,329	27,239	1,910
Community Focused			
Extended Schools Balances	661	822	161
Total Revenue			
	28,415	29,741	1,326
Devolved Capital Balance			
	2,858	1,583	1,275
Other Capital Balances	1,835	1,123	- 712
	1,000	1,123	112
Total School Balances	33,108	32,447	-661

For comparative purposes the balances shown at March 2014 exclude schools that converted to become Academies during 2014/15.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.2

School Balances 2014-15

Pupil Referral Units

Pupil Referral Unit Revenue	527	983	456
Pupil Referral Unit Capital	16	14	-2
Total PRU Balances	543	997	454

2.0 SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS

2.1 The Revenue Balances at 31 March 2015 are summarised below, together with a comparison with 2014. The balances are also expressed as a percentage of school delegated budgets.

MARCH 2015	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL	PRU	TOTAL
Balances % of Budget	£'000 17,224 11.0%	10,668	£'000 1,848 13.8%	£'000 983 27.0%	£'000 30,723 10.0%
Comparison with 2014 Increase (+) Decrease (-)	+ 2,525	- 1,291	+ 92	+ 456	+ 1,782

2.2 School Revenue Balances have increased by £1.3m from £28.4m to £29.7m. This represents an increase of 4.6% on the 2014 Revenue Balances. This figure now represents 10% of school budgets. The equivalent percentage in 2014 was 9.4%. However, the overall increase masks a drop in revenue balances for secondary schools of £1.3M. This is mainly due to the fact that pupil numbers are still falling in the majority of secondary schools along with the continuing reduction in sixth form funding.

PRU Revenue balances have increased by £0.45m from £0.54m to £0.99m. This represents an increase of 83% on the 2014 Revenue Balances. Further analysis of this will be undertaken as part of the work to look at High Needs resources and pressures for 2016-17 (as set out elsewhere on the agenda).

- 2.3 Further details are shown in **Tables 1 to 4.**
- 2.4. A key feature of the outturn position at March 2015, as in previous years, is that it is significantly better than anticipated at the commencement of the financial year. This trend applies to all types and sizes of schools. Details of the comparison are summarised below.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.2

School Balances 2014-15

2014/15 Projected Balance	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL	TOTAL
Chart Dudret	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Start Budget	11,345	5,820	797	17,962
Actual	17,224	10,668	1,848	29,740
	+ 5,879	+ 4,848	+ 1,051	+ 11,778

Further details of this analysis are provided in the enclosed Table 1.

- 2.6 Schools may have anticipated that balances would reduce to a greater extent as they:-
 - Met the challenges of falling rolls in secondary schools.
 - Responded to the pressure exerted nationally and locally for schools with larger balances to make some reductions.
 - Responded to uncertainty and potential reductions in funding for future years.
 - Responded to the potential impact of NI and Superannuation rises in future years
- 2.7 To address any concerns around budgeting assumptions, these issues now figure prominently in training provided for Heads, Governors and Bursars by the Financial Management for Schools Team.
- 2.8 The average Revenue Balance for all schools is £84,251 compared to £80,439 in 2013/14.

3.0 EXCESSIVE BALANCES

- 3.1 The Balances Control Scheme in North Yorkshire has been relaxed so that it targets only those schools that have particularly excessive balances and are at risk of contravening the limits set by the DfE.
- 3.2 If a school's revenue balance has exceeded 15% for the last 3 years a warning letter is sent asking for an explanation and details of their future spending plans. If the school still has a revenue balance in excess of 15% at the end of the 4th year, this would potentially be clawed back into the central schools block for use by all schools.
- 3.3 The following areas are allowable permitted exceptions:
 - Revenue contribution to capital projects already undertaken or planned for completion within the next financial year (evidence of approval by governors will be required)
 - Community focused extended schools balances (an income and expenditure statement of the community activity will be required)
 - Unused pupil premium. The conditions of the grant allow for any unspent elements to be carried forward to future years, however, as schools are required to report on how they have spent their pupil premium each year and



15 October 2015 - Item 4.2

School Balances 2014-15

the impact it has had, any funding identified as unused pupil premium would need to be consistent with this report.

- 3.4 Schools that manage their Revenue Balances within the permitted percentages will receive a very light touch approach from the Local Authority. It will only be when the school's excess balance exceeds the permitted percentage or where, through ongoing long term budget planning, that the school is looking to go into deficit that officers will become involved.
- 3.5 5 schools received a warning letter in July 2014, of which 3 exceeded the limit at March 2015.

Appendix 1 summarises the position of the 3 schools that exceeded the Balances Control Scheme and contains recommendations and / or options as to how the excess balance should be treated.

4.0 **REVENUE DEFICIT BALANCES**

- 4.1 13 Primary Schools and 3 Secondary Schools had negative revenue balances as at 31st March 2015, a total of 16 schools compared to 18 schools as at 31st March 2014.
- 4.2 11 of these schools had a Licensed Deficit Agreement of which 8 schools have a plan in place to return to surplus by March 16. The remaining 3 schools have a recovery plan in place which should enable them to return to a surplus balance within the next 3/5 years.
- 4.3 2 schools are still working on their financial recovery plan with support from the Local Authority.
- 4.4 3 schools had an unauthorised deficit, one of which was the result of a year end accounting error. Another school experienced unexpected increases in supply cover costs due to absences towards the end of the financial year and also additional staffing costs attributed to two looked after children taken on roll. The final school experienced an unexpected dip in early years pupil numbers and a reduction to their pupil premium funding allocation. All three schools are projecting to return to a surplus position by 31st March 2016.
- 4.5 The bottom of **Table 1** provides details of the schools which had a revenue deficit balance as at 31st March 2015.

5.0 CAPITAL DEFICIT BALANCES

- 5.1 18 Primary Schools and 5 Secondary Schools had negative capital balances as at 31st March 2015, a total of 23 schools compared to 26 schools as at 31st March 2014.
- 5.2 18 of these schools had a Capital Deficit Approval Agreement of which six are planning to return to surplus by March 16 and 3 by March 17. Work is on-going with the remaining nine schools to help them return to a surplus capital balance.
- 5.3 5 schools had an unanticipated deficit, one of which was less than £1k. Of the remaining four schools, three are projecting to return to a surplus position by 31st March 2016 and work is on-going with the fourth school to help them return to a surplus capital balance.



School Balances 2014-15

6.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 The Partnership is asked to note the position of school balances as at 31st March 2015.
- 6.2 The Partnership is asked to consider the position of the 3 schools that have exceeded the Balances Control Limit as set out in Appendix 1 and agree the appropriate action to be taken.

PETER DWYER

Corporate Director – Children & Young People's Service

Schools that have exceeded the Balances Control Limit as at 31st March 2015

1. (E2336) Hellifield Community Primary School

The table below summarises the revenue balance position of the above school for the last 4 years.

Financial Year	Revenue Balance	% of Revenue Budget	Amount exceeding
			the 15% limit
2011/12	£53.1k	18.8%	£10.8k
2012/13	£46.0k	18.7%	£9.0k
2013/14	£55.1k	18.5%	£10.4k
2014/15	£63.7k	19.3%	£14.3k

Hellifield Community Primary School has exceeded 15% for the last 4 years and currently has a balance that is £14.3k above the limit.

The school is projecting an in year deficit of £12k in 2015/16 which would result in a balance of £52k (15.4%) as at 31^{st} March 2016. They are projecting a further in year deficit for 2016/17 of £31k.

The school has attributed its' high balance to additional funding they received in 2011/12, 12/13 and 13/14 relating to the North Craven review and unexpected funding received in 2014/15 relating mainly to pupil premium and UIFSM.

Option 1

To remove all of the revenue balance over 15% (£14.3k) as at 31.3.15 from Hellifield Community Primary School as set out in the Balances Control Scheme and previous communication with the school.

Option 2

To take into account the projected in year deficit position for 2015/16 and remove £1.2k of the school's revenue balance to leave the school a projected revenue balance of 15% as at 31.3.16.

2. (E2355) Skipton Ings Community Primary School

Financial Year	Revenue Balance	% of Revenue Budget	Amount exceeding the 15% limit
2011/12	£71.8k	20.0%	£17.9k
2012/13	£120.4k	34.4%	£67.9k
2013/14	£129.2k	37.1%	£76.9k
2014/15	£81.2k	24.5%	£31.5k

The table below summarises the revenue balance position of the above school for the last 4 years.

Skipton Ings Community Primary School has exceeded 15% for the last 4 years, although balances did reduced by £48k in 2014/15

Skipton Ings Community Primary School went into special measures in 2013. It is acknowledged by the Local Authority and the school that a significant under-investment in teaching and learning contributed to the school going into special measures and led to the accumulation of high balances. The appointment of an IEB and a temporary headteacher also impacted on long term financial planning.

The school came out of special measures in October 2014 and appointed a permanent headteacher in March 2015. To help ensure continued improvement in outcomes for children, the school have maintained higher staffing levels than the current pupil numbers justify. As a result balances have fallen by £48k during 2014/15 and an in year deficit of £43k is forecast for 2015/16. The school recognises that current staffing levels are not sustainable and plan to undertake a review during the Autumn 2015 term.

Under the current scheme it would be possible to remove all of the revenue balance over 15% (£31.5k) as at 31.3.15 from Skipton Ings Community Primary School. However, given the statements above re the steps that the school have taken to use their surplus balances to secure removal from special measures and their plans to continue this progress, the proposal is to not remove any balance at this stage but notify the school that the position will be reviewed in March 2016 and that any revenue balance over 15% at 31_{st} March 2016 may be subject to claw back.

3. (E2365) Skipton Greatwood Community Primary School

Financial Year	Revenue Balance	% of Revenue Budget	Amount exceeding the 15% limit
2011/12	£218.2k	21.6%	£66.6k
2012/13	£191.7k	19.9%	£46.9k
2013/14	£174.9k	18.0%	£28.8k
2014/15	£160.9k	16.8%	£17.4k

The table below summarises the revenue balance position of the above school for the last 4 years.

Skipton Greatwood Community Primary School has exceeded 15% for the last 4 years and currently has a balance that is £17.4k in excess of the limit.

The school has an Enhanced Mainstream School that was allocated £8k of one off funding in 2012 for in-reach teaching provision for children with complex and challenging needs who move into the area at short notice – to date this has not been required. This funding is included in the balance of the school and it is proposed that it is excluded for the purposes of the Balances Control Scheme and that a separate discussion is held to determine the future of this funding.

The school has plans in place this year to purchase 6 interactive whiteboards at a cost of £20k. They plan to use revenue funding to finance this purchase but unfortunately did not transfer the identified revenue funding to capital at the end of the 2014/15 financial year. Had the school done this they would have been below the Balances Control Scheme limit.

Under the current scheme it would be possible to remove the revenue balance as at 31.3.15 over 15% (excluding the EMS balance of £8k). However, given the school already had plans in place as at 31^{st} March 2015 to make a revenue contribution to the value of £20k but just failed to action this in their accounts, the proposal is to not remove any balance at this stage. Assurance will be sought that the purchase of the interactive whiteboards has taken place and the associated revenue contribution transferred.





SCHOOL BALANCES

REVIEW 2015

Size of School	No of Schools	Actual Revenue Balance March 2015 £	% Balance to funding 14/15 %	Revenue Balance March 2014 £	% Balance to funding 13/14 %	Year on Year Variance £	Year on Year Variance %	Average Balance Per School 31/03/2015 £	Start Budget Projected Balance March 2015 £	Variance between Start Budget Projected Balance and Actual Balance £
Nursery Total	3	£209,473	26.42%	£98,306	12.97%	£111,167	113.08%	£69,824	£26,266	£183,207
< 30	19	£435,723	12.19%	£374,717	9.43%	£61,006	16.28%	£22,933	£259,567	£176,156
30 to 50	46	£1,561,803	14.47%	£1,420,867	12.87%	£140,936	9.92%	£33,952	£1,202,897	£358,906
50 to 75	51	£2,057,234	13.99%	£1,530,088	10.45%	£527,146	34.45%	£40,338	£1,312,878	£744,356
75 to 100	35	£1,434,625	11.46%	£1,083,925	9.00%	£350,700	32.35%	£40,989	£898,215	£536,410
100 to 125	23	£945,728	10.25%	£1,042,941	10.46%	-£97,213	-9.32%	£41,119	£808,651	£137,077
125 to 150	18	£899,880	9.96%	£637,985	6.76%	£261,896	41.05%	£49,993	£539,445	£360,436
150 to 175	21	£1,048,284	8.62%	£848,106	8.83%	£200,178	23.60%	£49,918	£700,026	£348,258
175 to 200	19	£920,162	7.34%	£941,935	7.51%	-£21,773	-2.31%	£48,430	£712,935	£207,227
Under 200 Sub-total	232	£9,303,438	11.00%	£7,880,563	9.52%	£1,422,874	18.06%	£40,101	£6,434,613	£2,868,824
200 to 225	23	£1,815,768	10.86%	£1,716,285	10.19%	£99,484	5.80%	£78,946	£1,320,205	£495,564
225 to 250	8	£582,057	9.67%	£531,288	8.64%	£50,769	9.56%	£72,757	£325,268	£256,789
250 to 275	12	£1,092,011	10.24%	£817,379	10.20%	£274,632	33.60%	£91,001	£560,509	£531,502
275 to 300	8	£948,739	12.08%	£930,878	9.71%	£17,860	1.92%	£118,592	£785,498	£163,240
300 to 325	7	£589,825	8.19%	£748,043	8.38%	-£158,217	-21.15%	£84,261	£370,343	£219,483
325 >	17	£2,683,173	12.05%	£1,976,517	8.61%	£706,657	35.75%	£157,834	£1,522,287	£1,160,887
Over 200 Sub-total	75	£7,711,573	10.90%	£6,720,389	9.37%	£991,185	14.75%	£102,821	£4,884,109	£2,827,465
Primary Total	310	£17,224,484	11.04%	£14,699,258	9.46%	£2,525,226	17.18%	£55,563	£11,344,988	£5,879,496
250 to 500	9	£1,903,525	9.83%	£2,363,622	11.87%	-£460,097	-19.47%	£211,503	£876,372	£1,027,153
500 to 750	11	£2,500,349	7.28%	£3,499,048	10.40%	-£998,700	-28.54%	£227,304	£1,368,098	£1,027,133
750 to 1000	11	£1,314,732	8.27%	£1,493,355	8.54%	-£178,624	-11.96%	£328,683	£822,705	£492,026
1000 to 1250		£3,346,481	11.00%	£2,756,607	5.23%	£589,873	21.40%	£557,747	£1,718,647	£1,627,833
1250 to 1500	1	£220,186	3.62%	£270,919	9.04%	-£50,733	-18.73%	£220,186	£120,319	£99,867
1500>	3	£1,383,188	6.46%	£1,575,446	7.18%	-£192,258	-12.20%	£461,063	£913,743	£469,445
Secondary Total	34	£10,668,461	8.37%	£11,958,999	9.00%	-£1,290,538	-10.79%	£313,778	£5,819,886	£4,848,575
		210,000,401	0.31%	211,930,999	5.00%	-21,230,330	-10.79%	2313,770	23,013,000	24,040,373
Special Total	9	£1,847,758	13.75%	£1,755,488	12.81%	£92,271	5.26%	£205,306	£797,372	£1,050,387
TOTALS 14/15	353	£29,740,703	10.01%	£28,413,745	9.41%	£1,326,958	4.67%	£84,251	£17,962,246	£11,778,457

Schools with Negative Balances

School	DfE No.	Actual Revenue Balance March 2015 £	Licensed Deficit	% Balance to funding 14/15 %	Revenue Balance March 2014 £	Start Budget In Year 14/15	Start Budget Projected Balance March 2015 £	Revised Budget Projected Balance March 2015 £	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016 £
Goathland	2043	-£4,865	-£6,000	-2.76%	-£13,339	£5,640	-£7,699	-£5,670	£20
Nawton	2075	-£16,326	-£20,000	-4.97%	-£25,900	£5,340	-£20,560	-£15,980	£830
Helmsley	2236	-£5,175	Unauthorised	-1.06%	£8,768	-£8,430	£338	£170	£13,450
Brotherton	2311	-£24,757	-£44,300	-4.19%	-£8,949	-£31,420	-£40,369	-£44,340	-£23,740
Cononley	2316	-£24,175	-£26,500	-5.76%	£10,170	-£34,600	-£24,430	-£26,550	£8,380
Fairburn	2320	-£27,006	-£24,000	-12.17%	£1,971	-£9,180	-£7,209	-£24,200	-£35,430
Harrogate, New Park	2330	-£37,003	-£30,322	-7.40%	-£9,876	£40,370	£30,494	-£30,320	£24,200
Hipswell CE	3053	-£2,133	Unauthorised	-0.38%	£17,446	-£12,450	£4,996	-£1,210	£4,900
Staxton, Hertford Vale CE	3155	-£3,524	-£1,000	-0.82%	-£2,029	£11,300	£9,271	£9,300	£1,520
Long Marston CE	3255	-£17,321	-£23,000	-7.82%	-£10,802	-£11,800	-£22,602	-£20,260	-£17,080
Ripon, Cathedral CE	3262	-£16,620	-£24,000	-2.25%	£23,430	-£36,730	-£13,301	-£23,180	-£40,840
Ingleby Arncliffe CE	3336	-£13,645	-£10,000	-8.04%	-£10,269	-£29,880	-£40,149	-£4,700	-£15,500
Malton, St Mary's RC	3609	-£56,266	Unauthorised	-14.20%	£29,808	-£22,830	£6,978	£11,200	£26,480
Easingwold	4005	-£19,424	Under review	-0.39%	£99,808	-£59,860	£39,948	£37,300	-£295,730
Bedale High	4052	-£41,420	-£60,000	-1.34%	£299,898	-£536,970	-£237,072	£7,520	-£371,630
Malton	4077	-£399,888	Under review	-12.29%	-£160,768	-£168,850	-£329,618	-£379,650	-£523,110

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March E 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
				%							£	£
Childhaven Nursery School	47	£2,661	£84,941	29.49%	£4,250		£78,030	,		£7,474	£1,809	£6,133
Brougham St Nursery School, Skipton	35	£85,299	£105,941	45.13%			£88,972			£5,385	£2,989	£6,623
Otley St Nursery School, Skipton	42	£10,346	£18,590	6.88%	-£7,960		£16,204		· · · ·	£1,699	£446	
Nursery total	124	£98,306	£209,473	£0.26			£183,207			£14,558	£1,688	£6,389
Leeming & Londonderry CP Goathland	19 20	£22,450	£25,303 -£4,865	14.20% -2.76%	-£10,780	,	£13,633			£6,064	£1,332 -£243	£9,378
Rosedale Abbey	10	-£13,339 £18,091	-£4,865 £10,391	-2.76%	£5,640 -£18,010		£2,834 £10,311	£4,890 -£18,470		£8,797 £8,970	£243 £1,039	£8,806 £15,573
Kettlewell C.P.	22	£56,851	£10,391 £34,452	18.30%	-£18,010		£10,311		,	-£2,568	£1,566	£8,557
Luttons	29	£47,969	£70,165	36.61%	-£11,050		£33,246			£13,860	£1,300	£6,665
Ampleforth St Hilda's CE	22	£3,255	£34,002	16.55%	£23,550		£7,198			£5,058	£1,576	£9,521
Arkengarthdale	28	£28,678	£31,718	15.91%	£6,880		-£3,840			£4,394	£1,133	£7,120
Bainbridge CE	28	£25,693	£34,299	16.41%	-£14,040		£22,646			£0	£1,223	£7,450
Bilsdale, Midcable, Chopgate CE	20	£17,369	£7,904	4.60%	-£9,790	-£9,465	£325	-£770	£7,134	-£3,044	£395	£8,599
Eppleby, Forcett CE	28	£25,592	£30,254	16.23%	-£3,420	£4,662	£8,082	-£20,050	£10,204	£6,023	£1,080	£6,658
Hackforth & Hornby CE	18	-£1,927	£14,774	7.51%	£3,460	£16,701	£13,241	-£30,410	-£15,636	£7,719	£821	£10,930
Kirkby Fleetham CE	29	£28,077	£32,984	15.81%	-£10,990		£15,897			£2,122	£1,137	£7,195
Bishop Thornton CE	24	£16,129	£16,441	9.93%	-£14,750		£15,062			£3,904	£685	£6,898
Askrigg	29	£13,581	£28,139	13.61%	£19,340		-£4,782			£2,408	£970	
Ingleby Arncliffe CE	29	-£10,269	-£13,645	-8.04%	-£29,880		£26,503	,		£4,831	-£471	£5,854
Burnsall	28	£37,233	£31,873	14.80%	-£14,330		£8,970			£0	£1,138	£7,691
Horton in Ribblesdale CE	22	£19,997	£23,400	11.80%	£110	,	£3,294	,		£0	£1,062	£9,000
Bishop Thornton RC	27	£2,081	£3,046	1.64%	-£1,920		£2,885			£0	£113	£6,895
Nun Monkton 10 to 30 Sub-total	14 445		£25,088 £435,723	15.13% 12.19%	-£12,760		£641 £176,156	,		£8,353 £76,890	£1,792 £978	£11,841 £8,026
Glaisdale	445	£34,922	£435,725 £43,342	15.24%	£3,670		£4,750			£16,328	£976	£6,771
Lealholm	32	£50,581	£43,342 £36,325	17.10%	-£26,510		£4,750 £12,253			£10,328	£1,032 £1,135	£6,640
Hinderwell, Oakridge	43	£20,457	£23,456	9.82%	-£2,190		£5,189			£582	£541	£5,503
Hunton & Arrathorne	35	£23,919	£15,180	6.85%	-£8,660					£6,382	£434	£6,327
North & South Cowton	43	£31,842	£43,411	19.14%	£11,700	,	-£131	,	,	£3,926	£1,010	£5,276
Osmotherley	38	£15,887	£26,962	12.55%	-£700		£11,774			£10,931	£710	
Stillington	41	£39,661	£48,182	18.66%	£9,170		-£649			£8,590	£1,175	£6,297
Castleton	34	£37,073	£21,191	9.83%	-£19,630	-£15,882	£3,748	£2,660	£23,851	£25,683	£623	£6,338
Burton Salmon	46	£61,569	£38,520	14.94%	-£30,450	-£23,049	£7,401	-£3,720	£34,800	£6,229	£837	£5,606
Drax	47	£12,443	£7,866	2.90%	-£4,290	-£4,577	-£287	-£9,140	-£1,274	£7,171	£167	£5,768
Fairburn	47	£1,971	-£27,006	-12.17%	-£9,180		-£19,797			£21	-£575	
Felliscliffe	44	£71,945	£65,414	28.62%	-£14,540		£8,009			£3,677	£1,487	£5,194
Skipton, Ings	41	£129,185	£81,162	26.27%	-£38,500		-£9,523			£8,847	£1,984	£7,552
Baldersby St James CE	34	£6,092	£29,946	13.16%	£8,750		£15,103			£7,240	£881	£6,694
West Burton CE	36	£35,208	£35,684	15.52%	£4,060		-£3,584	,	,	£0	£991	£6,385
Danby CE	47	£22,466	£31,936	12.14%	-£1,750		£11,220			£5,794	£679	
East Cowton CE Foston CE	40	£18,440 £17,208	£2,231 £15,705	1.08% 8.35%	-£17,260 -£2,390	,	£1,051 £886	£2,310 £14,140	,	£7,303 £0	£55 £523	
Gillamoor CE	30	£30,229	£15,705	24.02%	-£2,390 -£4,240		£31,904			£0	£523 £1,565	£6,209
Hovingham CE	36	£21,106	£20,711	9.20%	-£6,260		£5,865			£38,968	£575	
Ingleby Greenhow CE	39	£12,058	£4,635	1.99%	£880		-£8,303			£12,091	£119	
Masham, Kell Bank CE	38	£13,984	£34,084	13.82%	£7,090	,	£13,011	,	,	£5,709	£897	
Pickhill CE	32	£8,284	£2,220	1.18%	-£14,330		£8,267			£3,509	£69	
Snainton CE	42	£39,962	£50,425	20.84%	-£16,410		£26,873			£3,251	£1,201	£5,761
Spennithorne CE	41	£35,190	£34,708	13.73%	-£25,280		£24,797	,		£1,535	£847	
Snape and Thornton Watlass CE	40	£45,483	£24,879	14.07%	-£11,630		-£8,974		,	£15,113	£629	
Warthill CE	41	£49,810	£48,777	24.25%	-£13,740		£12,707			£3,755	£1,190	
Wykeham CE	30	£24,223	£34,698	14.68%	£10,290	£10,475	£185	-£15,690	£19,008	£7,171	£1,157	£7,877
Sherburn CE	43	£43,058	£79,166	28.50%	£25,890	£36,108	£10,218	£4,710	£83,876	£15,098	£1,841	£6,460
Weaverthorpe CE	42	£43,681	£36,902		-£16,370		£9,591			£7,497	£889	
Heslerton CE	38	£35,391	£45,364	18.58%	-£10	£9,973	£9,983	-£15,470	£29,894	£4,257	£1,194	£6,426

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March B 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
				%							£	£
Chapel Haddlesey CE	45	£30,527	£62,363	26.68%	-£1,930		£33,766			£41,526	£1,386	
Clapham CE	41	£44,853	£45,463	19.34%	-£4,280		£4,891	£20,870		£7,537	£1,109	
Cracoe, Rylestone District	31	£20,826	£32,420	12.85%	£17,070		-£5,476	,	,	£17,731	£1,046	,
Follifoot CE	48	£39,797	£87,909	33.09%	£17,560		£30,553			£8,799	£1,831	
Fountains Earth, Lofthouse	34	£24,376	£31,395	14.94%	-£9,350		£16,369	£4,440		£1,787	£923	
Kirk Hammerton CE	39	£19,218	£15,835	7.42%	-£18,300		£14,917	-£14,500		£3,070	£406	
Skelton, Newby Hall CE	47	£4,319	£12,028	5.68%	£9,890		-£2,181	£1,700		£636	£256	,
Middleham CE	49		£32,291	11.76%	-£9,230		£10,782			£0	£659	
Terrington CE	46	£10,567	£14,236	5.84%	£1,490		£2,180	-£11,140		£0	£309	
Swainby & Potto CE	36	£6,244	£4,455	2.07%	£9,240		-£11,030	£8,000		£0	£124	
Clint, Burnt Yates CE	33	£27,081	£38,263	17.12%	-£8,730		£19,912			£0	£1,159	
Kirkby in Malhamdale United	43	£8,271	£8,595	3.62%	-£2,860		£3,183	-£6,150		£0	£200	
Rathmell CE	30	£78,154	£88,688	38.14%	-£13,800		£24,334	-£12,740		£0	£2,956	
Egton Bridge, St Hedda's RC	40	£16,684 £25,882	£27,689 £46,205	11.59%	-£720 -£1,200		£11,725 £21,523	-£4,460		£0 £0	£692 £1,540	
Farnley CE 30 to 50 Sub-total	1811	£25,002	£46,205	19.08% 14.47%	-£1,200		£358,906	-£40,610		£342,994	£1,540 £863	
Reeth & Gunnerside	56	£62,141	£80,401	34.98%	-£217,970 -£11,210		£338,900 £29,470	£19,480	· · ·	£28,885	£803 £1,437	<u></u>
Slingsby	57	£33,494	£23,503	8.91%	-£11,210 -£10,070		£79			£20,005	£412	
Topcliffe, Alanbrooke	52	£100,480	£146,115	37.46%	-£10,070 -£6,230		£51,865			£10,117 £5,116	£412 £2,810	
Dishforth Airfield	55	£66,550	£78,524	25.71%	-£12,480		£24,454	-£7,370		£2,608	£1,428	
Sheriff Hutton	74	£922	£11,504	3.80%	£4,930		£5,653	£20,790		£4,211	£155	
Sinnington	67	£38,998	£40,278	14.51%	-£13,950		£15,230	£3,300		£4,211	£100	
Appleton Wiske	64	£36,735	£60,523	18.58%	£5,830		£17,958	-£14,640		£13,070	£946	
Brompton & Sawdon	68	£20,249	£39,748	14.37%	£3,240		£16,258			£6,519	£585	
Giggleswick	66	£41,188	£79,871	26.60%	£11,800		£26,884	-£15,570		£46,661	£1,210	,
Great Ouseburn	55	£10,766	£9,817	3.86%	-£10,730		£9,780	-£6,050		£1,989	£178	,
Summerbridge	54	£22,029	£35,454	12.11%	£14,190		-£765	-£12,700		£34	£657	
Hellifield	68	£55,171	£63,726	19.75%	-£2,760		£11,315			£12,769	£937	
Glasshouses	73	£25,391	£24,594	8.16%	-£5,240		£4,443	-£120			£337	
Darley	58	£26,150	£49,771	14.71%	£20,570		£3,051	-£9,340		£0	£858	,
Beckwithshaw	72	£50,860	£33,224	12.35%	-£15,780		-£1,856			£14,939	£461	
Scotton Lingerfield	72	£19,465	£34,590	11.37%	-£1,740		£16,865	-£3,680		£244	£480	
Sicklinghall	59	£22,082	£40,585	14.79%	£7,950		£10,553	-£8,200		£10,245	£688	
Leavening	58	£59,753	£45,839	16.76%	-£25,790		£11,876			£9,484	£794	
Aiskew, Leeming Bar CE	51	-£10,926	£2,608	1.02%	£6,580		£6,954	-£2,530		£8,439	£51	
Crakehall CE	73	£34,935	£54,208	16.21%	-£8,840	£19,273	£28,113	-£27,160	£27,048	£6,319	£743	£4,581
Great Ayton, Marwood's CE	61	£33,277	£23,513	8.41%	-£16,910	-£9,764	£7,146	-£2,920	£20,593	£5,045	£385	£4,583
Hackness CE	73	£8,974	£3,366	1.13%	£1,190	-£5,608	-£6,798	£20	£3,386	£1,429	£46	£4,090
Hawsker cum Stainsacre CE	54	£4,183	£22,958	8.39%	£5,440	£18,775	£13,335	-£12,920	£10,038	£102	£425	£5,067
Husthwaite CE	66	£30,601	£53,619	16.33%	-£6,750	£23,018	£29,768	-£10,000	£43,619	£5,555	£808	£4,951
Ravensworth CE	65	£37,785	£50,968	17.05%	-£4,090	£13,183	£17,273	-£14,700	£36,268	£4,790	£784	£4,600
Sandhutton CE	71	£29,339	£52,306	17.26%	-£3,200		£26,167	-£2,290		£6,190	£737	
South Kilvington CE	72		£37,399	12.11%	-£9,050		£22,495	-£11,580		£15,804	£519	
West Tanfield CE	50	£26,788	£43,181	14.94%	-£7,450		£23,844	-£37,990		£152	£864	
Barton CE	61	£12,603	£28,715	10.07%	£480		£15,631	£6,460		£8,521	£471	,
Settrington	55	£32,880	£33,844	12.66%	-£20,100		£21,064			£4,585	£615	
Melsonby Methodist	52	£19,783	£25,795	9.87%	-£3,200		£9,212			£9,302	£496	
Barlow CE	56	£15,835	£21,877	8.19%	-£14,710		£20,752			£9,324	£391	
Burton Leonard CE	67	£6,266	£15,007	5.27%	-£2,410		£11,151	-£10,890		£6,370	£224	,
Grassington CE	75		£36,709	13.14%	-£26,550		£14,356			-£21,174	£489	
Grewelthorpe CE	63	£65,513	£95,163	31.21%	£4,510		£25,140			£5,998	£1,509	
Long Marston CE	53	-£10,802	-£17,321	-7.82%	-£11,800		£5,281	£250		£3,601	-£327	
Markington CE	60	£10,589	£1,323	0.52%	-£3,270		-£5,996			-£1,975	£22	
North Stainley CE	60	-£13,847	£13,492	4.91%	£6,590		£20,749			£9,270	£225	
Threshfield	56	£41,496	£48,554	17.69%	-£22,010		£29,068			£4,500	£867	
Brafferton CE	69	£51,722	£61,811	20.96%	-£9,170		£19,259			£0	£896	
Carlton & Faceby CE	56	£19,111	£31,589	11.54%	£4,190		£8,288			£0	£564	
Egton CE	51	£31,033	£31,512	14.32%	-£22,640	£479	£23,119	£10,740	£42,252	£0	£618	£4,314

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March E 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
				%							£	£
Burneston CE	74	£35,906	£35,556	10.31%	-£8,110		£7,759	,	£21,066	£0	£480	
Austwick CE	51	£52,547	£72,557	28.85%	£1,150	£20,010	£18,860		£91,847	£971	£1,437	£4,979
Beamsley, Boyle & Petyt	58		£38,525	13.84%	-£12,780	£16,477	£29,257		£29,035	£0	£664	£4,799
Dacre, Braithwaite CE	74	£49,749	£117,617	37.98%	-£650	£67,868	£68,518		£56,147	£0	£1,589	£4,185
Long Preston Endowed	59		£42,272	14.44%	-£14,240		-£18,398		£42,232	£0	£716	,
Tadcaster West RC	56	£22,627	£35,228	14.15%	-£3,580	£12,601	£16,181	£8,990	£44,218	£0	£629	£4,447
Thirsk, All Saints RC	68	£13,501	£13,902	4.41%	-£2,640		£3,041		-£12,168	£0	£204	,
Whitby, St Hilda's RC Sacred Heart	50	£7,075 £9,305	£24,265 £7,052	8.21% 2.15%	£18,170 £16,110	£17,190 -£2,254	-£980 -£18,364		£15,685 £13,872	£0 £0	£485 £95	
50 to 75 Sub-total	3162		£2,057,234	13.99%	-£217,210		£744,356			£276,308	£651	£4,650
Staithes, Seton	94		£57,720	14.42%	-£2,080		-£1,343		£40,550	£39,440	£612	
Nawton	90		-£16,326	-4.97%	£5,340		£4,234		£834	£4,834	-£182	
Welburn	85	£18,423	£23,820	6.93%	-£6,230	£5,397	£11,627		£13,000	£3,686	£280	
Linton	95		£7,477	1.94%	-£15,740	-£15,412	£328		-£6,013	£7,781	£79	
Staveley	75		£41,362	12.36%	£14,140		-£437	,	£24,832	£12,724	£550	£4,447
Thornton in Craven	75		£41,930	12.89%	£3,320	£23,470	£20,150		£49,470	£7,593	£559	£4,336
Langton	77		£77,937	20.77%	£10,440		£19,684		£83,077	£9,782	£1,012	
Ainderby Steeple CE	89		£19,858	5.36%	-£7,570		£19,681	£3,210	£23,068	£8,940	£223	
Crayke CE	93		£42,039	12.31%	-£3,060	£12,693	£15,753	,	£38,149	£13,192	£452	,
Dishforth CE	76		£16,966	5.54%	-£16,690	-£732	£15,958		£14,736	£7,043	£222	
Sleights CE	89	£32,915	£36,341	10.10%	-£7,440	£3,426	£10,866		£32,071	£1,296	£408	
Huby CE	85	£44,697	£63,800	18.00%	-£10,660	£19,103	£29,763		£49,780	£8,630	£751	£4,171
Lythe CE	90	£46,458	£65,592	15.57%	£5,850	£19,134	£13,284	-£1,080	£64,512	£5,484	£731	£4,692
Sessay CE	76	£57,117	£51,963	15.64%	-£24,890	-£5,154	£19,736	-£20,310	£31,653	£5,847	£684	£4,371
Sutton in the Forest CE	87	£6,155	£7,956	2.33%	-£5,680	£1,801	£7,481	£6,410	£14,366	£5,654	£91	£3,932
Fylingdales CE	87	£12,852	£27,445	7.64%	£5,180	£14,594	£9,414	£4,940	£32,385	£12,130	£315	£4,129
Cliffe	98		£42,468	10.46%	-£620	£8,971	£9,591	-£9,590	£32,878	£2,396	£433	
Pateley Bridge, St Cuthbert's	92		£85,690	20.71%	£21,310		£35,943		£69,920	£9,320	£930	
Birstwith CE	85		£17,599	5.50%	-£15,670		£9,641	-£11,470	£6,129	£1,317	£207	£3,761
Goldsborough CE	82		£46,608	14.47%	-£5,970		£6,035		£14,278	£17,681	£568	
Green Hammerton CE	96	£68,172	£117,650	27.96%	£9,940		£39,538		£116,030	£981	£1,223	£4,376
Killinghall CE	93		£45,827	11.83%	-£3,480	£4,897	£8,377		£30,987	£5,509	£493	£4,166
Kirkby Malzeard CE	88	£22,701	£37,088	10.66%	-£2,890	£14,387	£17,277		£37,688	£8,395	£421	£3,952
Kirk Smeaton CE	97	,	£65,740	15.89%	-£5,560	£23,200	£28,760		£71,010	£5,272	£678	,
Rigton CE	93		£35,418	10.10%	-£12,050	£392	£12,442		£26,728	£878	£381	£3,769
Ripley Endowed	91	£6,626	£549	0.16%	-£6,630	-£6,077	£553	,	£15,099	£13,934	£6	
Roecliffe CE	93		£33,095	9.58%	-£13,790	£6,859	£20,649		£21,365	£4,385	£356	
Grantley, Fountains CE	82		£27,883	7.90%	-£11,360	£8,259	£19,619		£14,153	£3,024	£340	
Saxton CE	82		£45,892	13.84%	-£6,630	-£25	£6,605		£38,382	£12,118	£560	
Sharow CE Sutton in Craven CE	76 88	£21,638 £53,700	£23,659 £39,215	6.97%	-£10,850 -£33,630	£2,021	£12,871		£11,269 £36,655	-£4,754 £7,193	£312 £446	
Bolton-on-Swale CE	100	£33,700 £20,044	£39,215 £26,158	11.86% 7.28%	-£33,630 -£15,230	-£14,484 £6,115	£19,146 £21,345		£36,655 £46,458	£7,193 £0	£446 £262	
Kirkby Overblow CE	87	£20,044 £49,173	£20,158 £70,489	19.10%	£4,890	£0,115 £21,316	£16,426		£62,969	£0	£202 £810	£3,391
Marton cum Grafton CE	88		£35,209	10.97%	-£3,880	£21,310	£14,222		£39,379	£0	£400	£3,647
Ampleforth St Benedict's RC	96		£72,507	19.50%	-£17,840		£41,192		£66,977	£0	£755	
75 to 100 Sub-total	3070		£1,434,625	11.46%	-£185,710		£536,410	, ,	£1,264,825	£241,706	£467	,
Hawes	107		£27,730	7.34%	£3,030		-£595			£121	£260	
Appleton Roebuck	101	£33,668	£18,348	5.54%	-£27,270		£11,950		£26,568	£7,104	£182	
Askwith	115		£169,760	43.17%	-£57,360		-£74,578		£179,100	-£17,575	£1,476	
Cowling	116		£43,046	9.96%	-£17,110		£11,833		£29,626	£12,148	£371	£3,724
Lothersdale	102		£69,964	16.99%	£25,210		£1,120		£58,904	£8,821	£686	
Camblesforth	102	-£446	£31,756	7.26%	£7,010		£25,191		£66,216	£5,238	£294	
Tadcaster East	125		£1,393	0.32%	-£24,300		£1,766		£2,883	£3,536	£11	
Kellington	118		£25,846	6.55%	-£28,030		£10,770		£66,206	£545	£219	
Croft CE	117		£74,404	17.53%	-£12,620		£28,827		£70,584	£19,514	£637	
Knayton CE	105		£65,284	16.80%	£19,850		£1,177		£62,444	-£0	£622	
Topcliffe CE	100		£90,683	22.40%	£9,310		£53,343		£109,403	£420	£907	
Whitby, Ruswarp CE	105		£60,498	14.90%	-£1,420		£18,686			£12,426	£576	

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
				%				0.5.0.50			£	£
Staxton, Hertford Vale CE	108	-£2,029	-£3,524	-0.82%	£11,300		-£12,795	,	,	-£2,488	-£33	,
Bishop Monkton CE	108	£45,243	£50,142	12.72%	-£24,200		£29,099	-£25,610		£0	£464	
Hampsthwaite CE	116 109	£32,355 £75,031	£52,095 £46,354	12.74% 12.10%	£1,990 -£51,750		£17,751 £23,073	£4,400 -£25,880		£40 £6,362	£450 £427	
Gargrave CE	109	£75,031 £13,154	£46,354 £18,653	4.84%	-£51,750 -£5,900		£23,073 £11,399			£0,302	£427 £183	
South Otterington	110	£13,134	£13,646	3.30%	-£3,300 -£4,170		£6,543	,	· · · ·	-£1,858	£103	
Kirkby-in-Cleveland & Gt Broughton CE	111	£12,254	£22,379	5.51%	£3,930		£6,194	-£4,210		£0	£202	
Masham CE	108	£30,502	£40,852	11.05%	-£14,740		£25,090	-£13,350		£0	£378	
Malton, St Mary's RC	113	£29,808	-£56,266	-14.20%	-£22,830		-£63,244			£0	-£498	
Pickering St Joseph's RC	106	£47,353	£48,558	12.36%	-£12,040	£1,205	£13,245	£14,120	£62,678	£0	£457	£3,694
Scarborough, St George's RC	106	£55,077	£34,126	8.27%	-£12,180		-£8,770			£0	£321	
100 to 125 Sub-total	2516	£1,042,941	£945,728	10.25%	-£234,290		£137,077			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	£376	
Scarborough, Overdale	140	£101,188	£163,228	23.19%	-£18,690		£80,730	,	,	-£0	£1,170	
Helmsley	141	£8,768	-£5,175	-1.06%	-£8,430		-£5,513			£328	-£37	
Bentham, High Bentham	131	£23,726	£14,454	2.96%	-£18,730		£9,458			-£3,176	£110	
Bradleys Both Cononley	133 134	£45,919 £10,170	£84,537 -£24,175	17.65% -5.76%	-£11,260 -£34,600		£49,878 £255	-£7,120 £37,260	,	£10,224 £8,626	£636 -£180	,
Hensall	134	£10,170	£67,113	-3.76%	£2,630		£255 £44,552			£5,122	£476	,
Ripon, Moorside Infant	137	£45,961	£54,257	11.90%	-£7,510		£15,806			£4,818	£397	
Ripon, Moorside Junior	143	£9,997	£15,339	2.94%	-£4,120		£9,462			-£3,634	£107	
Rillington	135	£16,829	£27,595	6.65%	-£1,340		£12,106			£7,420	£204	,
Harrogate, Woodfield CP	141	£100,795	£63,991	11.04%	-£31,030		-£5,774			£6,635	£454	
Kirby Hill CE	141	£15,286	£31,318	5.69%	£14,360		£1,672			£0	£222	
Thornton Dale CE	148	£74,103	£125,356	24.52%	£10,650	£51,253	£40,603	£21,030	£146,386	£8,066	£847	
Escrick CE	130	£58,420	£100,175	19.46%	-£670	£41,755	£42,425	-£7,680	£92,495	£6,227	£771	£3,960
Wistow Parochial	138	£13,961	£27,738	5.62%	£6,100		£7,676	,		£12,240	£201	· · · ·
Kildwick CE	127	-£6,814	£5,731	1.24%	£7,000		£5,546			£3,475	£45	
Carleton Endowed	146	£10,632	£44,550	8.85%	£32,710		£1,208			£0	£305	
Barkston Ash RC Ripon, St Wilfrid's RC	132 149	£40,348 £48,764	£43,823 £60,024	9.91% 12.03%	-£10,010 -£25,600		£13,486 £36,860	-£3,160 £10,930		£467 £0	£332 £403	
125 to 150 Sub-total	2487	£637,985	£899,880	9.96%			£360,436				£403	
Northallerton, Mill Hill	162	£29,959	£26,350	3.83%	-£5,320		£1,711			£3,603	£163	
Whitby, West Cliff	155	£25,493	£42,415	6.56%	£37,980		-£21,058			£5,482	£274	
Catterick Garrison, Carnagill	167	£18,277	£77,842	11.28%	-£48,860		£108,425	-£38,610		£6,176	£465	
Alne	165	£37,672	£27,798	5.23%	-£19,910	-£9,874	£10,036	-£3,120	£24,678	£8,234	£168	£3,221
Amotherby	174	£73,755	£89,737	14.73%	£1,620	£15,982	£14,362	-£3,720		£12,157	£516	
Brompton	170	-£2,843	£61,038	10.99%	£49,910		£13,971	£76,370			£359	
Brotherton	158	-£8,949	-£24,757	-4.19%	-£31,420		£15,612			£4,076	-£156	
Carlton-in-Snaith	161	£33,288	£40,241	7.04%	-£16,770		£23,723			£11,677	£250	
Harrogate, New Park	170	-£9,876	-£37,003	-7.40%	£40,370		-£67,497			£4,596	-£217	
Ingleton Barlby Bridge	163 165	£29,710 £36,272	£51,910 £46,755	11.03% 7.15%	-£33,750 -£20,290		£55,950 £30,773	£23,210 £1,910		£18,214 £8,206	£319 £283	
North Duffield	165	£36,272	£46,755 £56,968	11.37%	-£20,290 -£36,770		£30,773 £35,312			£8,206 £17,034	£283 £349	· · · ·
Hipswell CE	163	£17,446	-£2,133	-0.38%	-£30,770 -£12,450		-£7,130	,	,	-£6,601	£349 -£13	· · · ·
Middleton Tyas CE	158	£45,852	£47,012	8.39%	£3,060		-£1,900	-£9,830		£110	£298	
Hambleton CE	153	£44,313	£41,236	7.80%	-£23,940		£20,863			£19,410	£270	
Skipton, Christ Church CE	154	£168,552	£142,004	24.01%	-£50,580	-£26,549	£24,031	-£15,720		£49,042	£922	
Forest of Galtres Ang/Meth	174	£1,809	£37,607	6.04%	-£750		£36,548	£17,030	£54,637	£3,796	£216	£3,580
Catterick, Michael Syddall CE	154	£76,758	£44,737	7.51%	-£5,540		-£26,481	-£23,030		£0	£291	
Cawood CE	150	£18,111	£52,659	10.14%	-£4,820		£39,368	,	,	£0	£350	
Selby, St Mary's RC	175	£84,952	£136,082	22.52%	£6,160		£44,970			£0	£778	,
Richmond St Mary's RC	154	£69,128	£89,787	15.90%	£23,990		-£3,331	£9,030			£583	
150 to 175 Sub-total	3411	£848,106	£1,048,284	8.62%			£348,258	<i>,</i>			£307	<u></u>
Leyburn CP Catterick Garrison, Wavell Jn	191 188	£62,077 £139,609	£51,760 £165,570	8.23% 21.02%	£21,960 -£5,910		-£32,277 £31,871			£686 £36,854	£272 £881	
Whitby, Airy Hill	188	£139,609 £32,874	£165,570 £47,394	6.18%	£1,190		£31,871 £13,330			£36,854 £12	£881 £239	
Cayton	198	£6,672	£47,394 £1,322	0.10%	£1,190 £4,540		-£9,890				£239 £7	
Northallerton, Alverton	190	-£20,481	£12,589	1.57%	£22,640		£10,430				£66	

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
-				%							£	£
Carlton Miniott	184	£25,954	£40,902	6.63%	£5,610		£9,338	,	,	£0	£222	£3,351
East Ayton	181	£92,256	£60,440	9.62%	-£40,530		£8,714			£9,729	£334	£3,472
Boroughbridge	181	£44,897	£20,008	3.37%	-£40,790		£15,901	£3,010		£872	£110	£3,269
South Milford Sutton in Craven CP	187 200	£33,853 £92,502	£35,731 £111,447	5.72% 17.67%	-£10,560 -£830	£1,878	£12,438 £19,775			£29,433 £20,049	£191 £557	£3,338 £3,153
Harrogate, Coppice Valley	184	£92,502 £787	£111,447 £28,838	4.48%	£11,210		£19,775 £16,841	£35,500 -£5,320		£20,049 £5,253	£357 £157	£3,153 £3,501
Ripon, Greystone	177	£54,469	£19,780	3.12%	-£44,140		£9,452			£9,202	£137	£3,583
Hemingbrough	189	£62,707	£63,325	10.26%	-£38,840		£39,458	,	· · · ·	£0,202	£335	£3,265
Riccall	183	£46,581	£53,362	8.33%	-£19,430		£26,211	-£22,370		£10,866	£292	£3,499
Harrogate, Saltergate Junior	180	£80,549	£57,044	9.44%	-£48,390		£24,885	,		£3,644	£317	£3,359
Harrogate, Saltergate Infant	193	£85,081	£38,294	6.34%	-£37,840		-£8,947	£8,250		£13,215	£198	£3,121
Ripon, Cathedral CE	195	£23,430	-£16,620	-2.25%	-£36,730		-£3,319	,	,	£0	-£85	£3,792
Settle CE	188	£39,683	£45,181	6.56%	£17,920		-£12,422	,		£7,644	£241	£3,671
Tockwith CE	181	£38,434	£83,796	13.48%	£9,920		£35,442			£268	£463	£3,435
175 to 200 Sub-total	3569	£941,935	£920,162	7.34%	-£229,000	-£21,773	£207,227	-£184,860	£735,302	£158,966	£258	£3,511
Whitby, East Whitby	218	£81,151	£82,334	9.97%	-£20	£1,183	£1,203	£3,650	£85,984	£13,057	£377	£3,786
Leeming RAF	213	£188,656	£135,852	16.95%	-£83,870	-£52,804	£31,066	-£59,250	£76,602	£55,349	£638	£3,762
Colburn	203	£88,279	£182,479	21.14%	-£26,950	£94,200	£121,150	-£62,710	£119,769	£0	£901	£4,261
Catterick Garrison, Wavell In	203	-£17,845	£44,850	6.01%	-£43,960		£106,655			£4,124	£221	£3,675
Scarborough, Wheatcroft	216	£111,933	£151,392	18.94%	-£23,310		£62,769	-£3,900	,	£0	£701	£3,700
Whitby, Stakesby	203	£4,636	-£21,657	-2.85%	£8,380		-£34,673			£4,471	-£107	£3,746
Hutton Rudby	204	£80,744	£87,807	13.21%	-£33,210		£40,273			£7,599	£430	£3,259
Pickering Infant	222	£75,777	£24,987	4.01%	-£56,470		£5,680	-£4,700		£32	£113	,
Skipton, Water Street	220	£82,374	£105,720	14.46%	£33,030		-£9,684	£5,040		£6,728	£481	£3,324
Whitley and Eggborough	219	£36,256	£67,231	8.69%	£2,860		£28,115			-£107	£307	£3,531
Sherburn in Elmet, Hungate	217 212	£129,041	£171,924 £97,330	24.90%	£4,400		£38,482 -£35,400			£0	£792 £459	£3,182 £3,288
Knaresborough, Meadowside Selby, Longman's Hill	212	£161,850 £67,208	£53,780	13.96% 7.80%	-£29,120 -£25,570	-£64,520 -£13,428	£12,142	£11,260 £2,970		£9,354 £0	£459 £264	£3,288 £3,380
Brompton-on-Swale CE	204	£35,779	£104,182	14.33%	-£23,370 -£10,190		£78,592			-£16,399	£204	£3,580 £3,617
Embsay CE	201	£77,332	£82,924	14.33 %	-£1,840		£7,432	,	· · · ·	£6,884	£403	£3,281
Kirk Fenton Parochial	220	£41,843	£24,860	3.64%	-£19,980	-£16,983	£2,997	£24,530		£12,545	£113	
Monk Fryston CE	208	£49,009	£56,418	8.28%	-£33,430	£7,410	£40,840	-£13,370		£11,057	£271	£3,274
Skipton, Parish CE	213	£109,590	£107,516	14.24%	-£29,010		£26,936				£505	£3,545
Ripon, Holy Trinity CE Infant	221	£37,874	£65,379	9.03%	£5,700	£27,505	£21,805			£33,061	£295	£3,272
Knaresborough, St Mary's RC	203	£85,326	£40,342	5.86%	-£12,820	-£44,984	-£32,164	-£9,400		£0	£199	£3,390
Skipton' St Stephen's RC	200	£47,942	£7,006	1.04%	-£15,490	-£40,936	-£25,446	-£45,300	-£38,294	£0	£35	£3,377
Harrogate, St Joseph's RC	214	£85,549	£103,747	14.84%	-£8,280	£18,198	£26,478	£28,520		£0	£485	
Scarborough, St Peter's RC	217	£55,979	£39,364	5.34%	£3,070	· · · ·	-£19,685	£4,050	· · · · ·	£0	£181	£3,398
200 to 225 Sub-total	4857	£1,716,285	£1,815,768	10.86%	-£396,080		£495,564	· · · · · ·			£374	· · · · · ·
Kirkbymoorside	240	£30,374	£68,603	9.51%	-£9,900		£48,129			£24,986	£286	£3,008
Burniston, Lindhead	226	£40,143	£62,462	8.60%	-£6,350		£28,669			£18,321	£276	,
Harrogate, Oatlands Infant	230	£46,285	£43,027	5.94%	-£9,440		£6,182			£455	£187	£3,149
Skipton, Greatwood	235	£174,927	£157,614	19.12%	-£58,960	-£17,313	£41,647	-£38,460		£1,140	£671	£3,510
Harrogate, Hookstone Chase	240	£90,127	£87,592	11.03%	-£49,270		£46,735			£74	£365	£3,309
Hunmanby	227	£97,189	£88,408	11.74%	-£14,790		£6,009			£20,060	£389	
Sherburn in Elmet, Athelstan Filey CE	243 235	£35,834 £16,408	£19,041 £55,310	2.76% 7.02%	-£45,830 -£11,480		£29,036 £50,382			-£16,788 £14,303	£78 £236	£2,836 £3,355
225 to 250 Sub-total	1876		£582,057	9.67%			£30,382				£230	
Northallerton, Applegarth	262	£20,960	£45,476	5.04%	£54,390		-£29,874				£174	
Romanby	262	-£8,729	£43,470	3.41%	£20,800		£18,146			£0	£174 £114	,
Sowerby	262	£87,232	£136,795	16.01%	-£27,290		£76,854	,		£9,154	£522	
Northallerton, Broomfield	256	£77,975	£100,700	12.67%	-£37,950		£61,668			-£1	£397	£3,136
Thirsk	253	£48,327	£93,551	10.81%	£2,910		£42,314	,		£16,263	£370	
Harrogate, Starbeck	251	£84,077	£66,541	8.04%	-£79,570		£62,034			£23,551	£265	
Thorpe Willoughby	260	£70,721	£65,992	7.74%	-£25,400		£20,671	,		£9,702	£254	£3,280
Selby, Barwic Parade	271	£57,688	£93,103	8.88%	-£28,510		£63,925			£0	£343	
Filey Junior	253	£163,307	£251,313	26.08%	-£48,720		£136,726				£993	
Richmond CE	250	£150,972	£136,949	15.32%	-£56,130	-£14,023	£42,107				£548	£3,580

School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March E 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Budget Provision per pupil
	_			%							£	£
Ripon, Holy Trinity CE Junior	263	£22,289	£24,079	2.85%	-£17,770	£1,790	£19,560	-£12,680	£11,399	£805	£92	£3,210
Scarborough, St Martin's CE	273	£42,560	£46,301	5.03%	-£13,630	£3,741	£17,371	£11,500	£57,801	£0	£170	£3,374
250 to 275 Sub-total	3118	£817,379	£1,092,011	10.24%	-£256,870	£274,632	£531,502	-£139,350	£952,661	£61,007	£350	£3,420
Malton	276	£135,791	£148,308	16.86%	-£70,950	£12,517	£83,467	-£37,220	£111,088	£6,947	£537	£3,185
Easingwold	276	£71,840	£54,660	5.80%	-£33,870	-£17,180	£16,690	£560	,	£9,222	£198	£3,415
Pickering Junior	285	£43,558	£76,497	8.40%	£410	£32,938	£32,528	-£32,760	£43,737	£11,004	£268	£3,196
Selby CP	299	£229,705	£204,527	17.83%	-£12,020	-£25,178	-£13,158	-£38,710	£165,817	£15,555	£684	£3,834
Harrogate, Oatlands Junior	292	£56,293	£74,457	8.12%	£33,270	£18,164	-£15,106	-£4,780	£69,677	£5,541	£255	£3,138
Harrogate, St Peter's CE	283	£71,881	£78,494	8.12%	£18,580	£6,613	-£11,967	£4,440	£82,934	£1,739	£277	£3,415
Selby Abbey CE	288 278	£196,905	£173,361 £138,435	14.91%	-£57,280 -£23,520	-£23,544	£33,736	-£9,410	£163,951	£2,288 £7,781	£602	£4,038 £3,346
Harrogate, St Robert's RC 275 to 300 Sub-total	278	£124,905 £930,878	£138,435 £948,739	14.88% 12.08%	-£23,520 -£145,380	£13,529 £17,860	£37,049 £163,240	£14,830 -£103,050	£153,265 £845,689	£7,781	£498 £417	£3,346 £3,450
	322	£930,878	, ,		,	-£22,706	£79,074	,			£272	£3,648
Stokesley Harrogate, Bilton Grange	322	£110,214 £50,839	£87,508 £32,385	7.46% 3.09%	-£101,780 -£11,340	-£22,706 -£18,454	£79,074 -£7,114	-£29,100 -£9,650	£58,408 £22,735	£13,857 £1,119	£272 £101	£3,648 £3,267
Harrogate, Grove Road	321	£30,839 £231,726	£32,385 £146,586	3.09% 14.16%	-£11,340 -£76,920	-£18,454 -£85,140	-£7,114 -£8,220	-£9,650 -£34,590	£22,735 £111,996	£1,119 £1,032	£101 £454	£3,207 £3,202
Glusburn	323	£231,726 £64.234	£146,586 £19,248	2.22%	-£76,920 -£43,190	-£85,140 -£44,986	-£8,220 -£1,796	-£34,590 -£5.260	£111,996 £13.988	£1,032 £2,488	£454 £62	£3,202 £2,793
Bedale CE	310	£76,312	£19,248 £104,948	10.50%	£11,630	£28,636	£17,006	,	,	£2,400	£334	£2,793 £3,184
Richmond Methodist	314	£112,293	£78,766	7.83%	-£87,590	-£33,527	£54,063	£1,430 -£59,940	£106,378 £18,826	-£1,154	£334 £253	£3,184 £3,235
St John's CE Primary School	316	£112,293 £102.424	£120,384	11.22%	-£68,510	£17,960	£34,063 £86,470	-£39,940 -£28,450	£10,820 £91,934	£1,154	£255 £381	£3,235 £3,395
300 to 325 Sub-total	2217	£748,043	£589,825	8.19%	-£377,700	-£158,217	£219,483	-£165,560	£424,265	£39,286	£266	£3,249
Newby	433	£146,572	£126,498	8.79%	-£50,280	-£20,073	£30,207	-£95,810	£30,688	£17,744	£292	£3,325
Scarborough, Barrowcliff Primary	356	£157,532	£239,091	32.17%	-£34,630	£81,559	£116,189	-£131,210	£107,881	£25,560	£671	£2,087
Scarborough, Braeburn Primary	387	£120,324	£294,753	37.53%	£15,730	£174,430	£158,700	-£20,870	£273,883	£23,177	£761	£2,007
Scarborough, Friarage	354	£46,378	£53,736	3.63%	-£26,000	£7,357	£33,357	-£4,340	£49,396	£3,857	£152	£4,184
Scarborough, Gladstone Road Primary	812	£103,705	£301,847	22.46%	-£53,110	£198,142	£251,252	-£48,390	£253,457	£13,018	£372	£1,655
Scarborough, Northstead	620	£210,901	£210,577	9.14%	-£96,710	-£325	£96,385	-£74,630	£135,947	£10,861	£340	£3,715
Catterick Garrison, Le Cateau	358	£94,651	£178,180	14.06%	£12,360	£83,529	£71,169	-£57,170	£121,010	-£24,025	£498	£3,543
Seamer & Irton	401	£101,429	£112,985	8.93%	-£25,590	£11,556	£37,146	£21,780	£134,765	£14,247	£282	£3,156
Harrogate, Western	478	£103,870	£79,056	5.74%	-£21,010	-£24,815	-£3,805	£730		£159	£165	£2,881
Willow Tree	524	£235,724	£311,561	19.98%	-£53,880	£75,837	£129,717	£97,070	£408,631	£59,607	£595	£2,976
Harrogate, Pannal	363	£50,619	£63,410	6.08%	-£43,730	£12,791	£56,521	-£2,370	£61,040	£1,100	£175	£2,871
Knaresborough, Aspin Park	424	£84,399	£104,291	7.94%	-£20,550	£19,893	£40,443	-£42,180	£62,111	£4,129	£246	£3,097
Harrogate, Rossett Acre	418	£111,844	£100,821	7.75%	-£31,100	-£11,024	£20,076	-£23,040	£77,781	£3,283	£241	£3,111
Barlby	352	£195,269	£175,733	15.34%	-£31,750	-£19,536	£12,214	-£45,400	£130,333	£12,000	£500	£3,257
Norton	530	£98,797	£48,877	3.10%	-£7,340	-£49,920	-£42,580	£65,660	£114,537	£130	£92	£2,978
Tadcaster, Riverside CP	406	£32,392	£65,554	5.57%	-£29,340	£33,162	£62,502	£22,950	£88,504	£174	£161	£2,900
Brayton CE Primary	386	£82,110	£216,205	18.98%	£42,700	£134,094	£91,394	£43,380	£259,585	£4,043	£560	£2,950
>325 Sub-total	7602	£1,976,517	£2,683,173	12.05%	-£454,230	£706,657	£1,160,887	-£293,840	£2,389,333	£169,062	£353	£2,929
GRAND TOTAL	42,543	£14,699,258	£17,224,484	11.04%	-£3,354,270	£2,525,226	£5,879,496	-£1,996,880	£15,227,604	£1,971,538	£405	£0

DfE no	School	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 2014/15 %	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil £	Average Budget Provision per pupil £
4004	Risedale Community College	417	£336,896	£173,010	6.62%	-£307,820	-£163,886	£143,934	-£271,290	-£98.280	£19,502	£415	£6,270
4041	Eskdale	296	£167,416	£183,678	12.39%	-£57,930		£74,192	-£100,520	£83,158		£621	£5,007
4075	Wensleydale	470	£219,138	£143,809	5.74%	-£134,960		£59,632	-£58,510	£85,299		£306	£5,335
4150	Filey	496	£100,978	£49,624	1.82%	-£258,430		£207,075	-£49,460	£164		£100	£5,495
4206	Upper Wharfedale	293	£374,025	£312,769	18.50%	-£120,240	,	£58,984	-£227,430	£85,339		£1,067	£5,772
4223	Nidderdale High	289	£288,166	£201,527	12.28%	-£188,280		£101,641	-£113,280	£88,247		£697	£5,679
4224	Brayton College	370	£326,648	£268,380	11.86%	-£216,810		£158,542	-£266,420	£1,960		£725	£6,115
4605	St Francis Xavier	467	£327.779	£327.883	15.42%	-£63.280		£63.384	-£77.720	£250.163		£702	£4,554
4610	Holy Family RC High	478	£222,577	£242,845	10.52%	-£139,500		£159,768	-£173,520	£69,325		£508	£4,829
9	250 to 500 Sub-total	3,576	£2,363,622	£1,903,525	9.83%	-£1,487,250	-£460,097	£1,027,153	-£1,338,150	£565,375	£130,541	£532	£5,414
4022	Rvedale	604	£244.813	£196.237	7.03%	-£134.870	-£48.576	£86.294	-£48.090	£148.147	£10.066	£325	£4.624
4052	Bedale High	649	£299,898	-£41,420	-1.34%	-£536,970		£195,652	-£330,210	/		-£64	£4,770
4069	George Pindar	688	£1,222,981	£1,067,788	30.41%	-£314,500	,	£159,307	-£250,080	£817,708	,	£1,552	£5,104
4074	Allertonshire	589	£357,055	£178,506	6.36%	-£294,600	-£178,549	£116,051	£0	£178,506	£5,588	£303	£4,763
4077	Malton	655	-£160,768	-£399,888	-12.29%	-£168,850	,	-£70,270	-£139,070	-£538,958		-£611	£4,969
4205	Settle College	610	£430,380	£670,502	20.82%	£11,070	£240,122	£229,052	£11,550	£682,052	£30,664	£1,099	£5,279
4216	Sherburn High	747	£224,279	£138,571	4.09%	-£115,800	-£85,709	£30,091	-£129,370	£9,201	£519	£186	£4,533
4221	Boroughbridge High	728	-£78,086	£9,722	0.29%	£970		£86,837	-£9,470	£252		£13	£4,617
4232	Barlby High	596	£371,359	£351,366	12.78%	-£196,400	-£19,993	£176,407	£55,830	£407,196	£0	£590	£4,614
4503	Northallerton College	708	£387,148	£184,195	4.91%	-£196,290	,	-£6,663	-£227,100	-£42,905		£260	£5,296
4604	St Augustine's RC	527	£199,989	£144,771	6.05%	-£184,710	-£55,218	£129,492	-£108,550	£36,221	£0	£275	£4,544
11	500 to 750 Sub-total	7,101	£3,499,048	£2,500,349	7.28%	-£2,130,950	-£998,700	£1,132,250	-£1,174,560	£1,325,789	£82,502	£352	£4,833
4035	Thirsk	957	£595,977	£492,004	10.88%	-£324,460	-£103,972	£220,488	-£345,110	£146,894	£2,125	£514	£4,724
4054	Lady Lumley's	885	£469,530	£491,574	12.08%	-£268,980	£22,044	£291,024	-£316,860	£174,714	£97,958	£555	£4,598
4215	Ripon Grammar	862	£272,917	£198,600	5.36%	£10,310	-£74,317	-£84,627	-£30,450	£168,150	-£259,696	£230	£4,299
4608	Ermysted's	788	£154,932	£132,554	3.68%	-£87,520	-£22,378	£65,142	-£59,980	£72,574	£0	£168	£4,576
4	750 to 1000 Sub-total	3,492	£1,493,355	£1,314,732	8.27%	-£670,650	-£178,624	£492,026	-£752,400	£562,332	-£159,613	£376	£4,554
4005	Easingwold	1,058	£99,808	-£19,424	-0.39%	-£59,860	-£119,233	-£59,373	-£276,300	-£295,724	£79,623	-£18	£4,671
4039	Caedmon College Whitby	1,098	£610,918	£863,197	21.58%	-£248,570	£252,279	£500,849	-£159,610	£703,587	£150,289	£786	£3,643
4047	Stokesley	1,148	£397,028	£383,135	7.55%	-£385,610	-£13,892	£371,718	£0	£383,135	£2,310	£334	£4,420
4070	Graham	1,198	£936,772	£1,196,594	17.32%	-£255,250		£515,072	-£382,010		£365,234	£999	£5,766
4073	Scalby	1,008	£390,641	£455,798	9.98%	£150	, .	£65,007	£101,270	£557,068		£452	£4,532
4225	Selby High	1,107	£321,441	£467,181	9.47%	-£88,820		£234,560	-£38,680	£428,501	-£243,578	£422	£4,458
6	1000 to 1250 Sub-total	6,617		£3,346,481	11.00%	-£1,037,960		£1,627,833	-£755,330			£506	£4,598
4609	St John Fisher RC High	1,413		£220,186	3.62%	-£150,600		£99,867	£3,040			£156	£4,304
1	1250 to 1500 Sub-total	1,413		£220,186	3.62%	-£150,600	· · · ·	£99,867	£3,040			156	£4,304
4076	Richmond	1,507	£795,527	£746,907	10.54%	-£461,810	,	£413,190	-£412,610			£496	£4,701
4202	King James'	1,688	£290,304	£367,082	4.86%	-£99,920		£176,697	-£79,760	£287,322		£217	£4,477
4211	Tadcaster Grammar	1,571	£489,615	£269,200	3.97%	-£99,973	· · · ·	-£120,443	-£92,120	£177,080		£171	£4,313
3	> 1500 Sub-total	4,766	£1,575,446	£1,383,188	6.46%	-£661,703	-£192,258	£469,445	-£584,490	£798,698	£38,187	£290	£4,494
34	Grand Total	26,965	£11,958,999	£10,668,461	8.37%	-£6,139,113	-£1,290,538	£4,848,575	-£4,601,890	£6,066,571	£515,137	£2,213	£4,729

DfE no	Name	No. on Roll	Revenue Balance March 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 14/15	Start Budget 2014/2015 In Year	Actual In Year budget position 2014/15	Variation	Projected In Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015	Average Revenue Balance per pupil	Average Provision per pupil
7000	Brompton Hall	44	£340,318	£523,284	30.81%		£182,966	£183,606	£39,650	£562,934	£11.475		£38,604
7000	Welburn Hall School	67	£252,470	£450,550	20.96%		£198,080	£83,840	£8,620	£459,170	£25,001	£6,725	£32,084
7015	Dales School	51	£186,869	£205,133	16.49%	,	£18,264	-£26,396	-£54,520	£150,613	£104,830		£24,391
7017	Springhead School	62	£309,676	£300,109	21.75%	-£232,620	-£9,567	£223,053	-£296,270	£3,839	£36,271	£4,840	£22,252
7022	Forest School	108	£227,342	£144,877	8.31%	-£116,410	-£82,465	£33,945	-£12,740	£132,137	£14,037	£1,341	£16,144
7024	Springwater School	45	£72,728	£36,872	3.14%	-£30,556	-£35,856	-£5,300	£52,550	£89,422	£0	£819	£26,113
7027	Brooklands School	51	£112,378	£53,701	5.98%	-£104,510	-£58,676	£45,834	-£38,820	£14,881	£3,600	£1,053	£17,611
7029	Mowbray School	139	£258,004	£156,866	7.51%	-£242,950	-£101,138	£141,812	-£87,850	£69,016	£100	£1,129	£15,029
7030	Foremost School	12	-£4,297	-£23,634	-2.22%	-£389,330	-£19,337	£369,993	£29,140	£5,506	£23,634	-£1,969	£88,768
9	Total	579	£1,755,488	£1,847,758	13.75%	-£958,116	£92,271	£1,050,387	-£360,240	£1,487,518	£218,948	£3,191	£23,217

Details of Individual Pupil Referral Unit balances

		Projected In							
DfE no	Name	Revenue Balance March 2014	Revenue Balance March 2015	% Revenue Balance to Funding 14/15	Year Revenue position 2015/16	Projected Revenue Balance March 2016	Capital Balance March 2015		
1100	Scarborough PRS	156,961	267,454	25.37%	117,300	384,754	0		
1102	Hambleton & Richmondshire PRS	62,545	273,999	25.34%	37,900	311,899	1,840		
1103	Craven PRS	173,509	181,917	28.95%	-97,600	84,317	8,297		
1104	Selby PRS	134,370	220,806	25.58%	-67,400	153,406	4,473		
	Whitby PRS	-	£38,509		-	-	-		
5	Total	£527,385	£982,685	27.09%	-£9,800	£934,376	£14,610		
5	Total	£527,385	£982,685	27.09%	-£9,800	£934,376			



Date of meeting:	Thursday 15 October 2015						
Title of report:	High Needs Funding						
Type of report: Delete as required	For information						
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	This report sets out the background to High Needs Funding and the current position in North Yorkshire. It also highlights that although minimal changes are being requested for 2016-17 from the DfE, works needs to be completed to review the impact of the Resource Allocation System in order to agree the local methodology for next year. This will be done through a series of meetings with the funding sub-group before being t back to the full NYEP for approval.						
Budget / Risk implications:	Not yet known, although any change in the Top-up funding for 2016-17 would impact on individual school budgets						
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership notes the content of this paper						
Voting requirements:	N/A						
Appendices: To be attached							
Report originator and contact	Anton Hodge – Assistant Director						
details:	anton.hodge@northyorks.gov.uk						
	01609 532118						
Presenting officer: If not the originator							



1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This report sets out the background to High Needs Funding and the current position in North Yorkshire. It also highlights that although minimal changes are being requested for 2016-17 from the DfE, works needs to be completed to review the impact of the Resource Allocation System in order to agree the local methodology for next year. This will be done through a series of meetings with the funding sub-group before being t back to the full NYEP for approval.

2 CURRENT POSITION

- 2.1 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) allocates funding to local authorities for High Needs as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This "High Needs Block" is not based on any national assessment of resources required; it simply reflects historic decisions made by schools and councils in the past two decades, although additional funding has been made to councils recently to assist with financial pressures. The High Needs Block is not separately ring-fenced within a local authority's DSG. This means that local authorities can decide to spend more or less of the funding than they have been "allocated."
- 2.2 Local authorities decide how much to set aside in their high needs budget, for the place and top-up funding to institutions (except place funding to FE institutions, commercial and charitable providers (CCPs) and specialist Post-16 institutions (SPIs). Some of the place funding is included in local authorities' initial DSG allocation and then deducted by the EFA so that it can pay the funding direct, for example to academies.
- 2.3 There may be instances where aspects of high needs provision are not allocated through place funding. For instance, specialist support for pupils with sensory impairments, or tuition for pupils not able to attend school for medical or other reasons. Local authorities may fund this provision from their high needs budget as a separate arrangement. Where such services are delivered by, or commissioned from, schools or other institutions, the authority may devolve funding from its high needs budget to that institution through a service level agreement.
- 2.4 Pupils and students who receive support from local authorities' high needs budgets include:
 - children aged 0 to 5 with SEN whom the local authority decides to support from its high needs budget. Some of these children may have EHC plans
 - pupils aged 5 to 18 (inclusive of students who turn 19 on or after 31st August in the academic year in which they study) with high levels of SEN in schools and academies, further education (FE) institutions, specialist post-16 institutions (SPIs) or other settings who receive top-up funding from the high needs budget. Most, but not all, of these pupils will have either statements of SEN or EHC plans
 - those aged 19 to 25 in FE institutions and SPIs who have a EHC plan and require additional support costing over £6,000 (if aged 19 to 25 without an ECH plan, local authorities must not use their DSG to fund these students)
 - school-age pupils placed in alternative provision by local authorities or schools.


High Needs Funding

- 2.5 High Needs Funding system has two main components:
 - core funding included within mainstream schools' and academies budgets, derived from their local funding formula. Other institutions receive place funding (sometimes known as elements 1 and 2 for post-16).
 - **top-up funding** (sometimes known as element 3).

High needs places

2.6 Place funding is allocated to an institution and includes the funding pupils and students attract for their core education and basic programmes and to provide a contribution to the additional costs associated with a support package. Most high needs places are typically funded at £10,000 per year in pre-16 settings, although this amount varies dependent on institution type. The following table sets out the responsibilities for funding high needs provision in different types of provider for both pre and post 16 students:

Pre-16 Post-16				
Type of provision	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)
Mainstream schools Mainstream academies	Funding to meet first £6,000 of additional need delegated within school budget and academy grant derived from local formula (in addition to the age- weighted pupil unit (AWPU) funding).	LA can provide additional funds where it would be unreasonable to expect school to fund from within notional SEN budget. Agreed per- pupil top up paid by commissioning LA	Element 1 (based on 16- 19 National Funding Formula (NFF)) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on allocated place number	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA
HN Units in mainstream schools HN units in mainstream academies	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA	Element 1 (NFF) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on agreed place number	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA
Maintained special schools Special academies Non maintained special schools	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA



High Needs Funding

15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

Pre-16	Pre-16 Post-16				
Type of provision	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)	
Independent Schools	N/A	Agreed per- pupil funding paid by commissioning LA	N/A	Agreed per- pupil funding paid by commissioning LA	
Maintained pupil referral units (PRUs) AP Academies	£10,000 per place based on agreed places	Agreed per- pupil top-up paid by commissioning school or LA	N/A	N/A	
Further education and sixth form colleges, Post 16 Independent Specialist Providers and CCPs	N/A	N/A	Element 1 (NFF) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on places commissioned by LAs	Agreed per- student top-up paid by commissioning LA	

High Needs Top-up funding

- 2.7 Top-up funding, sometimes known as element 3, is the funding required over and above the place funding to enable a pupil or student with high needs to participate in education and learning. This is paid by the local authority in which the pupil or student is resident or belongs (in the case of looked after children), from their high needs budget, in line with their place commissioning.
- 2.8 Top-up funding rates should mainly reflect the additional support costs relating to individual pupils and students, in excess of core funding, that the institution receives. Top-up funding can also reflect costs that relate to the facilities needed to support a pupil's or student's education and training needs (either for individuals or on offer to all), and can take into account expected place occupancy levels and other factors.
- 2.9 Top-up Funding in North Yorkshire is now allocated through the Can-Do Resource Allocation System (RAS) as agreed and finalised by the Schools Forum in November 2014 and March 2015. Transitional arrangements were confirmed for the current financial year which resulted in the capping of gains at some schools and the minimising of losses at others. This was agreed in order to give some time for moderation to test the robustness of the system.
- 2.10 The March 2015 paper about this issue is attached for information at Appendix 1.



3. DfE PROPOSALS FOR 2016-17

- 3.1 The DfE has confirmed that the high needs funding system remains largely unchanged for 2016-17. However, although additional funding has been allocated through the DSG in both 2014-15 and 2015-16, because the Spending Review settlement does not take place until after November 25th, the Department is not in a position to commit to funding growth in high needs places.
- 3.2 There is however, a 2016 to 2017 high needs place change request process which enables local authorities to notify EFA of changes to 2016 to 2017 place numbers for academies and FE institutions. These place numbers will then be used as the basis for EFA funding direct to these institutions.
- 3.3 The DfE wrote to LAs in September to seek views on proposals that 2016 to 2017 allocations for non-maintained special schools will be based on January 2015 school census; and allocations for special post-16 institutions will be based on 2014/15 ILR R14 data.

4 LOCAL ISSUES AND SUGGESTED WORKPLAN

- 4.1 There are a number of pieces of work which need to be carried out over the next two months to ensure that allocations are agreed and sent to schools and Pupil Referral Services in good time for the 2016-17 financial year. These include:
 - the current estimate of budget pressures in the High Needs Block
 - allocations through the RAS for next year, including the findings of moderation and the continuation or otherwise of transitional funding next year
 - proposals on non-maintained special schools (NMSS) and specialist post-16 institutions (SPI), (views invited by Friday 23 October 2015)
 - liaison with academies, FE institutions and CCPs in relation to 2016 to 2017 high needs place change request return (sign-off by Director of Children's Services, by 16 November 2015)
- 4.2 The DfE will only confirm the basis for NMSS and SPI placements "in January 2016" and the outcome of place change requests for not be known until "the end of January."
- 4.3 The EFA will notify allocations to academies and NMSS in February and the LA will also aim for this date with respect to LA maintained schools

21 January 2016	Deadline for submission of final 2016 to 2017 authority proforma tool to EFA
January 2016	Confirm basis for NMSS and SPI 2016 to 2017 high needs funding arrangements
End of January 2016	Outcomes of 2016 to 2017 high needs place change requests are confirmed



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

February 2016	
March 2016	2016 to 2017 allocations to post-16 institutions to be issued Final DSG allocations to LAs based on 2016 to 2017, net of academies recoupment and high needs place deductions (DSG allocations updated termly for in year academy conversions)
May 2016	Publication of 2016 to 2017 high needs place numbers at institution level

4.4 A number of dates have been arranged over the next few weeks for the Funding Subgroup and these will consider the issues raised above, with a report back to the Partnership in December/January.

5 <u>Recommendations</u>

5.1 The Partnership is asked to note the information included in this report.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE

SCHOOLS FORUM

Wednesday 4th March 2015

<u>Report Summary Cover for Item 5: Element 3 High Needs Funding with effect from April 2015</u>

Summary of Report Contents

This report revisits the reasons for developing a Resource Allocation System. It provides an update on the position of Element 2 funding allocated through the main school formula. It also outlines how the new Resource Allocation System will operate for all schools and settings, and for pupils and students aged 0-25 and the proposed transitional arrangements for the 2015-2016 financial year.

Finally, it explains the need to resolve the temporary arrangement that were put into place during 2014-2015 which involved allocating some of the Element 3 'Top up' by reference to prior attainment and sets out some transitional arrangements to be put into place in 2015-2016 financial year for those schools faced with the largest loss in funding.

Report prepared by: Andrew Terry, Assistant Director – Access and Inclusion (CYPS), and Judith Walls, Finance Manager – Strategic Resources (CYPS)

This report:

Requires a decision to be made by the Schools Forum	\checkmark
Seeks the guidance of the Schools Forum	
Is a consultation document seeking the views of the Schools Forum	
Is for information only : this report will not be presented to the Schools Forum. Members wishing to comment or raise questions on its content should advise the Clerk to the Schools Forum who will, if necessary, arrange for the author to be present at the meeting to respond to the issues raised. Please e-mail comments / questions to the Clerk to the Schools Forum: jayne.laver@northyorks.gov.uk	
Please note that all reports are uploaded to the CYPSinfo site after the meeting where they can be viewed by the public. If the information in this report is of a sensitive nature and you DO NOT want it uploading to the CYPSinfo site please indicate with a " X " in the box to the right.	
Note to Report Author: insert $\sqrt{1}$ against the description that applies to this report	4



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE

SCHOOLS FORUM

Wednesday 4th March 2015

ELEMENT 3 HIGH NEEDS FUNDING WITH EFFECT FROM APRIL 2015

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report revisits the reasons for developing a Resource Allocation System.
- 1.2 It provides an update on the position of Element 2 funding allocated through the main school formula.
- 1.3 It outlines how the new Resource Allocation System will operate for all schools and settings, and for pupils and students aged 0-25 and the proposed transitional arrangements for the 2015-2016 financial year.
- 1.4 It explains the need to resolve the temporary arrangement that were put into place during 2014-2015 which involved allocating some of the Element 3 'Top up' by reference to prior attainment and sets out some transitional arrangements to be put into place in 2015-2016 financial year for those schools faced with the largest loss in funding.
- 1.5 Once, and if, approved schools and settings can be notified of their allocations for 2015/16.

2.0 PREVIOUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS

2.1 The Schools Forum and its working group have considered this issue in January 2013, March 2014, October 2014 and November 2014. The discussions and recommendations from those from those meetings are reflected in this paper.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 There are currently approximately 1,900 North Yorkshire children and young people who have at least one of the following:
 - a Statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN)
 - an Education Health or Care Plan (EHCP)
 - a Section 139 Assessment
 - Early Years Inclusion Funding equivalent to Element 2 funding
- 3.2 For 16,544 pupils an allocation of Element 3 'Top-up' funding is made by reference to prior attainment at a cost of £2.7m.
- 3.3 The current budget for Element 3 'Top-up' funding (including the SEN exceptional funding, Inclusion funding for Early Years, and minimum funding guarantee) amounts to approximately £24m.
- 3.4 With effect from April 2014 the DfE required local authorities to implement new funding arrangements for High Needs special education funding. These arrangements apply to all children and young people aged 0 to 25 years, and across all types of provision except Independent Special Schools which the DfE is considering bringing into the arrangements, although this will not happen before April 2016.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

- 3.5 If a young person requires more than £6,000 of additional or different support then it is deemed to be High Needs and funded through what is known as Element 3 'Top-up' funding, The first £6,000 of additional support has to be found, in the case of mainstream schools, from their delegated budget, or in the case of Post 16 Providers and special schools, as a commissioned place.
- 3.6 The DfE's changes required the funding arrangements for **special schools** in North Yorkshire to be revised but there was no immediate replacement for the formula which had been introduced in April 2011. That being the case, the Banding Levels which identified the primary needs of pupils, and which had been used prior to 2011, were once again used, this time to determine the level of Element 3 'Top-up' funding. This approach was only reluctantly supported by special schools who recognised that there was no practicable alternative, and that the Minimum Funding Guarantee would provide a guaranteed level of funding for 2013-2014. This was then extended into 2015-2016.
- 3.7 In addition, with effect from August 2013, local authorities became responsible for allocating Element 3 'Top-up' funding to **post -16 providers.** There was no framework then in place in North Yorkshire to carry out an individual assessment of need to determine the funding level for these young people.
- 3.8 Following the introduction of a formula for **Early Years funding** in 2009, SEN funding arrangements for Early Years were developed to align to those in mainstream schools at the time. The DfE changes to SEN funding were not compulsory for Early Years Providers but following consultation, Early Years Providers confirmed their preference to be aligned to the new mainstream school funding arrangements for Element 2 and Element 3 SEN funding.
- 3.9 In recent years a number of concerns have been raised by **mainstream schools** as to how the number of hours funded on a Statement of SEN is determined, with the implication that the arrangements need to be more consistent and transparent.
- 3.10 The current system for providing financial support for **specialist equipment** required by children and young people with High Needs SEN should be revised to meet the new SEND duties in the Children and Families Act.
- 3.11 The local authority needs to have a funding framework in place which is capable of responding to requests from the parents of children and young people with an EHCP for a **personal budget or Direct Payment**, in line with the new SEND duties.
- 3.12 Having considered the implications of all the issues above, it was decided by the Schools Forum in January 2013 and March 2014 that **a new funding framework** should be developed in North Yorkshire for implementation in April 2015, with interim arrangements, where necessary, for 2014-2015.
- 3.13 The revised High Needs funding arrangements were developed and introduced in North Yorkshire in April 2014 following several discussions with the DfE. This is because SEN funding for individual pupils in North Yorkshire was already delegated for support equivalent to approximately £10k per annum, higher than the DfE threshold for Element 3 'Top up' funding (set at £6k). The total sum between the £6k and £10k thresholds amounted to £2.7m. The local authority was keen not to write Statements of SEN in order to allocate this sum to individual pupils as this would have involved more bureaucracy and delay for schools and for parents.
- 3.14 It was agreed, therefore, that **prior attainment** could be used as long as the funding followed the child when a child started or left a school.
- 3.15 In 2013-14 the DSG was split into 3 blocks under new arrangements for schools funding.



High Needs Funding

15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

These 3 blocks, which are indicative only, and not ring-fenced are:

- Schools
- High Needs
- Early Years

The DfE produced the following diagram to assist in understanding how the arrangements for Special Education Needs funding would operate with effect from April 2013: -

Funding Elements	Financial support for 0 – 25 year olds Responsibility of Provision	LA responsibility out of High Needs Block
Element 1 Funding (Universal Funding equivalent to £4,000 per pupil)	Funding Delegated to the Education Establishment based upon the number of children and young people attending the provision or through a commissioned place for specialist provision	
Element 2 Funding (Funding to meet additional and different needs up to the equivalent of £6,000 per pupil)	Early Years Providers will be allocated this based upon an application process. Mainstream Pre 16 Schools will be allocated this through their delegated formula Post 16 Provision through commissioned places Specialist provision and through a commissioned places	
SEN exceptional support		To provide support where there is not sufficient Element 2 funding provided
Element 3 Funding (Top-up funding)		Based upon the individual assessed need of the child or young person
Total	Equivalent of first £10,000 per pupil or per place	

4.0 Element 2 Funding

- 4.1 North Yorkshire County Council has been part of a campaign to ensure a more equitable distribution of funding to LAs across the country and this has manifested itself in the allocation of the equivalent of an extra £9.8m (or 3.1%) compared with the 2014-15 Schools Block. All of this additional funding has been allocated to schools.
- 4.2 This has meant that Mainstream Schools in North Yorkshire will receive the equivalent of an extra 3.1% towards their Element 1 and Element 2 funding in the 2015-2016 financial year. Details of the year on year difference of £383k in Element 2 funding are set out in **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 4.3 As the Element 2 Formula uses a number of proxy indicators (including pupil numbers, prior attainment results, IDACI, FSM, LAC and mobility), individual school allocations may



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

not all increase by the average 3.1%; some may increase above this and some below depending upon data changes between the two financial years. Any school faced with a reduction in the level of Element 2 funding may, if the overall school budget is affected, be covered by the mainstream Minimum Funding Guarantee.

5.0 Element 3 Funding Allocated by Reference to a Resource Allocation System

- 5.1 The new funding framework has to:
 - meet DfE requirements to determine the Element 3 'Top-up' funding by reference to an individual assessment of need
 - be applicable to all children and young people aged 0 25
 - be applicable to all types of provision included in the High Needs funding arrangements
 - be capable of providing indicative personal budgets for the education element of support that could form part of a personal budget or Direct Payment.
- 5.2 The background to the development of the Resource Allocation System has been reported to the Schools Forum on a number of occasions most recently in November 2014.
- 5.3 It was recognised that phase one of the developments would only consider the education component of the support. There will still be separate assessments processes to determine if a child or young person is eligible to funding from Health or Care. It may however be possible to consider aligning the Care assessment with the education assessment as a second phase to the development once the education element is fully supported and implemented.
- 5.4 Once the data relating to individual pupils and students have been submitted to the local authority these are loaded onto a master system where weightings are applied to the responses to the questions, based upon assumptions regarding the level of support required to deal with the particular aspects of need.
- 5.5 An initial moderation exercise has been undertaken to assess the consistency of understanding in completing the CAN-Do questionnaires based upon a random sample of questionnaires.
- 5.6 It has already been proposed and supported that further moderation will be required during the course of the next year where the weighted score derived from the completed questionnaire would result in an allocation considerably different to the current. Where there are concerns in individual cases, we will require schools and settings to provide the necessary evidence to support their response to the questionnaire. In the event that no evidence is available to support the completed questionnaire the result would be adjusted accordingly.
- 5.7 As agreed at the meeting of the Schools Forum in November 2014, and following receipt of further completed questionnaires, several options for introducing the revised arrangements were discussed with members of the Schools Forum Funding Sub Group at the beginning of February 2015.
- 5.8 The first consideration is how the budget would be dealt with in the new Resource Allocation System. There are currently separate Element 3 budgets for all the different phases of education.

Option 1 – Would retain the budgets within the separate phases (i.e. Early Years, Primary, Secondary, Special and Post 16) and then allocate the individual indicative



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

budgets in accordance with the weighted results from the CAN-Do questionnaires. This would lead to different financial allocation even if the results from the completed questionnaires indicated that the child or young person had the same level of need due to the fact that we would be retaining the historical allocation of budgets. This would not be consistent with one of the main principles of developing a RAS.

Option 2 - Would collate all the budgets for Element 3 Top-up Funding into one pot. This would then be used to determine the indicative allocation for all education provision in accordance with the weighted results from the CAN-Do questionnaires. This option would result in a move from the historical basis of the budgets to one that reflects the level of needs across all children and young people within the education system in North Yorkshire. This would mean that there would be an initial movement of budgets between the different phases but would reflect the current level of High Needs of children and young people.

Members of the Schools Forum Funding Sub-Group supported Option 2 being taken forward to the Schools Forum on condition that transitional funding would be available during 2015-2016 the first year of operating the Resource Allocation System.

- 5.9 The second consideration regards how transitional arrangements in 2015-2016. In implementing any new system it is not possible to replicate the same level of funding to all establishments. In addition, and as noted above, there will be further moderation of the CAN-DO questionnaire over the course of the next financial year to ensure that the results for Year 1 are as robust as they can be. Therefore, with this in mind, and to assist schools and other education providers manage any reductions, the following proposals have been developed:-
 - (a) To propose to cap the gains at school level in the first year to either Option 1 50% or Option 2 25%. The financial implications of both of these options are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
 - (b) Schools that lose from the application of the RA would receive the same level of funding as they have in 2014-2015 financial year. The difference will be given as transitional funding, except where the child has left the establishment or the level of support has significantly changed.
 - (c) The transitional funding for children losing from the application of the RAS would be partially off-set by the capping of gains in year one.

The financial implications of these options are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.

5.10 As stated above, the indicative Element 3 budget for 2016-2017 will be determined by the results of the completed Can-Do questionnaire during the annual review. In some cases this will mean an allocation that is less than the current amount. The education provider will have the indicative budget allocation confirmed as part of the annual review which would provide the opportunity to consider what the agreed outcomes should be for the child or young person and how best the agreed outcomes could be met from within the indicative budget allocation. This would also allow the Education Provider time to plan how this support will be provided with effect from April 2016.

6.0 Element 3 Funding currently allocated by reference to Prior Attainment

6.1 This matter was first discussed at the November meeting of the Schools Forum following receipt of a request from the DfE to discontinue the allocation of Element 3 Funding by reference to Prior Attainment.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

- 6.2 The DfE requested that with effect from April 2015 all Element 3 funding should be allocated by reference to an individual assessment of need by way either of a Statement of SEN or an EHCP, and, in our case, therefore through the Resource Allocation System.
- 6.3 A number of schools, which in the past would have provided the support up to £9,200 per annum from their delegated funding, have already submitted requests for statutory assessment believing that the additional and different support required exceeds the DfE's £6,000 threshold. It is recognised that further requests will be received from schools over the coming months and to ensure the local authority has sufficient budget to fund these applications it is proposed that not all of the £2.7m is allocated through the RAS.
- 6.4 The summary position regarding the current allocation of the £2.7m is set out in the table below: -

	No of pupils that receive PA E3 Funding	No of pupils that receive PA E3 & HN Funding	No of pupil that receive PA but do not have a statement	Average School Allocation	Maximum Allocation	Minimum allocation
Primary	8,833	327	8,506	£5,682	£66,893	0
Secondary	7,711	271	7,440	£18,778	£70,519	200
TOTAL	16,544	598	15,946	£7,301		

6.5 As this funding is from the High Needs Block it is not included in the calculation of the mainstream school's Minimum Funding Guarantee; any reduction in funding will be a real reduction.

There are 28 schools where the allocation of this funding exceeds 20k in the 2014-2015 Financial Year. For this reason it is felt that any transitional funding should be targeted at those schools faced with the largest reduction.

- 6.6 However, in considering the transitional funding, it is important to note that part of this money would be required to: -
 - fund part of the proposals set out above to ensure that no education provider loses funding in the first year of implementing the Resource Allocation System in addition to those providers receiving additional indicative budgets where they do not exceed the agreed cap;
 - fund additional requests for statutory assessments that it is anticipated will be received with the ending of this funding and some which have already been received.
 - establish a contingency which will be used in instances where the indicative budget determined by the Resource Allocation System will be insufficient to meet the agreed outcomes of the young person. This is something that has been recommended in developing a RAS as although the majority of children and young people should be able to have their agreed outcomes met from the indicative budget allocation there may be a small number where they can't be met and additional funding would be required.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

6.7 Two options for this second type of transitional funding have been considered: -

Option 1 provides transitional funding of 33% of the total allocation made during the 2014-2015 financial year if the original allocation is greater than 15% of the total Element 2 formula allocation. This would cost a total of £720k.

Option 2 provides transitional funding of 33% of the total allocation made during the 2014-2015 financial year if the Element 3 Allocation allocated by reference to Prior Attainment exceeds 1% of the total school budget excluding high needs funding. This would costs a total of £394k.

Details of what this would mean for individual schools are set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEM

7.1 It is proposed that the Element 3 Funding be built up for individual children and young people as below, however it should be recognised that there will only be a very small number of children that will have additional complex medical needs funded and the contextual element of funding will only be applicable for special schools, as agreed at the meeting of the Forum in November 2014. An illustration of funding for a child in either type of provision is shown.

	Mainsteam	Special
Component	£	£
Education Funding based upon the individual assessment of need arrived at by from the completion of the CAN-Do questionnaire	7,702	7,702
Funding based upon the individual complex medical/care needs of individual pupils where appropriate which are not funded by Health	500	500
Education contribution towards the cost of specialist equipment	0	1,124
For special schools and other specialist provision only an element of contextual funding	1,000	1,000
Total Element 3 Funding per individual child or young person	1,500	2,624

- 7.2 The DfE announced the total funding for the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant in December 2014. However the local authority is still awaiting confirmation of the total deductions from the High Needs Block for:
 - specialist Academies
 - non- maintained special schools
 - post- 16 providers in North Yorkshire
 - other local authority specialist and post- 16 provision



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

The implications for the High Needs Budget are set out in a separate report on this agenda.

- 7.3 Although the local authority has received further completed CAN-Do questionnaires since the end of November 2014 we have not received all the completed questionnaires for Post 16 and Early Years Providers (who received training later than other establishments). There are also a number of questionnaires missing for pupils who have just started at special schools or moved into the local authority. The individual indicative budget allocations for 2015-2016 can't be finalised until the questionnaires have been received. However it was felt that sufficient completed CAN-Do questionnaires had been received to be able to determine the weightings within the RAS. No further adjustments will be made to weightings for the 2015-2016 financial year although they will need to be kept under review to determine whether they will need to be adjusted prior to the 2016-2017 financial year.
- 7.4 The estimated budget for Element 3 Funding as set out in the budget report has been built into the Resource Allocation System after ensuring that there is sufficient funding for:
 - a contingency for in-year adjustments to Element 3 Funding;
 - a contingency to provide additional resources for individual cases where the indicative allocation is proved to be insufficient to meet the agreed outcomes within the Education Health or Care Plan or the Statement of Special Educational Needs;
 - a contingency to cover the estimated cost of provision for children and young people where we will not have received a completed questionnaire by the end of January 2015.
 - a budget has been set for the 2015-2016 financial year to meet the complex medical/care needs of individual pupils that are not fully funded by Health or Care.
 - a budget is identified to meet the contextual element of funding for special schools
 - a budget is identified to meet the minimum funding guarantee for special schools;
 - a budget is identified to meet the estimated exceptional SEN costs.
 - A budget is identified to meet the estimated Element 2 costs for Early Years Providers that will also be determined by the completion of the CAN-Do questionnaire up to a maximum of £3,600 which equates to 15/25 of the £6,000 DfE High Needs threshold.

8.0 Specialist Equipment

- 8.1 A number of children and young people require specialist equipment to access education. Some of this equipment is provided by Health and some is provided by the local authority from a retained budget of £64k. This funding is currently only available to mainstream 5-18 provision. In recognition of the additional responsibilities on the local authority for SEND, 0 25, it is only appropriate that this budget should be made available across the full age range and in all schools and settings.
- 8.2 There are criteria for determining if a child or young person is eligible to receive financial support for specialist equipment, and what type of support should be provided. Extending the availability of specialist equipment funding to all children and young people aged 0 25 will inevitably increase the budget required and it is difficult to estimate the extent of this.
- 8.3 All providers now have access to Element 2 SEN funding for children and young people with High Needs and should therefore contribute to the increased costs that would have to be met by this proposal.



15 October 2015 - Item 4.3

High Needs Funding

8.4 It is therefore recommended that funding to contribute to the purchase of specialist equipment will be available to all children and young people aged 0 – 25 who meet the criteria, but there will be an expectation that the first £500 for any child or young person within a given financial year should be met by the education provider from their Element 2 funding. Any costs above the £500 would be funded from the retained budget for specialist equipment. A maximum amount of funding per school of £10,000 will be set in the first financial year to ensure that the total budget available is not allocated to a very small number of education providers.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 Members of the Schools Forum are asked to:
 - a) Note the position on Element 2 funding for the 2015-2016 Financial Year for Mainstream Schools.
 - b) Endorse the proposal to implement the Resource Allocation System to determine Element 3 'Top up' allocations from April 2015.
 - c) Decide which option to adopt for transitional funding arrangements for the implementation of the Resource Allocation
 - **Option 1** to cap the gainers at a maximum of 50% in the 2015-2016 Financial Year
 - **Option 2** to cap the gainers at a maximum of 25% in the 2015-2016 Financial Year.
 - d) Note the fact that the Element 3 funding previously allocated by reference to Prior Attainment has to end with effect from March 2015.
 - e) Decide which option to adopt for transitional funding arrangements for the Element 3 Funding previously allocated by reference to Prior Attainment
 - **Option 1** to provide transitional funding of 33% of the total allocation made during the 2014-2015 financial year if the original allocation is greater than 15% of the total Element 2 formula allocation.
 - **Option 2** provides transitional funding of 33% of the total allocation made during the 2014-2015 financial year if the Element **3** Allocation allocated by reference to Prior Attainment exceeds 1% of the total school budget excluding high needs funding
 - f) Endorse all education providers having access to contributions from the specialist equipment budget after making the first £500 contribution per child per financial year with a maximum school allocation of £10,000 in the first year.
 - g) Note that indicative allocations for 2015-2016 will be notified to education establishments following the March 2015 meeting of the Forum, and approval by Executive Members and the Corporate Director, on condition that the completed 'CAN-Do' questionnaires have been returned.



High Needs Funding

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Element 2 Funding changes APPENDIX 2: Financial Implications of RAS, £2.7m pot and transitional funding APPENDIX 3: Summary of movements in different funding allocations

(NOTE – APPENDICES TO THIS PAPER ARE NOT INCLUDED BUT ARE AVAILABLE ON THE WEBSITE AT:

http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=30234

PETE DWYER Corporate Director - Children & Young People's Service

Report prepared by Andrew Terry Assistant Director for Access and Inclusion and Judith Walls – Finance Manager, Strategic Resources