

Delegated Cabinet Member Key Decision Report

Decision Maker and Portfolio area:	Cllr Shaid Mushtaq Education, Early Years and Skills
Date of Decision:	11 November 2019
Subject:	High Needs Funding for Oldham College
Report Author:	Donna Lewis, Head of Inclusion & Post 16
Ward(s) Affected:	No

Reason for the decision: The purpose of this report is to secure agreement to re-calibrate the number of High Needs places commissioned at Oldham College, so it more accurately reflects the number of high needs students placed in the college. This commitment of funding is taken from the LAs DSG/High Needs Block and passed straight to providers from the ESFA. This role is part of the LA statutory duties.

Summary: The High Needs Funding model has 3 parts:
Element 1: c£4000 for all students (from ESFA)
Element 2: £6000 for High Needs students (agreed by the LA, from ESFA)
Element 3: Calculated per student based on needs and provision to support needs (from LA/High needs pot – paid in year)

In November each year, the LA is required to confirm to the ESFA the number of High Needs places (E2) required for students at the college for the following academic year. Historically, colleges have absorbed any difference in E2 allocation and actual take up but as numbers grow, the LA needs to review its financial allocation. The ESFA guidance on acceptable percentage difference between the commissioned places and actual numbers

accepted by the college is around 10%. (based on possible dropouts or 'no shows') This report seeks to amend the commissioned places to reflect that percentage figure.

Commissioned places for Oldham College have remained at 100 since 2016/17 despite actual growth in numbers accessing places. For example:

- 2017/18 (106 actual including 11 from other LAs*)
- 2018/19 (131 actual including 15 from other LAs*).
- 2019/20 (estimated 197 including 38 from other LAs*).

To rectify this large differential in commissioned places and actual places utilised, the following options are set out.

What are the alternative option(s) to be considered? Please give the reason(s) for recommendation(s):

Option 1: Agree to placement numbers 143 (this accounts for students placed by Oldham and other authorities). This would be in place for the 2020/2021 academic year and reflects the 10% differential in actual numbers taken by the college.

Option 2: Do nothing, keep the allocation at 100. There is a risk that the college will refuse to accept students above this number on the basis that attendance is a significant pressure on college resources and exceeds the 10% guideline. This option could result in even more expensive cost as the students with EHC plans not placed at the college request a specialist (and expensive) provision elsewhere.

Recommendation(s):

The preferred decision is option 1. This acknowledges the growth in places for high needs students in preparation for the 2020/21 academic year and provides the college with some financial stability in supporting the growth in high needs students in their establishment.

Implications:

*What are the **financial** implications?*

The additional cost of increasing the place numbers to 43 is £168k pa for each of the 2019/20 and 2020/21 academic years, funding will come from the High Needs Block of the

Dedicated Schools Grant 2019-20.

If agreed this would increase the forecast deficit in the DSG by £180k to £4,440,000k.

Liz Caygill

What are the **procurement** implications?

None. Dan Cheetham

What are the **legal** implications?

None. Colin Brittain

What are the **Human Resources** implications?

No Implications. Andy Collinge

Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment attached or not required because (please give reason)

Not required.

What are the **property** implications

None. Andrew Hall

Risks:

Co-operative agenda

Inclusive economy – providing young people with SEND with the opportunity to develop their skills to improve their chances of securing employment and be part of their local community.

Has the relevant Legal Officer confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council's Constitution?

Yes

Has the relevant Finance Officer confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council's budget?

Yes

Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council?

No

Reason why this Is a Key Decision

(1) to result in the local authority incurring expenditure or the making of savings which are, significant (over £250k) having regard to the local authority's

budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

The **Key** Decision made as a result of this report will be published within **48 hours** and cannot be actioned until **five working days** have elapsed from the publication date of the decision, i.e. before **enter date**, unless exempt from call-in.

This item has been included on the Forward Plan under reference **enter Key Decision Document reference**.

List of Background Papers under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972:

There are no background papers for this report

Report Author Sign-off:	
Donna Lewis	
Date: 12/11/19	

In consultation with

(Relevant Executive Director/Director Andrew Sutherland Date: 12/11/19)



Merlin Joseph
Interim Director of Children's Services