



GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 14 April 2016 at 10.00 am in the Abbott Room, Dryden Centre

From the Chief Executive, Jane Robinson

Item Business

1. **Apologies**

2. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 8)

The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 17 March 2016

3. **National Funding Formula Consultation** (Pages 9 - 32)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

4. **High Needs Funding and Other Reforms Consultation** (Pages 33 - 40)

Alan Foster, Corporate Resources

5. **Education Excellence Everywhere - Education White Paper Summary** (Pages 41 - 44)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

6. **Surplus Balance Licence Change** (Pages 45 - 46)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

7. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 9th June, 10.00am

This page is intentionally left blank

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 17 March 2016

PRESENT	Ken Childs (Chair) Cllr Malcolm Brain Sarah Diggle Denise Henry Peter Lague Mustafaa Malik Ethel Mills Elaine Pickering Andrew Ramanandi Chris Richardson Michelle Richards Steve Williamson	Special School Governors Elected member representative Primary Governors Nursery Sector Representative Trade Union Representative Primary Haedteachers PVI Sector Representative Secondary Governors RC Primary Headteachers Secondary Headteachers Special School Headteachers Pupil Referral Unit Representative
IN ATTENDANCE:	Jan Batchelor Julie Robertshaw Jeanne Pratt Alan Foster Carole Smith Rosalyn Patterson	Care, Wellbeing and Learning Care, Wellbeing and Learning Care, Wellbeing and Learning Corporate Resources Corporate Resources Corporate Resources Corporate Services and Governance

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Allan Symons, Julie Goodfellow, Christine Ingle, Mark Lovatt and Linda Alder.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

3 EARLY YEARS REVENUE UNDERSPEND

A report was presented to the Forum requesting agreement on the use of some of the Early Years Block underspend to create additional two year old funded places. Two schemes in the west of the Borough were proposed, all providers have been consulted with.

The proposals are for Crawcrook and Ryton. In Crawcrook an expression of interest was received from Emmaville Primary School, discussions were held with the school and two possible schemes developed. It was noted that there is no capacity within the footprint of the current school therefore an option of a demountable classroom, at an approximate cost of £175,000, was proposed as an option. The alternative of

an extension to the existing building would cost approximately £380,000, this exceeds the remaining underspend in reserves.

In terms of Ryton, expressions of interest were received from Crookhill Early Years Pre-School and Care with Cuddles Day Nursery. At Crookhill Early Years either demountable accommodation or an extension would be needed, this would be at a similar cost to Emmaville, approximately £175,000. In relation to Care with Cuddles, no building works would be required, however revenue grant of £11,000 would be needed to support the purchase of equipment.

It was noted that there are currently two year old spaces at nurseries in Ryton village but there had been no take up, therefore it would be better to expand Crookhill. Concerns were raised that this could lead to investment in something which goes against a current provider which is in place. The cost of the demountable was also queried as the Forum felt there could be better value for money options. It was confirmed however that council services must be used. The Forum therefore requested that a full breakdown of costs be provided as well as a further report giving supply and demand analysis.

RESOLVED -

That no decision can be made on the proposals until a cost breakdown and a supply and demand analysis be brought back to a future meeting.

4 DSG QUARTER 3 BUDGET MONITORING

The Forum received the quarter three position of DSG for 2015/16. It was reported that overall there is an underspend of £10,000, this is compared to £900,000 last year. There is an overspend of £51,000 in the High Needs budget, this is due to vacant posts filled and an increase in PRU top up costs as a result of increased permanent exclusions.

There is underspend of £34,000 in the Early Years budget and £82,000 underspend in the termination of employment costs.

RESOLVED -

That the Schools Forum noted the content of the report.

5 PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS

A report was presented on the process for charging schools a tariff following a permanent exclusion. Schools now have funding recouped for a permanently excluded child, on a pro rata basis. The report addresses the short fall in the High Needs Block.

It was confirmed that there has been an increase in permanent exclusions over the last two years. In 2013/14 there were 24 permanent exclusions across Gateshead, 2014/15 there were 54 and for 2015/16 so far there have been 44 permanent

exclusions.

Analysis of the exclusions has been undertaken, however there are no obvious patterns. The majority of exclusions were in Key Stage 4 and was for challenging behaviour, persistent ongoing disruptive behaviour. 22% of exclusions during 2014/15 were due to drug related incidents. This year 90% of exclusions were due to persistent disruptive behaviour. It was noted that it is easier to place those children back in school who have been involved in a serious one off incident rather than those pupils who have persistently shown challenging behaviour. Therefore, as there is a high number of such exclusions this year, this will mean an increase in the number of pupils in the PRU.

A discussion was held at GASH around the proposal to implement a financial adjustment of £2,000 for each pupil who is excluded. GASH agreed that this was not currently a viable option to take forward.

It was questioned as to the reasons why GASH did not agree with option one. It was confirmed that GASH viewed this as a permanent exclusion tariff and it was therefore essentially unfair. Schools needed to retain their right to exclude and GASH felt that the proposal was a tax and a disincentive to exclude; it would also have more of an impact on some schools than others. GASH recognised the issue and acknowledged the problem in secondary schools and agreed it creates a burden on the High Needs Block.

It was queried why there has been a recent increase in the number of exclusions. It was noted that previously funding was available for alternative measures to deal with young people within schools to prevent permanent exclusions. It was noted that schools are reluctant to exclude but now there are no alternative routes and schools are under pressure to get results and therefore take action to ensure results are achieved.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the report and that further work will be undertaken to resolve the funding pressures in the high needs block, and the cost of educating permanently excluded pupils.

6 MAINSTREAM SCHOOL TOP UPS

The Forum received a report for approval on the Mainstream schools top up rates from April 2016. It was proposed that the bandings are reduced by 1.5% in line with MFG.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the mainstream banding proposal for 2016/17.

7 SPECIAL SCHOOLS FUNDING AMENDMENTS

A report was presented outlining the proposed amendments to the Special School Funding Formula.

It was reported that Eslington is now operating on a split site, Eslington previously received contingency funding and the position has been monitored. It was noted that approximately £85,000 should be added to Eslington's fixed costs as a proportion of the cost of running the site.

Furrowfield previously had its mini bus costs funded centrally from DSG, this has changes and the cost has been added to Furrowfield's fixed costs, in line with other schools. This estimated cost of the mini buses for 2016/17 is £22,500.

The Cedars school has increased substantially, there are now 138 pupils on roll, which is over a 60% increase in numbers since 2013/14. A proportion of the fixed costs has been calculated at £32,000.

In terms of Gibside School, this has expanded into Blaydon Children's Centre and fixed cost of the rental of the site is £13,000.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the proposed increases to the special schools fixed costs.

8 PRU FUNDING FORMULA

The Forum received a report outlining the proposed amendment to the PRU Funding Formula. The new funding model is based on commissioned place numbers and a number of top ups, and reflects hospital and home education funding.

It was noted that this is a step in the right direction to ensure funding is applicable to the resources required.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the proposed new PRU funding formula.

9 COMMISSIONED HIGH NEEDS PLACES

A report was presented to the Forum on the proposed commissioning arrangements for High Needs Places for 2016/17. It was reported that places will be commissioned, less the out of borough places, in order to protect the High Needs block.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the report.

10 NATIONAL LIVING WAGE IMPLICATIONS

The Forum received an update on the National Living Wage and was advised that HR Officers have written to all Headteacher's. There are implications for all Gateshead schools and a further report will be brought back to the Forum next year.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted that there will be an impact on schools budgets with the implementation of the NLW.

11 UPDATE FROM THE FAIR FUNDING CONFERENCE

The Forum received an update from the National Fair Funding Conference and the two consultations; Schools National Funding Formula, High Needs Funding Formula and other Reforms.

The consultation areas for the National Funding Formula include; removal of the LAC factor and removal of mobility factor. Work is ongoing to create a new Centrally Held Block of the DSG as it is proposed that the DfE will remove the flexibility to move funding between the different DSG blocks. The DfE is looking to reduce LA responsibility for school improvement and all other duties that are not consistent with the Admissions, fair access, transport arrangements and ensuring vulnerable pupil's needs are met. The Education Services Grant will be paid to local authorities at the current rate for 2016/17 and the first five months of 2017/18 to reflect the academic year.

In terms of the High Needs Funding Formula the areas for consultation were outlined, and the factors to be used to move to a national funding formula at a local authority level. In particular it was highlighted that the consultation looks at a five year implementation period, which will include a proportion of 2016/17 spending levels. Also, the removal of notional SEN from 2019/20 and removal of £10,000 per place funding for ARMs replaced by 'normal' mainstream formula funding plus £6,000 for each of the places.

It was noted that draft responses to both consultations are currently being written and it was proposed that an additional meeting be arranged to allow the Forum to debate the response to the consultations.

RESOLVED -

- (i) That the Schools Forum noted the information contained within the report.
- (ii) That the Schools Forum noted and agreed to review the consultation documents.
- (iii) That the Schools Forum noted the additional meeting date of 14 April 2016.

12 MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORT WORKER

Following the update at the last meeting, the Forum was advised that the bid for £72,000 funding for a high quality mental health worker was unsuccessful. This was due to the high levels of application and demand for funding.

It was noted that there is still some matched funding, therefore it was proposed that this be used for a mental health worker to work out of the PRU in addition to a post for LAC pupils.

The point was made that children in mainstream schools have no service at this level and if there was more mental health support at Key Stages 1 and 2, this may negate the need for this work in the PRU.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the funding of £72,000 from reserves to provide matched funding for the HEE Innovation fund application.

13 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 14th April at 10.00am.

TITLE OF REPORT: National Funding Formula Consultation

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forums attention the current consultation the proposed national funding formula for mainstream schools. This report builds on a report presented in March 2016.

Background

The Department for Education (DfE) launched a six week consultation on 7th March for a mainstream schools national funding formula (NFF), the consultation closes 17th April.

This is a “stage 1” consultation on the main principles of a NFF, and a “stage 2” consultation will be launched before the summer on the detail of the proposals. The stage 2 consultation should provide figures on the implications for individual schools of the application of a NNF. What it will not take into account is how funding would have changed between 2016/17 and 2017/18 for some schools especially PFI schools as it is proposed that some elements including PFI are funded on an historic basis.

The DfE want to move to a system where all school budgets are calculated and disseminated centrally, without local input and without reference to local priorities.

The proposals are based around 4 blocks:-

- Per pupil costs – basic per pupil rate
- Additional needs –
 - Deprivation
 - Low prior attainment
 - English as an additional language
- School costs
 - Lump sum
 - Sparsity
 - Rates
 - Premises (including PFI, split site and exceptional circumstances)

- Geographic costs – area cost adjustment

The proposals also include the removal of a number of funding factor including Mobility and Looked after Children. These two factors can still be used during the transition years.

The transition arrangements 2017/18 and 2018/19 there would be a “soft” application of a NNF, which would see schools funding being calculated at the school level then aggregated up to form the schools block of the DSG for LA’s. Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and capping at LA level will be applied before premises factors and rates. LA’s will then the option to apply a local formula to delegate funds to schools and apply a different MFG rate.

Capping will be required to ensure that MFG can be funded as there is no additional funding for the transition to a NFF.

The DfE are proposing that 100% of the schools block is delegated to schools, and in order to do this, the DSG will be re-based into 4 blocks and their will be no movement between the schools block and the high needs or early years blocks.

Funding that will remain with the LA will be in the new centrally held block, and will be created from centrally retained expenditure and a per pupil allocation from the Education Services Grant, (ESG).

The DfE are proposing to reduce LA’s education responsibilities to cover:-

- School Admissions
- Servicing of Schools Forum (to be reviewed)
- Fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN
- Education welfare services
- Asset Management
- Statutory and regulatory duties

In the short term the following responsibilities can be retained:-

- Contribution to combined budgets
- Termination of employment costs
- Equal pay back costs
- Capital expenditure from revenue – historic commitments
- Prudential borrowing

For Gateshead only have historic commitments for contributions to combined budgets and termination of employment costs.

Responsibilities such as school improvement and mainstream formula funding will be removed and the probability of the removal of funding for Schools Forum once the NFF is fully implemented.

The DfE are proposing to make a £600M saving from the reduction of ESG to both LA's and Academies.

LA's will see the funding of £77 per maintained pupil cease from September 2017, retaining £15 per pupil funding for all pupils. Academies will see their ESG reduced by between 1% and 3% of their total funding per year. A link to all the relevant documentation is below.

Schools National Funding Formula Consultation Document

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/supporting_documents/Schools_NFF_consultation.pdf

Online response form

- <https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/consultation/intro/view>

The Case for Change and Consultation Summary

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/supporting_documents/Summary%20and%20case%20for%20change.pdf

The Current Funding System

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/supporting_documents/Current_funding_system.pdf

Proposal

Schools Forum reviews discusses and amends as required the attached draft consultation document (appendix 1), and decides if Schools Forum would like to respond to the consultation.

Recommendations

Schools Forum notes the contents of the report and the draft consultation response and decides if a consultation response should be submitted in the name of Gateshead Schools Forum.

For the following reasons:-

To enable Schools Forum to have an input into the consultation into the NNF, and to put forward their collective views.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

This page is intentionally left blank



Schools national funding formula

Overview

We are seeking views on proposals to introduce a national funding formula for schools.

The consultation sets out how we plan to deliver a fair, transparent funding system where the amount of funding children attract for their schools is based on need and is consistent across the country.

This is the first of 2 planned consultations. At this stage we are seeking views on:

- the principles that underpin the formula
- the pupil characteristics and school factors we include in the formula

We are also seeking views on the overall funding system, in particular on our proposals to:

- introduce a school-level national funding formula where the funding each pupil attracts to their school is determined nationally
- implement the formula from 2017-18, allocating funding to local authorities to distribute for the first 2 years, and then to schools directly from 2019-20
- create a central schools block for local authorities' ongoing duties
- ensure stability for schools through the minimum funding guarantee and by providing practical help, including a restructuring fund

We set out in the case for change why we think the current funding system is unfair. You can also read more about how the current funding system operates.

We are consulting in parallel on proposals to introduce a high needs formula for children and young people with special educational needs.

Introduction

A Name

First name:

Carole

Last name:

Smith

B Email address

If you enter your email address you will be able to return to edit your response at any time until you submit it. You will also receive an acknowledgement email when you submit your response.

carolesmith@gateshead.gov.uk

C Response type

Please select your role from the list below:

Please select only one item

- Governor Headteacher/principal Local authority representative
 Multi-academy trust member Parent Pupil
 Sector organisation representative School business manager/bursar
 Teacher Other

Please select your organisation type from the list below:

Please select only one item

- Academy Academy - free school Academy - grammar school
 Maintained school Maintained school - grammar Local authority
 Multi-academy trust Representative body Other N/A

Organisation name:

Gateshead Council

Local authority area:

Please select only one item

- N/A Barking and Dagenham Barnet Barnsley
 Bath and North East Somerset Bedford Borough Bexley
 Birmingham Blackburn with Darwen Blackpool Bolton
 Bournemouth Bracknell Forest Bradford Brent
 Brighton and Hove Bristol Bromley Buckinghamshire Bury
 Calderdale Cambridgeshire Camden Central Bedfordshire
 Cheshire East Cheshire West And Chester City of London Cornwall
 Coventry Croydon Cumbria Darlington Derby
 Derbyshire Devon Doncaster Dorset Dudley Durham
 Ealing East Riding of Yorkshire East Sussex Enfield Essex
 Gateshead Gloucestershire Greenwich Hackney Halton
 Hammersmith and Fulham Hampshire Haringey Harrow
 Hartlepool Havering Herefordshire Hertfordshire Hillingdon
 Hounslow Isle of Wight Isles of Scilly Islington
 Kensington and Chelsea Kent Kingston upon Hull
 Kingston upon Thames Kirklees Knowsley Lambeth

- Lancashire Leeds Leicester Leicestershire Lewisham
 Lincolnshire Liverpool Luton Manchester Medway
 Merton Middlesbrough Milton Keynes Newcastle upon Tyne
 Newham Norfolk North East Lincolnshire North Lincolnshire
 North Somerset North Tyneside North Yorkshire Northamptonshire
 Northumberland Nottingham Nottinghamshire Oldham
 Oxfordshire Peterborough Plymouth Poole Portsmouth
 Reading Redbridge Redcar and Cleveland
 Richmond upon Thames Rochdale Rotherham Rutland
 Salford Sandwell Sefton Sheffield Shropshire Slough
 Solihull Somerset South Gloucestershire South Tyneside
 Southampton Southend on Sea Southwark St Helens
 Staffordshire Stockport Stockton-on-Tees Stoke-on-Trent
 Suffolk Sunderland Surrey Sutton Swindon Tameside
 Telford and Wrekin Thurrock Torbay Tower Hamlets Trafford
 Wakefield Walsall Waltham Forest Wandsworth Warrington
 Warwickshire West Berkshire West Sussex Westminster
 Wigan Wiltshire Windsor and Maidenhead Wirral Wokingham
 Wolverhampton Worcestershire York

D Would you like your response to be confidential?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Information provided in response to consultations, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want all, or any part, of a response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department for Education will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please give your reason for confidentiality:

Principles for a reformed funding system

1 Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

The principles are set out on pages 9 and 10 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Supports Opportunity - this is difficult when schools are facing real-time cuts and increasing responsibilities.
Funding System that is fair - takes away schools collective ability via Schools Forum working with the LA to direct funding towards local needs.
Funding System that is efficient - maybe more efficient but loses local knowledge and the ability of local areas to respond to local issues as a collective.
Transparent Funding System - This is already the case where LA's and schools work together on a funding system that is suited to the local area. When the 'hard' formula is implemented from 2019/20, schools will not be able to access local knowledge and guidance on their funding
Funding System that is predictable - The current funding system is just as predictable - what is difficult for school is getting the data so late. How will data be checked and if it is incorrect how will funding be rectified.

The structure of the funding system

2 Do you agree with our proposal to move to a school-level national funding formula in 2019-20, removing the requirement for local authorities to set a local formula?

Our proposal for the structure of the formula is on pages 11 and 12 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

LA's know their schools and can understand the different pressures at a local level. If LA's are removed from the funding system this will remove the ability to react to demographics and pressures at a local level. The one size fits all approach does not take into account local characteristics of schools. In Gateshead we generally have a large number of small primary schools and relatively fewer, larger secondary schools. The organisation of schools is not something that is easily changed without significant capital investment, and the agreement of stakeholders including the diocese and parents. If the flexibility to move funding between the blocks is removed, this reduces the LA's capacity to move funding to where it is needed most. In Gateshead we are experiencing significant increases in permanent exclusions. The re-couplement of pupil related funding for these exclusions does not cover the cost of educating these children in the Pru or alternative provision. If we cannot move money between the blocks there will be increasing pressure on the high needs block.

3 Do you agree that the basic amount of funding for each pupil should be different at primary, key stage 3 and key stage 4?

Our proposal for basic per-pupil funding is on page 18 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments. We welcome further evidence on the case for differentiating between key stages.

The need for more specialist equipment in KS3 & KS4, the wider range of subjects, and the need for smaller class sizes in KS4 for exam subjects requires differential rates. Currently there are wide variations in the values across LA's and this could have a significant affect on the primary:secondary ratio. As demographic changes work through the system how will this be managed on a national level? During the soft years this could cause unexpected pressures at a local level.

Building block B: additional needs factors

4a Do you agree that we should include a deprivation factor?

Our proposal for the deprivation factor is on pages 19 to 25 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

4b Which measures for the deprivation factor do you support?

The deprivation measures are explained on pages 20 to 25 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

- Pupil-level only (current FSM and Ever6 FSM) Area-level only (IDACI)
- Pupil- and area-level

Please provide any further comments on the deprivation factor. We welcome your comments on the measures we use to identify deprivation.

Ever6 FSM and IDACI should be used with more funding weighted towards FSM funding, as IDACI data is only updated every 5 years and can cause funding turbulence when the data changes. For Gateshead the difference in the 2010 and 2015 IDACI data sets had the biggest effect on our most deprived schools in terms on funding and the changes in pupils in the bandings. When a new data set is released there could be a phased approach so that changes in bands does not cause as much turbulence and is phase over 2 or more years.

The effect of the Universal Infant Free School Meal grant on infant FSM numbers needs to be addressed. Schools especially in the most deprived areas struggle to get the hardest to reach parents to provided the information needed to enable the school to access the additional funding in the formula and via pupil premium.

5 Do you agree we should include a low prior attainment factor?

Our proposal for the low prior attainment factor is on pages 25 to 27 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

- Yes No

Please provide any further comments. We welcome your comments on the indicators we use to identify low prior attainment.

Agree with primary and secondary prior attainment factors should be included and that the primary factors should be kept under review, especially with the new KS2 standards. However the White Paper Educational Excellence Everywhere talks about "Ensure schools help all pupils progress, particularly stretching the most able pupils and supporting low attainers" Funding for the higher attaining children should also be considered under a prior attainment factor.

There is no proposal to include LA's in the further work on what schools should offer to children with SEN, if LA's are to still have a role in SEN and high needs they need to be involved in any review and proposals.

As the "notional SEN calculation will remain for the "soft" years, work should be undertaken at a national level along with what schools should offer to provide guidance for schools. As well as an SEN offer schools should have a gifted and talented offer also if every child's potential is to be acheived.

6a Do you agree that we should include a factor for English as an additional language?

Our proposal for the English as an additional language factor is on pages 27 and 28 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

6b Do you agree that we should use the EAL3 indicator (pupils registered at any point during the previous 3 years as having English as an additional language)?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Gateshead use EAL3 on the advice from EMTAS service, as it was their opinion that it took children up to 3 years learn enough English to access the curriculum.

Building block C: school costs

7 Do you agree that we should include a lump sum factor?

Our proposal for the lump sum factor is on pages 29 to 31 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments. We welcome evidence to inform proposals in stage 2 of our consultation about how much lump sum funding should be included in the national funding formula.

The lump sum is especially important to ensure small schools remain viable, more data is needed to ascertain on a national level what the amount should be and if it should be different for primary and secondary schools. The average amount across all LA's will not reflect local needs. Gateshead has relatively few large secondary schools and relatively larger numbers of small primary schools. The size of our primary schools is not easily addressed without significant capital investment, and would require the engagement of stakeholders, including parents and the diocese.

8 Do you agree that we should include a sparsity factor?

Our proposal for the sparsity factor is on pages 31 to 33 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments. We welcome views on how well the sparsity criteria are operating locally.

To ensure that primary pupils in rural communities do not have to travel significant distances to attend school.

Building block C: other school costs

Our proposals for other school cost factors are on pages 33 to 35 of the consultation.

9 Do you agree that we should include a business rates factor?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Unless all schools become exempt from business rates and LA's receive an adjustment to their revenue support to compensate for lost revenue.
At present schools are revalued on a 5 year rolling basis so that it is not applicable to use historic cost as this can vary significantly from one year to the next. One of Gateshead's schools received a negative funding amount due to this issue, but will receive a rates bill for 2016/17. Also as the school population increase and schools are being expanded or new schools built this will have a significant impact on a schools ratable values which cannot be accounted for by using historic cost. This proposal is not fair and would mean that children in similar circumstances in different schools would have less funding available for their direct education.

10 Do you agree that we should include a split sites factor?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

This can increase costs for schools, such as travel time for teachers, needing additional teachers, admin.and caretaking staff (depending on how far apart the sites are) and the school will only attract one lump sum to cover the cost unlike a federated school or a multi academy trust. Split site costs should not be on a historic basis as costs may fluctuate or be a short term arrangement due to school re-organisations. A consistent approach and criteria should be developed and applied on a national basis when the NFF becomes hard to ensure that schools are funded on a consistent and fair basis.

11 Do you agree that we should include a private finance initiative factor?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

PFI schools can have significantly higher costs due to the individual PFI contracts. In Gateshead the gap between the PFI credits we receive and the cost of the PFI contract increases every year. This funding gap was passed to schools when Lord Lawson of Beamish converted to an academy, as at that time LA could not pay a liability on behalf of an academy school as this would have been viewed as still maintaining the school. However the PFI factor should not be funded on an historic basis as this will put an additional financial strain on PFI schools compared to non PFI schools. PFI funding should be increased each year in line with RPI to ensure that schools receive sufficient funding to pay their contractual obligations. The amount of funding is also adjusted every year by pupil numbers to ensure that there is no over or under funding. How will new PFI school costs be captured when funding is based on historic levels, as the proposed way or new PFI schools to be "charged" for their portion of the costs is for the LA's DSG to be top-sliced and the charge then passed to the schools.

12 Do you agree that we should include an exceptional premises circumstances factor?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Yes if specific guidance and criteria is provided to on what would constitute an exceptional premises factor so it could be applied to all schools in a consistent way and not rely on historic values. LA's may have dealt with exceptional premises factors outside of the DSG or outside of the formula, e.g. using condition funding to assist schools that have issues such as being a listed building or use of reserves under special circumstances.

13 Do you agree that we should allocate funding to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend for these factors?

	Yes	No
Business rates <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Split sites <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Private finance initiative <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other exceptional circumstances <i>Please select only one item</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Please provide any further comments. We welcome views on how we allocate funding for these factors from 2019-20.

Business rates - no due to the rolling program of rates revaluations, expansion of schools due to pupil numbers and new schools being built which cannot be account for on an historic basis
Split Sites - no as circumstances and costs could change needs to be a consistent national approach
PFI - no as this would not provide enough funds going forward for schools due to the costs rising by RPI, and how will new PFI commitments be captured
Other Exceptional Circumstances - no a criteria should be developed that can be applied consistently to all schools

Building block C: growth

Our proposal for growth funding is on pages 36 to 37 of the consultation.

14 Do you agree that we should include a growth factor?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

If a growth factor is included then this should be applied to all schools consistently and there should be one set criteria that all schools can be applied to all schools on a fair and consistent basis.

15 Do you agree that we should allocate funding for growth to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments. We welcome in particular comments about alternatives for allocating growth funding, both for the transitional period and from 2019-20.

If funding is made available then it should be applied to all schools on a fair and consistent basis. Growth in schools cannot be based on an historic basis as this will not reflect future requirements. Basing factors on historic spend contradicts the aim of a national funding formula of funding all children in similar circumstances on the same basis.

Building block D: geographic costs

The area cost adjustment is explained on pages 37 to 39 of the consultation.

16a Do you agree that we should include an area cost adjustment?

Please select only one item

Yes No

16b Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

More information

There are 2 potential methodologies.

The general labour market (GLM) methodology reflects differences in labour costs between different areas. It is based on the Department for Communities and Local Government's labour cost adjustment, which is used to allocate funds to local authorities.

The hybrid area cost adjustment has 2 elements: teachers' pay costs and non-teaching staff pay costs. For the teachers' pay element, it calculates notional averages for 4 regional pay bands: inner London, outer London, the fringe and the rest of England. The non-teaching staff costs element is based on the GLM methodology.

The hybrid measure reflects that the costs of teachers are lower in higher cost areas than the GLM indices would suggest. The use of notional averages is also intended to mitigate against the fact that schools in some local authorities can offer higher salaries because they are well funded.

Please select only one item

general labour market methodology hybrid methodology

Please provide any further comments:

Need more information on the areas that are finding it difficult to recruit and retain teachers for the whole of England and not just some geographic areas.
The impact of the proposed new NFF should be reviewed before applying ACA.

17 Do you agree that we should target support for looked-after children and those who have left care via adoption, special guardianship or a care arrangements order through the pupil premium plus, rather than include a looked-after children factor in the national funding formula?

Our proposal for funding these children is on pages 39 to 41 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Funding in the formula is to support the school to attend meetings and undertake paperwork that is associated with LAC children. LAC pupil premium plus, is for the child and not to support schools with additional workloads associated with these children. If LAC PP is to be used for this than the conditions of grant may need to be reviewed.

18 Do you agree that we should not include a factor for mobility?

Our proposal for mobility funding is on pages 41 and 42 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

In Gateshead we have used a mobility factor to assist schools that have mobile populations due to the nature of social housing in their area. This was introduced into the formula from 2014/15 following the publication of a report from the RSA on the educational effects on deprived children moving schools mid year. However to be able to apply this factor on a national level would be difficult as local knowledge is required to ensure that mistakes are not made due to mid year academy conversions.

19 Do you agree that we should remove the post-16 factor from 2017-18?

Our proposal for post-16 funding is on pages 42 and 43 of the consultation.

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

As the Schools block of the DSG is for 5 to 15 year olds, this factor should be removed in a phased way to enable LA's and schools to manage the transition.

Transition to the reformed funding system

Our proposals for the transition to the national funding formula are on pages 45 to 52 of the consultation.

20 Do you agree with our proposal to require local authorities to distribute all of their schools block allocation to schools from 2017-18?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

LA's have the local knowledge to understand and try to reduce turbulence to individual schools during the transition phase, and can highlight funding issues to the DfE. However this could cause local tensions as schools will know how much they would have received under the NFF if reductions have to be levied across all schools to fund increased PFI costs, pupil growth or rates issues.

21 Do you believe that it would be helpful for local areas to have flexibility to set a local minimum funding guarantee?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

LA's should be provided with enough funding so that MFG can be applied on a consistent basis and allow schools time to adjust to the new funding arrangements. LA's may have most of their schools losing funding under the NNF and have additional cost pressures. Setting a local MFG could create further turbulence for schools at a local level, which could create tensions between schools at a local level, and there would not be national consistency.

Funding remaining with local authorities

Our proposal for the funding that remains with local authorities is on pages 53 to 55 of the consultation.

22 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing responsibilities as set out in the consultation according to a per-pupil formula?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

The removal of the £77 per pupil from September 2017 is too quick for LA's to respond to such an decrease in specific funding over a short period of time. This proposal removes local discretion to arrange services to meet local needs and priorities.

23 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing historic commitments based on case-specific information to be collected from local authorities?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

This ensures that current commitments e.g. premature retirement costs can be met on an ongoing basis as these costs only reduce when the recipient dies.

The education services grant

Our proposal for the education services grant is on pages 56 to 61 of the consultation.

24 Are there other duties funded from the education services grant that could be removed from the system?

Funding should not be reduced until clear guidance has been provided to LA's on what duties remain with them and time given to re-structure.

25 Do you agree with our proposal to allow local authorities to retain some of their maintained schools' DSG centrally – in agreement with the maintained schools in the schools forum – to fund the duties they carry out for maintained schools?

Please select only one item

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

Most schools are feeling the effect of flat cash from 2010/11, requiring schools to fund and schools to pay for these services with out any additional funding will add to schools financial burdens. Annex B states that admissions, some asset management, education welfare is mentioned, but more clarity needed. Statutory and regulatory duties - many will remain with the LA, but the information is not specific enough to provided an informed comment.

More information needs to be provided so that LA and schools understand what schools will be required to pay for and who the statutory duty for these functions belongs to. The consultation states that schools forum will have to agree to have funding top sliced, what would happen if schools forum did not agree to the top slice?

Equality analysis

26 Please provide any comments on the equality analysis.

The equality analysis sets out the potential impact of our proposals on protected characteristics.

TITLE OF REPORT: DfE High Needs Funding Consultation – April 2017

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forum's attention the current consultation released by the DfE on a number of proposed reforms to High Needs Funding. This report is supplemental to the report presented to Forum in March 2016.

Background

The government committed through the 2015 spending review the intention to introduce the first ever national funding formula for schools, early years and high needs to "match funding directly and transparently to need". Therefore the Department for Education (DfE) released a six week consultation on 7th March 2016, setting out its proposals for the process of moving towards a national funding formula for high needs, inviting responses to the consultation to be submitted by 17th April 2016.

Consultation

This consultation is the first stage regarding the main principles of a national funding formula for High Needs, and a "stage two" consultation will be launched before the end of the summer on the detail of the proposals, including potential financial implications for individual Local Authorities and Schools.

The key proposals within the consultation include:

- To introduce a national funding formula for high needs from 2017-18 over 5 years;
- To use factors in the formula including population; health; disability; low attainment; and deprivation;
- To continue to allocate funding to local authorities for high needs, but on a formula basis;
- To retaining a significant element of funding based on what local authorities are currently spending, and capping the gains and losses of local authorities each year;
- To provide financial and practical help to authorities to assist them in reshaping their provision, including capital funding for new specialist places and new special free schools

The consultation paper and supplementary information below set out the details behind the proposals. An email was sent out to all schools on 23rd March which contained a copy of the draft consultation response in **Appendix 1**, encouraging them to either respond directly as a School to the consultation, or to feedback comments to me for inclusion in the Gateshead Council/ Schools Forum response.

High Needs Funding Reform Consultation Document

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/high-needs-fundingreform/supporting_documents/HighNeedsFundingReform_Consultation.pdf

Online response form:

- <https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/high-needs-funding-reform/consultation/intro/view>

High Needs Funding Consultation Technical Note

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/high-needs-fundingreform/supporting_documents/HighNeedsFundingConsultation_TechnicalNote.pdf

Research on funding for young people with special educational needs

- https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/high-needs-fundingreform/supporting_documents/Research_on_Funding_for_young_people_with_special_educational_needs.pdf

Proposal

Schools Forum reviews, discusses and amends as required the attached draft consultation response at Appendix 1, in order to submit a Schools Forum response to the consultation.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum notes the contents of the report and reviews the draft consultation response to submit on behalf of Gateshead Schools Forum.

For the following reasons:

To enable Schools Forum to have an input into the consultation regarding the changes to High Needs Funding, and to put forward their collective views.

CONTACT: Alan Foster

Appendix 1 – Draft High Needs Funding Consultation Response

A. Name

First name:

Last name:

B. Email address

If you enter your email address you will be able to return to edit your consultation at any time until you submit it. You will also receive an acknowledgement email when you submit your response.

Email: alanfoster@gateshead.gov.uk

C. Response type

Please select your role from the list below:

Please select your organisation type from the list below:

Organisation name: Gateshead Council

Local authority area:

D. Would you like your response to be confidential?

Yes No

Information provided in response to consultations, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want all, or any part, of a response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department for Education will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please give your reason for confidentiality:

1. Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

The principles are set out on pages 19 and 20 of the consultation.

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

The Authority's response on the proposed principles have been taken in light of the proposed funding envelope, in that there is a real terms reduction in schools funding over the term of this parliament, whereby any reallocation of funding at a national level will mean winners and losers, with the losers having minimal transitional protection, due to there being no additional funding to smooth the transition.

The Authority disagrees with the principle that the funding system should be simple, it is our view that the complex and varied system that is education in the UK warrants a funding system that is "fit for purpose", which doesn't always mean simple. Funding streams (ie DSG/ ESG) have been separate and have not been combined in the past to reflect that regardless of the size of school, a number of core responsibilities with fixed costs (finance/ HR/ legal/ school improvement) remain.

The authority agrees with the principle that the funding system should be efficient, but the proposal to ring-fence the blocks is not efficient as it will not promote the "right behaviours" across the system as a whole as there will be no impact on mainstream schools that are not inclusive of SEN or permanently excluded pupils.

The current funding system already gets funding to the front line, with 99.1% of Gateshead schools funding in 2015/16 going to schools budgets, with the remaining 0.9% retained by the LA approved each year by schools forum as being value for money and suitable.

2. Do you agree that the majority of high needs funding should be distributed to local authorities rather than directly to schools and other institutions?

Our proposal is on page 22 of the consultation.

Yes No

Please provide any further comments

3. Do you agree that the high needs formula should be based on proxy measures of need, not the assessed needs of children and young people?

Our proposal is on pages 22 and 23 of the consultation.

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

This will remove any perverse incentives associated with allocating funding on assessed need, but as provision, types of schools and local arrangements differ significantly, the move to a national formula must be carefully handled.

4. Do you agree with the basic factors proposed for the formula?

Our proposal is on pages 23 to 29 of the consultation. More information on the proposed indicators for the factors is included in the technical note.

	Agree	Disagree
Basic entitlement	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Population	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Child health	Agree <input type="radio"/>	Disagree <input checked="" type="radio"/>
Child disability	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Low attainment at key stage 2	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Low attainment at key stage 4	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Deprivation - free school meal eligibility	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Deprivation - income deprivation affecting children index	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>
Adjustments - for "imports/exports"	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>

Please provide any further comments. We welcome comments on the indicators we use for these factors.

The Children Not in Good Health data is based on census data and is an optional entry on the census, so this data may not provide a reasonable indicator of prevalence.

5. We are not proposing to make changes to the distribution of funding for hospital education, but would welcome views as we continue working with representatives of this sector on the way forward.

Funding for hospital education is covered on page 29 of the consultation.

6. Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

Our proposal for the area cost adjustment is on page 30 of the consultation.

There are 2 potential methodologies:

- i) The **general labour market (GLM)** methodology reflects differences in labour costs between different areas. It is based on the Department for Communities and Local Government's labour cost adjustment, which is used to allocate funds to local authorities.
- ii) The **hybrid** area cost adjustment has 2 elements: teachers' pay costs and non-teaching staff pay costs. For the teachers' pay element, it calculates notional averages for 4 regional pay bands: inner London, outer London, the fringe and the rest of England. The non-teaching staff costs element is based on the GLM methodology.

The hybrid measure reflects that the costs of teachers are lower in higher cost areas than the GLM indices would suggest. The use of notional averages is also intended to mitigate against the fact that schools in some local authorities can offer higher salaries because they are well funded.



general labour market methodology



hybrid methodology

Please provide any further comments. In particular, we welcome views on whether we should adopt an adjustment that reflects that specialist settings, compared with mainstream institutions, often employ more teaching assistants and other non-teaching staff.

The area cost adjustment must include teaching costs within its methodology to ensure to ensure an accurate measure of school costs. The general labour market methodology does not and therefore may not give a true representation of the costs between schools in different parts of the country.

7. Do you agree that we should include a proportion of 2016-17 spending in the formula allocations of funding for high needs?

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

8. Do you agree with our proposal to protect local authorities' funding through an overall minimum funding guarantee?

Yes No

Please provide any further comments:

The MFG must be at a level to ensure that sufficient time is given to Local Authorities to manage any funding reductions in the most reasonable way so as to not have a detrimental impact of provision to young people.

9. We welcome views on what should be covered in any national guidelines on what schools offer for their pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.

Our initial response to the Isos research proposal to provide national guidelines is on pages 37 and 38 of the consultation. It emphasises the importance of schools' decisions about what kind of support is most appropriate for their pupils with special educational needs, working in partnership with parents.

There should be a stipulation of a reasonable % of the school budget that should be allocated to SEN based on all of the research conducted by Isos, rather than just advising on what kind of support is appropriate. This will provide clarity to both schools and Local Authorities, particularly when they are conversing regarding top-up funding.

It is called 'notional' for a reason, in that LA's have calculated it in the past to provide an indication to schools based on their individual characteristics.

10. Do you agree with the proposed changes to the funding of special units in mainstream schools?

We are proposing that special units in mainstream schools receive the per-pupil amounts that would be due to the school by including the pupils in the units within the school's pupil count, plus place funding of £6,000, rather than £10,000 per place.

Further information is on pages 38 and 39 of the consultation.

Agree Disagree

Please provide any further comments:

11. We welcome examples of local authorities that are using centrally-retained funding in a strategic way to overcome barriers to integration and inclusion.

Information about how local authorities can use central funding to encourage appropriate mainstream inclusion is on page 39 of the consultation.

We welcome in particular examples of where this funding has been allocated on an 'invest-to-save' basis, achieving reductions in high needs spending over the longer term.

We would like to publish good examples we receive. Please check the box if you do not wish your response to be published.

I do not wish my response to be published

n/a

12. We welcome examples of where centrally-retained funding is used to support schools that are very inclusive and have a high proportion of pupils with particular types of special education needs, or a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs.

As set out on page 40 of the consultation, the Isos report proposed that we should issue clearer guidance on how this funding can be targeted. Before we do so we are keen to have examples of what local authorities are doing to achieve value for money in this area.

13. Do you agree that independent special schools should be given the opportunity to receive place funding directly from the Education Funding Agency with the balance in the form of top-up funding from local authorities?

Our proposal about the funding of independent special schools is on pages 40 and 41 of the consultation.

Agree Disagree

Please provide any further comments:

These providers represent less than 0.1% of provision in Gateshead, and their status as "independent" suggests they should be independent of the mainstream arrangements. We use these placements very sparingly and the risk is that any funding on the basis of maintained, academy and non-maintained special schools may mean that funding is top sliced from the high needs block for a number of years after provision has ended with an independent provider.

14. We welcome views on the outline and principles of the proposed changes to post-16 place funding and on how specialist provision in further education colleges might be identified and designated.

Our intended approach for post-16 mainstream institutions which have smaller proportions or numbers of students with high needs differs from the approach for those with larger proportions or numbers. Information about this and other proposals for changes to post-16 funding is on pages 42 to 46 of the consultation.

Please provide any comments:

There is already an element of SEN funding in the post 16 funding formula through the deprivation factor, as deprivation is one of the key factors associated with SEN as stated in the Isos research. We feel that the current system for allocation of £6,000 place funding for mainstream post 16 providers is finally beginning to work, and any move to change the arrangements may jeopardise the good work already progressed between providers and local authorities.

15. We welcome comments on the equalities impact assessment.

The equality analysis published alongside the consultation sets out the potential impact of our proposals on protected characteristics.



14 April 2016

TITLE OF REPORT: Educational Excellence Everywhere – Summary

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forums a summary of the Education White Paper – Educational Excellence Everywhere.

Background

The DfE have issued a White Paper on 17th March setting out the Government's vision for schools for the remainder of this Parliament.

The Paper consists of eight chapters, a conclusion and the DfE's Strategy Overview for 2015 to 2020.

Chapter 1 – Vision to Educational Excellence Everywhere

This chapter provides a view on where the education system is now, a summary of the further chapters.

Chapter 2 – Great Teachers – everywhere they are needed.

- Reform the National College for Teaching and Leadership
 - Create web tools for free teacher recruitment to enable schools to advertise vacancies more easily
 - Initial teacher training to be strengthened to include more subject knowledge, improved behaviour management training, and the use of evidenced teaching methods.
 - Replace the Qualified Teacher Status to be replaced with a "stronger more challenging" accreditation.
 - Develop new National Teaching Service
 - Build a diverse workforce with opportunities for teachers to work more flexibly
 - Move to an increasingly school-led ITT systems, so that the best schools and leaders control which teachers are recruited and how they are trained
-
- Ensure there is a sufficient supply of high quality CPD provision; including evidence based continuing professional development

- Examine feasibility of incentivising teaching schools to publish their research and CP on an 'open source' basis
- Support the establishment of an independent College of Teaching, peer-reviewed journal, and Education Endowment Foundation

Chapter 3 - Great leaders running our schools and at the heart of our system

- Design new voluntary National Professional Qualifications for leaders
- Encourage more leadership development training to be delivered by successful schools
- Rebalance incentives so that great leaders are not discouraged from working in challenging schools, through a greater emphasis on progress in the accountability system and by introducing 'improvement periods', during which schools will not be inspected by Ofsted
- Introduce the new National Teaching Service to support elite teachers and strong middle leaders to move to work in some of the nation's most challenging areas, aligning this with existing targeted leadership programmes for maximum impact
- Excellence in Leadership fund to be set up
- A new national database will be set up to track those involved in governance, and the potential barring of unsuitable individuals.

Chapter 4 - A school-led system with every school an academy, empowered pupils, parents and communities and a clearly defined role for local government

- All schools to be academies by 2022
- Small schools will have to form or become part of a Multi Academy Trust
- Online Parent Portal to keep parents informed about the school system, and school league tables
- The role of LA's will be limited to ensuring every child has a school place, needs of vulnerable pupils are met and parents are championed. No role for LA's in school improvement or maintaining schools
- Regional School Commissioners (RSCs) will intervene promptly where academies or MATs are underperforming

Chapter 5 - Preventing underperformance and helping schools go from good to great: school-led improvement, with scaffolding and support where it's needed

- 300 new teaching schools & 800 more National Leaders of Education (NLEs) will ensure that all schools in all areas can access support

- Teaching schools to be based on data (not Ofsted) and funding “better targeted”
- Establish new and better means of brokering school improvement by transferring responsibility from local authorities to schools and system leaders to spread expertise and best practice
- Targeted funding for system leaders to build capacity through school-to-school support and for RSCs to intervene in failing and coasting schools with support from an Intervention Fund

Chapter 6 - High expectations and a world-leading curriculum for all

- A world leading curriculum for academies to build on, including increased support for teachers to deliver this curriculum Continue to embed reforms to assessment and qualifications including GCSE, A Levels and reform primary assessment
- The National Citizen Service will be expanded to enable all pupils to take part
- Publish a strategy for improved careers provision for young people
- Reform the alternative provision (AP) system so that mainstream schools remain accountable for the education of pupils in AP and are responsible for commissioning high quality provision
- Focus on the outcomes and experiences of all children and young people with special educational needs and disability (SEND)

Chapter 7 - Fair, stretching accountability, ambitious for every child

- Ofsted will consult on removing graded judgments on quality of teaching, learning and assessment
- Reduction in using Ofsted grades for choosing system leaders, teaching schools
- League tables for multi-academy trust performance measures
- Schools judged as requiring improvement by Ofsted where a headteachers “steps forward” to lead improvement, a maintained school becomes an academy, a new school opens or a new sponsor is appointed will not face re-inspection for 30 months – a breathing space

Chapter 8 - The right resources in the right hands: investing every penny where it can do the most good

- A new, fair national funding formulae for schools, and for allocating high needs funding to local authorities for special educational needs and alternative provision
- A pledge to continue with pupil premium and Improve effectiveness of pupil premium spending by adopting evidence-based strategies
- RSCs able to “commission a pupil premium review”

- Tools for improved school efficiency/budgets & offer financial health checks
- Remove requirement for parent governors
- Agree an understanding with church regarding relationship with commissioners
- Redesign legal framework for academies/Las

Below is a link to the white paper for information.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/508447/Educational_Excellence_Everywhere.pdf

Proposal

Schools Forum notes the contents of the report.

Recommendations

Schools Forum notes the contents of the report.

For the following reasons:-

To provide Schools Forum with a summary of the white paper and the Governments and DfE's proposals for education.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

TITLE OF REPORT: Extension of Surplus Balances Licence

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forum for the ratification of a request to extend a surplus balance licence.

Background

In January 2007 Local Authorities were directed by the Secretary of State for Education to make certain directed revisions to their Schemes for Financing Schools.

Under the directed revisions a local authority scheme was required to include a mechanism to control school surplus balances. These revisions should have come into effect from 1st April 2007, but were only implemented for Gateshead Schools from April 2008.

Under the regulations in effect for 2011/12 Schools are permitted to have an “unlicensed” carry forward amount that is equal to or less than 8% for Special and Primary Schools, and 5% for Secondary Schools of the next financial year’s School Budget Share. Under the new regulations LA’s could review their clawback mechanism, and as per report to Schools Forum in March 2012 limits were raised. For primary and special schools the new thresholds would be 16% or £20,000 and 10% for secondary schools.

The Schools “Surplus Balance” is calculated using the schools closing balance as at the end of the financial year less, additional grants, pupil premium, any known prior year commitments, and the calculated “unlicensed” amount.

Surplus Balance Licences

Corpus Christi Catholic Primary Schools was granted a surplus balance licence for one year, part of the licence was for the refurbishment of toilets at the school. Unfortunately the work did not start as anticipated and as the toilets are required in term time, work can only be undertaken during holidays.

The work was started during February half term, the second phase was completed during the Easter holidays, and decoration may have to take place after this date.

Proposal

That Schools Forum ratifies the extension of the surplus balance licence due to the late start of the refurbishment of pupil's toilets.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Schools Forum ratifies the decision to extend Corpus Christi's surplus balance licence due to the late start of the refurbishment of the toilets.

For the following reason(s):

- To ensure that the Control of Surplus Balances Procedure is adhered to in a clear, fair and transparent manner.
- To enable the balance to be carried forward into 2016/17 when the refurbishment will be completed.

CONTACT: Carole Smith