

Rotherham Schools Forum

Venue: Rockingham PDC

Date: Friday, 24th June, 2011

Time: 8.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for Absence.
2. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 13th May, 2011. (copy attached)
(Pages 1 - 6)
3. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes
4. Formally Centrally Held Grant Consultation
- due to timescale, a paper will be distributed at the meeting
5. Details on the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership (Page 7)
- Nick Whittaker to report
6. Schools' Contingency Update - Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty and Redundancy Costs
- Vera Njegic to report
7. School Balances from 2010-2011 School Year
- Vera Njegic to report
8. DSG Funding % Split (Pages 8 - 9)
9. Behaviour Support Service Report
- Roger Burman to report
10. Value for Money Review of School Catering Service (Pages 10 - 11)
- Clare Burton to report
11. SEN Value for Money Review Update (Pages 12 - 14)
- Phil Marshall to report
12. School Funding Reform Consultation
- Joanne Robertson to report

13. Extended Services Update
- Sue Shelley to report
14. School Finance Steering Group - Terms of Reference
- Fiona Radford to report
15. Drug and Alcohol - Education Provision (Page 15)
- letter from Simon Perry (for information)
16. Supporting Roma Ethnic Children 0-19 Years
- Martin Fittes/Bev Booker to report
17. Finance Master Class for the Forum
18. Any other business.
19. Date, time and venue for the next meeting:-
- All meetings to be held on Fridays commencing at 8.30 a.m. at the Rockingham PDC (Fitzwilliam Room):-

7th October, 2011
9th December
20th January, 2012
2nd March
16th March

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM
FRIDAY, 13TH MAY, 2011**

Present:-

David Silvester	Wath C.E. IN THE CHAIR
Karen Borthwick	14-19 Partnership representative
Paul Blackwell	Dinnington Comprehensive
Sue Brook	NASUWT
Val Broomhead	Unison
David Butler	St. Bernard's R.C.
Steve Clayton	Thrybergh SSC
Bev Clubley	Thrybergh SSC
John Day	Wales High
Jane Fearnley	Herringthorpe Junior
Mr. G. Gillard	Sheffield Diocese
Geoff Jackson	Governor, High Greave Infant
Margaret Hague	The Arnold Centre
Angela Heald	Wath Our Lady and St. Joseph's
John Henderson	Canklow Woods/Whiston Worrygoose
Donna Humphries	Aston LC/Aston Hall J&I
Kay Jessop	Roughwood Primary
Helen Nartey	Hilltop Special
Lynne Pepper	Herringthorpe Infant
Dave Pridding	Swinton Comprehensive
Dave Sutton	Maltby Academy
Sue Warner	Wickersley Northfield Primary
Stuart Wilson	Rawmarsh Comprehensive

Officers:-

Rob Holsey	EDS, RMBC
Vera Njegic	Financial Services, RMBC
Joanne Robertson	Financial Services, RMBC
Dorothy Smith	CYPS, RMBC
Sue Wilson	CYPS, RMBC

Apologies for absence were received from Roger Burman, David Naisbitt and Joyce Thacker.

178. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8TH APRIL, 2011

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8th April, 2011, be approved as a correct record.

179. ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM - CONSTITUTION

Reflecting discussions that had taken place at previous Schools Forum meetings, a copy of the new constitution was submitted for approval.

It was highlighted that under No. 11 (Review of Constitution) it stated that the constitution and membership would be reviewed annually but under No. 3 (Membership) that the term of office would be for a maximum of 3 years.

Agreed:- That the constitution be amended accordingly.

180. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - OUTTURN STATEMENT AND BUDGET COMPARISONS

Joanne Robertson, CYPS Finance, circulated the outturn statement for the Centrally Managed Services 2011 including the proposed 2011/12 DSG allocation and the former Centrally Retained Specific Grants transferred into the DSG allocation.

Attention was drawn to the various budget lines that had a variance (overspend/underspend). Discussion took place on the document with the following issues highlighted/clarified:-

Centrally Managed Services

- This was the final budget for 2010/11 with the amount of funding available for DSG for the services listed
- A query was raised in relation to the heading 'Playing for Success' regarding the description shown on previous versions of the DSG budget. JR confirmed that this was match funding from DSG for the former a Standards Fund Grant. Details to be confirmed at next meeting.
- The Chair asked for an explanation regarding the reduction in % of DSG funding allocated to the Services shown on the spreadsheet. JR explained that there was no specific decision regarding the % of funding from any source, but for the financial year 2011/12 the allocation was agreed at the same level as in 2010/11 with the exception of those items no longer funded, Early Years, Private, Voluntary and Independent Sector funding and the Schools PFI allocations. The % of DSG for each service will depend on the amount of revenue, other grant an income deemed to be available. For some areas in 2011/12 there had been reductions in other sources of grant funding, revenue and income. Therefore the resulting % would change despite the allocation being the same.
- Trade Union activities -
 - o Currently if a Union had 30 members in a school, the school would provide 2 lessons cover for that Trade Union representative. This could have a big impact for secondary schools and would be paying out more for Trade Union time than the original agreement. Should there be full-time Trade Union activity in the Authority and in a school? Was this the best way?
 - o It had been the understanding that the time was for when Trade Union members met Local Authority Members to discuss Local Authority issues and not individual school issues
 - o It was more beneficial for issues to be dealt with at a local level rather than national
 - o The budget would not be able to sustain a small primary school that had to provide 3 Union representatives but could with regional representation
 - o Time was required to negotiate and clarify as to why funding was at that level

- Money was saved through local knowledge and the understanding that had been built up over many years
- The funding had been reduced to £56,442 from £112,883
- It had to be ascertained exactly what the funding covered and where independent schools sat within it

The 2 options before the meeting were (i) £112,443 budget with a short period of time to clarify the points above and then reconsider it at a future meeting with a view to the original budget figure retained or budget cut or (ii) £56,442 budget and clarity of the budget.

A vote then took place on the 2 options.

Agreed:- (1) That the budget for Trade Union activity be set at £56,442 with clarity on exactly what the money was used for.

Sue Brooks declared a personal interest in the above item and did not vote thereon.

Agreed:- (2) That a breakdown be submitted to the next meeting on the Schools Contingency Fund.

(3) That 3 monthly budget updates be submitted to future Schools Forum meetings.

(4) That a schedule be prepared for the next meeting showing the % split of all sources of funding for each service currently funded by DSG in 2011/12 and a comparison with 2010/11.

(5) That the Forum or a Sub-Group consider the budget in January/February, 2012.

Former Centrally Retained Special Grants transferred into DSG Allocation

- An explanation regarding the former centrally retained specific grants now included in the DSG allocation for 2011/12 was given. It was noted that there was a reduction in the funding earmarked as being equivalent to 2010/11 specific grant allocations.
- Overall 21% reduction due to the reduction in pupil numbers. It had been fixed pro rata apart from the Extended School Sustainability
- The Local Authority had in effect 'lost' £1M compared to what it would have received under the previous regulations. Previously the Authority received dual funding for any child with dual registration; DSG had now been withdrawn for dual registered pupils so there was only single funding
- Extended School Sustainability
 - In agreement with Joyce Thacker, Sue Shelley was going to use the remainder for the sustainability element for 2010/11 on staff pay up to the end of August, 2011. Sue was now seeking clarification on the remainder that was available for 2011/12. Did schools want her to spend it over an academic year, financial year or on the Extended

Service at all?

- Although the money had been put into the funds with the budget headings all was subjective in terms of if not being ringfenced any more, therefore, the money that sat next to each of the headings could be spent in a different manner or decided to maintain structure and arrangements in a different way
- Not to allocate it in the present method would mean unpredictability and instability for schools
- Concern with the current model. If your school was not in an action zone you had to use the money in your school budget to give equality/opportunities. Had the action zones been reviewed given the demographics of Rotherham had changed significantly since their inception 3 years ago?
- Schools needed to plan for the future and any withdrawal of funding had to be planned for
- Any review of the action zones needed to carefully consider what their benefits were so that rationale decisions could be made to allow for adjustment to financial changes
- Concerns had been expressed by Head Teachers with regard to the number of Roma/Slovakian children in their schools for which, at the present time, there was no real support as there was no funding through EMAC nor in terms of Pupil Premium. It had been requested that some consideration be given as to how Roma/Slovakian children could be supported through the allocation of funding
- The action zones were not just about the amount of funding they received but the impact they had on children's lives and how that was measured
- Notice would be given to staff next week. When a decision was made in June it may be that some of them could have moved on
- Identify any surpluses by City Learning Centres
- It was almost impossible to look at the budget headings and make changes for the current financial year. Planning should take place for 2012/13
- There was frustration by families that could not access it whose children would benefit
- Some schools were already providing their own provision
- Request the Finance Sub-Group to put together different scenarios for the use of the funding

The 2 options before the meeting were (i) that the funding be allocated to the Extended Services but with greater flexibility in the criteria or (ii) defer

until the June meeting after the Finance Sub-Group had met.

A vote then took place on the 2 options.

Agreed:- (6) That the funding be allocated to the Extended Services with greater flexibility in the criteria.

(7) That a number of Head Teachers work with Sue Shelley to look at the criteria.

181. CARETAKING OF SCHOOL PREMISES

A report was circulated setting out the current position with caretakers properties.

Currently there were 58 properties occupied by school caretakers at non-PFI schools in Rotherham. The rental income was collected by Housing Services for which they charged an 16% administration fee resulting in a net income of approximately £110,000 per annum.

It was proposed that the rental income be kept centrally and would be used solely to service, maintain and improve the properties. The servicing and maintenance requirements would be captured and then managed by the building managers as they currently did. The remaining income would be spent on improvements to the properties on a rolling programme determined by need and when properties became vacant due to a change in caretaker. The income would be fully spent each year with no contribution needed from other funding sources.

An annual report would be produced showing how the income had been spent, which properties benefited and the programme for the following year.

Agreed:- That the report be noted and communicated to all schools.

182. YORKSHIRE AND HUMBERSIDE GRID FOR LEARNING - FUNDING FOR 2011/2012

Sue Wilson, Performance and Quality Manager, gave a brief reminder of the background to the above issue.

The New Technology Working Group had met and considered what Rotherham Schools wanted and needed. They had received a presentation on the Yorkshire and Humber Grid for Learning on what it could provide that was not currently tapped into and there had been a cross over in the services. A plan was to be put together on who would provide what. It was hoped to improve the service through video conferencing and skype.

It was acknowledged that it had not been a great success in the past but there was a willingness to improve the service.

Agreed:- That the £100,000 be taken from DSG and that the New Technology Working Group continue to ascertain the merits of YHGL so as a decision could be made in December, 2011, as to whether a notice to quit was served.

183. NHS POSTS

Consideration was given to a letter sent to all Head Teachers by the NHS Foundation Trust regarding the Health funded posts Health Education Nurse Advisor, Speech and Language Therapist and the Moving and Handling Co-ordinator.

2 of the 3 posts were funded by DSG, the third post by the NHS.

It was acknowledged that more children with multiple and complex needs were coming through the mainstream school system. Staff were not experts or trained in how to move and handle such children. Since the letter, negotiations with the NHS had achieved funding for the Speech and Language Therapist post but not the remaining 2. Should the services be not funded, schools that used them would have to buy them in for a child with specific needs.

The issue would be discussed at the Value for Money meeting on 16th May, 2011.

Agreed:- That funding for the 2 posts be supported.

(Helen Nartey declared a personal interest in the above item.)

184. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**DFE Consultations**

Joanne Robertson reported that there were currently 2 consultations taking place:-

1. Academy funding
2. Schools funding from April, 2012.

The closing date for both was 26th May.

The DFE was requesting responses from individual schools and governing bodies. It was suggested that the Finance Sub-Group consider the 2 consultations but that in future consultations be submitted to the Forum in the first instance.

Funding Request

A request had been received from Asset Management seeking further funding from DSG for the shortfall in the fund for training drivers and escorts for children with disabilities.

Agreed:- That the request be discussed at the Value for Money meeting.

185. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - FRIDAY 24TH JUNE 2011 AT 8.30 A.M.

Agreed:- That a further meeting be held on Friday, 24th June, 2011, commencing at 8.30 a.m. at the Rockingham Teachers' Centre.

Rotherham School Improvement Partnership Next Steps

Following a series of consultation meetings with Heads, Learning Community Representatives and the SES team, the following actions and activities will take place:

1. The Strategic Group is now formed and will meet on Tuesday 7th June to determine protocols, ways of working, the relationship with the Teaching School Alliance and possible priorities for Year 1. The group comprises: Nick Whitaker, Anne Sanderson, Julie Turner, Amanda Bartholomew, Donna Humphries, David Hudson, Dave Sutton, Roger Burman, Joyce Thacker, Phil Marshall and a Primary Consultant Headteacher.
2. Schools and Learning Communities, with Consultant Headteacher, support will conduct a summative audit of performance that will RAG rate schools against national expectations of attainment and progress. This will cover outcomes for 2010, 2011 and current outcomes for Years 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10. These will be presented in Learning Community format. Support on data will be available from Karen Hopkins and Matthew Sorby, if required.
3. Additionally, the audit will identify strengths and support needs within and across schools and Learning Communities. The challenge for Consultant Heads and other colleagues is to broker a match between these elements beginning in September 2011. The RSIP will also source support from other LAs to deliver the mission underpinning the partnership work.
4. On the morning of June 6th Consultant Heads will meet briefly to discuss common ways of supporting the construction of the audit and school/LC self evaluation.
5. The intended timescales are:
 - SGC meet June 7th, early July and late July.
 - School and LA audit completed by late June
 - Summary and recommendations presented to SGC early July
 - Workforce arrangements finalised July 2011 e.g. SES, NLEs, LLEs, support commissioned school to school
 - Signposting of schools and Learning Communities' priorities, development needs, areas of strength, etc available September
6. The key role of the RSIP will be to identify the value added of funding new ways of working and finding ways in which we can help alleviate barriers to effective collaborative working in order that we can better deliver our mission. Progress will be communicated to other groups on a regular basis.

Services Funded by Dedicated Schools Grant in 2011/12 Financial Year- Comparison of % Funding Split to 2010/11 Financial Year

	2010/11							Notes
	Total Budgeted Expenditure	Funded By		Revenue		Other Income		
		Dedicated Schools Grant	%		%		%	
Autism Communication Team	168,205	162,438	97	0		5,767	3	Other income is income received in respect of Services Provided to Academies
Behaviour Support Service	711,325	701,325	99	0		10,000	1	Other income is fee income for courses delivered
Children and Families Special Needs Service	129,964	129,964	100	0		0		
Children in Public Care (Get Real Team)	468,229	143,856	31	220,121	47	104,252	22	Other income is area based grant which stopped at 31.3.11
Early Intervention Team	119,006	50,693	43	68,313	57	0		
Early Years ASD Support	90,464	90,464	100	0		0		
Early Years Private, Voluntary and Independent Provision	1,956,032	1,956,032	100	0		0		
Ethnic Minority Achievement Team	308,425	102,307	33	37541	12	168,577	55	£71,088 of other income was Area Based Grant which ceased 31/3/11
Hearing Impaired Service	602,404	561,557	93	40,847	7			Other income is services traded, some with Academies
Learning Support Service	670,669	327,471	49	0		343,198	51	Other income is income from individual schools - Service Level Agreement in place
Operational Safeguarding Unit	764,953	122,919	16	597,156	78	44,878	6	Other income is Section 28A Health Contributions and income from training
Payment to RBT for Assessment of Free Meals Eligibility	36,656	35,501	97	0		1,155	3	Other income is charges to Academies
Portage Service	203,421	199,198	98	0		4,223	2	Other income is Surestart Grant which has ceased 31/03/11
Primary Strategy - Central Co-ordination	333,439	190,960	57	0		142,479	43	Other income is Standards Fund - ceased for the Financial Year 11/12
Pupil Referral Units and Education Other than at School	2,537,679	2,039,072	80	43,250	2	455,357	18	Other income includes £28kArea Based grant which ceased 31/03/11
Rotherham College of Arts & Technology Year 11 Children	10,000	10,000	100	0		0		This is Rotherham MBC contribution - full costs not known
Resources & Business Strategy	171,321	18,186	11	93,566	55	59,569	35	Other income is Area based grant and other specific grant contributions which stopped at 31.3.11
Rotherham Mind	35,000	35,000	100	0		0		This is Rotherham MBC contribution - full costs not known
School Effectiveness Service	1,650,708	568,969	34	949,479	58	132,260	8	Other income is miscellaneous income and Surestart Grant (ceased 31.3.11)
Schools Catering Service	7,163,821	185,436	3	0		6,978,385		Other income is traded service related income and £427k school lunch grant
Schools Contingency	517,350	517,350	100	0		0		
Schools PFI	15,103,509	2,988,718	20	0		12,114,791	80	
Secondary Strategy - Central Co-ordination	385,991	203,355	53	0		182,636	47	Other income is Area Based Grant which ceased 31/03/11
SEN Assessment Services	330,273	30,452	9	252,054	76	47,767	1	as above
SEN Pupils Transport To Extra-District Schls	260,000	101,000	39	159,000	61	0		
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	3,292,504	3,060,009	93	232,495	7	0		
Special SEN Extra District Placements	0	-178,226	100	0		178,226		£464775 income from other LA's budgeted, offset by expenditure in other LA's £286,549
Trade Union Activities	112,883	112,883	100	0		0		
Visually Impaired Service	389,024	376,956	97	0		12,068	3	Other income is Services provided to Academies
Young People's Service	1,124,461	72,189	6	919,104	82	133,168		Other income includes Standards Fund Grant now ceased, rental income and recoverable employee costs

Services Funded by Dedicated Schools Grant in 2011/12 Financial Year- Comparison of % Funding Split to 2010/11 Financial Year

	2011/12							Notes
	Total Budgeted Expenditure	Funded By Dedicated Schools Grant	%	Revenue*	%	Other Income	%	
Autism Communication Team	168,205	162,438	97	0		5,767	3	Other income is income received in respect of Services Provided to Academies
Behaviour Support Service	711,325	701,325	99	0		10,000	1	Other income is fee income for courses delivered
Children and Families Special Needs Service	129,964	129,964	100	0		0		
Children in Public Care (Get Real Team)	219,606	143,856	66	75,750	34	0		
Early Intervention Team	170,969	50,693	30	120,276	70	0		
Early Years ASD Support	90,464	90,464	100	0		0		
Early Years Private, Voluntary and Independent Provision	2,529,431	2,529,431	100	0		0		
Ethnic Minority Achievement Team	187,337	102,307	55	37,541	20	47,489	25	Other income is DSG which was formerly specific grant
Hearing Impaired Service	602,404	561,557	93	40,847	7	0		
Learning Support Service	670,669	327,471	49	0		343,198	51	Other income is income from individual schools - Service Level Agreement in place
Operational Safeguarding Unit	762,144	122,919	16	593,899	78	45,326	6	
Payment to RBT for Assessment of Free Meals Eligibility	36,656	35,501	97	0		1,155	3	
Portage Service	199,198	199,198	100	0		0		
Primary Strategy - Central Co-ordination	190,960	190,960	100	0		0		
Pupil Referral Units and Education Other than at School	2,476,744	2,039,072	82	10,956		426,716	17	
Rotherham College of Arts & Technology Year 11 Children	10,000	10,000		0		0		
Resources & Business Strategy	3,000	3,000		0		0		Team ceased to exist for 11/12 - use of £3k DSG yet to be confirmed
Rotherham Mind	35,000	35,000	100	0		0		
School Effectiveness Service	1,420,355	568,969	40	851,386	60	0		
Schools Catering Service	7,418,858	77,265	1	0		7,341,593	99	Other income is traded service related income and £350k equivalent school lunch grant now in DSG (5/12)
Schools Contingency	517,350	517,350	100	0		0		
Schools PFI	15,583,000	3,233,435	21	0		12,349,565	79	
Secondary Strategy - Central Co-ordination	203,355	203,355	100	0		0		
SEN Assessment Services	233,544	30,452	13	203,092	87	0		Revenue saving of £50k offered up in 11/12
SEN Pupils Transport To Extra-District Schls	260,000	101,000	39	159,000	61	0		
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	3,197,639	3,012,009	94	185,630	6	0		
Special SEN Extra District Placements	0	-178,226	100	0		178,226		
Trade Union Activities	56,442	56,442		0		0		
Visually Impaired Service	389,024	376,956	97	0		12,068	3	
Young People's Service	1,020,997	69,023	7	817,525	80	134,449	13	

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO SCHOOL FORUM MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Schools Forum
2.	Date:	24th June, 2011
3.	Title:	Value for Money Review of School Catering Service
4.	Directorate:	Chief Executive's Office

5. Summary

It has previously been agreed by Head Teachers (in a meeting about DSG funding) that a Value for Money Review of the Local Authority's School Catering Services should be undertaken.

This review will be undertaken by the Local Authority's Corporate Commissioning Team. We aim to work with the Schools Forum to ensure that all schools are enabled to take part in this Value for Money Review.

Consultation with stakeholders will inform this review.

6. Recommendations

That Schools Forum Members agree that:

- 6.1 The members of the School Forum agree to be a part of the value for money review of School Catering.**
- 6.2 That a report on the findings of the review be presented to a future meeting.**

7. Proposals and Details

School meals are currently provided to Schools by the Local Authority's School Catering Service, with the exception of a few schools who have commissioned their own service.

A value for money review of the Local Authority's School Catering Service is being undertaken in June/July 2011.

The purpose of this review is to ensure that Schools are receiving the maximum benefit from the Service.

It is important in any value for money review that this is not just based on price but also the quality of the service and whether the balance between the two is right.

The Value for Money Review will consider:-

- the cost of a school meal in Rotherham;
- the quality of a school meal;
- the nutritional value of a school meal;
- the views of Head Teachers and Parents about the School Meals Service;
- past and present performance of the service;
- benchmarking with other Local Authorities;
- the additionally of the service.

A letter has already been drafted and sent to Schools, asking each Head Teacher to complete a satisfaction questionnaire. Head Teachers have also been asked to distribute parent satisfaction questionnaires to a selection of parents in their School. It is hoped that as many schools as possible are able to facilitate this consultation with parents.

Any opportunities for further consultation with parents will be taken, e.g Parents Forum and any suggestions or support from schools will be most welcome.

8. Finance

The only financial implications in undertaking the review relate to the costs associated with consultation and these should be minimal.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

That all stakeholders have the opportunity to put their views forward about the service.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Children and Young People's Plan in relation to improving the welfare of children and young people and ensuring they live a healthy lifestyle.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

None .

Contact Name: Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioning Manager, Ext 22308, email:chrissy.wright@rotherham.gov.uk.

1st Floor, Norfolk House, Walker Place, Rotherham S65 1AS
Tel: (01709) 254835 Fax: (01709) 822501

Where Everyone Matters

Email: clare.burton@rotherham.gov.uk
Email the Council for **free** @ your local library!

To All Rotherham Headteachers

24th May 2011

Dear Headteacher,

The Rotherham School Improvement Partnership has set up a group of colleagues from a range of backgrounds, including several Headteachers, to undertake a Value for Money Review on all Special Educational Needs Services delivered to children and young people and their families in Rotherham.

The purpose of this review is to ensure that Schools are receiving the maximum benefit from the Special Educational Needs Services available. We will also be looking at whether we have the right balance between the quality and cost of these Services.

To enable a judgement to be made about the quality of the Service, it is important that we include your views about the Services you are receiving. We will also be seeking the views of parents with children who have special educational needs.

This review will cover the following Services:

- Hearing and Visually Impaired Service
- Autism Communication Team
- Early years ASD Support
- Portage Service
- Support in, and for, all schools that have children with special educational needs

Please can you complete the attached assessment form prepared by the Local Authority Commissioning Team and return it to the following email address:-

commissioning@rotherham.gov.uk , or via internal post to: Clare Burton, Commissioning Team, Council Offices, Doncaster Gate

Thank you for your time in completing this assessment form. Please forward this by the 15th June, 2011.

If you require any further information about the assessment form, please contact Clare Burton, Operational Commissioner, Chief Executive's Office, Tel. 01709 254835 or email: clare.burton@rotherham.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Phil Marshall,
Consultant Head Teacher,
For and on behalf of the SEN VfM Review Group

SEN Review Assessment Form – Head Teachers

Name of Headteacher and School:					
Date:					
Please check a box for each statement to show how much you agree or disagree with it	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure / neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The overall objectives for the service are clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The service user is central to the service priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a culture of continuous improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corrective action is taken when performance is below target	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You are able to influence service design and delivery models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of the service is at the level expected	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are effective and accountable 'urgency' & contingency arrangements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The services are Value for Money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The services promote equality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are effective working relationships between Headteachers and the SEN service provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance targets are set in line with stakeholders expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Complaints are recorded appropriately, resolved effectively and efficiently and are learnt from	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users receive feedback about how their views have been used to develop the service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The provider regularly reviews performance against key objectives and determine and respond to poor performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SEN Review Assessment Form – Head Teachers

You are satisfied with the service provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please indicate any areas for improvement highlighting which specific areas you are referring to eg Hearing Impairment

Please indicate your views on the Value for Money of the SEN service and any other comments you may wish to include

Please return this form via email to commissioning@rotherham.gov.uk or send in the internal mail to Clare Burton, Chief Executive's Office, Commissioning Team, Doncaster Gate by 15th June

1st Floor, Norfolk House, Walker Place, Rotherham S65 1AS
Tel: (01709) 823687 Fax: (01709) 822501

Where Everyone Matters

Email: simon.perry@rotherham.gov.uk
Email the Council for **free** @ your local library!

Ref: CFS/CON/102/SP33

Contact: Simon Perry (01709) 823687

Chair
Rotherham Schools Forum
C/o Richard Bellamy
Democratic Services
45 Moorgate Street
Eric Manns Building
Rotherham S60 2RB

26 May 2011

Dear Chair

Re: Drug and Alcohol Education Provision in Primary and Secondary Schools

As you may be aware, the Young People's Substance Misuse Joint Commissioning Group (YPSM JCG), currently commissions Rotherham Healthy Schools to facilitate Drug and Alcohol Education in both Primary and Secondary Schools in Rotherham. The commissioned work comprises of the following:

- 'All Geared-Up' productions in primary schools to support the delivery of drug education
- Drug Life story Project in secondary, special schools and PRU's, to support the delivery of drug education
- Training for staff in schools to support the improvement of the teaching of drug education, including INSET support and courses for teaching substance misuse education at KS2, KS3 and KS4
- Support schools to write/update their drug education and drug related incident policies
- Dissemination of resources to schools, including updates on emerging drug issues – including legal highs and volatile substances

It has become clear that the YPSM JCG will no longer be able to commission this service post 31 March 2012, due to a very significant reduction in grant. I am therefore writing to alert you to this fact and to ask the Rotherham Schools Forum to consider continuing this excellently evaluated and valuable work, through each school contributing to the overall service cost of £25,200 per annum.

If you would like to discuss this matter further and/or meet with commissioning colleagues and myself, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Simon Perry
Chair, Young People's Substance Misuse Commissioning Group
Director of Community Services
Children & Young People's Services

c.c. Paul Theaker - Operational Commissioner, Commissioning, Policy and Performance
Anne Charlesworth - Head of Alcohol and Drug Strategy Team, NHS Rotherham