

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE**

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate  
Street, Rotherham. S60  
2TH**

**Date: Tuesday, 8th November, 2011**

**Time: 10.00 a.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th October, 2011 (herewith) (Pages 1 - 3)
4. 16-19 Bursary Fund - RMBC Policy for Learners on ESF Programmes (report herewith) (Pages 4 - 10)
5. Proposal for the Future Allocation of the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children in Rotherham (report herewith) (Pages 11 - 14)

#### **The Chairman authorised consideration of the following report received after the deadline:**

6. Potential Expansion of Thornhill Primary School (report herewith) (Pages 15 - 20)
7. Date and time of the next meeting: 22nd November 2011, 10.00 am

**CABINET MEMBER FOR LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE**  
**Tuesday, 18th October, 2011**

Present:- Councillor Rushforth (in the Chair) and Councillor Andrews.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dalton and Sangster.

**F26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 4TH OCTOBER, 2011**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture, held on 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2011.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member held on 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2011 be signed as a true record.

**F27. LOCAL AUTHORITY GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS**

Pursuant to Minute No. C50 of January 2000, consideration was given to nominations received to fill Local Authority vacancies on school governing bodies.

Resolved:- That, with the effective date of appointment as shown, the following appointments be made to school governing bodies, subject to satisfactory checks being undertaken:-

(i) New Appointments:

Mrs Claire Spencer	Aston Lodge Primary	18.10.11
Mrs Wendy Violentano	Aston Springwood Primary	18.10.11
Mr Matthew Ukpe	Canklow Wood Primary	18.10.11
Mrs Carolyn Smyth	Rawmarsh Rosehill Junior	18.10.11
Dr Richard Boland	Swinton Brookfield Primary	18.10.11
Mrs Andrea Roberts	Todwick Primary	18.10.11
Mr Richard Thomas	Wickersley Northfield Primary	18.10.11

**F28. NEW CHALLENGES, NEW CHANCES: NEXT STEPS IN IMPLEMENTING THE FURTHER EDUCATION REFORM PROGRAMME - REVIEW OF INFORMAL ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING**

Further to Minute H44 of the Cabinet Member for Adult Independence, Health and Wellbeing held on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 2010, Sue Shelley, Extended Learning Manager, presented the report which sets out the next steps in implementing the further education reform programme through a review of informal adult and community learning, and consultation exercise.

In November 2010, the Government published two strategy documents: 'Skills for Sustainable Growth' and 'Investing in Skills for Sustainable Growth', that set out the future direction of the reform of further education for those aged 19 and over. The Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) was now consulting on proposals to deliver the Government's aims for Informal Adult Community Learning to:

- Promote consistently high quality teaching and learning;
- Freeing college and other providers from as many bureaucratic restrictions as possible in order to allow a more effective response to the needs of communities.

The consultation on Informal Adult Community Learning was part of a wider consultation on the post-19 further education provision. This included consultation questions on:

- The structure of the sector;
- The impact of greater freedoms and flexibilities on the sector;
- The impact of simplifying the funding system;
- The provision of adult literacy and numeracy;
- The introduction of FE loans.

It was proposed that a Rotherham-wide response be submitted to the Department for Business Innovation and Skills as stakeholders' jointly have contributed to the consultation questions arranged through Rotherham's multi-agency Adult Learning Strategy Steering Group.

Reference was made to the draft response document as submitted which showed the proposed responses to the questions.

Discussion ensued as to why there was no suggested response to Question 7. It was noted that this was because the Local Authority did not deliver 'learning across localities', which was specified in the question.

The discussion also included:

- Terminology used within the consultation questions;
- The importance of the Local Authority's role in delivering Adult and Family Learning;
- Quality assurance;
- The role of the voluntary sector.

Resolved:- (1) That the review of Further Education Reform Programme and Informal Adult Community Learning be noted.

(2) That the Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning respond to the consultation by 21<sup>st</sup> October, 2011.

(3) That a further report regarding the outcome of the consultation and the impact upon the Council's delivery of Adult and Family Learning be submitted to the Cabinet Member when the proposals for the future are published.

(4) That the Extended Learning Manager and the Co-ordinator of Governor Development Services work together to ensure continuing professional development opportunities available are fully utilised and shared.

## **F29. TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE IN NEW CENTRAL LIBRARY, RIVERSIDE HOUSE**

Consideration was given to the report presented by Elenore Fisher, Cultural

Services Manager, which provided a progress update on the proposed implementation of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology required to deliver and improve library services in Riverside House.

The proposal for implementation (including all financial arrangements) was approved at the Corporate ICT and Information Governance Board meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> September, 2011 ('Technology upgrade in the new Central Library, Riverside House' - Option 2: Implement RFID technology to replace existing barcode system).

A request for an exemption from Standing Order 48.2.1 was made so that the Radio Frequency Identification technology contract could be awarded to an existing library supplier, 3M, instead of going through a formal tendering process with 3 suppliers.

In support of the business reasons that necessitated the exemption of the Standing Order, the report noted that:

- 3M offer technologies not currently available from other providers (e.g. the mobile workstations and printers for more effective on-the-spot enquiry work);
- 3M provide the barcoding self-service units currently in use. This would provide the most cost effective option for upgrading the units to RFID in the future;
- RFID recommend a 6-month implementation process (including staff training and familiarisation). Current timescales state that the new Library will open in April 2012, so it is crucial the project begins as soon as possible; a tendering process would delay the start of the project even further;
- RFID tags from the library book suppliers need to be ordered urgently, the process of re-tagging all current stock in the Central Library needs to commence, and suppliers need to be instructed to RFID-tag new stock. None of these are possible until a Radio Frequency Identification technology supplier is appointed.

Discussion ensued as to whether it would be possible to procure Radio Frequency Identification technology from other providers. It was noted that Radio Frequency Identification was available from other providers, but that, looking at the Library Service as a whole, using an alternative provider would incur extra charges relating to equipment and configuration of existing systems, which would lead to additional costs, compared to the use of 3M as the supplier of RFID.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and the contents noted.

(2) That an exemption from Standing Order 48.2.1 (requirement to obtain at least 3 written quotations for contracts with an estimated value of between £50K and £500K) be approved.

(3) That the supplier 3M carry out the Radio Frequency Identification implementation at the new Library at Riverside House.

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>8th November, 2011</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>16-19 Bursary Fund, RMBC policy for learners on ESF programmes</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Lifelong Learning and Culture</b>

**5. Summary:**

This paper sets out the implications on the Local Authority and post-16 providers in allocating and managing the 16-19 Bursary Fund (Bursary). RMBC is required to publish a Policy Statement on allocation of the Bursary for post 16 ESF learners. This policy will only cover Vulnerable Groups as ESF funding covers all course related costs

**6. Recommendations:**

**Children and Young People's Services Strategic Director recommends that the Cabinet Member approves this policy.**

**7. Proposals and Details:**

- Cabinet Member to endorse RMBC's policy covering ESF learners.
- RMBC to submit a business case to YPLA for additional funding by 31/10

**8. Finance:**

- To note that all 8 School Sixth Forms have received their allocations and are developing their own individual policies based upon a model template designed by Rotherham partners.
- To note the decision by Special Schools to take full responsibility for administering the Bursary for their learners

**9. Risks and Uncertainties:**

- YPLA has given assurance that all learners entitled to the Vulnerable Groups Bursary will be funded based on the Management Information collected and the receipt of a business case letter to request the necessary amount.

**10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:**

- 5% admin equates to £600 per year to develop policy, manage, administer, allocate and deal with appeals.
- As a result this work will be absorbed into the business of Raising Participation Team and Education Development and Resources given the existing responsibility for managing and delivering ESF

**11. Background Papers and Consultation:**

The 16-19 Bursary Fund (Bursary) exists to help students to continue in education where they would otherwise be prohibited from doing so on financial grounds. This funding replaces both the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) and the Discretionary Learner Support Fund (DLSF) and is available to young people in full or part time education from August 2011, subject to meeting eligibility criteria, some of which are set by providers. Bursary awards are to be used towards essential course related expenses and other costs associated with living and learning. Nationally, the Bursary is substantially less than the funding that was available for EMA (£180m compared to £550m per annum), which may impact on participation and NEET. Post-16 providers are indicating that their Bursary allocations are unlikely to support all the learners they would wish to support.

The 16-19 Bursary Fund has two elements:

- Vulnerable Groups Bursary - £1200 per year for young people in care, care leavers, young people in receipt of income support and disabled

young people in receipt of both Employment Support Allowance and Disability Living Allowance.

- Discretionary Bursary – Distribution of this remaining funding is at the discretion of individual providers and targeted towards young people facing the greatest financial barriers to participation and is **subject to affordability**.
  - a) Each institution retains 5% of the Bursary allocation for administration. The possibility of pooling this resource was discussed in July. There was little appetite amongst providers for a common Bursary policy across Rotherham. However, providers have worked with RMBC to develop a model policy to support the development of their own statements and processes.
  - b) As autonomous organisations, academies, colleges and Work Based Learning providers have received Bursary funding direct from the YPLA and are responsible for developing their own policies and the management and allocation to learners.
  - c) Maintained School Sixth Forms (SSF's) have received Bursary funding from the YPLA via RMBC (LA passports funding to Maintained SSFs, as per the Conditions of Funding contract). SSFs are responsible for developing their own policies and the management and allocation to learners.
  - d) RMBC receives £12,920 Bursary funding intended for learners in post-16 Special Schools and post 16 learners on ESF funded programmes, where the provider does not hold a contract with the YPLA. (£5700 for ESF and £7220 between the 3 Special Schools).
    - i. Special Schools have opted for the LA to passport Bursary funding to them. They are therefore required to take on management responsibility and develop their own policies. All 3 Special Schools are adapting the model policy.
    - ii. RMBC is required to publish a Policy Statement on allocation of the Bursary for post 16 ESF learners. This policy will only cover Vulnerable Groups as ESF funding covers all course related costs.
  - e) £12,920 is insufficient to meet demand for Bursaries in Special Schools and ESF learners; a majority of learners are likely to qualify for the Vulnerable Groups Bursary. The YPLA has reassured LAs that they will not be in any financial risk as funding will be made available from YPLA contingency funds to cover costs of Bursary to learners in the vulnerable groups. The first request for data has been announced (Number of Guaranteed Bursaries approved, as of 30<sup>th</sup> Sept to be submitted by 31<sup>st</sup> Oct). This will give the first indication of the true shortfall in allocations to RMBC and the SSs.

- f) The Student Support section within CYPS no longer exists. There were early discussions about where assessing and managing this work sits in RMBC. As there is such a close physical and financial link between Raising Participation team and EDR for ESF learners, it has been agreed to manage Bursary between the RP and EDR teams.

**12. Contact Name:**

**Author:**

Marie Boswell,  
Raising Participation Project Manager,  
01709 255224, [marie.boswell@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:marie.boswell@rotherham.gov.uk)



**Rotherham 16-19 Bursary fund policy statement:  
ESF contracted providers without YPLA Contract arrangement.  
August 2011**

## **Introduction**

**This policy statement sets out Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's (RMBC) policy for the administration and allocation of the 16-19 Bursary Fund (the Bursary) for young people accessing provision funded by ESF on behalf of RMBC, where providers do not hold a contract directly with the Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA), from August 2011.**

**NB: The allocation of Bursaries is subject to affordability and RMBC receiving the necessary funding from the YPLA.**

### **1.0 Purpose of the Bursary**

The Bursary replaces the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) and is available to young people in full or part time learning funded by the YPLA from August 2011, subject to meeting the eligibility criteria below.

The Bursary exists to help students to continue in education where they would otherwise be prohibited from doing so on financial grounds. The bursary is intended to enable a learner to continue in education and should not be viewed as an incentive to attract young people into learning or to a particular institution.

ESF provision funded by RMBC exists to engage, support and prepare young people who are not in education, employment, or training (NEET) to access mainstream education, training or employment (EET). This includes commissioning provision that removes any barriers young people face in making a successful progression into EET – for example, supporting travel costs, course equipment, exam fees, costs of placements, outdoor activities, visits and trips, etc.

As a result, RMBC will target the allocation of its Bursary for ESF learners towards those vulnerable young people who meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Young people in care
- Care leavers
- Young people in receipt of income support
- Disabled young people in receipt of Employment Support Allowance who are also in receipt of Disability Living Allowance.

Given the purpose of RMBC's ESF provision (with those providers that do not receive YPLA funding) to provide the necessary support to engagement and progression into EET by removing the barriers to learning, RMBC does not expect applications for the discretionary element of the bursary from this group of learners.

**Bursary funding is subject to funds available at all stages.**

### 3.0 Eligibility criteria

To be eligible, therefore to receive this Bursary from RMBC, you must be a young person aged under 19 on 31 August in the academic year in which they start their programme of study (where a young person turns 19 during their programme of study, they can continue to be supported to the end of the academic year in which they turn 19, or to the end of the programme of study, whichever is sooner). In general, bursaries will be paid only to young people who have reached the statutory school leaving age. In addition, you must be in one of the following vulnerable groups and provide the necessary evidence to confirm this:

- In Care
- Care Leavers
- In receipt of Income Support
- Disabled students in receipt of Disability Living Allowance AND Employment Support Allowance

£1,200 Bursary per year will be available, which will be allocated on a pro-rata basis of £40 per week, paid one month in arrears to the provider for the duration of the ESF funded programme, to a maximum of 30 weeks per learner per year.

The standards of behaviour, attendance or other specific conditions set by the programme deliverer must be met.

### 5.0 Application process

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) will seek to ensure that the funds available are:

- distributed fairly through a process which is transparent and easily understood;
- assessed and allocated to each individual's need, taking into account the financial circumstances of the applicant and the intended use of the fund; and
- used to widen access to, and participation in, post-16 education.

An application for Vulnerable Groups bursary should be completed by the young person, or by an advocate and **submitted to RMBC by the provider**. (Appendix 1)

Where a learner considers that they are eligible for a 'Vulnerable Groups Bursary', appropriate evidence must be supplied.

### 6.0 Payment process

Once a bursary application has been approved, upon receipt of a signed statement of payment being made to the learner (Appendix 2), RMBC will process the claim and reimburse the provider/deliverer by BACS on a monthly basis. It is recommended that the provider also uses a BCAS process to make payment to learners on a weekly or monthly basis as appropriate to individual learner need.

### 7.0 Data Storage and disposal

In accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998), personal information collected through the bursary application forms will be used solely for the purpose of determining eligibility for the 16-19 Bursary Fund. This data will be destroyed in agreement with RMBC's Data Protection and Retention policy.

### 8.0 EMA Transitional Arrangements 2011-2012

For students already claiming the EMA, Transitional Arrangements will be in place for 2011-2012. [http://readingroom.ypla.gov.uk/ypla/ypla-16-19 Transitional Arrangements Guide for 2011-12-gn-Jul11-v1.pdf](http://readingroom.ypla.gov.uk/ypla/ypla-16-19%20Transitional%20Arrangements%20Guide%20for%202011-12-gn-Jul11-v1.pdf)

Students receiving £1,200 Bursary may not claim EMA Transitional payments.

### 9.0 Appeals process

Should learners disagree with the outcome of either their application for a bursary award or, where a payment has been withheld due to attendance/behaviour, they should follow the RMBC's complaints procedure. For details, contact the Complaints Manager on 01709 823738 or e mail [cyps-complaints@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:cyps-complaints@rotherham.gov.uk)

### 10.0 Policy Review

This policy will be reviewed annually in the Summer Term and amended accordingly taking account of any advice and guidance from the YPLA or DfE.

### 11.0 Approval

This policy was approved by:

The Director of Children and Young People's Services

Signature

Date

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>8 November 2011</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Proposal for the Future Allocation of the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children in Rotherham</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>CYPS</b>

**5. Summary:**

This paper outlines the proposal for the future allocation of the pupil premium for Looked After Children.

It summarises the eligibility criteria and examines current and proposed practice.

**6. Recommendations:**

**That Cabinet member endorses the proposals in this paper**

## **7. Proposals and Details:**

### **Eligibility**

Identification of LAC who are eligible:

- SSDA903 census return submitted by LA to DfE to provide data on all aspects of LAC on 31<sup>st</sup> March
- DfE identify which children meet eligibility criteria for PPG and provide LAs with a provisional amount based on the previous year's census – no names attached
- LAs identify which children meet the criteria for the current year and allocate the money
- In October, DfE look at current year's census and provide an accurate figure to LAs

### **Children are eligible if they meet the following criteria:**

- On 1st April 2011, they had been looked after continuously for at least 6 months
- They are in Year Groups R to 11 during the 2011-2012 financial year

### **Use of PPG:**

- The Conditions of Grant states that PPG may be spent by maintained schools for the purposes of the school; that is to say for the educational benefit of pupils registered at that school to raise attainment. It is the responsibility of Head teachers to determine how the money will be best used.
- Schools will be required to report to parents on the use of PPG

### **Issues**

- Schools that had Y11 children on roll were allocated £430 for the financial year, April 2011 to March 2012 even though they would only be educating the children for a few weeks as they had completed exams and left school. (£13,000)
- Primary schools with Y6 children on roll were allocated the full £430 but these children were moving on to secondary school. The receiving school has not had an allocation. (£6500)
- Allocations have been made on a yearly basis but the frequent movement of LAC means that there are rapidly out of date
- Children who meet the criteria mid-year need to be allocated a proportion of the £430 when they meet the criteria
- For eligible children attending special schools, the Local Authority can decide how to allocate funds

## Proposals:

- The budget for PPG will be managed by the finance team using information provided termly by the Get Real Team
- The £430 be sent to schools on a termly basis – September (£150), January (£150) and April (£130) to ensure that children who move schools benefit from the funding and that children who are no longer eligible do not continue to receive funding which will then release funds for newly identified children
- If schools wish to use the money in one lump sum (i.e. for 1:1 tuition) then they may do so, by agreement with the Virtual Headteacher. If the child then moves school, the receiving school will not access new funding until the following April
- The use of PPG is identified on Personal Education Plans so that it can be discussed during planning meetings and is tied into the child's education needs. Independent Reviewing Officers have been made aware of the funding and will be able to refer to it during reviews
- Children who meet the criteria mid way through the year will be allocated the termly payment in the term after they become eligible. For example, a child who meets the criteria in October will then receive the funding in January and will be on the list provided by GRT
- Funding for children in Special Schools to be allocated in line with all other allocations and monitored via the child's PEP
- Funding for LAC in Academies will be paid to the academy on a termly basis
- Funding for eligible children being educated out of authority should be automatically passed to either the authority (see quote below) or the school which educates the children and will be done by Finance Team

... If the child is at a school in England but attends a school or academy located in a local authority other than the one which looks after the child, the authority that looks after the child shall pass the funding either direct to the school, or via the authority in which the school is located to pass on to that school, to spend for 2011-2012. Should the authority looking after the child pass funding to the school via another authority, it must first have written assurance from that authority that the amount of funding will be passed to the relevant school for spend in 2011-2012. PPG Conditions of grant Paragraph 17

## Items for consideration

- Schools are required to report to parents on how the PPG has been used to raise attainment. How as Corporate Parents would we receive this information?
- How can carers be made aware of the funding to enable them to ask questions at Parent & Carer evenings in school and also to discuss during review meetings?
- What is the best way of ensuring Designated Governors to be aware of the funding to form part of their role in challenging and supporting the school?

## **8. Finance:**

The pupil premium will be allocated as described above

There are no other cost implications other than the personnel costs of administering the scheme

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties:**

Any Pupil Premium money remaining unspent by the local authority will need to be given back to the DfE (see paragraphs 21, 23 and 25 in the Conditions of Grant). So it is important for those children not in maintained settings that their Pupil Premium allocation is spent by 31 March 2012.

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:**

The Rotherham Schools Improvement Partnership core objectives state that we aspire to and will strive for a situation where;

- (i) all students making at least good progress;
- (ii) no underperforming cohorts
- (iii) all children and young people consistently experiencing at least good learning; and
- (iv) all schools and settings moving to at least the next level of successful performance

Looked After Children are amongst our most vulnerable young people and as such have significant barriers to achieving the stated objectives.

Effective use of and evaluation of the impact of the Pupil Premium will assist us in our corporate responsibility to ensure the best possible outcomes for young people.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation:**

PPG Conditions of grant-DFE

Proposals for the future Allocation of Pupil Premium- Paper to DLT and Corporate parenting Body Oct 2011 (R Allard- Virtual Head LAC)

**Aurthor:**

**Martin Fittes**

**Assistant Head of School Effectiveness-**

**Vulnerable Groups/ Head of Virtual School for Looked After Children**

**Tel: 01709 - 255269 (int xt55269)**

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>8th November, 2011</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Potential expansion of Thornhill Primary School</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Children and Young People's Services Ward 13 Rotherham West</b>

### **5. Summary**

Thornhill Primary School has pressure on the school's accommodation from increasing pupil numbers from within the school's catchment area. Preferences for the school now regularly exceed the number of places (30) available each year. An initial Report and Appendix 'A' was submitted to Cabinet Member and Advisers on the 7th September 2011 and a pre-statutory consultation on the proposal to expand the school was approved at that stage.

Pre-statutory consultations have now been undertaken through separate meetings with Thornhill School Governors, Staff and Parents. Consultation meetings have also been undertaken with the Governing Bodies of Ferham, Kimberworth and Meadow View Primary Schools which are the neighbouring schools to Thornhill School. Copies of the consultation papers have been sent to Ward Members, the MP and the local Parish Council.

Separate meetings have taken place, and shall continue to take place, with the CYPs Capital Team, EDS Architects and Surveyors, Thornhill school staff and Balfour Beatty.

**This report details the outcome of these pre-statutory consultations and requests approval to commence the statutory stages of the process.**

### **6. Recommendation:**

**It is recommended that the statutory consultation process and timetable on the proposal to expand Thornhill Primary School, as set out in Appendix 'A', is begun and that a further report be brought to Members with details of the outcome of that consultation.**

---



## **7. Proposals and Details**

The proposal to be formally consulted on is:-

It is proposed to expand the numbers on roll at Thornhill Primary School from September 2011. The school will be expanded in order to accommodate 45 children per statutory year group (45 x 7 = 315 places) rather than its current capacity (30 x 7 = 210 places). The school would have an amended published admission number (PAN) of 45 per year group. The non-statutory nursery (F1) year group published admission number will also be increased to a published admission number of 26 full time equivalent places.

Appendix 'A' gives further details on births, numbers on roll and admissions preferences. Preferences for placement for entry into the Reception (FS2) year in September 2012 will be confirmed following the closing date in January 2012. After January 2012 the primary offer day is 15<sup>th</sup> April 2012 and projections will be continually monitored, updated and shared with Thornhill during the process outlined in this report.

Three separate meetings were held on the 4th October, 2011 for the Thornhill Governors; and 11th October for Thornhill Staff and Union representatives; and parents of pupils at Thornhill School. Three further meetings were held on the 11th and 12th October 2011 with the Governing Bodies of Ferham, Kimberworth and Meadow View Primary School.

All meetings were advised of the timetable for the consultation and how concerns/comments can be submitted during the statutory consultation period.

As the number of children attending Thornhill Primary would increase by 50%, it is a statutory requirement for notices on the increase in numbers to be published in the local press and on the school gates, and for any opposition to the expansion declared by 16 December 2011. The notices also advise where to write to in the event of any opposition.

## **8. Finance**

The capital cost of the building project which is currently under way is £0.9M. This building programme will provide two new classrooms and a Foundation Stage Unit. In addition parts of the existing school will be refurbished to provide an SEN and Multi Use area, cloakrooms and toilets. The capital cost will include the provision of a specified and agreed number of new classroom and dining tables and chairs and fixed ICT equipment. Funding for the project is from the Basic Need funding allocated by the DfE for the provision of sufficient school places.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers and consequently, individual school budget funding, are based on estimated projections at a point in time. Over provision at one school could have a negative impact on provision at other schools. Local Authorities have a duty, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental choice.

If the Authority moves on to the statutory phase, then formal objections may be lodged during the representation period following the publication of the statutory notice. A final decision should be determined by the Cabinet Member within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

The pre-statutory consultation meetings raised a number of issues and concerns which relevant services within CYPS will discuss and address in consultation with Thornhill senior leaders and Governors. In addition, a detailed and costed report will be submitted to Schools Forum, by January 2012, to request authorisation for DSG funding to be allocated to support the transitional September 2012 – March 2013 period (7/12<sup>ths</sup>). The additional pupils were not on roll for the 2011 January School Census return and, therefore, the 2011/2012 individual school budget allocation is insufficient to fund additional teaching and support staff required from September 2012.

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. It is likely that the expansion would enable more parents to access their catchment area and first preference school for their child and, therefore, increase that performance indicator.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Report to Cabinet Member and Advisers of the 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011. Report to Cabinet Member and Advisers of the 8th November, 2011 and minutes of the meetings held with relevant School Governors, staff and parents along with a summary of issues and concerns recorded in the minutes of the pre-statutory consultation meetings.

## **12. Contact Name**

**Helen Barre, Manager, School Admissions, Organisation & SEN Assessment Service, Ext 22656, [Helen.barre@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Helen.barre@rotherham.gov.uk)**

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES****Proposal to expand Thornhill Primary School****1 The Proposal**

It is proposed to expand the numbers on roll at Thornhill Primary School from September 2012. The school will be expanded in order to accommodate 45 children per year group ( $45 \times 7 = 315$  places) rather than its current capacity of  $30 \times 7 = 210$  places. The school would have an admission number of 45.

The school would have an admission number of 45 (rather than 30) for each year group.

The school currently accommodates 30 FS1 pupils part-time and this will also need to be increased to 45 FS1 part-time pupils.

**2 Existing Situation: Numbers on roll and Capacity**

Net Capacity	=	240
Admission Number	=	30
Number on Roll (2011) (NOR)	=	252
Surplus Places	=	0 (-12)

**3 Development of Numbers on Roll**

YEAR	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
NOR	196	192	208	212	222	270	290	300

The school has been operating at around its maximum number of places for a number of years. There has been increasing pressure to accommodate more pupils, particularly those born within the catchment area and a number of pupils have gained places at appeal.

The above figures for 12/13 onwards are an estimate of the likely numbers that will gain entry to the school.

The position in terms of catchment area births is as follows:

Birth figures	Admission Year							
	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
Thornhill	65	62	71	58	52	61	51	75

The number of preferences for entry to Reception in the last 3 years has been as follows:

09/10 entry = 44

10/11 entry = 43

11/12 entry = 42

#### 4 Potential Advantages and Disadvantages

The main potential disadvantage of expanding a school is that it has a knock on effect on the numbers on roll at nearby schools and could, in the worst case scenario threaten the viability of one or more schools. Notwithstanding this, the LA is obliged to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental choice.

The potential advantages are that more parents will be able to access their first preference school and will gain a place without having to go through the appeals process. The admission number of 30 and class size legislation currently restricts the number of pupils entering the school and some families are in the position of having older brothers and sisters split from their younger siblings and who have to attend alternative neighbouring schools, Currently appeals are being held for the school but parents are still unsuccessful due to the restrictions imposed by the class size legislation

The expansion from 30 to 45 places per year is seen as the best way forward in that it will provide the best scenario for Thornhill school, a better scenario for local parents whilst creating a minimal threat to the viability of other local schools.

#### 5 Financial Implications

The capital cost of the building project is currently estimated at £900,000. This will provide two new classrooms, a Foundation Stage Unit, SEN and Multi Use area, cloakrooms and toilets. Funding for the project is from the Basic Need funding allocated to the Authority from the DFE. Basic needs funding is provided for the provision of sufficient school places.

The school will be expanded with effect from September 2012 in every year group and will operate with four more classes than it currently does. It is anticipated that parents will apply for places prior to the expansion and that numbers on roll will increase substantially from September 2012. The school will need to plan for the expansion and appoint additional teaching and non teaching

staff. Funding for the additional staffing will come from the additional pupils on roll (awpu) and will be part of the school's annual budget. However, in the first year of operation, as the pupils will not be on roll in time for the schools budget to be allocated for 2012/13 additional funding from the Authority's overall schools budgets (Dedicated Schools Grant) will need to be made to the school. Based on current awpu's; additional funding of £151,079 will need to be made to the schools 2012/13 budget.

## 6 Consultation Timetable

Cabinet Member to agree to consultation	7th September 2011
Pre statutory consultation period Including meetings with governors, Staff and families etc.	up to 14th October 2011
Report to the Cabinet Member	9th November 2011
Publication of statutory notices	18 <sup>th</sup> November 2011
4 week period for representations and objections closes	16 <sup>th</sup> December 2011
LA decision	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2012
Implementation	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2012