



## **GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA**

**Thursday, 11 February 2016 at 2.00 pm in the Dryden Centre**

---

From the Chief Executive, Jane Robinson

---

Item Business

**1. Apologies**

**2. Minutes** (Pages 1 - 4)

The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 14 January 2016

**3. Rights to Request Childcare Consultation** (Pages 5 - 18)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**4. Consultation on Apprenticeships Targets for Public Sector Bodies** (Pages 19 - 26)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**5. Proposed Increase to Superannuation Rate** (Pages 27 - 34)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**6. National Living Wage Information** (Pages 35 - 36)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**7. Early Implementation of 30 Hours Free Childcare** (Pages 37 - 38)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

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

Thursday 17 March 2016 at 10.00am

This page is intentionally left blank

## GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

### GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 14 January 2016

#### **Present**

Ken Childs – Special School Governor  
Sarah Diggle – Primary Governor  
Mustafaa Malik – Primary Heads  
Allan Symons – Primary Governors  
Christine Ingle – Diocese Representative  
Denise Henry – Nursery Sector

#### **In Attendance**

Carole Smith – Corporate Resources  
Frank McDermott – Corporate Resources  
Roselyn White – Corporate Services and Governance

#### **1 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Peter Largue, Cllr Malcolm Brain, Julie Goodfellow, Martin Flowers, Ethel Mills, Jim Thomson, Chris Richardson, Elaine Pickering, Steve Haigh, Clive Wisby, Jane Bryant and Matt Younger.

#### **2 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

#### **3 DSG SETTLEMENT 2016/17**

The Forum received a report on the 2016/17 funding settlement which was received on 17 December. It was noted that overall the position for Gateshead is good because there are more pupils. For 2016/17 DSG the Schools Block Unit of Funding and the Early Years Block will remain the same. It was reported that primary numbers have increased but are down in the secondary sector, however overall there has been an increase in mainstream school pupils.

In terms of the Early Years Block there has been an increase of £246,000 in 2, 3 and 4 year old funding. There is also an estimate allocation of £250,000 for Early Years Pupil Premium. The mainstream block has been increased by just over £1M due to the increased numbers of pupils. Proposed deductions are; £1.2M for centrally retained funding, £100,000 to support Growth Fund and £128,000 DfE top slice for school licences. Therefore there will be £104M to distribute to mainstream schools

for 2016/17.

The high needs block is £19M after the deduction of centrally funded high need places, this is an increase of £182,000 from last year due to an increase in post 16 numbers in special schools.

It was reported that DfE announced the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) would remain at -1.5%. Pupil premium, free school meal and year 7 catch-up rates remain the same, however summer schools funding will not continue. It was noted that the SEND implementation grant will continue as will the home to school transport grant.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the Schools Forum approved 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.
  - (ii) That the Schools Forum noted the top slice of £100,000 for the provision of a Growth Fund.
  - (iii) That the Schools Forum noted the estimated Early Years Block.
  - (iv) That the Schools Forum noted the High Needs Block allocation.
  - (v) That the Schools Forum noted the rest of the funding information.

#### 4 **MAINSTREAM SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA**

The Forum received a report on the proposed Authority Proforma Tool (APT), the APT was received on 11 December. The Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations were issued by the DfE on 23 December and came into force on 12 January.

The schools block has been calculated at £105M, this includes £33,000 for newly qualified teachers training, with £104 available for distribution to mainstream schools.

Prior to modelling the PFI factor was re-calculated to take into account the changes in pupil numbers. Adjustments to registered pupil numbers for ARMS units was also made and de-delegation was input as agreed by the Forum.

The APT issued had updated IDACI data using 2015 scores as opposed to 2010 scores. The new data showed an unexpected large deprivation decrease. Data analysis officers within the Council were contacted to ascertain the reason for the change in the data. It was noted that IDACI is a relative measure therefore because some lower super output areas decreased, for example due to demolition and new builds in other areas, this had a massive impact. Free School Meals showed only small swings in numbers, in addition Acorn funding was looked at; this showed there

were not as significant changes as IDACI was showing.

Nine models were completed, and a summary of five models were provided to the Forum. The proposed model increases both primary and secondary IDACI bands 3 to 6, and sticks to the principle of targeting approximately 11% of funding at as deprivation previously agreed.

The Forum thanked the officers for their hard work over the Christmas period.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the Schools Forum approved the proposed amendments to the APT.
  - (ii) That the Schools Forum approved model 4 for mainstream school funding for 2016/17.

## 5 **CONTINGENCY FUNDING APPLICATION**

A report was presented to the Forum around the decision to provide White Mere Primary School with funding as a school in crisis. A contingency application was made under category C after it was found that the school hit all five areas of concern;

- School performance
- Standards and achievement
- Quality of education
- Behaviour and safety
- Leadership and management

The application was to fund Headteacher time and resources, this would cover the time when the school was paying for two Headteachers. The school was awarded £34,721.

It was queried what the current position with regards to the school is. It was confirmed that the school is not eligible for more funding because the governing body are now in control and previously the situation was out of the governing body's control.

- RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum noted the funding provided to White Mere Primary School.

## 6 **COUNCIL BUDGET CONSULTATION**

The Forum received a report outlining the current position in relation to the Council's budget. There is an estimated gap of £77M, with £50M to be saved over the next two years. Currently there are 66 savings proposals of £34M. The consultation closed on 30 December 2015.

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

## 7 **RIGHTS TO REQUEST CHILDCARE CONSULTATION**

A report was presented to the Forum on the 'Rights to Request Childcare Consultation' and was asked if a local authority response should be collated on behalf of the Forum.

It was noted that the consultation is around responses to requests for childcare and in Gateshead this looks to formalise processes already in place. The guidance states that if a number of parents request child care, schools must respond and review their arrangements. It is likely that schools will be asked to have formal processes in place.

**RESOLVED -** That the Forum agreed to respond to the current Rights to Request Childcare consultation and make colleagues aware that the consultation is live until 29 February should they wish to respond.

## 8 **HEALTH EDUCATION ENGLAND FUNDING APPLICATION**

The Forum received information on the availability of £1M fund from Health Education England, to support children and young people's mental health. Gateshead would like to apply for £72,000 for mental health worker and asked Schools Forum for matched funding as this would increase the chances of the application being approved.

It was noted that there is a need for mental health worker in Gateshead, in particular there is a gap in transition work. There are issues with transition from PRU's to either alternative provision or back to mainstream provision. Therefore an application for a mental health worker has been made to increase resilience and work with families. Therefore it is proposed that the bid and matched funding of £72,000 from DSG reserves be supported by the Forum.

It was queried whether this would be used only for the secondary sector. It was noted that the provision would be based in the PRU, however it would be too early to predict whether there would be capacity for the primary sector.

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

## 9 **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 11 February 2016 at 2.00pm



## REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

11 February 2016

Item 3

### TITLE OF REPORT: Rights to Request Childcare Consultation

---

---

#### Purpose of the Report

To bring to Schools Forums, as requested the Local Authorities draft response to the Rights to Request Childcare consultation and to ask if Schools Forum would like respond to this consultation.

#### Background

The DfE published the Right to Request Childcare consultation on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015, with a closing date of 29<sup>th</sup> 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](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](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.

### **Proposal**

That Schools Forum notes the LA's draft response and consider if they would like to make a response to the Rights to Request Childcare consultation. A copy of the draft response form is included at appendix 1.

### **Recommendations**

The Schools Forum considers the LA's draft response to the current Rights to Request Childcare consultation, and considers making a response to the consultation. The consultation is live until 29<sup>th</sup> 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.

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| <b>Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.</b> | <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](mailto: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 checked="" 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:  
The process is clear; however this could raise parent's expectations that all their requests will be met. This is also an additional administrative burden for schools to log, consider and respond to. The provision or expectations that provision of childcare by a school or in partnership with another provider or school could cause tension between schools were competition for pupils already exists. Schools in rural communities could find it difficult to provide these services at a reasonable rate that is still affordable for parents.

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:

The process is clear; however this could raise providers expectations that their requests will be met. This is also an additional administrative burden for schools to log, consider and respond to all requests. The DfE should consider providing draft processes and procedures for schools to amend for their school, giving further detail to the process and procedures. This standardisation would help providers that may want to work with more than one school, and schools in different local authorities.

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:

The advice is clear, however there is little detail, and schools would probably welcome some standard documentation that could be adopted by the school rather than have schools each produce their own procedure. If this is not going to be provided, then it is something that LA's may consider producing on behalf of all schools in their area.

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:  
Could be difficult for schools to administer this process and could leave schools vulnerable to challenge on their decisions. Schools will also need additional professional services e.g. legal and finance input.

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:  
Comments:  
Schools need to consider not just what number of requests should trigger a formal consideration of childcare, but would need to understand the pattern of demand and what would be viable for the school.  
It is suggested that small schools share facilities with other small schools. Many small schools are in remote rural areas, and may serve quite a large geographic area which would mean the sharing of such facilities would be impractical both for parents and pupils.  
It is suggested that children with SEN should also have access to childcare. Schools will have to have a very clear policy on this as it may not be viable to provide childcare to children that require one to one support, unless the school has a variable charging policy, but this could be seen as discrimination.  
Space in some schools is an issue and the school may not have any suitable non-teaching areas. If teaching areas are to be used the school must consider the impact this could have on lesson preparation or the possible disruption to the teaching space.  
Schools must also consider where to include a snack for either breakfast and

after school clubs, or if children should be allowed to bring into schools a snack for these times. Should schools have a consistent healthy schools policy to all snacks/meals either provided by the school or eaten on the school site? Another consideration is PFI schools which have specific contractual arrangements with their FM contractor. Being open additional hours, having greater use of buildings, facilities and utilities could be costly and complex to negotiate.

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:  
Financial viability – there maybe parental demand, but not at the cost of the childcare could be provided for, (PFI Schools). This maybe also be particularly difficult for children with an Education Health and Care Plan, as the cost of childcare for these individual children could be high depending on their individual needs.  
  
There is no question on the suggested timescales. Six weeks could be too short a timescale to properly consult with the governing body, and to give the governing body time to ask for further information, and then consider this information. This could be especially difficult were there are outside bodies to consult with e.g. PFI contractors, or where the school is part of a shared site. The school may have access issues and safe drop off and pick up arrangements need to be considered.

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:

Schools may not have total control over their buildings e.g. PFI schools, schools which are Voluntary Controlled, on a shared site or have access issues.

Need to also take into account the availability of places in the vicinity.

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?**

|   |                             |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|

Comments:

The options are clear; however the advice does not include and of the difficulties that may arise from any of these delivery models, or provide any detail on how these options might work in practice. Gateshead has produced a document for schools called 'Developing Childcare on School Sites' which gives detailed information on set-up options and the pros and cons of each option.

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:  
Staffing implications including the cost of redundancy should be considered if the school are taking on the childcare provision themselves, if the childcare provision is not viable, or fails. Supply insurance and the cost of providing maternity and sickness cover if the staff are directly employed.

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:  
We already encourage schools to engage with the LA as soon as they are considering changes to their early years or childcare arrangements.

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?**

|                              |                             |  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Sure |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|

Comments:  
This on-line information could not replace the local knowledge of the early education and childcare market held by LA officers.

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

Comments:  
More detailed guidance at a national level should be provided for schools to reduce the administrative burden together with standard forms for collecting information. Regulations covering maintained schools, academies and other providers should be updated to ensure that if there is the requirement of the LA to collect information schools and providers have a duty to provide the information.  
If information needs to be collated either regionally or nationally, standard documentation should be produced for all schools, providers and LA's to use to assist in the quality and consistency of information provided.

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.

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Please acknowledge this reply.</b> |  |
| 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?

Yes

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](mailto: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.CONSULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Wraparound.CONSULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



## REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

11 February 2016

Item 4

### **TITLE OF REPORT: Consultation on Apprenticeship Targets for Public Sector Bodies**

---

#### **Purpose of the Report**

To bring to Schools Forums attention the current consultation on Apprenticeship targets for public sector bodies, and to inform Schools Forum on the Apprenticeship Levy.

#### **Background**

The Department for Business Innovation and Skill and the Department for Education launched a joint consultation on Apprenticeship targets for public sector bodies which will run from 25<sup>th</sup> January to 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

#### **Apprenticeship Levy**

The consultation builds on the outcome of a previous consultation on the Apprenticeship Levy by the Department for Business Innovation and Skills that ran from 21<sup>st</sup> August to 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2015.

The consultation invited views from employers, business organisations, training organisations and anyone with a vested interest to comment on the Government's proposal to introduce an Apprenticeship Levy.

The outcome of the Apprenticeship Levy consultation is that all employers with more than 250 employees and a wage bill of over £3m per annum will have an apprenticeship levy of 0.5% that will be collected via PAYE from April 2017. The levy will apply to all Gateshead maintained schools as they are part of the Local Authority. The levy will also apply to academy and free schools that meet the criteria either as an individual school or as part of a multi academy trust.

Appendix 1 shows the estimated impact on Gateshead maintained schools.

Larger employers in England will be able to spend the levy to support all of their post-16 apprenticeships on training. Funding will be distributed via a digital voucher mechanism and those employers that are committed to apprenticeship training will be able to get back more funding than the 0.5% levy they have contributed.

The Government also announced that from April 2016 National Insurance contributions for apprentice's under the age of 25 will be abolished.

### **Apprenticeship Targets for Public Sector Bodies**

The Enterprise Bill had its second reading on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2016, and contains a provision to amend the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 so that the Secretary of State can set targets for prescribed public bodies in relation to the number of apprentices working for them in England.

The clause includes a duty on all prescribed public bodies which are set a target to have regard to that target. Public bodies will have a duty to publish information annually on progress towards meeting the target and send this information to the Secretary of State.

It is proposed that the duty applies to public sector bodies and organisations that have 250 or more employees in England at the time the list is compiled to ensure it is practicable for organisations to achieve, whilst also ensuring we are covering the vast majority of public sector employees in England. Smaller public bodies will be encouraged to deliver apprenticeship growth as part of our wider growth strategy.

The current consultation proposes that all public sector bodies should have a target of 2.3% apprenticeship starts each year from April 2017 based on head count. For Gateshead including schools this has been estimated on FTE numbers of 5,343 (including schools) or 123 apprenticeship starts a year, with maintained schools accounting for 42 of these starts. This figure will of course be higher if based on head count as the consultation suggests rather than FTE.

A copy of the consultation is available via the below link, and a copy of the consultation questions are shown in appendix 2.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/public-sector-apprenticeship-targets>

## **Proposal**

That Schools Forum notes the introduction of the new apprenticeship levy from April 2017 of 0.5% of an employer's pay bill for organisations with over 250 employees and a wage bill of over £3m, and that the Government is also currently consulting on the proportion of new apprentice starts each public sector body should have each year based on headcount information.

## **Recommendations**

The Schools Forum notes the introduction of the apprenticeship levy from April 2015 and that there is a live consultation on apprenticeship starts for public sector bodies.

## **For the following reasons:-**

To inform Schools Forum of the apprenticeship levy and the impact on maintained schools, and to bring to Schools Forum attention the current consultation on proposed number of apprenticeship starts.

---

**CONTACT:** Carole Smith

Appendix 1

| <b>Cost Centre(T)</b>                      | <b>Pay Bill</b> | <b>Levy</b> |
|--|-----------------|-------------|
| <b>Bensham Grove Nursery School Total</b>  | £207,478.73     | £1,037.39   |
| <b>Pupil Referral Unit Total</b>           | £982,679.48     | £4,913.40   |
| <b>Carr Hill Primary Total</b>             | £1,055,753.28   | £5,278.77   |
| <b>Kelvin Grove School Total</b>           | £907,539.64     | £4,537.70   |
| <b>South Street School Total</b>           | £916,965.76     | £4,584.83   |
| <b>Bede Primary Total</b>                  | £695,611.36     | £3,478.06   |
| <b>Oakfield Junior School Total</b>        | £524,734.01     | £2,623.67   |
| <b>Larkspur School Total</b>               | £530,962.96     | £2,654.81   |
| <b>Oakfield Infant School Total</b>        | £461,372.63     | £2,306.86   |
| <b>Ravensworth Terrace Primary Total</b>   | £609,461.59     | £3,047.31   |
| <b>Portobello Primary Total</b>            | £489,426.60     | £2,447.13   |
| <b>Birtley East Primary Total</b>          | £623,427.31     | £3,117.14   |
| <b>Dunston Hill School Total</b>           | £1,057,085.80   | £5,285.43   |
| <b>Emmaville Primary Total</b>             | £692,489.36     | £3,462.45   |
| <b>High Spen Primary Total</b>             | £506,430.18     | £2,532.15   |
| <b>Swalwell Primary Total</b>              | £629,817.64     | £3,149.09   |
| <b>Winlaton West Lane Primary Total</b>    | £1,021,183.94   | £5,105.92   |
| <b>Greenside Primary Total</b>             | £531,107.38     | £2,655.54   |
| <b>Blaydon West Primary Total</b>          | £392,300.33     | £1,961.50   |
| <b>Front Street School Total</b>           | £986,927.38     | £4,934.64   |
| <b>Highfield Com Primary School Total</b>  | £405,199.07     | £2,026.00   |
| <b>Ryton Community Infant School Total</b> | £474,836.45     | £2,374.18   |
| <b>Ryton Community Junior School Total</b> | £481,875.91     | £2,409.38   |
| <b>Washingwell Primary Total</b>           | £525,292.04     | £2,626.46   |
| <b>Bill Quay Primary Total</b>             | £635,775.36     | £3,178.88   |
| <b>Falla Park School Total</b>             | £716,310.35     | £3,581.55   |
| <b>Brandling Primary Total</b>             | £518,182.43     | £2,590.91   |
| <b>Lingey House Primary Total</b>          | £991,441.84     | £4,957.21   |
| <b>The Drive School Total</b>              | £613,539.95     | £3,067.70   |
| <b>White Mere School Total</b>             | £361,598.14     | £1,807.99   |
| <b>Clover Hill School Total</b>            | £490,922.09     | £2,454.61   |
| <b>Crookhill School Total</b>              | £479,591.81     | £2,397.96   |
| <b>Brighton Avenue Primary Total</b>       | £871,389.42     | £4,356.95   |
| <b>Lobley Hill Primary Total</b>           | £1,081,534.75   | £5,407.67   |
| <b>Wardley Primary Total</b>               | £740,913.91     | £3,704.57   |
| <b>Glynwood School Total</b>               | £793,221.02     | £3,966.11   |
| <b>Barley Mow Primary Total</b>            | £638,947.63     | £3,194.74   |
| <b>Windy Nook Primary Total</b>            | £812,483.44     | £4,062.42   |
| <b>Colegate School Total</b>               | £746,740.84     | £3,733.70   |



|  |                |             |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <b>Roman Road Primary Total</b>              | £537,686.21    | £2,688.43   |
| <b>Fellside School Total</b>                 | £543,715.20    | £2,718.58   |
| <b>Fell Dyke School Total</b>                | £906,035.50    | £4,530.18   |
| <b>Caedmon Primary Total</b>                 | £673,498.33    | £3,367.49   |
| <b>Kells Lane Primary Total</b>              | £880,469.42    | £4,402.35   |
| <b>Chopwell Primary Total</b>                | £670,910.24    | £3,354.55   |
| <b>Parkhead School Total</b>                 | £937,125.73    | £4,685.63   |
| <b>St Aidans Primary Total</b>               | £622,832.57    | £3,114.16   |
| <b>Harlow Green Primary School Total</b>     | £890,335.25    | £4,451.68   |
| <b>Rowlands Gill Primary School Total</b>    | £860,508.90    | £4,302.54   |
| <b>Whickham Parochial Total</b>              | £456,091.64    | £2,280.46   |
| <b>Corpus Christi RCP Total</b>              | £536,102.26    | £2,680.51   |
| <b>St Josephs RCP Gateshead Total</b>        | £595,300.94    | £2,976.50   |
| <b>St Oswalds RCP Total</b>                  | £613,030.28    | £3,065.15   |
| <b>St Peters RCP Total</b>                   | £506,230.54    | £2,531.15   |
| <b>St Annes RCP Total</b>                    | £361,373.71    | £1,806.87   |
| <b>St Josephs Catholic Jnr Birtley Total</b> | £296,188.04    | £1,480.94   |
| <b>St Josephs Catholic Inf Birtley Total</b> | £221,049.71    | £1,105.25   |
| <b>St Agnes RCP Total</b>                    | £466,946.38    | £2,334.73   |
| <b>St Josephs RCP Highfield Total</b>        | £326,016.50    | £1,630.08   |
| <b>St Mary and StThomas RCP Total</b>        | £571,738.64    | £2,858.69   |
| <b>St Philip Neri RCP Total</b>              | £380,537.20    | £1,902.69   |
| <b>St Josephs RCP Blaydon Total</b>          | £511,217.87    | £2,556.09   |
| <b>St Marys RCP Total</b>                    | £439,892.24    | £2,199.46   |
| <b>St Albans RCP Total</b>                   | £593,322.53    | £2,966.61   |
| <b>St Augustines RCP Total</b>               | £863,672.80    | £4,318.36   |
| <b>St. Wilfrids RCP Total</b>                | £378,123.28    | £1,890.62   |
| <b>Heworth Grange School Total</b>           | £3,673,989.18  | £18,369.95  |
| <b>Kingsmeadow School Total</b>              | £2,033,528.58  | £10,167.64  |
| <b>Furrowfield School Total</b>              | £1,238,348.17  | £6,191.74   |
| <b>Gibside School Total</b>                  | £1,615,428.55  | £8,077.14   |
| <b>Hill Top School Total</b>                 | £1,240,515.24  | £6,202.58   |
| <b>Dryden School Total</b>                   | £760,293.26    | £3,801.47   |
| <b>Eslington School Total</b>                | £739,598.22    | £3,697.99   |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                           | £53,144,204.89 | £265,721.02 |

## Appendix 2

### **Question 1 (paragraph 62)**

Do you agree that the organisations listed at Annex 2 and public corporations (at least with headcount of 250 or more in England) should be in scope?

Yes  No  Not sure

If No, which organisations are these (please list) and state why:

### **Question 2 (paragraph 62)**

Should any organisations listed at Annex 2 (plus public corporations with 250 or more headcount in England) be omitted?

Yes  No  Not sure

If Yes, which organisations are these (please list) and state why:

### **Question 3 (paragraph 62)**

Should any organisations that are not listed in Annex 2 be included? The full list of organisations under consideration can be found at [www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/na-classification/national-accounts-sector-classification/index.html](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/na-classification/national-accounts-sector-classification/index.html) (or Annex 2).

Yes  No  Not sure

If Yes, which organisations are these (please list):

### **Question 4 (paragraph 62)**

Should certain bodies be grouped together for the purposes of the target?

Yes  No  Not sure

If Yes, which are these (please list) and state why:

### **Question 5 (Paragraph 62)**

Do you have any other comments on the list of organisations?

### **Question 6 (Paragraph 69)**

Do you agree that headcount is the correct basis for the target?

Yes  No  Not sure

If No, please give reasons why not:

### **Question 7 (Paragraph 74)**

Do you think there is any further information that should be provided?

Yes  No  Not sure

If Yes, what should this information be?

### **Question 8 (Paragraph 79)**

Do you agree that the target periods set out at paragraph 78 are correct?

Yes  No  Not sure

If No, please give reasons why not:

**Question 9 (Paragraph 79)**

Do you have any other comments about the contents of this consultation document?

Yes  No  Not sure

If Yes, please state what:

**Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole?**

Please use this space for any general comments that you may have, comments on the layout of this consultation would also be welcomed.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

This page is intentionally left blank



## REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

11 February 2016

### Item 5

#### **TITLE OF REPORT: Proposed Increase in the LGPS Superannuation Rates**

---

#### **Purpose of the Report**

To provide Schools Forum with the latest information regarding the proposed increase in the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Superannuation rates from 2016/17.

#### **Background**

Every three years the Council's (including maintained school members) superannuation contributions to the LGPS undergo a triennial review.

The Council is a Scheduled Body member of the LGPS which is administered in Tyne and Wear by South Tyneside Council. As a Scheduled Body member, the Council is charged a comparatively lower contribution rate than other organisations on the basis that there is no separate rate for different parts of the Council which includes maintained schools.

#### **Outcome of the Review**

The latest triennial review set the deficiency payment at £10.9m for Gateshead. This amount increased by 3.9% in 2015/16 to £11.33m and will increase to £11.77m in 2016/17.

This requires an increased contribution from maintained schools of approximately £64k in 2016/17. As a result there will be an increase in employer's contributions from 29.1% to 29.5% effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016. A more detailed report is included at appendix 1.

A breakdown of the 2016/17 charges to individual schools is attached at appendix 2 for information.

#### **Proposal**

The Schools Forum notes the decision to increase Superannuation Rates from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016, and the estimated impact on schools budgets for 2016/17 is £64k.

## **Recommendations**

Schools Forum:-

- Notes the increase in superannuation rates from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016

For the following reason(s):

- To enable schools to set budgets for 2016/17 using the updated rate
- 

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**

## **Appendix 1**

### **Pensions and Accounting for Superannuation**

#### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this note is to explain the impact of the latest triennial review on the superannuation contributions made by the Council. The accounting treatment of these contributions has been agreed previously, this note sets out the financial implications for 2016/17 and the potential impact for the following year.
2. The cost of pensions is a key issue for the Council and, given the financial scale, needs to be carefully considered in the context of medium term financial planning and carefully monitored throughout the year.

#### **Background**

3. The Council is a Scheduled Body member of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) which is administered in Tyne and Wear by South Tyneside Council. As a Scheduled Body member, the Council is charged a comparatively lower contribution rate than other organisation's on the basis that there is no separate rate for different parts of the Council which includes maintained schools.
4. Both employees' and employers' contribution rates are paid to the LGPS and these are invested by the Tyne and Wear fund. The fund is valued on a triennial basis and contributions rates are then set by the Actuary for all employers who are members of the fund, (which includes schools non-teaching staff).
5. The fund has been reviewed for the year commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 with the outcome impacting on budgets for 2016/17.
6. Employee rates are a cost to the individual (by payroll deduction) and do not represent a cost to the employer.
7. Employers' contribution rates vary according to the performance of the fund and actuarial assumptions and have a direct impact on the budgets. In the broadest sense, the prime determinants of employer contribution rates are the financial and demographic experience of the Fund. The Fund's assets and liabilities move relative to one another as investment returns fluctuate, economic conditions vary and the membership profile changes.
8. There are three elements to the employers' contributions to the fund:
  - employers' standards contribution rate (Future Service Rate)
  - unfunded pensions
  - pension deficiency.

## **Employers' Contributions**

9. The first element is the employers' standard contribution rate which represents the amount which the employer must pay to the pension fund for every employee who is a member of the scheme. This is known as the Future Service Rate and will remain at 15.7% during 2016/17.
10. Unfunded pensions are charged as a lump sum where, in the past, employees received discretionary benefits. These discretionary payments are not the same as Strain on the Fund costs which represent the cost to the fund of an employee retiring early in terms of lost contribution and interest received. The current annual cost of unfunded pensions is approximately £2.1m, a slight decrease since the last review.
11. The third element of employers' contributions is the annual deficiency contribution. This is a lump sum which needs to be paid across to the pension fund on an annual basis to try to address the shortfall of pension assets against liabilities i.e. the shortfall on the fund. The deficiency payment is historic. A measure of the financial health of the fund is its "funding level" which is the ratio between its assets and liabilities. A pension fund that holds sufficient assets to meet all its projected liabilities would have a funding level of 100%. A funding level of below 100% is described as being in deficit. The Tyne and Wear Pension Fund has been in deficit since 1992. Further information can be found in the Full Annual Reports and Accounts 2013/14 and in the Funding Strategy Statement at [www.twpf.info](http://www.twpf.info).
12. The latest triennial review set the deficiency payment at £10.9m for Gateshead. This amount increased by 3.9% in 2015/16 to £11.33m and will increase to £11.77m in 2016/17. This reflects the annual recovery rate increase assumption used in the valuation.

## **Budgeting and Accounting for Employers' Contributions**

### **Methodology Since 2012/13**

13. Since 2012, the employers' contribution rate for every employee in the Tyne and Wear Pension Fund has been based on recovering all three elements of the employers' contribution to the fund. This means that all elements of pension payments are recovered from all parties responsible for employees who are members of the fund.
14. This methodology is in accordance with CIPFA's definition of 'total cost', it is more transparent to recover the full cost of local government pensions including the deficiency element thus reflecting more accurately the true cost of employing staff.
15. When preparing salary budgets, school budget for employers' superannuation costs are increased to recover the unfunded pensions and the budgeted lump sum. This was set at 29.1% in 2015/16, the basis of which is set out in paragraph 17.
16. This higher rate is then applied in the payroll system to ensure that employers' contributions are deducted at the higher rate. This means that the unfunded pensions and lump sum payment are effectively spread across all eligible employees.



17. The calculation for 2015/16 was as follows:

| Description                  | £'000        | Notes  |
|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Assumed salary base          | 100,111      | Estimated Salary base for employees in the LGPS adjusted for assumed workforce changes |
| Future Service Rate 15.7%    | 15,717       | Notified by actuary  |
| Unfunded Pensions            | 2,097        | Estimate based on current years payments   |
| Deficiency Payment           | 11,325       | Notified by actuary  |
| Total Amount to be recovered | 29,139       |  |
| Required recovery rate       | <b>29.1%</b> | Budget guidance 2015/16  |

18. The 2016/17 budget has been calculated using the revised rate of 29.5%. This takes into account all three elements of the contributions to the fund made by employers and assumes a decrease to the salary base as employees leave the organisation for varying reasons.

The calculation for 2016/17 is as follows:

| Description                  | £'000        | Notes  |
|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Assumed salary base          | 100,378      | Estimated Salary base for employees in the LGPS adjusted for assumed workforce changes |
| Future Service Rate 15.7%    | 15,759       | Notified by actuary  |
| Unfunded Pensions            | 2,092        | Estimate based on current years payments   |
| Deficiency Payment           | 11,767       | Notified by actuary  |
| Total Amount to be recovered | 29,618       |  |
| Required recovery rate       | <b>29.5%</b> | Budget guidance 2016/17  |

## Appendix 2

|                               |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Bensham Grove Nursery School  | 305   |
| Pupil Referral Unit           | 861   |
| Carr Hill Primary             | 1,087 |
| Kelvin Grove School           | 1,170 |
| South Street School           | 1,105 |
| Bede Primary                  | 593   |
| Oakfield Junior School        | 515   |
| Larkspur School               | 710   |
| Oakfield Infant School        | 433   |
| Ravensworth Terrace Primary   | 575   |
| Portobello Primary            | 601   |
| Birtley East Primary          | 989   |
| Dunston Hill School           | 1,359 |
| Emmaville Primary             | 765   |
| High Spen Primary             | 625   |
| Swalwell Primary              | 864   |
| Winlaton West Lane Primary    | 1,530 |
| Greenside Primary             | 701   |
| Blaydon West Primary          | 561   |
| Front Street School           | 1,334 |
| Highfield Com Primary School  | 492   |
| Ryton Community Infant School | 617   |
| Ryton Community Junior School | 455   |
| Washingwell Primary           | 729   |
| Bill Quay Primary             | 851   |
| Falla Park School             | 999   |
| Brandling Primary             | 671   |
| Lingey House Primary          | 1,145 |
| The Drive School              | 731   |
| White Mere School             | 297   |
| Clover Hill School            | 532   |
| Crookhill School              | 548   |
| Brighton Avenue Primary       | 1,393 |
| Lobley Hill Primary           | 1,272 |
| Wardley Primary               | 782   |
| Glynwood School               | 1,036 |
| Barley Mow Primary            | 742   |
| Windy Nook Primary            | 741   |
| Colegate School               | 817   |
| Roman Road Primary            | 607   |
| Fellside School               | 505   |
| Fell Dyke School              | 1,120 |
| Caedmon Primary               | 827   |
| Kells Lane Primary            | 866   |
| Chopwell Primary              | 750   |

|                                 |               |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Parkhead School                 | 1,119         |
| St Aidans Primary               | 880           |
| Harlow Green Primary School     | 814           |
| Rowlands Gill Primary School    | 927           |
| Whickham Parochial              | 473           |
| Corpus Christi RCP              | 372           |
| St Josephs RCP Gateshead        | 856           |
| St Oswalds RCP                  | 794           |
| St Peters RCP                   | 530           |
| St Annes RCP                    | 408           |
| St Josephs Catholic Jnr Birtley | 436           |
| St Josephs Catholic Inf Birtley | 358           |
| St Agnes RCP                    | 374           |
| St Josephs RCP Highfield        | 276           |
| St Mary and StThomas RCP        | 649           |
| St Philip Neri RCP              | 504           |
| St Josephs RCP Blaydon          | 611           |
| St Marys RCP                    | 618           |
| St Albans RCP                   | 604           |
| St Augustines RCP               | 1,069         |
| St. Wilfrids RCP                | 444           |
| Heworth Grange School           | 2,215         |
| Kingsmeadow School              | 1,784         |
| Furrowfield School              | 2,513         |
| Gibside School                  | 3,664         |
| Hill Top School                 | 1,603         |
| Dryden School                   | 1,160         |
| Eslington School                | 1,248         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                    | <b>63,511</b> |

This page is intentionally left blank

**Item 6**

**TITLE OF REPORT: National Living Wage**

---

**Purpose of the Report**

To bring to Schools Forum attention information about the implementation of the National Living Wage for Gateshead employees.

**Background**

The new compulsory National Living Wage (NLW) for employees aged 25 and above will be introduced on 1 April 2016 and will begin at £7.20 per hour in 2016. It is projected to rise to at least £9 per hour (possibly up to £9.35) by 2020.

The NLW is in addition to the UK Living Wage (which is £8.25 per hour) and the National Minimum Wage (NMW) rates for under 25 year olds. The different pay rates are shown below:

| Pay rate                           | Adult rate (25 years and over) | Adult rate (21-24 year olds) | 18-20 year old rate | 16-17 year old rate | Apprentice rate |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| NLW (from April 2016)              | £7.20                          |                              |                     |                     |                 |
| NMW                                |                                | £6.70                        | £5.30               | £3.87               | £3.30           |
| UK Living Wage (outside of London) | £8.25                          |                              |                     |                     |                 |

The Council's lowest hourly rate is currently £7.19 per hour, i.e. SCP 8, 1 pence per hour lower than the proposed NLW from 1 April 2016.

The Council is currently considering different implementation options which will affect the Council's pay and grading structures and therefore will have an impact on Schools.

The Council is due to make a decision on the option to implement the NLW on 23<sup>rd</sup> February. Following the decision Human Resources will contact all schools, providing information on the impact of the Councils decision.

**Proposal**

The Schools Forum notes that the NLW will be implemented from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016, and that HR will contact schools providing information on the impact of the Councils decision when it is known.

## **Recommendations**

Schools Forum notes that there will be an impact on schools budgets with the implementation of the NLW.

For the following reason(s):

- To inform schools that the implementation of the NLW will impact on maintained schools.

---

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**



### Item 7

#### TITLE OF REPORT: 30 Hours Early Implementation

---

#### **Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to inform Schools Forum the outcome of the Local Authority's application to be an early implementer for the 30 hours free entitlement.

#### **Background**

The DfE released documents and criteria for applying for Early Implementation status on the 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The DfE set very tight timescales and an application criterion for expressions of interest for LA's to be an early implementer.

LA's had until the 13<sup>th</sup> November to submit questions to the DfE for clarification or questions on the application process, and applications had to be submitted by 12 noon 20<sup>th</sup> November and all applications had to be signed by the Director of Children's Services (DCS).

#### **Outcome**

The DfE announced that Wigan, Staffordshire, Swindon, Portsmouth, Northumberland, York, Newham and Hertfordshire have been identified as early implementers from September 2016.

The government will also be looking at the issues that make it difficult for parents with particular challenges to access childcare, including special educational needs and disability.

The core group of councils will be supported by 25 LA's who will look specifically at innovative ways of making sure childcare is accessible to as many parents as possible.

Gateshead received notification on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, that it had been selected to be an Early Implementer Innovator that will share £4m with the other 24 LA's to support the core group of 8 LA's. Early innovators in each local cluster will work together and support the core group to focus on special educational needs and disability, flexibility, availability of places, and making work pay.

Gateshead is in the North East and Yorkshire and the Humber cluster which comprises of:-

Gateshead, Bradford, Sheffield, Eastriding, Wakefield and North Yorkshire

The DfE have not yet provided any detailed information on which area Gateshead will be requested to make childcare more accessible to as many parents as possible. As further details become available these will be communicated.

### **Proposal**

That Schools Forum notes the contents of this report that Gateshead has been chosen to be an early implementer innovator.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report and that further information will be brought to Schools Forum when it becomes available.

### **For the following reasons:**

- To inform Schools Forum of Gateshead's successful application to be an early implementer innovator.

---

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**