



GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 14 January 2016 at 10.00 am in the Dryden Centre

From the Chief Executive, Jane Robinson

Item Business

1. **Apologies**

2. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 6)

The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 10 December 2015

3. **DSG Settlement 2016/17** (Pages 7 - 10)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

4. **Mainstream School Funding Formula** (Pages 11 - 22)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

5. **Contingency Funding Application** (Pages 23 - 26)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

6. **Council Budget Consultation** (Pages 27 - 28)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

7. **Rights to Request Childcare Consultation** (Pages 29 - 42)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources.

8. **Health Education England Funding Application** (Pages 43 - 46)

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

Thursday 11 February 2016 at 2.00pm

This page is intentionally left blank

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

10 December 2015

PRESENT:

Ken Childs – Special School Governor
Steve Haigh – Secondary Academy Heads
Sarah Diggle – Primary Governor
Chris Richardson – Maintained Secondary Heads
Mustafaa Malik – Primary Heads
Ethel Mills – PVI Sector
Steve Williamson – PRU
Matt Younger – Primary Heads
Allan Symons – Primary Governors
Jim Thomson – Secondary Academy Heads
Cllr Malcolm Brain – Gateshead Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Carole Smith – Corporate Resources
Frank McDermott – Corporate Resources
Alan Foster – Corporate Resources
Jeanne Pratt – Care Wellbeing and Learning
Ann Muxworthy – Care Wellbeing and Learning
Rosalyn White – Corporate Services and Governance

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Peter Largue, Christine Ingle, Denise Henry, Clive Wisby, Jane Bryant, Elaine Pickering and Julie Goodfellow.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

3. EMTAS DE-DELEGATION OPTIONS

The Forum received a report requesting consideration be given to the de-delegation of EMTAS for mainstream maintained schools.

It was noted that staffing levels have been trimmed in light of budget cuts, however this is at a time of growth. There are currently 350 pupils supported by the services, speaking over 80 different languages. The service supports the education achievement of all ethnic minority and Traveller pupils across all Gateshead schools. It also supports training with schools on essential policies such as Hate Crime and to promote cultural awareness.

In terms of growth it was confirmed that there is further commitment required from January, following an increase in asylum seekers. A recent evaluation showed 100% satisfaction rate, with 85% of the responses rating the service good or very good. Despite this satisfaction rate the service will be re-evaluating how the service is provided.

It was noted that the service goes where the need is, all over Gateshead, and will further develop from January when more schools will need access to specialist services.

It was questioned how many responses were received to the satisfaction survey. It was confirmed that there were 19 responses, however a full evaluation of the responses has not yet been completed. It was suggested that some of the primary clusters do not think that the service is effective and due to the service being stretched schools feel that it is diluted in terms of what they get. It was noted that this information was not received back through the satisfaction survey. It was also acknowledged that the service is meeting the needs of pupils in different ways and certain schools take up more resource so some work is more thinly spread. It was pointed out that if the service was removed there would likely leave 500-700 children with no specialist support.

In terms of primary schools survey responses, it was noted that patchy information has been received as not all schools receive the service. However, it has been made clear to some of the primary representatives that schools are not sure what they will get and are not aware of other things that EMTAS are doing.

It was suggested that with the increasing number of languages in Gateshead schools more should be done to support schools to help themselves and support their own needs. It was confirmed that there is a 'talk package' in place that allows schools to support delivery and those schools with a high percentage of BME pupils are already able to deliver support. It was pointed out that Headteachers have a high expectation and the service needs to make it clear, through communications with schools, what they can deliver.

It was noted that delaying a decision on de-delegation of EMTAS would impact on staffing and contracts for some staff end before January. It was felt that the implications of not keeping the service would be severe, however the Forum agreed that termly reports be brought to future meetings around the work of the service.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the feedback from mainstream maintained primary schools be noted and service update reports be brought back to the Schools Forum on a termly basis.
 - (ii) That the Schools Forum, by majority vote,

agreed to the de-delegation of funds to continue with EMTAS service.

4. DE-DELEGATION OPTIONS

The Forum received a report requesting consideration be given to the further de-delegation of the Primary Behaviour Support Team and the Primary Fair Access Educational Psychologist.

It was reported that, in terms of behaviour support, discussions have been held with a number of Headteachers who use the service for more than two pupils. During these discussions issues were raised around communications and lack of clarity, therefore the services has changed accordingly. All staff have been provided with an ipad so they can feedback from schools on a daily basis, there is also now more clarity in terms of the role of teachers and teaching assistants and in particular what the service expects of the school.

More training is being rolled out to ensure more seamless approach for those pupils who need additional support. There has also been an increase in the number of permanent exclusions so work has been undertaken with primary schools around how children can be supported through early intervention.

It was noted that over 50% of primary schools use the behaviour support service, there were 54 cases last year, of which; 46 improved their behaviour, four were placed in specialist provision, two in the ARMS, one child returned to school action following a managed move and one child received a single plan. It was confirmed that an annual report is sent to all schools.

In terms of the Primary Fair Access Panel Educational Psychologist it was confirmed that 60 pupils have been referred to the Primary Fair Access Panel. 53 of these were appropriate referrals, 12 of whom received support from the educational psychologist. It was confirmed that every cluster is represented at the panel.

Currently work is ongoing to look at a model to support schools and build bespoke training to meet the needs of individual children.

The Schools Forum felt that it was positive that early intervention work was ongoing in primary schools. The Schools Forum was satisfied with a two year process in order to see patterns of impact and felt that a good level of information was provided to schools.

RESOLVED - That the feedback from mainstream maintained primary schools be noted and agreed the de-delegation of funds to continue with the Primary Fair Access Educational Psychologist and the Primary Behaviour Support Team special needs assistants.

5. EARLY YEARS FUNDING EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF 30 HOURS

A report was presented on the application for Gateshead to be an early implementer for the 30 hours free entitlement. It was noted that there will be no funding attached to this, however it will provide an opportunity to work on the admission process. It was also recognised that it is likely the children who may need the additional hours will not meet the criteria.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report and the information in the application form.

6. AUTUMN STATEMENT UPDATE

The Schools Forum received an update on the issues coming out of the Chancellors Autumn Statement that will impact on Early Years, Schools and High Needs Blocks of the DSG.

In relation to the Early Years Block it was noted that there will be an additional £300M to fund the increase to 30 hours free entitlement for working parents. As of yet there is no detail on what Gateshead's rates will be, however new rates will be based on information collected by the DfE on the cost of childcare.

The core schools budget in England will be protected and it is expected that a national funding formula will be introduced in 2017/18. Government has also expressed its intention to help all secondary schools to become academies.

It is not expected that there will be a change to the High Needs Block for 2016/17, however, a national funding formula will be introduced from 2017/18, following consultation during 2016/17. An additional £50M has been pledged for capital works for all early years settings.

It was queried what will happen to PFI when the national funding formula is introduced. It was noted that there is talk of top slicing DSG, but there will be no further information until the Government consult on proposals early in 2016.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report.

7. GROWTH FUND APPLICATION

The Forum received a report outlining a recent application for Growth Funding that did not satisfy all of the criteria, and therefore a request was made for funding outside of the criteria.

It was reported that Ravensworth Terrace admitted above its planned admission number in anticipation of a new build school. However, this

increase was 6% and is therefore below the 10% threshold contained in the Growth Fund Criteria.

The Schools Forum felt that the adverse impact on other schools in the area was not considered at the time of admitting the additional pupils and therefore alternatives to managing the situation had not been considered.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum decided Growth Funding was not applicable in this situation.

8. SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS

A report was presented outlining the revisions to Gateshead's Scheme for Financing Schools. The Forum was asked for any views prior to consultation with all maintained schools.

RESOLVED - That the Forum reviewed the changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools prior to the Scheme being sent out to all maintained schools.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Forum was advised that Carolyn Duffy, RC primary school representative, has resigned from the Forum and is replaced by Andrew Ramanandi.

10. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 14 January 2016 at 10.00am.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 3

TITLE OF REPORT: DSG Funding Settlement

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forum attention the information received from the DfE for the 2016/17 funding settlement and the work being carried out to provide schools and Early Years Providers with their budgets for 2016/17.

Background

The DfE issued the 2016/17 funding settlement on the 17th of December 2015. Gateshead will receive an estimated £134.101m Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2016/17.

The DfE announced the majority of the three main funding blocks for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and provided estimates for the remaining areas.

1. The early years block - for 2 and 3 & 4 year old funding, including Early Years Pupil Premium
2. Mainstream Schools block - which includes some centrally held funding
3. High Needs Block - which includes special schools, Pru and high needs top up funding

For 2016/17 DSG the Schools Block Unit of Funding (SBUF) and Early Years Block Unit of Funding (EYBUF) have remained the same as 2015/16 and are:-

- EYBUF is £3,882.71 per full time equivalent (FTE). An early year's pupil (3 & 4 year old) taking up all their entitlement (15 hours) is 0.6 FTE.
- 2 Year old funding is a block grant based on 345 FTE deprived 2 year olds, and annual funding rate of £4,607.50 has been announced. This is the same funding rate of £4.85 per hour as 2015/16.
- The estimated pupil numbers for 2, 3 & 4 year olds have been updated for 2016/17, and will be amended to take into account actual take up based on January 2016 and January 2017 census.
- The estimated pupil numbers for 3 & 4 year olds has been updated with an estimated increase of 68 FTE pupils. Funding will be updated later in the year to take into account any movements in pupil numbers.
- For the Mainstream Schools Block, the SBUF is £4,558.95 per mainstream school pupil. This funding excludes funding for historic ARMS places in mainstream schools. However for the actual calculation of the schools block, a SBUF of £4,551 has been used to calculate actual funding which takes into account the top slice of the DSG at the allocation stage for schools Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC).

- High Needs Block is a block grant which has seen an increase of £282k to reflect the increase in post 16 special school places.

The DSG Blocks

Early Years Block

The 2, 3 and 4 year old funding has been estimated at £9.222m, an increase of £264k from £8.958m in 2015/16. 2 year old funding remains the same at £1.590m. 3 & 4 year old funding has increased to £7.428m and increase of £264k which relates to an estimated increase of 68 pupils.

The Early Years Block also includes an estimated allocation of £205k for Early Years Pupil Premium, which has remained the same as 2015/16.

Mainstream Schools Block

The mainstream block has been calculated at £105.579m, an increase from £104.554m in 2016/17 of approximately £1.026m due to 225 additional funded pupils.

Out of the mainstreams schools block the amount proposed to be available to fund Gateshead mainstream schools is £104.145m with the below proposed deductions:-

- Centrally Retained funding to fund allowable central services of £1.206m
- Deduction from the schools block to support the Growth Fund of £100K
- DfE top-slice for school licences which the DfE will purchase centrally on behalf of all schools of £128k

Therefore there is £104.145m available to distribute to mainstream schools for 2016/17.

High Needs Block

The high needs block is has been announced at £21.040m (£19.3m after the deduction of centrally funded high needs places) which is an increase of £282K from 2015/16 and is for an increase in post 16 numbers in special schools.

Other Funding Information

The DfE also announced that the Minimum Funding Guarantee would still exist for 2016/17 and again would be at minus 1.5% of per pupil funding.

All pupil premium for 2016/17 will remain the same as 2015/16 at £1,320 for ever 6 Free School Meal (FSM) primary children, £935 for secondary FSM children, £1,900 for LAC and post LAC children and £300 for service children.

Early Years Pupil Premium which is included in the DSG has also remained the same and is to be paid to providers on a participation basis of £0.53 per eligible child.

The meal rate for universal infant free school meals (UIFSM) stays at £2.30 for the 2016 to 2017 academic year.

The year 7 catch-up premium continues in 2016 to 2017. The DfE will confirm the per pupil rate early in 2016.

Summer schools funding will **not** continue in 2016.

The primary PE and sport premium continues in 2016 to 2017.

As part of the government's commitment to improving outcomes for vulnerable children, the special educational needs and disability (SEND) implementation grant will continue at an increased level in 2016 to 2017. This is to support English local authorities in the transition to the new SEND system.

The grant for extended rights to home to school transport grant will continue in 2016 to 2017. We will confirm allocations in early 2016.

Further details will be available in later in the year for some of these grants.

Proposal

That Schools Forum approves to the calculation method for the Schools Block DSG to determine the amount of funding available to calculate mainstream individual school budgets. This will enable the individual school budgets to be calculated using the DfE's Authority Proforma Tool, (subject to a later report), and notes the estimated amounts available for the Early Years Block, the High Needs Block allocation, and the other funding information provided.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum:-

- Approves the centrally retained funding increase to £1.335m to take into account the estimated amount for the central services and for the central purchase of school licences.
- Notes the top slice of £100K for the provision of a Growth Fund.
- Notes the estimated Early Years Block
- Notes the High Needs Block allocation
- Notes the other funding information

For the following reasons:-

- To enable individual school budgets to be set
- To provide additional funding information

CONTACT: Carole Smith

This page is intentionally left blank

Report 4

TITLE OF REPORT: Mainstream Schools Funding

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forum the proposed Authority Proforma Tool (APT) for submitting funding factors and values to the DfE for approval and for the calculation of mainstream schools individual school budgets for 2016/17.

Background

Gateshead received its Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding settlement on 17th December 2015. From the date of the settlement work has been undertaken to calculate the amount available for mainstream schools and to calculate individual mainstream school budgets.

The Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations were issued by the DfE 23rd December and come into force 12 January, and the calculation of all schools and early years budgets must comply with these regulations.

The schools block has been calculated at £105,579K. This is calculated by 23,189 mainstream pupils multiplied by the GUF of £4,551 totalling £105,546K plus an additional £33K for newly qualified teachers training.

Out of the mainstreams schools block the amount available to fund Gateshead mainstream schools is £104,145K, an increase of £974K.

This amount of funding has been used to calculate Gateshead mainstream schools individual schools budgets based on the Authority Proforma Tool agreed by Schools Forum on 15th October and uploaded to the DfE in October 2015.

A number of inputs and adjustments were made to the APT prior to modelling. These included:-

- Thomas Hepburn Academy data set had the school having 65% of its pupils starting on a non-standards date. This is incorrect and relates to the date the school converted to an academy. The percentage has been therefore been adjusted to 5% which is an average of the previous 2013/14 and 2014/15 data, as last year's data was also incorrect.
- Input of estimated rates charges for 2016/17 and adjustments for actual rates charges for 2015/16 in comparison to the amount funded for 2015/16. There have been some swings in rates charges due to revaluations of school premises.
- The PFI factor was re-calculated to take into account the changes in pupil numbers and PFI charges.

- Adjustments to pupil numbers for main or current registered pupils for schools with ARMS, (as at October 2015).
- De-delegation has been input as agreed at October and Decembers Schools Forum

The December issued APT has updated data for the calculation of the mainstream school budgets. The updated data was checked against last year's data to assess the changes in data. There were found to be no unexpected changes in data, apart from IDACI numbers. At the time of issuing the APT, the DfE notified local authorities that the data set for IDACI had been updated from 2010 to 2015 data set.

Although the child data at post code level in the different Lower Super Output Area's (LSOPA's) is updated every year, the classification of the banding of the LSOPA's are not.

Comparison of the data sets between the October APT (2010) and the December APT (2015) showed unforeseen shift in deprivation across the borough, as shown in table 1 below.

Table 1

Number of Children in each IDACI Band using 2010 & 2015 Bandings							
	IDACI 0	IDACI 1	IDACI 2	IDACI 3	IDACI 4	IDACI 5	IDACI 6
2010	10065.21	2327.32	2608.24	3888.49	1822.87	1087.28	1282.60
2015	11106.77	2724.77	2667.77	4150.67	1561.41	825.16	282.45
Difference	1041.56	397.45	59.53	262.18	-261.46	-262.12	-1000.15
%	10.35%	17.08%	2.28%	6.74%	-14.34%	-24.11%	-77.98%

Colleagues in the Council who deal with data analysis were contacted to help ascertain the reason for the change in the data.

IDACI is a ranking based on the percentage of children aged 0 - 15 in each (LSOA) living in families that are income deprived - i.e. in receipt of income support, income based jobseeker's allowance or pension credit, or those not in receipt of these benefits but in receipt of Child Tax Credit with an equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) below 60% of the national median before housing costs.

The LSOA with a rank of 6 is the most deprived. LSOA's are small fixed geographic areas encompassing a population of approximately 1,000 people. These statistics are a measure of relative deprivation, not affluence, and to recognise that not every person in a highly deprived area will themselves be deprived. Likewise, there will be some deprived people living in the least deprived areas.

It is difficult to compare the 2010 and 2015 IDACI data published by the Office of National Statistics as the data sets have been compiled in different formats, and some areas have had boundary changes. After some investigation and discussion with other officers the general consensus is that Gateshead is relatively less deprived compared to all other districts, but the change in data does not represent a significantly less deprived population, although the borough has seen some lessening of deprivation.

A summary of possible reasons for this are:-

- The measure is a relative measure against all other LSOA
- Benefits are harder to claim
- Change in some boundaries for LSOA (new housing or demolished housing)
- New housing attracting more affluent families
- Slightly higher employment levels

To assess if the change in IDACI other deprivation measures were reviewed. ACORN scores which were available for 2008/09 to 2012/13 and 2015/16 were examined. Although there are some changes to individual schools, the overall data did not show such a dramatic swing in data as IDACI had, and the general trend is that our most deprived schools have not changed significantly and still have very similar levels of deprivation.

The changes in FSMe6 was also reviewed, and again showed small swings in data, but not above expected changes.

As can be seen from the table above the largest data swing is in the top bandings, and affects our most deprived schools to the greatest extent. The pattern is the same across both primary and secondary sectors. Appendix 1 compares the funding allocations on the October APT and the December APT using the October agreed formula. The change in pupil numbers between October 2014 and October 2015 has been included as this will affect the funding.

The EYFSP changed in 2013, so a weighting may be used to ensure that funding delivered through the primary prior attainment factor is not disproportionately affected by the year groups (years 1, 2 and 3) assessed under the new framework. The percentage weighting was changed so that the amount of funding driven through this factor was approximately the same as for 2015/16.

Modelling

For all models, all validation flags within the tool are green, which means that all validation checks within the tool have been satisfied and this indicates that the model complies with Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2015, and the required percentage allocations for AWPU and pupil led factors have been satisfied.

Due to an increase in pupil numbers, (225 additional funded pupils), the different distribution in pupils between the primary and secondary phase, and the updated data set, when the mainstream School budgets were calculated with the October submitted APT factor values without any capping or scaling, there was an under allocation of £463K. The under allocation was due to the reduction of £841K in IDACI funding and increase in MFG (model 1).

As previously agreed by the Mainstream School Funding sub group of Schools Forum, all representatives saw deprivation as a priority for funding and agreed that deprivation funding should allocate approximately 11% of mainstream schools funding.

Keeping to this principal, and as the changes in IDAIC data affected both primary and secondary schools, modelling was undertaken to try and minimise turbulence to schools that was due to data changes and distribute the agreed level funding via the deprivation factors compared to the October submission.

Summary of Models

Model 1 - as per the October submission. This model under allocates funding by £463K.

Model 3 - as per model 1, but with an increase in IDACI funding for both primary and secondary school for bands 3 to 6 and the re-introduction of IDACI band 2.

Model 4 – Increase to both primary and secondary IDACI bands 3 to 6.

Model 8 – IDACI bandings as per Model 1, with remaining funding allocated via FSM ever 6.

Model 9 – All deprivation funding allocated via FSM ever 6.

A summary of model outcomes is in appendix 2 as compared to the October submission.

Many models and variations on the models were undertaken, and the outcomes assessed against both the October submission, against the data in appendix 1, and models assessed against each other as per appendix 2.

The conclusion of these assessments were that all 4 models had similar outcomes, similar levels of MFG, but model 4 created the least turbulence for the schools most affected by the data changes (not taking account of pupil movements and other data changes). Although for many schools the movement between the models was the same due to MFG, model 4 also followed the principals agreed for the October submission and as such is the recommended model.

A copy of model 4 proforma is at appendix 3 and an outcome per school for model 4 is at appendix 4

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the changes in IDACI data from the October submission in appendix 1. That Schools Forum reviews the summary of model outcomes in appendix 2. The preferred model is model 4 for the following reasons:-

- Model 4 adheres to the funding principals agreed for the October submission.
- All models have a primary secondary ratio of 1.27
- Total MFG value across all models is very similar
- Model 4 allocates a very similar percentage of funding via IDACI as the October submission, and is very near to the 11% level previously agreed
- The proforma complies with DfE regulations
- To enable the proforma to be submitted to the DfE by the specified date of 21th January 2016
- To enable Gateshead Mainstream School budgets to be calculated and disseminated by 26th February 2016

Recommendations

That Schools Forum:-

- Approves the proposed amendments to the APT
- Approves model 4 for mainstream school funding for 2016/17

For the following reasons:-

- To enable the proforma to be submitted to the DfE within timescale
- To enable Gateshead Mainstream Schools to be calculated

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

School Name	IDACI (3)	IDACI (4)	IDACI (5)	IDACI (6)	Difference from Oct to Dec APT	Differenece in Pupil No's
Carr Hill Community Primary School	-£15,531	£72,313	£25,139	-£62,930	-£31,288	1
Kelvin Grove Primary School	£19,956	£17,114	£1,745	-£4,496	£91	4
South Street Primary School	-£3,536	£29,630	£8,249	-£39,833	-£5,491	16
Bede Community Primary School	£1,083	£11,464	-£3,637	£14,149	£23,059	5
Oakfield Junior School	£4,073	£455	-£442	-£643	£3,443	-3
LARKSPUR COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL	£2,343	£43,242	£32,131	-£4,537	£8,917	-2
Oakfield Infant School	£692	-£1,221	£581	-£1,287	-£1,235	1
Ravensworth Tce Primary School	-£9,536	£6,624	-£7,040	£0	-£9,952	13
Portobello Primary School	-£257	£1,662	-£1,777	£0	-£372	-6
Birtley East Primary School	-£10,539	£44,394	£39,160	£0	-£5,305	19
Dunston Hill Community Primary	£5,438	-£3,021	£20,292	£843	-£17,031	-9
Emmaville Primary School	-£293	-£246	£0	-£1,285	-£1,825	19
High Spen Primary School	£4,629	£111	-£419	-£610	£3,711	5
Swalwell Primary School	£2,511	-£1,947	-£836	£0	-£272	17
Winlaton West Lane Primary Sch	£15,189	£28,567	£0	£0	-£13,378	7
Greenside Primary School	£820	-£1,468	£0	£0	-£649	16
Blaydon West Primary School	£8,879	£13,792	£0	£0	-£4,914	17
Front Street Community Primary	£393	-£21	£0	£0	£372	-2
Highfield Primary School	£8,903	£0	£0	£0	£8,903	-3
Ryton Community Infant School	-£284	-£1,096	£0	£0	-£1,381	0
Ryton Community Junior School	£932	-£1,809	£0	£0	-£876	-10
Washingwell Community Primary School	£923	-£729	£0	-£648	-£454	2
Bill Quay Primary School	£1,036	-£480	-£432	£1,030	£1,154	-2
Falla Park Community Primary School	£15,318	-£3,659	£10,002	-£31,138	-£9,477	0
Brandling Primary School	£2,301	£227	£29,308	-£24,640	£7,196	18
Lingey House Primary School	£8,628	£800	£1,423	-£6,473	£4,379	36
THE DRIVE PRIMARY SCHOOL	-£684	-£419	£19,355	-£22,377	-£4,125	-1
White Mere Comm Primary School	-£1,541	£111	-£886	£0	-£2,316	-16
Clover Hill Primary School	£453	£0	£0	£0	£453	0
Crookhill Primary	£912	-£1,080	£0	£0	-£168	3
Brighton Avenue Primary School	£24,567	£36,760	-£1,348	-£5,157	-£18,698	-2
Lobley Hill Primary School	£19,210	-£5,342	-£1,765	-£1,283	£10,820	-5
Wardley Primary School	-£2,865	£2,500	£518	-£98	£54	-5
Glynwood Primary School	£9,135	£20,211	-£9,919	-£6,839	£12,588	41
Barley Mow Primary School	£7,876	£1,902	-£1,334	-£1,293	£7,151	-3
Windy Nook Primary School	-£8,509	£5,294	-£1,123	-£8,789	-£13,126	0
Colegate Primary	-£5,863	-£1,053	£707	-£3,740	-£9,949	-14
Roman Road Primary School	£10,436	-£611	£4,797	-£8,379	£6,243	3
Fellside Primary School	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	-4
Fell Dyke Primary School	£19,790	£2,155	£78,611	-£85,758	£14,798	8

Caedmon Community Primary	-£9,446	-£7,371	-£801	-£9,740	-£27,359	-8
Kells Lane Primary School	£1,080	£1,537	-£1,320	£0	£1,297	2
Chopwell Primary	£12,823	£0	£0	£0	£12,823	16
Park Head Primary School	£14,575	£26,461	£0	£0	-£11,886	4
St Aidan's CofE Primary School	£40,900	£39,036	£863	-£1,920	£807	6
Harlow Green Primary School	£27,328	£2,811	-£54	-£2,636	£27,450	19
Rowlands Gill Primary School	£10,743	-£2,160	-£880	£0	£7,703	10
WHICKHAM PAROCHIAL PRIMARY SCH	£352	-£360	-£440	£0	-£448	1
Corpus Christi Catholic School	£10,585	£12,853	£4,017	-£8,804	-£7,055	6
St Joseph's R C Primary School	-£4,806	£2,059	-£1,021	-£8,609	-£12,376	1
St.Oswalds RC (Aided) Primary	£18,204	£3,556	£28,430	-£32,165	£18,025	1
St Peter's R C Primary School	-£2,168	£6,624	-£3,960	-£3,200	-£2,704	1
St Anne's R C Primary School	£8,903	£2,006	-£742	-£1,920	£8,247	-8
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	-£1,169	£9,736	-£6,726	£0	£1,841	0
Birtley St.Joseph's Catholic Infant School	-£6,351	£9,573	-£6,600	-£640	-£4,018	5
St Agnes' R C Primary School	£729	£0	£0	£0	£729	3
St Joseph's R C Sch Highfield	£4,351	-£366	£0	£0	£3,986	-2
St Mary & St Thomas Aquinas	£1,937	-£6,511	£0	£0	-£4,574	-4
St Philip Neri R C Primary Sch	£15,485	-£8,902	-£7,141	£0	-£558	22
ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL	£5,239	£12,298	£0	£0	-£7,060	0
St Mary's R.C. Primary School	£410	-£362	-£884	£0	-£836	-2
St Alban's Catholic Primary School	-£4,141	£227	£1,440	-£4,135	-£6,609	6
Felling St.Augustine's R.C.P	£3,420	£3,431	£2,719	-£5,734	£3,836	4
St Wilfrid's R C Primary Sch.	-£192	£8,269	-£2,992	£9,544	£14,629	15
Kibblesworth Academy	£792	£1,872	-£1,320	£0	£1,344	0
RIVERSIDE PRIMARY ACADEMY	£8,312	-£7,694	£17,600	-£640	-£17,622	8
Sacred Heart R.C.(VA) Primary	£882	£110	£0	£0	£993	10
Primary Changes	£295,763	£50,100	-£7,396	£376,808	-£38,341	280
Heworth Grange Comprehensive	£1,415	£2,051	£49,130	-£52,721	-£125	18
Kingsmeadow Comprehensive School	£36,843	£38,053	£20,239	-£4,007	-£25,457	25
Thomas Hepburn Community Academy	-£8,965	£52,092	£14,329	-£91,631	-£34,175	-16
Thorp Academy	£13,596	£21,867	£133	£194	-£7,945	-79
Lord Lawson of Beamish Academy	-£3,656	£39,985	£37,248	-£8,657	-£9,576	-39
WHICKHAM COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL	£25,176	£14,227	-£5,892	£202	£5,259	31
Joseph Swan Academy	£37,175	£11,094	£11,633	-£48,193	-£11,557	-18
Cardinal Hume Catholic School	£16,222	£31,259	£11,041	-£49,648	£8,875	56
St Thomas More School	£27,092	£36,043	-£2,354	-£5,642	-£16,947	-21
Secondary Changes	£144,896	£26,291	-£2,732	£260,105	-£91,650	-43
Primary & Secondary	£440,659	£76,390	£10,128	£636,913	-£129,991	237

Appendix 2

		Model 1		Model 3		Model 4		Model 8		Model 9	
	October Submission	As submitted APT, funding under allocation		Addition of IDACI band 2 and increased bands 3 to 6		Increased IDCAI band 3 to 6		IDACI as per submitted with additional funging via FSM ever 6		All deprivation funding via FSM ever 6	
		Value	Change	Value	Change	Value	Change	Value	Change	Value	Change
Deprivation %	10.99%	10.24%	-0.75%	10.86%	-0.13%	10.86%	-0.13%	10.88%	-0.11%	10.88%	-0.11%
Deprivation Value	£11,307,227	£10,529,368	-£777,859	£11,249,993	-£57,234	£11,240,782	-£66,445	£11,274,294	-£32,933	£11,265,306	-£41,921
Primary IDACI	£1,971,041	£1,470,572	-£500,469	£1,889,199	-£81,842	£1,932,700	-£38,341	£1,470,572	-£500,469	£0	-£1,971,041
Secondary IDACI	£1,478,134	£991,593	-£486,541	£1,293,591	-£184,543	£1,240,880	-£237,254	£991,593	-£486,541	£0	-£1,478,134
Total IDACI	£3,449,175	£2,462,165	-£987,010	£3,182,790	-£266,385	£3,173,580	-£275,595	£2,462,165	-£987,010	£0	-£3,449,175
Primary FSM E6	£3,989,588	£3,978,932	-£10,656	£3,978,932	-£10,656	£3,978,932	-£10,656	£4,437,679	£448,091	£5,952,014	£1,962,426
Secondary FSM E6	£4,014,070	£4,088,271	£74,201	£4,088,271	£74,201	£4,088,271	£74,201	£4,374,450	£360,380	£5,313,292	£1,299,222
Total FSM E6	£8,003,658	£8,067,203	£63,545	£8,067,203	£63,545	£8,067,203	£63,545	£8,812,129	£808,471	£11,265,306	£3,261,648
Primary MFG	£373,260	£840,904	£467,644	£588,938	£215,678	£598,548	£225,288	£564,490	£191,230	£573,092	£199,832
Secondary MFG	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total MFG	£373,260	£846,780	£473,520	£567,935	£194,675	£598,548	£225,288	£564,490	£191,230	£573,092	£199,832
Total Primary Funding	£58,719,906	£58,671,892	-£48,014	£59,090,519	£370,613	£59,134,019	£414,113	£59,130,639	£410,733	£59,174,402	£454,496
Total Secondary Funding	£44,581,985	£44,162,583	-£419,402	£44,464,581	-£117,404	£44,411,869	-£170,116	£44,448,762	-£133,223	£44,396,011	-£185,974
Total Funding	£103,301,891	£103,653,167	£351,276	£103,555,100	£253,209	£103,545,888	£243,997	£103,579,401	£277,510	£103,570,413	£268,522
Primary Pupil Numbers	14,316	14,601	285	14,601	285	14,601	285	14,601	285	14,601	285
Secondary Pupil Numbers	8,699	8,652	-47	8,652	-47	8,652	-47	8,652	-47	8,652	-47
Primary Secondary Ratio	1.26	1.27	0.01	1.27	0.01	1.27	0.01	1.27	0.01	1.27	0.01

Appendix 3 Proposed Proforma

Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

LA Name: Gateshead
 LA Number: 390

Pupil Led Factors

Reception uplift		No	Pupil Units			0.00					
Description		Amount per pupil		Pupil Units		Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)		Notional SEN (%)	
1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Primary (Years R-6)	£2,905.00		14,601.00		£42,415,905	£76,954,425	40.96%		5.00%	
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£3,750.00		5,220.00		£19,575,000		18.90%		5.00%	
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£4,360.00		3,432.00		£14,963,520		14.45%		5.00%	
Description		Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)		Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)
2) Deprivation	FSM6 % Primary	£850.00		4,681.10		£3,978,932	£11,240,782	10.86%		23.00%	
	FSM6 % Secondary		£1,400.00		2,920.19	£4,088,271				19.00%	
	IDACI Band 1	£0.00	£0.00	1,734.81	982.80	£0				0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 2			1,662.87	992.42	£0				0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 3	£367.99	£437.99	2,679.95	1,461.69	£1,626,400				0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 4	£473.13	£563.13	1,030.66	529.95	£786,067				0.00%	0.00%
	IDACI Band 5	£578.27	£688.27	517.40	306.59	£510,213				23.00%	19.00%
IDACI Band 6	£841.12	£1,001.12	189.84	91.12	£250,899	23.00%	19.00%				
3) Looked After Children (LAC)		LAC X March 14		£1,500.00		182.10	£273,153	0.26%		0.00%	
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)		EAL 3 Primary		£260.00		632.05	£164,332	0.18%		0.00%	
		EAL 3 Secondary		£260.00		100.03	£26,008			0.00%	
5) Mobility		Pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates		£2,000.00		£2,000.00	100.01	0.19%		0.00%	
Description		Weighting	Amount per pupil	Percentage of eligible Y1-3 and Y4-6 NOR respectively	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)		Primary Notional SEN (%)	Secondary Notional SEN (%)
6) Prior attainment	Low Attainment % new EFSP	70.00%		33.13%			£2,070,287	2.00%		100.00%	
	Low Attainment % old FSP 73		£320.00	16.25%	3,656.58	£1,170,106					
	Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English or Maths)		£550.00		1,636.69	£900,181					100.00%

Other Factors

Factor	Lump Sum per Primary School (£)	Lump Sum per Secondary School (£)	Lump Sum per Middle School (£)	Lump Sum per All-through School (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
7) Lump Sum	£115,000.00	£140,000.00			£8,965,000	8.66%	0.00%	0.00%
8) Sparsity factor					£0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Please provide alternative distance and pupil number thresholds for the sparsity factor below. Please leave blank if you want to use the default thresholds. Also specify whether you want to use a tapered lump sum for one or both of the phases.								
Primary distance threshold (miles)		Primary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity primary lump sum?	Fixed			
Secondary distance threshold (miles)		Secondary pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity secondary lump sum?	Fixed			
Middle schools distance threshold (miles)		Middle school pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity middle school lump sum?	Fixed			
All-through schools distance threshold (miles)		All-through pupil number average year group threshold		Fixed or tapered sparsity all-through lump sum?	Fixed			
9) Fringe Payments					£0	0.00%		
10) Split Sites					£0	0.00%		0.00%
11) Rates					£1,432,686	1.38%		0.00%
12) PFI funding					£2,219,204	2.14%		0.00%
13) Sixth Form					£0	0.00%		0.00%
14) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)								
Circumstance					Total (£)	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)	Notional SEN (%)	
Additional lump sum for schools amalgamated during FY15-16					£0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Additional sparsity lump sum for small schools					£0	0.00%		0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance3					£0	0.00%		0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance4					£0	0.00%		0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance5					£0	0.00%		0.00%
Exceptional Circumstance6					£0	0.00%		0.00%

Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total) (£) £103,545,888 100.00% £7,772,900

15) Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG is set at -1.5%)			£598,548
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)			No
Capping Factor (%)	Scaling Factor (%)	100.00%	
Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied			
		£0	
		Total (£)	Proportion of Total funding(%)
MFG Net Total Funding (MFG + deduction from capping and scaling)		£598,548	0.57%

High Needs threshold (only fill in if, exceptionally, a high needs threshold different from £6,000 has been approved)			£0.00
Additional funding from the high needs budget			£0.00
Growth fund (if applicable)			£100,000.00
Falling rolls fund (if applicable)			£0.00
Total Funding For Schools Block Formula			
		£104,144,436	
% Distributed through Basic Entitlement		74.32%	
% Pupil Led Funding		87.82%	
Primary: Secondary Ratio		1 : 1.27	

Appendix 4

School Name	16-17 MFG Adjustment	16-17 Post MFG Budget	16-17 Post MFG per pupil Budget	Year on year % Change	De-delegation	Post De-delegation budget
	£598,548	£104,144,436			-£565,799	£103,578,637
Carr Hill Community Primary School	£18,738.88	£1,325,409.66	£4,418.03	-1.83%	-£11,634.00	£1,313,775.66
Kelvin Grove Primary School	£0.00	£1,269,977.43	£4,364.18	0.67%	-£11,284.98	£1,258,692.45
South Street Primary School	£0.00	£1,254,045.42	£4,543.64	2.42%	-£10,703.28	£1,243,342.14
Bede Community Primary School	£7,853.61	£805,894.37	£5,445.23	-3.23%	-£5,739.44	£800,154.93
Oakfield Junior School	£0.00	£850,674.53	£3,589.34	2.20%	-£9,190.86	£841,483.67
LARKSPUR COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0.00	£781,720.52	£4,947.60	4.83%	-£6,127.24	£775,593.28
Oakfield Infant School	£330.16	£674,173.95	£3,704.25	-1.29%	-£7,057.96	£667,115.99
Ravensworth Tce Primary School	£8,000.31	£834,534.91	£3,776.18	-2.08%	-£8,570.38	£825,964.53
Portobello Primary School	£0.00	£764,296.78	£3,746.55	0.17%	-£7,911.12	£756,385.66
Birtley East Primary School	£15,126.71	£883,274.83	£4,308.66	-5.18%	-£7,949.90	£875,324.93
Dunston Hill Community Primary	£0.00	£1,596,157.70	£4,156.66	-0.35%	-£14,891.52	£1,581,266.18
Emmaville Primary School	£0.00	£1,010,046.98	£3,607.31	-0.58%	-£10,858.40	£999,188.58
High Spen Primary School	£0.00	£616,176.36	£4,220.39	0.06%	-£5,661.88	£610,514.48
Swalwell Primary School	£62,731.21	£811,358.40	£4,887.70	-2.64%	-£6,437.48	£804,920.92
Winlaton West Lane Primary Sch	£31,178.78	£1,326,561.60	£3,695.16	-1.97%	-£13,922.02	£1,312,639.58
Greenside Primary School	£75,305.15	£747,514.09	£4,346.01	-2.79%	-£6,670.16	£740,843.93
Blaydon West Primary School	£40,574.75	£635,551.23	£4,778.58	-4.55%	-£5,157.74	£630,393.49
Front Street Community Primary	£0.00	£1,311,570.03	£3,516.27	-0.97%	-£14,464.94	£1,297,105.09
Highfield Primary School	£13,301.46	£632,774.66	£5,859.02	-0.36%	-£4,188.24	£628,586.42
Ryton Community Infant School	£3,391.83	£548,310.09	£4,091.87	-1.06%	-£5,196.52	£543,113.57
Ryton Community Junior School	£0.00	£726,903.26	£3,766.34	1.63%	-£7,484.54	£719,418.72
Washingwell Community Primary School	£19,040.85	£662,550.38	£4,089.82	-1.93%	-£6,282.36	£656,268.02
Bill Quay Primary School	£3,428.59	£769,598.78	£3,772.54	-1.15%	-£7,911.12	£761,687.66
Falla Park Community Primary School	£0.00	£966,001.23	£4,451.62	-0.44%	-£8,415.26	£957,585.97
Brandling Primary School	£6,123.27	£600,268.72	£5,359.54	-4.57%	-£4,343.36	£595,925.36
Lingey House Primary School	£19,478.71	£1,480,093.58	£3,766.14	-2.11%	-£15,240.54	£1,464,853.04
THE DRIVE PRIMARY SCHOOL	£0.00	£791,793.91	£4,374.55	-1.07%	-£7,019.18	£784,774.73
White Mere Comm Primary School	£0.00	£572,594.19	£4,004.16	1.89%	-£5,545.54	£567,048.65
Clover Hill Primary School	£0.00	£756,279.10	£3,601.33	0.07%	-£8,143.80	£748,135.30
Crookhill Primary	£11,836.89	£718,077.67	£4,103.30	-1.43%	-£6,786.50	£711,291.17
Brighton Avenue Primary School	£75,500.86	£1,226,238.64	£4,734.51	-2.32%	-£10,044.02	£1,216,194.62
Lobley Hill Primary School	£0.00	£1,460,715.43	£3,823.86	1.24%	-£14,813.96	£1,445,901.47
Wardley Primary School	£1,161.39	£979,572.45	£3,841.46	-0.95%	-£9,888.90	£969,683.55
Glynwood Primary School	£0.00	£1,169,548.52	£3,978.06	-1.89%	-£11,401.32	£1,158,147.20
Barley Mow Primary School	£8,481.25	£882,230.14	£4,547.58	-0.23%	-£7,523.32	£874,706.82
Windy Nook Primary School	£5,673.39	£1,091,261.56	£3,686.69	-1.28%	-£11,478.88	£1,079,782.68
Colegate Primary	£2,262.21	£883,215.50	£4,166.11	-1.78%	-£8,221.36	£874,994.14
Roman Road Primary School	£17,736.34	£693,331.54	£4,748.85	-1.49%	-£5,661.88	£687,669.66
Fellside Primary School	£0.00	£733,559.77	£3,560.97	-0.58%	-£7,988.68	£725,571.09
Fell Dyke Primary School	£0.00	£1,276,266.03	£4,607.46	-1.48%	-£10,742.06	£1,265,523.97
Caedmon Community Primary	£7,276.51	£879,128.97	£4,395.64	-0.62%	-£7,756.00	£871,372.97
Kells Lane Primary School	£0.00	£1,379,571.51	£3,316.28	-0.38%	-£16,132.48	£1,363,439.03
Chopwell Primary	£293.51	£888,314.97	£4,230.07	-5.09%	-£8,143.80	£880,171.17
Park Head Primary School	£35,765.93	£1,186,573.47	£3,995.20	-1.37%	-£11,517.66	£1,175,055.81
St Aidan's CofE Primary School	£0.00	£893,857.66	£4,381.66	0.19%	-£7,911.12	£885,946.54
Harlow Green Primary School	£2,856.90	£1,671,454.44	£4,481.11	-1.58%	-£14,464.94	£1,656,989.50
Rowlands Gill Primary School	£0.00	£1,395,938.97	£4,591.90	0.38%	-£11,789.12	£1,384,149.85
WHICKHAM PAROCHIAL PRIMARY SCH	£0.00	£758,287.80	£3,576.83	-0.05%	-£8,221.36	£750,066.44
Corpus Christi Catholic School	£0.00	£828,657.16	£4,102.26	-0.54%	-£7,833.56	£820,823.60
St Joseph's R C Primary School	£15,749.19	£836,473.36	£4,161.56	-1.36%	-£7,794.78	£828,678.58
St.Oswalds RC (Aided) Primary	£0.00	£830,981.01	£4,239.70	1.09%	-£7,600.88	£823,380.13
St Peter's R C Primary School	£0.00	£759,464.45	£3,616.50	-0.29%	-£8,143.80	£751,320.65
St Anne's R C Primary School	£0.00	£578,776.90	£4,255.71	1.49%	-£5,274.08	£573,502.82
St Joseph's Catholic Junior School	£0.00	£470,525.68	£4,397.44	1.00%	-£4,149.46	£466,376.22
Birtley St.Joseph's Catholic Infant School	£5,176.91	£403,487.25	£4,637.78	-2.75%	-£3,373.86	£400,113.39
St Agnes' R C Primary School	£3,704.08	£762,682.02	£3,631.82	-1.49%	-£8,143.80	£754,538.22
St Joseph's R C Sch Highfield	£0.00	£529,244.55	£4,134.72	2.55%	-£4,963.84	£524,280.71
St Mary & St Thomas Aquinas	£2,983.83	£741,398.83	£3,581.64	-0.98%	-£8,027.46	£733,371.37
St Philip Neri R C Primary Sch	£0.00	£653,868.47	£4,011.46	-2.59%	-£6,321.14	£647,547.33
ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL	£7,045.88	£783,196.35	£3,711.83	-1.28%	-£8,182.58	£775,013.77
St Mary's R.C. Primary School	£0.00	£753,541.59	£3,588.29	-0.12%	-£8,143.80	£745,397.79
St Alban's Catholic Primary School	£6,349.45	£821,564.66	£3,803.54	-1.68%	-£8,376.48	£813,188.18
Felling St.Augustine's R.C.P	£0.00	£1,157,874.48	£3,759.33	-0.07%	-£11,944.24	£1,145,930.24
St Wilfrid's R C Primary Sch.	£0.00	£585,806.30	£5,325.51	-2.86%	-£4,265.80	£581,540.50
Heworth Grange Comprehensive	£0.00	£5,130,389.62	£5,219.11	2.13%	-£11,796.00	£5,118,593.62
Kingsmeadow Comprehensive School	£0.00	£4,052,414.63	£6,974.90	-0.08%	-£6,972.00	£4,045,442.63
Kibblesworth Academy	£35,861.99	£625,988.48	£4,229.65	-1.32%	£0.00	£625,988.48
RIVERSIDE PRIMARY ACADEMY	£21,054.79	£883,548.09	£4,187.43	-1.57%	£0.00	£883,548.09
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	£7,172.00	£552,235.26	£4,060.55	-2.81%	£0.00	£552,235.26
Thomas Hepburn Community Academy	£0.00	£3,137,355.73	£5,842.38	-4.18%	£0.00	£3,137,355.73
Thorp Academy	£0.00	£4,241,491.88	£4,841.89	1.47%	£0.00	£4,241,491.88
Lord Lawson of Beamish Academy	£0.00	£6,801,824.61	£5,385.45	2.88%	£0.00	£6,801,824.61
WHICKHAM COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL	£0.00	£5,790,864.67	£4,566.93	1.06%	£0.00	£5,790,864.67
Joseph Swan Academy	£0.00	£4,537,679.12	£5,270.24	2.16%	£0.00	£4,537,679.12
Cardinal Hume Catholic School	£0.00	£5,368,183.13	£4,871.31	-0.07%	£0.00	£5,368,183.13
St Thomas More School	£0.00	£5,351,665.64	£4,531.47	1.12%	£0.00	£5,351,665.64

Item 5

TITLE OF REPORT: Re-Determination of School Budgets and Contingency Payments

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to inform Schools Forum of the decision to provide funding to a school with serious weaknesses.

Background

White Mere Primary School

Following an audit investigation in summer 2015, several key members of staff were suspended on full pay from the school, pending further investigations. These and a number other staff members have subsequently left the school.

The school has been placed in Category C by Educationgateshead which is "Schools requiring intensive intervention and support", and without this intensive intervention and support would fall into Category D, Ofsted judgement of "Serious Weaknesses" or "Special Measures".

Carr Hill School was asked to support White Mere with leadership time. Due to the number of issues at White Mere, Carr Hill brought in a management team which consisted of both head teacher and deputy head teacher support together with finance and admin support. Other staffing issues identified in the school have been addressed including PPA cover and lunchtime supervision. These issues, in addition to the school budget sustaining two head teachers, finance and admin support for a number of months has increased the pressure on the school budget.

White Mere Primary School chair of governors applied for contingency funding under item 4 of the Contingency Criteria as per appendix 1 (special measures) for the amount of £34,721. This request equates to a contribution towards additional head teacher costs and the provision of some much needed resources in the school to support teaching and learning.

Process

The request for contingency funding was reviewed against the criteria attached at appendix 1 and was found to meet criteria, "The provision of additional resources or other special support, temporarily, in response to a school found to be in need of Special Measures within the meaning of Part V of the Education Act 1993 and in accordance with DFE Circular 17/93."

The school budget position was also reviewed and the school budget is under pressure with a predicted small deficit at the end of the financial year, taking into

account all other revenue grants. The school has a small capital allocation which is expected to be spent this financial year.

Educationgateshead colleagues have been consulted and support the application due to the issues at the school. During the summer the school was assessed as meeting all 5 areas of concern under category C:-

- School Performance
- Standards and Achievement
- Quality of Education
- Behaviour and Safety
- Leadership and Management

Under these circumstances and noting that the school meets the contingency funding criteria White Mere Primary School has been awarded the sum of £34,721.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the amount of funding provided to the above school.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum notes the funding provided to the above schools.

For the following reasons:

- To provide funding to the school as a school requiring intensive intervention and support.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

Updated 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 found to be in need of Special Measures within the meaning of Part V of the Education Act 1993 and in accordance with DFE Circular 17/93.
5. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of pupils with new or revised statements of SEN, or for statemented pupils transferring between schools within the LEA.
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 1998 Act.
7. 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 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.

This page is intentionally left blank



Item 7

TITLE OF REPORT: Council Budget Consultation

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum attention an update on the level of savings Gateshead Council must make in the next 5 years to 2020, and the current savings proposals put forward for public consultation.

Background

Since 2010 the Council has made over £110 million in savings and there are over 2,000 less people working for the Council. The Council now has £300 per person less to spend than it did in 2010.

There have also been massive changes in national government policy impacting on the Council, its partners and local people. These include changes affecting welfare, criminal justice and devolution, as well as education.

The Chancellor made his Autumn Statement on 25th November setting out spending plans from 2017/18 to 2019/20, and it is estimated by 2019/20 the Council will have to save an additional £77 million, with £50 million to be saved over the 2 year period 2016-2018. This is against a background of growing demand for Council services, especially in social care.

The Council is currently consulting on 66 savings, themed under the following groupings:

	<u>Savings proposed £m</u>
• Adult Social Care	14.285
• Children's Services	4.277
• Communities and Volunteers	1.603
• Economic Growth	2.166
• Environment	4.706
• Public Health	3.059
• Governance and Resources	3.392
• Efficiency & Effectiveness Projects	1.000

The full consultation can be found at the link below.

[http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/Council%20and%20Democracy/consultation/Budget/Budget Consultation.aspx](http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/Council%20and%20Democracy/consultation/Budget/Budget%20Consultation.aspx)

The consultation will closed on 30th December 2015.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the contents of this report and the savings the Council will need to make following the Autumn Statement. Further reports will be brought to Schools Forum as more information is known on savings that could impact on Gateshead's schools and settings.

Recommendations

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

For the following reasons:

- To inform Schools Forum of the contents and possible impacts of the announcements affecting Gateshead's schools and settings.

CONTACT: Carole Smith



14 January 2016

Item 7

TITLE OF REPORT: Schools and Early Years Schools Finance Regulations Consultation

Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forums attention the “Rights to Request Childcare Consultation” and to ask Schools Forum if they would like to make a response in the name of Gateshead Schools Forum, and to ask Forum Members to make their colleagues aware of this consultation.

Background

The DfE published the Right to Request Childcare consultation on 7th December 2015, with a closing date of 29th February 2016 as per below link.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482577/Wraparound-and-holiday-childcare-consultation-document.pdf

The aim of this consultation is to gather views from interested parties on the draft departmental advice on how maintained schools, academies and free schools should respond to:

- a. Parents’ requests that the school that their child attends considers establishing wraparound and / or holiday childcare, and
- b. childcare providers’ requests to use school facilities for wraparound and / or holiday provision at times when the school is not using them.

The departmental advice sets out the principles guiding how schools should respond to these requests and the steps they should take. This advice aims to avoid imposing unnecessary burdens on schools and maintains school autonomy, whilst ensuring schools understand the basis on which they should be responding constructively to requests for wraparound childcare.

A copy of the draft departmental advice is available on the attached link.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482501/Wraparound-and-holiday-childcare-draft-departmental-advice-for-schools.pdf

The DfE will monitor the levels of wraparound and holiday care available through schools to see if this departmental advice is sufficient, and if it is not they will consider further measures to improve take up.

The proposed new plans to give families the 'right to request' wraparound and holiday childcare for children from Reception up to the end of Key Stage 3 (Year 9) from the school their child attends. Childcare providers will also have the 'right to request' the use of a school's facilities when the school is not using them – opening up good quality, affordable childcare when they need it.

The consultation also seeks views on the LA collecting information on childcare available in their area.

The LA has not yet drafted a response, but a copy of the draft response can be brought to February's Schools Forum if requested.

Proposal

That Schools Forum note that the consultation is open and consider if they would like to make a response to the current Rights to Request Childcare consultation. A copy of the response form is included at appendix 1. It is also requested that all Schools Forum Members make colleagues aware of the consultation so that they can respond if required.

Recommendations

The Schools Forum considers responding to the current Rights to Request Childcare consultation, and make colleagues aware that the consultation is live until 29th February should they wish to respond to this consultation.

For the following reasons:-

To put forward their views on the on the draft guidance on rights to request childcare, and ensure colleagues are aware of the consultation.

CONTACT: Carole Smith



Department
for Education

Appendix 1

Consultation response form

Consultation closing date: 29 February 2016

Your comments must reach us by that date

Wraparound and holiday childcare - parents and childcare provider 'rights to request'

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

The aim of this consultation is to gather views from interested parties on the departmental advice on how maintained schools, academies and free schools should respond to:

- a. parents' requests that the school that their child attends considers establishing wraparound and / or holiday childcare, and
- b. childcare providers' requests to use school facilities for wraparound and / or holiday provision at times when the school is not using them

The departmental advice sets out the principles guiding how schools should respond to these requests and the steps they should take. This advice aims to avoid imposing unnecessary burdens on schools and maintains school autonomy, whilst ensuring schools understand the basis on which they should be responding constructively to requests for wraparound childcare.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your 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 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 tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------

Reason for confidentiality:

Name:

Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.

Name of Organisation (if applicable): Gateshead Council

Address: Civic Centre, Regent Street, Gateshead, NE8 1HH

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](#) page.

Please insert an **X** into one of the following boxes which best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> Parent or carer	<input type="checkbox"/> School governor	<input type="checkbox"/> Heatteacher
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> School Business Manager	<input type="checkbox"/> Local authority staff
<input type="checkbox"/> Childcare provider / manager	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

Comments:

Paragraph 19 of the advice sets out what parents are expected to do to make a request for the provision of wraparound or holiday childcare. On receiving a

request schools may require information from parents about the amount of wraparound or holiday childcare they estimate they will use. While it is left for schools themselves to decide what process works best, there is an expectation that they should be clear with parents about the steps they will take, timescales and any information necessary to help the school make a decision. If the advice is not clear the department is keen to understand what might be included to make it clearer.

1 Is the process for parents lodging a request clear?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraphs 34 and 35 of the advice sets out what childcare providers are expected to do to request the use of school facilities for wraparound or holiday childcare. While it is left for schools themselves to decide what process works best there is an expectation that they should be clear with childcare providers about timescales and any information necessary to make a decision. If the advice is not clear the department is keen to understand what might be included to make it clearer.

2 Is the process for childcare providers lodging a request clear?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the advice set out the expectations of what schools should do to process a request from parents for wraparound or holiday childcare. While it is left for schools themselves to decide what process works best there is an expectation that they should be clear with parents about timescales and any information necessary to make a decision. If the advice is not clear the department is keen to understand what might be included to make it clearer for schools.

3 Is the advice on how a school should respond to a request from parents clear?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraph 36 of the advice set out the expectations of how schools should respond to a request from a childcare provider to use school facilities for wraparound or holiday childcare. While it is left for schools themselves to decide what process works best, there is an expectation that they should be clear with childcare providers about timescales and any information necessary to make a decision. If the advice is not clear the department is keen to understand what might be included to make it clearer.

4 Is the advice on how a school should respond to a request from a childcare provider clear?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraph 23 of the advice sets out the expectation that schools should establish a minimum threshold for the number of requests that will trigger formal consideration of the requests. This is to ensure that the actions that a school takes are based on an appropriate level of demand.

5 Is the advice on setting a threshold helpful?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

Paragraph 27 of the advice sets out three possible reasons why schools might reject parent requests. The department is keen to hear other suggestions of what else might be reasonable.

6 Other than those listed in the draft departmental advice, are there other circumstances in which it would be reasonable for a school to reject parental requests?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraph 38 of the advice sets out three possible reasons why schools may reject childcare provider requests. The department is keen to hear other suggestions of what else might be reasonable.

7 Other than those listed in the draft departmental advice, are there other circumstances in which it would be reasonable for schools to reject a provider request?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraphs 29 and 30 of the advice sets out the expectation that schools themselves should consider delivering the wraparound or holiday childcare directly themselves, or work with other schools to 'host' the childcare or work with private and voluntary childcare organisations to provide it. These options are designed to offer schools the maximum flexibility in the model of delivery.

8 Are the delivery options that a school should consider for delivering wraparound or holiday childcare clear?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraph 33 of the advice sets out a list of factors that schools may want to consider in arriving at a decision about how to deliver wraparound or holiday childcare. The department is keen to understand if there are additional factors that should be included.

9 Other than those listed in the draft departmental advice are there other factors that schools should consider in arriving at a decision about how to deliver wraparound or holiday childcare?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Paragraph 31 suggests that schools should discuss their plans with their local authority because of their statutory duty on the provision of childcare in the area. We will be exploring with the local government sector the implications of this

guidance, but the department would like to hear your views and receive evidence on any burdens for local authorities that it would create.

10 Do you think that this advice would create a new burden for local authorities? If so, what is your evidence for saying so?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

A major achievement over the past few years has been the long term growth of wraparound and holiday childcare. This has led to a wealth of innovative practice and knowledge which we are keen to draw together. Please include examples of websites or other sources of information and help in the comment box.

11 Do you agree that it would be helpful if the departmental advice on how to respond to 'right to request' included links to websites with information and advice about how to provide and commission wraparound and holiday childcare?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

We look forward to hearing your views on the proposals in the draft advice document. Finally it would be helpful to know whether you have any other comments on the proposals set out in this consultation.

12 Do you have any other comments on the draft departmental advice to schools?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No view
------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply.	
E-mail address for acknowledgement:	

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy

- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please email: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 29 February 2016

Send by post to: David Aickin, Early Years Team, 1st Floor, Department for Education, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT

Send by e-mail to: Wraparound.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

14 January 2016

Item 8

TITLE OF REPORT: Health Education England Funding Application

Purpose of the Report

To request matched funding from DSG reserves for a mental health worker.

Background

On Thursday 7th January 2016, the LA received notification that £1m funding was awarded to Health Education England (HEE) from the Department of Health (DoH). The funding underpins the conclusions of the Children and Young People's Mental Health Taskforce Future in Mind report which establishes a clear direction and some key principles about how to make it easier for children and young people to access high quality mental health care when they need it.

Applications are invited from any organisation working to improve the quality of mental health services to children and young people aged up to 18 years.

The maximum amount of funding that can be applied for is £200k.

The timetable for applications is very tight with applications having to be received by HEE 15th January 2016 before 17:00.

Applications will be assessed using the below matrix, and only applications that score above 60% will be considered for full or partial funding.

Application	Sub-category	% weighting
Description and scope of the project	Supports the vision of Future in Mind and/or contributes to Local	40

	Transformation Plan	
Outcomes, Benefits and Risks	How success will be measured	10
	Benefits to be realised in 2016/17 to improve outcomes for children and young people	10
	Potential risks and issues been identified and mitigation provided	10
Value for money (economical, efficient and effective use of resources)	Project cost	10
	Project impact upon future resources	10
	Match funding of project	10
TOTAL	100%	100%

On the 8th January officers met to discuss whether an application should be submitted and to review the application criteria.

Officers discussed many projects that would support the vision of Future in Mind or the Local Transformation Plan.

After much debate it was felt that the gap already identified by the work of the PRU Planning Group for mental health workers would be suitable for the bid. The bid will be for the metal health workers to work with:

- KS3 and KS4 children at risk of permanent exclusion, to help with intervention and transition either back into mainstream school or on to an appropriate alternative provision
- Children who have been permanently excluded to support the children's transition to either an academic or alternative provision.

The bid will request £72k funding for a high quality mental health worker. The breakdown of these costs is

- £60K for salary, including on costs
- £12K for overheads including supervision, training, travel and resources.

Having matched funding from Schools Forum will increase the overall score of the application and improve the bid's chances of success.

It is anticipated that the outcome of having this additional resource will lead to better outcomes for children, including better academic attainment, reduction in NEET children, increased employment prospects and better decision making to improve these children's life chances.

Organisations that are successful will be notified week commencing 25th January for projects to start before 31st March 2016.

Due to the very tight timescales and the need to get the application signed by the Director of Children's Services, and the desire to give Schools Forum members time to consider the proposal, a copy of the completed application form is not yet available. If Schools Forum is minded to support the bid with matched funding a copy of the bid and further detail will be brought to Schools Forum on 11th February.

If the bid is successful, both mental health workers would work out of the PRU to support both children at risk of being permanently excluded and those already permanently excluded to improve their life chances.

Proposal

That Schools Forum supports the bid to the HEE Innovation fund, with matched funding from DSG reserves of £72k for a mental health worker.

Recommendation

Schools Forum approves the funding of £72k from reserves to provide matched funding for the HEE Innovation fund application.

For the following reasons:-

- To increase the percentage score of the HEE bid for Innovation funding for a mental health worker, which if successful would increase the life chances of vulnerable young people.
- To secure funding to address a known gap in provision for vulnerable children and young people

CONTACT: Carole Smith

This page is intentionally left blank