
Dedicated Schools Grant Savings Options

Consultation on
A Series of Options To
Manage Costs Within
Sutton's DSG from
April 2017 Onwards

Colin Stewart - Executive
Head of Education and Early
Intervention, People
Directorate, London Borough
of Sutton

Contents

Introduction	3
Executive Summary	5
Consultation Purpose	7
Consultation Timescale.....	8
Consultation Process	9
Option One – Reducing Base Budget Provision to Schools	10
Option Two – Reducing Pupil Growth Funding	12
Option Three – Reducing Central Block Support Service Funding	15
Option Four – Reducing SEN Top-Up Funding	17
Option Three – Reducing Alternative Provision Top-Up Funding	18
Consultation Response Form	20

Introduction

1. In the last three years, the Sutton Schools Forum has received a number of reports from Local Authority officers which consistently highlighted increasing cost pressures within Sutton's Dedicated Schools Grant.
2. These reports led Schools Forum to instruct the Forum Formula Review Group to work with LA officers to consider ways in which these cost pressures might be managed and addressed.
3. Following meetings between LA officers, Headteacher Representatives and Governor Representatives on the Formula Review Group, a series of 6 options were prepared for Schools Forum to consider further at their meeting on October 10th 2016.
4. As a result the Schools Forum decided that five of the six options should progress to a full consultation with all schools.
5. This consultation sets out the detail of five of the options: reductions to School Base Budgets; reductions to Growth Funding provision; reductions to Central Block funding for LA services for schools; reductions in top up funding levels for Alternative Provision; and reductions in top up funding levels for some SEN provisions.
6. The sixth option, which Schools Forum decided not to progress to consultation, was an option to cease the funding for the recently establish Assessment Unit at Wandle Valley School.
7. This consultation sets out a summary of the details for each of the five options under consideration and asks schools not only for their views on each but to also consider which of the options would be their preferred to least preferred approach.
8. In addition, the consultation has been structured to encourage schools to provide a narrative commentary on each option and to provide schools with the opportunity to suggest any other options which Schools Forum should consider. The Forum have noted that while the challenges in Sutton are not as acute as they are in a number of other Local Authorities, the

cost pressures are nevertheless becoming more acute in Sutton in both individual schools and within the overall DSG budget.

9. The net effect of these cost pressures has been a series of in-year overspends within the Sutton DSG which have then been offset by DSG balances which had been accumulated in previous years.

Executive Summary

10. As stated above, the current net effect of DSG cost pressures has been a series of in-year overspends within the Sutton DSG which have then been offset by DSG balances which had been accumulated in previous years.
11. The Forum have noted that while the challenges in Sutton are not as acute as they are in a number of other Local Authorities, the cost pressures are nevertheless becoming more acute in Sutton in both individual schools and within the overall DSG budget.
12. The current net position is that the DSG is projected to overspend in the current financial year. At this point the most recent Local Authority estimate to the Schools Forum is that by March 31st 2017, Sutton's DSG overspend will either use up most of the remaining balances or may result in a DSG deficit to then carry forward into 17-18.
13. The Schools Forum have already taken some early decisions to try and reduce the cost pressures within the DSG. In 15-16 the Forum took the decision to discontinue DSG Central Block Funding into Sutton's Learning Support Service in 16-17. It also took the decision to alter the previous arrangement for supporting social care interventions by moving from funding a percentage of the total costs to setting a specific 'capped' amount of funding, and following consultations revised a number of arrangements for commissioning SEN places in specialist bases where there was some under-occupancy.
14. While these actions support work to reduce the risk of a deficit in the DSG at the end of 16-17, further work is needed to address the underlying financial pressures in Sutton.
15. The ongoing year on year cost pressures within the DSG in Sutton are created by a number of factors including: the rise in demand for SEN provision; the rise in demand for Alternative Provision; the number of SEN specialist places in Sutton which have been commissioned to meet emerging pupil needs but where the places are not being funded by the Education Funding Agency (EFA); the current arrangements for funding growth classes and 'bulge' classes which are needed to meet demand for places but which are not funded by the EFA; the impact of changes to post-19 funding arrangements for students with SEN which are now met by the DSG; and the gap between the rate of increase in DSG funding levels from the EFA and the costs of services, staff and goods.

16. In considering which options should be put forward for consideration, the Schools Forum noted that part of the rationale from the Formula Review Group was a recognition that while there could be scope to make cost savings in both the Schools Block and the Central Block of the DSG, it would also be necessary to consider how to reduce costs in the two key areas of funding pressure: the costs for SEN Placements and the costs for Alternative Provision Placements.

17. At the meeting on October 10th 2016, School Forum also accepted that the focus for this consultation would be for schools to weigh up and decide between options for savings, as opposed to decide solely whether or not they were or were not in favour of a particular option.

18. This is fundamentally different to previous consultations, which have put forward a specific proposal and effectively asked schools as consultees whether or not they were in favour of that option.

19. Schools Forum noted in October 2016 that schools would be made aware of the crucial distinction between a 'consultation' and a 'referendum' on these options. So schools respondents should be aware in any subsequent consideration of responses, and in any subsequent decision-making based on those responses, while the Schools Forum will take significant account of school consultation responses, it does not automatically follow that the majority response on any particular option will determine the Forum's final decision on whether or not to implement that option.

Consultation Purpose

20. To consult on a series of Schools Forum proposals to:
- (a) Option 1 - reduce the base budget provision to schools through the formula driven part of the Schools Block in the DSG
 - (b) Option 2 - reduce the level of funding for pupil growth
 - (c) Option 3 - reduce and then cease Central Block funding to Speech and Language Support Services, ASD Support Services and English as an Additional Language Support Services
 - (d) Option 4 - restructure the top up funding rates for pupils with Special Educational Needs to generate an overall reduction in top up rate costs
 - (e) Option 5 – reduce the top up funding rates for Alternative Provision placements
21. To support consideration of this proposal, the purpose of this document is to set out the context and rationale for each option and to make relevant information available to all those being consulted.
22. The feedback from the consultation will be reported back to schools and subsequently be considered by Schools Forum for final decisions.

Consultation Timescale

23. The consultation will begin on Wednesday 9th November 2016.
24. The consultation is scheduled for a 3 week period with the closing date for the consultation being Wednesday 30th November 2016.
25. Feedback from the consultation will be reviewed and summarised into a Consultation Response Report which will be published to Schools Forum on Monday December 5th 2016.

Consultation Process

26. The consultation process will allow for both paper survey responses and electronic survey responses.
27. The consultation will be promoted on the Council website - www.sutton.gov.uk
28. The paper and e-mail survey response forms are set out below.
29. At the end of the consultation the responses to the paper and electronic surveys will be aggregated and analysed. The results from that aggregation will be published in a 'Consultation Feedback Report' which will be distributed to all school Headteachers and Chairs of Governors, the Headteacher and Chair of the Management Committees at both Limes College and STARS and to all members of Schools Forum. The feedback report will also be published on the Council website.

OPTION ONE – Reducing the base budget provision to schools through the formula driven part of the Schools Block in the DSG

Rationale for the Proposal

30. The proposal to consult on this option is made because: (a) schools need to consider the connection between savings options in other parts of the DSG and whether or not they would wish to prioritise retaining those rather than retaining levels of funding to schools; (b) schools need to review and consider the scale of potential saving to the DSG against the implications of such a saving at individual school level; (c) to have a range of options in the size of any reduction in base funding through Schools Block
31. The Forum asked LA officers to set out two possible models for a reduction in base budget funding to schools:
- (a) Funding reductions of 0.5% to generate a saving to the DSG of £495K;
 - (b) Funding reductions of 0.75% to generate a saving to the DSG of £723K.
32. The modeling of the reductions of 0.5% and 0.75% are set out on page 11

Basic Entitlement reduction options												
			16-17 MFG Adjustment	16-17 Post MFG Budget	Saving					Number of Schools with MFG		
			£470,365	£135,071,135								11
			£569,976	£134,575,628	-£495,507							14
			£637,642	£134,348,086	-£723,049							17
			Original factor as per Jan 2016 APT			0.5% reduction in Basic Entitlement			0.75% reduction in Basic Entitlement			
URN	LAESTAB	School Name	16-17 MFG Adjustment	16-17 Post MFG Budget	16-17 Post MFG per pupil Budget	16-17 MFG Adjustment	16-17 Post MFG Budget	16-17 Post MFG per pupil Budget	16-17 MFG Adjustment	16-17 Post MFG Budget	16-17 Post MFG per pupil Budget	
Total			£470,365	£135,071,135		£569,976	£134,575,628		£637,642	£134,348,086		
102958	3192000	BANDON HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0	£3,281,956	£4,002	£1,451	£3,268,648	£3,986	£8,011	£3,268,648	£3,986	
102959	3192001	Barrow Hedges Primary School	£0	£2,466,428	£3,903	£0	£2,455,052	£3,885	£0	£2,449,996	£3,877	
134165	3192002	Tweeddale Primary School	£6,264	£1,729,006	£4,259	£13,572	£1,729,006	£4,259	£16,820	£1,729,006	£4,259	
102963	3192007	Cheam Common Infants' School	£15,202	£1,403,416	£4,177	£21,250	£1,403,416	£4,177	£23,938	£1,403,416	£4,177	
102964	3192009	Cheam Fields Primary School	£0	£1,700,010	£4,067	£0	£1,692,486	£4,049	£0	£1,689,142	£4,041	
102967	3192012	ABBAY PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0	£1,676,200	£4,118	£0	£1,668,874	£4,100	£2,341	£1,667,958	£4,098	
102969	3192016	Hackbridge Primary School	£0	£2,253,948	£4,091	£0	£2,243,976	£4,073	£0	£2,239,544	£4,065	
102971	3192019	High View Primary School	£0	£1,687,492	£4,086	£0	£1,680,058	£4,068	£0	£1,676,754	£4,060	
102975	3192023	DEVONSHIRE PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0	£2,473,973	£4,130	£0	£2,463,191	£4,112	£0	£2,458,399	£4,104	
102976	3192026	Manor Park Primary School	£0	£2,082,323	£4,107	£0	£2,073,179	£4,089	£0	£2,069,115	£4,081	
102977	3192027	Brookfield Primary	£0	£1,556,094	£4,139	£0	£1,549,326	£4,121	£0	£1,546,812	£4,113	
102980	3192034	VICTOR SEYMOUR INFANTS' SCHOOL	£0	£1,251,642	£4,186	£2,295	£1,248,555	£4,176	£4,687	£1,248,555	£4,176	
102981	3192037	Robin Hood Infants School	£4,149	£1,122,195	£4,203	£8,955	£1,122,195	£4,203	£11,091	£1,122,195	£4,203	
102982	3192038	Dorchester Primary School	£0	£2,270,332	£4,128	£0	£2,260,306	£4,110	£0	£2,255,850	£4,102	
102983	3192040	Beddington Infants School	£5,682	£1,150,492	£4,261	£10,542	£1,150,492	£4,261	£12,702	£1,150,492	£4,261	
102984	3192041	Robin Hood Junior School	£0	£1,453,095	£4,070	£0	£1,446,669	£4,052	£0	£1,443,813	£4,044	
102985	3192042	Nonsuch Primary School	£0	£934,976	£4,452	£0	£931,196	£4,434	£0	£929,516	£4,426	
102986	3192043	Foresters Primary School	£96,678	£1,024,963	£5,311	£100,152	£1,024,963	£5,311	£101,696	£1,024,963	£5,311	
102988	3192046	Amy Johnson Primary	£186,132	£1,548,513	£5,179	£191,514	£1,548,513	£5,179	£193,906	£1,548,513	£5,179	
102989	3192047	Rushy Meadow Primary School	£0	£1,682,127	£4,248	£0	£1,674,999	£4,230	£0	£1,671,831	£4,222	
131103	3192048	Culvers House Primary School	£0	£1,698,229	£4,235	£0	£1,690,993	£4,217	£0	£1,687,777	£4,209	
130934	3192049	Muschamp Primary School	£0	£2,034,831	£4,257	£0	£2,026,227	£4,239	£0	£2,022,403	£4,231	
102990	3193301	ALL SAINTS BENHILTON PRIMARY	£0	£1,390,283	£4,053	£0	£1,384,109	£4,035	£0	£1,381,365	£4,027	
102991	3193303	Holy Trinity C of E Junior	£0	£1,437,730	£4,005	£0	£1,431,268	£3,987	£0	£1,428,396	£3,979	
102992	3193304	St. Dunstan's	£0	£1,682,727	£3,895	£0	£1,674,951	£3,877	£0	£1,671,495	£3,869	
102993	3193500	St. Cecilia's R.C. School	£0	£1,701,749	£3,921	£0	£1,693,937	£3,903	£0	£1,690,465	£3,895	
102994	3193501	St Mary's Catholic Junior School	£0	£1,156,205	£4,015	£0	£1,151,021	£3,997	£0	£1,148,717	£3,989	
102995	3193502	St Mary's Catholic Nursery & Infants' Schools	£8,224	£1,117,282	£4,138	£13,084	£1,117,282	£4,138	£15,244	£1,117,282	£4,138	
102996	3193503	ST.ELPHEGE'S RC JNR.SCHOOL	£0	£1,203,839	£4,123	£0	£1,198,583	£4,105	£0	£1,196,247	£4,097	
102997	3193504	St Elphege's R.C.infants	£47,048	£1,191,136	£4,478	£51,890	£1,191,136	£4,478	£54,042	£1,191,136	£4,478	
103004	3195200	All Saints Carshalton C of E Primary School	£0	£1,365,127	£4,015	£0	£1,359,007	£3,997	£0	£1,356,287	£3,989	
103005	3195201	Stanley Park Junior School	£0	£1,422,886	£3,931	£0	£1,416,370	£3,913	£0	£1,413,474	£3,905	
103006	3195202	Stanley Park Infants School	£0	£1,101,807	£4,096	£4,421	£1,101,386	£4,094	£6,573	£1,101,386	£4,094	
103003	3194015	Stanley Park High School	£0	£5,400,386	£5,573	£0	£5,379,068	£5,551	£6,259	£5,373,699	£5,546	
103009	3195402	The John Fisher School	£0	£3,894,381	£4,961	£0	£3,877,111	£4,939	£2,658	£3,870,349	£4,930	
103013	3195406	ST PHILOMENA'S	£0	£4,787,578	£4,895	£0	£4,766,062	£4,873	£0	£4,754,326	£4,861	
139965	3192004	Harris Junior Academy Carshalton	£0	£1,429,429	£4,004	£0	£1,423,003	£3,986	£0	£1,420,147	£3,978	
141876	3192008	Green Wrythe Primary School	£36,556	£983,906	£4,800	£40,264	£983,906	£4,800	£41,912	£983,906	£4,800	
136535	3192010	CHEAM PARK FARM JUNIOR SCHOOL	£0	£1,628,772	£3,878	£0	£1,621,212	£3,860	£0	£1,617,852	£3,852	
140260	3192011	Cheam Park Farm Nursery and Infant School.	£0	£1,341,280	£4,064	£0	£1,335,340	£4,046	£0	£1,332,700	£4,038	
136796	3192045	Westbourne Primary School	£0	£1,802,988	£4,007	£0	£1,794,888	£3,989	£0	£1,791,288	£3,981	
136799	3194000	Carshalton Boys Sports College	£31,836	£5,563,983	£5,215	£55,310	£5,563,983	£5,215	£68,114	£5,563,983	£5,215	
136797	3194002	Carshalton High School for Girls	£32,594	£5,316,843	£5,157	£55,276	£5,316,843	£5,157	£67,648	£5,316,843	£5,157	
136800	3194007	Greenshaw High School	£0	£6,132,628	£5,002	£0	£6,105,656	£4,980	£0	£6,090,944	£4,968	
136914	3194011	Glenthorne High School	£0	£6,028,318	£5,053	£0	£6,002,072	£5,031	£0	£5,987,756	£5,019	
136756	3194019	Overton Grange	£0	£5,134,874	£5,074	£0	£5,112,610	£5,052	£0	£5,100,466	£5,040	
136621	3195400	Wilson's School	£0	£3,855,858	£4,657	£0	£3,837,642	£4,635	£0	£3,827,706	£4,623	
136795	3195401	NONSUCH HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS	£0	£4,273,511	£4,625	£0	£4,253,183	£4,603	£0	£4,242,095	£4,591	
136785	3195403	Cheam High School	£0	£7,335,996	£4,904	£0	£7,303,084	£4,882	£0	£7,285,132	£4,870	
136787	3195404	Sutton Grammar School	£0	£2,863,915	£4,664	£0	£2,850,407	£4,642	£0	£2,843,039	£4,630	
136789	3195405	Wallington Girls High School	£0	£4,746,632	£4,667	£0	£4,724,258	£4,645	£0	£4,712,054	£4,633	
136798	3195407	WALLINGTON COUNTY GRAMMAR SCHOOL	£0	£3,183,166	£4,681	£0	£3,168,206	£4,659	£0	£3,160,046	£4,647	
141891	3192022	BEDDINGTON PARK PRIMARY	£0	£1,397,407	£4,074	£0	£1,391,233	£4,056	£0	£1,388,489	£4,048	
102960	3192003	AVENUE PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0	£3,384,604	£3,868	£0	£3,368,818	£3,850	£0	£3,361,802	£3,842	
102962	3192006	CHEAM COMMON JUNIOR SCHOOL	£0	£1,331,668	£3,999	£0	£1,325,674	£3,981	£0	£1,323,010	£3,973	

OPTION TWO – Reducing the level of funding for pupil growth

Rationale for the Proposal

33. The cost of growth funding for bulge classes and extended numbers to admit is not currently included in the DSG calculations, which Local Authorities receive from government.
34. The School Forum puts growth funding into place so that any individual school is not placed in financial hardship as a result of growth; its main aim is to support staffing costs where additional income generated by additional pupils falls short of the amount needed.
35. It is not intended that the funding replicates formula funding (nor is this affordable); nor is it intended that schools have any significant surplus beyond staffing costs.
36. This means that the costs of growth funding for the provision of those necessary pupil places have to be met from the DSG. In areas of the country with little to no pupil growth this generates little year on year cost pressures, but in an area of significant growth in pupil numbers like we have in Sutton, this financial pressure is a considerable contributing factor for the DSG.
37. We estimate that for the current year, the costs of meeting growth-funding requirements for the DSG will be an additional £1.9 million.
38. The proposal to consult on this option is being made because: (a) in the absence of government funding for growth this continues to be an ongoing area of high additional expenditure within the DSG; and (b) in considering whether or not schools could afford a reduction in the amount of growth funding support over time they need to consider that option alongside other possible options.
39. There are two aspects to changing growth funding which schools are asked to consider.
 - a. The first is a reduction in the level of growth funding provided for bulge classes and growth from £80K per year to £51K. This proposal is based on an assumption that the staffing cost to meet the demand for growth would be done through a teacher at M3, plus a 10% allowance for PPA. This would include estimated on-costs of 27% and also include the provision of a £10K allowance for start-up. In 2017-18, this would generate an estimated DSG saving of £510K

b. The second model is a mechanism for tapering out growth funding as the growth in pupils delivers increased revenue to schools year on year through AWPU for growth

40. In the current model of growth funding we assume there is a need for an equal amount of funding for each separate year of the growth moving through the school. Under the tapered model it takes account over time of the additional income and headroom generated by the growth in the total number of additional pupils in the school.
41. For every school the current model of growth (£80K per year) would provide an additional £400K per secondary school from the DSG over 5 years and an additional £560K of DSG per primary school over 7 years. Under the tapered model this would reduce to only £120K per secondary school and only £120K per primary school.
42. The option of tapering off over time is modelled below. The model has a number of assumptions: the level of growth funding per class is gradually reduced over time as the additional pupils begin to generate AWPU funding through the formula; funding level in Year 1 is £80K (to provide an M6 teacher, teaching 22 hours a week, with PPA of 3 hours cost of £53k and at Primary an M3 teacher, as above, cost of £42k, an LSA NJC 16 (mid point on 14-17 range) for 30 hours at £18k); and an assumption that each additional student brings in £4k average when in the formulae (in practice, this is greater for secondary schools and average for all but a few primary schools

43. **EXAMPLE A: Secondary School Tapered Funding for Growth**

Year of growth	Growth students	Formula Income	DSG Support	Notes
1	30	0k	£80k	M6 teacher: £53k
2	60	120k	£40k	Average £80k for each of two classes
3	90	240k	£0k	Average £80k for each of the three classes
4	120	360k		£40k available to wider contributions
5	150	480k		£80k available to wider contributions
6	150	600k		£200k available to wider contributions

EXAMPLE B: Primary School Tapered Funding for Growth

Year of growth	Growth students	Formula Income	DSG Support	Notes
1	30	0k	£80k	M3 teacher plus LSA £60k
2	60	120k	£40k	Implies £80k for each of the two years
3	90	240k	£0k	Implies £80k for each of the three years
4	120	360k		£40k available to wider contributions
5	150	480k		£80k available to wider contributions
6	180	600k		£120k available to wider contributions
7	210	720k		£150k available to wider contributions
8	210	840k		£270k available to wider contributions

OPTION THREE – Reducing and ceasing the funding into some Central Block Support Services

Rationale for the Proposal

44. The Forum considered a range of options for possible reductions in funding of central services. It noted that there are already savings being delivered in the costs of Education Other Than At School (£111K) and Schools Causing Concern (£60K)
45. The Forum decided to consult on three further options:
- (a) Reducing the funding for Speech, Language and Communication to zero, phased over a three year period from its current funding level of £307K
 - (b) Reducing the funding for the ASD Service to zero, phased over a three year period from its current funding level of £267K
 - (c) Reducing the funding for the English as an Additional Language Service to zero, phased over a three year period from its current funding level of £224K.
46. The Forum recognised that the final decision may result in a decision to reduce all three of these services as outlined above or it may be through a combination approach. There are clearly a number of permutations.
47. But for the purpose of consulting on these options, the estimate is based on an assumption that all three reduce to zero by the same proportion each year. On the basis of these assumptions, there would be a £300K saving to the DSG in Year 1 (17-18), with further savings of £300K in Year 2 (18-19) and £200K in Year 3 (19-20).
48. The Forum noted that should this proposal be implemented as outlined above in conjunction with other options, the resulting overall saving to the DSG could be greater than needed to deliver a balanced DSG budget. The phasing approach to any saving might also determine whether this surplus would be available from year 1 (17-18) or in one of the subsequent years.
49. Should there be a surplus of the amount being saved exceeding the amount needed, then the Forum would consider seeking to mitigate some of the impact by delegating any surplus

to primary schools, partly to support them in considering whether or not to buy replacements for these services and partly because primary schools are proportionately much higher recipients of Central Block services and therefore any impact from changes in this area is likely to be disproportionately challenging for primary schools.

50. The Forum also propose the option of a significant revision to the arrangements for Schools Causing Concern. This would involve moving to a flat rate of funding to categories of school (support to accelerate progress and attainment and support to respond to an OfSTED judgement of inadequate). The LA will calculate the proposed flat rate based on a review of patterns of expenditure in the last 3 years
51. As part of the option to reduce spend on Schools Causing Concern, the Forum also suggest that this should include a new requirement on the LA to only use central block funding where schools needing support do not have the ability to self-fund the support required. This would effectively mean considering school budget position and school balances before deciding how much, if any, of the DSG Schools Causing Concern funding would be released.

OPTION FOUR – Restructuring and revising the Top-Up Rates for Students with Special Educational Needs

Rationale for the Proposal

52. The costs of SEN placements are one of the key contributing factors in creating the current funding pressures within the DSG. There is no evidence to suggest the increasing costs come from changing thresholds for statements of special educational need. Therefore the cost increases are in part generated from the rising proportion of SEN pupils and the impact of implementing some of the SEND Reforms, particularly around post-19 provision
53. The LA is developing a commissioning strategy for SEN which will set out how it proposes to maximise the scope for in-borough placement to meet a range of needs in the future. Through the South London SEN Commissioning Service, we are reviewing the costs of post-19 provision and for Sutton this is particularly focused on place costs at Orchard Hill College.
54. In addition to the steps outlined above, the Forum also agreed to consult on further savings options through reviewing all of the SEN top-up funding arrangements. The proposed changes have varying effects on individual bases and special schools. As a result the detailed proposals are the subject of a separate SEN Top-Up Rates consultation.
55. However, using those proposed changes as a model, Local Authority officers estimate that this would reduce DSG costs of placements in Specialist Bases £256K per annum and reduce the DSG costs of placement in Sutton Special Schools by £788K

OPTION FIVE – Restructuring and revising the Top-Up Rates for Students accessing Alternative Provision at Limes and STARS

Rationale for the Proposal

56. The costs of meeting the demand for Alternative Provision is a key area of budget pressure within the DSG.

57. The Forum agreed to put two options forward for consultation. These are to

- a. Reduce the level of top up funding to both Limes College and STARS by £2K per pupil
- b. Redirect the recoupment funds for permanently excluded pupils to the DSG rather than the PRU.

58. In 2015, government proposals for the funding of alternative provision increased the place funding for pupil referral units from £8K per place to £10K per place. The intention was to rebalance the proportion of funding PRU's received through shifting £2K to place funding from top-up, to provide greater certainty on funding levels and allow better up front planning against likely income.

59. At the time this was reported to Schools Forum in Sutton, the Forum were not asked whether or not their preferred option was to rebalance the funding by moving £2K to the per place funding and reducing the top up funding by the same amount or if their preferred option was to retain the top up rate, effectively increasing the funding to both Sutton PRU's by £2K per pupil in total.

60. At present when a pupil is excluded from mainstream school the proportionate amount of AWPU funding is effectively recouped from the school where the pupil had been on roll. This arrangement is only in place for pupils being moved to the roll of Limes College. The recoupment funding for permanently excluded pupils and pupils excluded as a 'Child at Risk of Exclusion' are currently sent to Limes and are now part of their incomes.

61. The recoupment for permanently excluded pupils should be returned to the DSG and this is the case in other authorities. Recoupment for 'CARE' pupils could only be done with the agreement of the schools involved.
62. Currently Sutton Secondary Schools have an agreement to provide recoupment funds for CARE pupils to Limes College but there is no agreement in place with the LA which would see 'CARE' recoupment routed back to the DSG.
63. The proposed change on top up rates would mean a saving to the DSG of £360K.
64. The proposals to redirect recoupment funding for permanently excluded pupils would result in a further estimated net saving to the DSG of approximately £53K, based on 15-16 recoupment levels.

Consultation Questionnaire Response Form

Please note: All proposals are linked to the consultation document.

Your Role (e.g. Headteacher, member of staff, governor):

Organisation:

Contact e-mail (optional):

1. On the assumption that the Forum must implement some of the savings options outlined above, can you indicate which would be your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th preference on the grid below? (please tick/place X)

OPTION	1 ST PREFERENCE	2 ND PREFERENCE	3 RD PREFERENCE	4 TH PREFERENCE	5 TH PREFERENCE
Option 1 – Reduce the base budget provision to schools through the formula driven part of the Schools Block in the DSG					
Option 2 - reduce the level of funding for pupil growth					
Option 3 - Reduce and then cease Central block funding to Speech and Language Support Services, ASD Support Services and English as an Additional Language Support Services					
Option 4 - Restructure the top up funding rates for pupils with Special Educational Needs to generate an overall reduction in top up rate costs					
Option 5 – Reduce the top up funding rates for Alternative Provision placements					

2. What are your views on the proposal to reduce the base budget provision to schools through the formula driven part of the Schools Block of the DSG (as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32)

3. What are your views on the proposal to change the level of growth funding from £80K to £51K? Could schools afford to make educational provision if the growth funding was reduced in this way? (as set out in paragraph 42)

4. What are your views on the proposal to introduce a Tapered Funding model for pupil growth? (as set out in paragraphs 44 to 47)

5. What are your views on the proposal to reduce and phase out Central Block DSG funding to Speech and Language, ASD and EAL Support Services?(as set out in paragraphs 49 to 53)

6. What are your views on the proposal to change the Central Block DSG Funding for Schools Causing Concern (as set out in paragraphs 54 and 55)

7. What are your views on the proposal to restructure and revise the top-up funding rates for SEN provision? (as set out in paragraphs 56 to 59)

8. What are your views on the proposal to restructure and revise the top up funding rates for Alternative Provision? (as set out in paragraphs 62, 63 and 67)

9. What are your views on the proposal to direct the recoupment funding for permanently excluded pupils back to the DSG rather than to the Limes College budget (as set out in paragraphs 64, 65, 66, and 68)

Additional Comments:

Thank you taking part in this consultation. Please return a postal response to Ian Callaghan, Commissioning and Business Insight Officer, Chief Executive Group, London Borough of Sutton, Civic Centre, St Nicholas Way, Sutton, SM1 1EA

If you prefer to respond through email please send your response form to ian.callaghan@sutton.gov.uk. An electronic version of this consultation document and an electronic response form will also be available at www.sutton.gov.uk/