

## SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Update on Alternative Provision funding model
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Stuart Collins, Director of Integrated Children's Services
<b>DATE:</b>	3 May 2019
<b>FOR:</b>	Note

### 1. Introduction & background

- 1.1 Between December 2018 and February 2019 CYPE ran a consultation with schools to discuss proposed changes to the way in which Alternative Provision across the County should be funded.
- 1.2 The consultation received over 100 responses from schools. Stuart Collins Director of Integrated Children's Services who led the consultation then met with all of the Alternative Provision Heads and Management Committee Chairs on 12th February to discuss the findings and consider the detail (Please see Appendix 1).
- 1.3 Following the responses to the consultation and during discussion with the Heads and Chairs at the February meeting there was broad agreement for 10 of the 14 proposals to be taken forward. A further meeting was then held on 5th April to discuss the detail of the 4 outstanding issues, (Please see Appendix 2).

### 2. Update

- 2.1 At the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April a further 2 proposals received broad agreement and the 2 remaining issues were adjourned for further work.
- 2.2 The grid below captures the sequence of agreement and the remaining issues still to be resolved and the ongoing actions to address these.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to continue to calculate the district allocation using the existing formula.	Agreed during the consultation
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal for Management Committees to introduce a fair representative voting system to determine financial arrangements and funding passed to schools.	Agreed during the consultation
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that, in any new	Agreed during the consultation

model, the Local Authority will ensure that it has a presence on all Management Committees.	
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that the number of commissioned places at PRUs within each district will reflect the funding formula methodology (which includes a recognition for deprivation) and will, therefore, vary, based on need but total 0.42% for the County.	Received consistent agreement at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 12th February.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that the Local Authority would include criteria in the contract which reduces 'in year' or 'future years' allocations for those schools and academies that take the money but fail to operate in a way that is inclusive.	Received consistent agreement at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 12 <sup>th</sup> February.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reallocate the selective school proportion across the non-selective school cohort within each district, once the financial envelope for the districts is calculated, on a pro-rata basis.	Received consistent agreement at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 12th February.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that the same incentives for schools within the devolved arrangements to engage with the support mechanisms available to them are applied as with the delegated model.	Received consistent agreement at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 12th February.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to develop a system whereby the Local Authority contributes to the local collaboration by serving as the Chair of the In Year Fair Access Panel and by providing administrative support for these panels, to ensure data collected is consistent across the county.	This proposal was declined, however further work was undertaken to consider the role and funding for a consistent Local Authority Clerk (akin to a Magistrates Clerk) to work across each of the IYFAP to advise and support the Management Committee on process, consistent management, implementation and application of incentives for schools to engage. This new proposal was agreed at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 5 <sup>th</sup> April.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to challenge schools which opts out of collaboration or deviates from the terms which agree the sums going to each school or does not engage with the In Year Fair Access processes, through the imposition of a	<p>The principle was agreed at the Heads and Chairs meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April.</p> <p>However, following the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April, it was agreed that Phil Wicker and Celia Buxton would develop a proposal to report back to Heads and</p>

financial penalty.	Chairs.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that funding is devolved to the local Headteachers, under a contract with the Local Authority.	There was broad agreement to the idea of a contract at the meeting on 5 <sup>th</sup> April although the detail is part of the work being considered in the item above.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that the Local Authority would seek redress and impose a financial penalty where a school's performance or engagement in the following was below published expectations.	There was broad agreement to the idea of a contract at the meeting on 5 <sup>th</sup> April although the detail is part of the work being considered in the item above.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal that any penalty, in line with proposal 13 (above), would apply to the school through their devolved proportion of the funding.	There was broad agreement to the imposition of a penalty at the meeting on 5 <sup>th</sup> April although the detail is part of the work being considered in the item above.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to move to using Published Admission Number (PAN), rather than the previous October census numbers, as this will provide higher allocations to those schools who are traditionally operating under capacity and are, therefore, likely to take a disproportionately higher share of our most challenging children.	Following a number of discussions throughout the consultation and the 2 scheduled meetings it was decided that in order to remove the chance for any school or district to be significantly negatively impacted Simon Pleace agreed to develop an option 3 which would be broadly between the PAN and Roll figure.  Simon is therefore working up a mid-point proposal.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal for to move to a model whereby, for districts with delegated arrangements where they have a physical PRU, only a proportion of the district allocation is delegated to the PRU (under Place Plus methodology), and the remaining balance of the district allocation is devolved to schools.	There was a mixed view held between those district arrangements with a physical PRU setting. As a result, Stuart Collins has agreed to visit each of the management committees to discuss the detail and potential impacts for each of the delegated districts these sessions are scheduled to take throughout May 2019.

- 2.3 It is felt that 5 of the 7 districts could be transitioned into a new model as soon as September 2019, however, while we will of course be working closely with alternative providers and mainstream settings to develop the details described above, in order to mitigate against any cliff edge scenario. It may be necessary to build in a period of transformation across two of the seven districts.
- 2.4 I therefore do not envisage that there will be the need for full scale restructures across settings or for children already in situ to lose their place or

be forced to change provision.

- 2.5 If we do move to a part delegated, part devolved model then we will work closely with settings impacted by any changes to ensure that the incentives to continue to provide places in mainstream settings mitigates the reductions in the number of spaces available in alternative provision, thus increasing the incentive to retain students.

### **3. Recommendation**

- 3.1 Members of the Forum are asked to note the content of this paper.