

Rotherham Schools Forum

Venue: Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham.

Date: Friday, 19 March 2010

Time: 8.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Introductions
2. Apologies for Absence.
3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 22nd January 2010 and Matters Arising (copy attached) (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Relocation of Wales SEBD Unit - ISB Funding transfer to LA (copy attached) (Pages 7 - 8)
5. LSC Update - Mike Firth to report
6. Audit Commission School Balance Report (copy attached) (Pages 9 - 10)
7. New Director Appointments in CYPS
8. Icelandic Banks Position
9. Any Other Business
10. Date and Time of Next Meeting

- 23rd April 2010 at 8.30 am in the Bailey Suite, Bailey House, Rotherham

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM
FRIDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2010**

Present:- Geoff Jackson (in the Chair); Mike Firth, Lyndon Hall, Geoff Gillard, Mick Hall, Val Broomhead, Steve Clayton, Jane Fearnley, Peter Hawkrige and Ruth Johnson.

Also in attendance:- Graham Sinclair, David Ashmore and Vera Njelic

71. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies for absence were received from Russell Heritage, Ann Jones, Margaret Hague, Rev Ann Wood, Catharine Kinsella, Joanne Robertson and Julie Westwood.

72. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH DECEMBER 2009

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Rotherham Schools Forum held on 11th December 2009 be approved as a correct record.

73. LSC FUNDING UPDATE

Mike Firth, (LSC) circulated the following documents:

- 16-19 Statement of Priorities 2010-11 – Q&A
- Young People's Learning Division – Briefing Note on the Handover of Financial Arrangements for 16-19 Funding on 1st April 2010

The key points contained within the 16-19 Statement of Priorities were:-

- Total investment of over £8.5 billion for learning participation and support for young people, an increase of 5.9% over 2009-10
- Funding participation increasing by 6.2% to over £7.5 billion, supporting over 1.6 million learners
- An increase of over 12% in Apprenticeship funding, for 21,000 extra learners
- Specialist provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities increasing by 12.7% to £267 million
- Capital funding increasing by over 26% to £270 million
- Final allocations agreed by 31st March 2010

The briefing note set out the main points of the LSC's handover of its financial relationships to local authorities from 1st April 2010 covering:

- The funding local authorities would receive from 1st April 2010
- Calculations of allocations payable to local authorities in relation

16-19 providers

- How local authorities would be paid and required to pay providers
- Procurement and contracting by local authorities
- Local authorities' relationship management of the providers they fund
- Responsibilities for financial monitoring of sixth form colleges and 16-19 providers
- Responsibilities for gaining assurance over YPLA funds for financial year 2010-11

A question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised:-

- Reference was made to the targets which had been set, and a query was raised as to who would be responsible for ensuring these were met. Confirmation was given that it would be the responsibility of the Local Authority for performance management. This would be monitored via the 14-19 Board, who were responsible for refreshing the plan and the Statement of Need. Mike Firth referred to 'The Framework for Excellence' – the Government's performance assessment tool for further education colleges and post-16 education and training providers who received funding from the LSC. It was suggested and agreed that Karen Borthwick be asked to attend a future meeting to provide members with a briefing to the group on the progress made regarding the transfer of responsibilities in Rotherham and our proposed management arrangements.
- In paragraph 36 of the Statement of Priorities, it was stated that funding was to be withdrawn from over 1,000 qualifications from 31st July 2010, which caused concern amongst members. Mike Firth confirmed that it was non-Section 96 qualifications, from which funding was being withdrawn, in effect reducing the breadth of programmes. Funding would only be available for those qualifications which were set against national targets.
- Members of the group expressed concern that targets were being set from the top down. The government were telling schools what they needed as opposed to the Local Authority telling the government what they required for young people.
- Mike Firth highlighted paragraph 53 of the Statement of Priorities which explained that in-year adjustments could be made to move funding from providers who significantly under delivered on learner numbers.
- Mike Firth explained that the Skills Funding Agency would have sponsorship of Colleges and therefore the responsibility for resolving major issues.

Mike Firth reported that the National Commissioning Framework (NCF) which set out the core systems for planning, commissioning, procuring and funding for the education and training for 16-19 year olds was

available on the internet, and he agreed to make the link available to members of the group, should they wish to access it.

He confirmed that growth money would be available and there would be a process for allocating it for those most in need in Rotherham. Some of the funds would however be held back for an open tender process.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

74. SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY FUND 2009/10

David Ashmore, Senior Manager, Resources and Access gave an update to members in respect of the Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund 2009/10.

He confirmed that 17 primary schools had been supported by the fund and a further 4 were still being monitored.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

75. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

Graham Sinclair, Programme Director, Building Schools for the Future presented the submitted report in respect of the Building Schools for the Future (Transforming Rotherham Learning) – Outline Business Case.

The Outline Business Case (OBC), was now ready for submission which was targeted to take place on 26th January 2010. This followed the successful approval by Partnerships for Schools of our Strategy for Change Part 2 in October 2009.

The key principles and objectives of the project which were outlined in the OBC were :-

- We are all responsible for all Rotherham's Children and Young People
- All Rotherham's learners will achieve; no one will be left behind
- Learning is the core business: investment, policy and strategy must be driven by opportunities for learners
- Learning Communities will be rooted in and responsible to the needs of local people.

Currently, BSF investment was contributing £80m towards the scheme with a further £25.5m coming from Council and school sources;

- | | |
|--|-------|
| • School Budget Prudential Borrowing | £2m |
| • Council General Fund – Prudential Borrowing | £5m |
| • Supported Borrowing from 14-19 | £6.5m |
| • Devolved Formula Capital Grant | £2m |
| • Supported Borrowing from Schools Modernisation and Access Initiative | £3.5m |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| • Primary Capital Programme | £6.5m |
| • Total | £25.5m |

The schools Forum was requested to confirm its agreement to the £2m Schools Budget Prudential Borrowing.

In order to help the affordability position going forward it was suggested there should be a contingency element to support any variances to the programme. The Programme Director had seen between £500k and £1m per annum as a contingency element.

Schools Forum was requested to underwrite this element from the DSG and the Programme Director would report on its use, if any, to future Schools Forums.

A question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised:-

- Concerns were expressed about the possibility of costs spiralling year on year. It was confirmed that the figures discussed had taken into account year on year costs and therefore it would remain the same. It was also confirmed that if the funding was not used it would go back to the schools budget.
- A comment was made that when the PFI came about the specification used was from Building Bulletin 92. Would the specification for this be from the 21st Century? Confirmation was given that schools built now would be a lot more spacious with classroom sizes being a lot bigger.
- Concerns were raised that to agree this could have implications for staff in some schools in that if cuts needed to be made that would be an area most likely to be affected.

Resolved:- (1) That the Schools Forum agree to the £2m contribution from the DSG to the capital expenditure in Phase 1 and;

(2) That the Schools Forum agree to underwrite a contingency element of up to £500k per annum from the DSG, which would be used across both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project, but that a reservation regarding staffing levels be noted.

76. **CONTRACT LEASES - INTERNATIONAL FINANCE REPORTING STANDARDS**

Vera Njelic, Principal Accountant (Schools) reported that as part of changes required in the preparation of accounts, information was required in relation to all leases held by schools. She confirmed that she had met with Bursars from Secondary Schools and would be writing to all schools to request this information on a proforma spreadsheet to be provided.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

77. WALKING TO SCHOOL INITIATIVES GRANT 2009-10

Consideration was given to a letter from the Department of Transport in respect of Payment of Walking to School Initiatives Grant under Section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003, which included detail of 10 Rotherham schools that had been successful and the funds they had received.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

78. TEACHER TRADE UNIONS FACILITATION TIME

Graham Sinclair, Programme Director, Building Schools for the Future, outlined the current arrangements regarding Teacher Trade Unions Facilitation time.

The local agreement currently provided time off for officials from the NUT; ATL; ACSL and the NAHT to support their members. The vast majority of teaching staff were members of the NUT or NASUWT.

The current 3 day allocation for each of the Trade Unions was proving to be insufficient, both in terms of the Trade Unions being able to deal with the level of case work and for management who are often unable to engage with Trade Union officials.

The Education Consultative Committee agreed the formal request made to the Strategic Director by both the NASUWT and NUT for time to be increased to 5 days per week.

It was noted that funding for the additional days from 2010 would be taken from savings made within the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Agreed:- That the increased number of days and funding contribution for the Teacher Trade Unions Facilitation Time be noted and agreed.

79. MALTBY ACADEMY FINANCE

Vera Njelic, Principal Accountant (Schools) updated the Group on the funding that had been allocated to Maltby Academy to cover the period 1 January – 31 March 2010 following the transfer out of local authority control.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

80. SECTION 251 FINANCIAL DATA COLLECTION

Vera Njelic, Principal Accountant (Schools) presented a letter received in respect of Section 251: Financial Data collection of education and children's social services budget information 2010/11. A number of

changes had been proposed in respect of data relating to the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF). As Rotherham had taken the decision to delay implementation of the EYSFF it was thought these changes would have less impact for Rotherham in 2010/11.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

81. SCHOOLS BUDGETS 2010/11

Vera Njelic, Principal Accountant (Schools) reported to members that the Authority was aiming to send budgets for 2010/11 out to schools by 19th March 2010.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

82. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting be held on Friday 19th March 2010 at 8.30 am at Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO SCHOOLS’ FORUM

1.	Meeting:	SCHOOLS’ FORUM
2.	Date:	19 th March 2010
3.	Title:	Funding for the resource unit at Wales Primary School
4.	Programme Area:	Children & Young People’s Services

5. Summary

Provision for primary aged children experiencing social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (sebd) in Rotherham is currently under review, led by Katy Edmondson, Curriculum Advisor for Behaviour and Attendance. In November 2009, the Inclusion Strategic Steering Group (ISSG) agreed a process of consultation with schools through the forum of cluster meetings and this is ongoing.

Primary provision for sebd is part time and children remain on the roll of a mainstream school. Provision includes the following:

1. Children with a statement of SEN
 - o Resource unit based at Thorogate Junior and Infant School (delegated resource)
 - o Resource unit based at Wales Primary School (delegated resource)
2. Children who are at risk of exclusion who may or may not have a statement of SEN
 - o Enhanced Resource Centre at St Ann’s, managed by the Behaviour Support Service

In November, the Local Authority received a request from the head teacher and Chair of Governors at Wales Primary School to close and relocate the resource unit. This followed difficulties over time with staffing and their capacity to meet the needs of the children and schools. The Local Authority approved the request, at Director level, and at February half term the unit ceased to operate.

Following prior consultation with the parents and schools involved, the children have now transferred to Thorogate resource unit. Two of the staff (HLTAs) have also transferred to Thorogate to retain continuity for the children, families and to extend outreach provision within the schools where the children are on roll. Thorogate resource unit had only two children on ‘roll’ and so the additional children have been accommodated within existing capacity, supplemented by the two additional staff. The two Thorogate children and two of the four Wales children are Y6 and will be supported through the transition phase to secondary education in September 2010.

The third Wales member of staff has been transferred to the Behaviour Support Service to provide targeted support for schools and children.

All the staffing arrangements are temporary until the outcome of the review is known.

6. Proposal for moving the delegated funding from ISB to the centre from 1st April 2010 until the outcome of the review is confirmed

The following is proposed with regard to the delegated funding arrangements:

The delegated (unit attached) allocation for 2010/2011 is £100,732. This largely covers staffing costs. The school also receives an additional allocation of £8,857 at 09/10 prices, from a budget held centrally, to fund non-pay costs.

For the remainder of the 2009/2010 financial year, Wales Primary School will continue to hold the delegated budget and additional allocation and be responsible for all expenditure relating to the functions of the resource. Therefore, staffing costs, travel claims, phone calls and any other relevant costs will continue to be charged to this budget. It is expected that Wales Primary School will remain within budget.

For the 2010/2011 financial year, the delegated budget allocation for the Wales resource will also be held centrally. Staffing and non pay costs will be paid accordingly. Given that the review may result in a further change to provision for primary sebd in Rotherham, and that the staff members are not all located at the resource unit, it is not considered expedient to transfer the budget allocation to Thorogate.

Arrangements have been made with the head teacher of Thorogate to confirm operational line management responsibilities.

7. Schools Forum are requested to support the proposal.

Contact Name:

Helen Barre
Special Educational Needs Assessment Service
Children and Young People's Services
01709-822656
Helen.barre@rotherham.gov.uk

Statistical Neighbour & Y&H Region Comparison	2006/07				2007/08				2008/09			
	Total No. of Schools	Total Revenue Balance	Ave Rev Balance per School	Total Revenue Balance as % of Income	Total No. of Schools	Total Revenue Balance	Ave Rev Balance per School	Total Revenue Balance as % of Income	Total No. of Schools	Total Revenue Balance	Ave Rev Balance per School	Total Revenue Balance as % of Income
Local Authority												
Rotherham	129	£5,822,312	£45,134	3.15%	128	£8,736,689	£68,255	4.44%	126	£6,891,508	£54,695	3.35%
Statistical Neighbours												
Doncaster	126	£11,762,584	£93,354	6.05%	131	£11,015,626	£84,089	5.41%	131	£8,270,398	£63,133	3.96%
Wigan	145	£10,251,028	£70,697	5.28%	136	£12,867,796	£94,616	6.29%	135	£13,752,594	£101,871	6.50%
Barnsley	97	£7,979,043	£82,258	6.00%	97	£10,325,030	£106,444	7.31%	96	£10,224,330	£106,503	7.00%
Tameside	99	£5,122,748	£51,745	3.71%	97	£7,392,222	£76,208	5.10%	97	£5,234,674	£53,966	3.65%
Hartlepool	39	£4,177,017	£107,103	6.29%	39	£4,643,927	£119,075	6.53%	39	£4,428,207	£113,544	6.00%
St Helens	71	£7,661,839	£107,913	6.98%	68	£8,282,320	£121,799	7.22%	68	£6,613,978	£97,264	5.64%
Wakefield	151	£13,999,095	£92,709	7.08%	150	£14,083,764	£93,892	6.73%	150	£13,537,192	£90,248	6.16%
Dudley	112	£11,150,564	£99,559	5.61%	108	£13,875,533	£128,477	6.58%	108	£12,146,011	£112,463	5.64%
Telford and Wrekin	84	£4,146,221	£49,360	4.12%	76	£4,307,453	£56,677	4.17%	75	£3,539,749	£47,197	3.40%
Yorkshire and Humberside												
Barnsley	97	£7,979,043	£82,258	6.00%	97	£10,325,030	£106,444	7.31%	96	£10,224,330	£106,503	7.00%
Bradford	206	£12,110,572	£58,789	3.30%	204	£18,980,444	£93,041	4.81%	203	£19,299,874	£95,073	4.71%
Calderdale	103	£6,271,373	£60,887	4.37%	103	£7,521,769	£73,027	4.93%	103	£7,366,938	£71,524	4.62%
City of Kingston-upon-Hull	101	£6,002,749	£59,433	3.74%	94	£6,390,962	£67,989	3.80%	94	£4,595,734	£48,891	2.76%
Doncaster	126	£11,762,584	£93,354	6.05%	131	£11,015,626	£84,089	5.41%	131	£8,270,398	£63,133	3.96%
East Riding of Yorkshire	158	£6,437,999	£40,747	3.39%	161	£9,434,923	£58,602	4.71%	154	£9,377,808	£60,895	4.52%
Kirklees	195	£15,012,944	£76,989	5.80%	192	£18,345,888	£95,552	6.61%	192	£18,238,197	£94,991	6.28%
Leeds	273	£7,227,132	£26,473	1.61%	268	£14,891,452	£55,565	3.15%	264	£17,659,490	£66,892	3.55%
North East Lincolnshire	76	£3,295,769	£43,365	3.21%	81	£2,853,225	£35,225	2.84%	71	£2,786,098	£39,241	2.82%
North Lincolnshire	84	£2,579,521	£30,709	2.77%	83	£2,505,258	£30,184	2.52%	81	£2,249,604	£27,773	2.23%
North Yorkshire	390	£18,258,945	£46,818	5.14%	387	£14,855,100	£38,385	3.99%	386	£13,237,329	£34,294	3.42%
Sheffield	184	£8,669,922	£47,119	3.01%	178	£13,086,108	£73,517	4.28%	177	£15,626,720	£88,287	4.90%
Wakefield	151	£13,999,095	£92,709	7.08%	150	£14,083,764	£93,892	6.73%	150	£13,537,192	£90,248	6.16%
York	68	£3,808,469	£56,007	4.18%	69	£5,247,455	£76,050	5.42%	67	£4,245,213	£63,361	4.26%
England												
England Totals	22,470	£1,670,198,878	£74,330	5.32%	22,302	£1,918,768,630	£86,036	5.75%	22,025	£1,781,973,700	£80,907	5.15%

Schools with Excessive Surplus Balances					
	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total Number of Schools					
Rotherham	30	22	26	43	22
Change on Previous Year		-26.67%	18.18%	65.38%	-48.84%
% of schools with excess Surplus Balances					
Rotherham	22.7%	16.8%	20.2%	33.6%	17.5%
England Average	40.9%	38.6%	38.4%	38.3%	32.7%
Y&H Average	31.8%	28.2%	30.0%	32.0%	24.6%
Statistical Neighbours	38.3%	37.1%	38.7%	42.3%	32.3%
Rotherham Rank - % of schools with excess surpluses (ranked lowest to highest i.e. LA with lowest % of schools ranks no.1)					
England (150 LA's)	16	8	18	58	21
Y&H (15 LA's)	3	2	3	8	4
Statistical Neighbours (11 LA's)	1	1	1	1	1