Open Report



City Council

06 June 2016

Update Report on High Needs DSG Bids

Report of	Director of Children, Adult and Family Services
Contact officer(s)	Helen Meigh – Team Manager CAF Dave Perrett – Assistant Director for Learning Services
Type of Decision	For Information
Cabinet Member	Councillor Janine Bridges - Cabinet Member for Education and Economy
Wards Affected	All Wards

What is the report about? How will it fit with the Council's priorities?

1.1 The purpose of the report is to update Schools' Forum on the creation of an innovation funding pot from the High Needs Block Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG).

What are we recommending?

2.1 Members of the Forum are asked to consider the report and:

• note the total amount of funding provisionally allocated through the setting up of an innovation fund from the High Needs DSG. This fund will allow schools and academies to bid for project funding to support outcomes related to High Needs pupils.

• note the evaluation for the progress of the project required to access the remaining funding.

How	How much will it cost and how will it be paid for?				
3.1	The innovation fund is funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant that is ring fenced for use on settings within the City.				
3.2	The total funding allocation is $\pounds1.234m$ to be paid to settings in six monthly instalments depending on the successful evaluation of the project at this point.				

Whe	When are we doing it?				
4.1	Ofsted inspected the LA's school improvement function in Jan 2015. Their report states that the LA need to "focus on raising attainment and reducing inequalities and achievement gaps between disadvantaged pupils and others" and that "the most able pupils and those with disabilities or who have special educational needs in mainstream schools are not making enough progress."				
4.2	To address this weakness, bids were welcomed from settings in the Autumn of 2015 for projects to improve the educational attainment and future outcomes for vulnerable pupils in the City.				
4.3	Initial allocations were paid to successful settings early in 2016.				

Every	ything else you need to know:	
5.1	On 18 th May 2015 Schools Forum approved a paper utilising £1.5m of unallocated funding on projects that will beneficially impact the outcomes for high needs pupils via a bid mechanism. Applications were sought from all schools and academies.	
5.2	The project leads were required to submit an application form to the group stating the aims and deliverables of the project, timescales and funding required. The application needed to clearly state how the project fitted in with the City Council and schools priorities.	
5.3	 The priorities were set as: To better meet the needs of pupils with high needs and vulnerability To improve the attainment of pupils with high needs To allow more students with high needs to be supported within the City To maximise the potential of all SEN pupils to achieve as much independence as possible and enjoy a quality of life which is both stimulating and rewarding To increase the provision for groups of high needs and vulnerable pupils To prepare for adulthood and accessing education, employment and training. 	
5.4	The project lead was required to supply evaluation criteria that will be used to assess the project as it is on-going to access further stage payments. It is the valuation process that is now the subject of this report.	
5.5	The successful applicants were given an initial 6 month payment. Subject to a successful evaluation of the project the remaining funding will be made available in 6 monthly instalments. All of the projects will be evaluated at the end of the project and will consider the success and impact on pupil achievement.	
5.6	The initial allocations were made early in 2016 and therefore the first round of evaluation is due in June 2016. Table 1 shows the successful applications and the total funding provisionally allocated to each project.	

School	Total Allocation	Allocation paid 2015/2016	
	£	£	
Star Academy	47,000	23,500	
Portland Special School	40,000	20,000	
Abbey Hill Special School	100,450	50,225	
Kemball Special School	142,235	71,118	
Ball Green Primary	150,000	75,000	
Kemball Special School	200,000	0	
Thistley Hough Academy	296,500	74,125	
Crescent Academy	67,500	33,750	
Summerbank Academy	16,200	8,100	
Encore	104,000	52,000	
CLT	70,000	0	
Total	1 222 005	407.040	
	1,233,885	407,818	
 The process of evaluation is set o Send evaluation form to leadate Arrange a visit by assessor Review of returned evaluation and High Needs Working G Assessor visit to project Completion of evaluation for High Needs Working Group Feedback to school within a Report to Schools' Forum 	ut below: Id contact at s to review the ion form befor iroup orm within 1 w o review evalu	chool for cor project e visit by ass eek of visit ation form	
 The process of evaluation is set o Send evaluation form to leadate Arrange a visit by assessor Review of returned evaluatiand High Needs Working G Assessor visit to project Completion of evaluation for High Needs Working Group Feedback to school within the set of the s	ut below: Id contact at s to review the on form befor froup orm within 1 w o review evalu 1 month of vis	chool for cor project e visit by ass eek of visit ation form it	

Technical Appendix:

The following sources of information were used for this report:

DfE: School & Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014-15

DfE: Section 251 Guidance 2015-16

DfE: School Funding Reform: Next steps towards a fairer system

LA: Previous Schools Forum Reports & Minutes relating to School Funding Reform & School Budgets

The following appendices are included as part of this report:

Appendix A High Needs DSG Bid Evaluation Form

Implications taken into consideration in this report:

Financial:

The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which is payable to local authorities under section 14 of the Education Act 2002 by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The formal terms of grant are given by the Secretary of State under section 16 of the Education Act 2002. The DSG is paid as a ring-fenced specific grant and must be used in support of the schools budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014.

Legal:

As set out by the School & Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014, there is a legal requirement to set a balanced Schools' Budget in consultation with the Schools Forum.

Public Health, Human Resources and Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012:

No direct implications from decisions relating to the report. Future funding allocations could impact on staffing within individual schools and services.

Equality Impact or Environmental Impact Assessments:

In making arrangements for funding young people with high needs, the local authority must treat those placed in maintained provision, in academies and free schools, in the further education sector, and in non-maintained and independent provision on a fair and equivalent basis

Existing Council Policies:

Children and Families Plan.

Key Risks:

The funding allocated through the innovation fund needs to make a difference in raising attainment and reducing inequalities and achievement gaps between disadvantaged pupils and others. The risk is that funding is paid to projects that are not effective in this aim if the valuation process is not robust.

Technical Appendix Part 2 - Executive Decisions*:

Option	Options Considered:				
1.	The High Needs DSG must be used to target the current issues relating to high needs pupils and should make a considerable improvement to the educational outcomes and preparation for adulthood of these pupils.				
2.	Projects to be funded are anticipated to target where additional provision is required, support for cohorts with specific needs and an improved outreach service for high needs pupils across the City.				

Reason for Decision:

* In accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Appendix A

					The read of the second	
liah Needs Bl	ock DSG Bid E	valuation - 6 m	onths			
J					are units in california	
					City of Stoke-on-Tr	ent
School						
Contact						
mount of bid						
unding received						
Key Points of Bid						
Тн	is will be completed	from the hid prior to	conding	out the evaluation	on form	
11			senuing		JITIOIIII.	
valuation						
cademic outcom						
Academic outcom	es utcomes quoted in th	e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom		e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom		e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom		e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom		e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom		e bid, how has the p	project pe	erformed in the fi	irst 6 months.	
Academic outcom Compared to the ou Sustainability	utcomes quoted in th					
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje						. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project of the outcom	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project of the outcom	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project of the outcom	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project of the outcom	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project of the outcom	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the outcom Compared to the project	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje	utcomes quoted in th					. If so
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje Iow.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje Iow.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje Iow.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje Iow.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje now.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	
Academic outcom Compared to the out Sustainability From what the proje now.	utcomes quoted in th	an this still be susta	ined afte	r the cessation c	of the DSG funding	

Economy (spendi					
	rchased at reasonable quality but lov	vest cost?			
Ale all lesources pu	chased at reasonable quality but lov	031 0031:			
1					
Are staff working co	st efficiently and not over resources	or over skille	d?		
The blan working box					1
1					
1					
Efficiency (spendi	ng well)				
	ou are showing efficiencies in the pro	oject.			
	¥	•			
1					
Effectiveness (spe					
Demonstrate how yo	ou are spending the funding effective	ely			
1					
1					
				1	
	emonstrate how the project is displa	lying value fo	or money in add	ition to the above and	
what, if anything, can	be done to improve this.				
1					
1					
I					
Financial Informati			ate and estimat	od fundia required for the	
This section is to she	ow the funding allocation, actual expe				
This section is to she					
This section is to she	ow the funding allocation, actual expe	e initial fundi		e why this has changed.	
This section is to she	ow the funding allocation, actual expe	e initial fundi Spend		e why this has changed.	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to she	ow the funding allocation, actual expe	e initial fundi Spend		e why this has changed.	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	
This section is to sh duration of the DSG	ow the funding allocation, actual expe funded project. If this varies from the	e initial fundi Spend to		e why this has changed. Remaining Expenditure	

Oninian of progra	ss and overall project outcomes					
opinion of progres	ss and overall project outcomes					
Evalution form comp	pleted by					
		-	1	<u>.</u>		
Date						
Assessors Report						
Financial Opinion						
					ſ	
					ſ	
					1	
					ſ	
					1	
					1	
					ſ	
					1	
					1	
					1	
	1		1			1
Overall ended	a antiputation of fur-stires					
overall opinion on	continuation of funding					1
					ſ	
					ſ	
					ſ	
					ſ	
	1	1				
		1			<u> </u>	\
A			Data		ſ	
Assessor			Date			1
		1				1
					ſ	
Finance Representative			Date			
Chair of High Needs Working Group						
Working Group			Date			