

Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday 17 September 2019 1.30pm at Three Rivers Academy, Walton-on-Thames

Approved by members at their meeting on Thursday 14 November 2019

Present

School and academy members:

Rhona Barnfield (Chair)	Howard of Effingham School	Academy member
Kate Keane (Vice Chair)	Ewell Grove Infant and Nursery School	Primary Head
Sally Cave	Guildford Children's Centre	Nursery school head
Katie Aldred	Bagshot Infant	Primary head
Susan Chrysanthou	Furzeffield Primary	Primary head
Tess Trewinnard	Wonersh and Shamley Green CE Primary	Primary head
Jo Luhman	Kings International College	Secondary head
Justin Price	Freemantles School	Special school head
David Euridge	Reigate Valley and other PRUs	PRU member
Geoffrey Hackett	Stepgates Community Primary	Primary Governor
Eric Peacock	Thorpe C of E Primary	Primary Governor
Fred Greaves	Oakwood School	Secondary governor
Matthew Armstrong-Harris	Rodborough	Academy member
Ben Bartlett	Hinchley Wood School	Academy member
Kate Carriett	George Abbot School	Academy member
Sir Andrew Carter	South Farnham Primary	Academy member
Elaine Cooper	Horsell Village School	Academy member
Jo Hastings	Ottershaw Infant and Junior Schools	Academy member
Ruth Murton	Thamesmead School	Academy member
David Monk	Pond Meadow School	Special academy member

Non school members

Sian Bath	Private, voluntary & independent nursery providers
Jayne Dickinson	East Surrey College Post 16 provider
Deborah Pepper	Guildford Diocese (CE)
Joe Dunne	RC Diocese of Arundel and Brighton
Nick Trier	Teaching union member of Education Joint Cttee
Andrea Collings	Family Voice Surrey

Local Authority Officers

Liz Mills (LM)	Director–Education, Lifelong Learning & Culture
Jane Winterbone	Assistant Director (Education)
Charisse Monero	Assistant Director (Commissioning)
Carol Savedra (CS)	Service Team Manager, Commissioning Team
Susie Campbell	Equalities and Wellbeing Service Manager, ELLC
Dave McNamara (DMc)	Interim Strategic Finance Business Partner
David Green (DG)	Senior Principal Accountant (Schools Funding)

Cabinet member for all age learning

Julie Iles

Others

Maria Dawes SAFE

1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed new members: Susan Chrysanthou and Sally Cave and returning member, Jo Hastings.

Apologies for absence had been received from:

Clare McConnell	Bisley CE (A) Primary	Primary head
Nicky Mann	Wallace Fields Infant	Academy member
Tim Stokes	Carwarden House Community School	Special academy member
Jonathan Gambier	Guildford Diocese (C of E)	
Tamsin Honeybourne	Teaching union member of Education Joint Committee	

James Malley (secondary academy representative) had resigned.

2 Declarations of interest

Fred Greaves declared an interest in the “de-delegation” item within item 6a, as a union representative.

3 Minutes of previous meeting (12 June 2019) and matters arising

Accuracy

Add Tess Trewinnard to list of apologies.

Matters arising

SEND outcomes (page 2)

LM recalled that the question about SEND outcomes had been asked in the context of commissioning post 16 places. The LA would be commissioning places for 2020/21 this autumn and would look at outcomes as part of that process.

High needs block (page 3)

A tabled paper was circulated showing EHCP growth divided into age ranges (attached as annex 1).

Children’s services academy and apprenticeship levy (item 7, page 10)

Members asked for data on who applied for funding from schools’ apprenticeship levy and on the outcomes of the applications. Jackie Spence to be invited to the next meeting.

Charging for academy conversions (item 12)

Fred Greaves wished it to be recorded that he considered it unfair to charge schools converting to academies, when previous converters had not been charged, and that it might cause some schools to think twice about converting.

4 Latest DfE funding announcement

The DfE funded local authorities using a school level national funding formula. The main changes in funding LAs in 2020/21 will be:

- Minimum per pupil level increased to £3,750 per primary pupil and £5,000 per secondary pupil;
- 1.84% minimum funding guarantee;
- Most pupil led factors within the soft NFF would increase by at least 4% (change in lump sum unclear);
- There will be a new formula for pupil mobility.

In funding individual schools the LA must

- Pass on the minimum per pupil funding levels (we will now need permission from the Secretary of State if we want to use lower values);
- Set the minimum funding guarantee at between 0.5% and 1.84% (cf -1.5% to 0.5% in 2019/20).

Nationally high needs block funding had increased by £700m and individual LAs' allocations would increase by between 8% and 17%. As an LA with significant floor protection, Surrey's increase was expected to be at the lower end of the range. An 8% increase might be £10m-11m.

Teachers' pay grants were expected to continue in 2020/21¹ but not to cover Sept 2020 pay increases.

Ben Bartlett noted that, in 2019/20, funding had been moved from schools block to high needs, despite additional high needs funding being allocated by the government. He understood that the Director of Children's Services had stated at secondary phase council in June that, if there was a significant increase in high needs block funding in 2020/21, the LA would waive any request to transfer funding from schools to high needs in 2020/21. Ben thought £10m was significant.

LM responded that that position hadn't changed but that £10m wasn't significant in the context of a £29m overspend against high needs DSG in 2019/20 and a potential overspend of £48m in 2020/21 in the absence of transformational change. A request for a transfer to high needs block could be expected in the consultation paper.

DG thought the LA could deliver full MPPL plus a transfer to high needs, but it would mean that the cost of the 0.5% transfer would be borne by those schools which were not on MFG and not on MPPL, and thus would have a disproportionate impact on fewer schools.

LM noted that changes were proposed to early years funding, which would remove the recurring surplus in early years DSG. There was no intention to continue indefinitely transferring funds from other blocks to high needs.

David Monk sought some equity in funding increases between mainstream and special schools. If "all were in it together" then all needed similar support.

¹ Ie continued funding for the Sept 2018 and Sept 2019 pay increases, to the extent that they are already grant funded

LM noted the need to consider the issue of increased teachers' pay costs in special schools.

Ben Bartlett asked for a table of block transfers including transfers of year end surpluses, He argued that there had been significant transfers from schools block to high needs over the years.

A table of LA contributions to high needs block and block transfers was circulated. This would be recirculated including the 2018/19 year end position (see Annex 2).

DMc noted that at the end of 2018/19 the high needs DSG deficit and the surplus on other blocks had been held separately and not so far netted off. High needs block overspends were not restricted to Surrey. There was a need to decide how to fund the accumulated deficit if the government did not provide additional funding.

LM advised that the LA aimed to contain annual high needs cost within annual HNB funding within three years.

Ben Bartlett noted that schools block had contributed £37m to high needs since 2014/15 and thought schools and early years blocks had contributed enough,

LM commented that the ringfencing of the DSG blocks could be a distraction from the main task.

Members noted the need to continue to lobby for increased high needs block funding,

5 SEN update

LM noted that the SEN strategy was intended both to achieve financial sustainability and improved outcomes for children.

The LA had consulted on a SEND strategy over ten weeks from October 2018 and the results had been reported to Cabinet in January 2019. Work on the strategy was continuing. Workshops had been held in the summer term. Two papers were going to Cabinet later in September, seeking capital funding for additional specialist places: 900 additional places were needed in special schools and SEN centres over the next four years, and 1,600 over ten years, based on current demand trends. £25m of capital funding was being requested for a 200 place special school to complement the two free schools already approved, and there were also plans for a number of additional SEN centres. The papers also covered the need to urgently address the state of pupil referral unit accommodation.

The overall DSG deficit at the end of 2018/19 did not exceed the 1% threshold above which the DfE required a recovery plan, so the LA had not prepared a formal recovery plan.

The NAO had noted in a recent report that nationally large sums were spent on a few children, because of the inadequacy of provision.

Locally, families and partners had had poor experiences and had low trust in the system.

While additional resources were required, existing resources were not being used well and needed to be used differently. OFSTED and CQC reports had highlighted that Surrey did not have a single system for supporting children. More contributions were needed from health. More early support was needed; there had been 600 requests for EHCPs for preschool children last year.

There was a need for improved practice both by SCC and partners

Work had been undertaken to create a graduated response to needs, and a profile of needs, which would be launched formally later in the month. This would then be reviewed in the spring term and adapted as necessary. It was important to clarify what was on offer and where the gaps were. It was hoped Health would also be involved in the roll out. Work was also being done on joint commissioning of therapies and emotional health and wellbeing support.

Eamonn Gilbert (new AD SEND) would be leading on a review of school designation and banding, which would be implemented in 2021/22 following formal consultation. In the meantime, some short term work would be done in this area.

The Cabinet was being asked to agree to commission a new education management system in order to have a more holistic view.

Work was being done with specialist providers to develop more cost effective provision, particularly where high unit costs were not linked to outcomes.

Early years SEN was a major focus, including a workforce strategy and level 3 training.

Additional funding was being given to schools, individually or in clusters, to support early intervention, particularly for children with ASD and SEMH: Funding would be allocated to schools in the autumn term in order to build capacity in schools (eg by training), although in specific cases funds might be available for specific children for short term interventions which would make a difference. Use of the funding would be monitored and it could be increased if necessary. Those clusters of schools might also work on the emotional health and wellbeing strategy.

There was a huge level of diagnosis of ASD. ASD strategy included work with London South Bank University, which had expertise in that area. The SAFE partnership would also be involved.

More work was needed on developing pathways for transition to adulthood. Only 9% of adults with learning difficulties in Surrey were in employment: Far more of those capable of employment should be in employment, supported by pathway planning, internships and apprenticeships. Only a small number of children with an EHCP should need to access adult social care on leaving education and so the others needed to be prepared for employment etc. Pathway planning needed to ensure that placements were actually likely to

deliver the desired outcomes. The post16 provider rep noted that the sector was already working closely with a number of major employers. Other members suggested that higher costs to education now could enhance employability and save social care costs later through more young people being employable.

Recommissioning of therapies was planned for 2021/22

The aim of the strategy was that fewer statutory plans would be required. The number of plans in Surrey was out of line with other south east LAs, though there was no reason to think Surrey's children were different.

A full leadership team was now in place, with two assistant directors working on commissioning (Eamonn Gilbert and Charisse Monero), Pip Hesketh as AD for vulnerable learners for all front line services to individual learners and Jane Winterbone as AD Education looked after services to schools: educational effectiveness, place planning etc. Eight SENCOs have been seconded from schools to work on the graduated response, two secondary SENCOs were needed and the cost of their time would be reimbursed.

A consultation would soon be launched on a new travel assistance policy. The level of discretionary travel provision in Surrey was much higher than in other LAs, and this stifled independence and was expensive. Too many children with SEND were travelling long distances to schools.

Members expressed appreciation for the huge amount of work which had been done.

David Monk asked that former non maintained special schools which were now academies, should be funded at the same top up rates as other state maintained schools in Surrey and that there needed to be a pathway to bring their funding into line. LM agreed that funding for NMI schools should be consistent with the SEND banding system.

One member argued that not providing travel for early years children with SEND would increase the costs of meeting their needs later.

Members thought schools working in clusters might be able to identify needs earlier and intervene earlier. Earlier investment might reduce longer term needs. However, they noted that capacity among headteachers to lead projects was reaching its limit. LM advised that funding was not restricted to clusters; she did not want to impose a new level of structure.

LM advised that there was clear evidence from longitudinal studies that short term packages of support could allow children to close the gap with their peers, such that no further support was required. The LA aimed to reduce the number of requests for statutory plans by meeting needs earlier. There would be a focus on outcomes.

One member argued that schools struggled to deliver basic staffing ratios and that the additional funding now available would only reverse some of the losses of the last few years.. She suggested that modelling should be undertaken to show what mainstream funding could provide and whether

needs were equitably funded across schools. LM suggested that such work might be useful but it would need to be school led. DMC noted that various bodies had tried similar work. Carol Savedra recalled that DfE had done detailed costing work prior to introducing the Early Years NFF. Members expressed general concern that there was insufficient funding in mainstream schools for them to do more to improve high needs outcomes.

Surrey currently had around 9,000 EHCPs and on present trends would have 14,000 by 2022/23.

The strategy aimed to reduce the use of NMI provision by moving pupils into state places at suitable transition points, where this was appropriate, and by building more state maintained places. Early identification should reduce the need for specialist places. An increase in the cost of support in mainstream schools had been assumed. The strategy also included a focus on preparation for adulthood and additional continuing health care support. Health funding was much lower in Surrey than elsewhere. Members noted that the strategy involved a much higher proportion of pupils with EHCPs being in mainstream schools

Surrey's high needs budget could be sustainable if the number of plans was reduced to the south east average and the unit costs remained the same. This would mean an 18% reduction in EHCPs over three years, compared to a current net annual increase of 13%

The most common need in NMI schools was ASD (hence the importance of an autism strategy) followed by SEMH. A reduction in use of the independent sector was targeted, Some children's needs would still be met in NMIs eg where Surrey did not have that type of provision There needed to be a shift from the perception that NMI schools provided the best outcomes. NMI proprietors ranged from charities to venture capitalists.

Dashboard data on strategy implementation would be shared with the partnership board, including individual programme and project data

Risks to the strategy included lack of progress on joint commissioning, preventative activity not delivering the targeted EHCP reductions, and insufficient resources to support schools.

The LA would be asking for a transfer of funds from the schools block to the high needs block and that proposal would be in the consultation. A proposal to increase the early years inclusion fund was on the agenda; this included maintained providers not just PVI.

Among the proposals was a review of learning support units in secondary schools, nurture groups and outreach. LM sought volunteers from the Forum to assist in reviewing these areas. Members suggested that learning support units were important in supporting year 7 placements of children with EHCPs including those in September 2019. LM recalled that the current LSUs were a historic legacy and that the need may now be support different pupils in different schools. Learning support units, nurture groups and outreach collectively cost £1m and had not been reviewed for some time. She agreed that work was needed on the best use of these resources

Members argued that there was clear research evidence as to the value of nurture groups. Some members argued for the extension of nurture group funding to other schools. One asked that any review should include “self funded” nurture groups in schools and the role of ELSAs and educational psychologists. LM noted that nurture groups were all fulfilling different purposes

The autumn consultation would not include a proposal to withdraw nurture groups

The special school representative asked that any review of outreach should be done soon and that the service should be funded at full cost.

Other issues suggested in discussion included;

- * some schools might need to be more involved in their local communities and, if they were, it might help to build parents’ confidence in local provision;
- * needs should be assessed objectively and not constrained by targets
- * a lot of additional state specialist placements had been created over the last few year but not in a co-ordinated way;
- * top ups for maintained and academy special schools needed to be reviewed to recognise increases in teacher and support staff pay.

..

6 Surrey schools formula funding consultation 2020/21

a) Schools funding

Process

DG asked for members’ assistance in developing the funding consultation proposals for schools. Only principles could be considered so far as DfE had yet to publish LA level figures. DfE submission deadlines had not changed ie November for requests for transfers to high needs block, January for detailed budgets. This meant Cabinet budget decisions no later than December. Thus consultation with individual schools could not be delayed beyond early October.

LM proposed a three week consultation starting early in October. Illustrations of impact on individual schools might have to be supplied during the consultation period, rather than at the start, depending on when DfE provided information.

Officers would compile a consultation paper and would try to circulate it to Forum members for comment. However, a quick turnaround would be essential. Illustrations of impact would be provided later.

Minimum per pupil funding (MPPL)

In 2020/21 LAs required Secretary of State’s permission to reduce the level of MPPL funding to individual schools. Full MPPL meant that schools on MPPL received the full benefit of the NFF whereas other schools would see their gains reduced in order to fund any block transfer. Members asked to see the

impact of this on small, medium and large schools. DG was happy to provide examples when DfE published the necessary data.

DG expected that full MPPL should be deliverable with a £3m block transfer- the issue was the impact on different schools.

Members asked whether the LA would withdraw the block transfer proposal if a request to vary MPPL was made and rejected. Withdrawal was unlikely given the level of pressure on the high needs block.

The consultation may include a question on varying the MPPL.

The level of the minimum funding guarantee (MFG)

DG suggested consulting on two levels of MFG, perhaps 1.3% and 1.84%. There were around 60 schools on MFG and a high MFG would give the most assistance to those schools, towards the impact of teachers' pay increases and other costs.

A high MFG meant a lower ceiling or slower progress towards the NFF LM noted that Surrey had already moved a fair way towards the NFF.

The lump sum

Small schools were seen to be struggling in Surrey and Surrey's lump sum exceeded the NFF lump sum. Officers proposed not to further reduce the lump sum, and to inflate it by the MFG percentage at a minimum, in order to assist small schools.

The Guildford Diocese representative particularly welcomed this proposal.

A proposal would be included in the consultation.

Growing schools

DG advised that growing schools had to be funded in two ways depending on the nature of the growth. It was inequitable to reduce funding rates for one route when they could not be reduced for the other. Therefore he recommended that, if necessary, funds should be transferred from NFF to support growing schools fund. The required transfer might be around £500,000

Progress to the NFF and the level of the ceiling

The level of the MFG, rate of progress to NFF and the level of the ceiling in gains were interrelated. For a given MFG, the faster the progress towards the NFF, the lower the ceiling. DG suggested that, as NFF formula factors were mostly increasing by 4%, the ceiling ought to be higher than 4%, otherwise schools with no change in circumstances (and not on MFG) would see less than 4% per pupil growth.

Minimum funding guarantee variations and pupil number variations

These needed approval by the Secretary of State and the deadlines for applications to reach the Secretary of State was 11 October.

DG asked for the Forum's support for:

- Varying pupil numbers so that where schools lost bulge classes in 2020/21 those classes were funded for the summer term only (seven schools);
- Providing a second year transitional lump sum for a school which had merged in September 2018;
- Excluding rent adjustments from the MFG where there were major changes in rent costs.

The Forum supported the proposed applications.

Additional SEN funding threshold

DG proposed to raise the threshold for additional SEN funding and to use previous October census data for the distribution, rather than termly averages. This would contain the cost within the intended budget.

Members suggested that the proposal would remove flexibility from schools to cope with increases in SEN, when schools were being asked to accommodate more children with SEN.

LM argued that the cost of the current arrangements was open ended and thus unpredictable. She also doubted that the funding was reaching the right schools, and suggested that the mechanism created a perverse incentive to seek EHCPs. She wanted to use the funding in the most helpful way for early support rather than EHCPs. The level of the threshold was the LA's choice. The budget needed to be containable within £900,000.

Jane Winterbone commented that some other LAs had set an additional support threshold of 110% of notional SEN funding.

The estimated cost so far in 2019/20 was £1.5m compared to a target of £900k, and 90 primary schools and three secondary schools received it so far. In 2019/20.

Examples of the impact of the proposed changes would be included in the consultation paper.

Members suggested that colleagues would have to turn away children with EHCPs if the funding was reduced, and that notional SEN funding should not be regarded as only for EHCPs but that it also covered other children with SEN, who were losing out because of the need to contribute to EHCPs.

Definition of the level 2 notional SEN budget

Surrey had generally held the average level 2 notional SEN funding per pupil constant as the formula had changed. Under the NFF much of the increase in funding had been through the low prior attainment factor. Therefore DG proposed to keep the proportion of low prior attainment funding deemed notional SEN constant, which would mean that the average notional SEN funding per pupil would increase as low prior attainment funding increased.²

²² The same principle would apply to “deprivation” notional SEN funding, which would mean that the average deprivation SEN funding would be reduced

“De-delegation”

DG explained that, in 2020/21, “de-delegation” was proposed for the same services as in 2019/20 at the same rates as 2019/20 (which were set out in the paper) except for:

- CAPITA SIMS-increased in line with expected costs;
- Universal offer –“de-delegation” was no longer proposed;;

The Vice chair explained that the universal offer “de-delegation” was not being requested in 2020/21, because colleagues had concluded that all schools should have a choice of whether to contribute. She also asked for a major rewrite of the school specific contingency.

DG confirmed that the proposed contribution rate for union facilities was not being changed and that the proposed secondary school rate was the same as the contribution being requested in 2019/20.

Susie Campbell asked whether any further information should be included on the behaviour and travellers services. There was a significant traded behaviour service in addition to the “de-delegated” core. The behaviour service contributed to the graduated response and to early intervention.

Susie saw the travellers service as a good example of the need for “de-delegation”, ie demand could be unpredictable, urgent and have a high impact on staff and pupils. “De-delegation” particularly supported smaller schools, which might be exposed (to high risk) under a traded model.

“De-delegation” concerned only maintained primary and secondary schools.

b) Early years

CS advised that no changes were proposed to the general principles of early years funding. Base rates for two, three and four year olds would increase in line with the increase provided by DfE (not yet known at local authority level), as would deprivation funding rates. Deprivation funding would remain the only supplement. A contingency would be retained at the reduced level provided in 2019/20. Maintained nursery school transitional grant would continue for the present

Centrally retained funding was proposed to continue, to include the inclusion fund for two year olds. Free school meals provision funding rates for maintained providers would be increased.

One member suggested that many schools were unaware that they could claim funding for free meals costs for nursery pupils. The PVI representative asked for it to be recorded that it was unfair that PVI providers couldn't claim free meals costs, and also that it might encourage a higher level of registration for early years pupil premium if they could. Another member suggested the cost would be offset by increased early years pupil premium. CS saw free school meals funding as an anomaly that we had to accept. She also noted that many PVI providers did not have the facilities to provide lunch, and that the LA had no data on those that did.

LM agreed that some modelling should be done on the issue to inform future proposals.

CS proposed that there should be no changes to the funding of SEN resource places in maintained nursery schools, but that there should be a review of all specialist SEND nursery provision.

An annual surplus of £2m had arisen because of the mismatch between annual and termly census data. CS proposed that this was used to increase the inclusion fund by £2m annually. This would support provision of early intervention and transition to school. In particular, intervention would support:

- Early communication and closing the word gap;
- Emotional resilience;
- Support for transition to school.

It would be important to work with early years providers and with families to develop the programmes, to ensure that providers and families tell us what works best and to target those in Surrey who need the support most.

The funding would not just cover SEND but also other disadvantaged children. It would not replace discretionary funding or deprivation funding.

The funding would need to count as “pass through” funding (ie not central spend) and thus would need to be passed on to providers focused on individual children.

Members noted

- Nurseries would need more staff training and more outside agency support;
- Providers would need to be clear what was on offer;
- There was a need to track back and identify the impact of early years support;
- There was a need for flexibility in the offer to providers in order to respond to the needs of different providers.

One member argued that there was a need for more specialist SEND nursery places, and that some SEND children were poorly served by a free play environment. Others argued that some nurseries successfully managed this and that there was a need for greater clarity as to what was on offer and where.

Another member questioned the LA policy of not assisting with transport costs of early years children attending specialist placements. CS suggested that it was difficult to find circumstances which justified early years children travelling long distances to provision. The focus was on providing localised support which meant that children didn't need to travel long distances. Surrey had previously exercised discretion where many LAs didn't. There was no duty in law to provide transport for under fives.

7 Schools Forum issues

Next meeting NOW RESCHEDULED FOR 14 NOVEMBER

To include: outcome of funding consultation.

Nominations for election of Chair and Vice chair to be invited at or after that meeting

8 Any other business

There was no other business

Meeting ended 5.20pm

ANNEX 1 Additional data requested for Schools Forum 17 Sept 2019

Breakdown of EHCP numbers by age (minutes, page 2) source workings for DFE SEN2 return
(we have actually analysed by key stage because we hold the data in that way.)

	Jan-17			Jan-18			Jan-19		
NMI/SPI	868			873			1,043		
State specialist	2,507			2,725			2,962		
Colleges	854			1,144			1,259		
Mainstream	2,336			2,635			2,960		
Other	278			333			508		
	6,843			7,710			8,732		
	pre school	Year R-14	Y15+ (Age 19+)	pre school	Year R-14	Y15+ (Age 19+)	pre school	Year R-14	Y15+ (Age 19+)
NMI/SPI	5	798	84	18	803	76	29	933	80
State specialist	8	2,478	8	12	2,669	1	10	2,952	2
Colleges		632	222		791	353		813	446
Mainstream	5	2,316	9	8	2,644	2	23	2,934	3
Other	1	248	29	1	282	50	26	415	66
	19	6,472	352	39	7,189	482	88	8,047	597
				from Jan 2017 to Jan 2018			from Jan 2018 to Jan 2019		
% change in preschool EHCPs (NCY -1 and below)				105.26%			125.64%		
% change Year R-14				11.08%			11.93%		
% change 19+				36.93%			23.86%		
% change overall				12.67%			13.26%		

Annex 2 LA contributions to high needs block and DSG block transfers to high needs

LA (non DSG) contributions to high needs block

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	total	total 14-20
total	£m	£m	£m								
	2.486	2.937	2.677	0	0	0	1.650	3.942	0.000	13.692	5.592

2017/18 figure includes £2.142m

Of SEND reform

grant

DSG block transfers to high needs from

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Schools	-0.9	9.1	10.75	4.6	?	3.1	26.65
Early years	6.6			1.3			7.9
	5.7	9.1	10.75	5.9		3.1	34.55

NOTE Separate DSG blocks were first introduced in 2013/14

2017/18 transfer of part of year end underspend