



County Assembly Meeting
Monday 30 October 2017
John Wigan Room, Oakwood House,
Maidstone ME16 8AE

Agenda

- 7pm** **Mrs Janice Brooke – Chair of the KGA**
Welcome & Chair's Update
- 7.15 pm** **Simon Pleace (Revenue & Finance Manager, KCC)**
National Funding Formula
- 7.45 pm** **Patrick Leeson (Corporate Director) Children, Young People and Education**
- **Update on Results in Kent**
 - **High Needs Funding**
- 8.30 pm** **Graham Willett (Interim Chief Executive)**
Education Services Company - Update

National Funding Formula

Kent Governors Association County Assembly Meeting

Monday 30 October 2017

Simon Pleace

Finance Business Partner for CYPE



National Context

- SofS announcement in mid July 2017 confirming introduction of NFF and an additional £1.3bn
- This is in addition to the £1.3bn announced in the 2015 spending review
- National school budget increasing from just under £41bn in 2017-18 to £43.5bn in 2019-20, an increase of 6.3%
- Approx. half of the £2.6bn relates to pupil growth

National Context

- Soft NFF confirmed for 2018-19 and 2019-20
 - Meaning we still operate a local funding formula
 - And still a key role for Schools' Funding Forum
 - But some tough decisions on competing priorities
 - Government's intention is to implement Hard NFF in the future (exact date unspecified) but our understanding is that this is subject to a change in primary legislation
-

How does a Soft NFF work?

- The NFF factors & rates are applied to all schools
- Maximum gains are capped at +3%
- Check that all schools are receiving +0.5%
- Then check that schools are receiving at least the Minimum Funding Levels (trumps +3%)
 - Primary = £3,300 in 18-19 and £3,500 in 19-20
 - Secondary = £4,600 in 18-19 and £4,800 in 19-20
- Revised school figures are then aggregated up to LA level to provide a revised Schools Block

What does this mean in £s?

- **Schools block** - using current school data
 - 2018-19 = +£27.6m (+3.3%)
 - 2019-20 = +£22.3m (+2.6%)
- This is before including rising pupil population
- **High Needs block** = +£2.1m in 2018-19, +£0.9m in 2019-20
- **Central School Services block** = -£171k in 2018-19 and then a further -£197k in 2019-20

Big Picture on DSG

Table 1 <i>figures subject to rounding</i>	DSG Schools Block	Movement in funding from			
		previous year		current year	
	£'m	£'m	%	£'m	%
2017-18	£839.4m				
2018-19	£867.0m	+£27.6m	+3.3%	+£27.6m	+3.3%
2019-20	£889.3m	+£22.3m	+2.6%	+£49.9m	+5.9%
Once NFF is fully implemented	£901.5m	+£12.2m	+1.4%	+£62.1m	+7.4%

How do we compare to OLAs?

- In relation to Kent
 - Our average DSG per pupil increases from £4,145 to £4,452
 - Our ranked position changes from 140 to 114, +26
 - We were 8.8% below the national average, and we will be 5.5% below
 - We will receive a 7.4% increase when NFF imp. (+5.9% over the next two years)

Local flexibility

- We can continue to move funding from Schools Block to meet pressures in High Needs Block
 - Restricted to 0.5% of Schools Block (c. £4.3m) but requires Forum approval
- We can choose a local Minimum Funding Guarantee rate of between 0% and -1.5% (stability v fairness?)
- We can introduce a Minimum Funding Level factor in our local funding formula

Other issues

- The NFF lump sum rate is £10k lower than our current rate
- The NFF rates for English as Additional Language pupils are significantly lower than our current rates
- The NFF no longer includes a LAC factor, but the Pupil Premium Plus has increase from £1,900 to £2,300 per LAC pupil from 2018-19
- PFI factor will now be increased annually by RPIX

KCC Consultation with Schools

- Today we have launched our consultation with all schools – runs for just over 4 weeks – closes on Sunday 26 November
- Consultation consists of
 - Consultation document (word and pdf)
 - Individual School Illustration Model (excel)
 - Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (word and pdf)
 - Online response form – need to register to submit

Which Overarching Principle should we follow?

- a) Should we look to move towards the NFF factors and rates asap?
- b) Should we ignore NFF and focus on our local priorities?
- c) Should we look to move towards the NFF but also take into consideration local circumstances?

If we went with option a)

	2018-19	2019-20	Remaining	Once NFF fully imp.
Primary	2.27%	1.87%	0.30%	4.45%
- Below 105	1.29%	0.79%	0.32%	2.40%
- Between 106 & 140	1.40%	0.61%	0.15%	2.16%
- Between 141 & 175	1.73%	0.85%	0.20%	2.78%
- Between 176 & 220	2.05%	0.89%	0.28%	3.23%
- Between 221 & 330	2.09%	1.18%	0.40%	3.67%
- Above 331	2.62%	2.74%	0.29%	5.65%
Secondary	4.13%	3.11%	1.81%	9.06%
- Selective	7.45%	4.39%	-	11.83%
- Non Selective	2.86%	2.62%	2.51%	7.99%

KCC Consultation with Schools

- Initial question on general principle
- Followed by 18 specific proposals about changes to individual factors/rates and other matters
- Prioritisation question – top 5 most important to you
- Invite comments on our EqIA
- General comments

Timetable

- 30 October – launch all school consultation
- During November – Headteacher briefings
- 22 November – Update KCC CYPE Cabinet Committee
- 26 November – consultation closes
- 1 December – SFF meeting
- 11 December – KCC Cabinet leading to a decision on formula changes
- January/February – School budgets calculated

Governors Association Meeting

30 October 2017

Patrick Leeson
Corporate Director
Children, Young People and Education

2017 Results EYFS

- The provisional Early Years Foundation Results of 74.3% are in line with the 2016 figure of 74.8%.
- This outcome is above the Emerging National figure of 70.7%

2017 Results Key Stage 1

- In **Reading, Writing and Mathematics combined**, 68.3% of Kent pupils met or exceeded the expected standard compared with 63.7% nationally.
- In **Reading**, 79% of pupils in Kent met or exceeded the expected standard, compared with 76% nationally.
- In **Writing**, 72% of Kent pupils met or exceeded the expected standard, compared with 68% nationally.
- In **Mathematics**, 78% of pupils in Kent met or exceeded the expected standard, compared with 75% nationally.

2017 Results Key Stage 2

- 64% of Kent pupils met or exceeded the expected standard in **Reading, Writing and Mathematics combined**, compared with 61% nationally.
- In **Reading**, 74% of pupils in Kent met or exceeded the expected standard, compared to 71% nationally.
- In **Writing**, 80% of pupils met or exceeded the expected standard, compared to 76% nationally.
- In **Mathematics**, 76% of pupils met or exceeded the expected standard, compared to 75% nationally.
- In **Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling**, 76% of pupils met or exceeded the expected standard compared to 77% nationally

KS2 Achievement Gap

- At KS2, the FSM gap is 25.4% - the same as the previous year (42.3% pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, writing and maths compared to 37% in 2016)
- For SEN pupils, the gap is 53% compared to 52% in 2016 (19.4% of SEN pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, writing and maths compared to 16% in 2016.)
- The Gender Gap is 7% compared to 5% in 2016.

2017 Results Key Stage 4

At KS4 in 2017, comparisons with performance in 2016 are difficult to make, given the implementation of new grades and more demanding examinations.

- For the Basics measure, the proportion of pupils achieving good grades (9-4) in English and mathematics, the figure is 63.2%, similar to 2016.
- Performance in the old measure of the percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more good GCSE grades (standard pass) including English and mathematics is 60%. This is an improvement on last year's figure of 57% and the 2016 national average.
- So far, 50% of Secondary schools have met or exceeded their 2016 performance in this measure.

2017 Results Key Stage 4

- The average Attainment 8 score for Kent is 47.1, compared to 50.4 in 2016
- The Progress 8 score is -0.11 compared to -0.04 in 2016, when the national average was -0.03
- Performance in the English Baccalaureate measure has fallen by 2.1% this year to 27.4%, however this is above the 2016 national figure of 24.8%

Results Post 16

At Post 16, a new grading system has been introduced and consequently, 2017 results cannot be directly compared to those in 2016:

- 75% of schools across Kent improved Average points score per entry at A level compared to 2016 figures
- 41% of schools met or exceeded the 2016 national figures for Average points score per entry at A level
- 60% of schools met or exceeded the 2016 national figures for Average points score per entry at Applied General level
- 55% of schools met or exceeded the 2016 national figures for Average points score per entry at Technical level
- The Kent Average Point Score currently shows improved figures compared to 2016 and exceeds the national average for 2016



Review of High Needs Funding – Findings and Proposals

Overarching Aims of the Review

- To ensure the High Needs top up budget is more predictable and more closely linked to patterns of need
- To ensure the budget continues to fund the top up required by schools to support the pupils with the most complex needs that may otherwise warrant statutory assessment
- To ensure the budget is used well in tandem with other resources such as LIFT to get the best outcomes for pupils
- To develop new models of funding as the increase in HNF is not sustainable

Best Practice

Schools, **regardless of size**, with proportionally smaller numbers of children with HNF:

- Identified their universal offer for SEN as a whole school response (whole school budget) or graduated approach; included details of Quality First Teaching (QFT) and in class differentiation; highlighting SEN is the class teacher's responsibility.
- Plan SEN provision with class teachers responsible for in-depth provision mapping.
- Monitor the progress of SEN pupils and overall effectiveness of the interventions by class teachers with oversight from the SENCo and SMT.

Best Practice Schools:

- Focus on developing independent learning skills as well as achieving SEN outcomes.
- Involve pupils and parents in planning provision.
- Have trained teaching assistants (TAs) delivering small group interventions
- Have class teachers work with children with SEN, individually or as part of a group.
- Have SMART targets set and tracked for time limited interventions.
- Use evidence based interventions.

Review Findings

- The demand for HNF does not always follow a pattern related to pupil profile and levels of need across the schools
- Wide variations in uses and access to HNF in schools across the county
- Over-reliance on TA providing one to one support and not always evidenced based interventions for pupils
- More inclusive schools with whole school approaches to SEN make less demand on HNF
- Training for all staff is needed to raise capacity in schools to address ASD, Speech & Language and SEMH

Review Findings

- Understanding of ‘normally available resource’ and ‘best endeavours’ means some schools do not know their budget and how to support SEN
- Effectiveness and impact of provision is variable re pupil outcomes
- Need to re-visit the criteria and decision making process for HNF to ensure resources are allocated to pupils with more complex needs and funding is spent on the most effective interventions

Review Findings

- Schools with similar characteristics (Size, IDACI, Prior Attainment) have very contrasting numbers of High Needs funded pupils, some are out of line with the patterns or trends for most similar schools.
- Four groups of schools emerged:
 - 1) very inclusive, good provision, little HNF demand
 - 2) appropriate levels of demand on HNF; used well
 - 3) over reliance on HNF and TAs; some ineffective interventions;
 - 4) very little use of HNF, do not always engage in LIFT and may not have effective SEN provision.

High Needs Funding - Primary School examples

Small schools with low levels of Notional SEN

	Pupil Numbers	High Needs Numbers	Percentage
School A	109	8	7.3%
School B	102	2	2.0%
School C	141	0	0.0%

Small schools with high levels of Notional SEN

	Pupil Numbers	High Needs Numbers	Percentage
School A	148	9	6.1%
School B	119	3	2.5%
School C	198	1	0.5%

High Needs Funding - Primary School examples

Large schools with low levels of Notional SEN

	Pupil Numbers	High Needs Numbers	Percentage
School A	459	25	5.4%
School B	454	11	2.4%
School C	482	3	0.6%

Large schools with high levels of Notional SEN

	Pupil Numbers	High Needs Numbers	Percentage
School A	422	27	6.4%
School B	405	7	1.7%
School C	415	2	0.5%

Proposals

More effective targeting of HNF

Eligibility, Affordability

- Focus on pupils with the most complex needs
- Clarify resources available to schools
- Use whole school budget and district LIFT
- Avoid unnecessary statutory assessment and use earlier intervention; back to basic purpose of HNF
- Use HNF Review feedback to ensure processes are transparent and have fewer steps in the application process

Proposals - Eligibility

- Clearer criteria so all schools better understand which pupils HNF is targeting in order to apply for HNF.
- More explicit about expectation that schools evidence how their normally available resource have been targeted.
- Greater emphasis on assess, plan, do and review cycle.
- Utilisation of the district LIFT offer as part of the provision.
- Expectations of relevant whole school training for the pupils' need type.eg. ASD awareness raising
- Fund the delivery of the best practice evidence based interventions
- Some school costs will not be fall within HNF and will not be funded. Eg. Disability adaptations

From LIFT Review

- There will be an expectation that a school has sought advice and support from the LIFT prior to HNF application.
- LIFT will offer more whole school training.
- Each district LIFT Executive will develop a bank of resources and assessment tools to be used by the district schools.
- HNF Officers, SEN Provision Evaluation Officers and District Coordinators will meet on a regular basis to discuss packages of support for CYP in receipt of HNF.

Proposals - Affordability

Top up

- By primary need type eg. ASD or HI
- Graduated to reflect severity
- Personalised for 5% most severe (profound)

Notional top up for smaller schools to continue.

HNF Officers will agree provision (criteria).

Costed provision plans submitted on application

Proposals - Process

- Shorter online application, duplication removed (schools will no longer need to add the details of the provision plan)
- Supported by robust pre existing evidence Eg. Reviewed provision plans showing the implementation of LIFT recommendations
- If additional information is required, applications will be deferred for a maximum of two weeks (school holidays will be taken into account).
- The system won't generate a timetable. School and parents will be informed of the amount of funding agreed and the length of the agreement
- Provision cost included on the pupil's provision plan
- Top up agreed to end of key stage for most complex
- Schools may be directed to training or support from LIFT
- Monitoring visits will increase

Next Steps HNF Review

- Findings and proposed changes supported by the Schools Funding Forum
- To be shared and discussed with schools at Heads Briefings in November and at meetings with KAH
- Support for the recommendations will be aided by the LIFT process offering more training, resources and assessment tools to schools
- Changes to funding need to fall into line with the National Funding formula changes from April 2018
- FE High Needs Funding Review will be completed by December 2017.



Education Services Company



Graham Willett Interim Chief Executive

Why are we doing this?

- To secure for the longer term the ability to provide the highest quality services that we can to children, young people and families in Kent
- To ensure that schools and other settings will continue to be well-supported by and work closely with their local authority to deliver the best possible outcomes

Things to know about the ESC

- Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo)
- Limited by Guarantee so surplus is reinvested into the services it provides
- Wholly owned by KCC
- Company board has representatives from our stakeholders as well as independent resource to support the company's activities
- 550+ staff at launch
- > £20million turnover

Which services will ESC provide?

IN the new Company	REMAINING in KCC
School Improvement	Early Help & Preventative Services
Outdoor Education	SEN
Schools Financial Services	Fair Access, Admissions
Early Years and Childcare	Area Education Officers
Education Psychology	Provision, Planning & Operations
Governor Services	Academies Conversion
Skills and Employability	Community, Learning and Skills (CLS)
Education Safeguarding	

The ESC will continue to deliver services on behalf of KCC as well as delivering strategic traded packages.

Our new website will also provide you with information and the means to access all KCC services.

How are schools getting involved?

- Stakeholder & Commissioning Board
 - A stakeholder group to support KCC in its delivery of services across the Children's directorate
 - Representation from Chair and Area Chairs of Kent Association of Heads
 - All stakeholder groups represented
- Company Board
 - 3 schools NEDS – headteachers from primary, secondary and special
 - 1 NED from Early Years Sector
 - Independent NEDS
 - KCC NEDS

When is all of this happening?

- November 8th 2017:
 - ‘soft’ launch of name and brand at EduKent Expo
- December 2017 – March 2018:
 - increasing publicity about ESC, what it will be doing, how and when etc.
- March 2018:
 - formal launch of company
- April 1st 2018:
 - ‘go live’ date
 - staff transfer into ESC via TUPE
 - contract between ESC and KCC for provision of services begins

Questions?