

ITEM 4b – Appendix 2

Overview of secondary school vacancies in Croydon

The number of vacancies across Croydon's secondary schools can change daily. The vacancies below have been calculated using the Spring 2021 School Census and therefore the data is correct as of 21 January 2021. All of Croydon's secondary schools are their own admissions authority and therefore manage their admissions arrangements and in-year applications.

The tables below outline the number of vacant school places across Years 7 to 11 in Croydon. These are broken down by Wards and Planning Areas.

Table 1 – total number of secondary school vacancies across all year groups – Years 7 - 11.

Table 2 – secondary school vacancies by year group

Please see the attached supporting narrative for additional information and clarification.

Table 1 – Total number of secondary school vacancies across all year groups (Years 7 - 11)

Ward	Planning Area	School	Total no. of places (Y7-11)	Vacancies
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	900	17
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy	180	2
Broad Green	North	Harris Invictus Academy Croydon	900	68
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	1114	15
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	900	0
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School	480	263
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	550	28
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	779	170
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	1092	26
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	900	54
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	900	2
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	600	4
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	750	168

Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	950	14
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	1640	8
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	750	24
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	725	51
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	750	0
Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	900	74
South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School	540	0
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	1790	76
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	1000	386
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	900	403
Borough Wide			19990	1853

Table 2 – Secondary school vacancies by year group**Year 7**

Ward	Planning Area	School	PAN	Vacancies	Notes
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	180	6	
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy	180	2	
Broad Green	North	Harris Invictus Academy Croydon	180	2	
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	236	1	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	180	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School			
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	110	28	PAN reduced from 180 to 110
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	180	77	
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	224	1	
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	180	8	
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	180	0	
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	120	0	
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	150	80	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	190	0	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	328	0	
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	180	21	
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	145	6	PAN reduced from 180 to 145, however, the school's capacity is 240 per year group.
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	150	0	

Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	180	65	
South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School	180	0	
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	350	16	PAN reduced from 390 to 350
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	200	56	School's capacity is 270 per year group.
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	180	129	
Borough Wide			4183	498	

Year 8

Ward	Planning Area	School	Admission no.	Vacancies	Notes
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	180	0	
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy			
Broad Green	North	Harris Invinctus Academy Croydon	180	0	
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	236	5	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	180	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School	120	84	
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	110	0	Reduced from 180 to 110
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	180	40	
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	224	0	
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	180	0	
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	180	0	
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	120	0	
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	150	31	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	190	0	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	328	0	
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	180	3	
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	145	7	Reduced from 180 to 145 however, school's capacity is 240 per year group.
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	150	0	
Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	180	0	

South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School	180	0	
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	350	2	Reduced from 390 to 350
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	200	32	School's capacity is 270 per year group.
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	180	102	
Borough Wide			4123	306	

Year 9

Ward	Planning Area	School	Admission no.	Vacancies	Notes
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	180	2	
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy			
Broad Green	North	Harris Invictus Academy Croydon	180	0	
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	216	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	180	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School	120	75	
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	110	0	Reduced from 180 to 110
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	180	51	
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	224	4	
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	180	7	
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	180	0	
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	120	1	
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	150	49	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	190	0	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	328	0	
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	150	0	Reduced from 180 to 150
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	145	22	Reduced from 180 to 145, however, school's capacity is 240 per year group.
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	150	0	
Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	180	6	

South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School	180	0	
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	350	21	Reduced from 390 to 350
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	200	84	School's capacity is 270 per year group.
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	180	63	
Borough Wide			4073	385	

Year 10

Ward	Planning Area	School	Admission no.	Vacancies	Notes
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	180	6	
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy			
Broad Green	North	Harris Invinctus Academy Croydon	180	18	
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	216	3	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	180	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School	120	78	
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	110	0	Reduced from 180 to 110
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	135	2	Reduced from 180 to 135
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	196	5	
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	180	27	
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	180	0	
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	120	1	
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	150	2	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	190	0	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	328	3	
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	120	0	Reduced from 180 to 120
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	145	15	Reduced from 180 to 145, however, school's capacity is 240 per year group.
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	150	0	
Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	180	0	

South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School			
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	350	22	Reduced from 390 to 350
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	200	114	School's capacity is 270 per year group.
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	180	50	
Borough Wide			3790	346	

Year 11

Ward	Planning Area	School	Admission no.	Vacancies	Notes
Addiscombe East	North	Oasis Academy Shirley Park (secondary phase)	180	3	
Addiscombe West	North	Ark Blake Academy			
Broad Green	North	Harris Invictus Academy Croydon	180	48	
Coulsdon Town	South	Woodcote High School	210	6	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Harris City Academy Crystal Palace	180	0	
Crystal Palace & Upper Norwood	North	Virgo Fidelis Convent Senior School	120	26	
Fairfield	North	St Mary's Catholic High School	110	0	Reduced from 180 to 110
New Addington South	South	Meridian High School	104	0	Reduced from 180 to 104.
Norbury Park	North	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College	224	16	
Norbury Park	North	St Joseph's College	180	12	
Old Coulsdon	South	Oasis Academy Coulsdon	180	2	
Park Hill & Whitgift	North	Archbishop Tenison's CE High School	120	2	
Purley & Woodcote	South	Thomas More Catholic School	150	6	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Harris Academy Purley	190	14	
Purley Oaks & Riddlesdown	South	Riddlesdown Collegiate	328	5	
Selsdon and Addington Village	South	The Quest Academy	120	0	Reduced from 180 to 120
Shirley North	North	Orchard Park High School	145	1	Reduced from 180 to 145, however, school's capacity is 240 per year group.
Shirley South	North	Coloma Convent Girls School	150	0	
Shirley South	North	Shirley High School Performing Arts College	180	3	

South Croydon	South	Coombe Wood School			
South Norwood	North	Harris Academy South Norwood	390	15	
West Thornton	North	The Archbishop Lanfranc Academy	200	100	School's capacity is 270 per year group.
Woodside	North	Oasis Academy Arena	180	59	
Borough Wide			3821	318	

Early Years Working Party– 25.5.21

Virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams

10.00 a.m. to 12.00 p.m.

Attendees:		
Theresa Staunton (TS) Chair	PVI representative on Schools Forum	√
Gill Bates (GB)	Best Start EY Market & Sufficiency Manager	√
Denise Bushey (DB)	Schools Places & Admissions Head of Service	X
Roger Capham (RC)	Director PACE Academy Trust	X
Paula Carter (PC)	Gingerbread Corner	X
Jane Charman (JC)	Head Teacher, Park Hill Infants	√
Shelley Davies (SD)	Director of Education	√
Orlagh Guamori (OG)	Local Authority Finance Manager	√
Asim Saleem (AS)	Local Authority Accountant	X
Polly Jones (PJ)	Head of Purley Nursery	√
Chris Marchant (CM)	Goslings Pre-School	X
Linda O'Callaghan (LOC)	St Mary's Infant School	√
Yetty Osonaike (YO)	Alpha Day Nursery	√
Jaqi Stevenson (JS)	Executive HT, Federation of Crosfield & Selhurst Nursery Schools & Children's Centres	√
G. Truss	Note Taker	

	Agenda Items	
--	---------------------	--

Please note: the recording of this meeting was deleted once transcription was completed

1	Apologies and welcome	TS
	The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies had been received from DB, RC, PC, AS, CM	
2	Minutes and actions	TS
	The minutes of the 23.3.21 meeting were agreed. Update on actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and detailed breakdown on 5% top slice still awaited – in today's finance update • The Best Start Early Learning Collaboration (BSELC). At the request of Chair a paper to be brought to next meeting detailing the Early Years support offer for 21/22 including what 	

	<p>service is being provided along with a full costing – on today's agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) – ongoing as CM absent • The Chair requested that an enquiry be made as to Finance as to why no one else from Finance attended this meeting or organised an updated paper for this meeting – Finance advised this has been addressed • Paper for Schools Forum detailing 21/22 rates and decision on distribution of MNS supplement – in today's finance update • Feedback to Finance the inadequacies of accessing of Funding Sheets - resolved 	
3	Covid 19/Funding update	SD
	<p>SD informed meeting that Croydon has gone through a long period where positive cases have been low however there have been a few new cases in some schools with some surge testing in one primary school. The LA are working with them to reduce bubble sizes – it is a 'bit of watch this space' at the moment.</p> <p>JC: said her school have had a few cases in last 2 weeks. They are attempting to bubble classes which is challenging but all is under control.</p> <p>The Holiday Activity Food (HAF) funding has been received from the government. The LBC are asking schools and external providers to put in applications to get grants as there is a commissioning process for this fund. The main focus is food and holiday provision. Croydon had excellent providers for the Easter programme and it is hoped they will return.</p> <p>ACTION: SD to clarify if HAF funding provision is open to Early Years FSM (Free School Meals i.e. funded 2YOs and EYPP 3YOs) and will inform Chair.</p>	
4	Finance update	OG
	<p>Early Years Budget – maintained nursery schools supplementary funding 2021/2022</p> <p>The purpose of this paper is to inform and confirm that agreement has been reached re distribution of funding.</p> <p>The paper was presented to Schools Forum where there was agreement on the methodology for its distribution which was per pupil numbers as per the census data, Table 1 column 3 illustrates.</p> <p>The initial allocation for maintained nursery schools budget is £536,405 However this figure is expected to reduce by 20% once the final allocation is announced as the actual pupil numbers across settings have fallen.</p> <p>It will be paid out in 3 tranches, first instalment will be paid in June based on the indicative amount and a final adjustments will be made using the last payment.</p> <p>Q1: JS asked if it was known when the final figure will come from the DfE?</p>	

A1: OG said they await the update from the DfE
GB said normally it would be July but this year there are termly census reports with figures being recalculated on a mid-point, summer figures were submitted last week. It is thought the DfE will make a final decision in November.

Q2: JS asked is there any risk that nurseries will end up with a 'claw back' from the first 2 payments for the 3rd payment.

A2: GB said it depends on numbers, numbers are down by 20-25% but payment is for a third so there should not be any claw back.

Q3: JS said you indicated we would submit the summer census figures. DfE would recalculate to a mid-point?

A3: GB said yes, DfE are monitoring closely and will use an average of spring and summer for their calculations.

Q4: JS asked is the expectation of the DfE that maintained nursery school funding will be calculated at the end of the year to go back to the 3 census points within that year and then determine how much that is or make a figure and then revise it, she was puzzled as to how it will work in practice!

A4: GB said she did not know but would ask.

TS said if everyone bases their figures on a 20% they will not be adversely impacted, figures are guaranteed at 85% of January 20 census.

Early Years Budget 5% Top Slice Outturn 2020-21

In 2021 the Early Years budget allocation to fund essentially retained services. In 2020-21 of £1,232,455 with a committed spend of £1,016,610 in 2020/21. Table 1 illustrates the breakdown of the essential budget and outlines the spend categories.

Q1: GB queried the line in Table 2. The 2 year tracker has been paid.

A1: OG said she will look at this but suspect it has been swallowed into another budget line. We will look for this.

ACTION: Track down payment of £4,200

Some highlights of the paper are the Best Start contract which has been terminated notice issued in 2021 and this will move into an in-house service.

The Work Force development is the upskilling of teams and the dissemination of the training out to providers and provision of training materials to the providers.

SEN Support Recharges which is a recharge made from High Needs for the 3 key worker posts.

There was an initial budget for further training but this was for smaller amount and was swallowed up into miscellaneous expenses, this will show an underspend in this budget.

Educational Psychologist. This service is .8 of time, provided through Octavo to support specialist admissions process for early years and the placements.

Nursery schools termly reviews by Octavo were unused because of Covid.

There was a small amount of reserves brought forward which when combined with the 20/21 underspend creates a ring fenced reserve of £470,712

The Early Years strategy is under development and this funding will be used to support the strategy.

It is noted that the future funding may be reduced by as much as 20% so the reserves may be needed to cover any services funded by the topslice.

TS said she had some concerns:-

- There was a lot of underspend - is this related to Covid?
- The Octavo contract - should this be in the 5%?
- Education Psychologists support the settings, this obviously did not have happen due to Covid but will we be able to access this support going forward?
- Workforce development training I thought this was done around the SEN team – is this a budget line which will no longer move forward?

Q2: JS asked if the additional BSELC payment will this be clarified (coding error) before the paper goes to Schools Forum.

A2: OG said this paper will not go to Schools Forum, it is only for the Early Years working group. This is the year end spend of 2020/21 and it will not be brought back. The next paper will be the 2021/22.

Q3: TS asked if the 20% drop being anticipated for this year – is the plan that the budget will deliver for this.

A3: OG said we would expect pupil numbers to increase. The strategy will have to provide an expenditure which is within its means.

TS: said Denise Bushay presented a paper to Schools Forum indicating we have significant declining numbers of pupils for primary school places. I think it might be worth bring this paper to the next Early Years Meeting, particularly sections on Reception classes and birth rate.

TS: thanked Finance for bringing the paper as it gives a lot of insight.

ACTION: Paper presented to Schools Forum by Denise Bushay to be brought to next meeting.

High Needs Budget – Early Years Funding 2020/2021 (paper to be circulated as first seen today)

This paper sets out the allocation from the High Needs budget to Early Years, for 2020/21 I was £965,820 Table 1 illustrates the break down. Appendix 1 shows a full breakdown of spend and this paper is a summary. Please note Pam Sokhi's paper (previously presented to this working group) has been used as a reference point, but she has not had sight of this paper - finance have inserted figures.

ACTION: circulate High Needs Budget-Early Years Funding 20/21 paper

Q4: GB asked about St Giles and 20 places as she thought they had only been commissioned for 12?

A4: OG said she would ask Pam Sokhi and added this paper is a financial report for 2020/21. Specialist provision was originally provided by Crosfield but transferred to St Giles from September.

JS said her understanding was that the numbers did not change but she was not privy to the commissioning arrangements of St Giles. Our contract terminated on 31 August 2020 and our staff moved over to St Giles staff team on 31 August but she had no knowledge of the contract arrangements.

TS said she thought there is a paper claiming the commissioned places for St Giles was at 12 but it was good to see some figures. Looking at the support for individual placements, we have seen a drop this year due to the pandemic, we were late in getting some children to panel. Our overall budget figure £1.1M for High Needs 0-5?

OG originally within the High Needs budget, £1.01M was allocated to EY and £965.820 has been spent.

TS: was there a budget increase for 2020/21? What is the record of placement figures?

GB: said £271,280 was spent in 20/21 which is a drop from the previous year's figure of £394,135

TS: This is good to have a comparison as we go forward to the Early Years Review. These figures are needed to see the financial support going into the sector. The number of children who are looking for specialist places this year has dramatically increased therefore Early Years may need a bigger slice of the High Needs budget to support them.

SD asked if any of the settings had feedback on the impact of the lockdown, intelligence from the sector would be useful.

TS: there were questions around gaps but not enough data. Personally her setting had been open throughout Covid. Some providers say the children have been quieter. She felt that we had lost out on SEN support and that the Early Years offer seems to be missing.

SD: The SENCO Forum has happened, are members invited to attend the Schools SENCO meetings? If this is a gap this should be investigated.

TS: Early Years have not had a forum since March 2019 and there have been a lot of changes Covid-19 aside e.g. new panels, SEND locality working

PJ: My school has not been invited to School SENCO forums before and would welcome it.

	<p>GB: Schools have a legal requirement to have a SENCO but not the PVI – therefore all providers need to be considered when support is being offered to ensure parity across the sector.</p> <p>ACTION: Nursery School SENCOs to be invited to School SENCO forum.</p> <p>JS: could nursery SENCOs act as a conduit between schools and the PVI?</p> <p>SD gave her apologies and left meeting.</p> <p>YO: said the needs of the PVI sector in terms of SENCO provision has been missed. From the provider point of view she has noticed that 2 and 3 year olds are coming to nursery and displaying anxiety and difficulties with personal and social development which she is putting down to Covid 19. They are also seeing children with special needs and believes SENCO forums for PVIs are necessary but are also different from schools.</p> <p>JS said a portage worker disclosed to her that they have not actually seen children face to face for a year and new children are coming in without a face to face assessments.</p>	
5	<p>Maintained Nursery School update</p>	DB
	<p>Croydon Council Education Directorate in Partnership with Early Help & Children's Social Care, Children, Families & Education Dept., Public Health, Health, Wellbeing & Adult Dept., Early Years & Children Strategy 2021-2024.</p> <p>This paper was previously circulated and the chair has requested comments from this working party.</p> <p>TS: We acknowledge that Denise has worked really hard to pull this together but that Early Years in terms of providers did not come out positive – the paper discussed gaps but there is not enough data to validate them. The crossover between health and education is vague. The paper is not specifically about Croydon but very general. Previously BSELC circulated factual information about the gap between free school meals as part of their termly monitoring. SEN is one of the biggest priorities which need addressing and according to Kathy Roberts, Denise Bushay is leading on SEN for Early Years. In September the statutory guidance changes and we have no Early Years offer. This is not a conclusive document which we can work with. We need to have an effective Early Years model which is financially supported to deliver services to Early Years, therefore we need to know what Croydon's long term strategy plan is. The 2YO Review has been in place for some time but there is no overall conclusion of what we want to deliver, or how well we are doing.</p>	

	<p>JS: I agree this paper does not recognise a lot of the strengths Early Years have. Re Key Priority 2 (SEND) it is not that the sector are unwilling it is the lack of support to enable the sector to do their job. Maintained nursery schools are conspicuous by their absence. Croydon have retained maintained nursery schools which is fantastic as they are a very valuable source but they are not even mentioned. SEN support is both a priority and a key need which if effective would support the other issues by default. There is no reference in the paper to the Revised EYFS which is changing in September 2021.</p> <p>GB: this document does not detail what Croydon's plan is going forward. There are multiple strands involved and if we try to accommodate and listen to everyone we will not achieve anything. Early Years should put together a plan for Early Years and bring it here for feedback to see if it addresses the needs. Then other strands could be fed in, we are only in control of the Early Years, this paper does not propose anything or offer direction, it is light on practicalities as the action plan is still to be developed. If we look at OFSTED grades the sector is doing well. However this could be misleading but when the curriculum changes we may see different results and the quality may fall. Denise has asked for feedback.</p> <p>JC: After reading the document she did not understand what the strategy was, the key priorities are not clear. Everything is very general; how are we going to narrow it down and discuss specifics? The paper gave no indication on how to move forward.</p> <p>LOC: her school has not noticed a great deal of difference with new Early Years children, the gaps in attainment are further up in the school. She felt there is too much in the paper – no clarity or way forward. Is the gap learning or financial?</p> <p>YO: the document is too general – there should be a section or break down as to how these points will be achieved, if not this document will not be effective. There should be continuity – how will it be achieved and who will work with us.</p> <p>ACTION: EY strategy to be updated accordingly</p>	
6	<p>Sufficiency update</p>	GB
	<p>Paper circulated previously.</p> <p>The Early Years Working Group are asked to A: Agree the distribution method for the 2020/21 Deprivation underspend B: Consider how best to use the 2020/21 DAF underspend.</p> <p>A: The working party discussed the three options in the paper and agreed on Option 3 - sharing the monies based on children attending all providers including childminders. The per child cost is £6.16, the total spend will be slightly under at £114,736.20</p>	

B: GB said the DAF sits within Early Years and a detailed and simple case/strategy on how to allocate the £91,020 underspend is required. SEN may claim they want the £91K and there is a fear that due to LBCs financial difficulties this money may be absorbed into a 'sharing of budgets' and will become lost in High Needs. The 19/20 underspend was only allocated in March and we need to move faster as otherwise settings are receiving funding after the child has left.

TS: Financially the Early Years High Needs budget was underspent last year. Much of the 5% top slice already goes towards SEN. TS sits on the High Needs working group with JS. The High Needs support a project/scheme called The Locality Clusters lead by Mark Southworth (Consultant Lead on Locality Inclusion Project). Would there be an opportunity to approach them, would this be effective? There would have to be governance as to how the money is distributed. This could be on a one year trial. One thought is the current clusters are small and that they may become less effective as they become larger. We want support for our SENCO which can then support the children in the places.

JS: informed the meeting that the Locality Cluster scheme is being rolled out across the borough putting schools into groups to work together to support children with additional needs within that group – with shared knowledge and a block of funding. When the consultant lead challenged and asked whether Early Years could be included she was informed this would be part of the Early Years Review and as we now know, this has not been mentioned in the report! The project is having a strong impact with benefits for greater collaboration and expertise in supporting schools. She felt we should put our energy into getting involved in the Locality Cluster project.

However the amount of money is not large when split into localities and although it would be good to mirror High Needs in terms of improving collaboration, she felt the simplest and most straight forward process would be to do what we did last year – and divide it out.

LOC: said she was worried that anything that goes to High Needs disappears. The effectiveness of the cluster groups has not really been had a long enough trial. Could this fund be divided up into amounts to schools like last year?

TS: what does the upcoming Croydon SEN audit look like? Does the audit look at the financial side? We have to show there is an effective use of the money. Could more information be brought to the July meeting about the audit?

OG: the Audit will look at the provision and look within that as to how it is funded, pupil numbers, and its effectiveness.

GB: Is it possible to commission training that all of the Early Years sector could attend?

	<p>TS: is there currently an officer at LBC who could come to a meeting to discuss how people/children can access the DLA and provide general information on how to access DLA.</p> <p>GB: CM has a straightforward table that details SEN payments and costs which could be used to evidence any DAF underspend.</p> <p>TS: this is a really good idea and would meet the requirement to evidence how the funding was used to support the children.</p> <p>TS: the 5% top slice, presumably someone will put forward a planned expenditure along with the impact on Early Years – we want to know what we are getting.</p> <p>OG: it comes from Early Years block – DSG funding and the LA must use it within the boundaries of the guidance. There would not be a need for the LA to come back and seek this group's permission on how they use it as long as it is within the boundaries but we need to continue to report on how centrally retained funds are spent.</p>	
8	Any other business	All

Meeting finished at 11.58am: Next meeting 6 July 2021

AGREED ACTIONS		
Agenda 2	Feedback from All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG)	CM
Agenda 3	Clarification on whether EY pupils are included in HAF scheme	SD
Agenda 4	Clarify how the final figure for the MNS supplement is to be calculated	GB
	Track down payment of online 2YO service provided by SDA	OG
	Pertinent extracts from DB's falling school roll paper to be brought to EYWG	DB
	Circulate High Needs paper	GB
	Confirm the number of specialist places at St Giles	OG
	What is the Early Years High Needs allocation for 21/22?	OG
	MNS SENCOs to be invited to School SENCO forum	SD
Agenda 5	Early Years Strategy to be updated	DB
Agenda 6	Details of what the SEN audit will review.	GB
	Additional information around DAF	GB
	Circulate CM's SEN template	GB

Schools Forum
High Needs Working Group
Minutes

Date Wednesday 19 May 2021

Time: 1.30pm - 3.30pm

Venue: via ZOOM Meeting

The Meeting was recorded and deleted once transcribed

Meeting started 1.30pm – 2.44pm

Invited:

Kathy Roberts	(KR)	Head of 0-25 SEN Service & Delivery
Orlagh Guarnori	(OG)	Finance Manger
Jenny Adamson	(JA)	Saffron Valley Collegiate Head Teacher
Jonathan Driscoll	(JD)	SEN Data Manager
Bridget Hamer	(BC)	SEN Finance Manager
Judith Lunnon	(JL)	Improvement & Development Advisor
Theresa Staunton	(TS)	Early Years
Lorraine Slee	(LS)	Red Gates Head Teacher
Marian Hampton	(MH)	Improvement Advisor – Schools SEND Support
Mark Southworth	(MS)	Consultant Lead, Locality Inclusion Project
Roger Capham	(RC)	PACE Academy Trust

Apologies:

Jolyon Roberts, Chair of Schools Forum

David Cooper, SEN Business Relations Manager for SEN at LB Croydon

Helene Greenidge, John Ruskin College

Sarah Bailey, Virtual School Head teacher for Look after Children

Jaqi Stephenson, Head of Selhurst Nursery & Children's Centre

Charles Quayle, Accountant

Chair:

Nick Dry (ND) HT St Nicholas School

Vice Chair:

Rob Veale (RV) HT Attwood Primary

Note Taker:

Bev High, Senior Admin Officer

Heather Beck, Senior Admin Officer

Agenda Item	Title	Lead
1:	Welcome and Introductions	Chair
	The Chair welcomed everyone and asked for introductions.	Nick Dry
2.	Changes to membership	Chair
	ND advised the group, as he mentioned at the last meeting he is going to finish working in Croydon on 31 st August 2021 and consideration needs to be given to who will be taking over the group. It usually the Vice Chair (VC) who takes over the position of Chair. RV is	Nick Dry

	<p>the (VC) and ND has already spoken to the Schools Forum about this and they are happy if there are no objections that RV becomes the Chair of the High Needs Group.</p> <p>The intention is that RV continues as (VC) at the next meeting in June and takes over as Chair at the meeting in September.</p> <p>ND confirmed that there were no objections from the members and congratulated RV. RV thanked the members and said he wanted to say a huge thank you to ND for all that he has done as Chair and advocate for so many of the children in Croydon over the years.</p> <p>ND said he wanted to discuss who will take over as (VC). He wanted to nominate LS. LS was not at the meeting at the moment but was expected to arrive later. ND asked whether anyone else would like to nominate themselves. No one else was nominated.</p> <p>Q: ND when LS arrives are they happy to agree to her as (VC) if she accepts? A: The members agreed to this</p> <p>LS joined the meeting at 10:55.</p> <p>ND advised LS in her absence that RV is going to be taking over the role of Chair of this group; and she had been nominated to take over the role of (VC) if she was willing to accept the role.</p> <p>LS: Said she was flattered to be nominated. She confirmed that she was happy to take on the role, although she said she was not quite sure what it entailed. ND advised that it would be supporting RV. Also to attend the Pre-meet as it is felt it was important that both mainstream and special schools were represented within the chairing of the group. LS will be part of the Schools Forum as well and deputise in RV's absence.</p>	
3:	Minutes of the last meeting held on 3 March 2021 Update on actions.	Chair
	<p>NR said there would be an update on Annual Reviews (Item 9) today</p> <p>ND said item in the High Needs Budget Special Needs Funding Mechanisms would be clarified further today. Item 8.</p> <p>ND asked about Early Years. KR said this was being discussed today and there will be further work undertaken by Shelley Davies who said that she is calling a Strategic Review Meeting around this subject, which will be looking in more detail at the design and the funding model to support it.</p> <p>Q1: ND asked if there was any updates on this.</p>	Nick Dry

A1: KR: Work has begun on a complete review of the Early Years strategy. Denise Bushay is leading on this looking across the whole of Early Years. At the moment it is very segregated. The intent is to have an overarching Early Years Croydon document, which everyone would sign up to and take forward.

KR said the spelling of Davis was incorrect and should be Davies on the minutes.

Q2: ND asked if this will then cover the whole of the Early Years, including SEN High Needs element.

A2: KR said it was going to be a comprehensive, strategic document. Denise Bushay is working on this at moment, pulling together the information to put forward as a first draft.

Item 7: LSS Phased Expansion Proposal 2021

ND: The learning support, the Inclusion project has now been approved by Schools Forum. He asked MS if he was happy with the outcome as this gave him the means to take it forward in the localities.

MS: said it has gone really well. Launch meetings for all of the new Heads was really well attended. 2-3 schools could not make it but separate meetings were arranged for them. It is all ready to go forwards now.

ND: It is good you now have transparency and are able to clarify where it is going.

MS: There are a couple of little issues. In the longer term they need to be aware about how it is funded.

When it was originally funded, the calculations were done by David (Cooper), it was all about new EHCPs. As we get into the second year; schools that were in the pilot, are now in their second year. Those schools now have students that will be rolling over, they were supported in the first year and will also need supporting in the second year; as well as the new students coming on board. It should just be a question of adjusting the budgets from both sides, as there should be less demand for the second year for the general EHCP.

There needs to be a conversation around this and some modelling around it. Also there is a small issue about students coming in with EHCPs from other authorities and how this is dealt with. This can be discussed and some protocols can be put in place. No other issues apart from these and everything else is going fine.

ND Asked MS to let the group know if he wanted to bring future updates.

MS said he may need to do this later on, perhaps in the new academic year.

Item: 8 Data Dashboard

ND: said this was talked about at the last meeting and what its purpose was and how it was put together. It is

	<p>on the agenda when we can discuss it in more detail and can 'drill' down a bit more. Hopefully some people will have used it. As a group we need to decide what data we might need to inform decisions, around the authority's High Needs spending. It is an extremely useful piece of work, which hopefully will evolve in the future.</p> <p>Item: 10 DofE Consultation on Revised High Needs National Formula</p> <p>Q1: ND: asked OG whether there had been any updates from the DofE following the consultation about what they are going to do? A1: OG; no update from them yet. An update was expected yesterday after the consultation, but so far nothing yet.</p> <p>The minutes were agreed.</p>	
4:	Annual Reviews – Addressing timescales (Agenda item not heard at last meeting)	
	<p>ND: informed meeting that this does relate to something highlighted on JD's dashboard which was around the timescales for Annual Reviews and various issues beneath that. KR has been looking into this. KR: this is one of the 'red flags' for us in terms of SEN performance across the borough and we must make sure we target the annual review processes that are required.</p> <p>The current position has been gathered from the data, which has been brilliant. Previously we did not have a handle on the size of the challenge. At the moment we are chasing down 1,075 sets of information, which has not been received from providers, but at the same time the data shows that we have over 1,600 sets of information that have come in, between September 2019 and April 2021 that have not been processed at our end either. This is the size of the challenge facing us.</p> <p>There is currently an advertisement for 3 additional targeted Annual Review Educational Health Co-Ordinators who will form part of a team to tackle this, not going back to September 2019, but certainly the last and this academic year. The co-ordinators will tackle the annual review systems and make sure there is the additional resource to roll this out. It is also a priority task going forward for the co-ordinators that are in situ. The councillors have agreed through the 'growth fund' to provide us with an additional 6 Educational Healthcare Plan Co-Ordinators. Whether they will be used to release the current Co-Ordinators to target the annual</p>	Jonathan Driscoll

	<p>reviews so there is a real sweep, will be looked at and a decision made later.</p> <p>The ambition is within 6 months the backlog will have been cleared and we will be up to date with the coming cycle of annual reviews.</p> <p>There is investment through the 'growth fund' and approval for the Co-Ordinators. A large volume of applications have been received for these posts.</p> <p>We are confident these can be filled quite quickly and we can get started. The original plan was for this to be managed through Ronny Burfield (SEND 0-12 Manager), as part of the SEN transformation drive.</p> <p>However, upon reflection it was felt it would sit better within the team. The team can then reallocate the priorities going forward.</p> <p>KR said she is keen to put a process in place where there were set dates, set meetings and certainly from a special school perspective it would be good to have those meeting set up regularly, so we can engage and make sure we are carrying out all of the annual reviews in Croydon's specials schools in a planned, supportive and timely way.</p> <p>KR added they were also in discussion with MS and other services to bring in that locality approach, so they can pick up the intelligence as well, such as if there are key schools that are struggling with this or key schools that are excellent at this. It is about identifying and targeting the work within those areas too.</p> <p>ND said it was not just about the work of the SEN Department. It was also around the timescales being met by schools.</p> <p>KR said she absolutely agreed they are trying to focus on which schools and where to target Croydon's efforts.</p>	
5:	Update on development of AVA (Addington Valley Academy)	Kathy Roberts
	<p>KR said the plan is for 80 places for September 2021. Those places are from reception up to KS3. With class formations of up to 7 pupils per class space, but with some flexibility around that.</p> <p>To confirm ASD/SLD are the profiles of the children we are seeking to place. 1 of the 80 places has been given to an out of borough child from Merton. The other 79 have been identified and 69 have been confirmed. The remaining 10 places are currently being negotiated.</p> <p>Post 16 is part of their plan – as part of their phased plan up to full capacity of 150.</p> <p>September 2021 it is 80 September 2022 it is 120 September 2023 it is 150</p> <p>To confirm that this will all be Croydon placed pupils. This is being made clear. There was a pressure at Post 16 involving 7 students. 1 of which was resolved by</p>	

continuing on with their current placement. There was 6 left outstanding. We were able to negotiate with AVA and the Orchard Hill Academy Trust (OCAT) which they are part of, to provide us with 6 places under the OCAT umbrella rather than AVA's. So OCAT staff will be delivering the courses for these 6 students on the new AVA site. This was a good partnership solution focused result. It is good in terms of our financial commitment to getting those children's needs met and prevented again a lot of out of borough placements.

Adding to that there has been 2 tribunals which would have led to very high costs for Croydon if the tribunal had favoured the parental choice of placement; but we came in very strongly and AVA was part of the partnership team and we were successful on both cases. The tribunals recognised that Croydon has established a quality provision. This is a really positive outcome.

The building is on track to open from 14th September 2021. The planning is in place for the move and it is underway.

There were a further 24 young people who do not have places at this point. This relates to placement pressure. There is a lot of interest from other boroughs. KR has been asked to meet with 2 on Friday 21st May. Other boroughs want to know how to secure places at AVA, but it has been confirmed that these are Croydon places.

Q1: ND; Do we have an agreement with them for a top up at AVA? What happens if they have higher offers made to place children from other boroughs? Do we have any agreement that our places take priority?

A1: KR; We are looking at what can be done. It is a bit like having a memorandum of understanding. The places are commissioned for Croydon children.

The same happens at Beckmead to a certain degree. KR was approached a while ago by Beckmead to ask if one of our places could be released as it was vacant, for an out of borough placement. KR declined this request. Out of borough schools could not do anything about this as Croydon has this commissioning agreement in place. It will be a similar relationship with AVA.

ND said that it does seem that academies are able to make admissions in a different way.

KR said AVA has a document from the DFE/EFSA that states the maximum size of the school and what we are commissioning, which is that all of the 150 places are for Croydon pupils. It states that should they want to go above numbers, they have to go to the Secretary of State to get approval for that. So if they wanted to go to 150 for Croydon and trade 30 places, they would have to get the Secretary of State's approval to grow by those places. It would still come through Croydon, so when we submitted places to the EFSA, we would submit our

	<p>places plus the 30. So it would be the EFSA would give them their place funding. There are some controls in place.</p> <p>OG said there have been discussions with the EFSA about this to ensure this is factually correct, that the commissioned places are their overall funded places. So that it is clear. This is so they are not trying to come back for additional funds when their import/exports come through.</p> <p>Q1: MS asked was AVA a free school?</p> <p>A1: ND said it was set up on the basis of being a free school, obviously it went through the DofE process to become a free school.</p> <p>Q2: MS asked if the LA started this.</p> <p>A2: ND said No, in order to build a new school it was necessary to go to the DofE and it had to be a free school or an academy.</p> <p>MS: said there is a process where LA's cannot build a free school or run a free school, but they can set up a competition.</p> <p>ND: There was a competition and Orchard Hill Academy Trust, who eventually won, who were up against The Beckmead Academy Trust.</p> <p>MS: said his point was as it is hugely oversubscribed was it worth going through that process again?</p> <p>KR: There was a limited offer by the DofE approximately around 5 years ago. They would invest in 12 new free schools and special school development. Boroughs and authorities had to 'bid-in' into this as part of the process and Croydon was one of the successful bidders.</p> <p>This was part of the initial process and the next was looking at the data, looking at what we needed to provide in Croydon and where the gaps were. What the provision needed to be and then going out to the market place.</p> <p>MS: said it is always worth keeping an eye on the EFSA's website to see if these type of opportunities come up again.</p>	
6.	Demand for specialist places in Croydon	
	<p>ND: This leads into Admissions so can KR tell us what this is like for her side? Admissions have grown this year quite significantly and it is worth bearing in mind even with the additional capacity created by AVA also St Nicholas' School who have opened up another 2 classes, providing 20 places. There is a paper going to Schools Forum stating across Croydon, pupil numbers are generally dropping quite significantly because of the fall in the birth rate. Although, there has been a drop in numbers we are still facing massive demand for specialist places. This puts pressure on the High Needs Budget continually.</p>	Kathy Roberts

KR: This is a fair summary. We have the growth and the development of our internal provision, so we can meet our need. This will eventually deliver savings within this High Needs deficit.

We have increased St Nicholas' by 20 but in the growth plan we could go up to 30. Bensham Manor has been increased by a small number of 7. There has also been an increase in placements across Croydon's ELPs as well. Around 2 ELPs have increased by up to 5 places. Croydon's Sensory ELP is being relocated for various reasons and the numbers there are increasing to 10. There has been pressure at the Early Year Reception end. It has been a strange year due to Covid as a lot of them are unknown in the system. This needs to be looked at as there is a real pressure there. As KR said she has 24 children with SEN that she is currently trying to negotiate places for, potentially these may have to go out of borough. We are aware, even with our level of investment, we will face challenges to secure as many places as needed.

In parallel we have the early intervention and preventative work going on. This has to be a 'whole' strategy, such as the work MS and his service are doing, which is meeting needs as early as possible, so they do not become more complex. Then making sure this works through the whole system.

In the partnership meeting yesterday the Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JNSA) was used to understand the population in Croydon. If the opportunity to create further provisions arises, we will be aware exactly what the nature of provision is required.

ND: The moment you open new specialist provisions it is filled up. It will open in September full.

Q1: NR; Given there will be 'space' in accommodation in the mainstream sector due to the drop in numbers, would it be better to look at more ELPs?

A1: KR; said possibly, we could certainly look at this. There are groups looking at the education estate and the best use of this. It is something we could consider.

LS: said Redgates is full up. Originally the plan was that we would go from a 3 form entry back down to a 2 form entry. This will not go ahead now due to what is happening.

Q1: ND asked MS if he was getting a feeling for children through the project who will be looking for special provision places eventually.

A1: MS said Yes, all of the time. They have tried to cut down on the EHCPs. The reason SENCOs and parents want EHCPs is not for support from us, as they know they can get that anyway, but they feel they need specialist education which is more than they will be offered in mainstream. If there was more specialist provision it could be filled very easily.

ND: The other concern is where there is additional demand for places it is from children coming up from early years into reception. This has been a strange year and many of those children have probably not had the 'start' in education because of Covid, which meant they could not achieve places in mainstream to begin with. The numbers are quite staggering compared to previous years. The numbers overall are well over 100 children who need specialist provision but they will not all be able to have specialist provision. Maybe this is something the LA needs to look at how early years support is given to different sorts of providers and parents. Maybe there should not be an expectation set that these children will go to specialist placements. This expectation needs to be managed.

KR: said that this is part of the Early Years strategy work that is going to be undertaken.

ND: said there is another element to be looked at which is how we can move children in specialist schools back into mainstream. There will be bureaucratic hoops to go through and there will be a lot of parental resistance to this. Sometimes the 'wrong' children go back, but not many go back at all. Can there be something that can be put in place, maybe a project about reintegration back into school? Where it has been done it has been successful. It will be difficult to convince parents if their child has a space in a special school like St Nicholas'.

TS: The early years is important, as we really need that investment in having that strategy, because it is not clear and support is really needed in identifying children. It has been a massive year, I have many more children in my setting this year, which will be going on into reception next year. There has been an increase of needs coming into the nurseries. KR knows I am very keen for a strategy in this area.

KR: Denise Bushay is leading on the development of the Early Years strategy, which is about bringing all of this together and making sure we are providing appropriately across the board as an organisation.

TS: The new Early Years framework is another concern as it does not seem to have addressed anything to do with SEN whatsoever. We will need to know what our 'core offer' is for support as this is a big change which is coming this September.

JL: said she was mindful of some of the work that Peter Gray did for Croydon. It was a sense that Croydon had more special school places than any other borough and it was trying to unpick this and work out where this demand was coming from. It was thought it came from the notion of exceptional and complex needs. It feels in our local population we do have this demand and that the children are complex. These needs are identified early and once there, will stay with them through life. JL

	<p>said she had reflected on this and on her mainstream schools. During the planning for this they were seeing a lot of surplus capacities in mainstream when their projection in a rise of places had not been fulfilled. In view of this JL said she mindful of creating more and more special schools. Should it be analysed to see if this is likely to be short term or longer term trend. Also should we be looking at why we have so many children in Croydon with this level of need early on? Children who are needing that specialist pathway? This should be a reflection on how we can look at demands on placements going forward and what this may look like.</p> <p>ND: Said he had been reading about schools saying how much children's language development has been affected by Covid, which means we will have a cohort of children; because they have not been in any kind of setting they will have not developed the sort of skills they should and this will become a special need when they start school. It is unknown at this point whether this will put more pressure on the system.</p> <p>KR: said it is also the socialisation side as health colleagues are reporting high levels of anxiety in very young children. This is very concerning.</p> <p>JD: As a general point admissions may be decreasing as people are moving away, because people can work from home more easily. This may have an impact on the general population and the SEN as a whole it – may be a trend.</p> <p>ND: Said he could answer this to some extent as he had been speaking to Denise Bushay. She has been looking at the trends of pupil numbers in Croydon. They are most definitely going down, probably for those reasons, but they have been reducing over the last 4-5 years. It has affected mainstream places, but special school places have gone up. This means there is even more of a problem in the proportion of children identified for that provision.</p>	
7.	SEN Data dashboard – discussion on headline changes and trends	Jonathan Driscoll (JD)
	<p>ND: JD dashboard. There is so much data in there. It will be useful as a means to get specific information and particularly if people start using it in their work areas, this will give us an idea of how well it works.</p> <p>As previously discussed, the data shows we still have a steady increase from 2017 of children with EHCPs and it is still increasing.</p> <p>The data shows the increase in special school places, despite the demographic of the population showing the birth rate is decreasing.</p>	

Q1: ND; Is this the most up to date dashboard you have JD?

A1: JD; Yes, this is the latest version

NR: A question has come out of the Schools Forum. This Schools Forum membership is probably made of people who do not have too much in-depth knowledge about what is discussed in the High Needs group. They also report to the councillors and there are questions they have been asking in relation to High Needs.

ND; What is the level of funding for independent non-maintained, per head, compared with maintained Croydon special schools, per head. In order to justify the strategy? It is tricky to work out as the dashboard does not include the funding. There are separate documents that do cover the funding as well. Would it be possible to put some headline funding data in there? We have got the rates, top-up etc. but not these details.

JD: said the Dash Board was being used for the SEND forum, but was aware that the finance section needed to be updated more. It is planned to have more of a finance section in the dashboard, so he will speak OG and colleagues about this, but also have a specific section about this for the High Needs funding group. Currently the dash board was for the general SEN area, but there was much more data which could be used for High Needs. Following discussions with KR, they will try and put something in place for the next High Needs working group meeting in July.

ACTION: JD liaise with OG to produce a summary funding dashboard for High Needs

ND: Said he was happy to talk to JD about the kind of things that need to be in there.

KR: said they had been talking a lot about this and the background. We have already meet with BH and CQ. We definitely need really focused finance data. To be able to answer the questions that have come out from the Schools Forum and this group. We need to have a really detailed breakdown of what we think is being asked for, but also a high level analysis of the breakdown of costs, as well as some simple but comparative costs: - residential, ELPs, mainstream, maintained, special, the independent special, and academies specials so that we can see the way the funding framework would look like around those.

JD: said he has just started to look at more DofE establishments. There are so many ways to classify the information and group it. We need to make sure we have the robust information that is needed and that it marries up to what we need. Some of the information is local, some is published, but it is also how you cut it and use it. There is so much data, but ultimately it needs to be made useful for this group.

	<p>ND: Also making it useful for our other audience in Croydon which is the Cabinet and council. They need this in a highly distilled format.</p> <p>Q1: JD What goes to Schools Forum?</p> <p>A1: ND: A lot of the information is about looking at the Designated Schools Block (DSG). How schools are funded. Value for money. Where there is money being overspent and where money can be saved? However, within High Needs there is relatively little information that goes to Schools Forum. It is left to the group to discuss, although we report to the Schools Forum; knowledge of High Needs funding is limited.</p> <p>JD: So a really clear headline on funding would be best?</p> <p>ND: This should also be related to the strategy. We have also got the Recovery Plan, which has got some key aims. So as long as the data is tied into that. This is what we measure and look at.</p> <p>KR: This data would be very helpful as they have to report regularly to various organisations such as the DoFE and DFSA as they are all monitoring and scrutinising Croydon on those recovery plans.</p>	
8.	<p>High Needs Budget - including relative cost of places in maintained and independent providers, and special and alternative provision funding mechanism</p>	<p>Orlagh Guarnori (OG)</p>
	<p>ND: This last item does not get enough scrutiny on the Schools Forum. This is how special schools are funded. When we go to Schools Forum with mainstream schools budgets, every element of their formula is analysed and if there is any contention around this it is agreed by the Schools Forum. There does not seem to be the same degree of transparency around special schools. There needs to be more transparency and discussion. This will be raised with Jolyon Roberts. The Head of a maintained Special school in Croydon has to make the same funding decisions as the head of a mainstream or academy school.</p> <p>ND: in the past there used to be a funding sheet of special schools which was produced by OG's department. They now receive a letter from the SEN department with the number of commissioned places, then the amount of funding attached to these places, but the ways the schools get their monies is more complicated than the base element and the top-up. There are other elements as well including the teachers' pension etc.</p> <p>Q1: ND; OG can you explain what is happening with the base funding for special schools and how it is going to change?</p> <p>A1: OG: Advised she would also bring KR in on this question.</p>	

KR: We had a meeting with regards to the special schools funding review work that had been undertaken, Moving forward with this using the intelligence gathered we intend to hold some financial workshops around this. We are working on trying to establish 4 bands: A, B, C, and D. With E as an exceptional funding band, with exceptional funding for special schools. The criteria will be very clear for the schools and for the whole system to work to only referring placement of pupils to those settings that meet that criteria. We are looking at the whole system so there is a relationship between the banded funding that goes into mainstream, the funding that goes to our ELPs and the funding that goes into our special schools. The intention is for this to be place for the new financial year, with potentially a transition year in place.

OG: This is how it will be started off. There will be more openness and transparency around the funding, because there will be clear definitions of what the bandings are and how the funding is driven. The payments will continue to be made in the same way as before. So termly for schools in advance, with the funding sheet attached. The funding sheet should be available for all schools to review.

In the terms of special schools it is a letter, because it is a commissioning arrangement in place. This is why the letter comes out from the SEN Team rather than through the schools finance team. The difference is that mainstream schools are funded on the number of pupils with a set amount of funding.

Q1: ND; Can you explain the detail this year, what changes there has been in the banding? He knew Croydon have not adopted the banding from the moderation exercise this year and were keeping to what was done last year, but there has been a change in the level funding for teachers' pensions?

A1: OG; In the High Needs Block they have rolled into High Needs funding teachers' pay and teachers' pension awards going forward. There is the period up until April, so they have given a separate allocation of funding from April 2021 just to allow for that transition period.

Originally it was £660 and was based on per pupil in the special schools settings. The final allocations show a higher amount. This is taken from their latest allocation sheet and will cover the period up until August 2021 and the amount allocated is £725.70 per place commissioned. This will go out to the special schools in the next funding run in June. The schools can get access to Croydon's funding sheets, which are all uploaded onto SharePoint. It will be made as a one-off lump sum.

ND: Action: Asked to commission a paper from OG around the transparency of these payments.

	<p>ND: said that LS will confirm that although the base element and the top-element is fairly clear and agreed with schools. However, different special schools are getting additional amounts of funding for lots of different items. The most basic one is funding for individual needs on top of normal funding through application to the SEN Dept. There are some who are getting funding for special projects such as outreach work. There really is not any transparency over this additional funding.</p> <p>ND: OG you may not know all about this but if a school is getting additional funding there needs to be transparency and fairness as it is all public money. Some of the special schools have had additional funding on top of their top-ups due to financial difficulty. There are lots of individual deals being done and no clear outcome, as this is being done through the SEN Dept. It is very difficult to manage this.</p> <p>KR: Most additional requests are managed through the Education Resource panel. This is where they are reviewed and approved or not. Fiona Robinson (Head of Bensham Manor) sits on this panel, although there is not always good attendance. Any decisions that go through the panel will be part of the paper.</p> <p>NR: The problem is that it is good that the schools know there is that process they can use to apply to potential obtain additional funds, but by the end of the year this adds up to significant funds that some schools can get, while others do not.</p> <p>LS: said she wanted to add her support for what ND has said but it also makes it very difficult for schools to work together. Everyone needs to work as a team and feel each of our students have equal opportunities across the borough regardless of which school they attend. Working together is crucial to building relationships.</p> <p>ND: said it seems there is more transparency around mainstream than special schools. The High Needs budget does not even go to Schools Forum unless it is for a special top-up. There needs to be more of a public document to show how special schools are funded. He said he is sure some deals are done in the mainstream sector as well.</p> <p>KR: said they try to manage this the best way they can as there is a consortium to agree the prices they pay for this. We might need to lay out the protocols and processes for this.</p>	
9:	Any Other Business	
	<p>ND: How many people read The Guardian article about High Needs budgets across the country particularly across the South East. Croydon are by no means the worst. Our neighbours in Surrey and Kent also have high deficits. In Surrey the accumulative High Needs deficit is now 80 million and their annual deficit is</p>	

	<p>running at 35 million. The Government has completely ignored this issue. This stems from moving the 16-25 age range into the code of practice without additional resources.</p> <p>Meeting ended.</p> <p>Next meeting – 23rd June 2021</p>	
--	--	--

NEXT MEETING Wednesday 23 June 2021

AGREED ACTIONS

Agenda item	Action	By Whom
7	JD liaise with OG to produce a summary funding dashboard	JD/OG
8	Commission a paper around the transparency of Special School funding	OG

Schools Block Working Group Minutes of Meeting

Date: Tuesday 11 May 2021
Venue: VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
Time: 10am – 12 noon

Please note the recording of this meeting will be deleted once minutes are processed.

Invited:

Orlagh Guarnori	(OG)	LBC Finance Manager
Soumick Dey	(SD)	Riddlesdown Collegiate
Markie Hayden	(MH)	Norbury Manor Business & Enterprise College
Leonore Fernandes	(LF)	St Joseph's RC Junior Head Teacher
Vivienne Esparon	(VE)	Forestdale Primary Head Teacher
Tyrone Myton	(TM)	Shirley High School Performing Arts College
Dave Winters	(DW)	Trade Union
Ashana Graham,	(AG)	Education Commissioning and Quality Assurance Manager
Denise Bushay,	(DB)	Head of Service School Place Planning and Admissions
Niora Amani,	(NA)	School Admissions Manager
Mel Arscott,	(MA)	School Admissions Manager

Chair: Patrick Shields (PS), St Mary's High School
Vice Chair: Position Vacant.

Note-taker: G. Truss

Agenda Number	Title
1:	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies received from Tina Price. Vice Chair Sharon Oliver has retired from Schools Block. The Chair thanked her for all her input into the Schools Block working group.
2:	Minutes of Meeting held on 9/2/2021 and update actions
	The minutes of meeting held on 9 February 2021 were agreed. Follow up actions are covered in today's agenda.
3:	PLACE PLANNING: Denise Bushay
	School Place Planning and Admissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note update of the current position in relation to school place planning and admissions • Note change in demand leading to high level of surplus places. • Appendix 1: Overview of Primary school vacancies; Reception to Y6 • Appendix 2: Overview of Secondary school vacancies; Y7-Y11.

Denise Bushay was accompanied by Niora Amani and Mel Arscott School Admissions Managers.

This paper covers the historic and current position Croydon is currently in with regard to school places. All the current information is based on the Spring Census 2021.

Croydon has a statutory duty to plan and provide school places for local children. There are 6 educational areas for planning of school places. Primary schools are North West; East; Central; South East; South; South West and for secondary schools North and South. Croydon works every year with the Greater London Authority (GLA) to produce a new set of School Roll Projections (SRP). A number of factors influence the forecasting of school place planning i.e. birth rate, housing growth, migration into and out of the borough.

The financial impact on schools with vacancies is long reaching. Croydon has worked with schools to reduce their PAN/admission numbers to avoid surplus places.

There are new housing projects/development in the South, South West and centre of Croydon which could increase the demand for school places and the council has to be mindful of its statutory duty. When classes are de-commissioned they are not permanently closed, they can be re-opened should demand increase. School Place Planning work closely with Space Planning colleagues to monitor new builds and population increase within the borough.

Appendix 1 gives a more detailed breakdown of vacancies in primary schools. There are ongoing meetings with Head teachers and school leadership teams to see how the surplus places can be managed so as to avoid a negative impact on schools budgets.

There are 35,820 primary school places and 4,179 vacancies across Reception to Year 6. For Place Planning purposes we plan from a pupil's entry point into school i.e. Reception and Year 7

In 2012/13 the north of the borough experienced a significant growth in demand for school places and Croydon invested by expanding a number of schools to create additional classrooms. The education landscape then changed with the introduction of academies and free schools; and from 2013 onwards there was a significant drop in the birth rate thus creating excess places.

The DFE and Audit Commission Report recommend that local authorities should have a number of surplus places ranging from 5% to 10% to allow flexibility within the system to respond to parental choice which is a major driver in demand for a particular school.

A number of factors can affect demand on school place planning and data is reviewed on a regular basis. The areas with the most surplus places are in the North, West and East of the borough and we have worked with the schools in these areas. In The South West of Croydon due to the Cane Hill housing development Croydon has had to add an extra classroom into one school.

In July Croydon will be receiving another set of School Roll Projections from Greater London Authority and we will submit a school capacity survey to DfE in July. The data will be used to undertake a review to help identify short, medium and long term capacity requirements within the school system. A targeted review will be initiated to identify surplus places and working with the Finance team to identify schools at risk of a deficit budget as a result of a reduced number of pupils. The department will work with Head teachers and governors to take this work forward. Exploration of a multi-agency working where the school allocated school space for other use e.g. pupils with additional learning needs or early year's provision.

School Admissions National offer day has highlighted Croydon has received an increase of 2.1% for the 2021 intake compared to 2020. A total 4667 applications were received compared to 4571 in 2020. 60% of parents/pupil received their first choice of school.

Patrick Shields thanked Denise, Niora and Mel for a very detailed and comprehensive paper.

Q1: Dave Winter said this was a very impressive paper to be read carefully. He was impressed with the approach to identify the right numbers in the right places. There must be some frustration if a person wishes to open a school and it upsets the careful planning you have done.

The paper and appendices identifies a number of schools are in difficulties in terms of surplus places and therefore the revenue is generated in order to provide an effective level of education. There is reference in the paper about Forum being able to give some support to these schools. He was not aware of a specific element within the budget for Forum to do this. Forum will have to use criteria to decide where limited resources are channelled. This will present Forum with a problem. In Para 7.6 'good schools being given priority' – he thought this was highly dangerous - what one person considers to be a good school others may not. There is an enormous challenge to the LA and Schools Forum to deal with the situation. He appreciated the detail Denise and her team had provided. There is a lot of work to be done to ensure this is managed within the borough.

A2: Denise Bushay said thank you for the recognition of the work in the paper. In terms of new schools we now have a closer relationship with the Regional Schools Commission office and the Education and Skills Funding Agency. Now they will contact the LBC Place Planning team with any proposals of new schools to get a view on demand. We will say currently we do not need any new schools and we will provide them with our data and hope this will help to influence their decision in terms of approving new schools. There have not been any new primary schools. The council has a statutory duty but does not have power to stop schools being established and we do say this will have unintended consequences

for Croydon's existing schools. In terms of a good school it is the Ofsted rating and this is what influences and drives parents.

It is probably a piece of work for individual schools to move towards marketing and putting their school in a positive light rather than just relying on the Ofsted rating. Local children for local schools is our ambitions.

Shelley Davies said It is important to reflect on where Croydon currently is and on the work Denise and her team have undertaken. Places in schools which are not being utilised and the effect on budgets can be challenging. This is a key aspect of the role of School Admissions and planning and predicting future places. In one year the figures were wrong in the North of the borough and that area is still feeling the effects now. The support of Schools Block and Schools Forum was welcomed when mapping what is needed.

Denise Bushay said The DFE guidance indicates that some discretion can be made for Schools Forum to help those schools with higher level of surplus vacancies to enable them to maintain financial sustainability.

Orlagh Guarnori said we have not had any de -delegation in a number of years but when we review the APPT tool every October there could be a case. We did discuss the need for some form of a contingency plan/fund going forward and we will look at this in October.

Patrick Shields said he was in agreement for a contingency pot for the unknown. 7 years ago a paper was presented about School Place Planning and that it was known year on year that 25% of the pupil population leave Croydon during transition from Year 6 to 7. Croydon at that point was carrying approximately 13% surplus when the recommendation was between 5 and 7% surplus. Things do happen outside the control of the LA. In the last 24 months 2 secondary schools have closed and the paper indicates 4.2 schools saying there is still a 12% surplus in Year 7 places. St Mary's has reduced their PAN in Year 7 by 60. Other schools have also reduced PAN. This will link to information we will receive regarding the quarterly return to schools. The situation is getting worse and as the birth rate has dropped again as this filters through the system the picture in 4 to 5 years' time will be schools with empty seats, who may become sink schools which will add pressure on resources to other parts of the system such as FAP and exclusions which drags money away from the good work. This is an ongoing issue. A comparison to 7 years ago the numbers have not improved. Is there anything we can do? do we reconcile ourselves that we cannot control place numbers we are carrying the upper limit of 10% or more in primary and secondary we are seeing schools closures I can see the situation getting worst.

Denise Bushay said in the last 6 to 7 years there were so many new schools being erected and this was the direction of travel of the government at the time and recently we have had Ark and Coombe Wood

with additional places. It is important to note it is parental choice which is key. If parents do not want to send their child to a school this will result in fall in roll. This has happened to the 2 schools who we are working with as there was not the demand for their places.

Due to the new housing developments happening this will yield pupils but we do not know whether for Reception or Year 6. We have to have the level of surplus of places although it is higher than we would want.

Patrick Shields: the reality is the reasons the schools got into this position was due to not having funding because there were too many places and too many new places generated.

Free schools are the preserve of the Regional School Commissioner. The challenge back to us through Forum and CHTA is are we aware of all this information and is the right lobbying being done. Lobbying in terms of planning permission around the building of schools; lobbying to say yes it would be ok to close down an old school building and have a new building funded by DFE but actually from a schools point of view it could be argued that schools got into that situation because there were too many schools places across the board.

Shelley Davies: We are in agreement. There were decision made which the LA lobby against but were not successful. The schools are now open and this will impact on our current school place planning. We have to work together. What can we do as a LA? We cannot fall below a certain number of surplus places. We are sharing all the information with you – what can we do collectively? We are developing our school place planning strategy but we have to do this alongside LA maintained schools/academies to ensure that popular schools do not open up additional forms of entry.

It is complicated when there is a surplus of places in one part of the borough but not enough in another part of the borough. The challenge at primary school level is there and to a lesser level for secondary as older children can travel further.

There are housing developments in the south of the borough where we don't have enough places. This is a question we need to ask and collectively find an answer.

Patrick Shields said that looking at these numbers we were looking at more school closures which is the reality of what these numbers spell out.

Tyrone Myton said he wanted to reinforce the detail in the papers which answers his questions but the numbers do not add up. Are there enough pupils in Croydon to fill all the current schools? Some schools have got bigger.

Schools are businesses and will grow their PAN if they think they can fill them.

The notion of what is a good school –. We are passing around children with barriers, different and social issues. This was not just a Croydon issue but an education issue. He could not see how all the Croydon schools can exist with the numbers we have

Denise said this is a London wide issue – other boroughs are facing similar issues and it has to be centrally driven. If there are new schools being proposed they should be lobbied against saying there is not a need for them. In her experience it is parental preference which is the key. The amount of time Schools Admissions officer spend trying to encourage parents to not apply for an oversubscribed school when there is a closer school nearby. Part of the council duties is diversity of provision. The LBC is not at the point of any school closures. We want parents to have a choice. The ultimate choice is a local school for a local child. It is not a Croydon issue but an education issue.

Shelley Davies said there has to be an alternative to closure. We are not just talking of the impact on future students but on current students and families. We have to learn from the issues we have identified and to think about what can be done differently should similar situations arise in other schools. The Finance Team are working with schools with deficit budgets. Denise and her team are mapping out the surplus places across the borough. The LA has control over certain things but not on birth rate, or inward and outward migration.

Happy to meet with a smaller group to think about where we are regarding the two schools and the learning from that and incorporate it into what we are doing.

Mel Ascot said she did some analysis of our vacancy data for in-year admission for current year 7 to 11. She do not see the picture the meeting were talking about - all of these vacancies. The data received from all secondary schools indicate we have very limited availability. From the data we get sent School Admissions struggle to place year 10 and 11 students. The data from the spring census is not entirely accurate and it is unclear why it is not accurate. At the point it was taken for year 10/11 there were 300 vacancies across Croydon – this is not the case. Schools are not giving us accurate information. Following a paper undertaken in November 2020 all schools were asked about surplus places in year 10 and 11 and the information received indicated that there was only a handful of places available. Schools were saying this was their maximum admission numbers. Entries did not match to the entry admission in Year 7.

This is not the information being shared with schools admission and we think there are not enough vacancies in our team.

Patrick Shields said schools can change their admission. But this would be evidenced in Governor minutes of decision where they have agreed to reduce their PAN. There is pressure for schools to make decisions around year 10/11. When St Mary's reduced their PAN it was evidenced in the governor's minutes in the appropriate manner.

Mel Ascot said it should be reflected on the census data being sent to the DFE which is not accurate.

Patrick Shields: This raises two issues – one, are the schools presenting accurate information? The second is if the data is incorrect it brings into question the validity of the reports we receive as they are data based. It is good for the broader picture but where schools have changed their admission entry for whatever reason it could lead to a different practice on the ground floor.

On Appendix 2 The secondary school overview on year 7 Table 21 says there are total PAN 4183 places, total 498 vacancies and with 280 reduction places in PAN. If added it would mean the surplus rate is 18.5% across the Croydon capacity. Virgo Fidelis has not been included. If we take it in the round the true vacancies rate in Croydon is 18.5%.

Denise Bushay said without the reduction it would be higher. We are looking at a targeted piece of work to look at schools who have a high level of vacancies and see how we can manage them.

The school census data is what we have to use as a benchmark whether schools are giving accurate figures or not.

Patrick Shields said this is probably a separate conversation but unless a school can provide evidence there is no vacancy - there is a statutory obligation for that school to accept that child.

Shelley Davies said there will be challenges in that. Some schools do their own admissions. The LA does not always get the information from all the schools in order to inform the data in Schools Planning.

Dave Winters said the discussion has been wide ranging which is an indication of the complexity of this issue. Within our teacher organisation there will be discussion as also in schools forum. There is a Teachers Professional Association Forum with trade union reps which is a good forum to bring together the different complexities which could feed into School Forum.

This is a serious issue, it needs to be managed and Head teachers are put in a difficult position of having to reduce their staffing level. Which affects the human element not just on students but on people who work in schools.

Vivienne Esparon asked if there were lessons to be learnt from schools who are doing well and could other schools do the same? There is more work to be done. One should be proud to go to any school in Croydon and how do we promote that?

Shelley Davies: The number of parental complaints and MP enquiries the LA get on a weekly basis asking to get children into oversubscribed schools. If the LA could do something collectively to say all schools in Croydon work super hard

Tyrone Myton: Branding is important but he wanted to reinforce the numbers. The numbers do not add up – the impact will be seen in 3 years' time – he cannot see how some schools can survive. Schools

	<p>have to look after their staff, going through restructure or redundancies is not nice.</p> <p>Patrick Shields: This is a good point to finish. There are 778 empty seats in year 7 based on the numbers presented today. This is unsustainable. Denise and her team have our sympathy. The paper was excellent.</p> <p>Schools Block Working Group are asked to note the update of the current position in Croydon in relation to school place planning and admissions and note the changes in demand leading to a high level of surplus places Schools Block agree unanimously to do this. Should we add – if the combined empty seats is closer to 20% which is almost double and with the current financial situation should we be recommending there is an urgent action plan/review to be put in place. If there are 5 places for every 4 students there is only one outcome.</p> <p>Denise Bushay asked the meeting to please wait until the next projection which will be in July – and there will also be a targeted piece of work looking at those schools with higher surplus vacancies. The situation may change and in July there will be up to date info.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said we talked about this 5 years ago This is a big crisis about to hit the borough. We are expecting a baby boom on the back of Covid-19 but this will not fill surplus places. We have outlined the facts as they are and fully commend the paper and await the view of School Forum as to how it is brought forward, with the above strong note from Schools Block as to the reality of the situation.</p> <p>Shelley Davies asked if it should be shared at the secondary CHTA meeting to widen out the discussion.</p> <p>ACTION Patrick Shields said he will ask for this to be put on the CHTA agenda.</p> <p>DECISION Schools Block note the issue and will wait and revisit the subject after the paper is published at Schools Forum.</p>
4:	Schools Resource Management Advisor (SRMA) - Update
	<p>Orlagh Guarnori gave a verbal update on SRMA which has been awarded to Croydon by the DFE. Currently the SRMA has had to postpone his visits to the remainder of the schools but intends to have all reports ready by 11 June. The report will be brought to the next Schools Block meeting (29/6/2021).</p>
5:	Growth Funding Spend on Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers: Ashana Graham

Patrick Shields apologies for the confusion around what this paper was about. It was thought this was the money which went to FAP and Permanent Exclusions etc., but have now established it is for ESOL.

The last paper submitted was in 2018/19. At the last meeting £600K was agreed for the commissioning of school places for ESOL Year 11 students; with an additional £25K agreed for EY support.

Previously the commissioning process was on a 3 year framework, this was extended to 4 years but has now ceased. There is now an Approved Provider Panel which operates on a similar framework, providing the LA and schools with a list of providers who have undergone the competitive process and have met quality assurance, terms and conditions and we can tap into commissioning services.

There was a delay to the framework going live due to the pandemic but is now live. In this particular category there are 6 providers who are able to deliver ESOL services to Y11 and new arrivals; 3 of which can also deliver the same services to ESOL learners with challenging behaviour. Please note the provider costs vary in the ratio of 1 to 3 plus. Mini competitions are used to all providers (promising larger number in the hope to drive down their costs) but it is a voluntary process and not all providers will respond to the request. The cost is significant. Prices can vary, there are 2 providers who can charge £5K and 2 providers who can charge £10 to £15K.

A similar amount of monies will be requested for next year to ensure there is enough money in the pot to commission services if the cheaper providers are either not willing or unable to provide required services. The numbers demanded in academic year 2019/20 was significantly lower than the year before. 75 places were commissioned across 2 providers Which compares to 100 plus in 2018/19. This year 60 places have been commissioned with 45 places earlier this year and for an additional 15 children recently Further commissioning this academic year is not expected as Year 11 students will have finished by May .

Last academic year the outcomes were fantastic with 95% pass rate and progression was similar. Students who did not pass was probably due to their late arrival and therefore could not be entered into exams.

Patrick Shields said the understanding from Schools Forum and Pre Meet yesterday was that places would be paid for on a 'per place' basis rather than a commissioning a set and awaiting to see how it will be filled. Is there any information on how many students? When you commissioned 65 places were there 65 students there for all time?

Ashana Graham said that although there may be short periods of time when spaces were not all used, this would not be for long. By October 30 places will be needed, last year in November the 2 groups were close to being filled quickly.

The issue is if it is priced on a 'per place' basis it works out much more expensive. With the mini competition, the providers know they are guaranteed to have 15 learners and therefore if we tender at £6k they could afford to deliver at £5.5K for the academic year; because they know

	<p>the business will come in. It is also around efficiency for the providers as they cannot employ staff with no students. They need to know the money/contract will come in so they can employ staff and classrooms etc.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said he thought a paper would be the best way to deliver this information to Schools Forum as it is hard to juggle the numbers. If there is a reduction in the number of pupils who need a place there should be a reduction in the funding/cost. 65 places at £5K each total £225K which is short of the £600K which was mentioned as allocated, accepting that there is a variance in the cost of providers. It would be good to get a sense of where things are at. Who writes the report? in terms of presenting this as a paper to gain clarification and understanding as there is confusion on how places are being commissioned. A robust answer needs to be in place to cover the inconsistency. Possibly check back on old papers to check previous resolutions.</p> <p>Ashana Graham: I need to be clear in terms of the last normal year we had. There was an increase in demand. 120 commissioned places for ESOL learners. I do understand that £655 is low if it is £365K spend on 65 children.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said he appreciated it and Covid-19 play into those figures but one question Schools Forum will ask is, what will happen to the surplus – this is just to pre-empt some of the questions we will get.</p> <p>Shelley Davies said for the report to Schools Forum to illustrate the number over the past 5 years and include a table showing actual numbers over the past 5 years to illustrate the direction of travel and commissioned places. There was discussions about reducing the amount which came from Schools Forum but then there was a year when it went up.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said he did not have any papers. It might be useful to bring the new paper to Pre meet and then onto Schools Forum. It would be good if the paper could be circulated before the meeting to see if it is viable to bring to Pre meet. If there could be clarity in the report on the percentage fill rate of the places and also be clear on the commissioning.</p> <p>ACTION: Updated paper from Ashana Graham for presenting to Schools Forum with up to date data.</p>
6:	<p>Quarterly Returns</p>
	<p>Orlagh Guamori verbally updated the meeting. A paper will be brought to meeting in June.</p> <p>Of the 48 maintained schools in Croydon. 10 schools ended the year in a deficit position, the impact of the pandemic did benefit some schools as the original projected deficit was not as severe as projected. 4 are maintained nursery schools, 3 were primary and 3 were secondary.</p>

	<p>Moving forward to 2021/22 we only have an initial draft budget but will have the final data in June. 9 schools are proposing a deficit 3 nurseries, 3 primary and 3 secondary, one of which is due to close. The amounts are still significant.</p> <p>In year 2021/22 budget we are looking at schools presenting a deficit close to £2M. We are working closely with the schools and these schools are the ones the SMRA is visiting.</p> <p>The schools are using the new deficit template which helps the LA track the plan and recovery plan.</p> <p>A paper to the June meeting will summarise the information.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said this was a significant amount and Schools Block and Schools Forum have given a commitment to support the LA and have identified money for the LA to have their own SMRA. Can the £50k be ring fenced to stop it being re distributed?</p> <p>Orlagh Guarnori said yes it will be requested to be ring fenced but the LA are also making use of the free SMRA the DFE has allocated.</p> <p>Patrick Shields asked if it was timely enough – 9 schools are in £2M deficit and the SMRA from DFE was only visiting 3.</p> <p>Orlagh Guarnori said the SMRA is visiting 5 schools. Finance want to focus their attention on reviewing the schools who were visited last year and to do an overview of the 9 schools to see if there were any common factors for their deficits.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said he had understood the working group would get reports from the SMRA but none received so far.</p> <p>Orlagh Guarnori said all the reports will be brought back all together to have a complete picture.</p>
7:	Proposed Use of Schools Block Reserve Funds
	<p>Propose to use some of reserves to fund the 22 pupils who are being moved from Virgo Fidelis.</p> <p>The APT tool for 2021/22 had accounted for Virgo Fidelis to be funded up to 31/8/2021 when the school will close. There are some reserves within Schools Block funding and it is proposed to use this to support the move of 22 pupils from Virgo Fidelis to another school to complete their exams. The decision has been made to move the group as one block to St Mary's RC Secondary School.</p> <p>The DSG Schools Block has an underspend which has been transferred to Reserves. The underspend was achieved as a result of funding provided to the LA in respect of a school that converted mid-year to an academy but had been full funded by ESFA. We are waiting for the ESFA to make that recruitment. In the interim we propose to use £70K.</p>

	<p>If not recruited it will be brought back to Schools Block working group/Forum.</p> <p>The option is to fund the 22 pupils as per the current rate per pupil from the Virgo Fidelis schools ISB for 21/22 at £5465.00 to fund at 7/12mths</p> <p>Tyrone Myton asked for those 22 pupils moving to St Mary's - will St Mary's hold their performance data if published?</p> <p>Patrick Shields said yes it would.</p> <p>Shelley Davies: With St Andrews' entry was suspended entry for year 7, the rest of the children remained in the school. The concern was to move the cohort of year 10 to another school would have a detrimental effect on the pupils.</p> <p>Tyrone Myton said he thought it is fantastic for the pupils to finish their education all together.</p> <p>Shelley Davies said we need to ensure the funding needs are there and this is the way to do it. This will go to a vote at Schools Forum and it would be good to have a recommendation from Schools Block.</p> <p>Patrick Shields said he was going to excuse himself from the recommendation as it directly impacts upon his school.</p> <p>Dave Winters said he moved on behalf of Schools Block that we accept the recommendation made and the funding and the arrangements made for the students move to St Mary's RC High School is approved by Schools Block.</p> <p>Vivienne Esparon asked what would happen to the money.</p> <p>Orlagh Guarnori said we are awaiting update from SAFA to see if they will claw back funding if not it remains within the Schools Block reserve.</p> <p>DECISION: Schools Block were in unanimous agreement of the above proposal to use some of reserves to fund the 22 Year 10 pupils to move from Virgo Fidelis to another secondary school to complete their exams.</p>
8	<p>Any Other Business</p>
	<p>The Chair requested list of all signed up members of School Block.</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for attending.</p>

**MEETING FINISHED AT 12.22 pm. NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY 29 JUNE 2021
AGREED ACTIONS**

SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERSHIP - June 2021
APPROVED LIST OF MEMBERS and REPRESENTATIVES

Academy representatives					
SCHOOLS TYPE	MEMBER	END DATE	ALTERNATE MEMBER	END DATE	Membership
na					
Academy	Jolyon Roberts Pegasus Academy Trust	02.10.21	Rob Hitch Harris South Norwood	20.01.23	8
	Chris Andrew St James the Great	20.01.23	Vacancy		
	Soumick Dey Riddlesdown Collegiate	11.03.22	Vacancy		
	Vacancy		Vacancy		
	Rob Veale Atwood Primary Academy	11.03.22			
	Neil Ferrigan Good Shepherd RC	20.01.23			
	Roger Capham Pace Academy Trust	16.01.23			
	Tyrone Myton Shirley High School	20.01.23			

Maintained School Headteachers					
SCHOOLS TYPE	MEMBER	END DATE	ALTERNATE MEMBER	END DATE	Membership
Nursery	Jaqi Stevenson Crosfield Nursery	08.06.24	Jane Charman Park Hill	Nil	1
Primary	Vivienne Esparon Forestdale Primary	02.10.21	Leonore Fernandes St Joseph's Junior, Infant & Nursery	27.01.24	2
	Vacancy		Vacancy		
Secondary	Patrick Shields St Marys High School	02.10.21	Nathan Walters Thomas More High	12.02.23	1
Special	Nicholas Dry St Nicholas School	26.07.21	Lorraine Slee Red Gates School	20.11.21	1
Pupil Referral	Jenny Adamson Saffron Valley Collegiate	01.09.22	Ian Walters Saffron Valley Collegiate	17.10.21	1

Maintained School Governors					
SCHOOLS TYPE	MEMBER	END DATE	ALTERNATE MEMBER	END DATE	Membership
Nursery		Nil	See HT above		See HT above
Primary	Dave Harvey Elmwood Junior School Vacancy	16.01.23	Vacancy Keran Currie Norbury Manor Primary School	30.01.22	2
Secondary	Vacancy		Vacancy		1

Non School Members					
	MEMBER	END DATE	ALTERNATE MEMBER	END DATE	Membership
14 - 16	Kevin Standish John Ruskin College	21.02.22			1
Early Years - PVI Provider	Theresa Staunton Abacus Childcare	02.10.21	Christine Marchant Goslings		1
Southwark CofE Diocesan Rep.	Josephine Copeland All Saints CofE Primary	n/a		n/a	1
Southwark RC Diocesan Rep.	Linda O'Callaghan St Mary's Infant School	n/a		n/a	1
Trade Union Rep.	Dave Winters National Union of Teachers	16.01.23	Joe Flynn NEU	16.01.23	1
Cllr. Majority Group.	Joy Prince				1
Cllr. Minority Group.	Helen Redfern				1

OBSERVERS	
Cllr Alisa Flemming	Cabinet Member – People Dept.
Cllr Margaret Bird	Conservative Cabinet member
Cllr Shafi Khan	Non - Cabinet Member - People Dept.
Muriel Rant	Education Finding Agency Rep.
Shelley Davies	Interim Director of Education and Youth Engagement
Vacant	Interim Head of School Standards, Safeguarding and Youth Engagement
Orlagh Guarnori	Finance Manager
Kate Bingham	Interim Head of Finance - Children, Families and Education
Kathy Roberts	Head of Service: SEND Transformation and Delivery Education and Youth Engagement
Heather Beck	Clerk

