

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM  
FRIDAY, 4TH MARCH, 2011**

**Present:-**

Mr. G. Jackson <b>(Chairman)</b>	High Greave Infant School
Roger Burman	Winterhill School
Anita Burtoft	Laughton All Saints C. of E. School
Steve Clayton	Thrybergh Comprehensive School
Jane Fernley	Herringthorpe Junior School
Geoff Gillard	Sheffield Diocese
Peter Hawkridge	Teacher Unions
John Henderson	Whiston Worrygoose Primary School
Russell Heritage	Wingfield Business and Enterprise College
K. Jessop	Roughwood Primary School
Ruth Johnson	Pre-School Learning Alliance
Paul Lakin	Borough Councillor
Margaret O'Hara	Newman School
Liz Parker	Unison
Philip Robins	Primary Governor
David Silvester	Wath C. of E. Primary School
Nick Whittaker	Hilltop/Kelford Schools

**Officers**

David Ashmore	Children and Young Peoples' Services, RMBC
Rob Holsey	Children and Young People's Services, RMBC
Vera Njelic	Schools Finance, RMBC
Dorothy Smith	Senior Director, Schools and Lifelong Learning, RMBC
Sue Wilson	Children and Young Peoples' Services, RMBC
Dawn Mitchell	Democratic Services, RMBC

**150. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21 JANUARY 2011**

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2011, be approved as a correct record.

**151. METHOD FOR ALLOCATING GRANTS MAINSTREAMED INTO THE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT**

Further to Minute No. 146 of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2011, David Ashmore, Resources and Business, CYPS, reported on the outcomes of consultation that had taken place with Head Teachers.

Due to time constraints, there had only been a 7 days turn round for responses which may have lead to the 40% return rate. Head Teachers had been asked for their views on 3 specific questions relating to how grants that were to be merged into the Dedicated Schools Grant from April 2011 should be allocated.

The summary of responses received from schools was presented to the Forum. This demonstrated overwhelming support for each of the 3 proposals.

It was also noted that Special Schools that had received a pro-rata allocation for their specialism in 2010/11 covering the period Sept 2010 to March 2011, would receive a full year's allocation in 2011/12.

Agreed:- That the current mechanism be retained until September, 2011, in order that further dialogue may take place.

## **152. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT BUDGET - CENTRAL SPEND 2011/2012**

In accordance with Minute No. 145 consideration was given to the consultation that had been conducted with Head Teachers on central spend from the Dedicated Schools Grant in 2010/11 and proposals for 2011/12 allocations.

The Sub-Group was not yet in a position to finalise all the lines of expenditure from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) as there were a few outstanding issues to be decided not least of which was confirmation of pupil numbers which determined the overall funding available.

At present, approximately £700,000 of expenditure had been identified which Heads considered should be reallocated to other priorities for 2011/12. A further meeting of Heads and CYPS leadership staff was arranged for 16<sup>th</sup> March to finalise outstanding issues.

David Silvester reported that the focus had been on the appropriateness of some items of expenditure to be funded from DSG in terms of relevance and supporting pupils' outcomes. This was the first stage of the review. The second stage would involve scrutiny of all the other items in DSG to see if efficiencies could be made and whether the money was being effectively utilised which may lead to a reduction in some areas and growth in others.

Head Teacher representatives spoke of the strong partnerships that existed in the Rotherham school community on a peer to peer basis and with the Local Authority. Being efficient and effective in the deployment of resources was seen as critical in maintaining and building upon these strengths.

Agreed:- That this item be further discussed at the meeting to be held on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2011.

## **153. CONSTITUTION OF THE ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS FORUM**

David Silvester circulated a report setting out the results of the consultation that had taken place on the 2 models for the reconstituted Schools Forum:-

### **Model A - 15 Members**

4 Primary Head Teachers, 2 Secondary Head Teachers, 1 Special Head Teacher, 1 Nursery Head Teacher/Manager, 1 Academy Head Teacher, 1 PVI Manager, 1 14-19 Partnership representative, 1 C of E Diocese Board representative, 1 Catholic Diocese Board representative and 1 Trade Union representative

**Model B – 23 Members**

7 Primary Head Teacher, 7 Secondary Head Teachers, 1 Special Head Teacher, 1 Nursery Head Teacher/Manager, 1 Academy Head Teacher, 1 PVI Manager, 1 14-19 Partnership representative 1 C of E Diocese Board representative, 1 Catholic Diocese Board representative and 2 Trades Union representative

Just under half of all schools replied. 80% voted for Model B.

It was proposed that Head Teachers would take the lead and feedback to colleagues.

Discussion ensued on the proposal:-

- Important that it was not 2 representatives from the same Trade Union
- Serious concern regarding no Governor representation in the models proposed
- Feeling that it was appropriate to be Head Teacher lead but Governor representation was important

It was noted that nominations would be sought the following week. By the next Forum meeting, nominations should have been made.

Agreed:- (1) That Model B be endorsed as the way forward for the newly reconstituted Schools Forum.

(2) That the issue of Governor representation at the reconstituted Schools Forum be discussed further on 18<sup>th</sup> March.

**154. EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA**

The Local Authority had established an Early Years Formula Funding Group in 2009 representative of provider stakeholder groups with the remit to develop a single local formula for funding early years provision in the maintained and PVI sectors.

11 local authorities had piloted implementation of a single funding formula in 2008/09. The experiences and issues arising from the pilots had informed DCSF guidance to remaining authorities.

Rotherham had undertaken a cost analysis of all Rotherham providers delivering the free entitlement to gain a clear understanding of typical local provider costs. These were used to inform determination of provider rates and any differentiation of rates between providers.

The Coalition Government had announced that the formula was to be implemented from April, 2011. They had also made it mandatory for local authority's to include a base rate and a deprivation rate in their formulae. Rotherham's proposed formula was:-

(Basic Hourly Base Rate + Deprivation Supplement + Quality Supplement) x

number of hours participation.

### **Basic Hourly Rate**

The Sub-Group proposed that different base rates be applied to the following types of providers:-

- Maintained nursery schools
- Primary schools with maintained classes
- Private, voluntary and independent sector (PVI) providers

All establishments within each of the above 'types' would receive the same rates in the formula.

### **Deprivation Supplement**

It had been agreed that deprivation be measured against the child and not the setting which would bring a level of consistency with aspects of the current schools' funding formula. To calculate the IMD per setting, the January pupil census data be used.

### **Quality Supplement**

On the recommendation of the Extension to the Free Early Education Entitlement Working Group, it was agreed that Quality in Action Accreditation should be used as the single measure. All providers should be paid the funding for a guaranteed 2 years (2011-12 and 2012-13) to enable them time to achieve accreditation. For 2013-14 the supplement would be withdrawn from providers who had not achieved the accreditation.

The following points were highlighted:-

- Out of the 60 primary schools affected, 49 either broke even/gained a little and 11 stood to lose a little. A protection factor had been introduced so losses on that proportion of school funding was capped at 5%.
- PVI - All stood to benefit a little. Those with the lowest rate of deprivation would gain by a rate slightly below inflation
- Maintained sector schools - in previous years there has been no budget adjustments made to the funding originally received. The new Regulations stated that for 3-4 year olds if the numbers changed through the year then the budget would be adjusted. The Finance Team would inform primary schools as to their indicative budgets but would not make any final adjustments until the year end. However, Head Teachers would be made aware of any positive or negative changes in advance.

Agreed:- (1) That the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula, as proposed by the Early Years Funding Formula Working Group, be approved.

(2) That the hourly rates, as per the report, be approved subject to finalisation of the Dedicated Schools Grant and agreements in respect of central expenditure.

(3) That when the Standards Fund Group 1.10 for 2010/11 ended on 31<sup>st</sup>

March, 2011, any residential funding remaining be added to the Dedicated Schools Grant in 2011/12 for contingency purposes.

**155. ACADEMY RECOUPMENT FOR SEN SUPPORT SERVICES**

David Ashmore, Resources and Business, CYPS, reported for information on a change in arrangements for recouping the DSG element of LACSEG funding for Academies.

The changes related to the Government's decision to exempt local authority expenditure in relation to SEN Support Services from the Academy recoupment process for 2011/12. Technically, the Government had decided that expenditure in the line currently referred to as 1.2.2 (Provision for pupils with SEN, provision not included in line 1.2.1) in Section 251 Statements, would not be recouped from local authorities in the year 2011/12. This meant that local authorities would retain the money for SEN Support Services that would otherwise have been taken away and given to Academies for them to commission those Services themselves.

The DFE had listed to concerns expressed by groups that supported children with SEN that it was more effective and more efficient for the Services to be operated on an authority-wide basis.

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

**156. YOUNG PEOPLE'S LEARNING AGENCY - REMOVAL OF THE TEACHERS PAY GRANT POST-16**

David Ashmore, Resources and Business, CYPS, referred to the 16-19 Statement issued by the Young People's Learning Agency in December, 2010, in relation to staging the removal of the Teachers' Pay Grant (post-16) paid to local authorities to cover pay progression and other pay benefits in schools that were not paid separately to other providers.

Rotherham's allocation was in the region of £500,000. Officers had been unable to clarify at present whether that would be entirely removed from 1<sup>st</sup> April or what "staging the removal" actually meant. Clarification had been sought from the YPLA but they had not been able to offer any confirmation.

The Principal Accountant, Schools Finance, reported that presently the figure received from YPLA was added to the DSG. This would therefore reduce the funding available to all schools.

The Teachers Pay Grant used to be a separate grant to fund teachers should they go through the threshold. It was made up of 2 funding streams, DSG and LSC, the latter which covered post-16.

It was noted that the Government was trying to level the playing field between the funding for 6<sup>th</sup> forms in schools and how colleges were funded. At present colleges received less funding per pupil than schools.

Discussion ensued with the following points raised:-

- The DSG would shrink as a result of withdrawal of the TPG. The impact would be on all schools.
- Once pupil numbers were confirmed, the DSG figures included the number of pupils in Academies. A calculation was then made of what funding the 3 Academies would have received from the local authority if they had still been maintained schools plus the Centrally Retained element. The DFE were notified accordingly and the sum deducted from that which the Authority received for its schools. The YPLA then allocated the funding for Academies directly to them.
- At present all the Academies were buying Services from the Authority and had signed up to be very much part of Transforming Rotherham Learning and wanted to be part of the Rotherham school community. They were committed to buying most of the services back at least for the next 12 months but the continuation of that would depend on the relationship and value for money
- Concern with regard to Pupil Premium and then the possible/probable higher costs coming to schools.
- What services did the Academies buy back in?

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

## **157. YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER GRID FOR LEARNING**

Sue Wilson, Performance and Quality Manager, CYPS, reported on the Y&H Grid for Learning which was 1 of 10 Broadband Consortiums in the country which Rotherham had been part of for many years. However, the funding for this had now changed and, together with budget cuts, meant that there was now no funding.

Current costs of the Consortium and Broadband was £160,000 year; £70,000 for membership of the Consortium and £90,000 for the connectivity which from April was to be upgraded to 2GB.

The Y&H was currently going through a reprocurement process. As part of that process, last year (before any of the budgets cuts were known) a Letter of Intention had been signed stating that the Authority wished to continue with arrangement.

Potential options needed to be discussed as to how the funding gap of approximately £160,000 was to be found.

Discussion ensued on the Grid:-

- The portal was not used enough
- When new computer equipment was purchased by schools they had to be downgraded as the system was not sufficiently up-to-date to cope

- From April schools would have 2GB as their main connectivity with 1GB backup
- Work with some schools was taking place on the costing up of an alternative service. However, there was a 3 year fixed price contract signed on behalf of the schools
- Discussion was taking place with regarding charging mechanisms with the option of a pay-as-you-go service

Agreed:- That this issue be discussed further at the 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2011, meeting including the possibility of funding connectivity only.

#### **158. MINISTERIAL STATEMENT ON BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE**

David Ashmore, Resources and Business, CYPS, submitted a Ministerial Statement by the Secretary of State for Education for information.

It referred to the Judicial review brought against the Secretary of State for Education by a number of Councils following the decision to cancel Building Schools for the Future projects.

Mr. Justice Holman had been absolutely clear that the decision was not open to legal challenge “on a discrete ground of irrationality” and that the Department for Education or Partnerships for Schools had done nothing that “went so far as to create a substantive legitimate expectation that any given project would definitely proceed”. However, the Judge had felt that consultation had not gone far enough.

The Judge had not ordered a reinstatement of funding for any BSF project neither had he ordered any compensation to be paid to any of the claimants.

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

#### **159. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business to report.

#### **160. DATES AND TIMES OF NEXT AND FUTURE MEETINGS**

Agreed:- That a further meeting be held on Friday, 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2011 at 8.30 a.m.