

0Rotherham Schools' Forum

Venue: Rockingham Professional Development Centre **Date: Friday, 9 December 2011**

Time: 8.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 7th October 2011 (copy attached) (Pages 1 - 6)
2. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

DEFERRED FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:

- Removal of Rotherham Schools' Forum Budget – Transfer to Rotherham School Improvement Partnership

FOR DECISION:

3. Schools retaining over 8% of School Budget.
4. Extended Services 2012 - 2013. (Pages 7 - 10)
5. Trade Union Decision.

PENDING FUTURE DECISION:

6. Carbon Reduction Commitment.
7. PFI Charges. (Pages 11 - 12)
8. Budget Setting Information. (Page 13)
9. Commissioning Item - Value for Money Review of Education Catering Service (papers provided separately).
10. Hospital Teaching Service. (Pages 14 - 19)

FOR INFORMATION (see papers):

- School Finance Value Standard (page 20)
- Roma / Slovak Distribution of Funding (paper provided separately)
- Post-16 Funding Consultation (pages 21-24)

A new system will enable Decision Items to be discussed as fully as needed. Items for a future meeting can be established in detail and then information to be acknowledged and distributed. This should enable the maximum time for discussion.

11. Date and Time of Next Meeting - Friday 20th January, 2012 at 8.30 am

Dates of future meetings:-

Friday 2nd March 2012

Friday 13th April 2012 (Easter holidays – to be rescheduled)

Friday 22nd June 2012

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM
FRIDAY, 7TH OCTOBER, 2011**

Present:- David Silvester (in the Chair)

Primary Schools : Jane Fearney, Angela Heald, John Henderson, Donna Humphries, Lynne Pepper and Sue Warner.

Secondary Schools : Paul Blackwell, Roger Burman, David Butler, Bev Clubley, John Day, David Pridding and Stuart Wilson.

Early Years : Margaret Hague.

Extra Representation : Steve Clayton and Nick Whitaker.

Non-School : Councillor Amy Rushforth, Sue Brook, Karen Borthwick and Geoff Gillard.

Also in attendance:- Joyce Thacker, Dorothy Smith, Susan Gray, Katy Edmondson, Philip Marshall, Joanne Robertson, Vera Njelic, Sue Shelley and Martin Fittes.

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. G. Jackson, Mrs. A. Burtoft and Mrs. V. Broomhead.

18. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 24TH JUNE, 2011

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 24th June, 2011, be approved as a correct record.

19. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

20. CENTRALLY RETAINED GRANT - SLOVAK/ROMA COMMUNITY

Martin Fittes submitted a report concerning a proposal to fund either 2, 3 or 4 Community Development Workers to support the Clifton Learning Community and especially the Slovak/Roma community (where pupils do not have English as a first language). It was suggested that funding could be provided according to the needs of the Learning Community and/or individual schools, using a "Rotherham pupil premium" formula.

Discussion took place on:-

: the funding for and line management of Mr P Sabados (Education Welfare Officer);

: the need for the Community Development Workers to assist in ensuring that pupils' attendance at school improves.

Agreed:- That the appropriate funding, depending upon the number of pupils concerned, be transferred from the Centrally Retained Grant to schools as quickly as possible.

21. VALUE FOR MONEY REVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS - PROGRESS REPORT

Philip Marshall presented a report containing a brief update on how the findings from the value for money review of special educational needs are being addressed.

The value for money review exercise was undertaken by a selection of Head Teachers, Senior Managers and the School Effectiveness Service with support from the Commissioning Team on behalf of the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership. The purpose of the review was mainly to scrutinise the Dedicated Schools Grant funding allocated to the centrally managed services for children and young people with special educational needs, and to ensure that it is being used efficiently and is value for money.

The services reviewed included:-

- Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired Services
- Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Autism Communication Team and the Portage Service
- Special Educational Needs Pupils, Extra District and Special Educational Needs Assessment Services
- Complex Needs, Primary General and Secondary Special Educational Needs

The importance of raising the attainment levels of pupils with educational needs was emphasised.

The Schools Forum noted the progress already undertaken and asked that a further report be presented at the next meeting.

22. BROOM CENTRE FUNDING

Consideration was given to a report presented by Katy Edmondson concerning the Behaviour Support Service. The report stated that this Service has been allocated a budget of £701,325 for 2011/12 from the centrally retained part of the Dedicated Schools Grant. The proposal is that from April 2012 £50,000 of this budget is re-directed to meet some of the outstanding budget requirement for the new Broom Centre. This is enabled owing to a full service restructure of the Behaviour Support Service and reduced costs of this team. This will then become part of the Broom Centre's base budget.

It was noted that in the next academic year (2012/13), only £36,000 will be needed from the EO8 budget which could be reduced further if Rotherham was to sell places to nearby authorities.

Agreed:- That the sum of £50,000 be allocated to the Broom Centre from April 2012, as detailed in the submitted report.

23. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - FINAL ALLOCATION

Joanne Robertson presented a report containing the forecast out-turn position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA) Funding for schools for 2011/12. The current

position, including the deficit carry forward from 2010/11 is an under-spend of £806,000, including an agreed carry forward of £214,000 into the 2012/13 financial year for the continuation of Extended Schools Subsidy.

Agreed:- (1) That the contents of the report be noted.

(2) That the Schools Forum approves the necessary budget amendments, as now reported, for the 2011/2012 financial year.

24. DEDICATED SCHOOL GRANT SPEND

Joanne Robertson presented a report (per the item above) containing the current spending position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

Agreed:- That the contents of the report be noted.

25. SCHOOLS CONTINGENCY - REDUNDANCY COSTS

The Schools Forum discussed a report prepared by Paul Fitzpatrick concerning the costs of redundancy. The report stated that the principle whereby in cases of redundancy the costs are picked up by the Local Authority unless there is a good reason where this should not occur, has been maintained by use of the contingency fund.

The use this method to deal with redundancy costs ensures (i) that no school has suffered potentially significant liabilities in relation to redundancies; and (ii) it is clear to schools that only in cases where redundancy is absolutely necessary and where correct procedures have been followed, will the school not be liable for the cost.

The 2010/2011 redundancy costs from the contingency fund related to 32 redundancies, including teaching and support staff and the total cost was £177,000. The budget for 2011/2012 is £157,350

Agreed:- (1) That the contents of the report be noted.

(2) That the current system whereby a contingency budget is allocated, shall be continued and maintained at the same amount as for the 2010/2011 financial year.

(3) That Paul Fitzpatrick be asked to attend a meeting of the Schools Forum, early in 2012 and present a detailed, progress report about this issue.

26. TRADE UNION BUDGET REVIEW

The Schools Forum discussed a report prepared by Paul Fitzpatrick concerning the budget for the facilities time for local Trade Union officials. The proposal is that funding continues to be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant. Until the 2011/12 budget for Trade Union facilities time was set, the allocation was £112,000 per annum. The Schools Forum previously decided that for 2011/12 the budget would be halved, with an allocation of £56,000 per annum being made.

Discussion took place on the letters of support received from some head teachers, for the Trade Union facilities time and on the facilities time made available to other trades unions.

Agreed:- (1) That the current allocation of £56,000 be maintained for Trade Union facilities time during the current, 2011/2012, financial year.

(2) That Paul Fitzpatrick be asked to attend a meeting of the Schools Forum, early in 2012 and present a detailed, progress report about Trade Union facilities time.

27. SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM - SECOND CONSULTATION

Joanne Robertson presented a report stating that on 19th July, 2011, the Secretary of State for Education had launched the second part of a consultation on the reform of the school funding system. It followed the Department for Education's earlier consultation (April 2011) on the principles of school funding reform. The consultation period lasts for twelve weeks, ending on Tuesday 11th October 2011.

The consultation document sets out proposals for the mechanics of a new funding system, the contents of a new national formula and future funding arrangements for the Pupil Premium, early years provision and High Cost Pupils. It also clarifies the responsibilities of local authorities, schools and Academies in relation to central services. The Department for Education is consulting on whether these reforms should be implemented from 2013/2014 or wait until a later spending period.

This item will be debated further during the Finance master-class, to be held at the rising of this meeting of the Schools Forum.

28. SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD

Consideration of this matter was deferred until the next meeting.

29. EXTENDED SERVICES BUDGET REVIEW

Sue Shelley presented a report about the Extended Services budget which previously consisted of two grants:- (i) Extended Services Sustainability and (ii) the Extended Services Disadvantage Subsidy. The allocation of these previously separate grants has been committed to the continuation of Extended Services for the academic year 2011/2012.

The allocation for 2011/2012 is:

- Extended Services Disadvantage Subsidy (Go For It!) £893,600
- Extended Services Sustainability £593,945

The report included an analysis of the budget for the period September 2011 to August 2012.

Agreed:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

5

30. REMOVAL OF SCHOOLS FORUM BUDGET - TRANSFER TO RSIP

Consideration of this matter was deferred until the next meeting.

31. YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER GRID FOR LEARNING - CONTRACT DISCUSSIONS

Susan Gray presented a report about the Yorkshire and Humber Grid for Learning Foundation Ltd (YHGfL), a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee which is owned by twelve local authorities in the region.

John Moore (Chief Executive of the YHGfL) was welcomed to the meeting. Mr. Moore explained the benefits of the YHGfL services available to schools, including access to the National Education Network and the video conferencing service. A case study document was distributed to Schools Forum members.

The YHGfL was created in such a way that any services taken by member authorities do not have to be procured – the 'Teckal exemption' means that the YHGfL is, in effect, a traded service of each authority. This saves each authority money and effort in obtaining services, rather than having to procure them individually from other providers. As the YHGfL is owned by the local authorities, it also means that there is less risk than using commercial providers and, because of the not-for-profit basis, there is the need only to cover costs so YHGfL is normally more cost-effective than alternative providers.

The YHGfL services are broadly: (i) Consultancy, (ii) Network and technical services, (iii) Staff development and (iv) Education and related services.

The report stated that a new grid was installed in April 2011 which provides high-bandwidth and high-reliability connectivity around the region. The funding for YHGfL this has historically come from the Broadband for Schools Capital Grant and more recently the Harnessing Technology Grant (25% centrally held).

Discussion took place on the costs and benefits of maintaining the current three years' contract with the Yorkshire and Humber Grid for Learning. The service appeared to be under-utilised and Schools Forum members felt that there should be more information provided to schools about the services available.

Agreed: (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the current level of funding shall continue for the remaining two years of the current contract with the Yorkshire and Humber Grid for Learning.

(3) That a due process of monitoring and review be undertaken during the final twelve months of the current contract with YHGfL, to inform the decision as to whether a further contract should be negotiated; this item will therefore continue to be debated at meetings of the Schools Forum.

32. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Rotherham Schools Forum requested that a report be submitted to the

next meeting about the current tendering process for the school meals catering service.

33. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting of the Rotherham Schools Forum be held on Friday, 9th December, 2011, at the Rockingham Teachers' Centre, beginning at 8.30 a.m.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM
--

1. Meeting:	Rotherham Schools' Forum
2. Date:	9th December 2011
3. Title:	DSG funding for Extended Schools
4. Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services (CYPS)

5. Summary:

The new Coalition Government merged a number of former Standards Fund Grants into the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2011/12 under the guiding principle that schools were to be given freedom and flexibility across all their budgets to choose how best to support their pupils. Any previous targeting of funds and earmarking of specific amounts was removed.

For 2011/12, Schools Forum agreed that funding levels for Extended Services be maintained through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) at the same levels as they were provided for in 2010/11 and the local authority continued to direct and manage this funding. The agreement was for one year only so schools now need to decide on how this funding (£1,487,545 in 2011/12) should be distributed in 2012/13.

The key issues for consideration are:-

- (i) Do schools wish to continue to ring-fence and therefore target funding for extended services in 2012/13?
- (ii) Do schools want the LA to retain funding for extended services and deliver services on their behalf as is the current position or do schools want the freedom and flexibility to choose how resources are deployed?
- (iii) Is the current mechanism for distribution of funding appropriate or does it need amending?

6. Recommendations:

- (i) The Government's removal of ring-fencing from former Standards Fund Grants including the former 'Extended Services Grant', gives schools the freedom to decide how this funding is deployed to best meet the needs of pupils. From 2012/13, it is therefore proposed that this funding be delegated to schools and form part of the 'Individual Schools Budget' with each school receiving an allocation through an agreed formula.
- (ii) A proportion of the current 'Extended Services' funding is allocated on the basis of free school meals. The Government's intended primary driver of funding to meet the needs of deprived children is through the Pupil Premium. To this end, the Government has committed to increasing the Pupil Premium from £625m in 2011-12 to £1.25bn in 2012-13 as announced in September. It will rise again each year until 2014-15 when it will be worth £2.5bn. Schools therefore need to decide on

whether the £1.487m (est. £36 per pupil) should continue in part, to be funded on the basis of free school meals.

- (iii) For the purposes of transparency and in recognition that the Government is currently consulting on wide ranging reform to the funding of schools for implementation from 2013/14, a one year interim solution is proposed. In order that schools can clearly identify the funding they receive for 'Extended Services' it is proposed that the total funding available be maintained at the same per pupil level for 2012/13 i.e. approximately £36 per pupil, and a new formula factor introduced for 1 year only.
- (iv) Formula options:-

For the purposes of simplicity, two options are proposed:-

Option 1 - that each school receives the same per pupil unit of funding allocation based on the January census pupil number count.

This option is based on the rationale that the former purpose of the Grant is irrelevant and in order to impart the choice that the Government intends, all schools are entitled to a similar amount with the Pupil Premium providing the means by which additional funding is allocated to schools for deprivation.

Option 2 - that funding is allocated 50% on pupil numbers and 50% on free school meals numbers.

This option is based on the rationale that the former purpose of the Grant remains relevant and that schools with higher levels of deprivation should continue to receive higher levels of funding. This option provides most stability at individual school level as it reflects to some degree, current practice. The main issue with this approach is the continued 'lock-in' to the former purposes of Grants at a local level whilst national policy through the Pupil Premium is changing in respect of how deprivation funding is driven. Given the increases in Pupil Premium over coming years, there would be a widening gap between per pupil funding for schools serving the most and least deprived communities.

- (v) Delegation of 'Extended Services' funding does not mean that schools discontinue provision of extended services, simply that schools take responsibility for decisions of what to fund and how much. There is a risk however that economies of scale may be reduced or even lost through a more distributed model. Such risks however can be mitigated if schools work together under the learning community model approach. This also presents opportunities for staff currently employed via the local authority to be redeployed into schools and to use their skills and knowledge in partnership approaches. It is in everyone's interests to make early decisions regarding this funding to provide time for partnerships to plan for their future.

7. Background

'Extended services' is an umbrella term that refers to schools' extra-curricular activities or wider services provided before and after the school day to the local community. Extended services can enable schools to provide

- high-quality learning opportunities either side of the school day
- ways of intervening early when children are at risk of poor outcomes, e.g. by providing access to study support, parenting support or to more specialist services (such as health, social care or special educational needs services)
- ways of increasing pupil engagement
- ways of improving outcomes and narrowing gaps in outcomes between different groups of pupils
- access to childcare services and/or activities before and after school (such as breakfast clubs, sports and arts activities, and study support) that can enable parents to take up or stay in employment
- community use of facilities, such as facilities for adult and family learning, sports and ICT.

Schools often find it helpful to work in partnership with their local authority, other schools (as part of clustering arrangements) and private and voluntary sector providers to develop and deliver access to extra curricular activities and services. As at September 2010, more than 99 per cent of schools were offering access to a range of extended services according to the DFE.

The Coalition Government has said that it wants schools to decide which extended services to offer based on the contribution they are making to improving pupil outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged pupils.

The schools White Paper 'The Importance of Teaching' published in November 2010, stated that the Government 'will rely on schools to work together with voluntary, business and statutory agencies to create an environment where every child can learn, where they can experience new and challenging opportunities through extended services, and where school buildings and expertise are contributing to building strong families and communities'.

This paper does not seek to question the value or contribution of 'extended services'. It is more a question of control over the decision making process. In an education system where schools are being given more autonomy and with it greater accountability, then it should be for schools to decide how they deploy their funding. This may result in schools increasing or decreasing the amount of funds invested in extended services. The fundamental issue though is that schools are given the choice.

The DFE have published evidence on the impact of extended services which schools may find informative in arriving at future funding decisions:-

<http://www.education.gov.uk/popularquestions/schools/typesofschools/extendedservices/a005585/what-are-extended-services>

8. Finance:

Schools Forum were presented with details of the funding for extended services in October 2011. The amounts of extended services funding for 2011/12 provided through the DSG are:-

- | | |
|---|----------|
| • Extended Services Disadvantage Subsidy (Go For it!) | £893,600 |
| • Extended Services Sustainability | £593,945 |

Prior to 2011, funding for extended services was provided as a ring-fenced grant through the Standards Fund. From 2011, there is no requirement to earmark specific amounts for extended services. Schools have the freedom and flexibility across all their budgets to target funds as they see fit to best support their pupils.

The budgeted costs for Extended Services as reported to Forum in October, cover central staffing costs until August 2012. There is therefore no commitment or call on 2012/13 budgets at present in respect of extended service provision.

9. Risk and Uncertainties

The Authority employs a small number of staff funded through the extended services budget. Should Schools Forum decide that funding be delegated to individual schools, then these staff may be subject to redeployment or redundancy. Should schools decide that 'extended services' offers valuable means to support pupil outcomes then it would be entirely possible for existing staff to be re-deployed into schools and continue their work through partnership arrangements i.e. schools within learning communities use part of their allocations to fund a post and provide the required service(s).

An early agreement by schools regarding 2012/13 funding would be in the interest of all parties to seek positive outcomes for those affected.

Paper for Schools Forum**Schools Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Funding**

The Council's PFI contract with Transform Schools (Rotherham) Limited (TSRL) runs for a period of 30 years from the 1st April 2004. The contract is a standard PFI design, build, finance and operate contract, with TSRL a company specifically set up for the purpose of this contract. All the companies involved in the PFI arrangement are Balfour Beatty group companies. The contract has involved the transfer of all the risks associated with the building and its operation and maintenance to the PFI contractor.

As with all PFI contracts, TSRL borrowed the funds for the construction work from the money market, in our case from the European Investment Bank and AXA. TSRL are responsible for making the payments on this debt. However, TSRL's only income source is the Council, so that we make monthly payments, termed a Unitary Charge (UC), to TSRL, to allow them to repay the debt and to cover the cost of maintaining and operating the buildings. The Council's estimated total UC payment in 2011/12 is £14.04m. Around 50% of the UC payment is fixed, as it relates to the capital element, and the other 50% increases annually in relation to RPI-X inflation.

The annual funding of this UC payment comes from a number of sources, including Central Government Grant of £6.2m, £5.25m from PFI Schools from their school premises budgets and £3.233m from DSG. The estimated income and expenditure for the Schools PFI for 2011/12 is summarised in the table below.

<u>Schools PFI Budget</u> 2011/12	£			£
<u>Expenditure</u>			<u>Income</u>	
UC Payment	14,036,000		PFI Grant	6,222,509
Additional Utilities	450,000		School Budget Contributions	5,250,000
Business Rates	940,748		DSG	3,233,000
Additional Cleaning Payment	140,000		Other Contributions	159,693
Additional Lifecycle Costs	85,595		Insurance Refund	388,922
Additional FM Costs	25,000		EIB Refund	334,500
Vandalism Costs	47,500			
Vending (lost income)	147,108			
Free Meals Expenditure	580,000			
Total Expenditure	16,451,951		Total Income	15,588,624

The Council is responsible for paying utility bills at the PFI schools, and takes the risk on price changes. However, the amount within the PFI contractor's model for utilities has always been significantly lower than the actual utility costs, so an additional amount has been built into the Budget for this. In addition, the Council receives the free school meals budgets from the PFI

schools, which it uses to fund actual free meal expenditure. The Council's Facilities Services provide the cleaning services to the PFI schools via a sub-contract to BBW, as this contract is running at a loss, there is an additional contribution from the PFI Budget to this Service. The Council is also responsible for paying all the additional lifecycle and FM costs associated with the Council and school variations that have been incorporated into the Contract since its commencement. The Council receives all payment mechanism deductions in respect of the contract, however, historically these have averaged only around £15k-£20k per annum.

Future DSG Contribution Assumptions

The table below shows the future assumptions for the contribution from DSG to support the PFI UC payments.

2012/13	2014/15	2015/16
£m	£m	£m
3.445	3.639	3.729

In addition, schools premises budgetary contributions are assumed to increase by 2.5% annually in line with the long term assumption on RPI-X inflation within the model. The PFI grant is fixed over the life of the contract, as it is supporting the capital element of the PFI payment.

Implications of Academy Conversions

Any PFI schools that convert to academies will remain in the PFI contract and the Council will continue to make payments to the PFI contractor in respect of these schools. So far no PFI schools are Academy convertors, so this has not been an issue.

If we were to change how the funding is allocated and instead of top-slicing DSG for the premises funding, it was allocated to schools on an individual basis, then this would be included in the Total Schools Budget amount that the Council notifies the DFE that the Academy would have received had it still been an LA Maintained School. This then would be deemed to be included in the amount the DFE pay over to Academies.

However, separate legal agreements would be required with any PFI academy school to ensure that they continue to pay their premises budgets to the Council, to enable it to fund its payments to the PFI contractor on their behalf.

Description	Actual Expenditure 2010/11		Original Budget Allocation 2011/12	Revised Budget Allocation 2011/12		Reason for change in % DSG contribution
	DSG as % of Total Funding		£'000	£'000	DSG as % of Total funding 2011/12	
Delegated Schools Budgets	n/a	n/a	165,604	159,102	100	Not applicable
School Rates	100	2,383	2,260	2,300	100	Not applicable
RSIP	n/a	-	765	765	100	Not applicable
Centrally Managed Services for Schools						
Autism Communication Team	97	162	162	170	80	Reduction in income from academies - EIG allocated in 2011/12
Behaviour Support	99	701	701	572	100	Income from Course fees not budgeted in 2011/12
BSF Director	11	11	0	0	-	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Building Learning Communities	16	7	0	0	-	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Children and Families Special Needs Service	100	130	130	224	42	Team Restructure
Children in Public Care	31	136	144	152	44	Area Based Grant paid in 10/11 but not in 11/12
Early Intervention Team	43	51	51	54	22	Early Intervention Grant Allocated in 11/12
Early Years ASD Support	100	90	90	93	67	Early Intervention Grant Allocated in 11/12
Education Welfare Service	0.5	4	0	-	-	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Education Health Partnerships	34	92	0	0	-	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Private, Voluntary and Independent Nursery Education	100	1,723	2,529	2,529	100	Additional take up due to increased entitlement for 2 year olds
Ethnic Minority Achievement		102	103	150	ess: 43%	Part of School Effectiveness
Family Learning	3	5	0	0	-	Same level of DSG both years
Hearing Impaired Service	93	562	562	590	97	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
LAC Business Support Learning Support Service	48	13	0	0	-	Not able to charge Academies in 11/12 - could in 10/11
Maltby BIP Operational Safeguarding Unit	18	123	123	126	18	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Free School Meals Assessment	97	36	36	36	97	No change
Portage	98	199	199	204	98	No change
Primary Strategy – Central Co-ordination	50	147	191	191	ess: 43%	Proportion of funding not known - not an RMBC budget - funding carried forward from 10/11
Pupil Referral Units	81	2,135	2,039	2,502	95	Agreed change in level of DSG allocated for 2011/12
Y10/11 RCAT Children Resources and Business Strategy	-	-	10	10	100	Restructure of units
	100	18	3	3	100	Not applicable
Rotherham Mind Safeguarding Locality Teams		35	35	0	this	Agreed change in level of DSG allocated for 2011/12
		189	0	0	-	Proportion of funding not known - not an RMBC budget
School Effectiveness Service		475	569	608	ess: 43%	No DSG allocated in 2011/12
School Catering Service	2	185	77	427	6	Part of School Effectiveness
Schools Contingency	100	108	517	379	100	Not applicable
School Museum Service		58	0	0	-	Additional funding from former specific grant for 2011/12
PFI	21	2,989	3,233	3,233	21	Not applicable
Playing For Success		29	0	0	-	DSG funding withdrawn for 2011/12
Secondary Strategy – Central Co-ordination		203	203	203	ess: 43%	Not applicable
SEN Assessment Team	9	30	30	33	14	Reduction in Area Based Grant income and reduction in revenue funding
SEN Transport to Extra District Schools	100	101	101	101	100	No change
Special Educational Needs SEN Extra District Placements	80	2,674	3,012	2,865	83	needs led Service
Trade Union Activities	100	113	56	56	100	needs led Service
Visual Impaired Service	97	377	377	419	100	DSG funding reduced for 2011/12
Young People's Service	2%	72	69	73	5	Not able to charge Academies in 11/12 - could in 10/11
Youth Justice	13	114	0	0	-	Major restructure of Young People's Service - reduction in revenue funding
Sub Total		14,357	15,503	16,158		No DSG allocated in 2011/12
Formerly Centrally Retained Specific Grants						
Pupil Referral Units	see above	see above	368	0	see above	see above
Ethnic Minority Achievement	see above	see above	47	0	see above	see above
Education Action Zones	not applicable	not applicable	287	287		Funding proportion not known - not an RMBC budget
City Learning Zones	not applicable	not applicable	163	163		Funding proportion not known - not an RMBC budget
School Lunch Grant	see above - catering service	see above - catering service	350	0	see above - catering service	see above - Catering Service
Extended School Sustainability	not applicable	not applicable	594	594	100	not applicable
Extended School Subsidy	not applicable	not applicable	894	894	100	not applicable
Former Standards Funds Grant - Broadband Connectivity (Harnessing Technology)	not applicable	not applicable	100	100	100	not applicable
NHS Funded Posts			91	0		posts within Children & Families Special Needs Service
Funding for Roma/Slovak Pupils	not applicable	not applicable	287	287		not applicable
Allocated to individual Schools	not applicable	not applicable	2,992	2,992		not applicable
Balance remaining to allocate	not applicable	not applicable	305	305		not applicable
Sub Total			6,478	5,622		
TOTAL			190,609	183,946		

Hospital Teaching Service

HISTORICAL GUIDANCE

On 1st November 2001, the Government issued statutory guidance on access to education for children and young people with medical needs. It set out minimum national standards of education for children who are unable to attend school because of medical needs. The time frame for this is, 'a pupil is absent from school due to ill health for a period of 15 days'.

The education of pupils with medical needs is a partnership and it is essential that education, health and other agencies work closely together to provide the support to enable a pupil with medical needs to receive appropriate education. This includes Local Authorities, schools and related bodies.

If a child of compulsory school age cannot attend school because of sickness or injury, the local education authority must arrange suitable education for them. Some children will receive education in hospital schools or hospital teaching units, and some will receive tuition at home.

A child who is admitted to hospital should have their educational needs assessed as soon as is reasonable after admission. They should be given tuition as soon as their condition allows.

The minimum entitlement to education is 5 Hours a week.

(DfES 0732/2001)

The new coalition government has withdrawn this document. Currently, a national survey is being carried out through the NAHHT to collect credible national data to demonstrate to Ministers and the Department of Education the nature and complexity of the work that is done everyday in provisions for children and young people with medical and mental health needs. This is quality assured by the NFER and the findings will be reported back to ministers by the middle of January.

There is also the issue of the '25 hour entitlement to education' and how current provision can meet this.

Brief outline of Rotherham's Hospital School

A.

1. Ongoing from 1979. Initially based at Doncaster Gate Hospital
2. Provides education on the ward for pupils aged 4-18 years
3. Moved to Rotherham District General Hospital in 1986
4. Stand alone school including: Hospital provision, Maple House & Home Tuition Service
5. Governed by a Management Committee
6. Judged as GOOD by OFSTED 2009/10

7. Full time provision on the ward
8. Staffed by:
 - a. Head
 - b. Full time teacher
 - c. Part time teacher
 - d. Teaching assistant
 - e. Clerical officer
9. **In April 2011 the Hospital Home Tuition Service (HHTS) was realigned and split into the ARC, which includes the PRU's, Home Tuition Service, and Maple House.**

B.

1. **The Hospital School was transferred to Newman School with a vision to move the school from good to outstanding. Monies to initially be transferred from HHTS to Newman. There was no consultation; however Newman's Acting Head at that time had always felt the Hospital School would be better placed in this way.**
2. Staffing was reduced to a 0.5 Teacher and a 0.5 Teaching Assistant (TA). Due to uncertainty of the needs of the school and future planning, staff were appointed on a supply basis
3. Newman teacher 1.5 days (supply)
4. Existing hospital school teacher 1 day (permanent)
5. Newman school 0.5 TA (supply)
6. Input from the Newman Deputy Head for 2 weeks at initial setup
7. Ongoing leadership and management from Newman Deputy Head
8. Ongoing administration support from Newman office staff
9. This necessitates the school only being open 9-12 each day.

C.

9th November 2011 the LA, without consultation, decided to close down the Hospital School from Christmas 2011. Seeking support from Joyce Thacker and Martin Fittes, the school is to now remain open until the end of the financial year to allow consultation to take place.

Improvement thus far to Hospital School systems:

- Electronic in-house registration system, rather than admitting pupils via SIMS. Pupils are entitled to their mark in their substantive school. Schools are contacted to keep them informed.
- Every pupil attending the hospital school is assessed on their first day of attendance to ascertain educational levels. Through consultation with child/parent/school teacher areas of priority are identified. Wherever possible work is designed to supplement work being covered at the substantive school.
- An individual education plan (IEP) is drawn up for each pupil identifying the learning objective/target and activity agreed. When the pupil completes the activity, it is assessed and feedback on the outcome is added to the IEP. Currently, 92 % of targets are achieved. Detailed

analysis is kept and used for future admissions and to keep schools informed.

- Depending on numbers admitted on any one day, pupils can usually receive teaching for three sessions each day.
- Worksheets and online learning is left for the afternoon sessions. Work completed during afternoon sessions is discussed with the pupil the following day.
- All completed work is given to the parent or pupil, to pass on to school.
- A resource bank has been set-up on the Hospital School computers which covers all key stages and subjects. This is a dynamic resource and is constantly being added to and updated. Staff are able to quickly access a topic/work suitable for the pupil from nursery to A' level.
- Hospital School staff are trained and able to invigilate exams whilst the pupil is in hospital.
- Work with pupils on exam revision and completion of specific modules.
- Implementation of questionnaire for parents/pupils/schools to feed into self-evaluation and school improvement.
- Ongoing dialogue with hospital staff ensuring Hospital School staff are aware of any issues with individual pupils. To feed into external services on discharge.
- Inviting classroom which pupils take pride in and where they can share their work with parents and friends.
- All staff are part of the 'Outstanding' Newman team: Reducing isolation, providing access to ongoing training and support, and online access to all Newman's planning and resources.
- Possible inclusion of longer stay pupils in selected Newman lessons, either physically or by Skype.
- The school is affiliated to the NAHHT and is working with membership to inform the government feeding into future changes to statutory provision.

Statistics

Detailed analysis of the summer/exam term is particularly interesting.

32 children were educated within the Hospital School over the two month period.

19 KS 3-4

8 KS 2

9 KS 1

19 of these children / young people were admitted with undiagnosed abdominal pain which was ultimately associated with exam stress. The Hospital School staff contacted pupil's schools and offered invaluable 1-1 exam revision or support to complete exam modules.

6 were admitted with chronic illness

5 were admitted with acute illness

4 were admitted with accidental injury

1 with emotional problems

From May to July 2011 the Hospital School delivered education to 93 pupils.
The time spent in the hospital by each pupil was:

57 were admitted for 1 day

18 were admitted for 2 days

7 were admitted for 3 days

3 were admitted for 4 days

3 were admitted for 5 days

1 child triggered the statutory 15 day criteria

The autumn term has seen a huge rise in pupils being admitted to the ward, 113 thus far in 2011 compared to 59 in 2010.

Discussion with hospital school staff across the country through the NAHHT, suggests Hospital Schools are being looked into as a form of cost saving in these times of financial austerity.

Chris Seymour, current Chair of the NAHSL:

'The problem with statute is that it's open to local interpretation. Section 19 of the 96 Act which refers to Education Otherwise and Local Authority responsibility to arrange 'suitable' education. The attempt to contextualise this for medical needs is still the Access Document which, on page 8, opens the door for LAs to make these kinds of decisions as it refers to 'prolonged' or 'recurring' being the criterion for teaching from day one and then only as far as possible.

I think LAs are looking at how they can meet the absolute minimum and avoid the courts.

Sorry I can't be more positive with my response. I also know that the DFE's permanent exclusion trial committee are looking at how Section 19 responsibilities can be delegated and there are concerns about splitting off excluded pupils from those out of school for other reasons. A consultation on this looks likely so we need to keep eyes and ears peeled!

Rotherham DGH is a relatively small hospital, pupils with chronic and complicated medical conditions have consultants in specialist units which are located across the country, and hence if they are admitted to Rotherham DGH they are transferred to these units once their condition has stabilized.

The main question to answer is:

‘Do the benefits of this provision offer ‘value for money’ and does this provision positively impact on pupil progress and well-being?’

- Feedback from hospital staff, parents, pupils and substantive schools is exceedingly positive.
- Often pupils are eagerly waiting at the door of the Hospital School for it to open each day.
- Evidence of positive impact on attendance figures.
- Direct positive impact on schools’ exam results, through extra revision, completion of exam modules and invigilation of actual exams.
- Dialogue between substantive school & Hospital School provision ensures optimum educational outcomes.
- Pupils are emotionally supported during their stay in hospital facilitating a smooth transition into substantive school.
- Identification of additional services which could support the pupil and the school on discharge .e.g. Mental Health and exam stress

Costs to continue current provision for the next academic year:

£30,000 for 2011-2012

Possible solution to generating the £30,000:

Rotherham has 16 Secondary, 71 Junior & Infant, 14 Infant, 13 Junior and 6 Special schools.

If these are simply graded by their size/population and possible use of the service:

- Secondary: 5 units per school x16 = 80
- Special: 3 units per school x 6 = 18
- Junior & Infant: 2 units per school x 71 = 142
- Junior: 1 unit per school x 13 = 13
- Infant: 1 unit per school x 14 =14

Total units: 267

£30,000 divided by 267 units equates to £112 per unit

The above figures highlight how little equivalent contribution per school per year from the **DSG** would be needed to preserve this valuable service:

- Secondary £560
- Special £336
- Primary £224
- Junior £112
- Infant £112

Newman School is committed to continuing to facilitate this valuable provision and requests support from the Schools Forum to provide the necessary funding from the DSG.

The new Inspection Arrangements from January 2012 demand each school and Local Authority work together to take all necessary steps to 'narrow the gap' for all pupils by reducing the negative effect of any 'barriers to learning' on each individual pupil's educational progress.

Newman school believes the Hospital School has an invaluable role to play in supporting schools and the LA to enable a significant number of Rotherham's children and Young People to achieve their full potential despite periods of absence from their school due to short or sustained periods of ill health.

Further more, Newman School believes the Hospital School could play a larger and more important role in working with families and schools along side other agencies to promote the health and well-being of a significant number of our children and Young People who experience unacceptable levels of stress during national tests and examinations.

2nd December 2011

Julie Mott & Margaret O'Hara Newman School

SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD (SFVS)

What is the SFVS?

Schools manage many billions of pounds of public money each year. Effective financial management ensures this money is spent wisely and properly, and allows schools to optimise their resources to provide high-quality teaching and learning and so raise standards and attainment for all their pupils. The SFVS replaces the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS) and has been designed in conjunction with schools to assist them in managing their finances and to give assurance that they have secure financial management in place.

Who is the SFVS for?

The standard is a requirement for local authority maintained schools. Other schools are welcome to use any of the material associated with the standard, if they would find it useful. **Governing bodies** have formal responsibility for the financial management of their schools, and so the standard is primarily aimed at governors.

What do schools need to do?

- The standard consists of 23 questions which governing bodies should formally discuss annually with the head teacher and senior staff.
- The questions which form the standard are in sections A to D. Each question requires an answer of Yes, In Part, or No.
 - If the answer is Yes, the comments column can be used to indicate the main evidence on which the governing body based its answer.
 - If the answer is No or In Part, the column should contain a very brief summary of the position and proposed remedial action.
- In Section E, governors should summarise remedial actions and the timetable for reporting back. Governors should ensure that each action has a specified deadline and an agreed owner.
- The governing body may delegate the consideration of the questions to a finance or other relevant committee, but a detailed report should be provided to the full governing body and the chair of governors must sign the completed form.
- The school must send a copy of the signed standard to their local authority's finance department.

There is no prescription of the level of evidence that the governing body should require. The important thing is that governors are confident about their responses.

What is the role of local authorities (LAs)?

Unlike FMSiS, the SFVS will not be externally assessed. LAs should use schools' SFVS returns to inform their programme of financial assessment and audit. LA and other auditors will have access to the standard, and when they conduct an audit can check whether the self-assessment is in line with their own judgement. Auditors should make the governing body and the LA aware of any major discrepancies in judgements.

Timetable – key dates

- Maintained schools which had not attained FMSiS by the end of March 2010 must complete and submit the SFVS to their local authority by 31 March 2012; and conduct an annual review thereafter.
- For all other maintained schools, the first run through is required by 31 March 2013; and an annual review thereafter.
-

Training

The schools Finance Team are holding a training session for schools on the new standard on 27th September at 1:30pm in Rockingham PDC Hall.

16-19 Funding Formula Review Consultation

The Government's case for change:

- Commitment to all young people staying on in learning to age 18 by 2015 – with a simple post-16 funding system which is fair and transparent will underpin this commitment (Schools White Paper).
- Funding for full-time students age 16-18 should be on a per programme basis, with a given level of funding per learner [adjusted] for differences in the content-related cost of courses, and for particular groups of high need learner (Wolf).
- Learners without Grade C English and maths should progress towards them post 16 (Wolf).

Purpose of Funding Review:

- To ensure the 16-19 funding formula better supports the Government's aims for transparency and fairness.
- To respond to the social mobility agenda through options for an equivalent post-16 'premium'.
- To support the reforms recommended in the Wolf Review (consultation should be read in conjunction with the DoE consultation on 16-19 programme of study).

Timeframe

Autumn 2011	Consultation with the sector
Spring 2012	Decision on and announcement of the changes to be made
2013/14	Raising of the participation age to 17
2013/14	Implementation of new funding formula for 16-19 providers
2015/16	Raising of the participation age to 18

The LA's Response

- 1) The consultation is about the technicalities surrounding post-16 funding methodology. The LA is in a difficult position to respond, as it does not have the technical expertise to fully understand the unintended consequences on providers, provision and geographical locations of each option.
- 2) As a result, the LA backing one methodology over another might be construed as favouring a particular sector, provision offer or geographical location.
- 3) Urge all post-16 providers to respond.

Consultation Details

1) Clear Set of Principles will underpin the new funding system

- Supports full participation in education and training up to age 18 by 2015 and continued drive to close the gap between rich and poor
- Removes risks of perverse incentives to 'pile up' qualifications and steer students onto easy courses
- Funding follows the learner based on lagged funding
- Where practical, the basic elements of the formula should be aligned with proposals for a fair funding formula pre-16
- The formula should contain as few variables as possible and the main users are able to understand how budgets are calculated
- Funding is based on inputs (currently guided learning hours) which recognise the cost of delivery, not outputs
- Delivers change without additional costs over the Spending Review period
- The formula should allow costs to be managed – no 'hidden' demand-driven elements
- The changes should be managed carefully for example through transitional protection, to avoid destabilising quality provision

2) Introducing simpler and more transparent funding for disadvantage

Option 1: A single fund to recognise all forms of disadvantage that includes:

- Funds currently allocated for disadvantage uplift and the proportion of ALS calculated on prior attainment in English and maths
- Allocated directly to providers on a single measure of deprivation
- Funds for meeting support needs resulting from any learning difficulty or disability up to £5,500 would be met by retaining a separate pot

Option 2: A fund to address economic disadvantage only with a separate budget to address other support needs and low level LDD needs, very similar to current arrangements:

- A fund allocated solely to address the needs of learners due to them being from low income households or other identified disadvantaged circumstances.
- It would be allocated directly to providers
- A second, separate budget would be allocated to address other learning support needs (which could use GCSE points scores in English and maths as a proxy for identifying these needs) and low level LDD needs.

Option 3: A fund to address general economic disadvantage only, with a separate budget to address low level LDD needs. Funding to address other learning support needs to be integrated into programme funding:

- This option would create a fund allocated solely to address the needs of learners due to them being from low income households or other identified circumstances, as in option 2 above.
- A separate budget would be allocated to address low level LDD needs.
- No separately identified budget to address more general educational disadvantage this element of the current ALS budget would be incorporated into programme funding and it would be for providers to use the enhanced programme funding for this purpose where appropriate.

3) Options for calculating and allocating disadvantage funding

Option 1: Mirror pre-16 eligibility:

- To include pupils eligible for FSM in one of the last 3 years (known as FSM ever 3), or
- To include pupils eligible for FSM in one of the last 6 years (FSM ever 6).

Option 2: Index of Multiple Deprivation:

- The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is an indicator that shows the relative deprivation of small geographical areas, known as lower super output areas (LSOAs).

Option 3: Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI):

- IDACI is a sub-set of the IMD that focuses on the percentage of children under 16 that live in families that are income deprived (defined as household income below 60% of the national average before housing costs, and/or in receipt of certain benefits).
- It is also an area-based measure that would have the advantage of focusing the funds more closely on children in areas of general economic disadvantage.

4) Simplifying participation funding

Option 1: Funding all full time learners at the same rate:

- All full- time learners would be funded at the same rate, regardless of the actual size of their programme
- The level of funding would be appropriate for a substantial programme of learning
- Programmes would be uplifted by programme weightings.

Option 2: Uplift to recognise larger programmes:

- Option 2: would be very similar to option 1, but in addition would recognise that in some cases large programmes, both academic and vocational, are necessary to meet the aspirations and needs of some young people and therefore attract additional funding.
- 2a There could be two rates available for a full time learner: a rate for the majority of provision that reflects the historical average of delivery (as in option 1), with a second rate for a smaller number of learners on large programmes such as the International Baccalaureate, five A levels, and large vocational programmes.
- 2b There could be a weighting applied to the basic rate for larger programmes, to recognise the additional costs they incur.

Option 3: Funding to recognise different programme sizes:

- A basic full time programme which would include the basic entitlement. An example of programmes included might be level 1 and level 2 programmes and small A level programmes. Providers would have the flexibility to design each programme to include English and maths where considered appropriate.

- An enhanced full time programme to recognise delivery of programmes, that require more teaching time, for example 4 A levels and level 3 vocational programmes.
- A large full time programme as described in option 2, to include programmes for example 5/6 A levels and the International Baccalaureate and large vocational programmes.

5) Success Rates

- Option 1: Continue to recognise success
- Option 2: Remove the success factor completely from the funding formula
- Option 3: Remove the achievement element, but keep the retention element
 - retention element calculated at programme component level
 - retention element calculated at learner level

6) Programme Weighting

- Do you agree we should merge the lowest two programme weightings into one?
- Would reducing the number of weightings for vocational programmes be a significant simplification?
- Do you think that the proposed weightings for programmes would appropriately reflect the relative delivery costs?

7) Transitional Protection

- Option 1 would be to implement all changes in 2013/14 with transitional protection for a three year period. We would supply each provider with an indication of what their individual position would be at the end of the three year period, to ensure providers can manage any reduction. We would apply a maximum limit to any reduction in funding per learner in the first year, with any balance being removed over the next two years.
- Option 2 would be to extend the period of transitional protection by applying a maximum limit to the change in funding per learner each year.

Responses

Responses must be received by 4 January 2012 either:

- online: education.gov.uk/consultations
- by email: 16-19Funding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk, or
- by post:
Consultation Unit
Area 1C
Castle View House
Runcorn
Cheshire WA7 2GJ

The results of the consultation will be published in Spring 2012.