

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE
CORPORATE DIRECTOR MEETING WITH EXECUTIVE MEMBERS
26 NOVEMBER 2019
2020/2021 SCHOOL FUNDING – DISAPPLICATION REQUEST

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report asks the Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service, in conjunction with CYPS Executive Members, to agree a recommendation to submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State to request a transfer of up to 1% funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Schools Block to the High Needs Budget. Local Authorities are required to submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State in circumstances where the transfer request is in excess of 0.5% or where a transfer request of 0.5% or less has been opposed by the Schools Forum.
- 1.2 Whilst the North Yorkshire Schools Forum acknowledged the significant financial pressures on the High Needs budget, the option approved by the Schools Forum was a 0% transfer.
- 1.3 The report outlines the demand pressures in High Needs, developments and progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for SEND Education Provision 0-25 and the financial medium-term outlook and presents the rationale for the disapplication request to transfer up to 1% from the Schools Block to the High Needs budget.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 In late summer / early autumn 2019 the DfE provided information in relation to 'levelling up' school funding and related information on the implementation of the National Funding Formula (NFF) for 2020-21.
- 2.2 The national funding formula for schools has been running for two years; 2020-21 will be the third year of the 'soft' implementation.
- 2.3 The DfE provided provisional NFF allocations on Friday 11 October as well as notional school-level allocations. The key elements of the NFF for 2020-21 include:
 - The mandatory minimum per-pupil level is set at £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools. The primary level will rise to £4,000 in 2021-22;
 - The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) must be set somewhere between +0.5% and +1.84%, in conjunction with a local gains cap;
 - The DfE have confirmed that local authorities will continue to be able to transfer up to 0.5% of their schools block to other blocks of the DSG, with schools forum approval. A disapplication will be required for transfers above 0.5%, or any amount without schools forum approval;
 - The DfE are introducing a new formulaic approach to the mobility factor;

- Teachers' pay grant and teachers' pension employer contributions grant will both continue to be paid separately from the NFF in 2020-21.
- 2.4 The local authority will continue to set a local schools formula, in consultation with local schools. However, the DfE has confirmed its intention to move to a single 'hard' national funding formula to determine every school's budget. The timescale, or any transition period, is not yet known.
- 2.5 Although there is some – although limited - local discretion over the design of the funding formulae for 2020-21, the DfE has determined that the minimum per-pupil funding (MPPF) level will be a mandatory factor. A consultation on the MPPF has been undertaken by DfE and the local authority consultation response can be seen in **Appendix 1**. Although the DfE indicated that a government response would be published in November 2019, it is now not clear whether this will be published during the purdah period prior to the General Election on 12 December 2019.
- 2.6 A consultation on school funding arrangements for the financial year 2020-21 was launched on 18 October 2019. This affects all maintained mainstream schools and mainstream academies in North Yorkshire. The consultation launch date was later than usual and reflected the late publication of individual LA allocations from the DfE. Financial modelling of the impact and implications of the allocation for individual schools was undertaken by the North Yorkshire Finance Team and concluded by 18 October 2019. Key considerations in the financial modelling include:
- The level of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (i.e. the minimum per pupil increase which any school will receive - which DfE have mandated must be set somewhere between +0.5% and +1.84%)
 - The level of a local gains cap (i.e. the maximum amount a school can gain on a per pupil basis)
 - Whether to undertake a block transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block given the continued DfE funding shortfall for children with SEND
- 2.7 A consultation paper (**Appendix 2**), along with the financial modelling supporting various options (**Appendix 3**) in which each of the key factors interact with each other, was released to schools and academies on 18 October 2019. As has been our practice for many years, the consultation paper was released through the e-Red Bag. The consultation period extended from 18 October 2019 through to 7 November 2019 although covering the half-term period. The duration of the consultation period - which is not covered by a statutory time requirement – was set in order to comply with DfE deadlines. Any request to undertake a Block transfer must be submitted to the Secretary of State by 28 November 2019. This must be preceded by a key decision which is due to be taken on 26 November 2019 (and papers published on 18 November 2019). In order for this request to be considered, there must be evidence of Schools Forum published papers and minutes of the discussion.
- 2.8 In effect, the DfE have provided the start date (release of information) and end date (submission deadline) and have arguably set local authorities up to fail by providing insufficient time for consultation with schools and academies. In their guidance notes, the DfE state that they *“..appreciate that, with funding levels and allocations being announced later than in previous years, local authorities have less time for modelling and consultation.”* Although this does not feel satisfactory – the local authority normally consult for at least 4 weeks and sometimes longer if it runs over half-term – the local authority feel that there has been little choice given the time restraints imposed by central government.

- 2.9 To provide a consultation end-date of 7 November 2019, an addendum to the main 2020/21 School Funding report to Schools Forum was circulated to Schools Forum members on 8 November 2019 detailing the results of the local consultation with schools (as detailed in section x of this report) and any written responses
- 2.10 Whilst the Schools Block is ring-fenced in 2020-21, it is possible to transfer up to 0.5% of schools block funding out with the agreement of the Schools Forum. Transfers of more than 0.5% of the schools block require the local authority to make a Disapplication Request to the Secretary of State as does the position where the Schools Forum has turned down a proposal from the authority to move funding out of the Schools Block, but the authority wishes to proceed with the transfer. The DfE acknowledge that most requests to transfer funding from the Schools Block will arise as a result of pressures on their High Needs Budgets.
- 2.11 The DfE confirmed that with regard to the NFF for High Needs, the funding floor will be set at 8% (per head of 2-18 population) based on local authorities' high needs allocations in 2019-20, including the additional temporary funding of £125m announced in December 2018. The gains cap for local authorities is set at 17%, allowing authorities to see up to this percentage increase under the formula, again calculated on the basis of per head of population.
- 2.12 On 11 October 2019, the DfE confirmed that North Yorkshire would see an 11.1% increase (per head of 2-18 population) for 2020-21 amounting to an indicative £5.4m cash increase. This additional funding is welcome and reflects the significant amount of lobbying undertaken by the local authority to secure a fairer funding deal for children and young people in North Yorkshire. It also indicates that the Government have listened to some of the concerns from local authorities, schools, parents and carers. However, the additional funding is insufficient to close the funding gap in the context of a 68% increase in the number of children assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) since 2015. It is a step in the right direction but does not secure the financial stability required to address the impact of policy changes imposed by DfE through the Children and Families Act 2014.
- 2.13 The local authority has consistently maintained that it is not just the total quantum of funding that needs addressing but also the distribution methodology. Although the 'historical spend' element of the High Needs funding formula has been cash-limited, it still represents 40% of the total funding allocated (i.e. it is not a reliable or efficient factor to reflect demand or cost drivers). The methodology is in urgent need of review and should better reflect the cost of delivering a broad and high-quality education provision in sparse and rural areas.
- 2.14 A further issue is in relation to the Special Schools' Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). The Department for Education have determined that the Special Schools' MFG will be 0% (i.e. no increase in per pupil spending levels). In effect, the DfE is encouraging local authorities to pass on a real-terms decrease for special schools whilst supporting an increase for maintained schools. It is not clear what rationale the DfE have used for this separate approach, particularly given that special schools in North Yorkshire experienced the sharpest fall in school balances in 2018-19 reflecting a significant amount of financial pressure. The local authority is examining this issue but any increase over and above the DfE's proposed 0% MFG, will further widen the funding shortfall, as the local authority seeks to balance fairness to schools with efficient financial management of the total High Needs Block.
- 2.15 A further consultation on tightening the ringfence on Dedicated School Grant (DSG) also effectively prohibits the local authority from using local authority resources to assist with DSG financial pressures. This presents a significant issue for the local

authority; in 2018-19, the local authority incurred a £3.3m deficit on High Needs and, in 2019-20, planned for a net cross-subsidisation of High Needs of £3.7m – by March 2020, the local authority will have cross-subsidised the DfE funding shortfall by up to £7m. Financial modelling is currently being undertaken to assess the funding shortfall for 2020-21, but it is estimated that this will be in the order of £4-6m. The local authority response to this consultation is provided in **Appendix 4**.

- 2.16 In the absence of additional funding being provided by central government and formula reform, the local authority must, and will, take necessary action to reduce costs and to live within the funding envelope available.

3.0 High Needs

- 3.1 Previously, Schools Forum have agreed to transfer 0.5% of Schools Block funding into the High Needs Block for 2018-19. This amount represented £1.66m and was consulted with schools and agreed with Schools Forum. The transfer was agreed following recognition of an unprecedented increase in the numbers of requests for Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) and the level of financial pressure in the High Needs system. In 2019-20, following consultation with schools and subsequent approval by Schools Forum, 0.5% of Schools Block funding was agreed to be transferred to the High Needs Block. This equated to £1.6m. However, given the scale and pace of the demand pressures and consequent financial issues, the local authority felt bound to submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State seeking a 1% transfer from Schools Block to the High Needs Block. The disapplication request was successful and is significantly assisting with the 2019-20 financial position - £3.3m of the £8m financial pressure has been funded by the 1% transfer. The transfer has not been adequate to counter the cost pressures for a number of reasons:

- High Needs Block funding provided by the Department of Education is simply insufficient. Despite the Block transfers and the temporary funding announced in December 2018, the local authority has had to cross-subsidise the High Needs Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) by £7m (£3.3m in 2018-19 and £3.7m in 2019-20) over the last two years.
- There has been an unprecedented increase in Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Since 2014, there has been a 68% rise in EHCPs and this trend has continued throughout 2018 and 2019. This is an unfunded burden on schools and the local authority.
- Tackling the financial pressure requires a system-wide approach to the development of plans and will not provide immediate relief in sustainable savings.

- 3.2 A breakdown of the specific budget pressures in High Needs Commissioning that have led to the requirement for a transfer is listed in the table below. High Needs Commissioning makes up over 80% of the overall High Needs Block in budget terms.

	Budget £k	Spend £k	Var £k
Special Schools	17,172	17,572	400
Mainstream Schools	6,215	6,306	91
E3 Support	200	200	-
Early Years E2 & E3 Funding	619	748	128
Independent Schools	5,519	6,043	524

Non Maintained Schools	1,059	1,219	160
SEN Legal Services	25	58	33
OLA Expenditure	1,817	1,868	52
ISP'S	3,139	2,825	-314
FE Colleges	1,761	1,933	172
Personalised Learning (E3 Top up)	1,260	1,151	-109
PRU Funding / Post 16 Medical / ISP for Hospital Schools	4,304	4,364	60
HN Budget Shortfall	-230	-	230
Contribution from Local Authority	-3,748	-	3,748
Additional HNB funding (Dec 18)	-1,243	-	1,243
Block transfer	-1,600	-	1,600
Total	36,268	44,285	8,017

- 3.3 The number of EHCPs is a major driver of the financial pressure above, which has seen a 68% rise since 2014. The resulting in-year financial pressure of £8.0m overspend is offset, in part, by:
- the planned contribution of £1.6m from the Schools Budget transfer;
 - £1.2m temporary funding announcement from December 2018;
 - £3.7m LA cross-subsidisation

The balance is funded by the supplementary 0.5% transfer from Schools Block agreed by Secretary of State in February 2019.

- 3.4 Demand for special school places has risen significantly - locally and nationally - since 2014. In North Yorkshire, this means an increase of 28% more young people requiring special school provision. In response to this, an additional 198 places have been commissioned in maintained special schools or special academies at a cost of nearly £2.0m in base funding alone.
- 3.5 Commissioning of maintained special school places has not been able to keep pace with demand due to the physical constraints of some schools and this has contributed to increased demand, and therefore spend, in the non-maintained and independent sector. Since 2014 there has been an increase from £3.3m to £7.3m per annum for providing specialist provision through non-maintained and independent sector schools.
- 3.6 As the Code of Practice has extended the duty on the LA to maintain Education, Health and Care plans up to 25, this has increased the requirement to commission more post-16 and post-19 provision. This currently stands at 422 places in FE and 6th Form colleges from 55 places in 2014. In terms of financial pressure, this accounts for an increase from £330k to £1.755m.
- 3.7 Commissioning of places in Alternative Provision (AP) has consistently been at 88 places per year in North Yorkshire. However, following extensive engagement and consultation with schools and AP providers, this is planned to increase to 162 from September 2020.
- 3.8 Despite this increase in commissioning activity, we are aware that demand is continuing to rise and must be met through the High Needs Budget. To assist in meeting continued demand and to reduce spend in the independent sector, NYCC

submitted a bid for a Free School. This bid was successful and will provide 100 special school places the Selby area where there has previously been none. Satellite provision from Mowbray School will also provide up to 60 additional places in Ripon serving Hambleton, Richmondshire, Harrogate Rural and East Craven areas. There are also actions to be taken forward in the strategic plan to strengthen the targeted mainstream offer for those young people that need an enhanced offer of support in a mainstream environment.

4.0 Discussion on Strategic Plan for SEND Education Provision 2018-23

- 4.1 Following approval and publication of the Strategic Plan for SEND Education Provision in September 2018, significant work has taken place to deliver and implement the actions contained in the plan. The plan can be found at www.northyorks.gov.uk/sendplan. The Strategic Plan sets out areas of detailed review to reshape provision in both mainstream and special school settings, the core and additional offer to schools around inclusion support services, and ways of working, collaboration and governance. This is a comprehensive strategy aimed at improving the offer for children and young people within the budget available. In November 2018, the LA reported that with the projected rate of increase of EHCPs there was a medium-term financial pressure of £10-13M if left unchecked. Despite the allocation of additional funding in December 2018 and subsequently in September 2019, there is still a medium-term unfunded financial pressure of £4-6M. At this point in time, the LA does not have costed plans to bring high needs expenditure to levels that can be sustained within anticipated future high needs funding levels. This remains a significant unfunded pressure from DfE. A financially sustainable, inclusive and effective system is a high priority for the local authority and we will continue to work to address the gap.
- 4.2 As the Strategic Plan is being delivered, the vision and principles set out remains at the forefront of the work. We want all children and young people in North Yorkshire to:
- Have the best educational opportunities so that they achieve the best outcomes;
 - Be able to attend a school or provision locally, as close to their home as possible, where they can make friends and be part of their local community;
 - Make progress with learning, have good social and emotional health, and be prepared for a fulfilling adult life.

Strategic Plan Principles		
An inclusive culture and ethos	Joint commitment and accountability to children and young people	Right support, right time, right place

- 4.3 The Strategic Plan is also very clear about the need to work within the High Needs funding available, and as actions are delivered, these continue to be the parameters within which work is carried out. During the first year, opportunities to reduce pressure on the High Needs Budget through the actions in the Plan have been identified.

Progress in delivering the Strategic Plan

- 4.4 Progress has been made in delivering the actions in the plan, but it should be recognised that the plan is intended to be long term, therefore some of the more

significant pieces of work are in progress rather than completed. The paragraphs below indicate main areas of progress in the three key areas of the Strategic Plan:

- Ensuring a continuum of SEND education provision across the county (universal, targeted and specialist);
- Local governance, accountability, decision making and support;
- Re shaping the high needs budget

4.5 The continuum of provision

In respect of universal provision, the following progress has been made:

- Delivery of SENCO networks every term, and increased attendance of FE SEND leads at the secondary networks;
- Development of the CPD directory (due to be published Autumn 2019);
- Development and implementation of the Ladder of Intervention for SEMH;
- Pilot of relationship based approaches in schools, including a conference on the Pivotal approach for secondary schools;
- Supporting SENCOs in the identification and support for children and young people requiring SEN support in mainstream schools;
- Leaver preference process introduced for young people with EHCPs

4.6 In the area of targeted provision, the following progress has been made:

- Revision and publication of the AP directory for schools;
- Establishment of a provider forum for AP providers;
- Revision of the model of commissioning places from the Pupil referral services (PRS) (Craven, Harrogate, Scarborough, Selby) and AP providers (Whitby and Ryedale) and implementation from April 2019;
- Working in partnership with headteachers, new delivery models have been developed for the PRS in Craven, Hambleton/Richmondshire, Scarborough and Selby. These include a preventative approach and financial contributions from schools and will be implemented from September 2020;
- Engagement with existing EMS schools and other interested schools about the new targeted provision model, the development of a SLA and funding model. £232,558 of Special Provision Capital Funding (SPCF) has been agreed for developing the new targeted provision;
- Completion of a public consultation on proposals for a new approach to education provision for children and young people with medical needs.

4.7 Developments in universal and targeted provision aim to improve the early identification of the needs of children and young people, and interventions to meet these needs. The aim is also to reduce pressure on special school places in the County. Our forecasting continues to indicate, however that special school capacity will not be enough to meet needs in the longer term, and this capacity also needs to increase to enable reduction in more expensive other local authority and independent and non-maintained places. The following progress had been made:

- 38 more places in North Yorkshire special schools were commissioned for academic year 2019/20 compared to 2018/19;
- There are stronger processes for making decisions for children and young people who may need an extended day or residential curriculum at one of North Yorkshire's residential special schools;
- Work funded through the Special Provision Capital Fund (SPCF) has been completed at The Dales School, Springwater School, Springhead School and Brooklands Community Special School. £217,600 was allocated to this work. It has improved facilities and increased places by at least 24 in total. The work at Brooklands School was completed early;

- Work to improve facilities and increase places by 25 has been completed at the Forest School. This was funded by £1.1 million of Schools Condition Grant;
- The Council's bid for a special free school in the Selby area was successful. The proposed school will be for 100 pupils aged 3-19 with needs in the area of communication and interaction and/or cognition and learning. Currently assessment of applications from groups who want to open and operate the school is taking place, and work is ongoing with the DfE on the development of the school;
- Approval and £373,679 SPCF funding was secured to develop a satellite provision for Mowbray Special School on the former Moorside Infant School site. Mowbray School (Ripon) will open in January 2020;
- A broader range of post 16/post 19 provision is available across a larger number of providers. There has been an increase of 8% in young people with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) attending a post 16 further education course between 2017 and 2018;
- Phase 1 of the redesign of the learning offer from the Adult Learning and Skills Service (ALSS) has been completed;
- The number of places on the personalised learning programme (PLP) has increased and a further increase of over 30% is expected for September 2019. In a recent OFSTED inspection (June 2019) provision for learners with high needs from ALSS was judged as good;
- The number of supported internships (SIs) has increased by 39% between 2017 and 2018. A further increase is expected from September 2019. Supported internships have been introduced in the Council, with four interns starting in September 2019.

Local governance, accountability, decision making and support

- 4.8 North Yorkshire County Council has the strategic overview and a number of statutory duties it must carry out for children and young people with SEND. Nevertheless, there was a strong message received during the development of the Strategic Plan that there should be some local governance and decision making for each area which should include a range of stakeholders. The plan therefore set out actions to develop Local Area Inclusion Steering Groups and Inclusion Panels.
- 4.9 In order to ensure effective joined up working, efficient use of time, and maximum impact for children and young people, it has become clear that it is better to develop locality boards which bring together both Inclusion and Education and Skills services to work locally with stakeholders. This will enhance the local approach, accountability and responsibility. In terms of children and young people with SEND these boards will:
- Consider priorities for action and improvement;
 - Be involved in discussions regarding commissioned targeted and specialist provision;
 - Make decisions about the use of locally allocated high needs funding
- 4.10 Working in partnership, Inclusion and Education and Skills have begun to develop five locality boards which will incorporate and enhance the role of the proposed Inclusion Steering Groups set out in the Strategic Plan. Terms of reference, constituted membership and supporting documentation are being developed, alongside locality dashboards setting out performance information. Initial meetings of

the boards have been held in Selby, Hambleton/Richmondshire and Scarborough/Whitby/Ryedale.

- 4.11 In parallel to this, proposals for restructuring the Inclusion service to create multi-disciplinary locality based teams have been consulted on and amendments made to the new structure. The restructure is progressing.

Reshaping the High Needs Budget

- 4.12 The Strategic Plan was clear that a review and reshaping of the systems and processes for allocating the High Needs Budget would be carried out and that this would be to support the continuum of provision, the SEND partnership approach and the locality teams.
- 4.13 As a result, the following have taken place:
- SEN support funding for schools to access high needs funding for pupils without an Education Health and Plan (EHCP) in three specific circumstances – moved-in, transitions and sudden short term high needs – has been piloted, reviewed and implemented;
 - A consultation on and implementation of a banding system for element 3 funding for children and young people with EHCPs. The system is more transparent, more equitable and less bureaucratic;
 - A consultation on and implementation of a system for joint funding provision between Children and Young People's Services and Health and Adult Services for young people post -19 with EHCPs in five-day provision;
 - In respect of PRS/AP provision, a consultation was held on a revised place based funding model. The model was revised in response to consultation, but remained as place based commissioning and initial changes were implemented from April 2019. Proposed models for alternative provision in Craven, Hambleton/Richmondshire, Scarborough and Selby include financial contributions from schools;
 - Development of the funding model for the new targeted mainstream provisions is based on Government High Needs funding guidance;
 - The Inclusion restructure considered the most efficient way to use centrally allocated high needs funding to create locality teams providing the roles and expertise required to support early identification and intervention for children and young people with SEND. The restructure will be implemented from April 2020;

Initial Impact of the Strategic Plan

- 4.14 As noted above the Strategic Plan is a longer term five-year plan. A number of the key actions are yet to be completed. Information at this point only therefore give a snapshot about short term impact at the end of the first year.
- 4.15 In terms of data, the following trends have been noted:
- The number and proportion of children receiving SEN Support has risen in each of the last 3 years. Although the proportion of children receiving SEN support in North Yorkshire is lower than the national average, the gap is narrowing. Taken in the round it is clear that the increase in the number of children receiving SEN support is not as a result of an increase in the overall school population. This may point to improved identification of needs within

school, enabling more children to access the support they need to reach their potential in North Yorkshire's schools;

- It is positive that 42.5% of children with an EHCP were attending a mainstream school in January 2019. This is significantly higher than the national picture (39.2%) and almost identical to the picture in January 2018 (42.6%);
- Among children with an EHCP there is some evidence of a decrease in the number of fixed term exclusions and permanent exclusions over the last two and a half years. However, the picture is less positive in terms of children receiving SEN Support or those children without SEND. There is a similar picture in terms of permanent exclusions – there has been a reduction in the number of children with an EHCP subject to a permanent exclusion, whilst the number of children receiving SEN Support or those without SEND subject to a permanent exclusion remains largely unchanged;
- 9 out of the 10 maintained/academy special schools in the county are rated either good or outstanding but OFSTED. 86.6% of primary schools and 79.1% of secondary schools have a good or better OFSTED judgement;

- 4.16 The expected impact of reshaping elements of the High Needs Budget is as follows:
- Once the place based funding model for PRS/AP is realised in 2021/22 there will be a reduction in spend against the High Needs Budget of £1.2 million;
 - It is estimated that being able to educate pupils at the proposed special free school in Selby in Selby would result in a long-term saving to the High Needs Budget which could be in the region of £250,000 to £500,000 per annum and in the longer term, result in savings of £300,000 to £500,000 per annum in the Local Authority transport budget;
 - The restructure of the Inclusion Service will result in a reduction in spend against the high needs budget of £250,000.

Longer term impact

- 4.17 Through the Strategic Plan the aim continues to be that need is met through lower cost universal and targeted provision and more local specialist provision, so that over time the overall costs of provision will reduce. There should be less need for more expensive other local authority and independent and non-maintained special schools as well as a reduction in transport costs.

5.0 High Needs Funding Announcement

- 5.1 In November 2018, the local authority consulted on 0.5% and 1.0% transfers from the Schools Block in the context of a £10-13M in-year projected deficit by March 2020 if left unchecked. The results of the consultation showed support for a 0.5% transfer. Schools Forum discussion in November endorsed this view; The Schools Forum were able to support a 0.5% transfer but did not support a 1.0% transfer. The local authority acknowledged this view given well documented financial pressures facing some schools. A disapplication request was submitted to the Secretary of State seeking a 1.0% transfer and this was approved in February 2019.
- 5.2 In December 2018, the DfE announced further temporary High Needs funding of £1.24m both 2018-19 and 2019-20. In October 2019, this funding was confirmed again for 2020-21 and an additional £5.4m allocated to North Yorkshire for 2020-21. Additional funding is welcome but is insufficient to address the scale and pace of the financial pressure. With an £8m underlying overspend position in 2019-20, the local

authority had anticipated that further cross-subsidisation of the DfE funding shortfall would be necessary (in 2019-20, this amounted to a net investment of £3.7m). However, with a further DfE consultation effectively prohibiting LA support to high needs through a tightening of the DG ringfence - but without any indication of how this will be funded – the LA has felt it necessary to consult on some contribution from the Schools Block in 2020-21. Even with a full 1.0% transfer, it is likely that the accumulated deficit will rise by March 2021.

- 5.3 In addition to the in-year financial pressure, the LA recorded a £3.3m High Needs Block deficit in 2018-19; by the end of March 2020, it is expected that the accumulated LA cross-subsidisation of DfE funding shortfalls will amount to £7.0m. As indicated elsewhere in this report, in North Yorkshire there has been a 68% increase in the number of children and young people assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans since 2015. With such unprecedented increases in demand, the local authority has experienced cost pressures that cannot be avoided whilst still meeting statutory obligations. Awarded the minimum amounts of Special Provision Capital Fund, it has not been possible to reshape provision quickly although the local authority has been achieved some good progress despite this.
- 5.4 It is important to recognise that the 1.0% transfer in 2019-20 has been insufficient in addressing the High Needs financial pressure. Costs within the High Needs Block have continued to exceed the funding allocation for the following reasons:
- the indicative increase in High Needs funding of 11.1% for 2020-21 and the 1.0% increase between 2017-18 and 2019-20 has been insufficient in the context of demand increases.
 - A significant element of the funding formula is based on historic spending. This bears no reflection to the actual cost drivers creating financial pressure and penalises the local authority (and schools) for past efficiencies.
 - There has been an unprecedented increase in demand as a direct consequence of the 2014 SEND legislative reforms. The number of Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) have risen by 68% since 2015 from c.1,700 to c.3,000 plans and is expected to continue to rise by c.250-300 plans each financial year.
 - Information on trends and pressures in SEND were highlighted at the September 2019 Schools Forum meeting and are provided as **Appendix 5** to this paper for ease of reference.
- 5.5 The local authority can only seek approval for a transfer from 2020-21 budgets. Based on current information, the local authority will have a c.£7m accumulated deficit on High Needs by 31st March 2020 with a provisional projected in-year shortfall in 2020-21 in the order of £4-6m. The projection of a £4-6m in-year shortfall in 2020-21 is based on assumptions of further increases in demand and the delivery of all savings plans previously – there is, therefore, some risk attached to these assumptions and figures will be further refined as part of the budget setting process. A transfer of 1.0% would reduce the £4-6m by c.£3.4m leaving an in-year projected deficit position of £1-3m. As demand is expected to continue to rise beyond 2020-21 and given the scale of the financial pressure, it is the view of the local authority that additional funding into the North Yorkshire system is needed rather than recycling funding within the county. We will continue to lobby DfE and MPs on this point.
- 5.6 The DfE have indicated that where a local authority has a cumulative overspend of more than 1.0%, producing a deficit on its DSG reserve, its recovery plan should look to bring the overall DSG account into balance within a timely period. It is possible that, in 2020-21, the local authority will trigger the criteria to prepare

a formal recovery plan. Although this will, in practice reflect most of the developments outlined in this report, it may require the local authority to press harder to find efficiencies and reshape provision. The DfE stipulate that in all cases, local authorities' recovery plans must demonstrate how they will bring in-year spending in line with in-year resources within three years at most.

6.0 Collaboration

6.1 Specific pieces of collaborative working to secure suitable, cost effective, local high needs places includes:

- Working with special schools to identify and deliver work funded through the DfE Special Provision Capital Funding (SPCF) to increase places in North Yorkshire special schools. Years 1 and 2 of the SPCF will deliver at least an additional 40 places overall (Springhead School, Springwater School, The Dales School, Forest School, Brooklands Schools).
- Working with Mowbray School on the development of a 60 place satellite provision on the site of Moorside Infant School in Ripon.
- Working with headteachers of existing EMS schools and those interested in the new model of provision, to commission the new targeted provision in mainstream schools, which will come on stream from September 2020.

6.2 Collaborative working also includes:

- A High Needs Funding sub group of the Schools Forum which provides a further opportunity for discussing and exploring high needs funding proposals and actions, including those deriving from the Strategic Plan.
- Regular meetings with Special School Headteachers including discussions about commissioning.
- Working with FE networks and providers to develop the post 16/19 offer for children and young people
- In phase 2 of the Strategic Plan, exploring and developing opportunities for working jointly across education, health and social care to joint commission services and provision

7.0 Contributions from Health and Social Care

7.1 Details of contributions from health and social care budgets towards the cost of specialist places are detailed in the table below:

	HAS Expected contribution 2019-20	CSC Expected contribution 2019-20	Health Expected contribution 2019-20
	£	£	£
Out of County Residential Placements	199,680	2,091,186	610,793
Specialist Post 16 Institutions	371,928	0	0
Total	571,608	2,091,186	610,793

8.0 Commissioning Response to Special Provision Demand

a. PRS Transformation

- 8.1 Between October and November 2018 the Local Authority undertook a public consultation on the way Pupil Referral Services and Alternative Provision in the County are funded. Proposals were brought forward to move to a place-based model of funding in line with national averages and local special schools.
- 8.2 The original proposal was to fund places at £17k per full time place and to implement this change as of September 2019. After consideration of public feedback, the original proposals were amended prior to approval to extend the timeline for implementation, an increase of place funding to £18k per place and the LA to continue to provide 50% of the previously established discretionary element of funding to aid transition to new models.
- 8.3 These changes mean that there will be a £1.2m reduction in spend against the High Needs Block. However, the extension of the timeline to implement changes will mean this is not fully realised until 2021/22.

b. Medical Tuition Model

- 8.4 In line with the SEN Strategic Plan, the authority has consulted upon a different model for commissioning in-reach and outreach support for the education of pupils with medical needs. This model is underpinned by the development of a clear referral and decision-making process for young people unable to access education in school on medical grounds.
- 8.5 The consultation took place during September / October 2019 and the authority is in the process of evaluating the consultation responses.
- 8.6 The financial modelling has been based around the offer of 8 hours support at Key Stages 1 and 2, 10 hours support at Key Stage 3 and 12 hours of support at Key stage 4. It has been forecast that this model and support can be delivered within the aggregate budget resource of £700k – although clearly this is a budget where it is difficult to predict demand and the financial analysis can be volatile because of the relatively small pupil cohort.

c. Targeted Mainstream Provision

- 8.7 The LA are implementing targeted mainstream provisions for SEMH and Communication and Interaction. This aspect of the plan has been developed to respond to the growth in the prevalence of both primary needs, provide more local cost effective provision and address a gap in continuum of provision between mainstream and special school offers.
- 8.8 This development will see over 200 additional places created for children and young people with an assessed primary need of SEMH or Communication and Interaction, predominantly at bands 6 and 7. It is anticipated this will help meet the increased

demand created through the issuing of new plans as well as help to ensure that special school capacity is utilised to meet the needs of those with the most complex SEND.

- 8.9 In order to implement this action, the current model of Enhanced Mainstream Provision will be decommissioned from the end of August 2020 with new targeted provisions being brought into operation from September 2020.

d. SEND Locality Hub Restructure

- 8.10 During the development of the SEND Strategic Plan for Educational Provision 2018-23, significant support was received for the creation of locality based SEND Multidisciplinary teams. Professionals working within the teams would be responsible for working with education settings to promote the early identification of children and young people with SEND and ensuring appropriate interventions to meet need.
- 8.11 The savings target associated with the model is £250k. Benefits of the new structure include
- the ability to meet need at the earliest opportunity
 - key working approaches to children and young people with SEND
 - therapeutic offer strengthened particularly for targeted provision and individual assessed need
 - focus on partnership working in localities to address areas of need in SEND
- 8.12 Teams will provide direct support to schools and education providers to build skills and expertise in meeting the needs of children and young people with SEND. They will adopt a key working approach to ensure consistency and co-ordinated involvement of professionals to ensure that the holistic need of children and young people and education settings are supported.
- 8.13 The proposed new organisational structure of the SEND and Inclusion Service responds to the key priorities stipulated within the Strategic Plan for SEND Provision which in summary include:
- local educational provision for children and young people with SEND
 - locality based governance and accountability for SEND and Inclusion across key stakeholders
 - high quality casework including early identification of need and a joined up approach across partners to meet need via a timely and effective approach
 - enhanced therapeutic support for targeted and specialist provision and individual children and young people
 - enhanced practical support for education settings from specialist professionals who can coach and model approaches to support children and young people and build capacity in schools
 - ability to review provision for children with SEND and effective commissioning and contracting arrangements on an ongoing basis
 - improved performance outcomes for SEND and Inclusion across localities

e. Introduction of a Banded System Approach for Element 3 Top-up funding

- 8.14 From 1st April 2019, NYCC moved to a banding methodology for allocating Element 3 top-up funding. The previous Resource Allocation System (the Can-Do) needed to be replaced for the following reasons:
- 1) It was not clear and transparent as to why a certain amount had been allocated for each child.

- 2) The Can-Do operated separately from the EHCP so we were unable to evidence that the resource allocated was directly related to the assessed needs and required provision in the EHCP
 - 3) The Can-Do consisted of a series of questions to which school could respond identifying different levels of significance. This was quite a subjective process which led to children with similar needs having very different Can-Do allocations across the county
 - 4) There was no opportunity for schools to be held accountable at annual reviews for their assessment of need and provision as their answers to the Can-Do were not part of the annual review process and did not need to be evidenced.
 - 5) The inconsistency and lack of transparency made it very difficult to predict and forecast demand and budget going forward across the High Needs Block.
- 8.15 Following a period of research and consultation, a banding methodology (used by the vast majority of LAs) was chosen and developed to replace the Can-Do. The NYCC banding system consists of 10 bands each of which has descriptors according to primary need.
- 8.16 Bands 1-3 are SEN Support levels and the feedback from SENCOs since implementation is that this has been very helpful in discussions with parents to demonstrate need and provision that can be made in school at SEN Support levels. It has also helped schools to develop effective SEN Support plans based on the needs and provision in the descriptors.
- 8.17 Bands 4 and upwards are EHCP level. Feedback to date has been as follows:
- 1) It is now very clear as to why a band has been allocated. Schools have found this helpful in annual reviews themselves and are able to propose a band and provide the evidence to support their identification of descriptors. The SEN team are able to review that evidence against those descriptors and feedback as to whether they agree with the proposed band or to give feedback as to why they have allocated a different band.
 - 2) Inconsistencies in banding are being resolved and schools and the SEN Team are starting to see that similar children with similar levels of need have the same funding. This is helping both ourselves and schools to more confidently forecast funding going forward.
 - 3) The SEN Team and SENCOs are becoming increasingly confident and competent at allocating the appropriate band. SENCO networks in Autumn 2019 have been an opportunity to share learning from the first term of implementation of the banding system and to provide further training around evidencing descriptors which SENCOs have found useful.
 - 4) All Special School pupils were banded by the SEN Team prior to 1st April 2019. The learning from this and in particular the need for annual review documentation to provide clear evidence has been helpful in developing training and guidance for the SEN Team and for mainstream schools.
 - 5) Mainstream school pupils will be moved to a band as they have their annual reviews. All mainstream pupils will be allocated to a band therefore by 31st March 2020.
- 8.18 With the move to a banding system, we anticipated that inconsistencies in funding would be resolved and that there would be changes – both increases and decreases – in funding due to the nature of a banded system. This is already becoming apparent and a further report on the impact of this change will be available following the transfer of all E3 allocations to a band from 1st April 2020.

f. Proposed Special Free School – Selby

8.19 The Local Authority submitted a bid to the DfE in October 2018 for a special free school in the Selby area. Notification was received in March 2019 that the Secretary of State had approved the bid to move to the next stage.

- The proposed school will be for up to 100 pupils aged 3 to 19 with needs in the areas of communication and interaction and/or cognition and learning needs. Communication and interaction needs will include speech language and communication needs and Autism. Cognition and learning needs will include moderate and severe learning difficulties. Some children and young people may have related social, emotional and mental health needs but this will not be their primary need. Children and young people placed at the school will have an Education, Health and Care Plan and will have been assessed as requiring this type of school. The proposed site for the school is in Osgodby.
- The school will be a free school. Free schools are state funded academies which are outside Local Authority control and are operated by academy trusts. They have more control over how they operate, for example they do not have to follow the national curriculum. They are held accountable through OFSTED inspections and exam results.
- There is no opening date set for the school at present. The Department for Education (DfE) has indicated that they do not anticipate that any of the special free schools in the current wave will open before September 2021.

8.20 There are two strands of work currently in progress:

- The Local Authority is engaged in a process with the DfE to identify an academy trust to open and operate the school. This will involve assessment against published criteria and interviewing proposer groups. The Local Authority assessment is involving a range of stakeholders, including parent/carer, mainstream and special schools voice. The groups who apply have to demonstrate that they can effectively provide high quality education for the children and young people who will attend the school. Whilst the Local Authority is involved in the process the final decision on the successful proposer group rests with the Secretary of State. The timescales for this decision making process are:

September to December 2019	The Local Authority and the DfE assess applications and hold interviews.
Winter 2019	Secretary of State's decision on successful proposer groups
Early 2020	Announcement of successful proposer groups.

- Work with the DfE in respect of the site and the building is developing but is in the early stages. The school will be designed and procured by the DfE and their consultants though they will work with the Local Authority and the trust appointed to open and operate the school. Among the considerations that the design will need to address are the impact on the landscape and neighbouring properties, highway access and traffic, and the public right of way which crosses the site. The DfE has to complete assessments before confirming the use of the site.

- 8.21 It is estimated that being able to educate pupils at the proposed special free school in Selby would:
- Result in a long-term saving to the High Needs Budget which could be in the region of £250,000 to £500,000 per annum
 - In the longer term, result in savings of £300,000 to £500,000 per annum in the Local Authority transport budget.
- 8.22 Information about the proposed special free school can be found at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/proposed-special-free-school-selby>.

g. Special Provision Capital Fund

- 8.23 From 2018 to 2021 the DfE has committed a total of £365 million through the Special Provision Capital Fund to develop capacity and improve facilities in provision for children and young people with SEND who have Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs.) The allocation of funding to North Yorkshire is £848 837 in total.
- 8.24 North Yorkshire's funding has been allocated to develop capacity and improve facilities as follows:

School/provision	SPCF amount	Capacity increase (if relevant)	Current position
Springwater School	£40 000	6	Work complete
Springhead School	£43 000	6	Work complete
The Dales School	£55 000	6	Work complete
The Forest School	£25 000 (plus £1.1m schools condition grant)	25	Work complete
Brooklands Community Special School	£79 600	6	Work complete
Mowbray School (Ripon)	£373 679	Up to 60 places	Work ongoing
Targeted mainstream provision (specific schools to be identified)	£232 558	To be determined	Work to be identified as new targeted provisions come on stream

- 8.25 More information about the SPCF can be found at <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/send-specialist-support-and-inclusion>.

h. Strategic Capital Considerations

- 8.26 The authority is acutely aware that capital resources have been challenging to access for all maintained schools in recent years. However, specifically in the context of the SEN Strategic Plan we have been assessing whether there are specific arguments that the limited availability of capital resources for specialist provisions has led to those facilities being perceived as offering poorer alternatives to independent provision, leading to an increased risk of expensive independent sector

placements having to be initiated. It is also the case that, particularly within a pupil population that is so dispersed and even though the SEN Strategic Plan has made significant strides to develop more resilient pathways for young people with EHCPs, that there will be gaps in meeting specific categories of need within specific geographies.

- 8.27 Consequently we have embarked on work to test whether significant capital investment could yield significant benefits in terms of both easing some of our cost pressures, and improving the quality of outcomes for young people with EHCPs (whilst recognising the excellent job performed by the family of special schools within the County). This work is at an early stage and has to be considered more speculative at this juncture – but we have had a preliminary discussion with the High Needs Sub Group – and will keep the Forum informed of both the developments and how the potential opportunities to secure capital can be progressed.

i. Mowbray School (Ripon)

- 8.28 In March 2019 approval was given to the development of a satellite provision for Mowbray special school. This will be known as Mowbray School (Ripon) and will open in January 2020. It will be for primary pupils.
- The initial commission of places will be 20 from January 2020, rising to 30 in September 2020 and 40 from September 2021. There will be scope for a commission of up to 60 places overall.
 - The development of the provision will be supported by £373 679 of Special Provision Capital Funding.

j. Increased Capacity and Commissioned Special School Places

- 8.29 In 2019/20 an additional 38 places were commissioned from North Yorkshire special Schools. This increase is in addition to 53 additional places being commissioned in 18/19 and takes the total number of commissioned places to 910 costing £8.2m in base place funding.
- 8.30 Although some special schools are constrained in terms of physical capacity it is intended to increase commissioned special school places further in 2020/21. It is planned to increase Forest Moor School from 50 to 80 places over the next 18 months. The satellite of Mowbray School in Ripon will add an additional 20 places in 2020/21 and will increase to 40 by 2021/22. In addition to this it is anticipated that the additional capital investment at Forest School will yield a further increase of at least 12 places during the next financial year.
- 8.31 These increases have been targeted to address the rising demand for specialist places for those with SEMH and C&I needs. This in part is to ensure sufficient provision for the increasing demand created by the issuing of new EHCPs as well as providing the option for young people in high cost independent provision to return to more local specialist provision.

9. Results of the Local 2020/21 School Funding Consultation

9.1 39 responses have been received to the Consultation, as shown below.

LA Maintained Primary	20
LA Maintained Secondary	5
LA Federation - Primary	3
LA Federation - Cross-Phase	1
Primary Academy	8
Academy Trust	2
	<u>39</u>

(57 schools and academies are represented in the responses received providing an overall response rate of 16.43% (15.35% LA maintained schools, 18.87% academies). 290 schools / academies are not represented in the consultation responses. 6 responses, representing 15% of the consultation responses received, supporting the same option (Option 1) have been submitted from one academy trust and a number of the schools within it).

9.2 The Consultation requested the views of schools and academies on 6 options related to the transfer of funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs budget and the level of the MFG and associated funding gains cap. The consultation results are detailed in the table below:

Options supported in respect of the transfer of funding to High Needs in 2020/21 and the level of Minimum Funding Guarantee protection, and associated funding gains cap to be applied in the calculation of school budgets for 2020/21 (support could be indicated for more than one option):		
Option:		No. Responses Received Supporting Option
Option 1	High Needs Transfer: 0% MFG: 1.37% Funding Gains Cap: 100%	23
Option 2	High Needs Transfer: 0% MFG: 1.84% Funding Gains Cap: 34.33%	16
Option 3	High Needs Transfer: 0.5% MFG: 0.5% Funding Gains Cap: 13.81%	11
Option 4	High Needs Transfer: 0.5% MFG: 1.84% Funding Gains Cap: 11.47%	15
Option 5	High Needs Transfer: 1.0% MFG: 0.5% Funding Gains Cap: 10.61%	2
Option 6	High Needs Transfer: 1.0% MFG: 1.84% Funding Gains Cap: 8.50%	2

--	--

A number of schools and academies also provided additional comments to support their responses. These comments are detailed in **Appendix 6** to this report

- 9.3 Marginal majority support was indicated through the responses received to the Consultation for a MFG of less than the maximum allowed level of 1.84%. In 2018-19 the decision was made by the North Yorkshire Education Partnership to implement a funding formula which reflects the NFF principles and the associated transitional arrangements. The implementation of a lower level of MFG protection allows for a higher funding gains cap and facilitates a quicker transition for schools to the NFF funding values within the constraints of the overall funding levels received by North Yorkshire LA from the DfE.
- 9.4 The Schools Forum considered the results of the Consultation at their meeting on the 13th November 2019. Whilst the North Yorkshire Schools Forum acknowledged the significant financial pressures on the High Needs budget, regrettably, the option approved by the Schools Forum was Option 1 which provides a 0% transfer from Schools Block to the High Needs Budget, a MFG of 1.37% and allows for 100% of funding gains to be retained.

10.0 Equalities Impact Assessment

- 10.1 The Equalities Impact Assessment produced in relation to the 2020-21 School Funding Consultation is contained within **Appendix 7** to this report.

11.0 Summary

- 11.1 The Local Authority recognises the views expressed by schools and academies through the Consultation and the views provided at the meeting of the Schools Forum at the meeting on the 13th November 2019. However, significant budget pressures on High Needs are expected to continue in terms of:
- High Needs Block funding provided by the Department of Education continues to be insufficient. The 11.1% increase (per head of 2-18 population) for 2020-21 amounting to an indicative £5.4m cash increase does not address the forecast budget pressures for the next financial year.
 - The local authority will have a c.£7m accumulated deficit on High Needs by 31st March 2020 with a provisional projected in-year shortfall in 2020-21 in the order of £4-6m.
 - There has been an unprecedented increase in Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Since 2014, there has been a 68% rise in EHCPs and this trend has continued throughout 2018 and 2019 and continued growth is expected in 2020. This is an unfunded burden on schools and the local authority.
 - The North Yorkshire Strategic Plan for SEND Education Provision launched in September 2018 seeks to deliver a financially sustainable, inclusive and effective system. Strategic developments identified within the Plan are progressing, but it is a longer term strategy with financial savings being realised in over a number of years rather than in the short term.

- The potential for a tightening of the ringfence on Dedicated School Grant (DSG), effectively prohibiting the local authority from using local authority resources to assist with DSG financial pressures. This presents a significant issue with the local authority cross-subsidising the DfE funding shortfall on High Needs by up to £7m by 31st March 2020.

Regrettably, given the reasons outlined above, the local authority feels that it is left with no alternative but to, again, submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State to transfer up to 1% of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Budget for the 2020/21 financial year.

12.0 Recommendation

- 12.1 The Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service, in conjunction with CYPS Executive members, are asked to approve the submission of a disapplication request to the Secretary of State to transfer up to 1% of the Dedicated Schools Grant Schools Block funding to the High Needs Budget for the financial year 2020 to 2021.

HOWARD EMMETT
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR – STRATEGIC RESOURCES (CYPS)

North Yorkshire County Council**Consultation Response: Implementing mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels**

Question 1: Do you agree that, in order to calculate mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels, all local authorities should follow the NFF methodology? If not, please explain your reasons.

No. The calculation of the mandatory minimum per pupil funding level on the basis of the school's total core funding discriminates against more inclusive schools and small, rural schools and academies at both primary and secondary phases. Under the Government's proposed calculation of mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels, the schools that will benefit the most will be those with pupil cohorts that do not have the characteristics associated with additional funding. As the mandatory minimum per pupil funding level is applied to a school's total core funding after the calculation of additional funding, it has the effect of cancelling out the benefit that additional funding allocates to a school; the schools with few pupil characteristics associated with additional funding benefit the most.

The proposed methodology benefits those schools with low levels of disadvantaged pupils, schools in affluent communities, and schools with low numbers of pupils with low prior attainments. Crucially, we also believe that the proposed methodology rewards larger schools in urban areas that benefit from economies of scale and unfairly penalises small, rural schools. This is because in small – but geographically vital – schools, the lump sum provides a higher relative per pupil figure. However, the lump sum simply recognises the cost of delivering education in sparse and super-sparse communities and the diseconomies of scale that flow from those conditions.

Question 2: Do you agree that any requests from local authorities to disapply the use of the mandatory minimum per pupil levels should only be considered on an exceptional basis and in the context of the grounds described above? If not, please explain your reasons.

Whilst the local authority agrees that the application of a mandatory minimum per pupil funding level should be consistent, we do not agree that local authorities should be required to apply to the Secretary of State or Department for Education for a disapplication. Discussions with local Schools Forums and locally elected Members should provide the necessary oversight and decision-making function.

Question 3. Please provide any additional comments you wish to make on the implementation of mandatory minimum per pupil levels.

Whilst the implementation of mandatory minimum per pupil levels will provide additional funding for some schools in local authority areas that are receiving funding below the headline thresholds (£3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools), we remain concerned that the basic cost of delivering a good quality broad curriculum in sparse and rural areas like North Yorkshire is not addressed by the latest proposals – and this

concern is accentuated when the proposals will see the continuation of schools in some areas (particularly in London) continuing to receive significantly higher allocations.

Question 4a: Do you think that any of our proposals could have a disproportionate impact, positive or negative, on specific pupils, in particular those who share a protected characteristic? Please provide evidence to support your response.

Yes. Schools with high levels of deprivation, low attainment and mobility should attract more funding as these schools have pupils with greater needs compared to schools in more affluent areas. The proposed methodology unfairly overlooks those schools currently below the minimum per pupil level of funding but who have pupils with characteristics associated with additional funding. The proposed methodology also unfairly restricts the flow of funding to small and rural schools that are vital in serving their local communities who simply cannot obtain the same level of operational efficiency as their larger, urban counterparts. This does not provide equality of opportunity for pupils in rural areas.

Question 4b: How could any adverse consequences be reduced and are there any ways we could better advance equality of opportunity between those pupils who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not? Please provide evidence to support your response.

A fairer methodology would be to increase the AWPU factor to ensure that the total per pupil funding is equivalent to a minimum per pupil level. This would enable those schools who have pupil cohorts associated with additional funding to benefit from the funding that should flow from those pupil characteristics.



NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

SCHOOL FUNDING FROM 2020-21

A CONSULTATION PAPER

October 2019

Revised Deadline for responses: Thursday, 7th November 2019 (5.00pm)

1 Summary

- 1.1 This consultation paper sets out the latest position from the DfE and the North Yorkshire Local Authority with regard to school funding for 2020/2021. The consultation seeks the views of schools in order to inform the following key decisions:
- The use of funding from the school's budget in 2020/21 to support the continuing financial pressures relating to children and young people with High Needs
 - The level at which the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) protection and associated cap on funding gains which an individual school can benefit from is set.
- 1.2 In addition, a further separate consultation will be undertaken specifically with special school establishments (LA maintained schools and academies) in relation to the MFG protection level associated with the formula used to calculate their funding allocations.
- 1.3 The local authority continues to lobby DfE and MPs on the issue of the overall quantum of schools and high needs funding and the additional cost pressures associated with sparsity and rurality. We will continue to advocate for a better funding deal for children and young people in all North Yorkshire education settings (including maintained schools and academies).
- 1.4 The DfE released their 2020/21 funding announcement and the associated detailed funding information required to model funding formula options for the next financial year on the 11th October 2019; this is later than usual. This has resulted in a much shorter timescale being available to consult on local school funding developments than would normally be the case; the DfE have acknowledged this position. In order to report the results of the consultation to the meeting of the North Yorkshire Schools Forum on the 13th November 2019 and to meet the DfE deadline of the 28th November 2019 for the submission of any formula disapplication requests, the consultation period is just over 2 weeks and it is necessary to run over the half term holiday period.
- 1.5 The views of schools and academies provided through this consultation will be fed back to the Schools Forum on 13th November 2019. This consultation will begin on 18th October 2019 and close on 7th November 2019 (**revised deadline**)

2 Background

- 2.1 In Autumn 2017 the Department for Education (DfE) announced national changes to the school funding formula which will eventually see all school budgets set using a new national funding formula (NFF). In the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years a 'soft' approach has been undertaken where the funding which local authorities receive is based on the new formula but with transitional arrangements. The North Yorkshire Schools Forum has adopted an approach of calculating school budgets using these principles for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years.
- 2.3 The local authority continues to lobby DfE and MPs on the issue of the overall quantum of funding and sparsity. Written and oral evidence has been provided to the Education Select Committee in calls for evidence from two inquiries: school and college funding, and high needs. The local authority has written to local MPs, ministers in the Ministry of Housing,

Communities & Local Government, the DfE and HM Treasury and we will continue to advocate for a better funding deal for children and young people in all North Yorkshire education settings (including maintained schools and academies).

- 2.3 In July 2017, the Secretary of State announced that the Government would provide an additional £1.3bn nationally for school funding in 2018-19 and 2019-20. The formula in 2019-20 provided for a minimum per pupil level of funding (MPPL) of at least £4,800 per pupil for every secondary school and £3,500 per pupil for every primary school. The North Yorkshire Schools Forum agreed the principle to ensure that each school received at least the MPPL of funding. In order to achieve this funding commitment, a minimum funding guarantee (MFG) of -1.5% was agreed.
- 2.4 In 2019-20, North Yorkshire successfully applied for a disapplication request to the Secretary of State for Education to transfer 1% of the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in recognition of the significant financial pressure (in the context of a 61% rise in the number of children and young people assessed as requiring Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs)). This equated to approximately £3.3m.

3. 2020/2021 Schools Funding Policy

- 3.1 Following the formation of a new Government, a new education funding policy was triggered by the announcement from Boris Johnson MP in his first speech as Prime Minister on 24 July 2019:

"My job is to make sure your kids get a superb education wherever they are in the country and that's why we have already announced that we are going to level up per pupil funding in primary and secondary schools and that is the work that begins immediately behind that black door and though I am today building a great team of men and women I will take personal responsibility for the change I want to see. Never mind the backstop – the buck stops here."

- 3.2 In September 2019, Gavin Williamson MP, Secretary of State for Education, made an education funding announcement to the House of Commons that in excess of £14bn additional funding over three years would be made available, "...ensuring that funding for all schools can rise at least in line with inflation next year." The table below describes how the £14bn has been arrived at:

Year	Additional Annual Amount	Cumulative Annual Amount	Cumulative Cash Amount
2020-21	£2.6bn	£2.6bn	£2.6bn
2021-22	£2.2bn	£4.8bn	£7.4bn
2022-23	£2.3bn	£7.1bn	£14.5bn

- 3.3 The Government is seeking to raise the overall education funding quantum by £7.1bn by 2022-23. Within the £2.6bn funding announcement for 2020-21, £700m is earmarked for High Needs. It is estimated that £300m is required for national pupil number growth and c.£1bn will be

required to fund the inflation commitment of 1.84%. An additional £400m was also announced for 16-19 education.

- 3.4 The Government also confirmed that £1.5bn per annum will be available for the next 3 year period to continue to fund additional pension costs for teachers as a result of the recent revaluation and determination of employer contributions.
- 3.5 The impact for individual schools will see the MPPL funding for secondary schools rise to £5,000 per pupil from 2020-21 (currently £4,800 per pupil in 2019-20). For primary schools, the MPPL funding will rise to £3,750 from 2020-21 (currently £3,500 per pupil) and subsequently to £4,000 per pupil from 2021-22.
- 3.6 Local authorities, in consultation with Schools Forum, will continue to have some discretion over their schools funding formulae for 2020-21 and will ultimately determine allocations in their area. However, the government have confirmed that, as a step towards the implementation of a 'hard' formula, the use of the national MPPL funding, at the values in the school NFF, will be mandatory.
- 3.7 The Government also indicated their intention to move to a national funding formula "as soon as possible".
- 3.8 Overall, the additional funding announcement is enormously welcome and reflects the level and intensity of lobbying of individual authorities, including North Yorkshire, for an improved funding settlement for the education sector. Three-year announcements are also welcome and will, to a certain extent, support financial planning for the medium-term.
- 3.9 A report by the Education Policy Institute in August 2019 reveals, however, that although the policy will bring a number of schools up to a new minimum threshold, there will likely continue to be a number of local authority areas, typically in London and the South East, which continue to receive significantly higher per pupil levels of funding.
- 3.10 The Education Policy Institute also highlights that *"...the schools that would benefit the most from this policy would be those that do not have the characteristics associated with additional funding under the NFF."* This is likely to be the schools with low numbers of disadvantaged pupils, low numbers of pupils with low results and low numbers of pupils for whom English is not their first language. We remain concerned that small schools – at both primary and secondary level – will, perversely, not benefit from this policy approach due to the disproportionate impact of the lump sum on the calculation of MPPL funding.
- 3.11 The DfE have developed a new formulaic methodology for the allocation of mobility funding for 2020/21 which will replace the previous methodology which was based on historic spend.
- 3.12 Teachers' pay grant and teachers' pension employer contributions grant will both continue to be paid separately from the funding formula in 2020-21.
- 3.13 A Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) will continue to be a feature of the formula for 2020-21 but must be set between +0.5% and +1.84%. This funding protection will sit alongside Minimum Per Pupil Levels (MPPL).

- 3.14 It has also been confirmed that local authorities can again transfer up to 0.5% of their Schools Block to other blocks of the DSG, with schools' forum approval. To transfer more than this, or any amount without schools' forum approval, they will have to make a request to the Department for Education.
- 3.15 Other measures included in the package of reform alongside the education funding policy announcement are:
- The DfE will consult on lifting the inspection exemption for outstanding schools;
 - There will be additional funding for strong academy trusts to expand;
 - A new specialist academy trust will also be set up specifically to take in and turn round the most challenging schools struggling with long term underperformance. The trust will be piloted in the North of England and offer direct support from school leaders with a proven track record in improving education.
 - The DfE will increase the level of support to schools that Require Improvement (where they have not been judged 'Good' by Ofsted in the previous ten years);
 - Continue to expand the school resource management programme;
 - Working with Ofsted, the DfE will ensure that parents have the information they need about how schools are utilising funding;
 - Pay will be increased for *all* teachers with starting salaries to be increased by £6,000, up to £30,000 by 2022-23;
 - There will be a £10m investment in a new national behaviour hub;
 - The DfE will consult on revised behaviour and exclusions guidance;
 - The Government will also work with Ofsted to ensure all inspection reports also include a 'rating for financial management and oversight' with the school, academy or academy trust.

4. 2020/21 North Yorkshire School Funding – Indicative Position

- 4.1 The indicative 2020-21 Schools Block funding for North Yorkshire (calculated using the NFF) provides a 5.19% (£17.4m) increase compared to the 2019-20 funding level. Our analysis indicates that £4.8m of this additional funding will be required to fund the increase in the MPPL from £3,500 in 2019/20 to £3,750 per pupil in 2020/21 for primary schools and from £4,800 in 2019/20 to £5,000 per pupil in 2020/21 for secondary schools.
- 4.2 For 2020-21 the DfE are continuing to allow the transfer of up to 0.5% of the Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block. The approval of the Schools Forum is required for this transfer and the views of local schools and academies will need to be considered in determining this decision. Any proposal to transfer more than 0.5% will require the approval of the Secretary of State. Within North Yorkshire there continues to be significant budget pressures related to High Needs and these are discussed more fully in section 5 below. The Local Authority very much acknowledges the difficult financial challenges currently being faced by schools. However, it is regrettably felt that, given the continued significant growth and associated budget pressures on High Needs, the local authority is left with no alternative

but to consult on a transfer of funding from the Schools block to High Needs for the next financial year. **In this regard it is again necessary to propose that funding is transferred from the Schools Block to High Needs in 2020/21. The views of schools are requested on transfer options of 0.5% and 1%.**

- 4.3 The DfE are allowing local authorities to be able to locally set the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) level between plus 0.5% and plus 1.84% per pupil. This is one of the mechanisms which determine the change in per pupil funding levels which a school can experience from year to year. The level of the MFG controls the level of gain and loss in per pupil funding levels at individual school level when compared to the previous financial year. In this respect, the MFG provides a mechanism for controlling the impact of schools moving to the NFF i.e. a lower MFG allows those schools which gain from the NFF implementation to start to receive some funding benefit, however those schools which will lose funding under the NFF will start to see a reduction in their funding levels. In 2018-19 the decision was made by the North Yorkshire Schools Forum to implement a funding formula which reflects the NFF principles and the associated transitional arrangements. **Schools are requested to provide their views on the MFG protection level options of between +0.5% or +1.84% for 2020/21.**
- 4.4 The level of any transfer of funding from the Schools Block to High Needs and the level of the MFG protection has a direct impact on the level of the cap which is required to be set on the funding gains which can be experienced by an individual school. This is due to the level of funding required to deliver the funding transfer and the MFG protection i.e. the higher the MFG protection, the greater the funding requirement.
- 4.5 Appendix 1 of this document provides a schedule of the indicative implications at individual school level of the High Needs transfer, and MFG protection levels and funding cap options. It needs to be noted that the modelling is based on the 2019/20 funded pupil numbers and data and the actual 2020/21 funding allocations will be based on the October 2019 pupil census information.

The options which schools are asked to consider are:

	High Needs Transfer	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Funding Gains Cap*
Option 1	0.0%	1.37%	100%
Option 2	0.0%	1.84%	34.33%
Option 3	0.5%	0.5%	13.81%
Option 4	0.5%	1.84%	11.47%
Option 5	1.0%	0.5%	10.61%
Option 6	1.0%	1.84%	8.50%

*level of gain retained e.g. 100% - full gain retained, 34.33% - gains capped at 33.34% of full gain level.

- 4.6 The 2020/21 MPPL amounts of £3,750 for primary schools and £5,000 for secondary schools take precedence over the MFG calculation so irrespective of the MFG level, schools will receive at least the MPPL funding amount.
- 4.7 The DfE have confirmed that the de-delegation of services will continue to be allowed for 2020/21. At the meeting of the Schools Forum in November 2019 consideration will be given to the proposal to continue to de-delegate the contingencies related to Schools in Financial Difficulty and Unreasonable School Expenditure. The Forum will also consider whether or not it is appropriate to continue to de-delegate the funding associated with the work undertaken through the Trade Unions (Professional Associations Facilities Agreement - PAFA) or whether this work should be delivered through a traded service.

5. High Needs Funding

- 5.1 The indicative position with regard to the High Needs block funding received by North Yorkshire from the DfE is that the overall funding will increase from £49.55m in 2019/20 to £55.03m in 2020/21; an increase of £5.48m. Whilst the increase in High Needs funding is welcome, it is still not sufficient to address the continued significant increase in demands and pressure on High Needs services (further detail provided below). The actual amount retained by the local authority is lower than the £55.03m due to deductions from the Education, Skills and Funding Agency (ESFA).
- 5.2 Within North Yorkshire there continues to be very significant pressure on High Needs funding. It is anticipated that the underlying financial pressure in 2019-20 will be in the order of £6.8m. This is reduced, in part, by the £1.6m (0.5%) transfer of funding from the Schools Block into the High Needs Block in 2019/20 and a £3.7m funding contribution from the Local Authority core budget. **The overall result is an expected overspend of £1.5m on the High Needs budget in 2019/20; this is against the background of a £3m overspend in 2018/19. Future demand predictions indicate that, based on current trends, the underlying financial pressure of £6.8m will grow by approximately £1.5m - £2.5m in each of the next few years and that, if left unchecked, by March 2022 there will be a recurring overspend of between £10m - £13m per annum. Key factors which are contributing to this overspend position are:**
- The impact of the new SEND practices which were introduced as part of the Children and Families Act 2014
 - A significant increase in the number of children receiving SEN Support with a 16% increase in Primary School pupils and a 23% increase Secondary School pupils between January 2016 and January 2019
 - The total number of children with Education Health & Care Plans (EHCP) has increased by 61% between 2014/15 and 2018/19 (financial years)
 - The total number of pupils in independent and non-maintained day out-of-authority placements has shown a year on year increase since 2014-15 with an associated increase in expenditure. In 2017-18 the average cost per pupil was £54k.
 - Whilst the total pupils in independent and non-maintained residential out-of-authority placements has decreased year on year since 2014-15, a trend of increasing expenditure has been seen between 2016-17 and 2017-18 despite fewer pupils. In 2017-18 the average cost per pupil was £135k.

- 5.3 The Dedicated Schools Grant reserve within the North Yorkshire Local Authority is almost entirely depleted which means that overspends are carried forward and will need to be met from future years funding allocations. This is clearly a very challenging and concerning position with regard to the High Needs budget as the additional funding is insufficient to cover current cost pressures aside from the forecast trend of continued increase in demand for High Needs services / support and a continued increasing budget overspend.
- 5.4 The DfE have recently released a consultation proposing to change the regulations for the operation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The consultation proposes that any deficit an LA may have on the DSG is carried forward and that local authority core budget funding cannot be used to support DSG overspends. Whilst it is welcome that the DfE are highlighting and taking more ownership of the crisis and shortfalls in SEND funding, it is concerning that without core LA budget support it is unlikely that, within North Yorkshire, any accumulated deficit on the High Needs budget could be recovered within the DSG funding quantum without adversely impacting on service provision. In the 2019/20 financial year £3.7m of local authority core budget has been allocated with North Yorkshire to support High Needs. Further support will be unable to be provided in the future if the DfE consultation proposals are implemented.
- 5.5 The context for the proposal to transfer funds from the Schools Block to High Needs (0.5% (£1.76m) or 1% (£3.52m)) is for this funding to provide interim support towards the financial pressures whilst the longer term savings proposals detailed in the North Yorkshire Strategic Plan for SEND are progressed.
- 5.6 A number of developments have been implemented in 2019/20 to address the unsustainable overspend position on the High Needs budget. These developments include:
- The replacement of the CAN-DO Resource Allocation System with a Banded System
 - Moving to study programmes of 600 planned hours per academic year for post-16 study for young people with EHCPs.
 - The transformation of Pupil Referral Services (PRS) and Alternative Provision establishments with a reduced funding allocation.
- 5.7 The developments planned for 2019/20 are estimated to provide savings of £1.1m. Clearly, this is not sufficient to address the underlying projected overspend and further measures will be considered in order for future financial sustainability to be achieved for the High Needs budget.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1 Accompanying this consultation paper is a response form. We would be grateful if you could return this by email by 5pm on Thursday, 7th November 2019 (**revised deadline**). Please send your responses to Deborah.wilbor@northyorks.gov.uk
- 6.2 The results of this consultation will be presented to members of the North Yorkshire Schools Forum for final decisions to be made at its meeting on 13th November 2019. Schools will be notified of the outcome of this before the end of November.

- 6.3 The DfE release the data needed to calculate next year's budget in mid-December. We aim to publish primary and secondary school budgets by mid-February.

7. Consultation Questions

- 7.1 The questions set out in the accompanying response form are as follows:

Q1. Please indicate which of the following options you support in respect of the transfer of funding to High Needs in 2020/21, the level of Minimum Funding Guarantee protection and associated funding cap applied in the calculation of school budgets for 2020/21 (support may be indicated for more than one option):				
	High Needs Transfer	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Funding Gains Cap*	Support (Y / N)
Option 1	0.0%	1.37%	100%	
Option 2	0.0%	1.84%	34.33%	
Option 3	0.5%	0.5%	13.81%	
Option 4	0.5%	1.84%	11.47%	
Option 5	1.0%	0.5%	10.61%	
Option 6	1.0%	1.84%	8.50%	

Q2: Do you have any further comments relating to the LA's proposals for school funding for 2020/21?

- 7.2 Please could you send your response to these, by email, by **5pm on Thursday 7th November 2019 (revised deadline)** to deborah.wilbor@northyorks.gov.uk

Accompanying Appendices

- Appendix 1: Schedule of the indicative implications at individual school level of the High Needs transfer and MFG protection level options.

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019-20

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019-20				No High Needs Transfer		0.5% Transfer to High Needs		1.0% Transfer to High Needs		No High Needs Transfer Funding Variance to 2019/20		0.5% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20		1.0% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20	
DFE No	School Name	Phase	Current Year 2018/20	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
				MFG 1.37% Cap: 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap: 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap: 10.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 8.5%	MFG 1.37% Cap: 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap: 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap: 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap: 11.47%
8152000	Thomas Hinderwell Primary Academy	Primary	1,011,957	1,072,183	1,072,183	1,087,858	1,087,858	1,059,178	1,059,178	60,208	60,208	55,991	55,991	47,219	47,219
8152001	Brotherton and Bryant Community Primary Academy	Primary	632,670	678,205	678,205	675,708	675,708	670,671	670,671	45,534	45,534	43,037	43,037	36,091	36,091
8152002	Slaney Hall Primary Academy	Primary	841,983	851,850	851,850	845,597	855,293	845,002	855,300	9,874	13,292	3,814	13,301	3,619	13,316
8152003	St Stephen's Catholic Primary School and Nursery, A Voluntary Academy	Primary	681,247	724,816	724,816	721,908	721,908	716,842	716,842	43,569	43,569	40,660	40,660	34,795	34,795
8152004	Camblesforth Community Primary Academy	Primary	348,882	368,450	368,450	364,987	364,987	362,020	362,020	22,577	22,577	21,104	21,104	18,137	18,137
8152005	Hawes Primary School	Primary	402,218	441,214	441,214	430,519	430,519	431,734	426,082	37,968	37,968	36,301	30,730	28,510	22,884
8152007	Trinity Academy Richmond	Primary	726,883	771,344	771,344	768,252	768,252	762,014	762,014	44,482	44,482	41,369	41,369	35,132	35,132
8152008	Outwood Primary Academy Greystone	Primary	593,542	643,539	643,539	640,955	640,955	635,745	634,135	49,990	49,990	47,413	47,413	42,202	40,592
8152009	Saxton Church of England Primary School	Primary	322,001	341,908	341,908	340,530	340,530	337,752	337,752	10,907	10,907	18,529	18,529	15,751	15,751
8152010	Braeburn Primary and Nursery Academy	Primary	1,845,393	1,874,329	1,877,102	1,866,790	1,877,110	1,854,009	1,877,128	28,940	31,719	21,407	31,728	8,628	31,745
8152011	Keble Gateway Academy	Primary	85,840	260,750	260,750	259,711	259,711	257,616	257,616	175,101	174,062	174,062	174,062	171,969	171,969
8152012	Cambrai Primary School	Primary	105,309	188,465	188,465	187,714	187,714	186,202	186,202	83,150	83,150	82,405	82,405	80,894	80,894
8152040	Leeming and Londonderry Community Primary School	Primary	206,748	205,005	237,761	219,285	217,162	216,477	214,549	58,257	31,013	12,537	10,414	9,729	7,800
8152041	Glaisdale Primary School	Primary	261,720	263,735	264,430	262,465	264,438	262,470	264,450	2,006	2,701	736	2,710	741	2,727
8152042	Leatholm Primary School	Primary	211,674	233,975	233,975	221,517	219,850	219,334	217,810	22,301	22,301	9,843	8,176	7,060	6,141
8152043	Gothland Primary School	Primary	193,812	216,058	211,271	200,778	196,565	190,210	198,105	23,045	17,858	7,166	5,952	5,603	4,463
8152047	Great Smeaton Academy Primary School	Primary	231,704	256,063	256,063	244,340	242,211	241,523	239,589	25,219	25,219	12,576	10,447	9,759	7,825
8152060	Oakridge Community Primary School	Primary	257,869	259,559	260,214	258,363	260,222	258,368	260,239	1,890	2,545	864	2,553	898	2,570
8152081	Staltheis, Seton Community Primary School	Primary	429,080	436,351	437,814	437,814	434,355	434,355	434,355	18,441	18,441	14,725	14,725	11,333	11,333
8152083	Hulton and Anshcombe Community Primary School	Primary	288,156	313,456	313,456	308,053	302,889	301,546	298,501	27,270	27,270	19,668	18,503	15,360	13,116
8152084	Kirkymoorside Community Primary School	Primary	775,983	821,073	821,073	818,434	818,434	811,902	811,902	45,710	45,710	42,471	42,471	35,939	35,939
8152085	Layburn Primary School	Primary	711,625	749,374	749,374	746,367	746,367	740,302	740,302	37,740	37,740	34,742	34,742	28,677	28,677
8152074	Malton Community Primary School	Primary	678,678	930,817	930,817	927,157	927,157	919,776	919,776	54,940	54,940	51,280	51,280	43,898	43,898
8152075	Newton Community Primary School	Primary	426,166	400,317	400,317	458,554	458,159	455,000	440,708	35,150	35,150	33,387	32,993	28,834	24,542
8152076	Newby and Scalby Primary School	Primary	1,485,605	1,585,151	1,585,151	1,585,151	1,585,151	1,585,151	1,585,151	99,546	99,546	90,546	90,546	90,546	90,546
8152080	Applegarth Primary School	Primary	1,055,004	1,109,417	1,109,417	1,105,019	1,105,019	1,096,152	1,096,152	54,323	54,323	49,925	49,925	41,058	41,058
8152081	North and South Cowton Community Primary School	Primary	227,063	245,541	245,541	242,959	239,644	238,704	236,356	16,478	16,478	15,026	14,462	11,641	9,334
8152083	Osnotherley Primary School	Primary	248,812	277,362	277,362	263,438	260,981	260,145	257,899	28,850	28,850	14,618	12,149	11,333	9,087
8152097	Ronanby Primary School	Primary	286,054	285,130	285,130	282,190	282,190	279,107	276,520	19,078	19,078	16,864	14,068	13,053	10,400
8152088	Rosedale Abbey Community Primary School	Primary	970,396	1,031,526	1,031,526	1,031,526	1,031,526	1,031,526	1,031,526	61,130	61,130	61,130	61,130	61,130	61,130
8152108	Rosedale Abbey Community Primary School	Primary	178,208	198,365	188,043	181,032	180,215	180,012	179,258	22,147	11,835	4,824	4,007	3,804	3,050
8152108	Barrowcliff School	Primary	1,491,801	1,510,288	1,510,689	1,498,568	1,510,697	1,498,571	1,510,714	18,489	24,888	6,785	24,890	5,770	24,914
8152114	Friarage Community Primary School	Primary	1,578,385	1,595,995	1,602,784	1,583,561	1,602,793	1,583,565	1,602,810	19,811	26,400	7,176	26,408	7,181	26,425
8152117	Gladstone Road Primary School	Primary	3,006,614	3,132,791	3,132,791	3,120,348	3,120,348	3,095,247	3,095,247	123,178	123,178	110,734	110,734	85,633	85,633
8152120	Scarborough, Northstead Community Primary School	Primary	2,454,814	2,486,180	2,497,038	2,460,290	2,497,047	2,460,295	2,497,054	31,369	42,224	11,476	42,233	11,481	42,250
8152132	Singsby Community Primary School	Primary	421,527	490,887	490,887	449,227	449,227	445,881	445,772	20,359	29,359	27,700	27,700	24,245	24,245
8152133	Snape Community Primary School	Primary	170,849	184,385	184,385	178,134	178,086	175,407	175,398	13,736	13,736	7,485	6,217	5,648	4,898
8152136	Sittington Primary School	Primary	221,780	223,199	223,199	222,280	223,700	222,293	223,723	1,439	1,937	529	1,946	533	1,963
8152139	Stokesley Primary Academy	Primary	955,536	1,013,016	1,013,016	1,008,951	1,008,951	1,008,756	1,008,756	57,477	57,477	53,412	53,412	45,217	45,217
8152150	Alanbrooke School	Primary	368,273	369,079	370,857	367,521	370,860	367,526	370,863	3,405	4,584	1,248	4,592	1,253	4,610
8152151	Wetburn Community Primary School	Primary	403,964	458,075	458,075	440,376	434,213	432,037	428,477	54,091	54,091	36,391	30,229	28,052	22,493
8152154	East Whitby Primary Academy	Primary	790,436	826,575	826,575	826,239	826,239	819,513	819,513	39,139	39,139	35,803	35,803	29,078	29,078
8152163	Mil Hill Community Primary School	Primary	673,298	715,187	715,187	712,359	712,359	708,600	708,600	41,800	41,800	39,061	39,061	33,362	33,362
8152164	Easingwold Community Primary School	Primary	920,578	968,458	968,458	964,033	964,033	958,245	958,245	47,870	47,870	44,055	44,055	37,687	37,687
8152165	Dishforth Airfield Community Primary School	Primary	518,238	527,245	527,245	525,158	525,158	523,470	523,470	11,007	11,007	9,920	9,920	4,713	7,232
8152166	Leeming RAF Community Primary School	Primary	815,573	856,287	856,287	852,825	852,825	848,141	848,141	40,714	40,714	37,352	37,352	30,588	30,588
8152167	Goburn Community Primary School	Primary	910,896	967,498	967,498	963,871	963,871	955,857	955,857	47,832	47,832	43,805	43,805	36,091	36,091
8152170	Scarborough, Overdale Community Primary School	Primary	687,601	677,659	681,141	671,283	681,150	671,287	681,167	10,058	13,540	3,682	13,549	3,688	13,566
8152171	Union-on-Ouse Primary School	Primary	443,887	472,100	472,100	470,237	470,237	466,480	466,480	28,413	28,413	26,550	26,550	22,793	22,793
8152173	Catterick Garrison, Le Cateau Community Primary School	Primary	1,541,348	1,612,638	1,612,638	1,606,285	1,606,285	1,605,300	1,605,300	71,292	71,292	64,936	64,936	53,954	53,954
8152183	Sowerby Primary Academy	Primary	1,107,820	1,169,753	1,169,753	1,169,753	1,169,753	1,169,753	1,169,753	61,924	61,924	61,924	61,924	61,924	61,924
8152186	Sheriff Hutton Primary School	Primary	410,317	481,578	481,578	454,340	447,901	445,022	439,8						

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019/20

Individual School			No High Needs Transfer		0.5% Transfer to High Needs		1.0% Transfer to High Needs		No High Needs Transfer Funding Variance to 2019/20		0.5% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20		1.0% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20	
			Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		Option 5		Option 6	
			MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%
DfE No	School Name	Phase	2019/20											
8152257	East Aston Community Primary School	Primary	784,092	830,045	830,045	827,081	827,081	821,008	821,008	45,053	45,053	42,089	42,089	30,106
8152301	Appleton Road Primary School	Primary	480,359	509,364	509,364	508,091	498,347	495,588	498,605	49,005	49,005	45,732	37,087	38,227
8152302	Askwith Community Primary School	Primary	468,428	465,565	495,595	493,652	493,652	489,735	499,735	27,100	27,100	25,226	25,226	21,309
8152305	Bentham Community Primary School	Primary	562,098	562,098	562,098	559,958	559,958	555,097	555,097	27,130	27,130	25,017	25,017	20,758
8152309	Boroughbridge Primary School	Primary	599,277	631,474	631,474	628,995	628,995	623,095	623,095	35,197	35,197	32,718	32,718	27,719
8152310	Bradleys Both Community Primary School	Primary	542,590	574,031	574,031	572,348	572,348	567,744	567,744	32,041	32,041	29,758	29,758	25,154
8152312	Burton Salern Community Primary School	Primary	275,211	280,884	280,884	288,701	288,701	288,357	288,357	14,653	14,653	13,480	13,480	11,145
8152314	Caston-in-Snails Community Primary School	Primary	807,914	844,111	844,111	841,569	841,569	836,443	836,443	36,197	36,197	33,655	33,655	28,528
8152316	Cononley Community Primary School	Primary	589,624	589,150	589,150	586,708	586,708	582,057	582,057	29,528	29,528	27,174	27,174	22,433
8152317	Cowling Community Primary School	Primary	548,506	577,103	577,103	574,827	574,827	570,239	570,239	30,597	30,597	28,322	28,322	23,733
8152320	Fairburn Community Primary School	Primary	335,643	336,548	336,548	336,644	336,564	336,648	336,611	3,003	4,043	1,101	4,051	1,108
8152321	Ketnesing Fellcliffe Community Primary School	Primary	283,880	319,020	319,020	303,327	300,334	298,017	296,937	36,040	36,040	16,447	16,153	15,036
8152324	Giggleswick Primary School	Primary	320,511	363,637	363,637	357,816	353,023	351,352	347,024	34,126	34,126	28,305	23,512	21,841
8152327	Great Ouseburn Community Primary School	Primary	275,337	297,010	297,010	295,831	290,271	292,020	288,714	21,673	21,673	20,494	17,634	16,093
8152328	Harrogate, Bilton Grange Community Primary School	Primary	1,140,548	1,211,781	1,211,781	1,206,913	1,206,913	1,197,091	1,197,091	68,233	68,233	63,365	63,365	53,544
8152329	Harrogate, Grove Road Community Primary School	Primary	1,118,888	1,178,891	1,178,891	1,172,208	1,172,208	1,162,783	1,162,783	56,003	56,003	53,320	53,320	43,875
8152330	New Park Primary Academy	Primary	833,532	866,222	866,222	868,532	868,532	861,106	861,106	35,490	35,490	33,000	33,000	27,574
8152331	Oaklands Infant School	Primary	844,400	891,709	891,709	891,709	891,709	891,709	891,709	47,359	47,359	47,359	47,359	47,359
8152332	Starbeck Community Primary School	Primary	771,946	811,598	811,598	808,403	808,403	801,064	801,064	39,650	39,650	36,458	36,458	30,019
8152333	Western Primary School	Primary	1,425,238	1,527,238	1,527,238	1,527,238	1,527,238	1,527,238	1,527,238	101,500	101,500	101,500	101,500	101,500
8152335	Summerbridge Community Primary School	Primary	288,268	311,530	311,530	310,287	309,132	307,738	304,070	22,268	22,268	21,019	19,894	18,458
8152336	Hillfield Community Primary School	Primary	290,088	312,999	312,999	311,758	311,758	309,250	309,250	16,913	16,913	15,673	15,174	13,174
8152337	Hensall Community Primary School	Primary	548,090	576,584	576,584	574,298	574,298	569,688	569,688	28,488	28,488	26,202	26,202	21,592
8152338	Glasshouses Community Primary School	Primary	322,074	359,098	359,098	359,134	359,383	343,727	339,435	31,014	31,014	28,060	23,308	21,853
8152343	Kettlewell Primary School	Primary	216,330	236,791	236,791	226,478	224,760	224,224	222,859	20,481	20,481	10,148	8,429	6,329
8152348	Lillothorpe Primary School	Primary	441,908	467,320	467,320	465,437	465,437	461,841	461,841	25,322	25,322	23,439	23,439	10,643
8152347	Darley Community Primary School	Primary	268,442	292,682	292,682	288,995	285,515	284,328	281,180	24,251	24,251	20,553	17,073	15,887
8152348	Beckwithshaw Community Primary School	Primary	364,030	391,164	391,164	389,590	389,590	386,443	385,742	26,535	26,535	24,069	24,069	21,814
8152350	Scotts Linerfield Community Primary School	Primary	322,848	433,642	433,642	430,307	432,963	421,720	415,968	40,795	40,795	37,459	31,116	28,873
8152351	Selby Community Primary School	Primary	1,471,854	1,490,347	1,490,347	1,478,622	1,490,758	1,478,622	1,490,758	18,403	24,895	6,787	24,904	6,772
8152354	Sicklinghal Community Primary School	Primary	314,971	336,007	336,007	334,668	334,668	331,059	331,763	21,037	21,037	19,887	18,687	16,957
8152355	Skipton, Water Street Community Primary School	Primary	783,265	833,308	833,308	837,308	837,308	837,308	837,308	54,133	54,133	54,133	54,133	54,133
8152357	Skipton, Water Street Community Primary School	Primary	681,516	718,519	718,519	718,519	718,519	718,519	718,519	37,004	37,004	37,004	37,004	37,004
8152357	South Miford Primary School	Primary	311,804	349,979	349,979	335,166	331,234	328,871	326,290	38,174	38,174	23,361	10,430	14,488
8152358	Staveley Community Primary School	Primary	801,504	843,482	843,482	840,112	840,112	833,315	833,315	41,078	41,078	38,609	38,609	31,812
8152359	Sutton-in-Craven Community Primary School	Primary	383,370	383,370	383,370	380,263	380,263	376,339	373,392	31,471	31,471	29,938	26,885	24,960
8152363	Whitley and Eggborough Community Primary School	Primary	680,094	917,014	917,014	914,299	914,299	907,007	907,007	51,000	51,000	47,304	47,304	40,103
8152364	Willow Tree Community Primary School	Primary	1,069,823	2,075,104	2,075,104	2,068,875	2,068,875	2,050,271	2,050,271	105,480	105,480	97,251	80,847	80,847
8152395	Skipton, Greatwood Community Primary School	Primary	882,044	875,580	875,580	872,122	875,493	865,703	875,510	13,542	13,542	10,078	13,449	3,656
8152396	Moorside Infant School	Primary	360,210	383,525	383,525	382,024	382,024	376,000	376,000	23,315	23,315	21,814	19,760	18,760
8152367	Moorside Junior School	Primary	489,597	519,991	519,991	517,941	517,941	510,808	510,808	39,394	39,394	37,344	33,211	30,327
8152368	Hookstone Chase Primary School	Primary	1,103,430	1,162,087	1,162,087	1,157,413	1,157,413	1,150,901	1,150,901	58,587	58,587	53,882	53,882	47,471
8152372	Pannal Primary School	Primary	1,036,490	1,048,490	1,048,490	1,048,490	1,048,490	1,048,490	1,048,490	109,500	109,500	109,500	109,500	109,500
8152376	Oaklands Community Junior School	Primary	1,053,755	1,128,755	1,128,755	1,128,755	1,128,755	1,128,755	1,128,755	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
8152377	Aspley Park Academy	Primary	1,486,447	1,592,197	1,592,197	1,592,197	1,592,197	1,592,197	1,592,197	105,750	105,750	105,750	105,750	105,750
8152380	Sherburn Hungate Primary School	Primary	708,388	845,016	845,016	841,822	841,822	834,777	834,777	48,630	48,630	43,326	36,391	36,391
8152381	Thorpe Woughton Community Primary School	Primary	1,032,405	1,087,000	1,087,000	1,083,003	1,083,003	1,074,982	1,074,982	55,561	55,561	51,258	42,577	42,577
8152382	Rossett Acre Primary School	Primary	1,425,568	1,524,848	1,524,848	1,524,848	1,524,848	1,524,848	1,524,848	101,250	101,250	101,250	101,250	101,250
8152383	Coppice Valley Primary School	Primary	758,005	801,109	801,109	797,893	797,893	791,408	791,408	45,104	45,104	41,889	35,404	35,404
8152389	Meadowdale Academy	Primary	773,095	813,754	813,754	810,487	810,487	803,899	803,899	40,748	40,748	37,482	30,894	30,894
8152390	Barwick Parade Community Primary School, Selby	Primary	1,055,845	1,107,033	1,107,033	1,102,642	1,102,642	1,093,786	1,093,786	51,188	51,188	48,797	37,941	37,941
8152391	Ingletton Primary School	Primary	633,981	670,989	670,989	668,323	668,323	662,987	662,987	36,988	36,988	34,342	29,008	29,008
8152392	Tadcaster Primary Academy	Primary	1,441,410	1,470,947	1,470,947	1,469,050	1,469,050	1,465,253	1,465,253	29,528	29,528	27,640	23,834	23,834
8152393	Glusburn Community Primary School	Primary	1,267,359	1,356,359	1,356,359	1,356,359	1,356,359	1,356,359	1,356,359	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
8152400	Barby Bridge Community Primary School	Primary	748,845	781,315	781,315	778,217	778,217	771,960	771,960	32,409	32,409	29,372	23,124	23,124
8152401	Barby Community Primary School	Primary	1,273,875	1,356,375	1,356,375	1,356,375	1,356,375	1,356,375	1,356,375	82,500	82,500	82,500	82,500	82,500
8152402	Hemingbrough Community Primary School	Primary	852,010	889,220	889,220	886,513	886,513	881,053	881,053	36,310	36,310	33,603	28,143	28,143
8152403	Hunmanby Primary School	Primary	659,955	904,459	904,459	900,904	900,904	893,735	893,735	44,503	44,503	40,849	33,779	33,779
8152404	Langton Primary School	Primary	369,432	434,214	434,214	428,573	428,573	420,304	420,304	35,782	35,782	34,140	29,472	27,352
8152405	Leavening Community Primary School	Primary	289,921	289,509	289,509	287,054	284,181	283,188	280,559	26,589	26,589	17,144	14,241	13,267
8152406	Luttons Community Primary School	Primary	236,483	264,375	264,375	244,372	247,168	246,478	244,493	27,912	27,912	12,909	10,723	8,930
8152407	North Outfield Community Primary School	Primary	510,126	551,405	551,405	549,258	549,258	544,028	544,028	32,279	32,279	30,131	25,801	25,801
8152408	Norton Community Primary School	Primary	2,207,230	2,317,741	2,317,741	2,308,750	2,308,750	2,290,608	2,290,608	110,511	110,511	101,520	83,377	83,377
8152410	Riccall Community Primary School	Primary	694,484	731,062	731,062	731,062	731,062	731,062	731,062	37,498	37,498	37,498	37,498	37,498
8152411	Riflington Community Primary School	Primary	565,730	599,881	599,881	597,318	597,318	592,555	592,555	33,932	33,932	31,589	26,825	26,825

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019/20

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019/20			No High Needs Transfer		0.5% Transfer to High Needs		1.0% Transfer to High Needs		No High Needs Transfer Funding Variance to 2019/20		0.5% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20		1.0% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20						
DfE No	Individual School	Phase	Current Year 2019/20	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		Option 5		Option 6		Option 7		Option 8	
				MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.61%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.5%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.61%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.5%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%
8153008	Arkengarthdale Church of England Primary School	Primary	158,750	171,444	184,317	161,053	160,883	160,818	160,247	12,694	5,568	2,393	1,913	1,887	1,497				
8153008	Bainbridge Church of England Primary and Nursery School	Primary	195,887	228,163	223,002	208,585	204,999	204,411	202,722	30,277	27,115	10,969	9,112	8,525	6,835				
8153009	Baldersby St James Church of England Primary School	Primary	238,949	259,559	259,559	252,536	250,234	249,483	247,306	20,610	20,610	13,585	11,285	10,534	8,446				
8153010	Bedale Church of England Primary School	Primary	1,268,688	1,357,488	1,357,488	1,357,488	1,357,488	1,357,488	1,357,488	88,500	88,500	88,500	88,500	88,500	88,500				
8153012	Badale Micklebale Chop Gate Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	173,301	173,301	184,172	177,773	177,020	178,848	176,157	10,771	10,811	4,412	3,665	3,488	2,706				
8153015	Brompton-on-Swale Church of England Primary School	Primary	771,432	814,457	814,457	811,249	811,249	810,399	810,399	43,025	43,025	39,817	39,817	38,987	38,987				
8153016	West Burton Church of England Primary School	Primary	102,117	212,584	208,911	188,935	197,781	197,453	196,395	20,447	16,794	6,816	5,664	5,336	4,278				
8153020	Crakehall Church of England Primary School	Primary	418,045	440,745	440,745	430,044	430,044	435,015	435,015	22,700	22,700	20,999	20,999	17,570	17,570				
8153021	Crayke Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	411,433	457,325	457,325	449,280	442,876	440,508	434,826	45,892	45,892	37,853	31,443	29,175	23,363				
8153022	Croft Church of England Primary School	Primary	455,145	476,553	476,553	477,020	477,020	473,750	473,750	24,408	24,408	22,484	22,484	18,005	18,005				
8153025	Danby Church of England Voluntary Controlled School,	Primary	229,591	255,856	255,856	244,002	242,300	241,451	239,100	26,265	26,265	15,311	12,718	11,680	9,500				
8153027	Dishforth Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	357,168	381,706	381,706	380,189	380,189	377,131	377,131	24,539	24,539	23,022	23,022	19,064	19,064				
8153030	East Cowdon Church of England Primary School	Primary	107,483	212,675	212,675	208,000	206,072	208,356	204,598	15,102	15,102	11,422	9,488	8,873	7,114				
8153034	Trinity Academy Eppley Forest	Primary	230,598	261,782	261,361	243,034	240,928	240,240	238,337	31,184	30,703	12,436	10,330	9,651	7,739				
8153035	Sleights Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	444,805	477,183	477,183	475,289	475,289	471,472	471,472	32,378	32,378	30,484	30,484	26,087	26,087				
8153036	Foston Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	208,258	232,893	228,345	216,204	213,686	213,228	211,848	26,636	22,089	8,948	7,432	6,072	5,590				
8153040	Gillmoor Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	249,530	273,186	273,186	264,242	261,760	260,920	258,670	23,656	23,656	14,712	12,220	11,369	9,140				
8153042	Marwood Church of England Voluntary Controlled Infant School, Great Aytou	Primary	291,674	307,304	307,304	308,080	309,080	303,812	303,812	15,630	15,630	14,405	14,405	11,938	11,938				
8153045	Hackforth and Hombly Church of England Primary School	Primary	210,380	220,792	221,281	219,899	221,289	216,903	221,306	1,412	1,900	519	1,900	1,928	1,928				
8153048	Hackness Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	357,865	399,103	399,103	387,349	389,353	380,800	376,101	41,238	41,238	29,481	24,488	22,744	18,236				
8153050	Hawker Cum Stainsacre Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	284,102	303,451	303,451	302,270	302,270	299,880	298,109	18,349	18,349	18,168	18,168	15,788	14,007				
8153053	Hipswell Church of England Primary School	Primary	782,650	786,600	786,600	783,577	783,577	777,290	777,290	24,641	24,641	21,527	21,527	15,249	15,249				
8153054	Hovingham Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	227,687	246,231	246,231	236,499	237,409	236,859	235,041	18,544	18,544	11,812	9,812	9,172	7,354				
8153055	Huby Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	408,485	436,844	436,844	435,105	435,105	431,599	430,937	30,359	30,359	28,620	28,620	25,113	24,452				
8153057	Husthwaite Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	320,472	356,279	356,279	344,027	340,038	338,664	335,058	35,806	35,806	23,554	19,565	18,102	14,588				
8153060	Ingleby Greenhow Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	290,342	293,337	293,337	277,373	274,590	273,662	271,141	32,396	32,396	18,431	13,649	12,720	10,169				
8153062	Kirby Hill Church of England Primary School	Primary	492,110	517,055	517,055	516,088	516,088	512,325	512,325	25,842	25,842	23,975	23,975	20,212	20,212				
8153065	Kirkby Fleetham Church of England Primary School	Primary	211,344	236,574	235,541	221,139	219,451	218,967	217,458	28,230	28,230	17,706	14,137	13,112	10,112				
8153068	Knapton Church of England Academy	Primary	586,648	587,078	587,078	585,319	585,319	580,585	580,585	31,029	31,029	28,672	28,672	23,919	23,919				
8153069	Lythe Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	342,403	368,080	368,080	364,761	364,167	362,102	358,627	23,617	23,617	22,296	21,603	19,630	16,164				
8153076	Kell Bank Church of England Primary School	Primary	107,158	218,104	218,104	204,846	203,078	203,008	201,849	20,465	18,457	7,487	6,219	5,860	4,690				
8153079	Trinity Academy Middleton Tyes	Primary	540,460	571,660	571,660	569,394	569,394	564,812	564,812	31,206	31,206	28,934	28,934	24,353	24,353				
8153088	Pickhill Church of England Primary School	Primary	228,520	249,735	249,735	240,708	239,693	238,048	236,219	20,915	11,888	9,873	9,220	7,400	7,400				
8153090	Ravensworth Church of England Primary School	Primary	290,325	317,442	317,442	310,959	307,484	306,273	303,112	27,117	27,117	20,634	17,139	15,048	12,787				
8153099	Sand Hutton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	348,265	384,221	384,221	378,107	371,442	369,706	365,529	35,958	35,958	27,001	23,177	21,531	17,284				
8153101	Sessay Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	378,874	426,351	426,351	411,536	405,973	404,017	399,994	47,877	47,877	32,865	27,298	25,320	20,320				
8153108	Snainton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	211,851	217,851	217,851	216,083	215,204	215,234	215,234	6,897	6,897	5,816	4,969	4,069	3,112				
8153109	South Kington Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	407,784	430,525	430,525	428,816	428,816	425,377	425,377	22,701	22,701	21,054	21,054	17,013	17,013				
8153110	Spennithorne Church of England Primary School	Primary	223,441	255,254	255,254	238,032	235,561	234,747	232,567	31,813	31,813	12,120	11,300	9,006	7,606				
8153113	Sutton on the Forest Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	323,959	344,474	344,474	343,096	343,096	340,318	340,318	20,515	20,515	19,137	19,137	16,350	16,350				
8153117	Thornton Dale C of E (VC) Primary School	Primary	607,990	644,951	644,951	642,403	642,403	637,263	637,263	37,252	37,252	34,703	34,703	29,584	29,584				
8153119	Thornton Watlase Church of England Primary School	Primary	225,151	263,603	263,603	236,530	234,603	233,991	232,339	38,512	28,135	11,379	9,452	8,840	7,088				
8153120	Topcliffe C of E Academy	Primary	425,831	465,874	465,874	464,007	459,271	456,836	450,653	40,243	40,243	38,437	33,640	31,207	25,022				
8153124	St Nicholas Church of England Primary School, West Tanfield	Primary	240,368	262,310	262,310	257,512	254,809	253,636	251,006	21,942	21,942	17,144	14,241	13,288	10,638				
8153128	Ruswarp Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	397,203	415,571	415,571	413,942	413,942	410,859	410,859	18,368	18,368	16,739	13,456	13,456	10,900				
8153130	Wykeham Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	308,853	327,221	327,221	325,909	325,909	323,264	322,937	20,568	20,568	19,258	16,256	16,011	13,284				
8153133	Barton Church of England Primary School	Primary	258,911	284,783	284,783	278,709	275,358	274,217	271,184	25,851	25,851	19,708	16,445	15,306	12,273				
8153139	Fylingdales Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	364,418	408,820	408,820	39595													

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019-20

DFE No	Individual School	Phase	Current Year 2019/20	No High Needs Transfer		0.5% Transfer to High Needs		1.0% Transfer to High Needs		No High Needs Transfer Funding Variance to 2019/20		0.5% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20		1.0% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20	
				Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
				MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.6%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.6%
8153244	Hambleton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	651,475	685,019	685,739	683,019	683,019	677,533	677,533	34,264	34,264	31,544	31,544	26,058	26,058
8153245	Hampshwaite Church of England Primary School	Primary	496,203	526,074	526,074	526,065	526,065	518,713	518,713	28,871	28,871	26,762	26,762	22,510	22,510
8153247	St Peter's Church of England Primary School	Primary	1,000,668	1,068,720	1,068,720	1,068,720	1,068,720	1,068,720	1,068,720	68,022	68,022	68,022	68,022	68,022	68,022
8153248	Kilnham Church of England Primary School	Primary	593,213	631,937	631,937	629,472	629,472	629,472	629,472	38,724	38,724	36,259	36,259	31,287	31,287
8153249	Kirkby Melzeard Church of England Primary School	Primary	405,753	437,453	437,453	435,721	435,721	432,230	432,230	31,701	31,701	29,068	29,068	24,477	24,477
8153251	Kirk Farlow Church of England Primary School	Primary	753,550	794,491	794,491	794,491	794,491	794,491	794,491	40,935	40,935	40,935	40,935	40,935	40,935
8153252	Kirk Hamerton Church of England Primary School	Primary	282,328	317,467	317,467	310,198	312,414	311,001	307,209	25,141	25,141	23,872	23,872	18,675	18,675
8153253	Kirk Smeaton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	468,163	503,203	503,203	501,283	501,283	497,412	496,029	35,040	35,040	33,120	33,120	29,240	29,240
8153255	Long Marston Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	187,840	203,833	203,833	197,281	195,682	195,101	193,734	15,993	15,993	9,441	7,843	7,351	5,894
8153256	Markington Church of England Primary & Nursery School	Primary	236,693	263,186	263,186	253,014	250,249	249,320	246,820	26,503	26,503	16,331	13,565	12,643	10,137
8153257	Monk Fryton Church of England Primary School	Primary	742,480	787,555	787,555	787,555	787,555	787,555	787,555	45,078	45,078	45,078	45,078	45,078	45,078
8153258	North Stainley Church of England Primary School	Primary	310,980	339,750	339,750	337,802	333,258	331,877	327,571	28,768	28,768	28,768	28,768	20,717	18,811
8153260	North Ryeon Church of England Primary School	Primary	327,423	355,354	355,354	353,088	351,675	349,984	345,536	41,449	41,449	39,623	34,077	31,611	25,340
8153261	Ripley Endowed Church of England School	Primary	837,560	878,425	878,425	875,104	875,104	868,589	868,589	40,826	40,826	37,500	37,500	30,900	30,900
8153262	Ryeon Church of England Primary School	Primary	963,601	1,017,120	1,017,120	1,013,100	1,013,100	1,004,991	1,004,991	53,519	53,519	49,499	49,499	41,300	41,300
8153264	Roecliffe Church of England Primary School	Primary	369,225	388,704	388,704	387,279	387,279	384,225	384,225	19,480	19,480	17,954	17,954	14,900	14,900
8153266	Fountains Church of England Primary School	Primary	370,454	410,502	410,502	411,715	406,254	404,336	399,407	40,038	40,038	32,251	26,790	24,872	19,043
8153268	Selby Abbey Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	1,451,078	1,469,490	1,475,271	1,457,653	1,475,279	1,457,658	1,475,296	17,973	24,165	6,577	24,204	6,582	24,221
8153270	Settle Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	664,501	730,275	730,275	727,423	727,423	721,872	721,872	35,774	35,774	32,922	32,922	27,170	27,170
8153271	Sharrow Church of England Primary School	Primary	440,324	468,370	468,370	468,509	468,509	462,750	462,750	28,045	28,045	26,185	26,185	22,435	22,435
8153272	Skelton Newby Hall Church of England Primary School	Primary	197,428	217,060	217,060	208,513	208,513	206,041	204,334	20,534	20,534	11,037	9,203	8,615	6,908
8153273	Christ Church Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	948,060	1,000,860	1,000,860	996,887	996,887	988,877	988,877	52,853	52,853	48,881	48,881	40,870	40,870
8153274	Skilpton Parish Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	440,587	483,870	483,870	482,039	482,039	458,336	458,336	23,309	23,309	21,472	21,472	17,769	17,769
8153275	Spofforth Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	483,218	510,319	510,319	508,268	508,268	504,194	504,194	27,101	27,101	25,070	25,070	20,978	20,978
8153276	Sutton in Craven Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	332,107	332,107	332,107	321,073	316,991	315,583	311,894	35,137	35,137	24,102	20,021	18,613	14,924
8153277	Threshfield School	Primary	720,649	762,841	762,841	759,778	759,778	753,600	753,600	42,192	42,192	39,129	39,129	32,951	32,951
8153278	Tockwith Church of England Primary Academy	Primary	507,109	543,074	543,074	540,924	540,924	536,589	536,589	33,964	33,964	33,915	33,915	29,479	29,479
8153282	Wistow Parochial Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	657,149	693,465	693,465	691,189	691,189	685,630	685,630	36,708	36,708	34,039	34,039	28,481	28,481
8153284	Holy Trinity C of E Infant School	Primary	496,208	532,749	532,749	530,062	530,062	526,545	526,545	36,451	36,451	34,394	34,394	30,247	30,247
8153285	Gargrave Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	513,168	549,550	549,550	536,268	536,268	534,060	534,060	27,382	27,382	25,231	25,231	20,892	20,892
8153287	Kildwick Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	544,007	573,736	573,736	571,430	571,430	566,781	566,781	26,729	26,729	27,424	27,424	22,775	22,775
8153288	Forest of Calver Anglican/Methodist Primary School	Primary	224,837	236,899	236,899	235,951	235,951	234,042	234,042	12,063	11,115	11,115	11,115	9,205	9,205
8153291	Askdog Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	458,337	506,811	506,811	503,736	503,736	493,309	486,377	48,474	48,474	45,400	37,712	34,972	28,041
8153301	Bolton-on-Swale St Mary's C of E Primary School	Primary	445,003	472,180	472,180	470,282	470,282	466,457	466,457	27,177	27,177	25,279	25,279	21,454	21,454
8153304	St Peter's Bratton Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	275,770	308,879	308,879	294,323	291,183	290,122	287,280	33,100	33,100	18,544	15,404	14,343	11,590
8153306	Carlton and Fecheby Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	247,300	284,939	284,939	282,058	259,559	258,735	256,407	37,639	36,537	14,758	12,259	11,435	9,169
8153307	Michael Syddall Church of England Aided Primary School	Primary	705,743	761,438	761,438	758,377	758,377	752,207	752,207	55,693	55,693	52,034	48,684	40,808	36,484
8153308	Egton Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	297,318	329,531	329,531	327,328	327,328	324,005	324,005	14,515	14,515	13,313	13,313	10,889	10,889
8153316	Kirkby and Great Broughton Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	487,168	523,993	523,993	521,888	521,888	517,645	517,645	26,825	26,825	24,720	24,720	20,477	20,477
8153319	Masham Church of England VA Primary School	Primary	462,537	492,037	492,037	490,105	490,105	486,212	486,212	29,499	29,499	27,588	27,588	23,674	23,674
8153320	Middleham Church of England Aided School	Primary	211,723	222,068	222,068	221,175	221,175	219,378	219,378	10,345	10,345	9,452	9,452	7,655	7,655
8153328	St Martin's Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School, Scarborough	Primary	993,469	1,034,020	1,034,020	1,029,860	1,029,860	1,021,486	1,021,486	40,551	40,551	36,397	36,397	28,016	28,016
8153331	Terrington Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	227,630	249,161	249,161	239,062	237,825	236,071	235,120	21,531	21,531	12,032	9,904	9,341	7,489
8153337	Burneston Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	204,731	312,547	312,547	311,291	311,291	308,700	308,700	17,818	17,818	16,500	16,500	14,029	14,029
8153350	Austwick Church of England VA Primary School	Primary	273,074	296,509	296,509	291,378	288,278	287,233	284,426	23,405	23,405	18,304	15,204	11,352	9,169
8153351	The Boyke and Petyr Primary School	Primary	347,884	371,410	371,410	370,020	370,020	367,220	365,546	23,528	23,528	22,136	22,136	17,692	17,692
8153352	Bunsall Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	207,680	235,412	235,412	210,939	210,939	214,865	214,865	27,752	22,911	9,278	7,707	7,220	5,794
8153354	Carlton Endowed C of E Primary School	Primary	558,951	603,899	603,899	601,079	601,079	595,450	595,450	34,918	34,918	32,128	32,128	26,499	26,499
8153355	Cawood Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	523,305	551,161	551,161	548,078	548,078	544,515	544,515	27,705	27,705	25,582	25,582	21,119	21,119
8153357	Dacre Brathwaite Church of England Primary School	Primary	339,215	374,714	374,714	368,518	361,894	360,286	356,110	35,499	35,499	27,303	22,679	21,071	18,005
8153360	Kirkby in Hamthamde United Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	273,302	306,511	306,511	291,582	288,468	287,442	284,400	33,209	33,209	18,280	15,185	14,141	11,338
8153361	All Saints Church of England School	Primary	373,780	398,406	398,406	396,893	396,893	393,061	393,061	24,716	24,716	23,112	23,112	19,681	19,681
8153362	Long Preston Endowed Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	328,019	368,651	368,651	363,598	359,029	357,441	353,314	32,033	32,033	29,970	22,410	20,822	16,695
8153363	Marton-Cum-Grafton Church of England Voluntary Aided Primary School	Primary	498,025	546,253	546,253	544,442	542,037	539,574	535,318	38,248	38,248	34,930	34,031	31,569	25,312
8153368	Richard Taylor Church of England Primary School	Primary	998,116	1,046,320	1,046,320	1,046,320	1,046,320	1,046,320	1,046,320	60,204	60,204	60,204	60,204	60,204	60,204
8153369	Barkston Ash Catholic Primary School	Primary	518,249	545,928	545,928	543,724	543,724	539,295	539,295	27,071	27,071	25,475	25,475	21,040	21,040
8153371	St Mary's Primary School Knaresborough, A Voluntary Catholic Academy	Primary	717,577	755,573	755,573	752,540	752,540	746,422	746,422	37,966	34,963	34,963	28,845	28,845	28,845
8153372	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	Primary	538,175	587,082	587,082	584,784	584,784	580,191	580,191	28,887	28,887	26,609	26,609	22,018	22,018
8153373	St Mary's Catholic Primary School	Primary	680,545	711,950	711,950	709,090	709,090	703,323	703,323	31,405	31,405	28,545	28,545	22,778	22,778
8153376	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	Primary	335,944	355,654	355,654	354,220	354,220	351,330	351,330	20,160	20,160	18,728	18,728	15,836	15,836
8153377	St Robert's Catholic Primary School, Harrogate	Primary	1,033,121	1,093,457	1,093,457	1,089,061	1,089,061	1,080,192	1,080,192	60,336	60,336	55,940	47,072	47,072	47,072
8153378	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Harrogate, A Voluntary Academy	Primary	740,421</												

APPENDIX 1 - Indicative Individual School Allocations & Variance to 2019-20

Individual School			Current Year		No High Needs Transfer		0.5% Transfer to High Needs		1.0% Transfer to High Needs		No High Needs Transfer Funding Variance to 2019/20		0.5% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20		1.0% Transfer to High Needs Funding Variance to 2019/20	
			2019/20	Phase	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
					MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.5%	MFG 1.37% Cap 100.0%	MFG 1.84% Cap 34.33%	MFG 0.5% Cap 13.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 11.47%	MFG 0.5% Cap 10.81%	MFG 1.84% Cap 8.5%
8154001	EBOR Academy Fley	Secondary	2,064,509		2,099,805	2,099,805	2,091,570	2,099,220	2,075,026	2,099,243	35,296	35,296	27,067	34,718	10,517	34,735
8154002	Scarborough University Technical College	Secondary	1,047,491		1,050,870	1,054,188	1,052,025	1,054,177	1,052,030	1,054,194	12,389	16,877	4,534	16,886	4,539	16,703
8154003	Brayton Academy	Secondary	2,123,726		2,213,780	2,213,780	2,204,920	2,204,920	2,187,098	2,187,098	90,558	90,558	81,191	81,191	63,368	63,368
8154004	Risedale Sports and Community College	Secondary	3,247,652		3,290,029	3,304,595	3,293,348	3,304,804	3,293,351	3,304,821	42,077	58,644	15,395	58,652	15,399	58,659
8154006	Outwood Academy Easingwold	Secondary	2,971,885		2,990,785	2,990,785	2,990,785	2,990,785	2,990,785	2,990,785	118,800	118,800	118,800	118,800	118,800	118,800
8154022	Ryedale School	Secondary	3,508,598		3,649,168	3,649,168	3,649,168	3,649,168	3,649,168	3,649,168	142,600	142,600	142,600	142,600	142,600	142,600
8154035	Thirsk School & Sixth Form College	Secondary	3,880,448		4,047,684	4,047,684	4,031,733	4,031,733	4,016,848	4,016,848	187,210	187,210	171,285	171,285	156,400	156,400
8154039	Caedmon College Whitby	Secondary	3,126,397		3,269,493	3,269,493	3,257,342	3,257,342	3,232,909	3,232,909	143,098	143,098	130,945	130,945	106,513	106,513
8154041	Eskdale School	Secondary	2,542,195		2,680,946	2,680,946	2,670,267	2,670,267	2,648,798	2,648,798	138,751	138,751	128,072	128,072	108,601	108,601
8154047	Stokesley School	Secondary	4,825,452		5,025,452	5,025,452	5,025,452	5,025,452	5,025,452	5,025,452	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
8154052	Bedale High School	Secondary	2,407,679		2,631,101	2,631,101	2,620,917	2,620,917	2,600,443	2,600,443	133,422	133,422	123,238	123,238	102,784	102,784
8154054	Lady Lumley's School	Secondary	3,758,001		3,908,601	3,908,601	3,908,601	3,908,601	3,908,601	3,908,601	150,600	150,600	150,600	150,600	150,600	150,600
8154069	George Pinder School	Secondary	3,519,652		3,711,717	3,711,717	3,696,853	3,696,853	3,686,964	3,686,964	191,855	191,855	178,991	178,991	147,103	147,103
8154070	Graham School	Secondary	5,355,328		5,642,761	5,642,761	5,620,523	5,620,523	5,575,807	5,575,807	287,433	287,433	265,195	265,195	220,479	220,479
8154073	Sculby School	Secondary	4,701,170		5,023,726	5,023,726	5,003,499	5,003,499	4,982,826	4,982,826	282,557	282,557	242,330	242,330	201,657	201,657
8154074	Northsterton School & Sixth Form College	Secondary	4,720,117		4,720,117	4,720,117	4,720,117	4,720,117	4,720,117	4,720,117	179,400	179,400	179,400	179,400	179,400	179,400
8154075	The Wensleydale School & Sixth Form	Secondary	1,852,204		1,927,531	1,927,531	1,920,224	1,920,224	1,905,534	1,905,534	75,328	75,328	68,020	68,020	53,330	53,330
8154076	Richmond School	Secondary	5,259,201		5,476,401	5,476,401	5,476,401	5,476,401	5,476,401	5,476,401	217,200	217,200	217,200	217,200	217,200	217,200
8154077	Malton School	Secondary	3,316,125		3,429,208	3,429,208	3,429,208	3,429,208	3,429,208	3,429,208	113,083	113,083	113,083	113,083	113,083	113,083
8154152	Norton College	Secondary	3,423,128		3,611,601	3,611,601	3,597,069	3,597,069	3,587,843	3,587,843	188,473	188,473	173,941	173,941	144,715	144,715
8154200	Harrogate Grammar School	Secondary	6,704,738		6,982,336	6,982,336	6,982,336	6,982,336	6,982,336	6,982,336	277,600	277,600	277,600	277,600	277,600	277,600
8154202	King James's School	Secondary	6,334,200		6,590,280	6,590,280	6,590,280	6,590,280	6,590,280	6,590,280	258,000	258,000	258,000	258,000	258,000	258,000
8154203	Outwood Academy Ripon	Secondary	3,422,094		3,487,123	3,487,123	3,438,569	3,438,569	3,438,573	3,438,573	45,029	60,616	16,475	60,627	16,479	60,644
8154205	Settle College	Secondary	2,586,055		2,656,540	2,656,540	2,640,137	2,640,137	2,630,008	2,630,008	70,488	70,488	60,082	60,082	52,953	52,953
8154208	Upper Wharfedale School	Secondary	1,695,932		1,715,858	1,722,756	1,703,228	1,722,756	1,703,228	1,722,756	19,926	26,625	7,292	26,633	7,296	26,850
8154210	South Craven School	Secondary	6,731,772		7,010,572	7,010,572	7,010,572	7,010,572	7,010,572	7,010,572	278,800	278,800	278,800	278,800	278,800	278,800
8154211	Tadcaster Grammar School	Secondary	6,263,728		6,523,728	6,523,728	6,523,728	6,523,728	6,523,728	6,523,728	259,800	259,800	259,800	259,800	259,800	259,800
8154216	Ripon Grammar School	Secondary	3,167,104		3,283,904	3,283,904	3,283,904	3,283,904	3,283,904	3,283,904	126,800	126,800	126,800	126,800	126,800	126,800
8154218	Sherburn High School	Secondary	3,471,169		3,611,768	3,611,768	3,611,768	3,611,768	3,611,768	3,611,768	140,600	140,600	140,600	140,600	140,600	140,600
8154217	Rossett School	Secondary	5,891,808		6,136,208	6,136,208	6,136,208	6,136,208	6,136,208	6,136,208	244,400	244,400	244,400	244,400	244,400	244,400
8154219	Harrogate High School	Secondary	2,666,597		3,098,507	3,098,507	3,078,130	3,078,130	3,051,245	3,051,245	122,110	122,110	109,733	109,733	84,847	84,847
8154221	Boroughbridge High School	Secondary	2,266,044		2,388,497	2,388,497	2,377,504	2,377,504	2,359,424	2,359,424	118,452	118,452	109,459	109,459	91,389	91,389
8154223	Widdersdale High School	Secondary	2,031,431		2,055,600	2,054,048	2,040,297	2,040,297	2,040,291	2,054,074	24,229	32,617	8,866	32,626	8,870	32,643
8154225	Selby High School Specialist School for the Arts and Science	Secondary	5,785,979		6,111,752	6,111,752	6,087,455	6,087,455	6,038,610	6,038,610	315,773	315,773	291,476	291,476	242,632	242,632
8154232	Barby High School	Secondary	2,685,191		2,821,573	2,821,573	2,810,291	2,810,291	2,787,808	2,787,808	136,383	136,383	125,100	125,100	102,417	102,417
8154518	Skipton Girls' High School	Secondary	3,204,865		3,333,665	3,333,665	3,333,665	3,333,665	3,333,665	3,333,665	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000
8154604	St Augustine's Roman Catholic School, Scarborough	Secondary	3,066,283		3,179,484	3,179,484	3,166,882	3,166,882	3,140,940	3,140,940	113,221	113,221	100,419	100,419	74,877	74,877
8154605	St Francis Xavier School	Secondary	2,500,782		2,604,182	2,604,182	2,604,182	2,604,182	2,604,182	2,604,182	103,400	103,400	103,400	103,400	103,400	103,400
8154609	Ernst's Grammar School	Secondary	2,811,424		2,926,224	2,926,224	2,926,224	2,926,224	2,926,224	2,926,224	114,800	114,800	114,800	114,800	114,800	114,800
8154609	St John Fisher Catholic High School	Secondary	5,355,882		5,577,882	5,577,882	5,577,882	5,577,882	5,577,882	5,577,882	222,200	222,200	222,200	222,200	222,200	222,200
8154610	Holy Family Catholic High School, Carlton	Secondary	2,296,003		2,416,948	2,416,948	2,407,233	2,407,233	2,387,700	2,387,700	120,945	120,945	111,230	111,230	91,696	91,696
8154611	St Alden's Church of England High School	Secondary	6,496,056		6,764,850	6,764,850	6,764,850	6,764,850	6,764,850	6,764,850	268,800	268,800	268,800	268,800	268,800	268,800

North Yorkshire County Council

Consultation Response to: Clarifying the Specific Grant and Ring-fenced Status of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

We welcome the Department's acknowledgement that insufficient DSG funding for High Needs has caused local authorities to cross-subsidise the DfE funding shortfall. We also welcome the Department's acknowledgement that this is an unsatisfactory position. However, we believe that the Department's response is financially irresponsible, and we urge the Department to consider a more balanced policy response.

During 2018-19 and 2019-20, North Yorkshire County Council has cross-subsidised High Needs by £7.0m. Despite the announcement of additional funding in September 2019, we expect further cross-subsidy will necessary in 2020-21. The issues resulting in the in-year and accumulated deficits are well rehearsed: since 2015, there has been a 68% increase in the number of children and young people assessed as requiring an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Funding rose by only 1% between 2017 and 2019 and the additional funding for 2020 represents an 11.1% increase. It is not surprising, therefore, that deficits arise in the context of such a mismatch between an anachronistic funding formula and the demand that it seeks to fund. That 40% of the funding formula is still linked to historic spending indicates that the Department continues to prioritise stability over fairness. This effectively locks in funding inequities and we urge the Department to fundamentally review the formula. We would welcome the opportunity to be part of the review and to inform a fairer funding formula.

It is correct to state that if the DSG is in a cumulative deficit position, it is necessary for Chief Finance Officers to prudently ensure that such deficits are appropriately funded. Local authorities are required to set a balanced budget and to knowingly ignore an in-year deficit without any understanding of how it will be funded is entirely irresponsible. Whilst the Department's view is that deficits should not be covered by general funds and should, instead, be covered by DSG income over an indeterminate period of time, it is not satisfactory to make this statement without any indication of how this might be achieved. As set out above, even with the additional DSG funding announced in September 2019, it will simply not be possible to achieve a balanced in-year position in 2020-21 and it will certainly not be possible to repay the £7m cumulative deficit.

Demand continues to rise and there is limited capital funding available to reshape provision across the county (for context, in North Yorkshire, the number of EHCPs has been rising by c.300 every year with one new 100-place free special school to be built over the next few years). The local authority must meet its statutory obligations under the Children and Families Act 2014 and the SEN Code of Practice. How does the Department believe that local authorities will achieve sufficient efficiencies of the magnitude required and at such a pace to confidently state that future DSG income will meet the deficit? Will further High Needs DSG be made available to local authorities? If so, why does the Department not say so? If not, then the position is simply unsustainable. Chief Finance Officers (S151 officers) will be placed in an impossible position with current legislation requiring local authorities to set a balanced budget and contrary DfE guidance stating that a balanced budget position is not required. For those authorities already with depleted reserves, there will be a temptation

to follow the DfE guidance. This will be a mistake. The Department only needs to look as far as Northamptonshire to see the impact of poor financial mismanagement. The DfE's approach would encourage such behaviour – it is poor financial practice and unethical to place finance staff, Members and others in such a position. If local authorities cannot sustain DSG deficits, the sector, MHCLG, DfE and HM Treasury should be transparent about the issue and work together to collectively find a resolution. To proceed with the proposal will inevitably result in a judicial review. This can be avoided by listening to the concerns in the sector and adopting a more balanced policy position.

The DfE consultation document states that “*the local authority may not fund any part of the overspend from its general resources*”. Even if the local authority does not overtly budget for the inevitable cross-subsidisation, the local authority is cash-flowing the deficit. Where does the Department believe those funds are coming from? How far should local authorities take this tightening of the ring-fence? Presumably, the lost interest on the local authority general fund incurred because funds are cashflowing the High Needs DSG deficit should be appropriately charged to the cumulative DSG deficit?

Given that a considered Government response to the consultation outcome will be impacted by the announcement of the General Election, it does not seem reasonable that the Department can carefully consider all responses to the consultation and make an informed decision on the proposals in time for the setting of local authorities' budgets for the financial year 2020-21. Preparation of budgets are already well underway and late announcements by the DfE will not be helpful in explaining the changes to Members and other stakeholders. It would seem prudent for the Department to take a longer period of time engaging with the local authority sector and introduce considered proposals for the financial year 2021-22. We do not believe that it is appropriate to change the conditions of grant in respect of the overspend position for 2019-20.

In response to the specific consultation questions:

Question 1: Do you agree that we should change the conditions of grant so that future arrangements for dealing with DSG overspends are worded as follows:

- **the local authority must carry forward the whole of the overspend to the schools budget in future years;**

Yes – the local authority should ensure there is a clear record of any cross-subsidisation of DSG. This should be recorded in the notes to the accounts and a financial record maintained.

- **the local authority may not fund any part of the overspend from its general resources, unless it applies for and receives permission from the Secretary of State to do so.**

No. The local authority should continue to ensure there is balanced budget position within the organisation. Budget papers should clearly recognise any DfE funding shortfall/ cross-subsidisation. This would be a more appropriate policy response from the Department and allow time for further engagement with local authorities in 2020.

Question 2: As noted in the context section, carrying forward an overspend to the schools budget in future years currently requires the consent of the local schools

forum, or if that is not forthcoming the authorisation of the Secretary of State. This is set out in regulations 8(6) and 8(10) of the School and Early Years Finance (England) (No 2) Regulations 2018. If the conditions of grant are changed so that the local authority must carry forward the whole of any DSG overspend to the schools budget in future years, it will no longer make sense to require the schools forum to agree such a carry forward. We therefore propose to delete regulations 8(6) and 8(10) from the new regulations for the financial year 2020-21. Do you agree that we should delete regulations 8(6) and 8(10) from the new School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations for the financial year 2020-21, so that local authorities are able to carry forward any DSG overspend to the schools budget in future years as the new conditions of grant will require?

Yes. How does the Department expect deficits to be funded if a Schools Forum declined to carry forward a DSG overspend if the Department also expressly prohibits local authorities from funding a deficit? There is, however, a logical inconsistency requiring local authorities to carry forward DSG deficits without Schools Forum approval and then centrally determining whether local authorities can manage DSG pressures across the four Blocks of DSG funding. The DfE continues to place a stranglehold on the local management of resources and yet witnesses numerous issues of financial sustainability in High Needs, individual schools and in Early Years. Why has the DfE not considered providing more autonomy and flexibility to local authorities in providing a more localised approach to financial pressures? The quantum of funding is still insufficient, the distribution of funding is anachronistic but the DfE is also choking local responses to systems-wide issues. High Needs funding remains in crisis; the DfE should be working with local authorities to pilot innovative approaches, not relentlessly pursuing yet more 'one size fits all' centralised planning approaches.

Question 3: The purpose of making these changes to the conditions of grant and to the regulations is to establish clearly that local authorities will not be required to cover any DSG deficit from general funds, and therefore do not need to have free general reserves available to match the deficit. Do you agree that the proposed new conditions of grant and regulations will establish clearly that local authorities will not be required to cover any DSG deficit from general funds?

No. We believe this proposal represents a dangerous approach to financial management within local authorities and we urge the Department to rethink the proposal.



NORTH YORKSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

Date of meeting:	Thursday, 26 September 2019
Title of report:	Special Educational Needs Update 2018/19
Type of report: Delete as required	For information only
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	<p>The report provides an overview of special educational needs and disability across North Yorkshire together with a high level update on the implementation of the SEND Strategic Plan 2018-2023 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some high-level trends; - Development of locality boards for SEND; - Enhanced mainstream schools;
Budget / Risk implications:	None
Recommendations:	Schools Forum are asked to note the contents of the report
Voting requirements:	None
Appendices: To be attached	None
Report originator and contact details:	<p>Jane le Sage, Assistant Director - Inclusion</p> <p>Jane.lesage@northyorks.gov.uk</p>
Presenting officer: If not the originator	Jane le Sage

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The report provides an overview of special educational needs and disability across North Yorkshire together with a high level update on the implementation of the SEND Strategic Plan 2018-2023.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Children and Families Act introduced in September 2014 transformed the approach to meeting the needs of children and young people with SEND embedding the following changes:
- A Local authority must undertake assessment if they are of the opinion that the child has or may have special educational needs and it may be necessary for special education provision to be made for the child or young person.
 - Introduction of a revised 20 week statutory assessment process and Education, Health and Care Plans for 0-25 year olds
 - Introduction of a new category called SEN Support to replace previous school action and school action plus
 - Greater emphasis on parent/carer and children and young people's voice in meeting individual needs and in the development of services and strategy
 - Local Offer web site to ensure information and guidance is widely available for SEND
- 2.2 The impact of the changes to legislation have been significant both locally and nationally and have resulted in significant increases in requests for assessments and significant pressures on the High Needs Block budget.

3.0 Impact in North Yorkshire

- 3.1 The proportion of children with an EHC plan has grown from 1827 in August 2015 to 2970 in August 2019, a 62.7% increase.
- 3.2 The most common primary need continues to be Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) which forms 31.2% of the total and 927 children, an increase from 425 children at the same point in 2015 (+118%).
- ASD has also seen the largest increase in its proportion of all EHC plans, +7.9% from August 2015 to August 2019.
 - SEMH is the only other primary need which has increased in its proportion of the entire EHC plan population, +1.7% in the same period.
- 3.3 On average 670 requests for statutory assessment are received by the local authority each year. The proportion of all requests which were assessed averaged 68% in 2017/18. The proportion of requests which led to an EHC plan being issued was 59.7% in 18/19, an increase from 58.1% in 17/18.

Special Educational Needs Update 2018/19

- 3.4 In 2018, in North Yorkshire, 84.2% of new EHC plans were issued on time (i.e. within 20 weeks from the initial request for assessment), the national rate was 58%. Timeliness appears to be further improving with the percentage of EHC plans issued on time being 93.8% to date for the 2019 calendar year.
- 3.5 DfE statistical release in January 2019 highlights that the early identification of children with special educational needs (SEN Support) in schools remains lower than the national average at both primary and secondary level. The identification trend has increased in NY since 2015 but remains below the national average of 11.9% in 2019 (10.9% NY). Early identification remains a high priority for North Yorkshire.
- 2019 primary 12.6% national 12.1% NY
 - 2019 Secondary: 10.8% national 8.5% NY
- 3.6 In 2018-19, the local authority underlying overspend on the High Needs Block amounted to £6.1m offset, in part, by the application of £1.6m temporary transfer from schools and £1.2m temporary funding announced in December 2018.
- 3.7 The net overspend impacting on the local authority was, therefore, £3.3m. This needs to be repaid from High Needs in the future.
- 3.8 In 2019/20, the local authority have invested additional net funding into High Needs of £3.7m, over and above the High Needs grant allocation from DfE. This cross-subsidisation of the Department for Education (DfE) funding shortfall is supplemented by temporary funding amounting to £1.2m and a further £1.6m temporary transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block.
- 3.9 In addition, further financial pressure in the order of £1.5m during 2018-19 has resulted in an underlying financial pressure of £8.0m. This has reduced, in part, by the recent Spending Review announcement that confirmed that the £1.2m temporary funding would be maintained in 2020-21. However, further financial pressure is anticipated in 2020-21 and despite the announcement of an additional £700m nationally for High Needs, any additional funding is unlikely to cover the full extent of the DfE funding shortfall. Further details from DfE are expected to be published in October 2019.
- 4. Ofsted/CQC Regulatory Framework for SEND**
- 4.1 The Local Area SEND Inspection Framework was fully introduced in 2016 inspecting the effectiveness of local areas in fulfilling their duties under the Children and Families Act 2014. If Inspectors are not convinced that this is the case they may insist on a Written Statement of Action (WSA) which is monitored closely over an agreed timescale to ensure performance is improved.
- 4.2 North Yorkshire underwent its inspection in June 2016
- 4.3 Under the current inspection framework local areas will be re inspected on a 5 year cycle and therefore North Yorkshire will expect inspection at some point in 2021.

- 4.4 It is unclear as to whether the Inspection framework will be revised following the completion of the first round of local area inspections and in light of the announcement on 6th September that there would be a national review of funding and provision for SEND.

5.0 SEND STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION

SEND Strategic Plan 2018-23

- 5.1 An independent review of special educational provision was commissioned in 2016/17 and the findings of such were used to inform the development of the SEND Strategic Plan 2018-23
- 5.2 The Plan provides details of the reshaping and development of SEND provision and support to ensure that children and young people with SEND can have their needs met locally and that there is emphasis on early identification and intervention of children with SEND.
- 5.3 The implementation of the plan is monitored by a multi-agency SEND Strategy group which meets every 2 months.

6.0 DEVELOPMENT OF LOCALITY BASED MODELS FOR SEND

- 6.1 From April 2020 the geographical area of North Yorkshire will be divided into 5 localities for the purposes of SEND:
- Hambleton/Richmondshire
 - Craven
 - Selby
 - Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale
 - Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon
- 6.2 **Locality based boards** (0-25) are currently being established with membership from education settings and officers from Children and Young People's Services. The boards will be responsible for monitoring performance across the locality for SEND and Inclusion and for working in partnership with the local authority to address under performance. The Boards will have access to a small amount of funding which they can deploy to support local priorities identified for SEND and Inclusion. The Boards are currently in their infancy but positive engagement is underway in Selby, Hambleton/Richmondshire and Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale. The Boards will be facilitated by SEND and Education and Skills local authority Officers.
- 6.3 From April 2020, **SEND multi-disciplinary hubs** will also be established in localities following a restructure of the local authority SEND and Inclusion Service. The hubs will be made up of a range of SEND professionals including specialist teachers and practitioners, assessment officers and therapists. They will work closely with schools and settings to support the early identification of children and young people with SEND and ensuring settings are equipped to meet need. The new hubs will adopt a key working approach when working with children and young people with SEND and will ensure close working arrangements with partners including Early Help and Health.

7.0 DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROVISION IN NORTH YORKSHIRE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SEND

- 7.1 The local authority has undertaken significant review of educational provision for children and young people with SEND and this has informed the content of the SEND Strategic Plan. Progress to date includes:

Enhanced Mainstream Schools

- 7.2 From September 2020 the local authority will be commissioning the development of 31 enhanced mainstream schools across the county for Autism and Social, Emotional, Mental Health. The EMS will provide access to mainstream lessons together with personalised support for individual children and building expertise with the wider staff team.
- 7.3 The schools will provide places for 8 children predominantly with Education, Health and Care Plans with a small number of flexible places.
- 7.4 The EMS will be provided with an enhanced offer of training from the local authority and access to specialists from the SEND Hubs including Educational Psychologists, Speech and Language and Occupational Therapists.
- 7.5 The new models of EMS will provide over 200 highly supported places in mainstream school for children with Education, Health and Care Plans who cognitively can access a mainstream curriculum but require more support in terms of their additional needs.
- 7.6 Currently there are 20 schools that have shown interest in becoming an EMS. Engagement events have been planned in localities in September/October so that interested schools can gain more information before reaching a decision.

Alternative Provision

- 7.7 Following the decision by the Executive in January 2019 to transform the models of AP into an early intervention model, new models have been developed to ensure schools have access to AP at an early stage to minimise the need for permanent exclusion.
- 7.8 Models have been developed based on the following agreed key principles:
- Young people remain part of their local home school community
 - Home schools retain responsibility for young people on AP overseeing engagement and progress
 - All children and young people accessing AP are entitled to high quality, full time and relevant education which enables them to fulfil their potential
 - AP should be used proactively to personalise the learning programme of young people disengaging from a more traditional mainstream curriculum
 - Young people accessing AP should receive high levels of pastoral and learning support and access to a broad social curriculum that prepares them for adulthood
 - Young people on AP programmes should have access to qualifications appropriate to their abilities and that wherever possible contribute to Progress 8 performance

Special Educational Needs Update 2018/19

- 7.9 There will not be any significant changes to the existing 2 models of school managed AP in Ryedale and Whitby. However, the new locality models for PRS include an AP offer for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 students, based on:
- Key Stage 3: Partnership model with schools with 2/3 day part time AP provision and the remainder of the curriculum provided in school. Short term placement and interventions with the expectation that children will transition back into school
 - Key Stage 4: AP offer which includes part and full time placements for KS4 and short term interventions
- 7.10 The new models from September 2020 will provide 162 full time places across the county and Head Teachers will be responsible for managing the capacity versus demand in liaison with the PRS Head Teacher and the Local Authority.
- 7.11 The current Pupil Referral Services remain central to the delivery of the new AP models and in 2 areas the PRS will also be responsible for leading the delivery of the secondary SEMH enhanced model in identified mainstream schools, Hambleton/Richmondshire and Scarborough.

Specialist Provision

- 7.12 The local authority has been successful in securing a special school in Selby through the last wave of DfE free school applications.
- 7.13 The proposed school will be for up to 100 pupils aged 3 to 19 with needs in the areas of communication and interaction and/or cognition and learning needs. Communication and interaction needs will include speech language and communication needs and Autism. Cognition and learning needs will include moderate and severe learning difficulties. Some children and young people may have related social, emotional and mental health needs but this will not be their primary need. Children and young people placed at the school will have an Education, Health and Care Plan and will have been assessed as requiring this type of school.
- 7.14 The school will be a free school. Free schools are state funded academies which are outside Local Authority control and are operated by academy trusts. They have more control over how they operate, for example they do not have to follow the national curriculum. They are held accountable through OFSTED inspections and exam results.
- 7.15 There is no opening date set for the school at present. The Department for Education (DfE) has indicated that they do not anticipate that any of the special free schools in the current wave will open before September 2021.

Mowbray School (Ripon)

- 7.16 Approval was given in March 2019 for the creation of a satellite provision for Mowbray School on the site of the former Moorside Infant School in Ripon. This will be known as Mowbray School (Ripon)
- 7.17 Mowbray School (Ripon) will open in January 2020, initially with 20 places, rising to 30 from September 2020 and 40 from September 2021. The satellite will have capacity for 60 pupils when fully developed.

Education of Children with Medical Needs

- 7.18 The local authority is currently undertaking a public consultation on a new model to provide education for children with medical needs who are unable to attend school.
- 7.19 Currently this provision is commissioned from the Pupil Referral Service (excluding Scarborough) and the primary SEMH enhanced mainstream schools.
- 7.20 The consultation recommends proposals to increase the range and amount of education provided and ensure that this offer is open to all who may require it at any stage in their education. The new proposed provision is a central based medical education service under the leadership of a nominated officer within Inclusion.
- 7.21 The proposals offer an increased amount of education and range of options, including digital solutions, personal home tuition and group education. This is to enable a flexible, bespoke package to be created for each child and agreed at a meeting with pupils, their family, health professionals and schools to ensure a pupil and family-centred approach that reflects the child's needs. Regular review will ensure that the right package continues to be in place, with steps taken to encourage reintegration as soon as possible.
- 7.22 The proposed service would also be available to children with special educational needs and disabilities that have an additional medical need and that attend special schools, are in post-16 education or are in education with an education, health and care plan up to the age of 25.

8.0 BUILDING CAPACITY IN MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN WITH SEND

- 8.1 The local authority is working closely with mainstream schools to further develop capacity and expertise in working with children and young people with SEND. Developments include:
- On line Directory of CPD detailing the range of training available, calendar, providers and cost
 - Roll out of Pivotal Education training across the local authority, heavily subsidised for Year 1 by the local authority. Pivotal is a relationship based model of managing behaviour.

- Planned SEND Conference in April 2020 to share good practice in schools of Inclusion

8.2 The finalisation of the Early Help Strategy and Ladder of Intervention provides a structured framework for schools and settings to meet the needs of children and young people they are concerned about, involving other agencies as appropriate. The strategies are being formally launched this month.

9.0 HEALTH SEND DEVELOPMENTS

9.1 CCGs have recruited a new Designated Clinical Officer from April 2019 and this is having a positive impact, particularly in terms of:

- Support to clarify issues around consent for EHC assessments with Health providers
- Case management of national trial Tribunals
- Support to drive up quality of EHC Assessment Health advice – a one page guide on “Dos and Don’ts” have been written by the DCO and circulated to all Health providers.
- A named contact to ensure advice given by health professionals is accurate and correct in terms of SEND
- A lead role in contributing to the Self Evaluation of SEND and Ofsted preparations
- Development of central contacts across CCGs and Health providers for EHC notifications and Tribunal notification almost completed.
- Health SEND Networks are providing a useful forum to discuss and resolve

AUTISM ASSESSMENT PATHWAY

9.2 There have been recent changes to local commissioning arrangements affecting the Hambleton, Richmondshire and Whitby and Scarborough Ryedale CCG areas.

9.3 After a temporary closure due to high demand, Hambleton, Richmondshire and Whitby CCG has re-opened for referrals at the beginning of July 2019.

9.4 The CCGs have been working with the provider, Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust (HDFT), to develop a new model to reduce the current waiting time for an assessment in both Hambleton, Richmondshire and Whitby CCG and Harrogate & Rural District CCG. This has involved redesigning the way in which an autism assessment is carried out, moving from the standard ‘one size fits all’ approach to a more ‘tailored’ approach, selecting and adapting those autism assessment tools which are the best fit for each child’s needs. This transformational model will ensure a sustainable service going forward while continuing to deliver a NICE quality service.

9.5 It has also been agreed that a Waiting List Initiative will commence on 1st August 2019, to allow HDFT to clear 20% of the backlog by September 2019 and the whole of the backlog on the waiting list by July 2020.

9.6 Harrogate specialist children’s team remain committed to supporting delivery of post diagnostic support to parents and have reported a potential peak of diagnoses during October due to the waiting list initiative. Communications are in place with NYCC to

ensure joint discussions regarding the management of demand and parental expectation.

- 9.7 For Scarborough Ryedale CCG the previous Provider York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (YTHFT) gave notice on the Children's Behaviour service (which included Autism diagnostic service). An exercise was completed to appoint a new provider. The Retreat is now the Provider for Children's Autism diagnostic service for the Scarborough locality. The approach is new and allows families a choice in an online service or face to face consultation.

- 9.8 Post diagnostic support remains a key area for further development across partners.

10.0 TRANSITIONS

- 10.1 Transitional arrangements for young people with SEND has been reviewed across Children and Young people's Services and Health and Adult Services.
- 10.2 Joint working between HAS and CYPS social workers starts when a young person reaches 16 years so that transitional arrangements are in place by the young person's 18th birthday. In some complex cases, joint working may be initiated at an earlier stage to ensure there are fully agreed arrangements for how need will be met as the young person reaches adulthood.
- 10.3 Progress against the new arrangements are overseen by a joint HAS/CYPS Governance Group and will be subject to Post Implementation Review in December/January 2019.

11.0 PROGRESS AGAINST OFSTED INSPECTION

- 11.1 Encouraging progress has been made in terms of the 2016 North Yorkshire Local Area SEND Inspection. However analysis of recent inspection reports from other areas have shown a focus on particular areas of the reforms including:
- Early identification and support
 - Monitoring of outcomes of children and young people with SEND including attendance and exclusion
 - Extent of parent/carer engagement and co-production and satisfaction
 - Joint commissioning arrangements between local authorities, health and key partners
 - Quality and timeliness of Education, Health and Care Plans and reviews
 - Engagement of health and care in the statutory assessment process
 - Transitions
 - Educational provision
- 11.2 Currently the Self Evaluation for North Yorkshire is being updated for the 19/20 year and additional working groups are being established to focus on areas that require strengthening including:
- Participation and co-production with parents/carers, children and young people
 - Joint Commissioning arrangements
 - Attendance of children with SEND

12.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 It is recommended that the progress in terms of SEND Developments is noted.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Send Strategic Plan 2018-23

Local Area SEND Ofsted Reports

DfE SEND Statistical Releases

STUART CARLTON

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

Appendix 6

2020/21 School Funding Consultation - Comments Received

School Type	Comment
Primary Academy	<p>As the Head of an Academy that appears to benefit due to the NFF implementation and is unaffected regardless of which adjustments are made to the application of percentages, I would like to offer views from a “neutral perspective”:</p> <p># The LA has been proactive in its lobbying and should be complimented on the impact that this has had in moving the school finance agenda forward on behalf of all children within the LA (and those in similar circumstances).</p> <p># Addressing high needs issues has been a significant issue for the LA for many years and the current strategic plan appears to be a positive move towards long term improvements for the benefit of everyone. However, the financial burden that the transition period brings is significant and the plan would be in jeopardy without another year of its funding boost. Further to this, it is imperative that the plan is implemented efficiently and in a timely fashion otherwise there may not be another opportunity to introduce additional funding beyond the base level in future years. I support the move to increasing the transfer to high needs of 1% as a means of moving the LA strategic plan forward efficiently.</p> <p># In turbulent times the need for good employee/employer relationships is vital. PAFA being de-delegated has ensured that union representation has been available to employees in a reasonable timeframe. This has enabled the employer to efficiently and effectively put policy into practice and has enabled the NYCC HR service to maintain a strong reputation as a traded service. If PAFA was weakened through delegating responsibility to schools, there is a danger that the currently stretched but functioning services cannot meet the increasing demands resulting in dissatisfaction on all sides. PAFA should be de-delegated to minimise the risk of a breakdown of relationships between employees and the service providers of HR.</p>
Primary Federation	<p>The additional funding for schools from the Department in Education has come at a time when the pressure on school budgets had become insurmountable. Schools are in desperate need of the full amount being allocated:-</p> <p>To support the increasing range of need of pupils in school with less funding allocated to pupils with an EHCP</p> <p>To maintain and improve the standard of education we can offer</p> <p>To ensure the safety of all of our pupils all of the time</p> <p>To ensure leadership capacity within both schools when a Federative arrangement is in place.</p> <p>To be pro-active in maintaining the school building.</p> <p>Schools acknowledge the huge pressure on the high needs budget and understand that the local authority is in huge deficit but this should not be at the expense of the needs of pupils in mainstream school.</p>
Primary Academy	<p>I would not support a 1% HNF contribution. Whilst there is significant shortfall still in HNF, the additional incoming High Needs Block funding must be taken into account and some ‘respite’ be allowed to school budgets such as they can benefit from promised additional income. Our school benefits from minimum per pupil level funding throughout all options and is not at risk of any HNF top-slice impact, but nonetheless the principle is there.</p> <p>Further I believe that given ‘hard NFF’ is the direction of travel, then MFG should not be used to artificially protect against the ultimate outcome. Such protection should be planned for at individual school level or ultimately by bespoke arrangement with the LA. In turn this allows schools which have long been underfunded to gain from NFF roll-out, albeit it does not necessarily level up funding nationally! Therefore the MFG should be as low as modelling pragmatically will allow without forcing schools into vulnerability, this then determines the cap.</p>

School Type	Comment
LA Maintained Primary	I'm happy to support any of the options that don't involve a 1% transfer to the high needs budget.
Academy Trust	<p>This does not seem to be a full options appraisal since there is no 0.0%/ 1.84%/ 100% option offered.</p> <p>Individual academies and MATs are under the same financial pressures described in the consultation and therefore it does not seem at all equitable to take a higher proportion out of the schools block into higher needs. The trust is working through a series of initiatives to address the historical deficits that we have inherited but any additional financial pressure at this point would have a direct impact on the offer to our children.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that describes any measures to change or streamline services or otherwise implement initiatives to make efficiencies such as those schools and MATs are expected to make before asking for additional funding from schools' allocations.</p> <p>The illustrative funding has been presented on a pdf rather than an excel spreadsheet and so in terms of verifying the formulae behind the calculations or scenario planning this is not possible. It is possible that Option 2 could have been supported but without the underpinning data and in a few hours outside of half term it is not possible to work this out.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that properly describes the expectation that schools could have of the service to be provided for the funding. If there was a clear description of what the different service levels would be to the school then it might be easier to evaluate what amounts to an investment decision.</p> <p>In short the consultation does not provide the tools or the time to properly consider the options presented, but fundamentally a transfer out of the schools block on the basis that there is insufficient funding is not a compelling rationale when it is a situation that equally applies to schools and MATs already struggling to balance the books.</p> <p>It should be noted that this consultation has only come to the Trust from a contact of a contact, which is not an acceptable situation. It also appears that the diocese was not in receipt of the consultation documentation which, given the hugely truncated timelines, is worrying.</p>
LA Maintained Primary	<p>Representing two small schools within an Federation with four times the national average of children with EHCP schools need every single pound available.</p> <p>The removal of exceptional element 2 funding is crippling our budget. We are funded on basis of 2 EHCP (one in each small school). We have 7. Previously we received additional element 2 funding for every EHCP over our 'expected'. School is currently funding the first part 1&2 funding of 5 more EHCP than expected for schools our size.</p> <p>Unsurprisingly this additional funding required to be found by the school matches our deficit demonstrating very starkly the impact of being a successful inclusive school.</p>
LA Maintained Primary	<p>Representing two small schools within an Federation with four times the national average of children with EHCP schools need every single pound available.</p> <p>The removal of exceptional element 2 funding is crippling our budget. We are funded on basis of 2 EHCP (one in each small school). We have 7. Previously we received additional element 2 funding for every EHCP over our 'expected'. School is currently funding the first part 1&2 funding of 5 more EHCP than expected for schools our size.</p> <p>Unsurprisingly this additional funding required to be found by the school matches our deficit demonstrating very starkly the impact of being a successful inclusive school.</p>

School Type	Comment
LA Maintained Primary Federation	<p>It would also be interesting to understand more about the wider financial planning taking place in relation to schools and education. For example, what is the strategy for small schools going forward? Also, given that there seems to be an increasing number of federations how we ensuring that these are funded properly and that Federation is not driven only by finance.</p> <p>Also, what is happening in relation to ensuring schools with higher numbers of pupils registered as SEN actually have those children and that the issue isn't poor provision? Do some schools cost more in relation to SEN and do we know why (excluding special schools)? How are schools that don't cost much in terms of accessing services rewarded for their positive work?</p> <p>Given the numbers of service pupils in the county could we have greater clarity on funding relating to turbulence rather than the OFSTED defined 'mobile' category.</p>
LA Maintained Cross Phase Federation	<p>Our preference is for no transfer to the High Needs Block as this would allow all schools to receive a minimum funding guarantee level of 1.37%. and it will allow those schools that are currently capped to receive the level of funding indicated by the NFF.</p> <p>We acknowledge the pressure on the High Needs Block but believe that this should not be resolved by top slicing school budgets. School budgets are already sharing the financial impact of increased numbers of students with EHCPs. In particular schools who are capped or on the minimum funding level, do not receive an increase in their Element 2 funding proportionate to the increase in the SEN needs of students. This combined with low levels of Element 3 funding, results in an ever increasing proportion of the school's budget being used to fund the gap in high needs funding. If school budgets are then also top sliced to transfer funding to the High Needs Block this is a double hit.</p> <p>If the Local Authority choose to ask the Secretary of State for a transfer to the High Needs Block then out of the options presented we would select Option 3, however, as stated our preference is for no transfer.</p>
LA Maintained Secondary	My selection is only Option 4 which supports some High Needs transfer

School Type	Comment
Primary Academy	<p data-bbox="555 209 2083 261">At XXXXX, we are already under considerable financial pressure to support pupils with all levels of additional needs. Whilst we always prioritise these children in terms of our funding and budget, we are physically and financially stretched.</p> <p data-bbox="555 292 2083 400">Individual academies and MATs are under the same financial pressures described in the consultation and therefore it does not seem at all equitable to take a higher proportion out of the schools block into higher needs. The trust we are part of (XXXXX Academy Trust) is working through a series of initiatives to address the historical deficits that we have inherited but any additional financial pressure at this point would have a direct impact on the offer to our children.</p> <p data-bbox="555 430 2083 483">There is nothing in the consultation that describes any measures to change or streamline services or otherwise implement initiatives to make efficiencies such as those schools and MATs are expected to make before asking for additional funding from schools' allocations.</p> <p data-bbox="555 513 2083 566">It is possible that Option 2 could have been supported but without the underpinning data and in a few hours outside of half term it is not possible to work this out.</p> <p data-bbox="555 596 2083 705">There is nothing in the consultation that properly describes the expectation that schools could have of the service to be provided for the funding. If there was a clear description of what the different service levels would be to the school then it might be easier to evaluate what amounts to an investment decision. In short the consultation does not provide the tools or the time to properly consider the options presented.</p> <p data-bbox="555 735 2083 788">It should be noted that this consultation has only come to our attention from a contact of a contact, which is not an acceptable situation. It also appears that the diocese was not in receipt of the consultation documentation which, given the hugely truncated timelines, is worrying.</p>
Primary Academy	<p data-bbox="555 810 2083 919">My preferences are based upon the need to safeguard XXXXX Academy, which continues to face an ongoing deficit situation despite teaching and support staff redundancies, increased class sizes and reduced resources. Whilst I understand and appreciate the need to reduce the LA SEND deficit, reducing my school deficit is of paramount importance for my school community in order to safeguard jobs and support for children with SEND whilst upholding standards.</p>

School Type	Comment
Primary Academy	<p>This does not seem to be a full options appraisal since there is no 0.0%/ 1.84%/ 100% option offered.</p> <p>Individual academies and MATs are under the same financial pressures described in the consultation and therefore it does not seem at all equitable to take a higher proportion out of the schools block into higher needs. The trust is working through a series of initiatives to address the historical deficits that we have inherited but any additional financial pressure at this point would have a direct impact on the offer to our children.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that describes any measures to change or streamline services or otherwise implement initiatives to make efficiencies such as those schools and MATs are expected to make before asking for additional funding from schools' allocations.</p> <p>The illustrative funding has been presented on a pdf rather than an excel spreadsheet and so in terms of verifying the formulae behind the calculations or scenario planning this is not possible. It is possible that Option 2 could have been supported but without the underpinning data and in a few hours outside of half term it is not possible to work this out.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that properly describes the expectation that schools could have of the service to be provided for the funding. If there was a clear description of what the different service levels would be to the school then it might be easier to evaluate what amounts to an investment decision.</p> <p>In short the consultation does not provide the tools or the time to properly consider the options presented, but fundamentally a transfer out of the schools block on the basis that there is insufficient funding is not a compelling rationale when it is a situation that equally applies to schools and MATs already struggling to balance the books.</p>
Primary Academy	As a member of the School's Forum I am greatly concerned that due to the timing of this consultation there will be a low response rate from schools.
LA Maintained Primary Federation	I am not convinced we have been given sufficient information to make an informed decision.

School Type	Comment
Primary Academy	<p>This does not seem to be a full options appraisal since there is no 0.0%/ 1.84%/ 100% option offered.</p> <p>Individual academies are under the same financial pressures described in the consultation and therefore it does not seem at all equitable to take a higher proportion out of the schools block into higher needs. Our trust is working through a series of initiatives to address the historical deficits that we have inherited but any additional financial pressure at this point would have a direct impact on the offer to our children.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that describes any measures to change or streamline services or otherwise implement initiatives to make efficiencies such as those schools and MATs are expected to make before asking for additional funding from schools' allocations.</p> <p>The illustrative funding has been presented on a pdf rather than an excel spreadsheet and so in terms of verifying the formulae behind the calculations or scenario planning this is not possible. It is possible that Option 2 could have been supported but without the underpinning data and in a few hours outside of half term it is not possible to work this out.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation that properly describes the expectation that schools could have of the service to be provided for the funding. If there was a clear description of what the different would be to the school then it might be easier to evaluate what amounts to an investment decision. In short the consultation does not provide the tools or the time to properly consider the options presented, but fundamentally a transfer out of the schools block on the basis that there is insufficient funding is not a compelling rationale when it is a situation that equally applies to schools and MATs already struggling to balance the books</p>
LA Maintained Primary	<p>We fully support a transfer to the High Needs budget to help meet the growing need of provision for SEN children. Funding and support in the wider context has diminished so greatly in recent years against an increase in SEN levels and schools are being expected to bridge this gap, putting pressure on central budgets.</p> <p>As a school recently out of deficit and reliant on MFG to top up our funding, we cannot support an MFG lower than 1.84% due to the indicative impact on our funding levels.</p>
LA Maintained Secondary	<p>Increase the financial support provided to small rural schools to protect against a hard formula.</p> <p>Implementing a 1% High Needs transfer disadvantages small schools. The maximum amount of funding should be allocated to the Schools Block.</p>

School Type	Comment
LA Maintained Primary	<p>As a school we are not in support of percentage of school funding to be transferred to the High Needs. We feel we get very little help from NYCC in this area and have put many strategies in place to help our high need pupils for which we have to pay for. We do not feel we should have a fund the support other schools require.</p> <p>We are aware that High Need across NYCC is constantly increasing and taking that into consideration would go with option three.</p> <p>It states within the consultation that a pay increase for all teachers with starting to be increased by 6,000 by 2022. Will this then mean all other teaching scales with also be increased and will there be a pay grant to help schools with the cost of this?</p> <p>The NYCC narrative on high needs projects a significant overspend going forwards. Has this factored in the new free school in these calculations as fewer pupils hopefully would then be going out of county / to independent places and travelling less- will this then reduce costs?</p>
LA Maintained Secondary	<p>Q1: I would support Option 6- this delivers the High needs Transfer you require while ensuring PPF meets inflation at 1.84% for schools., but caps gains at 8.5% which seems reasonable.</p> <p>Q2: XXX only ever receives the MPPL of £4800 or the projected £5000 so in some sense figures related to MFG are somewhat academic for us.</p>
LA Maintained Primary	<p>I am extremely concerned about the lack of funding in schools for SEND and the impact this has on school communities. The reality of trying to manage SEND without adequate staff to support is extremely challenging. Even when an EHCP is applied for (and taking into account the notional £6000) the shortfall between Element 3 funding and the cost of staffing is massive.</p> <p>I am not clear whether if schools do not pass on high needs transfer funding whether it is then down to each school to fund E3 of their high needs pupils</p>
LA Maintained Primary	Please ensure service schools / those with high mobility are protected following changes to mobility factor for NFF
LA Maintained Primary	Following consultation with governors and the FMS Officer we have chosen Option 1 2 or 3. In the event of only one choice needed please go with Option 1.
LA Maintained Secondary	XXXXXX School continues to suffer the impact of being an extremely small rural school without the ability to achieve economies of scale. The school need the maximum support through MFG. Our per pupil funding is still well below where it needs to be especially with regard to the high number of High Needs students on roll.

School Type	Comment
Primary Academy	<p data-bbox="555 209 1552 233">This does not seem to be a full options appraisal since there is no 0.0%/ 1.84%/ 100% option offered.</p> <p data-bbox="555 264 2074 344">We are under the same financial pressures described in the consultation and therefore it does not seem at all equitable to take a higher proportion out of the schools block into higher needs. We are now part of a Trust that is working through a series of initiatives to address the historical deficits that we have inherited but any additional financial pressure at this point would have a direct impact on the offer to our children.</p> <p data-bbox="555 376 2056 424">There is nothing in the consultation that describes any measures to change or streamline services or otherwise implement initiatives to make efficiencies such as those schools and MATs are expected to make before asking for additional funding from schools' allocations.</p> <p data-bbox="555 456 2069 536">The illustrative funding has been presented on a pdf rather than an excel spreadsheet and so in terms of verifying the formulae behind the calculations or scenario planning this is not possible. It is possible that Option 2 could have been supported but without the underpinning data and in a few hours outside of half term it is not possible to work this out.</p> <p data-bbox="555 568 2074 679">There is nothing in the consultation that properly describes the expectation that schools could have of the service to be provided for the funding. At the moment the support we receive is very limited and not effective for us to agree to an increase in contribution we need reassurance what we would be getting and also a clear description of what the different services would be to the school then it might be easier to evaluate what amounts to an investment decision.</p> <p data-bbox="555 711 2056 791">In short the consultation does not provide the tools or the time to properly consider the options presented, but fundamentally a transfer out of the schools block on the basis that there is insufficient funding is not a compelling rationale when it is a situation that equally applies to schools and MATs already struggling to balance the books</p>

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated April 2019)

School Funding 2020-21 (School & High Needs Block Funding)

If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.



যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।

如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。

اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو برائے مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	North Yorkshire County Council: Central Services
Lead Officer and contact details	Howard Emmett - Assistant Director – Strategic Services
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Sally Dunn – Head of Finance (Schools & Early Years) Catriona Lowin - Accountant (Schools and Early Years)
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	The proposal has been subject to a school wide consultation process from 18 th October ending 7 th November 2019 and this EIA will be

	<p>updated during and following the consultation responses.</p> <p>The item will be discussed at the North Yorkshire School Forum meeting on 13th November.</p>
When did the due regard process start?	<p>In setting School Funding in 2019/20, due regard was given to the recognition of the increased budget pressures in High Needs for children meeting these needs as part of their educational provision. As a result the Secretary of State gave permission to transfer 1% (£3.39m) of the Schools Block funding to support High Needs.</p> <p>This EIA considers the same issue in respect of 2020-21 School and High Needs Funding.</p>

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)

The EIA considers the need to change how we use the Council's DSG (Dedicated School Grant) and specifically the funding blocks for High Needs and Schools Block

In 2019/20, the DfE acknowledged the increasing pressures related to High Needs budgets faced nationally and allowed LAs, with the permission of their School Forums to use up to 0.5% of the Schools Block funding to support High Needs, plus they allocated additional funding to all local authorities. However, with significant budget pressures of £6.8m, in 2019-20, North Yorkshire successfully applied for a disapplication request to the Secretary of State for Education to transfer 1% of the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in recognition of this financial pressure.

For 2020/21, the DfE is continuing to allow the transfer of up to 0.5% of the School Block funding to the High Needs Block. The approval of the Schools Forum is required for this transfer and the views of local schools and academies will need to be considered in determining this decision. Any proposal to transfer more than 0.5%, or transfers of 0.5% where Schools Forum approval has not been given require the approval of the Secretary of State.

Given the demand for High Needs Services for children & young people (0-25) and the resulting financial pressures in North Yorkshire (see 2.) transfers of 0%, 0.5% and 1% are being considered from the School Block to High Needs Block for 2020/21.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed? What are the aims? What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)

The proposal seeks to meet the increasing demand for High Needs Services through a transfer in 2020/21 of up to 1% of the School Block funding to the High Needs budget for North Yorkshire County Council – up to approx. £3.52m to assist in meeting the increasing demands and financial pressures of High Needs.

For 2019/20, the Council received an overall funding allocation of £49.55m for High Needs, with an underlying pressure of £8.0m. Future demand predictions indicate that based on current trends the underlying financial pressure of £8.0m will increase in 2020-21.

This is evidenced by the following increase in activity:

- A significant increase in the number of children receiving SEN Support with a 16% increase in Primary School pupils and a 23% increase Secondary School pupils between January 2016 and January 2019
- Numbers of children with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP) increasing by 68% between 2014/15 and 2018/19 (financial years)

The purpose of making this transfer to the High Needs Block is to provide funding towards the financial pressures. The Council's five year Strategic Plan for SEND (Education Provision 0-25) 2018-23, identifies the re-shaping of the High Needs Budget as one of the three core areas of the Council's Plan. A number of developments have been implemented in 2019/20 to address the unsustainable overspend position on the High Needs budget. These developments include:

- The replacement of the CAN-DO Resource Allocation System with a Banded System
- Moving to study programmes of 600 planned hours per academic year for post-16 study for young people with EHCPs.
- The transformation of Pupil Referral Services (PRS) and Alternative Provision establishments with a reduced funding allocation.

Further progress on the Strategic Plan will include:

- Consulting on implementing a medical tuition model;
- Development of targeted in-reach provision within mainstream schools;
- Implementation of the free Special School in Selby

However, this is not sufficient to address the underlying projected overspend and further measures will be considered in order for future financial sustainability to be achieved for the High Needs budget

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

The impact of the proposal will be to reduce the overall quantum of funding remaining in the Schools Block and allow for a corresponding increase in the overall funding available in the High Needs Block, dependent that is upon the preferred percentage that emerges from the consultation, the views of the School Forum and the decision taken by the Council. The funding will remain ring-fenced to the overall Dedicated Schools Grant.

The shift of funding from one block to another will have an impact on children and young people including those with protected characteristics (e.g. targeting of resources for children with SEND) in both the donor and recipient blocks. The Council's SEND Strategy sets out these details in terms of ensuring a continuum of SEND education across the County for children and young people aged 0-25.

From an individual school perspective, the benefits of this shift will be dependent upon the cohort and characteristics of the children in the schools. As each school will make a contribution to the transfer of funds but certain schools may benefit more than others in terms of their funding requirements from the High Needs Block.

The impact on individual schools may also vary in relation to the proposed level of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) to be implemented in 2020/21.

Section 4. Involvement and consultation (What involvement and consultation has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results? What consultation will be needed and how will it be done?)

The DfE released their 2020/21 funding announcement and the associated detailed funding information required to model funding formula options for the next financial year on the 11th October 2019; this is later than usual. This has resulted in a much shorter timescale being available to consult on local school funding developments than would normally be the case; the DfE have acknowledged this position.

In order to report the results of the consultation to the meeting of the North Yorkshire Schools Forum on the 13th November 2019 and to meet the DfE deadline of the 28th November 2019 for the submission of any formula disapplication requests, the consultation period is 18th October 2019 – 7th November 2019 - just under 3 weeks and it has been necessary to run the consultation over the half term holiday period.

The consultation document was sent to all schools and academies (see link) inviting responses to be returned to the LA by 7th November. The responses and results from the consultation exercise will be presented at the Schools Forum on 13th November 2019. This EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses. Schools will be notified of the outcome of this process before the end of November.

Link:

<https://r1.dmrk.net/4BPJ-OPXA-022EF6J396/cr.aspx>

Section 5. What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result.

The specific proposal in the EIA is cost neutral as the overall quantum stays the same; rather there is a movement of funding from one block to another. This EIA does refer to the pressures in the High Needs Budget and the Council's SEND Strategy identifies actions that will enable the Council to operate within its available funding

Section 6. How will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
Age	✓			There are almost 161,000 children and young people aged 0-25 in North Yorkshire. The proposal to move funds from the Schools Block to High Needs Block within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will mean that the funding quantum will continue to be for the benefit of children and young people. No other age bands will be affected.

Disability		✓		10.9% of the school population in North Yorkshire is at SEN Support and 2.5% of the school population have Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). There are currently 1100 more children with EHCPs funded by North Yorkshire than at the beginning of 2016. By transferring funding from the Schools Block in 2020/21, interim funding will ensure appropriate needs are met and children with these characteristics are less disadvantaged receiving the universal, targeted or specialist educational support they need.
Sex		✓	✓	The SEND population of young people in North Yorkshire with an EHCP is higher among boys, (61%), so proportionally there may be a greater benefit from these proposals for boys than girls but this will be in line with assessed need.
Race	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Gender reassignment	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Sexual orientation	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Religion or belief	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Pregnancy or maternity	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
Marriage or civil partnership	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic

Section 7. How will this proposal affect people who...	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.
..live in a rural area?	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic
...have a low income?	✓			No data available at time of writing to show there is a greater impact on those children with SEND and families with low incomes
...are carers (unpaid family or friend)?	✓			It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as a result of this proposal for this characteristic

Section 8. Geographic impact – Please detail where the impact will be (please tick all that apply)	
North Yorkshire wide	✓
Craven district	
Hambleton district	
Harrogate district	
Richmondshire district	
Ryedale district	
Scarborough district	
Selby district	
If you have ticked one or more districts, will specific town(s)/village(s) be particularly impacted? If so, please specify below.	

<p>Section 9. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, providing evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information etc.</p> <p>None identified other than a potential positive impact for boys with SEND by targeting DSG funding in this way.</p>

Section 10. Next steps to address the anticipated impact. Select one of the following options and explain why this has been chosen. (Remember: we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us)	Tick option chosen
1. No adverse impact - no major change needed to the proposal. There is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact identified.	✓
2. Adverse impact - adjust the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We will change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, or we will achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people.	
3. Adverse impact - continue the proposal - The EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. We cannot change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts, nor can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people. (There must be compelling reasons for continuing with proposals which will have the most adverse impacts. Get advice from Legal Services)	

4. Actual or potential unlawful discrimination - stop and remove the proposal – The EIA identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination. It must be stopped.	
Explanation of why option has been chosen. (Include any advice given by Legal Services.) No significant adverse impacts have been identified from the EIA affecting one or more protected characteristic. The proposal does not recommend a reduction to the level of funding for children and young people rather it seeks to target that available to the area of High Needs identified as an area of growing demand, The EIA identifies that the Council has a Strategy in place to re-shape High Needs Budgets (parts of which are to receive a separate EIA) and that this funding in 2020/21 will provide interim financial support to protect those children with special educational needs and disabilities. The consultation with schools will conclude on the 7 th November. This EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses should this be required.	

Section 11. If the proposal is to be implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?) In addition to the regular monitoring and reporting of finances to the School Forum, the Strategic SEND Plan sets out a comprehensive countywide North Yorkshire Inclusion Partnership model which will make sure there is a strategic vision across North Yorkshire. The membership will include as well as LA senior officers both senior representatives from education providers across the 0-25 age range and parents/carers. The new model will include local area groups and panels to ensure the efficient and fair use of financial resources
--

Section 12. Action plan. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA, including post implementation review to find out how the outcomes have been achieved in practice and what impacts there have actually been on people with protected characteristics.				
Action	Lead	By when	Progress	Monitoring arrangements
1. To undertake a formal consultation with schools	Howard Emmett – Asst. Director	7 th November 2019		
2. To report outcomes to School Forum	Howard Emmett – Asst. Director	13 th November 2019		
3. Pending outcome from 1.& 2. write to DfE for a disapplication request	Sally Dunn Head of Schools & Early Years	28 th November 2019		

4. Review via North Yorkshire Inclusion Governance Groups				
---	--	--	--	--

Section 13. Summary Summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The Equality Impact Assessment has assessed the impact of the proposal namely

- To change how we use the Council's DSG (Dedicated Schools Grant) and specifically the funding blocks for High Needs and Schools Block
- To consider transfers of 0%, 0.5% and 1% from the School Block to High Needs Block for 2020/21.
- To hold consultation with all schools and academies in North Yorkshire over these proposals
- To report findings, conclusions and recommendations to the School Forum

At this stage of the EIA there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal made will significantly disadvantage one or more protected characteristics rather it will assist in supporting targeted funding to children with SEND.

The EIA was presented to the meeting of the Schools Forum on the 13th November 2019. No comments were received on the EIA.

Section 14. Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Catriona Lowin

Job title: Accountant

Directorate: Central Services

Signature:

Completion date: 16th October 2019

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Howard Emmett

Date: