

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 13 October 2016 at 2.00 pm in the Dryden Centre

From the Acting Chief Executive, Mike Barker

Item	Business
1	Apologies
2	Minutes (Pages 3 - 6) The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 22 September 2016
3	Update of Contingency Funding Wording (Pages 7 - 10) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
4	Use of Early Years Underspend (Pages 11 - 12) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
5	Early Years National Funding Formula (Pages 13 - 14) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
6	Mainstream Schools Formula Sub Group (Pages 15 - 16) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
7	Date and Time of Next Meeting Thursday 8 December at 2.00pm

This page is intentionally left blank

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 22 September 2016

PRESENT:

Ken Childs (Chair)	Special School Governors
Sarah Diggle	Primary Governors
Julie Goodfellow	Primary Academy Headteachers
Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
Christine Ingle	Diocese Representatives
Mustafaa Malik	Primary Haedteachers
Ethel Mills	PVI Sector Representative
Elaine Pickering	Secondary Governors
Andrew Ramanandi	Primary Headteachers
Michelle Richards	Special School Headteachers
Chris Richardson	Secondary Headteachers
Steve Williamson	Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Matthew Younger	Primary Headteachers

IN ATTENDANCE:

Frank McDermott	Corporate Resources
Carole Smith	Corporate Resources
Steve Horne	Care Wellbeing and Learning
Laura Pidcock	Show Racism the Red Card
Rosalyn Patterson	Corporate Services and Governance

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Jim Thomson, Allan Symons, Denise Henry and Cllr Chris McHugh.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

3 SHOW RACISM THE RED CARD

The Forum received a report requesting funding for Show Racism the Red Card to provide anti-racism education workshops in schools. The total cost of the work would be just under £15,000, this would be rolled out to a selection of schools initially.

It was questioned whether the number of schools is limited by the capacity of the organisation and how this was funded previously. It was confirmed that this was previously funded through capacity building fund, however this is no longer available for school delivery. It was noted that there is a certain amount of staff and there is currently a waiting list of schools so each local authority has been asked to identify

tension areas. There are two routes of referral; either through a teacher or due to tension in the community and support is required, therefore it is targeted where need is most and is not a blanket approach.

The value of the workshops was acknowledged however it was suggested that this was not a decision for the Schools Forum and rather would be for a more strategic view at a Local Authority level. It was confirmed that this has been asked to come to the Forum as an attempt to ensure all schools benefit from it as it would be hoped the majority of pupils have access to it.

The point was made that needs would have to be assessed and that if incidents occur in the community there must be something additional than just the work in schools. It was confirmed that this is one element of a bigger strategy.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum supported the proposals and funding request from Show Racism the Red Card.

4 NATIONAL EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA CONSULTATION

The Forum received a report on the Early Year National Funding Formula (EYNFF) consultation and the draft response. The consultation proposes to introduce a new early years national funding formula for three and four year olds and make sure that children with SEN attract extra funding.

The funding formula to allocate funding to local authorities will be based on hourly base rate for existing 15-hour entitlement for all three and four year olds and additional 15 hours for children of working parents. Additional needs funding will be based on; free school meal eligibility, English as an Additional Language and Disability Living Allowance. This will then be multiplied by an Area Cost Adjustment for Gateshead. It was noted that parameters have been proposed so that no local authority can lose more than 10% or gain more than 22.9%.

It was reported that there will be transitional protection for nursery schools for at least two years proposed by the DfE, to acknowledge the higher costs of nursery schools provision.

The consultation proposes that local formulas are standardised, for example local authorities must pass at least 93% of funding to providers, this rises to 95% in 2018/19. In addition there must be a universal base rate of funding to all providers of 89.5% of available funding by 2019/20. The DfE are proposing a limited number of additional factors can be part of a local authorities formula, these include; deprivation, sparsity, efficiency, flexibility and delivery of additional 15 hours. It is proposed that there is a 10% cap on the total value of the supplements. It is also proposed that the DLA funding is ring-fenced and will be given as an annual amount.

The consultation proposes that an Inclusion Fund be set up by local authorities for SEN children. It was noted that a set of procedures would be needed in order for this to work efficiently and transparently. It also proposes that services can be delivered by local authorities to providers free at the point of use if the Inclusion Fund is used

to support local services.

It was noted that there has been no detailed modelling as of yet of the possible impact on Gateshead settings, however if the proposals are implemented the resulting funding formula would mean the only nursery school in Gateshead would no longer be viable and would be detrimental to the maintained sector.

The Forum agreed to the response and agreed to establish a subgroup to review the EYSFF and that this be open to non-Schools Forum members.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the Schools Forum agreed the consultation response to be submitted in its name.
 - (ii) That the Schools Forum agreed to form a subgroup to start work on the need of a new EYSFF for Gateshead.

5 UPDATE OF CONTINGENCY FUNDING WORDING

The Forum received the updated wording for Gateshead's Contingency Criteria, to include updated legislation in relation to schools causing concern.

The point was made that there is not a clear duty to provide funding to these schools and it was questioned how allocations for academies and maintained schools are done on a similar basis. It was confirmed that each application is assessed on its own merits and the procedures applied. It was questioned what is the objective criteria as in maintained schools the local authority may have asked for a school to do something, whereas for academies this would be the Secretary of State. It was acknowledged that this would not make a difference as it is about Gateshead children rather than individual schools.

It was suggested that reference to the percentage of surplus balance should be removed from the criteria as well as point six; in-year allocations to schools in respect of the admission of pupils permanently excluded by other schools.

- RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the proposed changes, including the above amendments, to Gateshead's Contingency Criteria.

6 SCHOOLS FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Forum received report outlining the school funding announcements that have been made by the DfE.

- RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report detailing announced funding arrangements for 2017/18.

7 SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING FORMULA DATA 2016 - 2017

A report was presented showing analysis produced by the DfE on values and funding factors used by other local authorities, this has allowed Gateshead to be

benchmarked.

It was reported that in terms of primary basic entitlement Gateshead is mid nationally but high in relation to regional and statistical neighbours. KS3 and KS4 basic entitlement is low in comparison to the national picture.

It was noted that 122 local authorities use IDACI as a deprivation measure. Primary FSM average funding was lower than regional neighbours and higher than statistical neighbours. Secondary FSM was third regionally and second against statistical neighbours.

Prior attainment funding is relatively low in comparison to all groups and EAL is low, particularly in the primary sector. Also, in comparison Gateshead has a high mobility factor. 14 local authorities used the maximum lump sum and Gateshead was in the middle in terms of primary lump sum and slightly lower in the secondary sector.

In terms of the primary: secondary ratio Gateshead was ranked ninth and seventh respectively against regional and statistical neighbours. In relation to notional SEN Gateshead was in the middle compared to the national picture.

The Forum agreed that the report was useful and interesting to see comparisons.

It was proposed that a sub-group be set up to review the data, agree areas to review and model potential outcomes. Steve Haigh, Chris Richardson, Mustafaa Malik, Ken Childs, Sarah Diggle and Andy Ramanandi volunteered to sit on the sub-group. Dates for the sub-group will be set up prior to the next Schools Forum.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report and agreed the suggested areas to be reviewed for Gateshead's mainstream Schools Fair Funding Formula for the financial year 2017/18.

8 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The date and time of the next meeting is Thursday 13 October 2016 at 2.00pm.

TITLE OF REPORT: Contingency Criteria Wording Update

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum the updated wording for Gateshead's Contingency Criteria.

Background

This report builds on the report brought to Schools Forum on 22 September.

During the discussion of the above report Schools Forum requested 2 further changes to the Contingency Criteria:-

- The removal of criterion 6 below as this is no longer relevant and is covered under the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations.
- 6. ~~For in-year allocations to schools in respect of the admission of pupils permanently excluded by other schools. Such allocations will be determined in accordance with Regulations made by the Secretary of State under Section 47 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.~~
- The removal of the surplus balance percentages from the year end clawback mechanism.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus balance ~~in excess of 16% for primary and special schools or 10% for secondary schools~~ the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.

It is also proposed that the below criteria be amended to include Education Health and Care Plans.

5. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of pupils with new or revised statements of SEN /**Education Health and Care Plan**, or for these ~~statemented~~ pupils transferring between schools within the LEA.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum approves the requested amendments to the Contingency Criteria, and the suggested changes to Criteria 5 to reflect the move from children having statements to having Education Health and Care Plans.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum approves the proposed changes to Gateshead's Contingency Criteria.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Gateshead's Contingency Criteria is up to date and quotes the most recent legislation and guidance.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

Updated July 2016 Contingency Funding Criteria

The LEA will retain centrally contingency funding that **could** provide in-year support to schools for:

1. Cost pressures specifically identified and caused by a relatively large numerical change in pupil numbers, especially if it relates to a single age-group, where the change is outside the control of the governing body and where the timing of the change in circumstances prevents no opportunity to the school to plan accordingly (e.g. housing demolition or compulsory purchase orders, or reorganisation)
2. The correction of significant errors in the data or in the application of the resource allocation formula.
3. Emergency costs arising from incidents outside the control of the governing body of the school (e.g. flood or fire damage). The money allocated for these purposes will be earmarked for specific use.
4. The provision of additional resources or other special support, temporarily, in response to a school as described in the DfE guidance "Schools Causing Concern" issued March 2016, and in accordance with Section 44 of the Education Act 2005, sections 60, 61 and 62 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
5. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of pupils with new or revised statements of SEN /Education Health and Care Plan, or for these pupils transferring between schools within the LEA.
6. Schools that are in financial difficulty, and can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to address financial issues, and that the current financial difficulties are not as a result of financial mismanagement. Schools must apply the LEA's "Model of Reasonableness" before making an application to demonstrate that they meet the criteria.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.

This page is intentionally left blank



13 October 2016

TITLE OF REPORT: Use of Early Years Block Revenue Underspend for Capital

Purpose of the Report

1. To request Schools Forum permission to change the character of the accommodation to be purchased for additional 2 year old places at Emmaville Primary School.

Background

2. This report builds on those previously brought to Schools Forum in March and June 2016. It was stated in the March report that there was £258,000 remaining of the Early Years underspend. The June report granted £11,000 to Care with Cuddles as a start-up grant, and £205,000 to be used to purchase additional accommodation for 2 year old places at Emmaville Primary School.
3. At the time of writing the June report, the only affordable option was thought to be the purchase of a demountable. Following work over the summer and a strategic review of the school site it has become apparent that traditional one classroom new build extension without the re-provision of outside space would cost in the region of £220,000. It is anticipated that the re-provision of outside space will form part of another phase of development on the Emmaville site.

Proposal

4. That Schools Forum allow the agreed £205,000 for the demountable at Emmaville to be allocated to the provision of a one classroom new build extension, together with an additional £15,000 from the Early Years underspend to enable a traditional new build extension to be built at the school.

Recommended Options

5. It is recommended that Schools Forum:-
 - Approves the re-direction of £205,000 from the provision of a demountable to the construction of a one classroom new build extension.

- Approves the allocation of an additional £15,000 towards the construction cost of the one classroom new build extension.

For the following reasons

- To ensure the Council meets its statutory duty to provide sufficient places for funded two year olds.
- To enable approval to be sought from the Secretary of State to approve an application for the use of Early Years Block revenue underspend for capital purposes

CONTACT Carole Smith

TITLE OF REPORT: Early Years National Funding Formula

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to update Schools Forum on the progress made by the Early Years National Funding Formula working groups.

Background

2. The Government issued a consultation document on a new Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) which will be implemented from April 2017.
3. The consultation is predominantly split into two areas; how the LA will received funding from the DfE as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant, and how LAs can distribute funding to providers.
4. In order to take forward work in these two areas, two groups are being set up a Strategic Officers group and Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) sub group of Schools Forum. The proposed work programmes are detailed below.
 - A strategic officers group work programme:-
 - Agree a set of principles
 - To review and estimate income received from the DfE,
 - Funding needed to administer early years payments, (EYSFF, Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) and Disability Living Allowance (DLA).
 - Possible set up of an Inclusion Fund including the principles, criteria and processes
 - Any other items that may emerge as further policy and information is released by the DfE
 - A EYSFF sub group of Schools Forum possible work programme:-
 - A set of agreed principles
 - Review of the current formula and factors
 - Review of the factors permissible under the new proposals
 - Impact assessment of changes for all settings
 - Transition arrangements
5. The officer group has had an initial meeting and a further meeting is scheduled for 31 October. At the time of writing, the EYSFF subgroup had not formed as there are still vacancies on the group.

Proposal

6. That schools notes the contents of the report and that updates on the work programmes and proposals will be brought to Schools Forum.

Recommendations

7. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Schools Forum is informed of progress of the groups
- To ensure that Schools Forum is consulted on funding decisions

CONTACT: Carole Smith

TITLE OF REPORT: Mainstream School Funding Review

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update to Schools Forum from the Mainstream Schools School Forum sub group.

Background

2. The sub group formed during September's Schools Forum met for the first time on 5 October.
3. The group was presented with a proposed agenda, Item 7 from September's Schools Forum, and some information on movements of the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Indices IDACI bandings from October 2015 to January 2016, to the data in the test Authority Proforma Tool APT model which contains the updated IDACI bandings.
4. The group discussed several areas and agreed that at the next meeting the data behind Item 7 will be reviewed by the group, together with historical data and trends for deprivation and prior attainment.
5. It was reported that should there be a further increase in pupil numbers between October 2015 to October 2016 school census, this may provide a small amount of additional funding if no factor values are changed. Further work will be undertaken to try and determine if there is headroom before the next meeting which is scheduled for 2 October 2016.
6. The group acknowledged the very tight timescale for work to be undertaken in order to be able to take proposals to Schools Forum in December.

Proposal

7. That schools notes the contents of the report and that updates on the work programme and proposals will be brought to Schools Forum.

Recommendations

8. It is recommended that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Schools Forum is informed of progress of the groups
- To ensure that Schools Forum is consulted on funding decisions

This page is intentionally left blank