

Helen Barrington

Director of Legal and Democratic Services County Hall Matlock Derbyshire DE4 3AG

Email: anne.barrett@derbyshire.gov.uk Direct Dial 01629 538372 Ask for Anne Barrett

# PUBLIC

To: Members of Cabinet Member - Education

Friday, 28 May 2021

Dear Councillor,

Please attend a meeting of the **Cabinet Member - Education** to be held at <u>**11.00 am</u>** on <u>**Tuesday, 8 June 2021**</u> in Members Room, County Hall, Matlock DE4 3AG.</u>

The agenda for which is set out below.

Yours faithfully,

Heren E. Barington

Helen Barrington Director of Legal and Democratic Services

# <u>A G E N D A</u>

#### PART I - NON-EXEMPT ITEMS

1. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of interest (if any)

2. Minutes (Pages 1 - 2)

To receive the non-exempt minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member -Young People held on 13 April 2021

- 3. To consider the report of the Executive Director for Children's Services on Graduated Response for Individual Pupils (GRIP). (Pages 3 14)
- 4. To consider the Joint report of the Executive Director of Children's Services and the Director of Finance & ICT on Dedicated Schools Grant Outturn 2020-21 (Pages 15 - 22)

PUBLIC

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the **CABINET MEMBER – YOUNG PEOPLE** held on 13 April 2021.

# <u>PRESENT</u>

# Cabinet Member - Councillor A Dale

Also in attendance – Councillors J Patten and J Coyle

**14/21** <u>**MINUTES**</u> **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Young People held on 2 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

# 15/21 CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF SCHOOL GOVERNORS

The Cabinet member had been asked to confirm the nominations of persons to serve as local authority school governors.

Nominations to school governing boards were proposed as set out below.

Any appointments made by governing boards would be subject to the completion of a Declaration of Eligibility form, a proof of identity check and an enhanced DBS check.

Name	School	Nominating Councillor	Appointment
Bolsover M Hilton	Bolsover Infant & Nursery School	J Dixon	New appointment
Derbyshire Dales M Griffiths	Middleton Community Primary School	I Ratcliffe	New appointment
Erewash A Fletcher	Morley Primary School	C Hart	New appointment
South Derbyshire D Shepherd	Stenson Fields Primary School	N Atkin	Re-appointment
South Derbyshire M Stephens	Melbourne Infant School	L Chilton	New appointment

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet Member confirms the nominations for persons to serve as local authority governors as detailed in the report.

16/21EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLICRESOLVED that underRegulation 4 (2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings)

and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that in view of the nature of the items of business, that if members of the public were present, exempt information as defined in Paragraph 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed to them.

#### SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED AFTER THE PUBLIC, INCLUDING THE PRESS, WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING

1. To confirm the exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2021.

**17/21 MINUTES RESOLVED** that the exempt minutes of the meeting Held on 2 March 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

Public



Agenda Item No. 3

# FOR PUBLICATION

# DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

# CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

# 8 June 2021

# **Report of the Executive Director for Children's Services**

# Graduated Response for Individual Pupils (GRIP)

# 1. Divisions Affected

1.1 County-wide.

# 2. Key Decision

2.1 This is not a key decision

#### 3. Purpose

- 3.1 To propose and seek approval to make changes to the administration of the Graduated Response for Individual Pupils (GRIP) as follows.
  - 1) Extend the funding allocation cycle to cover the full length of a Key Stage in which the application has been made (i.e. For the allocation of additional funding to only expire at the end of Year 2, Year 6, Year 9 and Year 11)
  - 2) Replace the current cycle of annual GRIP funding applications, which must contain detailed review information, with 'annual evaluations' carried out by schools and support services with parents. These will be recorded in the child's school records and available to the special education needs and disability (SEND) Locality Teams officers as part of their ongoing work to support schools in developing and delivering inclusive provision for all children with SEND.

3) Remove the clause agreed in October 2018 which commits Derbyshire County Council (DCC) to backdate the funding to the time of application if there is a delay in decision making. However, in exceptional circumstances if the application was subject to an unnecessary delay then the payment will be backdated.

# 4. Information and Analysis

#### 4.1 Background

The GRIP process is a Derbyshire County Council policy initiative to deliver an 'Element 3' type funding stream to support inclusion and learning for young children with special education needs and disabilities (SEND) in mainstream schools. This is an innovative approach in Derbyshire which allows schools to access funding early and use to meet the needs of children and young people sooner, so resulting in earlier progress and less escalation to more formal and costly processes. It is funded from the high needs block of the Dedicated School Grant and allocated by a GRIP panel, chaired by a lead SEND officer (LSO). The funding is available by application and after the school has met the first £6,000 of costs for the provision of the young person.

GRIP funding was introduced in 2014 to enable resource to be delivered quickly to mainstream schools without the undue wait due to the formal 20-week assessment process that might lead to an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP).

The concept of this discretionary policy is rooted in the graduated response described within the SEND Code of Practice: 0-25 Statutory guidance 2015.

At the time of its development and approval through full Derbyshire County Council Education Cabinet in 2015, it had the support of parents and schools, as there were manifest benefits in terms of enabling schools to develop and resource their own person-centred action plans for children and young people with SEND within their local community schools. Since its inception, **2,316** individual pupils have received a GRIP allocation. Of these **579** (25%) have gone onto having an EHC Plan. This means that 1,737 individual children and young people have been supported through GRIP but have never moved to a EHC Plan.

The children and young people who receive GRIP allocations have life-long SEND associated diagnosed learning or physical/sensory disabilities, or enduring and very significant communication or social, emotional and mental health needs. The outcomes expected for them are long-term in nature and focused on preparing them for adulthood. GRIP is not designed for children and young people with short-term barriers to learning of a temporary nature.

The data confirms this in that of the 2316 pupils who have received a GRIP allocation, 75.4% continue to receive support from the High Needs Block funding.

To receive a GRIP allocation, schools are required through the referral form to demonstrate how they have spent £6000 (element 2 funding) required under the National Funding Formula to address the child's identified barriers to learning and participation. Through a provision map, the school are required to demonstrate what interventions are in place to address the needs that they have identified, how children are progressing towards their learning outcomes as a result of the interventions and how much it costs.

Where approved, funding is currently allocated for one year with an evaluation expected in the final quarter of the funding period, and a subsequent "evaluation application" to provide funding for a further year. The SEND Strategic Transformation Plan has been developed on the basis of the ISOS high needs review in June 2019. Within the plan there are many strands of development. This paper is specifically intended to satisfy Theme 3, Strand 3.3: *Relaunch an updated and improved GRIP process.* 

The tensions in the system have been highlighted and exacerbated by the ongoing COVID pandemic in terms of school staffing capacity and children's attendance, as well as the schools having to focus on developing safe secure sites and delivering remote learning. With school staff under pressure, it is imperative that the local authority can support them by streamlining processes required of schools wherever possible.

Equally there has been an impact on the capacity of SEND Officers to focus on GRIP applications when other forms of support to schools and families have been necessary.

The local authority needs to ensure that the GRIP process supports schools to meet need to avoid them resorting to requests for more costly EHC needs assessment. Equally, it is important that parents have confidence that the schools to provide support and interventions to pupils with SEND quickly and effectively in their local community school, and without the need to apply for an EHCP.

It is also important to streamline process to generate capacity in the SEND locality teams so that they work with schools over the quality of the applications and play their part in processing the applications efficiently.

#### Key Issues:

#### Performance:

The local authority (LA) currently has a target time of 75 days to process applications; it would like to have this time reduced over time to 35 days, and ideally 28 days.

- In 2019, the average wait time from the LA receiving the application to a decision been given to the school was 84.3 days.
- In 2020, the average wait time from the LA receiving the application to a decision been given to the school was 91.3 days.

During the current year, as of 18 December 2020 there have been 1443 GRIP applications of which 794 had previously had GRIP allocated.

This means that "evaluation applications" (i.e. where a pupil has previously had GRIP allocated previously and the application is not a new one) account for 55% of all applications received.

Using data below relating to the Panel process, these 794 "evaluation applications" account for a combined figure of 869 hours of DCC officer time (circa 0.5FTE).

#### Panel process:

The current GRIP allocations are decided through GRIP panels. All applications and evaluations are decided by this panel, to ensure robust scrutiny and to provide an audit trail of decisions involving public money.

An average GRIP panel meeting lasts three hours with five staff. The last 13 panel meetings (5/1/21 to 21/1/21) have made 96 decisions at an average of 13.7 decisions per meeting or 4.57 decisions per hour.

There are currently 276 outstanding applications (137 North Locality Team areas and 139 South Locality Team areas).

If no new applications were received it would take another 20 Panel meetings to clear the existing applications.

#### 5. Consultation

5.1 A Call for Views on sufficiency of SEND provision was completed in January 2021 where stakeholders were given the opportunity to comment of the GRIP process. Where comments were positive they

demonstrated that the GRIP funding is valued for meeting needs early and giving schools the flexibility to support children and young people quickly and without a formal assessment of needs. The negative comments made regarding the GRIP process mainly concerned the administration of the process which is considered unwieldly and as causing delays.

#### 6. Alternative Options Considered

6.1 The recommended options are below and the alternative is to make no change to the current process. The case for a necessary change is recorded above. A further, fuller review of funding streams to support children and young people with needs will identify whether there are significant changes recommended to the GRIP process

#### 7. Implications

#### 7.1 <u>Risks</u>

- 1. The additional documentation on schools and the time delays in processing them is undermining confidence in the system. If this is not changed, this will inevitably lead to a rise in applications for EHC Needs assessments and EHC plans, where the financial draw on the High Needs Block funding is significantly higher by about 40% in Primary Schools and 33% in Secondary Schools.
- 2. Financially, an annual evaluation means that schools may not consider whether the top-up funding through GRIP could be reduced but this will be addressed as part of the wider review of SEND funding streams and GRIP paperwork.

#### Benefits:

- 1. Many evaluation applications request additional funding greater than previously allocated; the figures however suggest that there has been a higher increase in the average spend on GRIP this financial year. Since approximately 55% of these allocations are evaluations, the increase is more likely to be better managed with less evaluations.
- 2. The LA can extract greater value from the spend within the High Needs Block to support the inclusion of children with SEND in mainstream schools.
- 3. For schools, there will be far fewer unnecessary paperwork and review mechanisms to complete, meaning that school staff can concentrate on

developing practice and delivering interventions to the children and young people.

- 4. Schools will have the benefit of knowing that funding has been secured for a longer period. This stability will enable them to plan with more security and will aid with staff retention and continuity. This is particularly true given that at present the 12-month allocation could expire at any point in the school year, whereas the proposal is to maintain allocations to the end of a school year in which the pupil reaches the end of a Key Stage.
- 5. The reduction in paperwork will enable the LA to process applications more quickly, enhancing confidence in the GRIP system for both schools and families.
- 6. Parents will also have the same security that there is longer term provision in place for their child. This will give them greater confidence that their child will be supported effectively through programmes of support that will have time to be embedded and delivered over longer time frames and empower their ongoing involvement in their child's learning.

#### 8. Background Papers

8. None identified.

#### 9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1: Implications

#### 10. Recommendation(s)

That Cabinet:

Consider the information provided in this report and to make three administrative changes to the GRIP process:

a) Extend the funding allocation cycle to cover the full length of a Key Stage in which the application has been made (i.e. For the allocation of additional funding to only expire at the end of Year 2, Year 6, Year 9 and Year 11) rather than chronological time periods of one year, which could end at any time in that year.

b) Replace the current cycle of yearly applications, which must contain detailed review information, with 'annual evaluations' carried out by schools

and support services with parents. These will be recorded in the child's school records and available to the SEND Locality Teams officers as part of their ongoing work to support schools in developing and delivering inclusive provision for all children with SEND.

c) Remove the clause agreed in October 2018 which commits DCC to backdate the funding to the time of application if there is a delay in decision making. However, in exceptional circumstances if the application was subject to an unnecessary delay then the payment will be backdated.

#### 11. Reasons for Recommendation(s)

11.1 As stated above, approximately 55% of all applications are evaluation applications, rather than new applications. Removing these from the GRIP process will significantly reduce the number of applications that school staff need to complete, as well as reducing officer time in assessing applications. It is expected to also improve performance in terms of reducing average wait times for schools to receive funding from the point of application.

11.2 It will also significantly reduce the number of cases that need to be seen at the panel meetings. Given that GRIP allocations are for pupils with longterm SEND, it is highly unlikely that their barriers to learning and participation will change over time. On that basis, potential challenges to their successful inclusion in mainstream school will persist throughout their school careers. Applying for GRIP allocations every year therefore seems to be unnecessary. It is the changing of key stage that is the key review time for pupils with SEND.

#### 12. Is it necessary to waive the call in period?

12.1 No

Report Author: Paula Williams Contact details: paula.williams@derbyshire.gov.uk

#### This report has been approved by the following officers:

On behalf of:	
Director of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer Director of Finance and ICT Managing Executive Director Executive Director(s)	

#### Implications

#### Financial

1.1 The changes proposed in this paper are not expected to change any fundamentals in the overall modelling of costs but should reinforce and sustain the position of GRIP as a High Needs Block allocation mechanism in Derbyshire. This is particularly relevant to managing spend given the recent increase in EHC plans in Derbyshire which represent significantly higher cost per pupil compared to GRIP.

The average allocation of a GRIP is between £4000 and £4400. This figure has remained notably consistent throughout the period of operation and there has been no incremental increase over time, once the system became more widely known and used by schools. However, it should be noted that the average for this academic year 2020-21 has seen a rise in the average closer to the top of this range.

This is in contrast to EHC Plans in which the cash allocation (referred to as mainstream top ups) has been slowly rising over the past five years at an average allocation around Level 3 ( $\pounds$ 6500) but are now running at average above this at a mid-point between Level 3 and 4 at an average amount of  $\pounds$ 7560 in Primary and  $\pounds$ 6324 in Secondary, with a more marked rise in both phases over the past two years.

During the key stage period in which GRIP allocations would be in place, the records will be maintained by school on the child's progress and the SEND Officers will be monitoring these using the live GRIP reports and through their regular casework meetings with schools, to ensure that GRIP allocations are not continued where the progress of the child in overcoming their barriers to learning and participation means additional recourses are no longer appropriate.

No additional spend is required by the LA to implement the proposed changes, other than to inform schools through the usual local authority/schools' communication channels. Minor changes to the information on the Local Offer will also need to be made.

#### Legal

2.1 GRIP is not a statutory process; it is a discretionary policy developed within Derbyshire County Council.

The GRIP process sits within the graduated response described in the statutory Department for Education 'SEND Code of Practice 0-25 years' (January 2015), principally Chapter 1 Principles and Chapter 6 Schools. The Code sets out the guidance on the duties, policies and procedures under Part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014 and associated regulations. The proposed changes make no change to the legal standing of the GRIP process, which went through legal diligence on approval by Cabinet in 2015.

#### Human Resources

3.1 There are no human resource implications

#### Information Technology

4.1 There are no information technology implications

#### **Equalities Impact**

5.1 Children and young people with SEND are a protected group under the Equalities Act 2010.

This proposal has been considered in the context of considering whether the changes create any impact, negative or positive, including where this could constitute unfair treatment, additional inequality or disadvantage or result in hardship and exclusion.

There are no implications in terms of equality impact, as the proposed changes to the GRIP process do not alter the client population of children and young people with SEND that are served by the GRIP process. The changes will not impact on access to support for any child or young person or disempower their parents in decision making.

#### Corporate objectives and priorities for change

6.1 This paper is connected to the transformation of services for children and young people with additional needs

# Other (for example, Health and Safety, Environmental Sustainability, Property and Asset Management, Risk Management and Safeguarding)

7.1 The project will give parents/carers security that there is longer term provision in place for their child. This will give them greater confidence that their child will be supported effectively through programmes of support that will have time to be embedded and delivered over longer time frames and empower their ongoing involvement in their child's learning.

# Report Sign Off and Version Control

Report Title	
Author	
Meeting and Date	
Version	
Key Decision (published)	
Exempt item (notice of private meeting published)	

Implications	Name and Comments	Date Approved
Finance		
Legal		
Human Resources		
Information Technology		
Equalities		
Corporate Objectives and priorities for change		
Consultation		
Other – please specify		

# Author's Directorate Sign Off

	Date
Managing Executive	
Director/Executive	
Director	
DMT – if applicable	
CMT – if applicable	
Cabinet Member briefed	

Other – please specify	

This page is intentionally left blank

PUBLIC

Agenda Item No. 4

Author: Karen Gurney (x38755)

# DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

# 8 June 2021

# Joint Report of the Executive Director of Children's Services and the

# Director of Finance & ICT

# DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT OUTTURN 2020-21

# (CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND SAFEGUARDING)

# 1. Purpose of the Report

To provide the Cabinet Member with a report of the Revenue Budget outturn

of the Dedicated Schools Grant (Young People portfolio) for 2020-21.

# 2.1. Outturn Summary

The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and  $6^{th}$  form grant income recorded by the Authority in 2020-21 was £368.032m. This, plus the release of a reserve holding rates refunds in respect of schools of £0.721m, resulted in income of £368.753 being available to fund expenditure in 2020-21.

The Revenue Budget Outturn Statement showed full year expenditure of  $\pounds 370.037m$ . The overspend compared to income is  $\pounds 1.284m$ , however this includes an underspend of  $\pounds 1.370m$  which is ring-fenced to schools and a further  $\pounds 0.850m$  underspend of school growth funding,  $\pounds 0.322m$  of which has been earmarked to contribute to pre and post opening grants to planned new schools. The overspend falling to the Authority is therefore  $\pounds 2.976m$ .

The Authority will report a DSG deficit reserve at the end of 2020-21 of  $\pounds$ 6.187m. Other DSG committed reserves totalling  $\pounds$ 5.030m offset this deficit reserve within the Authority's accounts meaning that the aggregate reported DSG position is a net deficit reserve of  $\pounds$ 1.157m.

Following a consultation with LAs and other stakeholders, the DfE have amended the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations such

that a DSG deficit must be carried forward to be dealt with from future years' DSG income, unless the Secretary of State authorises the LA not to do this.

As a first step to recovering the deficit in Derbyshire, the Schools Forum agreed in January 2020 to allocate only some of the 2020-21 Pupil Growth fund within the Schools Block. The Forum agreed to leave £1.325m of the £3.428m grant for 2020-21 unallocated as a positive contribution towards the shortfall and the reported position for 2020-21 reflects this contribution.

In setting budgets for 2021-22, the Schools Block was overcommitted to maintain the National Funding Formula factors where the rise in pupil counts was not yet reflected in the calculation of funding allocated to the Authority. This shortfall was met from the Pupil Growth Fund. The only planned contribution to the deficit in 2021-22 is from the Central Schools Services Block which the Schools Forum agreed should be under-committed by  $\pounds 0.725m$  for this purpose.

	Controllable Budget £m	Actuals £m	Over/(Under) Spend £m
Expenditure			
Central School Services Block	4.265	4.261	(0.004)
Schools Growth funding incl KS1	3.448	1.273	(2.175)
Re-pooled school funding	4.489	3.120	(1.370)
Early Years Block – Central LA expenditure	1.338	1.220	(0.118)
Early Years Block - Schools/PVI	39.676	40.221	0.545
High Needs Block – LA expenditure	64.353	69.606	5.253
High Needs Block – Allocated LA School budgets	3.200	3.200	0.000
Schools Block – LA mainstream Primary and Secondary schools	247.136	247.136	0.000
Total Expenditure	367.722	371.260	3.538
Dedicated Schools Grant Income	(361.745)	(361.873)	(0.148)
6th Form Grant	(6.825)	(6.825)	0.000
Release of rates reserve	0.000	(0.721)	(0.721)

The significant areas of expenditure and income for 2020-21 are shown in the table below:

	Controllable Budget £m	Actuals £m	Over/(Under) Spend £m
Total Income	(367.904)	(368.753)	(0.848)
(Surplus)/Deficit	0.000	1.284	1.284

#### 2.2. Key Variances

- 2.2.1. Schools Growth funding, underspend £2.175m £0.725m of pupil growth funding received in 2020-21 was earmarked with the approval of School Forum for pre and post opening grants for new schools. Grants of £0.403m were made during 2020-21 and the unspent allocation of £0.322m has been transferred to an earmarked DSG reserve to contribute to future payments. Schools Forum approved that £1.325m of growth funding could be left uncommitted for 2020-21 to be set against either in-year or accumulated overspend within the High Needs Block. The balance of the underspend, £0.528m, is primarily due to allocations to support schools to meet KS1 pupil/teacher ratios being lower than anticipated.
- 2.2.2. Re-pooled school funding, underspend £1.370m The net underspend is ring-fenced to schools and has arisen mainly because claims from primary schools for the cost of covering staff on maternity leave were lower than the re-pooled amount leading to an underspend of £0.420m. Also, the top-sliced amount collected for redundancy costs exceeded actual costs in year by £0.701m. This underspend has been transferred to an earmarked DSG reserve.
- 2.2.3. Early Years Block Schools/PVI, overspend £0.545m

The final Early Years Block allocation for 2020-21 will not be determined until November 2021 (usually July) and will be calculated 75% on January 2020 planned attendance and 25% on January 2021 planned attendance at schools and settings. Although Early Years settings were open during the lockdown period between January and March 2021, attendance in January 2021 was lower and then rose throughout February and March 2021. As the Authority's expenditure is determined by the number of hours that children actually attend settings and the funding is driven by the planned attendance recorded in January 2021, there is expected to be a reclaim of grant by the DfE and this anticipated recovery has been reflected in 2020-21 outturn and is the main cause of this overspend.

2.2.4. High Needs Block, overspend £5.253m

Top-ups paid to mainstream schools in Derbyshire were greater than planned by £3.063m due to a greater number of children for whom this support was assessed as being required.

Expenditure on top-ups paid to special schools within Derbyshire exceeded plan by £1.209m, again mainly due to an increase in the number of children receiving support in their education from these establishments.

Planned spend was also exceeded by £2.417m where children were educated in schools in other local authority areas or where provision was made in independent and non-maintained special schools. This increase above planned expenditure was due both to increased numbers of children supported in this way and an increase in the average cost of provision overall.

These overspends were offset by underspends on High Needs Block central services provided by the Authority totalling £1.048m. These underspends are primarily due to lower travel expenditure and lower expenditure on supplies and services due to staff working remotely and delivering support virtually. There was also lower expenditure on specific support for individual pupils due to lower referrals into services.

- 2.2.5. Dedicated Schools Grant income, underspend £0.148m The underspend is due to grant receipt in respect of Early Years 2019-20 received during 2020-21 following finalisation of grant allocations for the Early Years Block.
- 2.2.6. Release of Rates Reserve, underspend £0.721m The underspend is due to release of rates refunds received in respect of schools where appeals against valuations had been lodged. School rates are funded by the DSG and it is therefore appropriate that reductions in this expenditure are allocated back to the DSG and help mitigate against the deficit position.

#### 2.3. DSG Reserves

The table below shows the movements in the individual elements of the Dedicated Schools Reserve during 2020-21.

The Authority is now recording an overall deficit on the DSG reserve of  $\pm 1.157$ m which represents cumulative overspend against allocated grant of  $\pm 6.188$ m which is being offset by other earmarked DSG funds.

The Department for Education (DfE) has issued a template recovery plan and has indicated that Authorities that show either a deficit DSG

balance or a significant reduction in their DSG reserve will need to demonstrate to the DfE that an action plan is in place to address this deficit. Derbyshire is building on the work identified within the SEND review by ISOS to ensure that SEND provision is effective and efficient and continues to make representations to DfE to ensure that need is adequately funded.

Reserve title	Balance before final DSG outturn Surplus/ (Deficit)	Increase/ (Decrease)	Balance at 31 March 2021
	£m	£m	£m
Uncommitted DSG	(3.228)	(2.959)	(6.188)
Support for pupils in schools	0.038	-	0.038
New Schools pre and post opening grants	2.102	0.322	2.424
Schools re- pooled funds	1.063	1.370	2.433
Early Years contingency	0.152	(0.016)	0.136
Total	0.127*	(1.284)	(1.157)

\*Note: The closing balance at the end of March 2020 was a surplus of  $\pm 0.188$ m however  $\pm 0.061$ m was drawn down during the year, mostly to cover increases to the budget allocated for schools' rates bills.

# 2.4. Individual School Balances

Collectively, local authority school and PRU budgets underspent in-year by a total of £11.355 million after allowing for a reduction of £0.328 million due to schools converting to academy status. The following table shows an analysis of schools' balances as at 31 March 2021 compared with the position at 31 March 2020.

	Nurs	Prim	Sec	Spec	Total
	(£	(£	(£	(£	(£
	million)	million)	million)	million)	million)
Balance as at 31 March 2021	0.517	29.459	2.313	1.066	33.356

	Nurs (£ million)	Prim (£ million)	Sec (£ million)	Spec (£ million)	Total (£ million)
Balance as at 31 March 2020 – schools remaining maintained	0.383	20.082	0.858	0.678	22.000
Balance as at 31 March 2020 – schools converted to academy in 2020/21	0.000	0.537	(0.422)	0.013	0.129
Net Increase/(Decrease) (£ million)	0.134	8.840	1.878	0.375	11.227
March 2021 surplus balances (£ million)	0.517	29.760	2.949	1.090	34.316
March 2020 surplus balances (£ million)	0.383	20.619	0.436	0.691	22.129
March 2021 deficit balances (£ million)	0.000	0.300	0.636	0.024	0.960
March 2020 deficit balances (£ million)	0.000	0.737	1.097	0.049	1.883

In addition to the £33.356 million held by schools, £1.569 million was held in the Schools' Capital Reserve account. This reserve holds earmarked funds for future capital developments at individual schools in order to minimise the distorting effect of holding these funds within their own school balances.

The significant increase in overall school balances is driven by lower spending in schools during the year due to fewer pupils in school and the cancellation of exams. In addition, schools receive additional grants from DfE for PE and catch-up for pupils and the opportunities to run activities and programmes using these funds has been constrained due to the pandemic during 2020-21.

# 3. Financial Considerations

As detailed in the report.

# 4. Other Considerations

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: legal, prevention of crime and disorder, equality of opportunity, environmental, health, human resources, property, social value and transport considerations.

# 5. Key Decision

No

# 6. Call-in

No

# 7. Background Papers

Held on file within Children's Services Department. Officer contact details – Karen Gurney, extension 38755.

# 8. Officer Recommendations

That the Cabinet Member notes the report.

Jane Parfrement Executive Director Children's Services Peter Handford Director of Finance & ICT This page is intentionally left blank