ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM FRIDAY, 21ST JANUARY, 2011

Present:-

Mr. G. Jackson Chairman

Kath Blagden Clifton Community Arts School

Roger Burman Winterhill School

Anita Burtoft Laughton All Saints Primary School Jane Fearnley Herringthorpe Junior School

Geoff Gillard Diocese of Sheffield
Margaret Hague The Arnold Centre

John Henderson Whiston Worrygoose Primary School
Russell Heritage Wingfield business and Enterprise College

Ruth Johnson Pre-School Learning Alliance

Paul Lakin Borough Councillor Margaret O'Hara Newman School Philip Robins Primary Governor

David Silvester Wath C. of E. Primary School
Nick Whittaker Hilltop and Kelford Schools
Rev Ann Wood Kimberworth/Whiston

Officers

Rob Holsey Children and Young Peoples' Services, RMBC

Vera Njegic Schools Finance, RMBC

Liz Parker UNISON

Dorothy Smith Senior Director, Schools and Lifelong Learning, RMBC

Dawn Mitchell Democratic Services, RMBC

141. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies for absence were received from Val Broomhead, Councillor Jane Havenhand and Peter Hawkridge.

142. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING THEREFROM

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 10th December, 2010, be approved as a correct record.

Arising from Minute No. 135 (CSR Headlines), it was noted that the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) which was currently paid to 16-19 year olds from low income backgrounds who stayed in full-time education, had been ceased from 2011/12 onwards. Students whose parental income was less than £30,810 were previously entitled up to £30 per week.

Arising from Minute No. 136 (Schools White Paper 'The Importance of Teaching'), it was noted that Finance Officers had attended a meeting at which DFE representatives were present. It had been suggested by the DFE representatives that the proposed school funding consultation, including introduction of a national funding formula, would likely take place during Autumn 2011 with potential implementation from 1st April, 2012.

Arising from Minute No. 137 (Early Years Funding Formula), David Ashmore reported that the budgets for schools that provided education to 3 and 4 year

olds as part of the 15 hours free entitlement, would be adjusted to reflect termly changes in pupil numbers during 2011/12. Schools needed to be aware of the in-year changes to allocations in respect of these pupil numbers, which was a change from previous practice and required by law.

143. EDUCATION FUNDING SETTLEMENT 2011/12

Consideration was given to a report by the Principal Accountant, Schools Finance, to all Head Teachers/Finance Officers setting out the key points of the Education Settlement for 2011/12.

The main points were:-

Schools Budget Revenue Funding

Would be maintained at "flat cash per pupil" until 2014-15 with the new Pupil Premium being paid over and above. Schools would have to absorb the costs of inflation such as the full year effect of the September 2010 teacher pay award. Mainstreamed (consolidated) grants would also be funded at the same flat cash level per pupil.

The Secretary of State for Education had stressed that the actual level of budget for each individual school would vary. It would depend on local decisions about how best to meet needs which would mean that some individual schools may see cash cuts in their budgets either because they had fewer pupils or because changes were made within local authorities to the distribution of funding.

The maximum potential level of cash cuts would be controlled by the Minimum Funding Guarantee (see below).

Pupil Premium

To be introduced from 1^{st} April, 2011. Total funding for the Premium would be £625M nationally in 2011/12 and be built up over time amounting to £2.5bn a year by 2014/15.

For the next financial year, every pupil in mainstream primary and secondary schools, currently eligible to receive a free school meal (as recorded on the January 2011 pupil census), a Pupil Premium lump sum of £430 would be received. The schools would be able to decide how best to spend the money. Pupils in special schools and pupil referral units, or not in school, would also qualify but expenditure would be controlled by the Local Authority.

Grants consolidated into the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)
 A number of grants had been mainstreamed into the DSG from April, 2011 (see report submitted).

The Authority was to consult Head Teachers on the precise mechanism for allocating the funding. The amount of DSG delegated to schools via the funding formula would be agreed with this Forum.

Minimum Funding Guarantee
 Due to falling rolls and/or Local Funding Formula changes, some schools

would see a cut to their budget, however, a negative Minimum Funding Guarantee had been set. This would ensure that no school saw a reduction compared with its 2010/11 budget (excluding sixth form funding) of more than 1.5% per pupil before the Pupil Premium is applied.

Schools Budget Capital Funding

The Capital settlement for Education for 2014/15 was 60% lower than 2010/11. The Government's main priority for the remaining funding would be to encourage local authorities to respond to the significant pressures for additional school places, particularly at primary age, in many areas of the country because of rising birth rates and changed migration patterns. In line with this, "basic need funding" (Capital Grant) for the expansion of school places was to be doubled nationally to £800M for 2011/12.

Devolved formula capital would be allocated to schools based on a national formula of £4,000 per school and a per pupil sum which was weighted for the type of pupil:-

£11.25 primary £16.875 secondary £33.75 special

Early Intervention Grant (EIG)

The Grant had been created to replace 22 previous separate grants expenditure for which was controlled by the Local Authority. In national terms the new allocation was 10.9% lower than the sum of the previous grants. For Rotherham this meant an allocation of £12.3M in 2011/12, rising slightly to £12.5M in 2012/13.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised/clarified;-

- Even if a parent was eligible for free school meals and chose not take them up, they should be encouraged to come forward and thereby included on the school census and funding received by the school. This may become a much bigger issue as the Government changed the distribution mechanism for Pupil Premium
- The mechanism by which the Government had chosen to fund Pupil Premium (free school meals eligibility) currently excluded the Slovak/Roma community owing to their circumstances regarding benefits. This community was prevalent in certain areas of the Borough and a small number of schools (especially St. Ann's, Coleridge, East Dene) look set to miss out on funding where thee were significant support needs
- The Government had indicated that schools would be required to demonstrate and report how they had utilised the Pupil Premium and what impact it had made but it was unclear at present how this was to be undertaken
- There was no guidance as yet with regard to the movement of pupils during a school year. It was felt that it would be the annual census and no in-year adjustments

 Work was ongoing on the grants replaced by the Early Intervention Grant to determine priorities and the impact of reduced funding

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

144. BSF AND CAPITAL SPENDING REVIEW

Robert Holsey, CYPS Capital Projects Officer, submitted an update on the results of the Capital Review and the financial settlement on Education Capital spending for 2011/12.

The DfE had announced on the 13th December, 2010, that the recommendations of the James Review of DfE's Capital Programmes would not inform the allocation of Capital until 2012/13. However, the DfE had indicated that, whilst the methodology of allocation and management of the Capital funding to the Authority may change, they had confirmed that the headline amounts of funding for basic need and for capital maintenance for 2012/13 until 2014/15 would be in line with the amounts shown be as follows:-

Fund/Programme	2010/11	2011/12
Capital allocation - reduction	£17,400,863	£8,233,139
Devolved Formula Capital - reduction (amount of funding allocated each year to primary and secondary schools to be spent by them on their priorities in respect of buildings, ICT and other capital needs. It was anticipated that schools would use their allocation to maintain ICT infrastructures and equipment)	£4,493,053	£901,446
Modernisation – Capital Maintenance and Basic Need – Increase (funds devolved to local authorities to improve the infrastructure of the school estate and to upgrade existing school buildings or build new ones in line with local asset management plan priorities)	£3,189,944	£4,347,484
Basic Need – Increase (designed to enable local authorities to provide additional school places to cope with growing numbers)	£950,255	£2,128,678
Primary Capital Programme – no funding (still commitment to providing a new through school for Maltby Lilly Hal Junior and Maltby Hall Infant School with an anticipated operational date of September, 2013. This would be funded from the remaining PCT funding for 2010/11 and the Modernisation – Capital Maintenance budget 2011/12)	£6,217,692	-

Access Initiative Funding – no funding (to improve the accessibility of mainstream schools to disabled pupils and those with special educational needs had received no funding for 2011/12. Any additional adaptations would need to be sourced from the Modernisation – Capital Maintenance or designed within any new buildings or extensions funded from Basic Need)	£615,305	-
Likewise Extended Schools – no funding (provided pump priming capital funding to develop extended schools across an area. Any allocation would need to come from Basic Need and Modernisation funding)	£116,794	-
Maltby Academy		£11.1M
Voluntary Aided Schools [DfE confirmed that they would retain the	£712,852	£138,674
Local Contribution to Voluntary Aided Programme LCVAP for a further year)	£1,104,968	£716,857

A letter had gone out to all schools explaining the above together with a template so they could work out what their allocation would be.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The original plan had been for Maltby Academy to be part of a campus but the new funding allocation was just for the Academy. It was up to the Authority how it chose to spend the funding on site but it had to ensure that the building retained was fit for purpose and safe
- In the past procurement for Academy work had taken 52 weeks; this had been reduced to 26 giving a very tight timescale
- Basic Need and Capital Maintenance allocations could be used for nonschool purposes. An example of the proposed development at Churchfields was cited as an example
- Meetings would take place with the Building Managers and Head Teachers to establish the priorities for the school buildings to ensure they were safe, dry and warm
- In the case of boiler failure by a school in negative funding, funding would be sought from Capital Maintenance

Agreed:- That the financial settlement for Rotherham Education Capital Spending 2011/12 be noted.

145. METHOD FOR ALLOCATING GRANTS MAINTAINED INTO DSG

Suggested Methodology for Distribution of Dedicated Schools Grant

David Ashmore, Resources and Business, CYPS, reported that the Government had announced a number of funding streams, previously seen by schools as separate items, now merged into the Dedicated Schools Grant. The Forum's opinion was sought as to whether the methodology currently employed was appropriate or whether should it be changed. Views expressed would then be fed into the forthcoming meeting with Head Teachers.

Vera Njegic, Principal Accountant, Schools finance, circulated the current and suggested methodology for distribution:-

Grant	2010/11 Methodology	Suggested Methodology for 2011/12
School Development Grant main	Prior Year Allocation Per Pupil	Amount per pupil using 2009/10 figures school by school
Specialist Schools	Amount per pupil for specialism and additional specialism + lump sums for languages/lead schools etc.	Amount per pupil using 2009/10 figures school by school
LIG	As per prior year with minor adjustment for some schools	Amount per pupil using 2009/10 figures school by school
EMAG	£419,530 distributed between schools with ethnic minority pupils over 10% of PLASC	Same cash amount and distribution, channelled via Social Deprivation Formula factor
School Standards Grant	Greater of £12,000 per school (£29,000 Special Schools) + £120 per pupil (£130 Secondary Schools) Or 2.1% increase per pupil on 2009/10	Increase school lump sum factor by £12,000 (£29,000 Special Schools) Increase Age Weighted Pupil Unit factor by £120 (£130 Secondary Schools)
School Standards Grant Personalisation	£2,285,618 distributed to schools on formula basis using attainment, pupil numbers and free school meals	Same cash amount channelled via SEN formula using similar data

It was noted that a decision was required within 4 weeks.

Discussion ensued on the above with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The first 4 grants listed above worked on an allocation per pupil
- To change the methodology significantly would create massive pressures on some schools. It would be sensible to retain the current mechanism to maintain stability thereby giving time for a more considered debate as to the way forward
- Any changes to distribution methodologies could have an enormous impact on Specialist Schools
- 4 weeks was too short a time span to give full and proper consideration to such an issue and make radical changes

Dedicated Schools Grant

David Silvester, Wath C. of E. Primary School, reported that a group had been established with the remit of examining the spend of the DSG for its appropriateness, value for money and benefit to the children of Rotherham and the amounts of spend allocated to each budget heading. The Group had held meetings with Secondary Heads and Primary Heads and discussed all spend as to its justification and appropriateness.

Several budget headings and amounts of money had been highlighted that the group wished to examine as a matter of priority with a view to making any proposed changes to be effect from April, 2011. Bearing timescales and stability in mind, there was a compelling argument that there were some funds in the DSG not appropriate for reallocation in 2011.

With regard to the 2011/12 allocation, the group wanted to meet officers in Directorates as there were issues that needed further explanation and understanding before a case could be put forward for redirection in 2011.

Agreed:- (1) That Head Teachers be informed of the Forum's view that the methodology to be used for 2011/12 be the same as current applied.

(2) That a special meeting be held on Friday, 18th February, 2011, at 8.30 a.m. in the Town Hall to discuss the above matters further.

146. CONSTITUTION OF SCHOOLS FORUM

In accordance with previous discussions, the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2010 were submitted for information.

Deriving from discussions regarding the Dedicated Schools Grant was the need to ensure that all schools felt part of the Forum and complete transparency.

It was felt that the Forum needed to be reconstituted for the 2011/12 financial year to ensure that it continued to be representative of Rotherham's Learning Communities and ensure alignment of funding to TRL principles, strategy and priorities.

Agreed:- That Head Teachers bring forward proposals on membership of a revised Schools Forum (to take effect from 1st April, 2011) to the special meeting to be held on 18th February.

147. EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

Agreed;- That this item be deferred to a future meting.

148. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

149. DATE AND TIME OF MEETINGS

Agreed:- (1) That a special meeting of the Forum be held on Friday, 18th February, 2011 at 8.30 a.m.

(2) That meetings of the Forum be held as follows in 2011 commencing at 8.30 a.m. in the Town Hall, Rotherham:-

18th March 8th April 24th June