



## Wirral Schools Forum

<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, 25 January 2011
<b>Time:</b>	6.00 pm
<b>Venue:</b>	Council Chamber, Wallasey Town Hall

**Contact Officer:** Sue Ashley  
**Tel:** 0151 666 4579  
**e-mail:** SueAshley@wirral.gov.uk  
**Website:** <http://www.wirral.gov.uk>

---

## AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 1 - 8)**
3. **MATTERS ARISING**
4. **CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT UPDATE (Pages 9 - 10)**
5. **EDUCATION WHITE PAPER**  

Powerpoint Presentation by Mark Parkinson
6. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO LMS FUNDING FORMULA FOR SCHOOLS 2011/12 (Pages 11 - 16)**
7. **FUTURE FUNDING OF GILBROOK OUTREACH SUPPORT (Pages 17 - 18)**
8. **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA (Pages 19 - 26)**
9. **SCHOOLS BUDGET 2011/12**  

Report to follow.
10. **COMMISSIONING PLACES IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS (Pages 27 - 44)**
11. **WIRRAL SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORMULA (Pages 45 - 48)**

**12. DEPRIVATION FUNDING REVIEW**

This paper is at the end of the pack.

**13. SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT UPDATE**

Verbal report from Steve Dainty

**14. SCHOOL REDUNDANCY COSTS (Pages 49 - 52)**

**15. DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF (Pages 53 - 56)**

**16. FORUM PROCEDURES, FORUM MEMBERSHIP AND SCHEME CHANGES (Pages 57 - 88)**

**17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**18. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Suggested dates

Late March

Late June

Late September

Early December

# Agenda Item 2

## WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM

Wednesday 29 September 2010

**Present:**

R. Longster (Chair)

Schools Group

S. Dainty	M. Kophamel
I. Davies-Foo	G. Zsapka
K. Frost	J. Weise
I. Cubbin	B. Renshaw
C. Penn	P. Dixon
P. Sheridan	E. Cogan
S. Wall	A. Baird
J. Owens	

Non-Schools Group

G. Peters	N. Reilly
J. Kenny	D. McDonald

**In Attendance:**

H. Cooper	D. Armstrong
A. Roberts	J. Bulmer
P. Edmondson	J. Bevan
C. Warburton	P. Rutter
S. Ashley	Cllr. T. Harney
M. Lightburn	R. Richardson
N. Hickin	

**Apologies:**

M. Potter	M. Mitchell
B. Cummings	Cllr. S. Clarke

Mr. Howard Cooper in the Chair.

Mr. Cooper welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the academic year. Brief introductions were made round the table.

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011.**

Mr. Cooper asked for nominations for the position of Chair for the academic year 2010-2011. Mr. R. Longster was nominated by Gillian Zsapka and seconded by Steve Dainty. There were no other nominations so Mr. Longster was elected unanimously.

**Resolved:** That Mr. Richard Longster be elected to serve as Chair of the Wirral Schools' Forum for the academic year 2010-2011.

Mr. R. Longster in the Chair.

**2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011.**

Mr. Longster asked for nominations for the position of Vice Chair for the academic year 2010-2011. Mr. S. Dainty was nominated by Irene Davies –

Foo and seconded by Gillian Zsapka. There were no other nominations so Mr. Dainty was elected unanimously.

**Resolved:** That Mr. Steve Dainty be elected to serve as Vice Chair of the Wirral Schools' Forum for the academic year 2010-2011.

3. **APOLOGIES.**

Apologies were received as indicated above.

4. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2010.**

The Minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

5. **MATTERS ARISING.**

\* **Minute 8 – Budget Update.**

Mr. Cooper updated members on the current budget situation.

Mr. Cooper re-iterated the fact that there had been reductions in Local Authority grant allocations during the year, the biggest ones relating to the Area Based Grants. There had been no changes to the Dedicated Schools Grant or the Revenue Support Grant.

CYPD's share of the scheduled cuts was in the region of £2.6m. Cabinet had reviewed committed and uncommitted expenditure and had decided to protect Children's Services as far as possible and had agreed £1.5m worth of cuts only.

It was expected that there would be very significant reductions in grants in future years. Further reports would be brought back to the Forum.

6. **DSG RESERVE AND FINAL GRANT ALLOCATION 2010/11.**

Mr. Roberts advised that the DSG grant for 2010/11 announced on 1<sup>st</sup> July was £194,032,000, an increase of £36,600 compared to the amount budgeted.

The Forum had agreed to carry forward any grant balances either from the final grant settlement or year end accounts until the end of the funding period in 2010/11. The DSG is calculated from January 2010 PLASC and early years Census data. This information can not be finalised before the budget process has been completed. The Schools Budget was set using an expected level of DSG of £193,995,400. The pupil data has now been agreed nationally allowing the DfE to set final DSG figures. The final census data for Wirral has increased the pupil count used for DSG to 45,456, an increase of 8 pupils which will result in an additional £36,600 more grant. The current DSG balance is £821,551.

Mr. Roberts reported that the Use of DSG Reserve was £65,000 for Gilbrook Outreach and £756,551 for School Pay harmonisation.

**Resolved:** That the DSG reserve balance and future use be noted.

7. **IMPLEMENTATION OF JOB EVALUATION AND HARMONISATION FOR SCHOOL SUPPORT STAFF.**

The report outlined proposals for the implementation of the Council's policy on Job Evaluation and Harmonisation of Conditions of Service across Schools' Support Staff.

Mrs. Rutter explained that the Council had implemented the scheme for all staff up to spinal point 34 and harmonised working conditions across centrally employed staff. The second phase was to implement the scheme for school support staff. Of the schools in Wirral, there are Community Schools where the Council is the employer and Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools where the Governors are the employer. Whilst Job Evaluation and Harmonisation has not taken place in Community Schools, the Council remains open to Equal pay claims from members of support staff. Foundation and Voluntary Aided Schools are less liable to such claims.

Mrs. Rutter referred to the proposals listed and advised that they had been discussed in detail with the relevant Trade Unions who represent School Support Staff. The funding of the proposals will be in the region of £2.6m. It had been agreed previously by Cabinet that the costs would not be met by Council funds but would come from within the DSG and any such monies allocated by the Schools Forum. The sum of £300k had been agreed by the Forum in 2007/8 and set aside for this purpose. It was anticipated that the remainder will be funded through the DSG Reserve and in-year underspend.

The whole process had been very difficult and challenging across all public services. There had been several issues and concerns but it was felt that this was the only option available. Much support for the proposals was received at the meeting.

**Resolved:** (i) That the Schools Forum note the report  
(ii) That the Schools Forum agree unanimously to using the DSG Reserve in year for this purpose.

8. **UPDATE ON THE REVIEW OF SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS WITH SCHOOLS.**

The report updates the Schools Forum on the further progress of the review of traded services offered to schools by Wirral Council. These services are all due for renewal on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011. Mrs. Rutter advised that the panel of representatives was convened to act as a conduit between schools and the Authority service providers in order to consult on the renewal of Service Level Agreements.

The service providers have presented proposals for the new Service Level Agreements and this information has been shared with all Primary Schools.

Schools will be asked to make decisions on which services they wish to procure and at what level where the options are available by January 2011.

A report to Cabinet in September by the Head of Corporate Human Resources and Organisational Development outlined the benefits of a centralised HR and OD service to the Council. It suggested a three staged approach to co-ordinate the move to centralisation. In recognition of the SLA for HR and the need to consult schools, the report stated that the position of schools would be assessed in Phase three in April 2011. A number of schools had expressed concerns over the implications a centralised HR service would have on the ability of schools to deliver on the Standards Agenda if the direct link to the expertise and knowledge of staff from the Children and Young People's Department was not retained. This concern was picked up by members of the Forum. Mr. Cooper assured members that there was a keen awareness of the importance of schools as customers and that there was no wish to jeopardise relationships with schools. The point had been made strongly to Corporate HR.

The regular meetings between CYPD Officers and the Professional Associations were valued and cherished and were seen as very positive.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

9. **CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF GILBROOK OUTREACH SERVICE AND BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS.**

Mr. Bulmer referred briefly to the previously highlighted problems regarding the long term funding of the Gilbrook Outreach Service and its viability. The Schools Forum had previously agreed that the shortfall in funding be found from the contingency for 2010/11. This was seen as a temporary measure and the purpose of this report was to provide the opportunity for further consultation.

Mr. Bulmer re-iterated that the Gilbrook Outreach Service had played an important part in supporting primary schools in dealing with pupils who present behaviour problems. Approximately half of the primary schools had purchased support through service level agreements but others would certainly benefit from the service.

The Schools Forum working group considered various funding methods for the service. The working group considered the option of raising charges to the level required to cover all costs but this would double the charges to individual schools and make the service too expensive. All schools would benefit from having access to the specialist knowledge available at some time although frequency would vary from school to school. The working party concluded that the most sensible way forward would be to consider funding the service centrally from the DSG.

The review of the future of the Gilbrook Outreach raised issues concerning the Authority's arrangements for providing general support and advice on behaviour issues in the primary sector. Support had been available from a number of different services and individuals in the past, support needed to be more systematic and better coordinated. The report outlined a plan to

offer behaviour support to all primary schools from a coordinated team of professionals. The proposal could only be successful if the Gilbrook Outreach Service was secured as an important component of the Authority's arrangements for behaviour support. All primary schools would have access to a number of services as indicated in the report.

If the Schools Forum were to agree to centrally fund the Outreach Service, it would enable the Authority to provide a more effective support for schools. It was proposed that schools be consulted on two proposals:-

- (i) that the Schools Forum should agree that £150,000 from the Direct Schools Grant should be used to fund the current Gilbrook Outreach Service from April 2011
- (ii) that the £45,000 currently set aside for permanently excluded pupils money to new schools should also be used to assist schools supporting pupils at risk of permanent exclusion

**Resolved:** That the Schools Forum agree unanimously to the proposal indicated above.

#### 10. **UPDATE FROM THE DEPRIVATION WORKING PARTY.**

Mr. Roberts reported on the first meeting of the working group which is examining and reviewing deprivation funding and the impact on school performance. The work will contribute to the review of the School Funding Formula.

The group looked at a range of data about the performance of schools and the analysis focused on the key indicators for KS2 and KS4. Data from 2008 and 2009 was presented in order to see if there were any emerging trends. Raw results and Contextual Value Added scores were presented. The data focused on the FSM to non-FSM gap as this was the one that is currently a National Indicator. Data was presented ranked in order of the level of deprivation funding received. In this way the group could look at the impact not only in those schools who received the greatest amount of deprivation funding but also the impact in those schools who received least. The group made a number of observations from the data presented.

Mrs. Cogan asked whether the group looked at those schools that do not receive deprivation funding but have suffered a reduction in funding.

*(Note: This data was included in the report. It has been part of the working group's term of reference and will be updated at the next meeting.)*

The group identified a number of steps to be reported to the Autumn term meetings.

**Resolved:** That the Schools Forum note the report and endorses the future work outlined.

#### 11. **DFE SCHOOL FUNDING CONSULTATION 2011/12.**

Mr. Roberts explained that the DfE had begun a short period of consultation on school funding ahead of the Comprehensive Spending Review and

Indicative Dedicated School Grant (DSG) Allocations for 2011/12. The consultation paper asks Authorities a number of questions and these are set out in the report along with the suggested responses. The paper is predominantly about national changes but the outcome will have some impact on the local scheme. The DfE have indicated that they do not wish to amend the DSG formula at this time and they will concentrate on the introduction of a Pupil Premium.

Mr. Roberts referred in turn to the questions posed in the report and the suggested answers. The consultation will close on 18<sup>th</sup> October so Mr. Roberts indicated that he would be happy to receive any feedback and co-ordinate this with the Chair of the Wirral Schools Forum.

The Schools Forum and the Cabinet are asked to note the consultation and approve the responses set out in the report.

**Resolved:** That the Schools Forum note the consultation and approve the responses as set out.

## 12. **PLAYING FOR SUCCESS.**

Mr. Armstrong reported on the current position in respect of the Playing for Success initiative based at Tranmere Rovers and managed by CYPD. The initiative started in 2004 and current funding support will finish in March 2011 however, at its meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> September, Cabinet agreed to extend funding until August 2011 to allow further time to develop a possible basis for part or full funding.

Mr. Armstrong described one possible way to maintain this very successful scheme into 2011/12.

**Resolved:** (i) That the Playing for Success initiative be funded in 2011/12 from the centrally managed SEN/Behaviour budget, subject to the clauses as described

(ii) That the Playing for Success initiative be the subject of a further report once consultations with the School Forum and schools are completed and following research on other funding options.

## 13. **EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA UPDATE.**

The report updates the Forum on the implementation of a funding formula for Early Years.

A Working Group had met to consider how a single formula should best be designed, taking into account guidance from the DfE and models operated by pilot authorities. There were a number of outstanding issues that the Working Group would need to consider before finalising the new Formula for Early Years. A number of providers had offered 15 hours free Early Years Education from the start of term and a small number of others had confirmed that they are making a flexible offer available to parents either within or outside the school day. Progress and feedback from these changes would also be considered by the Working Group.



**Resolved:** (i) That the report be noted.  
(ii) That the proposed Formula be reported to the Forum for approval at the December meeting.

14. **CONSULTATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO LMS FUNDING FORMULA TO SCHOOLS.**

The report proposes consulting schools on a number of changes to the LMS funding formula with effect from 1st April 2011. The changes referred to Gilbrook School, equal pay and harmonisation costs and consolidation of grant funding.

Schools would be contacted in early October requesting their comments and these will be reported to the next Forum meeting.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

15. **CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FINANCE REGULATIONS 2011.**

Mr. Roberts reported that the DfE had launched a consultation exercise on the new School Finance Regulations 2011.

The main changes from previous regulations relate to decisions and proposals outlined in the 2011-12 school funding consultation document issued in July. These include the requirement for all authorities to introduce an early years single funding formula from April 2012 and mainstreaming of some specific grants into the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Mr. Roberts commented that they seemed sensible changes. Responses needed to be received by 10<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**

\* **Special School Numbers.**

Mr. P. Edmondson reported that the numbers of pupils attending some of our Special Schools had started to reduce. It was difficult to predict, however, whether this was a trend or a short term issue. He intended to discuss this matter in more detail with Special School Headteachers in order to consider the best way forward.

17. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING.**

Confirmed that the next Meeting will take place on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

This page is intentionally left blank

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM – 25 JANUARY, 2011

#### REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF LAW, HR AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

#### CRC ENERGY EFFICIENCY SCHEME - IMPLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENTS COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW

---

##### Executive Summary

This report provides brief details of both financial and operational changes to the existing Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme. The changes were included within the Governments Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in October 2010.

##### 1.0 Background

On 1<sup>st</sup> April the government's Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRC) came into force. Prior to the CSR in October last year, the scheme was due to operate as previously reported to the Forum in June 2010. The CSR introduced significant changes which are detailed below.

##### 2.0 CSR Implications

2.1 As part of the Comprehensive Spending Review the government announced a number of changes that will impact on Schools.

2.2 The CRC Energy Efficiency scheme will be simplified and the first direct purchase of allowances will now take place in 2012 with the revenues from the sales being used to support the public finances, providing funding for the environment and the renewable agenda, rather than being recycled back to participants as previously outlined. However, the scheme remains one focused on carbon reduction and is still a legal obligation for participants.

2.3 With the recycling payment no longer being returned to participants, costs will be considerably higher per annum and continue to increase year on year. The unit cost will initially be £12 per tonne but this is now expected to rise to £16 per tonne by 2014.

2.4 The changes in summary are:

- There will be no sale of allowances in April 2011.
- The first sale will be 2012 for emissions from April 2010 to March 2011.
- The league table will be published as planned in October 2011 but will only have reputational impact.
- Changes to the scheme will be made to **remove the recycling payment mechanism** and consultation with DECC and the Environment Agency continue.
- There will be no recycling payments, revenue from the scheme will be retained by the Government in support of public finances.

##### 3.0 What Schools need to do

3.1 The Government have stated that the scheme will continue as a 'carbon reduction scheme' with Schools having a responsibility to actively reduce their use of energy and associated carbon emissions as quickly as possible. The

outcome being a managed and maintained reduction ensuring carbon percentages are at a level which ensures the financial impact of allowances can be managed cost effectively.

#### **4.0 Improving Future Performance**

4.1 We need to plan to reduce emissions longer term. With the right approach we're not just reducing carbon costs and avoiding penalties, we are also lowering ongoing energy costs, positively affecting our reputation and reducing the depletion of finite resources.

#### **5.0 Financial Implications**

5.1 The revised financial implication for Schools is now quite significant. In 2012 the average cost to a Primary School is expected to be £1,000 rising to a maximum of £2,800 and the average cost for a Secondary School is expected to be £5,800 rising to a maximum £8,500 in the first year.

5.2 If as suggested the price rises from £12 per tonne in 2012 to £16 per tonne by 2014 the costs shown above would rise to £1,200; £3,300; £6,800 and £9,800 respectively.

#### **6.0 Recommendation**

6.1 That the Schools Forum:

1. Note this report.
2. Continue to encourage Schools to actively reduce their energy use and associated carbon emissions in an effort to minimize the financial effects of the changes to the CRC Energy Efficiency scheme.

**Bill Norman**  
**Director of Law, HR & Asset Management**

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM – 25<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2011

#### REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

#### PROPOSED CHANGES TO LMS FUNDING FORMULA FOR SCHOOLS 2011-12

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report proposes amending the LMS Funding Formula with effect from 2011-12 as follows:

Gilbrook Outreach Service – inclusion of £150,000 within the Special School Formula for Gilbrook to provide behaviour support services in all primary schools. This growth will be funded from an anticipated reduction in SEN costs.

Consolidation of grant funding – the use of previous grants, to be included within the local formula (as permitted by regulations), initially for 1 year. This will help maintain stability of funding for all schools.

Equal pay and harmonisation costs – the inclusion of any additional agreed funding to be allocated over all formula factors.

### 1.0 Background

Following the last Schools Forum meeting all maintained schools and academies were consulted on proposed changes to the local schools funding formula arising from grant funding changes proposed by the DFE. (Funding for Gilbrook Outreach is dealt with separately on this agenda).

The consultation, which was extended until the end of term, was responded to by 1 nursery school, 28 primary schools, 6 secondary schools and 4 special schools. The response rate of just less than 30% is quite low, due in part to the technical nature of the questions asked. The questions raised in the consultation were also considered at Primary Heads, WASH and WISPA. The questions and responses are attached in the appendix 1.

### 2.0 Consolidation of Grants

The details of the school funding settlement announced in December confirmed that specific grants that were previously separately identified for schools such as SSG and SDG would be included within Wirral's overall Dedicated Schools Grant. These grants are included for 2011-12 at their previous level and without any national redistribution. Grants total £34 m, which is about 15% of DSG, £760per pupil.

They are:

	£M
School Standards Grant	8.2
School Standards Grant (Personalisation)	2.8
School Development Grant	13.3
Specialist Schools	2.7
High Performing Specialist Schools	1.0
School Lunch Grant	0.5
Ethnic Minority Achievement	0.2
One to one tuition	1.6
Extended Schools sustainability	1.2

Extended Schools subsidy	1.2
Primary Strategy	1.2
Secondary Strategy	0.6
Diploma Grant	<u>0.1</u>
	<b>34.6</b>

Grant Funding includes amounts for Specialist Schools and High Performing Specialist Schools (although not Training Schools via TDA).

In future the amounts for these areas will be included within DSG and will vary directly as a result of changes in pupil numbers (aged 3-15) even though in the case of HPSS these are not being continued by the DFE.

### 3.0 Consultation Questions

1) Do you agree that grants should be included in the formula using available funding factors?

This question tried to seek the views of schools about the relevance of these grants, in the future for example SDG is made up of a number of quite old funding areas, compared with 1-2-1 tuition (an initiative rolled out to all schools last year). If these grants should continue should they be allocated using proxies where available?

#### Answer

The vast majority of schools answered Yes to this question, very few responses argued that individual grant allocations should cease.

2) Should SDG and Specialist Schools be allocated within the formula?

SDG does not model well in the funding formula. In work undertaken to illustrate, this using deprivation and AWPU data, about 1/3 of schools would always gain and 1/3 would always lose. Any formula therefore would redistribute significant funds – up to £13 m.

Specialist Schools funding is also problematic, not all secondary schools are specialist schools and 1 special school also receives funding. A new formula could redistribute over secondary, secondary and special or all schools.

#### Answer

The majority of schools answered No, funding should not be subject to distributional changes, a view endorsed by the Headteacher Associations.

3) Where it is not possible to match grant allocations in the formula should the previous level of grant be a new factor in order to continue the weighting of the current distribution

#### Answer

Yes. The overriding view of schools is to maintain stability. This will be best achieved by using the previous grants within the formula funding. Changes in distribution can potentially cause severe turbulence, a factor recognised by many schools.

4) Do you agree that formula factors should be amended to take account of additional pay harmonisation costs, using AWPU, AWPU and Deprivation or all formula factors?

#### Answer

Using all formula factors was preferred by most responses. Adjustments will also need to be made for special places.

Modelling indicates that of the 3 options this is the closest to totals in school phases.

5) Ongoing savings from schools closure total £500,000. Should this amount be earmarked towards meeting pay harmonisation costs?

Answer

Schools generally agreed with this suggestion.

#### **4.0 Proposal**

No changes to grant allocations are therefore recommended in 2011-12. This will give time to adjust to a tighter funding regime, for the introduction of the Pupil Premium, to consider DFE proposals for a new funding formula and the implications of the academy model. In order to achieve this each grant area will be built into the formula using its previous make-up and the latest data available – pupil numbers, FSM and pupil attainment.

At this stage it is not proposed to fully delegate all grant funding from 1<sup>st</sup> April. Some funds for national strategies will need to be held back (as currently) to support specific schools, similarly Ethnic Minority Development Grant and SDG for City Learning Centres, Advanced Skills Teachers and summer schools will continue to be managed centrally.

Additional funding for pay harmonisation will be allocated over all formula factors.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Forum agree the referral of these local formula changes to Cabinet for approval.

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

AR734/PW

# School Funding 2011-12 Consultation

## Appendix 1

### Summary of Responses

Page 14	Question 1			Question 2			Question 3			Question 4				Question 5		
	Do you agree that, subject to available funding, the grants should be included in the formula as described using the available funding factors identified?			Should SDG and Specialist School funding be allocated within the formula? If so this is likely to redistribute funding amongst schools compared with the current position			Where it is not possible to broadly match grant allocations in the formula, should the previous level of grant be a new factor in order to continue the weighting of the current distribution?			Do you agree that the Formula factors should be amended to take account of additional pay harmonisation costs using: AWPU, AWPU and deprivation (illustrated at 25%) Or all formula factors?				Over the last funding period a number of schools have been closed. These ongoing savings total £500,000. Should this amount also be earmarked towards meeting pay harmonisation costs?		
	Yes	No	Not known	Yes	No	Not known	Yes	No	Not known	AWPU	All formula factors	AWPU & Deprivation	Not known	Yes	No	Not known
1 Nursery	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
28 Primary	24	3	1	9	17	2	23	4	1	5	16	2	2	22	3	2
6 Secondary	1	3	2	-	6	-	5	1	-	2	1	1	2	2	2	1
4 Special	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	-	1	1	3	-	-	2	-	2
Overall	Yes				No		Yes				All formula factors			Yes		





This page is intentionally left blank

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### SCHOOLS FORUM – 25 JANUARY 2011

#### **THE FUTURE FUNDING OF THE OUTREACH SERVICE FROM GILBROOK SCHOOL.**

---

##### **Background**

At the meeting of the Schools Forum held on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2010 members will recall that a report concerning the future funding of the behaviour support service from Gilbrook School was considered.

1. The report summarised the findings of a working party which had investigated the options regarding the future funding of the outreach service from Gilbrook. For 2010-11 the Forum had agreed to find £79,000 from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserve to ensure that the service continued. The Working Group recommended in future that the full costs of the current service, £150,000 be funded from DSG.
2. At its meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> September 2010 the Forum unanimously recommended the following proposals :
  - (i) That £150,000 from DSG should be used to fund the outreach service from April 2011.
  - (ii) That the £56,000 currently set aside from the contingency for permanently excluded pupils when they move to new schools should also be deployed to support schools in preventing exclusions.
3. Following consultation in the autumn term 2010 on the recommendations of the Forum responses have been reviewed from 27 primary schools and one secondary school. All supported the recommendations with one exception.
4. In view of the “flat cash” settlement reported elsewhere on this agenda it is proposed to fund the costs of the proposal from reduced demand on centrally held SEN budgets.
5. The proposed changes will have implications for the organisation of the service not least in terms of moving from a service only provided to those schools which have a service level agreement to one which is authority wide. In order to assist with a possible increase in demand officers are discussing with a member of staff currently employed centrally, and with significant experience of behaviour support, as to whether they may transfer to the team based at Gilbrook on a full time basis. Any costs which would result from such a redeployment could be met by resources currently available centrally for behaviour support. Discussions are at an early stage and whatever the outcome it is certain the staff currently employed in the team will continue to provide an excellent service.

## **Recommendation**

In view of the outcome of the consultation the recommendations of the Schools Forum at its meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> September 2010 are confirmed.

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM 25<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2011

#### REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

---

##### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends the introduction of an Early Years Single Funding Formula from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011. This formula will fund providers of early education for the free 15 hour entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds. It will apply to all maintained nursery schools, maintained mainstream nursery classes and private, voluntary and independent providers.

##### 1.0 Background

Over the last 2 years a Working Group from the Schools Forum has met to consider the design of a single funding formula for Early Years (EYSFF), taking account of guidance from the DFE and models operated by pilot authorities. The decision to implement the EYSFF was deferred at the January 2010 Schools Forum meeting in order to resolve concerns raised by nursery schools, who would lose financially from the plan to move away from place led funding to funding based on attended hours.

##### 2.0 Formula Update – Nursery Schools

A number of meetings have been held with nursery schools during the year to address their concerns including:

- Comments that the formula did not take account of nursery school costs or quality of provision
- Transition was too short with insufficient protection
- Nursery schools SEN provision and SEN places were not recognised

Agreement has been reached on the following:

- SEN costs within nursery schools and nursery classes would be funded centrally
- Nursery schools would have 12 places reserved for SEN
- Salaries of Early Years Educators would receive some protection for 3 years. Pay harmonisation costs would also be included
- Transition would be extended to 3 years and ensure funding at 90%, 85% and 80% of the current formula.
- Equivalent grants for SSG and SDG would be included as a lump sum within the Formula
- Nurseries would be exempt from the excess balance calculation for 3 years.

These changes will give the schools additional funding, and time to work with the new formula and to implement any revised structures required.

### 3.0 Formula Proposals

It is recommended that the formula to be implemented should use a single base rate for all providers, together with a number of specific supplements for deprivation, quality, flexibility and a headteacher supplement (for nursery schools only). The hourly rates are as follows:

	2010-11 £
Base Rate	3.19
Deprivation	0.14
Quality	<u>0.16</u>
	3.49
Flexibility in school hours	0.18
Flexibility outside school hours	<u>0.18</u>
	3.85

The deprivation supplement is banded high, medium and low (£0.23, £0.14 and £0.05). The above rates compare with the current rate of £3.24 for PVI's and will be unchanged in 2011-12.

The resources identified for the formula are:

	£
Existing 3 and 4 year funding	4,175,800
Nursery and nursery class budgets	3,575,000
Extension and flexibility costs	2,030,200
Deprivation growth	200,000
Consolidation of grants – SSG, Extended Schools etc.	183,700
Other	<u>60,500</u>
	10,104,200

Indicative budgets are attached in Appendix 1, together with a comparison of funding received in 2010-11. These use draft data until final calculations can be completed using January 2011 Census data. Based on draft data there are 161 providers who gain and 5 who lose. There is a ceiling mechanism within the formula which pays for the nursery school protection over the next 3 years. This limits the maximum gain to 20% above the minimum funding guarantee for any provider. This percentage is subject to change on receipt of final data.

### 4.0 Flexibility Supplements

Flexibility supplements are amounts paid to settings who are prepared to offer an Early Years facility to parents to meet different demands, for example delivering a service over the lunch period or for longer hours during the day, rather than the standard five x three hour sessions per week.

Providers have been able to take up this additional supplement since September 2010. Take up has not been as high as expected - 48 out of 165 settings (28% compared to an expected 70 or 80%). It is planned to review the effectiveness of this supplement over the next 12 months. Initial evidence from pathfinder authorities are that many local authorities do not have a flexibility factor.

## **5.0 Minimum Funding Guarantee**

The DfE have set a minimum funding guarantee of -1.5% for the 2011-12 financial year. This will be applied across all providers for the EYSFF.

## **6.0 Comments from Pathfinder Areas and Government Response to Select Committee**

The pathfinder formula analysis issued by the DFE confirmed that there is a wide variation across the country in the complexity of formulae and the funding rates used for providers. Nursery schools receive more funding, with either higher base rates or significant supplements. Deprivation is calculated from postcode data, most formulae contain a quality supplement, although few reflect the need for flexibility. The paper detailing the government's response to the Select Committee agreed that "many maintained nursery schools offer an exemplary standard of education" and "should continue to be funded accordingly under the EYSFF". However the response is also clear that nursery schools have empty places and should be encouraged to achieve capacity.

Overall the response confirms the governments continued commitment to Early Years and the EYSFF, with all settings funded on the basis of participation.

## **7.0 Budget and Payments**

All settings will receive an indicative budget before the start of the financial year. This budget allocation will set out the basis of the formula, fixing the hourly rates and supplements and estimating the grant to be paid for the year. Estimates will be based on data held for the previous calendar year. Settings will receive two payments a term, the first using estimated attended hours, the second based on actual hours recorded each term.

## **8.0 Next Steps**

- Providers have received some information outlining the changes that have or will be introduced. It is planned to write with the formula details after this meeting and invite all groups to a series of briefings to be held on 28<sup>th</sup> February
- Cabinet will approve the formula at its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> February
- Indicative budget allocations will be issued to all providers in mid March
- The formula will be reviewed at the end of 2011-12. The work of the Steering Group will conclude at that time.

### **Recommendations**

- i) That the Forum note the report
- ii) That the views of the Forum on the proposed formula be referred to Cabinet on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2011.

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

This page is intentionally left blank



**PROTECT**

**EYSFF - 201011 Indicative Budgets**

Total/Average Maintained Sector	3,805,634	4,076,770	3.68	4,073,252	3.81
Total/Average PVI	N/A	5,430,437	3.46	5,434,098	3.47
<b>Total/Average All</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>9,507,206</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>9,507,350</b>	<b>3.56</b>
Contingency for Flexibility				260,000	
Contingency for Additional Hours				336,850	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>10,104,200</b>	

**201011 Actual for Comparison**

2010/11 Actual funding has been provided for comparison. Please note the following:

- For nursery schools this is the final 2010/11 allocation including grants. This does not include additional funding for the increase to 15 hours or for flexibility
- For primary schools with nursery classes, this is a proportion of the 2010/11 final allocation as detailed on the notes page in this document. This does not include additional funding for the increase to 15 hours or any flexible provision
- For the PVI sector, 2010/11 total funding is not yet known. However, the current hourly rate of £3.24 can be used for comparison

DCSF/URN	Setting	2010/11 Actual	Floor/Ceiling Amounts		Formula Amounts	
			Final Budget	Final Hourly Rate	Greater MFG/Formula	Final Hourly Rate
1000	Brentwood Nursery	294213	264792	8.75	229823	7.59
1001	Leasowe Early Years Centre	422750	380475	9.43	276375	6.85
1002	Ganneys Meadow Early Years Centre	664964	598468	9.93	474534	7.87
2000	Bedford Drive Primary School	77462	86296	3.58	86296	3.58
2001	Bidston Village CE Primary School	68557	81191	3.34	86994	3.58
2021	Woodlands Primary School	68922	81004	2.96	97841	3.58
2048	Devonshire Park Primary School	64673	76159	3.09	90502	3.67
2100	New Brighton Primary School	77423	91352	3.30	96533	3.49
2102	Liscard Primary School	79386	93213	3.14	103444	3.49
2104	St. George's Primary School	77733	91302	3.10	102690	3.49
2107	Riverside Primary School	57519	67687	3.49	69434	3.58
2108	Kingsway Primary School	19834	23303	3.23	25812	3.58
2110	Park Primary School	64551	75512	2.87	94082	3.58
2112	Eastway Primary School	35355	36838	3.58	36838	3.58
2116	Sandbrook Primary School	42547	44571	3.58	44571	3.58
2118	Lingham Primary School	61940	69887	3.49	69887	3.49
2201	Woodslee Primary School	53772	63533	3.22	68767	3.49
2204	Town Lane Infant School	75997	89342	3.01	100776	3.40
2205	Grove Street Primary School	71573	85122	3.07	104340	3.76
2214	Mendell Primary School	38180	45188	3.33	47293	3.49
2221	West Kirby Primary School	38906	45674	3.30	47124	3.40
2226	Black Horse Hill Infants School	41336	84966	3.40	84966	3.40
2244	Egremont Primary School	72284	85203	3.47	88014	3.58
2249	Portland Primary School	63265	74632	3.57	74750	3.58
2254	Manor Primary School	29675	31468	3.58	31468	3.58
2255	Mersey Park Primary School	77354	91021	3.15	103373	3.58
2256	Overchurch Infants School	77464	91047	3.09	100113	3.40
2258	Rock Ferry Primary School	74235	87417	3.23	96982	3.58
2261	Cathcart Street Primary School	31311	36849	3.11	42477	3.58
2262	Cole Street Primary School	29601	34861	3.35	37268	3.58
2263	Well Lane Primary School	58473	68910	3.01	82054	3.58
2266	Church Drive Primary School	56248	66186	3.31	69751	3.49
2274	Heygarth Primary School	64893	49292	3.43	50151	3.49
3375	Millfields Primary School	41295	48132	3.09	54339	3.49
2279	Hillside Primary School	31025	36442	3.50	37322	3.58
3011	Christ Church CE Primary School (Birkenhead)	63780	75162	3.49	77167	3.58
3324	St. Paul's Catholic Primary	34238	34100	3.58	34100	3.58
3333	St. Joseph's Catholic Primary (Wallasey)	48874	57649	3.06	67340	3.58
3335	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	74487	85854	3.49	85854	3.49
3363	Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary	26868	31691	3.27	36491	3.76
3368	Holy Cross Catholic Primary School	68480	80775	3.44	84103	3.58
3369	St. Anne's Catholic Primary School	40490	47760	3.57	47847	3.58
3371	St. Michael & All Angels Catholic Primary School	48475	57178	3.19	70684	3.94
3372	St. Werburgh's Catholic Primary School	65614	77394	3.16	87638	3.58
3373	St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School (B'head)	74515	87893	3.03	101297	3.49
3376	Pensby Primary School	55099	63983	2.95	73746	3.40
510085	Treetops - Carlton House		45867	3.69	45867	3.69
510729	Redcourt - St Anselm's		137504	3.67	137504	3.67
510889	St Andrews Pre-School Playgroup		63696	3.33	63696	3.33
511117	Prenton Preparatory School		40260	3.67	40260	3.67
511365	Nyehome Nurseries Wirral Clatterbridge		34029	3.40	34029	3.40
512081	Kingsmead School		32509	3.76	32509	3.76
512216	Little Cherubs Day Nursery - Birkenhead		65280	3.49	65280	3.49
512639	St Peters CE (Heswall) Pre-School Playgroup		58479	3.42	58479	3.42
512851	Woodland Day Nursery		19422	3.49	19422	3.49

**PROTECT**

DCSF/URN	Setting	2010/11 Actual	Floor/Ceiling Amounts		Formula Amounts	
			Final Budget	Final Hourly Rate	Greater MFG/Formula	Final Hourly Rate
513106	Smarties Playgroup		51754	3.60	51754	3.60
513666	Early Days Childcare Centre		62532	3.24	62532	3.24
513951	Gayton Pre-School		52751	3.58	52751	3.58
513973	Our Lady of Pity Pre-School**		45208	3.24	45208	3.24
513974	Oasis Childcare		49647	3.33	49647	3.33
514440	Prenton Pre-School Birkenhead		52608	3.24	52608	3.24
514659	Moreton Baptist Pre-School Playgroup		89215	3.49	89215	3.49
515350	Prenton Pre-School (Storeton)***		23227	3.33	23227	3.33
515375	Busy Nought to Fives		27193	3.24	27193	3.24
516164	Kingfisher Day Nursery		14531	3.58	14531	3.58
516337	The Wendy House		16470	3.33	16470	3.33
516748	Irby Primary School Pre-School		40681	3.42	40681	3.42
516771	St Johns Pre - School Playgroup		102238	3.33	102238	3.33
516774	St Peters (Birkenhead) Pre-School Playgroup		50941	3.42	50941	3.42
516894	The Oval Pre-School Playgroup		25784	3.33	25784	3.33
516924	St Bridgets Pre-School Playgroup		28115	3.40	28115	3.40
517174	Esholt Day Nursery		19188	3.60	19188	3.60
517554	Ash House Day Nursery		41852	3.69	41852	3.69
518070	Brookhurst Pre-School		66537	3.24	66537	3.24
518282	Ladybird Pre-School Playgroup		68947	3.42	68947	3.42
518410	First Class Nursery Ltd		88545	3.49	88545	3.49
518426	Our Lady of Pity Annexe Pre-School		32815	3.24	32815	3.24
519076	Greasby Playgroup**		23464	3.24	23464	3.24
519347	Holy Trinity Pre-School Hoylake		60089	3.24	60089	3.24
519593	Riverbank Nursery		26920	3.33	26920	3.33
519920	Pulford Playgroup		91835	3.24	91835	3.24
520021	Christ the King Pre-School Playgroup		71400	3.24	71400	3.24
520026	Nyehome Nurseries Wirral Arrowe Park		19394	3.40	19394	3.40
520397	Thingwall Pre-School Playgroup		37471	3.24	37471	3.24
520842	See-Saw Playgroup		59607	3.33	59607	3.33
521004	Manor Childcare Centre		35264	3.42	35264	3.42
521427	Prenton Methodist Church Playgroup		54085	3.49	54085	3.49
522564	Rainbow Pre-School Playgroup		33349	3.24	33349	3.24
524382	Sunny Days Preschool		42423	3.58	42423	3.58
524401	Benty Heath Kindergarten		31819	3.58	31819	3.58
524581	Brookdale Pre-School Group		65517	3.42	65517	3.42
524681	Ladymount Pre-School Playgroup		51370	3.24	51370	3.24
524856	Treetops at Beechwood Day Nursery		36701	3.76	36701	3.76
525136	Plymyard Pre-School		31264	3.33	31264	3.33
530514	Jack & Jill Day Nursery (Oxton)		57717	3.82	58170	3.85
530521	Thornton Hough Playgroup		25029	3.24	25029	3.24
534147	Birkenhead Preparatory School		133824	3.40	133824	3.40
534148	New Brighton Children's Centre		45346	3.69	45346	3.69
534149	Reach High Day Nursery		12346	3.82	12734	3.94
534150	Oakdale Nursery		45519	3.82	46949	3.94
534153	Building Blocks Day Nursery		17083	3.33	17083	3.33
534154	Stars Pre-School		44215	3.49	44215	3.49
534155	Vale House Playgroup		9830	3.33	9830	3.33
534156	Plus Club Preschool		33291	3.24	33291	3.24
534157	Parkside Day Nursery and Pre-School		21395	3.33	21395	3.33
534158	Parkwood Day Nursery -Bidston		48790	3.49	48790	3.49
534161	The Learning Tree Nursery		11698	3.33	11698	3.33
534162	Bluebells Day Nursery (Bebington)		28688	3.60	28688	3.60
534163	Eversley Nursery School		46811	3.49	46811	3.49
534164	Harrison Day Nursery		72201	3.33	72201	3.33
534165	Ss Peter & Paul's CPS (Little Acorns)		52867	3.33	52867	3.33
534166	Bebington Pre-School Playgroup		49081	3.33	49081	3.33
534171	Pitter Patter Ltd		45164	3.49	45164	3.49
534176	Busy Bees Day Nurseries		53766	3.33	53766	3.33
534178	Miriam Place Neighbourhood Nursery		22699	3.82	23411	3.94
534179	Windmill Day Nursery		19727	3.69	19727	3.69
534180	Ducklings Day Nursery-Hoylake		21118	3.24	21118	3.24
534181	Little Rainbows Day Nursery		22982	3.49	22982	3.49
534182	Sanderlings Day Nursery-Bidston		7625	3.58	7625	3.58
534183	Daisy and Jake Day Nursery Moreton		86474	3.82	87152	3.85
543184	Small Steps Day Nursery		38149	3.76	38149	3.76
543185	Ducklings Day Nursery - Moreton		27782	3.33	27782	3.33
552608	Bidston Avenue Early Years Pre-School		93571	3.42	93571	3.42
552613	Bright Smiles Day Nursery		11146	3.60	11146	3.60
552615	Pudsey Day Nursery		30045	3.49	30045	3.49
552617	Sanderlings Day Nursery-Hoylake		30161	3.40	30161	3.40
552618	Seashells Day Nursery		14980	3.42	14980	3.42
552619	The Waterside Day Nursery		108242	3.69	108242	3.69

**PROTECT**

DCSF/URN	Setting	2010/11 Actual	Floor/Ceiling Amounts		Formula Amounts	
			Final Budget	Final Hourly Rate	Greater MFG/Formula	Final Hourly Rate
552621	Tots Day Nursery		35442	3.60	35442	3.60
552624	Bluebells Day Nursery (Bromborough)		42793	3.60	42793	3.60
552625	Great Meols Pre-School Playgroup		57504	3.24	57504	3.24
552626	Grove Street Community Wraparound		54581	3.42	54581	3.42
552627	Bethany Day Nursery		33301	3.24	33301	3.24
552628	Little Robins Nursery		32502	3.69	32502	3.69
552629	Kiddy Factory Nurseries		11056	3.33	11056	3.33
552630	Jack & Jill Day Nursery (Seacombe)		71132	3.78	71132	3.78
552631	St Chad's Playgroup		38995	3.40	38995	3.40
552634	Little Cherubs Day Nursery - Wallasey		14108	3.42	14108	3.42
567871	Daisy and Jake Day Nursery Thurstaston		72944	3.76	72944	3.76
567872	Mary Manor Nursery School		76420	3.67	76420	3.67
567874	Three Gables Day Nursery		21569	3.24	21569	3.24
567875	The Priory Pre-School		67930	3.42	67930	3.42
567876	Upton St Marys Pre-School Playgroup		25453	3.49	25453	3.49
567878	Wirral Christian Centre		64010	3.58	64010	3.58
567879	Our Lady and St Edwards Pre-School		104057	3.42	104057	3.42
567880	Funtrain Day Nursery		22141	3.42	22141	3.42
567881	Daisy Day Nursery		12737	3.33	12737	3.33
567882	Greenleas Preschool		60167	3.24	60167	3.24
567883	Little Monkeys Day Nursery		18252	3.33	18252	3.33
567884	Little World		15862	3.42	15862	3.42
572900	Avalon School		88924	3.40	88924	3.40
580314	Barnston Buddies Day Nursery		63973	3.76	63973	3.76
580838	First Steps Playgroup HMC		22236	3.40	22236	3.40
582083	Holy Trinity Pre-School Spital		19216	3.24	19216	3.24
582856	Townfield Pre-School		143235	3.69	143235	3.69
583410	St Agnes Pre-School Group		66193	3.60	66193	3.60
583499	Poulton Penguins		105254	3.76	105254	3.76
583722	Marigold Day Nursery Ltd		40727	3.60	40727	3.60
583762	Summerhill Day Nursery		12297	3.58	12297	3.58
584176	Somerville Preschool		77836	3.60	77836	3.60
584814	Greasby Infant Pre-School		42399	3.24	42399	3.24
598613	Daisy and Jake Day Nursery Spital		27326	3.60	27326	3.60
598681	Auntie Jayne's House		5161	3.33	5161	3.33
1	Honey Bees		37603	3.78	37603	3.78
2	Lyn's Little Ones		14244	3.42	14244	3.42
598614	Jack & Jill Day Nursery (Brimstage)		1701	3.60	1701	3.60

This page is intentionally left blank

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### SCHOOLS FORUM

#### REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

#### **CONSULTATION FOR COMMISSIONING PLACES IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS**

---

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As pupil numbers fall and a number of parents are expressing a preference for a mainstream school for their children with special needs a shift in demand for some special school places has been identified. This change in demand does not apply to all types of Special Needs and, for instance, demand for places for children with Social and Emotional difficulties remains at previous levels. Previously the authority has responded to such changes in a fairly rigid way, which did not facilitate school planning. This paper sets out an approach, discussed with special school headteachers and governors, that can be used to manage this reduction in funded places in a planned and more flexible way.

#### **1. Current Funding Arrangements**

Unlike mainstream, where schools are funded on the number of pupils on roll, special schools are funded on the number of places for the three years of the funding cycle. This approach recognizes that special schools should neither have an incentive to attract children nor an incentive to maintain children on roll when a review of their statement indicates that they could have their needs better met in mainstream or other schools.

#### **2. Current Numbers in Wirral Special Schools**

An analysis of the number of places funded in special schools, (Appendix One) using the October census data indicated a mismatch between funded places and actual pupils on roll thus leading to potential over funding of some schools at least on a nominal basis. In addition the authority is faced with financial pressures by special schools for extra funds from the exceptional needs budget heading which is overspent, and by requests for pupils to attend independent school provision out of the borough.

The mismatch is most apparent for places for children with specific, complex and moderate learning difficulties.

#### **3. Wirral and the National Context**

The overall number of pupils attending special school provision in Wirral in comparison to other authorities is very high. Wirral maintains more statements of SEN, and has more pupils in special provision both in the borough and outside the borough, than the national average. (See Appendix Two for details.) This can be attributed to local parental demand, local policy, good special school provision and, in the past, a lack of suitable alternative mainstream provision. Current fluctuations in the number at each school can be attributed to such factors as parental preference, reduction in the general pupil population, the changing nature of some special educational needs, and the increased capacity of mainstream schools to make provision.

#### **4 Funding Adjustments for Excess Demand**

Periodically the authority finds itself in the position where it has to make available either more places in special schools or fewer places. Currently a formula is in place whereby numbers can be increased in response to a growth in demand. The “trigger mechanism” for funding additional places recognizes that during the course of a year the number on roll in a special school can fluctuate. At times the number can be marginally below the number funded and at other times marginally above. To respond to a growth, the current agreement is that if the school exceeds its number by more than five pupils funding, based on the average weighted pupil cost for the school, is released for the sixth and each additional pupil admitted. This system that has been agreed with schools has worked well and it is not proposed to modify it.

#### **5. Funding Adjustments to Reduced Demand**

The current procedure is if numbers on roll reduce then there will be a reduction in funded places. The requirement to reduce numbers in the past has not been a frequent event although it has been used, for instance, to reduce the numbers at Ellera Park.

The current procedure is straightforward but has a number of weaknesses. It does not build in enough flexibility to encourage inclusion work or assist in long term planning for the school or strategic planning of the Authority, nor does it happen as part of a planned cycle or by some numeric trigger and it is not responsive to short term movements in numbers. It also has the potential to be a disincentive for children to be returned to a mainstream or other school.

As the pupil population is falling and as parents are increasingly wanting the choice for their children with special needs to be educated in mainstream planning and managing the number of places in special provision needs to be improved.

A procedure that mirrors the trigger mechanism for funding excess demand is proposed to manage a reduction in demand. This means that if a school has more than five empty places the Authority negotiates with the school what the “surplus funding” can be commissioned to achieve for one year. At the end of that first year a review takes place which could lead to further work being commissioned or numbers being reduced for the start of the next academic year.

Consultation has taken place with Wirral Special Headteachers’ Association (WISPHA) and Governors have met on two occasions to consider this proposal. In addition the proposal was taken to the Professional Associations meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2010. Attached as Appendix Three are the written comments received from Special Schools in response to this proposal.

At a meeting with Governors held on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011 those present were in agreement with the proposal but wanted a smaller working party to consider in finer detail how the procedure would operate.

#### **6. Conclusion**

The Children and Young People's Department has identified that whilst the overall budget for statemented pupils in special schools needs to be maintained at current levels there is a need for some changes in the way special school places are commissioned and kept under regular review. In addition demand on other budget lines is increasing thus requiring an appropriate response.

In order to manage this situation more flexibly, and to ensure the best use of scarce resources, a modification to current arrangements for dealing with a reduction in pupil numbers at special schools is proposed.

If these commissioning arrangements were to be supported it would allow for a more flexible response meet the needs of children and families from our resources and allow special schools a clearer process and time frame in which to plan for any reduction in numbers.

It is recommended that if funding were to be re-directed it could be used, for example to :-

- (1) Fund growth in those special schools where demand outstrips the number of funded places or where enhanced provision could potentially avoid independent school provision.
- (2) Support an extended role for special schools in providing support to mainstream schools.
- (3) Support the funding of places in independent school provision where this is necessary.

It is recommended that a Panel made up of members of the Schools Forum and Special School representatives along with officers would consider any proposals.

Any consequent changes to the Funding Formula would be approved by Cabinet.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The forum is asked to note the comments from Special Schools in Appendix Three and recommend the extension of the trigger mechanism to accommodate a reduction in Special school place numbers from the start of the new funding cycle.
- The Forum is asked to note that a group of Special School and Schools Forum representatives will be consulted to consider in detail the procedures around the application of this approach.

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

This page is intentionally left blank



**Appendix One - Wirral Special Schools: Places and Funding based on School Census Data**

Name of School:	Type of Special Educational Need:	Number of Places	On Roll January Census 2010	Surplus Place Funding January 2010	Numbers on roll October Census 2010	Surplus place funding October 2010
Orretts Meadow KS2 Primary 7-11	Specific Learning Difficulties	66	57	£83,700	40	£241,800
Hayfield Primary	Moderate Learning Difficulties: Social Communication Difficulties	120	109	£119,000	104	£174,400
Clare Mount Secondary 11-19	Moderate Learning Difficulties: Social Communication Difficulties	189	204	N/A	205	N/A
Lyndale Primary	Complex Learning Difficulties	45	26	£296,000	28	£265,200
Elleray Park Primary	Complex Learning Difficulties	75	76	N/A	80	N/A
Stanley Primary	Complex Learning Difficulties	90	73	£255,000	72	£270,000
Meadowside Secondary 11-19	Complex Learning Difficulties	75	76	N/A	75	N/A

Foxfield 138 Places	Complex Learning Difficulties	138	123	£229,500	119	£247,000
Gilbrook Primary	Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties	50	51	N/a	44	£78,000
Kilgarth Secondary 11-16	Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties	50	48	£21,600	42	£64,800
The Observatory Secondary 11-16	Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties	50	47	£42,300	49	£14,100

Surplus calculations made by calculating:  $\frac{\text{total place-led funding}}{\text{total number of places}} \times \text{number of empty places}$ .

The total resources spent on SEN across all schools and settings by Wirral is £23.2 million, i.e. about 10% of the total schools budget. This figure includes money spent on special schools, statemented pupils in mainstream schools, on pupils educated out of borough, and those receiving home-tuition, etc.

01/12/2010

## Appendix Two

### Wirral SEN Data National Data Sets from January Census

#### **% of the 0-19 population with statements**

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
England	2.14%	2.13%	2.05%	1.98%	1.91%	1.87%	1.85%
Wirral	2.79%	2.69%	2.54%	2.45%	2.48%	2.49%	2.50%

#### **Placements in maintained special schools - % tage of pupils placed in maintained special schools (5-15 pop)**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
England	1.19%	1.18%	1.19%	1.19%	1.20%
Wirral	1.80%	1.90%	2.03%	2.07%	2.08%

63

#### **Placements in resourced provision/units/special classes in mainstream schools -rate per 10,1000 pop (2009)**

	2008	2009
England	27.1	26.3
Wirral	59.2	56.1

#### **Placements made by LA in independent and non-maintained special schools – Rate per 10,000**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
England	9.4%	9.4%	9.6%	9.5%	10%
Wirral	15.1%	16.25	16.2%	14.3%	13.8%

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix Three

### Response from Special Schools to the Trigger Mechanism for reducing funding

Hi Peter and Paul

I took the paper on the 'Principles and reviewing arrangements for commissioning places at Wirral Special Schools' to our full Governing Body meeting on 01.12.10. My Governors felt that it was a well laid out paper that gave a clear and reasonable explanation of the process the LA would follow. They do not feel that they need Officers to explain this paper, process or principals further and they assume that when it comes to discussing the actual implications for individual schools they will be informed and consulted at that time. At this point therefore they do not intend to send any representatives to the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December.

Governors did, however, make two further comments by way of feedback.

1. They welcome the fact that the LA are looking at this issue and would hope that plans and decisions are made promptly. We are in a financially very uncertain times and budget planning becomes therefore very problematic. Governors here do not wish to maintain a large budget carry forward and they will spend this wisely as soon as we are confident that we can afford to do so. We want to have more certain long term budget planning in place as soon as possible but need to know how the number of funded places will change in order to do this.
2. On point (iv) of the principles Governors would strongly suggest that a commitment to keep places under review and to **make prompt adjustments where required** is added. Governors here are very cautious about reducing places now and then future numbers rising again with no adjustment made. Once again we would return to having trigger funding. We have been in that position before and it is very unhelpful. While we do not expect an exact match of places / numbers every year or changes being made annually we would request a commitment to making adjustments as numbers consistently grow as well as when they fall.

I hope this clarifies our position and views.

Andre Baird  
Headteacher, Foxfield School

Dear Peter

Thank you for your letter of 13 December in relation to special school places and funding.

I have previously shared this information with the governors finance committee including chair of governors, but have forwarded your letter to Breda as requested.

I have made my thoughts on the matter clear to WISPHA colleagues and to Paul Ashcroft.

- A fair and equitable system is paramount and no school should be dependent on trigger funding year on year to maintain its provision.
- Schools with large surpluses should not be tapping into the exceptional needs budget for additional funding.
- There should be no delay in redressing the balance and clawing back the surplus funding in a measured and systematic way

Hope that helps!

Best wishes for Christmas and the New Year,

Shirley Allen, Headteacher  
Clare Mount Specialist Sports College

Dear Mr Edmondson

We are suggesting that we reduce our overall numbers from 120 – 115, the reduction coming from the Moderate Learning Difficulties section of the school. We are suggesting this in good faith on the understanding that this reduction in places would result in a reduction of finances of no more than £60,000.

We would propose to the authority that the monies derived from a further five surplus places (again from the MLD section of the school) enable us to do the following :-

1. We are currently running a quickly expanding service to mainstream schools that has been very well received and will extend this by –
  - a) Training on site working alongside staff at Hayfield School.
  - b) Support and advice on practice to Headteachers, SENCOs, Teachers and Teaching Assistants.
  - c) Support and advice offered to teachers of specific pupils in mainstream schools.
  - d) Training courses offered to staff of a number of schools.
  - e) Sharing and loaning of specialist resources.  
(This in addition to the work that we do from our inclusion budget)
2. Expand the Communication Difficulties Base by 8 places (48 in all). (Current situation : 1 over number, 3 pupils in main body who LA recognised would be better placed in CDU, 2 pupils in main body with recent diagnosis of ASD, further parents were refused the CDU as a preference as it was full. Also offer placement for pupils with a receptive language disorder who are not currently supported by language bases). We recognise that the funding proposal would have to be amended accordingly.
3. Consider an assessment unit / nursery. (This may alter the proposal to reduce the numbers by five).

Additional considerations :-

- We will continue to support a small number of children who are very complex and whose needs are met by allocated Hayfield staff only because of surplus place funding.
- Also ask the authority to consider the difficulties in class sizes / organisation with reference to age and ability levels and fluctuating numbers.

The projected figure of 95 in May 2010 rose to 106 current, 107 in January 2011. As the number rose to above 100, because of the range of age and ability levels, it was not tenable to meet the children without creating an eleventh class. From January 2011 we will be operating with 107 children spread over 11 classes.

This is because it is typical to have classes of 14 within the MLD sector, for children aged 7 and over. For our youngest children with MLD, their needs have been proved to be best met in classes of 10 and under. It is only in exceptional circumstances that the spread of ages should be greater than 3 years. Trying to operate within 10 classes meant that the spread of age ranges within a class was greater than this and it was difficult to deliver a number of differing age and ability appropriate curricular in one class.

Whilst we appreciate that each school is unique, we would wish to see that there is fairness and transparency across the sector in any decisions that are made. We are particularly keen that Principle iii of the "Principles and Reviewing Arrangements for Commissioning Places at Wirral Special Schools" is adhered to.

Mr N Cooper  
Chair of Governors  
Hayfield School



Dear Mr Edmondson

My understanding of the purpose of the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December was to determine the principles on which we would base a policy to deal with a reverse trigger mechanism. The Governing Body of Kilgarth School and I are concerned that the seventy-five spare places are taking up £1.25m.

We were saddened that the meeting focused primarily on who would lose and who would win because we felt that the focus should have been on agreeing principles upon which the problem could be managed equitably and fairly.

Our view is that the proposals you put forward were reasonable, appropriate and just and we hope to work with you to progress the formulation of a policy at the meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011.

Jane Dawson, Headteacher  
Kilgarth School

The Governors of Stanley School have read the proposals and fully understand the thinking behind them. They thank the officers of the Local Authority for their work on this.

We agree that places need to be kept under continual review and are happy to be in dialogue with the Local Authority about this.

We would ask that the following points be taken into consideration.

We would like to further investigate the trends in the numbers. Our present fall in numbers is directly related to a situation several years ago when Elleray Park accepted a narrower range of pupils than they currently do. This led to us being oversubscribed in certain year groups to accommodate these pupils. Leavers groups over a 3 year period recently were double the normal rate. We lost half the school over this period. This is not a normal pattern.

We believe the service we offer is of the highest quality. Our Nursery is not only accredited by the National Autistic Society (a specialist qualification) but by the Effective Early Learning Project (a mainstream one). We would like the Local Authority to explore ways this expertise can be better used for pupils with mainstream Nursery providers. This point may well be true for Lyndale and Elleray Park as well. We would particularly like to see more use made of the Assessment Place facility.

Our parents tell us repeatedly that they felt that better information about the availability of special school placements should have been made earlier to them. Linked to this we feel this option should be actively promoted as a positive one by all employees of the Local Authority and would like to discuss this further.

The population of the Special Schools has never been related to the formula for funding. For many years Stanley School was full, had many challenging pupils and has only recently called on central funding for this. This was probably an error on the part of the Headteacher as it may have led to the view that there were no significant problems in the school. Staff simply coped. The fall in numbers has highlighted the conditions we worked under for many years and we feel that the current ratios more closely reflect the staffing levels required for this group of pupils – in particular the more challenging who we are able to keep within the Local Authority system. We have clear evidence of the positive impact of the current numbers on behaviour for the most challenging groups. We would welcome a dialogue on this including our use of centrally funded money.

On a general note, in view of the uncertainty around school funding we would urge caution in making changes to any Special School funding. For the CLD sector we are 'end of the line' establishments. If we cannot cope with pupils it will inevitably result in expensive Out of Authority placements.

Many thanks for giving these points your consideration.

Chair of Governors  
Stanley School

## Background

The Lyndale school at present caters for children with profound and multiple learning difficulties. About 80% use wheelchairs and are incontinent, about 80% are gastrostomy fed and 54% have epilepsy. This results in the need for a high staff / pupil ratio. For example toileting a child requires two staff. The school has at present 30 pupils and the number of places is 45.

The school is organized around the needs of the particular group of children. They can move safely around the school, they can exercise on the floor safely and there are enough staff to constantly observe their actions and reactions, as most of them are not able to communicate verbally.

The regime that is needed to educate the children has been an issue of ongoing discussion within the school. The Governing Body have discussed the issues many times and discussions have been held with Officers of the Authority, including the Director, many times in the last five years.

The Governing Body have requested over this time the Authority to jointly agree what the needs of the children are. We regret that this has still not been done.

At present the budget available to the school means that it is not viable in the long term.

We believe that the present proposals will in reality move from place led to pupil led funding.

## The proposals

Although a figure of £280,000 is given as the “extra funding” available to The Lyndale School, our estimate is that there would be a decrease of about £130,000. This is based on the removal of 5 each of the higher two bands.

This would result in our losing 2 Teachers and 4 Teaching Assistants. This would result in teaching groups of 9-10. Each class would be staffed by 1 teacher and 4-5 Teaching Assistants per group of 10. This would not allow for the staff – pupil ratio needed by the children. It must be noted that such a ratio would mean that the school would need to make requests for 1-1 staff for extra funding for individual children in terms of ensuring their safety. At present this does not need to be done in view of the staffing ratio.

## Our proposals

- An urgent review of the provision for PMLD children, starting with the needs of the children and using a “needs led” method to work out budgetary requirements.

- A review of costs of educating children out of Borough and in particular costs for PMLD children.
- That we ensure that any papers to Cabinet and Schools Forum have all of the facts needed for proper decision making.

#### Key Points

- The school has been asking for a review of finances for the last five years – a review based on the needs of children.
- The bands in the present formula need to be reviewed because of the changing needs of the children.
- Parents should be fully involved in the process.

Chair of Governors  
The Lyndale School

Dear Peter

Re: Surplus Place Funding

Since our meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> December and the information that you forwarded, the Finance Committee were able to meet and would like to submit the following views.

Whilst appreciating the needs of future pupils with SEN on the Wirral, we are concerned too, regarding the present population. In particular we have to consider those pupils currently attending Meadowside and those aspiring to attend Meadowside, in the coming year and subsequent years. This is where we consider increased funding and flexibility is required.

The opportunity to increase staff : pupil ratios, develop staff specialism and expertise; and improve provision in those schools currently benefiting from the surplus place funding is worthy, however this opportunity should be afforded to all Special Schools and not be developed through the unfair allocation of these funds. Without additional funding Meadowside cannot develop in this way.

Parents who wish their son/daughter to attend Meadowside should have access to excellent provision resourced by Meadowside. Places that are requested here should be resourced here, with opportunities for the school to develop as a centre of excellence, offering appropriate inclusive activities.

We recommend that the funds available from surplus places:

- Be recouped and retained within the SEN Sector
- Be available to fund resourced places in Special Schools requested by parents
- Be ring-fenced for Special Schools with specific criteria set for applications to be considered by a panel of Head Teachers; to meet the exceptional needs presented by individual pupils. There could be bandings of support ring-fenced for the different categories of need. This could then be used to enhance the staffing and provision around the child

We look forward to discussing this further.

Finance Committee  
Meadowside School

This page is intentionally left blank

## WIRRAL COUNCIL

### WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM – 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011

### REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

### WIRRAL SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA 2011-12

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 The current funding formula was agreed for the 3-year funding period 2008-2011. This funding period has now come to an end
- 1.2 The DfE have indicated that they do not wish to make any major changes to the distribution of the Dedicated Schools Grant for the year 2011-12, and will concentrate instead on the implementation of the National Pupil Premium.
- 1.3 Changes to the local formula will be required in order to implement the central government intention to consolidate grant funding and to implement the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

#### 2. The Minimum Funding Guarantee

- 2.1 The Minimum Funding Guarantee has been set by the DfE at -1.5%.
- 2.2 The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) baselines for all schools will be amended to include grants that are to be consolidated. This includes:
  - School Standards Grant and School Standards Grant (Personalisation)
  - School Development Grant
  - Specialist Schools
  - One to One Tuition
  - Extended Schools Sustainability
  - Extended Schools Subsidy
  - School Lunch Grants
  - National Strategies
- 2.3 The MFG baselines for primary schools with nursery classes will be amended to exclude any elements which relate to nursery pupils, to avoid double funding nursery pupils when the Early Years Single Formula is implemented in April 2011. The elements affected are:
  - AWPU
  - Nursery lump sum
  - Rates
  - IMD
  - SEN pupilsThe Early Years Single Formula will include a separate MFG calculation.

#### 3. Recalculation of Fixed Elements

- 3.1 Certain elements used in the calculation of the formula were fixed for 2008-11 to give schools budget stability for the funding period. It is proposed that these elements are updated for 2011-12 budgets using the most recent available data. Although this data is broadly similar to 2008, there are some significant movements between schools. The percentage of the total budget allocated to each element will remain the same.
  - Free School Meals – updated from the January 2011 School Census

- School IMD Score – updated from pupil postcodes in the January 2011 School Census
- Prior Attainment (secondary schools only) – current Year 7, 8 and 9 pupils' attainment at KS2. For Year 7, it is proposed to use teacher assessment data for KS2 Science results as there were no science tests in 2010.
- Sixth form ratio (secondary schools only) – updated from the January 2011 School Census
- Premises element for Special schools – the most recent floor area information will be used

#### **4. Distribution of Grants**

- 4.1 For the 2011-12 financial year, grants will be included as a new formula element. They will be allocated on the same basis as they have in previous years, using the most recent available data.

#### **5. Looked After Children**

- 5.1 Data on Looked After Children (LAC) will no longer be collected as part of the School Census. The current formula allocates funding based on the number of LAC in each school as at the January School Census.
- 5.2 A request for a separate data collection for LAC will be made. Completion of this data collection by schools will be essential for the continued allocation of funding for LAC, as Wirral does not hold data on children looked after by other local authorities who are educated in Wirral schools.

#### **6. Education Inclusion Bases and Resourced Provision**

- 6.1 Funding for Education Inclusion Bases and Resourced Provision in mainstream schools has previously been inflated each year at the same rate as the minimum funding guarantee. It is proposed that the funding for this element remains at the same cash value, rather than reducing the funding by applying the MFG rate of -1.5%.

#### **7. Indicative Budgets**

- 7.1 Indicative budgets will be provided to schools for 2012-13, with no increase in funding as indicated by the DfE.

#### **8. Requested Changes to MFG Baselines**

- 8.1 If schools have changed circumstances within the year, such as a new Education Inclusion Base provision or a change in the number of places, a report is taken to the Schools' Forum to request a change to the baseline for the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee.
- 8.2 Under new DfE regulations, any changes to MFG baselines must be approved by the Secretary of State. An application to the Secretary of State must include evidence of support from the Schools Forum.
- 8.3 If the baseline is not changed, this will distort the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee and the budget allocations.



8.4 Calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee 2011/12:

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>REASON FOR CHANGE</b>	<b>REQUESTED NEW MFG BASELINE £</b>
Devonshire Park Primary	Change to places in EIB provision	1,218,645
Wallasey School	Increased places in EIB provision	4,303,650
Bebington High School	Increased places in EIB provision	3,484,264
Hilbre High School	Increased places in EIB provision	3,679,664
Clare Mount	Place Change	1,985,012
Gilbrook School	Addition of Outreach places	891,902

8.5 Calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee 2012/13:

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>REASON FOR CHANGE</b>
Devonshire Park Primary	Change to places in EIB provision

MFG baselines can only be calculated when the allocations for 2011 have been finalised.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That:

- (1) the Schools Forum note the report
- (2) the Schools Forum agree to the recalculation of fixed elements as outlined in the report
- (3) the Schools Forum agree to support an application to the Secretary of State for MFG baseline changes

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

This page is intentionally left blank

## WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM

25<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011

### REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

#### SCHOOL REDUNDANCY COSTS

---

##### 1.0 Executive Summary

This report recommends that the existing provision for school closures in the Schools Budget of £325,000 is also used in future to meet redundancy costs in schools arising from deficit recovery plans. In addition where this is the case that schools may be asked to contribute to these costs.

##### 2.0 Background

Schools may seek to reduce their workforce and in certain circumstances make staff redundant for the following reasons:

- school closure / merger / federation
- changes in school funding
- falling school rolls
- changes in curriculum.

The LA works closely with schools and governors during this time to support changes in schools, ensuring that Employment Legislation and guidance is followed and that the intended outcome is achieved.

##### 3.0 School Finance Regulations

Guidance for the treatment of premature retirement costs are contained in School Finance Regulations. These determine make up of the Local Authority and the Schools Budget.

The Local Authority (non-schools) budget is set out in Schedule 1 of the Regulations and includes budgets for:

“Expenditure in respect of the dismissal or premature retirement of, or for the purpose of securing the resignation of, or in respect of acts of discrimination against, any person except to the extent that these costs are chargeable to the schools’ budget shares or fall within paragraph 36(b) of Schedule 2.”

Most redundancy costs have tended to fall within this category and have been charged to the LEA/Children’s Services budget where there is a budget provision of £304,000.

The Regulations quoted above give an exception in Paragraph 36(b) of Schedule 2 (Schools Budget) where redundancy costs may be charged to the schools budget. This states that expenditure on redundancy or premature retirement costs may be included for “the purpose of the schools budget where the expenditure is on termination of employment costs” provided that they are “limited to the amount

deducted by the Authority under paragraph 36 of Schedule 2 to the 2008 regulation for the previous funding period”.

This has in the past given the ability to charge some School Premature Retirement costs to the Schools Budget, for example, school closure redundancies. School Forum guidance gives the forum decision-making powers to approve the use of the schools budget for this purpose.

Guidance states, “The forum must be satisfied that there is a saving to the Schools Budget at least equal to the expenditure proposed”. Where there is a deficit recovery plan the saving to the schools budget from redundancy is a reduction in school salary costs.

#### 4.0 Redundancy Costs 2010/2011

There have been significant costs in 2010-11. These are shown below and split between school deficits and school closures.

	Teaching £	Non-Teaching £	Total £
School deficit recovery			
Primary	55,522	31,102	86,624
Secondary	437,669	114,490	552,159
Special	16,347	-	16,347
Other	22,071	-	22,071
	<u>531,609</u>	<u>145,592</u>	<u>677,207</u>
School Closure			
Primary	76,016	25,628	101,644
Secondary	578,138	46,407	624,545
	<u>654,154</u>	<u>72,035</u>	<u>726,189</u>

#### 5.0 Redundancies arising from School deficits.

The number of schools in deficit needing to agree a recovery plan has started to increase, there are notably a number of large secondary deficits arising from falling rolls and/or teaching costs exceeding resources available. Schools in deficit are required to agree their recovery plans with the LA, almost all plans will include a need to reduce teaching/non-teaching staff.

#### 6.0 School Closures

In 2007/08 the Forum agreed to create a budget to cover school closure costs. At the start of the Primary Review it was recognised that in reducing surplus places this would remove a number of expensive places and increase funding for all other schools. However, in the short term there would also be costs arising from school closure - most notably staff redundancy/premature retirement costs. In 2010 - 11 closure costs are exceptional since they include the closure of 2 secondary schools, Rock Ferry and Park High School and 1 primary school - St Laurence’s. It is not

anticipated that there will be such significant demands on this budget in future. Although one-off costs have been high, currently within the contingency budget there is a reserve of £500,000 from the closure of 5 primary schools. It is planned that this will be distributed to all schools from 2011/12 as a permanent increase to school budgets.

## 7.0 Recommendation

1. That from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 the schools budget is also used to match fund costs associated with an approved school deficit recovery plan.
2. The views of schools are sought through Headteacher groups regarding additional contributions to these costs.
3. The Forum consider a further report at its next meeting.

**David Armstrong**  
**Interim Director of Children's Services**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF WIRRAL**

### **SCHOOLS FORUM**

**JANUARY 2011**

### **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE**

### **DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF FOR VOLUNTARY AIDED, ACADEMY AND FOUNDATION SCHOOLS**

#### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1. Cabinet is currently in the process of reviewing the Council's discretionary policies with regard to the award of business rate relief to a variety of organisations including schools. It is proposed to reduce the discretionary school rate relief from April 2012.
- 1.2. Comments have been made in recent years concerning the size of Wirral's Discretionary Rate Relief Budget when compared to similar sized councils.
- 1.3. At present the net cost to schools budget from this change would be £268,000. However this will increase in line with increases in business rates. From April 2012 it is estimated that the cost would be £300,000.

#### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1. Mandatory rate relief of 80% is awarded to voluntary aided, academy and foundation schools at no cost to the Council.
- 2.2. Top up discretionary rate relief of the remaining 20% is currently awarded to the same categories of schools, however 75% of this cost is borne by the Council's Discretionary Rate Relief Budget (DRRB)
- 2.3. The cost that is borne by the DRRB for 2010-11 currently stands at approximately £581,000 of which £268,000 relates to the award for schools, by far the largest single category of award.
- 2.4. A schedule of schools currently in receipt of this top up relief is detailed in Appendix A.
- 2.5. The total DRR amount awarded to schools during 2010-11 is £357,000 of which £89,000 is a central government grant and £268,000 is a council contribution.
- 2.6. One of the options that Members are being asked to consider to reduce the burden on the Discretionary Rate Relief Budget is to cease

awarding discretionary relief in certain instances with effect from 1 April 2012. This change to schools would reduce council costs by £268,000 but would increase the amounts paid by schools by £357,000.

### **3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 The Council is under pressure to reduce the levels of discretionary rate relief. If the top up discretionary rate relief eligibility was removed from this category, a total cost of £400,000 would need to be added to the overheads covered by the Dedicated Schools Grant with effect from 2012-13. This would give the authority an annual saving of £100,000.
- 3.2 The alternative proposed is that a contribution of £300,000 from the Dedicated Schools Grant to the Discretionary Rate Relief Budget is made each year with effect from 1 April 2012. Schools would continue to receive DRR and the council would generate an equivalent revenue saving. This is £100,000 less than would otherwise be required.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Forum agrees to a contribution to the Discretionary Rate Relief Budget of £300,000 with effect from 2012-13.

IAN COLEMAN  
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE



## Appendix A

Account Id	School	Current Rv	Actual Relief Awarded	Cost to the Authority
700371819	WEATHERHEAD	540000	-£42,052.71	-£31,539.53
700057272	WIRRAL GRAMMAR (BOYS)	186000	-£15,400.80	-£11,550.60
700108985	WEST KIRBY GRAMMAR	192000	-£16,828.46	-£12,621.35
700109007	HILBRE SECONDARY	307500	-£25,461.00	-£19,095.75
700109023	WOODCHURCH HIGH	223000	-£18,464.40	-£13,848.30
700109230	WIRRAL GRAMMAR (GIRLS)	277500	-£22,977.00	-£17,232.75
700240047	CALDAY GRAMMAR	120000	-£11,117.28	-£8,337.96
70010882	SOUTH WIRRAL HIGH SCHOOL	220000	-£18,216.00	-£13,662.00
70010926	BEBINGTON HIGH SCHOOL	220000	-£18,216.00	-£13,662.00
70010936	RIDGEWAY HIGH SCHOOL	186000	-£15,400.80	-£11,550.60
70037727	ST ANSELMS COLLEGE SPORTS GROUND	4150	-£343.62	-£257.72
70037728	UPTON HALL SCHOOL	280000	-£23,184.00	-£17,388.00
70037730	DAY NURSERY ADJ ST PETERS PRIMARY	2300	-£182.49	-£136.87
70037733	PLEASINGTON HIGH SCHOOL	397500	-£32,913.00	-£24,684.75
70037735	OUR LADY OF PITY PRIMARY S ANNEXE	5700	-£311.75	-£233.81
70037737	ST ANDREWS AIDED C OF E PRIMARY	38500	-£3,187.80	-£2,390.85
70037740	ST MARYS COLLEGE	257500	-£21,321.00	-£15,990.75
70037741	WOODCHURCH C OF E SCHOOL	23000	-£1,904.40	-£1,428.30
70037742	PRIORY C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL	21500	-£1,780.20	-£1,335.15
70037743	OXTON ST SAVIOURS C OF E SCHOOL	22500	-£1,863.00	-£1,397.25
70037744	ST PETER & PAUL SCHOOL	21000	-£1,738.80	-£1,304.10
70037745	ST PETERS COMBINED SCHOOL	20000	-£1,548.62	-£1,161.47
70037746	ST PETERS C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL	34750	-£2,877.30	-£2,157.98
70037747	ST PAULS R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	14250	-£1,115.50	-£836.63
70037748	ST MICHAEL & ALL ANGELS RC PRIMARY	19500	-£1,701.36	-£1,276.02
70037749	ST LAURENCES JUNIOR SCHOOL	14250	-£1,180.95	-£885.71
70037750	ST JOSEPHS R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	39750	-£3,203.59	-£2,402.69
70037751	ST JOSEPHS R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	22250	-£1,842.30	-£1,381.73
70037752	ST JOSEPHS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL	40500	-£3,353.40	-£2,515.05
70037753	ST JOHNS JUNIOR SCHOOL	21250	-£1,737.11	-£1,302.83
70037754	ST JOHNS R C INFANT SCHOOL	19000	-£1,573.20	-£1,179.90
70037756	ST ANNES R C AIDED PRIMARY SCHOOL	20000	-£1,724.69	-£1,293.52
70037757	ST ALBANS R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	35500	-£2,939.40	-£2,204.55
70037758	SACRED HEART R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	29250	-£2,421.90	-£1,816.43
70037759	OUR LADY & ST EDWARDS SCHOOL	20000	-£1,495.26	-£1,121.45
70037760	OUR LADY OF PITY PRIMARY SCHOOL	27750	-£2,297.70	-£1,723.28
70037761	OUR LADY OF LOURDES PRIMARY SCHOOL	13000	-£1,004.20	-£753.15
70037762	LADYMOUNT RC AIDED PRIMARY SCHOOL	28250	-£2,333.81	-£1,750.36
70037763	HOLY CROSS R C PRIMARY SCHOOL	49250	-£3,937.18	-£2,952.89
70037765	DAWPOOL C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL	21000	-£1,738.80	-£1,304.10
70037766	CHRIST THE KING PRIMARY SCHOOL	34750	-£2,877.30	-£2,157.98
70037767	CHRISTCHURCH C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL	43750	-£3,622.50	-£2,716.88

70033073	ST WERBURGHS RC AIDED PRIMARY	24500	-£2,907.36	-£2,180.52
70037725	ST ANSELMS COLLEGE	206000	-£14,800.94	-£11,100.71
<b>Totals</b>			-£357,098.88	-£267,824.16

Department for Education

**SCHOOLS FORUMS:  
OPERATIONAL AND GOOD  
PRACTICE GUIDANCE**

Issued: December 2010

# **CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION	page 3
<b>SECTION 1: SCHOOLS FORUMS REGULATIONS: CONSTITUTION AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES</b>	
Regulations	page 4
Membership	page 4
Schools members	page 4
Election and nomination of schools members	page 5
Election and nomination of Academies members	page 7
Non-school members	page 8
Restrictions on membership	page 9
Recording the composition of Schools Forums	page 10
Observers	page 10
Procedures	page 11
Public access	page 12
Working groups	page 12
Urgent business	page 12
<b>SECTION 2: EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS FORUMS</b>	
Introduction	page 14
The role of Executive Elected Members	page 15
Attendance of local authority officers at meetings	page 16
Administration of the business of Schools Forums	page 16
Clerking the Schools Forum	page 17
Meeting notes and recording decisions	page 18
Resources of the Schools Forum	page 18
Agenda setting	page 18
Chairing the Schools Forum	page 20
Communication	page 20
<b>SECTION 3: INDUCTION AND TRAINING</b>	
Induction of new members	page 22
Training	page 22
<b>SECTION 4: FURTHER INFORMATION AND CONTACT DETAILS</b>	
Web links	page 24
Contact details	page 24
<b>ANNEX A</b>	
Suggested Model Format for Schools Forum Papers	page 25

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This guide is designed to provide members of Schools Forums, local authority officers and elected members with advice, guidance and information on good practice in relation to the operation of Schools Forums.
2. It is organised in four sections:
  - Section 1 provides information on the constitutional and procedural requirements as set out in the Schools Forums Regulations<sup>1</sup>.
  - Section 2 covers a number of key aspects of the operation of Schools Forums at local level, drawing on good practice from a number of Schools Forums.
  - Section 3 provides information on the kinds of induction, training material and activities that local authorities should consider providing to members of their Schools Forum.
  - Section 4 contains information on sources of further information and Departmental contact details.
3. The guide draws on the experience and knowledge of Schools Forum members, local authority members and officers and the Department and its partners. Other than where it is describing requirements set out in the Regulations it is not designed to be prescriptive – what is good practice in one Schools Forum may not be appropriate in another, given the diverse circumstances of local areas. However, it is hoped the guide will stimulate some debate within Schools Forums and contribute to their ongoing development.
4. The Department hopes that Schools Forums and local authorities find this guide useful. It has been the subject of consultation with a wide variety of external partners. In particular, members of the Department's School Funding Implementation Group, made up of representatives of head teachers and governors, the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS) and the Local Government Association, have provided valuable input and advice on the content of the guide. The Department is grateful for their assistance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2010 (S.I. 2010/344)

## **SECTION 1**

### **SCHOOLS FORUM REGULATIONS: CONSTITUTION AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

#### **Regulations**

1.1. National regulations govern the composition, constitution and procedures of Schools Forums. Local authorities can provide Schools Forum members with a copy of these regulations or alternatively they can be accessed at:

*[Schools forums - The Department for Education](#)*

#### **Membership**

1.2. The regulations provide a framework for the appointment of members, but allow a considerable degree of discretion in order to accommodate local priorities and practice.

1.3. A forum must have at least 15 members. No maximum size is stipulated, and authorities will wish to take various issues into account in deciding the actual size, including the need to have full representation for various types of school, and the authority's policy on representation of non-schools members. However, care should be taken to keep the forum to a reasonable size.

1.4. Types of member. Forums must have 'schools members', 'non-schools members' and Academy member(s) if there is at least one Academy in the authority's area. Schools and Academy members together must number at least two-thirds of the total membership of the forum and the balance between primary, secondary and academies members should be broadly proportionate to the pupil numbers in each category. It is for the local authority to determine the length of members' terms of office.

#### **Schools members**

1.5. Schools members represent specified phases or types of schools within the authority. At the least, Schools Forums must contain representatives of two groups of schools: primary and secondary schools. The numbers of members in each group should be proportionate to the ratio of pupils in each phase. Beyond this, Schools Forums must also include representatives of special schools and nursery schools, if local authorities maintain such schools.

1.6. Where a local authority maintains one or more special schools the Schools Forum should have at least one schools member from that sector. The same applies to nursery schools.

1.7. Middle schools are treated according to their deemed status and while there is no specific provision in the regulations to require separate representation of middle schools it is good practice to ensure that all the various age phases of schools in an authority have adequate representation. Where middle Schools exist, therefore, many local authorities include them as a separate group in the membership structure of Schools Forums.

1.8. The authority then has discretion to divide the groups referred to in paragraph 1.5 into one or more of the following sub-groups–

- head teachers or head teachers’ representatives in each group;
- governors in each group;
- head teachers or head teachers representatives and governors in each group;
- representatives of the particular school category.

Head teachers can be represented by other senior members of staff within their school. Governors can include interim executive members of an interim executive board. The sub-groups do not have to be of equal size – for example, there may be more representatives of head teachers of primary schools than governors of such schools, or vice versa. It is good practice for Schools Forums to aim for a membership structure based on an equal proportion of head teachers and governors, though this is not always possible for a variety of reasons. Nevertheless it is important that even where equal numbers of head teachers and governors cannot be achieved there is sufficient representation of each type of schools member in each group to ensure debate within the forum is balanced and representative.

1.9. Where the authority is considering dividing one or more of the groups into sub-groups consisting of representatives of the particular school categories in order to ensure separate representation of the various types of school (such as community, voluntary and foundation) as well as one or more of the other sub-groups referred to in paragraph 1.8, it might wish to take into account any resulting complexity and size before making the decision.

1.10. Whatever the membership structure of schools members on a forum, the important issue is that it should reflect most effectively the profile of schools across the authority to ensure that there is not an in-built bias towards any one phase or group.

1.11. The term of office for each schools member should be stipulated by the authority at the time of appointment. Such stipulation should follow published rules and be applied in a consistent manner as between members. They need not have identical terms – there may be a case for varied terms so that there is continuity of experience rather than there being a complete change in the membership at a single point.

#### Election and nomination of schools members

1.12. The relevant group or sub-group is probably best placed to determine how their schools members should be elected.

1.13. We would recommend to those who draw up the scheme that a vacancy amongst a community primary school head teachers' group would be filled by a nominee elected according to a process that has been determined by all the community primary school head teachers in the local authority and in which all community primary school head teachers had the opportunity to stand for election and/or vote in such an election.

1.14. Similarly, if a local authority's Schools Forum has, say, a sub-group of Voluntary Aided and Foundation secondary school governors, we would recommend that all governors of such schools are eligible to stand for election and all can vote in any such election.

1.15. As outlined above, the composition of Schools Forum should be constructed in such a way that ensures that any potential schools member holding a single office/position (head teacher or governor) can represent only one group or sub-group. However it would be quite legitimate for a single person who holds multiple offices/positions to be eligible for membership of more than one group or sub-group. A person who is a governor of, say, a primary school and a secondary school is able to stand in elections as a representative of either group but can be appointed to represent only one of those groups.

1.16. The purpose of ensuring that each group or sub-group is responsible for their election process is to guarantee that there is a transparent process by which members of Schools Forums are nominated to represent their constituents. Some groups and sub-groups may face logistical and administrative difficulties firstly in determining the process for their elections and secondly in running such elections.

1.17. Appropriate support to each group or sub-group to manage their election processes should be offered by the clerk of a Schools Forum, or the committee/democratic services of a local authority. This may just include the provision of advice but may also consist of providing administrative support in actually running the elections themselves.

1.18. As a minimum, we would recommend that the clerk of a Schools Forum make a record of the process by which the constituents of each group and sub-group elect their nominees to the Schools Forum and be able to advise the Chair of the Schools Forum and local authority on action that needs to be taken, where necessary, to seek new nominees.

1.19. In determining the process by which elections should be operated it is perfectly legitimate for a local authority to devise, in consultation with their Schools Forum, a model scheme for the constituents of a group or sub-group to consider and be invited to adopt. However, such a model scheme cannot be imposed on any constituency: adaptations and /or alternative schemes may be adopted. A single scheme need not be adopted by each constituency.

1.20. In fact, schemes are very likely to differ in substance between different



sized constituencies or between those constituencies that have an existing 'parent' group and those that do not. For instance, within most local authorities there are head teacher associations. These may serve as an appropriate vehicle for the organisation of elections. However, care should be taken to ensure that every possible eligible member of a constituency has an opportunity to be involved in the determination of their group's election process and is given the opportunity to stand for election if they choose to do so.

1.21. It would not be compliant with the Regulations for the steering committee or chair of a 'parent' group simply to make a nomination to represent their group or sub-group on a Schools Forum. Schools members must be elected (but see below).

1.22 The local authority may set a date by which the election should take place and must appoint the schools member if the election has not taken place by that date. The person appointed should be a member of the relevant group.

1.23 We would recommend that any scheme takes into account a number of factors;

- a. the process for collecting names of those wishing to stand for election;
- b. the timescale for notifying all constituents of the election and those standing;
- c. the arrangements for dispatching and receiving ballots;
- d. the arrangements for counting and publicising the results;
- e. any arrangements for unusual circumstances such as only one candidate standing in an election; and
- f. whether existing members can stand for re-election.

1.24 In the event of a tie between two or more candidates, then the local authority must appoint the schools member instead. The authority may decide to appoint one of the candidates rather than someone else and might wish to take into account the experience or expertise of the individuals, and the balance between different types of school represented on the Forum.

#### Election and nomination of Academies members

1.25 Academies members must be elected by the governing bodies of the Academies in the authority's area, and they are probably best placed to determine the process. Academies members are there to represent the governing bodies of Academies and are, therefore, not necessarily restricted to principals, senior staff or governors. The same factors should be taken into

account as for the election of schools members, set out in paragraph 1.23.

1.26 Where there is only one Academy in the authority's area, then their governing body must select the person who will represent them.

1.27 As with schools members, the local authority may set a date by which the election should take place and must appoint an Academies member if the election does not take place by that date, or if an election results in a tie between two or more candidates.

#### Non-schools members

1.28 Non-schools members may number no more than a third of a forum's total membership (excluding observers – see paragraph 1.44). The authority must appoint at least one person to represent the local authority 14-19 partnership and at least one person to represent early years providers from the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector. Early years PVI settings need to be represented because funding for the free entitlement for three and four year olds comes from the Schools Budget, and authorities are required to introduce the Early Years Single Funding Formula from April 2011.

1.29 The authority may also appoint additional non-schools members to the forum to represent the interests of other bodies but, before doing so, they must consider whether the Church of England and Roman Catholic dioceses situated in the authority's area; and, where there are schools or Academies in the area with a different religious character, the appropriate faith group, should be represented on the forum. If diocesan authorities nominate members for appointment as non-schools members they may wish to consider what type of representative would be most appropriate – schools-based such as a head teacher or governor, or someone linked more generally with the diocese.

1.30 It is also good practice for local authorities to ensure that the needs and interests of all the pupils in the local authority are adequately represented by the members of a Schools Forum. The interests of pupils in maintained schools can be represented by schools members. Some pupils in a local authority, however, are not in maintained schools but instead are educated in Pupil Referral Units (PRUs), now called short stay schools, hospitals, independent special schools and non-maintained special schools. Certain types of non-schools members can play an important role in representing the interests of these groups of pupils. They can also play a role in representing the interests and views of the services that support those groups of vulnerable and at-risk pupils who nevertheless are on the roll of maintained schools, such as looked after children and children with special educational needs.

1.31 The purpose of non-schools members is also to bring greater breadth of discussion to forum meetings and ensure that stakeholders and partners other than schools are represented. Organisations which typically provide non-schools members are trades unions, professional associations and representatives of youth groups. Parent groups could also be considered.

However, as there are clearly limited numbers of non-schools members able to be on a Schools Forum, care should be taken to ensure that an appropriate representation from wider stakeholders is achieved.

1.32 The length of term of office for non-schools members is at the discretion of the authority. Schools and Academies must be informed, within a month of the appointment of any non-schools member, of the name of the member and the name of the body that that member represents.

#### Restrictions on membership

1.33 There are two important restrictions placed on who can be a non-schools member of a Schools Forum. Firstly, the local authority cannot appoint an elected member of the local authority who is appointed to the executive of that authority (a lead member/portfolio holder) 'executive members'. Secondly, the local authority cannot appoint the Director of Children's Services or any officer employed or engaged to work under the management of the Director of Children's Services, and who does not directly provide education to children (or manage those who do) ('relevant officer').

1.34 In practice this second restriction will apply to the Director of Children's Services, Assistant Directors and other senior officers with a specific role in strategic financial management and/or who are responsible for the funding formula for schools.

1.35 Schools Forums have the power to approve a limited range of proposals from their local authority: the restrictions ensure that there is no conflict of interest between the proposing body (the local authority) and the approving body (the Schools Forum).

1.36 However, non-executive elected members and those officers who are employed in their capacity as head teachers or teachers or are otherwise engaged to provide direct support to pupils are eligible to be members of forums.

1.37 In the case of non-executive elected members, they may be either a schools member (by virtue of them being a school governor) or a non-schools member. As a non-schools member they would be well placed to fulfil the broader overview and scrutiny role they have within the local authority in general.

1.38 Officers who are employed as teachers or head teachers such as teachers-in-charge of PRUs (short stay schools) are eligible for membership. So too are those who work for, and those who directly manage, a service which provides education to individual children and/or advice to schools on, for example, learning and behavioural matters.

1.39 So, for example, an officer working for or directly managing an education service for looked after children or pupils with sensory difficulties can be a non-schools member of a Schools Forum as they are well placed to

represent the needs and interests of a particular group of pupils.

1.40 School improvement partners are also able to be non-schools members of a Schools Forum as they will be able to bring an additional professional voice to debates.

1.41 However, the inclusion of non-executive elected members, certain officers or school improvement partners is not a requirement. Many Schools Forums do not have such members on them and it is for each local authority and Schools Forum to consider how best to ensure the right balance of school and non-school representation on the forum, taking into account their local circumstances and preferences.

#### Recording the composition of Schools Forums

1.42 Each local authority must make a written record of the composition of its Schools Forum detailing the numbers of schools members and by which group or sub-group they were elected, the number of Academies members and the number of non-schools members, their terms of office, how they were chosen and whom they represent. This record should also indicate the term of office for schools and Academies members.

1.43 As well as the term of office coming to an end, a member ceases to be a member of the Schools Forum if he or she resigns from the forum or no longer occupies the office by which he or she became eligible for election, selection or appointment to the forum. For example, a schools member representing community primary school governors who is no longer a governor of a community primary school in the relevant authority must cease to hold office on the Schools Forum even if they remain a governor of a school represented by another group or sub-group. Other situations in which membership of the Forum ends are if a member resigns from the forum by giving notice in writing to the authority and, in the case of a non-schools member, the member is replaced by the authority, at the request of the body which the member represents, by another person nominated by that body.

#### Observers

1.44 The Regulations provide that any elected member or officer of the authority who is not a member of the Schools Forum is entitled to attend and speak at a forum. This is to ensure that, while not members of Schools Forums, executive elected members and senior officers with responsibility for strategic resource management have a clear right to participate in any discussions that the Schools Forum may have, particularly where a local authority has asked its Schools Forum to approve a proposal. Where this is the case it is good practice that the executive member and/or senior officer is able to speak to such an item and respond to any queries the Schools Forum raises. Elected members and officers of an authority who are not members of the schools forum are only entitled to attend and speak at a forum in their official capacity and not in any personal capacity.

## Procedures

1.45 Many procedural matters are not prescribed in the Regulations and are at the discretion either of the authority or the forum itself. However, there are requirements in the Regulations relating to:

a. quorum: A meeting is only quorate if 40% of the total membership is present (this excludes any observers, and it is 40% of the current membership excluding vacancies). If a meeting is inquorate it can proceed but it cannot legally take decisions (e.g. election of a chair, or a decision relating to funding conferred by the funding regulations). An inquorate meeting can respond to authority consultation, and give views to the authority. It would normally be good practice for the authority to take account of such 'unofficial' views, but it is not legally obliged to do so. In practice, the arrangements for meetings should be made to reduce the chance of a problem with quora. The quorum stipulation is in the Regulations to help ensure the legitimacy of decisions;

b. election of a chair: Under the Regulations, if the position of chair falls vacant the forum must decide how long the term of office of the next chair will be. This can be for any period, but the forum should consider carefully whether a period exceeding two years is sensible. A long period will also cause problems if the member elected as chair has a term of office as a member which comes to an end before their term of office as chair ends. The forum should then elect a chair from amongst its own members except that any non-executive elected member or eligible officer who is a member of a forum may not hold the office of chair;

c. voting procedures: The Regulations provide that a forum may determine its own voting procedures. The powers which Schools Forums have to take decisions on a range of funding matters increase the importance of clear procedures. These procedures should take account of any use of working groups by the forum – for example a decision might be taken by voting to accept a report by a working group (see also below). As part of any voting procedure there should be clarity in the procedures for recording the outcome of a vote, and any resolutions a Schools Forum makes in relation to any vote taken;

d. substitutes: the local authority must make arrangements to enable substitutes to attend and vote at forum meetings. This applies to schools members, Academies members and non-schools members. The arrangements must be decided in consultation with forum members.

e. defects and vacancies: the Regulations provide that proceedings of the forum are not invalidated by defects in the election

or appointment of any member, or the appointment of the chair. Nor does the existence of any vacancy on the forum invalidate proceedings (see paragraph 1.45(a) on quorum).

f. timing: Schools Forums must meet at least four times a year

1.46 Where the Regulations make no provision on a procedural matter, local discretion should be exercised. It is for the authority to decide how far it wishes to establish rules for the Schools Forum to follow, in the form of standing orders. While it is entitled to do so, it is of course good practice to allow the forum to set its own rules so far as possible.

### Public access

1.47 Schools Forums are more than just consultative bodies. They also have an important role to play in approving certain proposals from their local authority and are therefore involved in the decision making process surrounding the use of public money at local level. Schools Forums should consider how best to ensure that their proceedings are subject to public scrutiny. Local authority council meetings and committee meetings are held in public except in certain specified cases and Schools Forums should start from the presumption that there is no reason not to allow public access.

1.48 Some Schools Forums already operate very much along the lines of a local authority committee. This is perfectly legitimate where there is such local preference. Certainly papers, agendas and minutes should be publicly available. This is most easily achieved by publishing them on a website.

### Working Groups

1.49 It is open to a Schools Forum to set up working groups of members to discuss specific issues, and to produce draft advice and decisions for the forum itself to consider. The groups can also include wider representation - for example, an early years reference group can represent all the different types of provider to consider the detail of the early years single funding formula. The reference group would then be able to give its considered view on the local authority's proposals to the Forum. It is not good practice (though it is legal, if properly decided upon and recorded) for the forum to delegate actual decisions or the finalisation of advice to a working group, as this may have the effect of excluding legitimate points of view.

### Urgent business

1.50 It is good practice for the local authority to agree with its Schools Forum an urgency procedure to be followed when there is a genuine business need for a decision or formal view to be expressed by the forum, before the next scheduled meeting. The authority may of course call an unscheduled meeting; but it may also wish to put in place alternative arrangements such as clearance by email correspondence or some other means. Such instances should be avoided so far as possible but are legitimate provided all members

of the forum have an opportunity to participate and the logistics provide a reasonable opportunity for consideration.

1.51 It is not legal for the chair to take a decision on behalf of the forum, no matter how urgent the matter in question; but a forum may wish to put in place a procedure for the Chair to give the authority a view on an urgent issue.

## **SECTION 2**

### **EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS FORUMS**

#### **Introduction**

2.1. As the previous section outlined, local authorities have responsibility for establishing Schools Forums. They also have an ongoing responsibility to provide them with appropriate support, information and guidance in carrying out their functions and responsibilities.

2.2. The following outlines some aspects of what local authorities and Schools Forums should consider in ensuring that their Schools Forums are as effective as possible

2.3. Central to the effectiveness or otherwise of a Schools Forum will be the relationship between it and its local authority. The local authority will have a significant influence on this: the support it provides; the resources it devotes and the weight it gives to the views of Schools Forums all contribute to the nature of the relationship. There are therefore a number of characteristics of this relationship that are particularly important:

2.4. *Partnership:* The work of the Schools Forum is likely to be most effective when there is a genuine partnership between it and its local authority. In practice this means having a shared understanding of the priorities, issues and concerns of schools and the local authority. However, it also means being honest and open where there are some tensions or disagreements over priorities. Overall there should be a shared commitment to working together on the agreed priorities and understanding of the contribution that can be made by each side to their achievement.

2.5. *Effective Support:* The local authority is the main source of support and guidance to a Schools Forum. It is vital therefore that the business of the Schools Forum is supported by the local authority in an efficient and professional manner. The management of meeting cycles, production of papers and the provision of good quality advice and guidance all contribute to the effectiveness of Schools Forums.

2.6. *Openness:* It is important that a Schools Forum feels it is receiving open and honest advice from its local authority. In the vast majority of cases this is the situation, but there will inevitably be some issues about which a local authority and its Schools Forum may disagree. This can cause tension but a Schools Forum should be able to feel that it is receiving all the information it needs to reach necessary decisions or informed views.

2.7. *Responsiveness:* Local authorities should as far as possible be responsive to requests from their Schools Forums. These may include requests to discuss particular topics or issues as well as requests for information, data or other support. However, Schools Forums themselves



should also be aware of the resource implications of their requests. The resources (both officer time and other resources) that a local authority devotes to the Schools Forum are a local matter that ideally should be discussed and agreed between the local authority and Schools Forum. Within the resources available, Schools Forums should have a degree of control over the issues they consider and information provided. Beyond this, local authorities will want to support their Schools Forum as far as they are able but Schools Forums should also take a realistic view of the resource implications of any requests they make.

2.8. *Strategic view:* Schools Forums are most effective when they take a strategic view of the issues they are considering. While members of a Schools Forum are representatives of their specific sector or phase, they should be able to consider the needs of the whole of the educational community, rather using their position on a Schools Forum to advance their own sectional or specific interests. Schools Forum chairs have a particularly important role in ensuring that this is the case: they can influence the kinds of issues and topics discussed and should set the tone for the discussions at meetings. Equally, local authorities have a role in ensuring that all members of a Schools Forum are well briefed and able to participate fully in discussions.

2.9. *Challenge and Scrutiny:* Schools Forums may be asked to agree to proposals from their local authority that will have an effect on all schools in the local area. The extent to which forums can scrutinise and challenge such proposals is an important aspect of their effectiveness. Many local authorities and Schools Forums pride themselves on the collegiate nature of their relationship and the consensus by which they operate: others may be less concerned about this. Whatever the nature of the relationship, however, there will be instances where it is incumbent on a Schools Forum to challenge and scrutinise a local authority's decisions, proposals or existing arrangements. Effective local authorities and Schools Forums manage this well and while agreement can often be reached under relatively informal circumstances, it is vital that there are formal procedures in place to ensure that any decisions the Schools Forum makes are reached in an appropriate and transparent manner.

2.10. The characteristics identified above are just some of the aspects that will contribute to an effective Schools Forum. The following provides more detail on some of the specific issues that local authorities and Schools Forums may wish to consider in thinking about their own arrangements.

#### The role of Executive Elected Members

2.11. A Schools Forum needs to ensure that there are systems in place for executive members of the Council to be aware of its views on specific issues and, in particular, any decisions it takes in relation to the Schools Budget and individual budget shares.

2.12. It is common for an executive member (usually the portfolio holder with

responsibility for schools or children's services) to attend Schools Forum meetings. By doing so such elected members are able to contribute to the discussion and receive first-hand the views of the forum: it is clearly good practice for this to be the case and the regulations provide the right for executive members to attend and speak at forum meetings. However, there is no requirement for this to happen so at the very least there should be clear channels of communication between the Schools Forum and executive members.

#### Attendance of local authority officers at meetings

2.13. There is no requirement for specific officers to attend meetings of the Schools Forum beyond any officers who, in consequence of local decisions, are non-schools members of the Forum. However, as with executive members it is clearly good practice for the senior manager with resource responsibilities, and perhaps the Director of Children's Services, or senior manager with school improvement responsibilities, to attend meetings.

2.14. It is important to consider the capacity in which officers who are not members of a forum attend the meetings of their forum. In practice, it is usual for officers to have prepared the papers and information for the forum, present the papers at meetings and participate in any discussion. This will usually suffice, but on particularly contentious matters Schools Forums may want to consider what, if any, further information is needed, beyond that supplied, to reach an informed decision.

2.15. While processes should not be excessively bureaucratic or time-consuming, both the local authority and the Schools Forum should consider how such situations can best be managed to provide assurance to all schools that fair and effective decisions are being reached.

2.16. Also, in the majority of cases Schools Forums are supported by a specific officer. In the course of their work, however, Schools Forums will be required to consider a whole range of issues and they may consider it appropriate that other officers attend for specific items of business. Where this is the case, the local authority should meet the Schools Forum's requests as far as possible.

#### Administration of the business of Schools Forums

2.17. The vast majority of a Schools Forum's business will be transacted on the basis of prepared papers. It is therefore important that these are of a high standard and produced in a timely and consistent manner.

2.18. It is good practice for the Schools Forum and local authority to agree a standard for these. It is usual for papers to be dispatched at least one week prior to the meeting at which they will be discussed to allow members to consider them and if necessary canvass views from the group they are representing. Consideration should be given to whether papers should automatically have a wider distribution to enable representations to be made

to Forum members.

2.19. Consistency in the presentation of papers also contributes to the effectiveness of meetings: it helps set the tone of meetings, facilitate the engagement of all members and signal the importance the local authority attaches to the work of the Schools Forum. Ideally such a standard should be agreed between the Schools Forum and local authority. Annex A provides a suggested model format for papers.

### Clerking the Schools Forum

2.20. Clerking of a Schools Forum should be seen as more than just writing a note of the meeting. A good clerk provides an invaluable link between the members of the Forum, the chair and the local authority. It is a role often undertaken by an employee of the local authority though in some cases independent clerks are used.

2.21. Clerks should manage the logistics of the meeting in terms of ensuring dispatch of papers and producing a note from the meeting. In considering the style of meeting notes consideration should be given to making them intelligible enough for non-attendees to get a sense of the discussion as well as clearly indicating the conclusion and action agreed in relation to each agenda item. Verbatim reports of a Schools Forum's discussion, however, are unlikely to be very useful. Schools Forums may consider whether a simple action log should be maintained by the clerk to ensure all action points agreed are followed up.

2.22. Beyond this a good clerk can:

- a. provide the route by which Schools Forum members can access further information and co-ordinate communication to Schools Forum members outside of the formal meeting cycle;
- b. respond to any queries about the business of the Schools Forum from head teachers, governors and others who are not on the Schools Forum themselves;
- c. be responsible for ensuring contact details of all members are up to date;
- d. maintain the list of members on the Forum and advise on membership issues in general;
- e. assist with the co-ordination of nomination/election processes run by the constituent groups;
- f. keep the Schools Forum website up to date: e.g. by posting latest minutes and papers etc;
- g. monitor, on a regular basis, the Schools Forum and general Schools Funding section of the Department for Education (DfE)

website; and arrange for the distribution of any relevant DfE information to Schools Forum members;

- h. if appropriate, provide technical advice in relation to the Schools Forum regulations and in relation to the operation of a Schools Forum's local constitution; and
- i. organise, operate and record any voting activity of the Schools Forum in line with the provisions of its local constitution.

2.23. Not all of these tasks may be able to be undertaken by the Schools Forum clerk. However, each one is important and there should be arrangements in place to ensure they are discharged adequately.

#### Meeting notes and recording of decisions

2.24. A vital part of the effective operation of Schools Forums is to ensure that an accurate record of the meeting is taken, including, where appropriate recording the outcome of any votes and decisions taken.

2.25. Notes or minutes of each Schools Forum meeting should be produced as soon after the meeting as possible to enable members and others to see the outcome of any discussions and decisions/votes. It is good practice to formally agree the accuracy of the note/minutes at a subsequent meeting.

#### Resources of the Schools Forum

2.26. The costs of a Schools Forum fall in the retained budget portion of the Schools Budget of local authorities. Nationally there is variation in the level of funding local authorities identify against Schools Forum expenditure: the median expenditure in 2010-11 was £21,000.

2.27. It is legitimate to charge the running costs of Schools Forums to this budget including any agreed expenses for members attending meetings, the costs of producing and distributing papers and costs room hire and refreshments and for clerking of meetings. Beyond these costs some Schools Forums have a budget of their own to use for activities such as commissioning research or other reports. The level of resource devoted to Schools Forums is a matter for local authorities, though it is clearly good practice for this to be discussed with their Schools Forum.

#### Agenda Setting

2.28. The process by which the agenda for a meeting or cycle of meetings is set is in many respects one of the key determinants of the effectiveness or otherwise of a Schools Forum.

2.29. The frequency and timing of meetings of the forum should be agreed in advance of each financial and/or academic year. In drawing up this cycle of meetings, in consultation with the Schools Forum, the local authority should

provide a clear overview of the key consultative and decision-making points in the school funding cycle. These will be drawn from a combination of national and local information and should inform the basic agenda items that each meeting needs to cover. For instance meetings will need to be scheduled at appropriate points to enable the Schools Forum to consider the outcomes of local consultations and national announcements.

2.30 Regulations state that the local authority must consult the Schools Forum annually in connection with various schools budget functions, namely:

- arrangements for the education of pupils with special educational needs
- arrangements for the use of pupil referral units and the education of children otherwise than at school
- arrangements for early years provision
- arrangements for insurance
- administrative arrangements for the allocation of central government grants paid to schools via the authority
- arrangements for free school meals

2.31 Consultation must also take place when a local authority is proposing a contract for supplies and services which is to be funded from the Schools Budget and is in excess of the EU Procurement thresholds. The consultation must cover the terms of the contract at least one month prior to the issue of invitations to tender.

2.32 The Forum has the responsibility of informing the governing bodies of all schools maintained by the authority of the results of any consultations carried out by the authority relating to the issues in paragraphs 2.30 and 2.31.

2.33 Schools Forums generally have a consultative role. However, there are situations in which they have decision-making powers. The respective roles of Forums, local authorities and the DfE are summarised in Table 1. The areas on which Forums make decisions on local authority proposals are:

- Breaches of the central expenditure limit – if it is proposed that spending on central expenditure within the Schools Budget should rise faster than the Schools Budget as a whole
- Charges to the Schools Budget relating to prudential borrowing, termination of employment costs, special educational needs transport costs and contributions to combined services. In the case of the first three, the Forum must be satisfied that there is a saving to the Schools Budget at least equal to the expenditure proposed and, in the case of combined budgets, that there is an educational benefit from the expenditure

- The level of the schools' specific contingency; the contingency can be used where a governing body has incurred expenditure which it would be unreasonable to expect them to meet from the school's budget share, to correct errors, and to fund in-year increases in budgets

In each of these cases, the local authority can appeal to the DfE if the Schools Forum rejects its proposal.

2.34 In 2011-12, local authorities will also need to agree with their schools forum if they wish to set the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) at a higher level than -1.5% or disapply it for the early years single funding formula. Any other proposals to vary the MFG will need to be discussed with the schools forum but will need to be approved by the Secretary of State. Beyond this, however, local authorities and Schools Forums may want to consider issues of an essentially local nature such as the specific operation of a factor in the funding formula or other matters relating to local school funding issues.

#### Chairing the Schools Forum

2.35 The chair of a Schools Forum plays a key role in setting the tone, pace and overall dynamic of the forum. They should provide an environment within which all members are able to contribute fully to discussions and guide the forum to making well informed decisions.

2.36 The relationship between the chair and the local authority is therefore vital. The chair should be very clear on the substance of the agenda items, understand the issues involved and the decisions and/or actions that need to be taken in respect of the Forum business. It is good practice for there to be a pre-meeting between the senior officer of the authority supporting the Schools Forum and the chair and vice-chair of the Forum to ensure that all the issues are clearly understood.

2.37 Equally, the chair has the responsibility of representing the views of the Schools Forum back to the local authority: for instance, they should, where appropriate, take the initiative to make suggestions for improvements to the way the business is conducted, and, in exceptional cases and with support of the members of the Schools Forum take the view that they do not have sufficient information on which to base a decision and ask that an item is deferred until further information is available. However, in doing so, the Chair and Schools Forum should be fully aware of the consequences of deferral.

#### Communication

2.38. Communication to the wider educational community of the discussions and debates of, and decisions made by, Schools Forums is fundamental to their effective operation. The more schools and other stakeholders know about the proceedings of Schools Forums, the more their work will be an important and central part of the context of local educational funding. This is

particularly important given the decision making role that Schools Forums have.

2.39. Each Schools Forum should therefore be clear what its channels of communication are. One channel is to ensure that all its agenda, minutes and papers are publicly available – ideally through web-pages devoted to the work of the Schools Forum. However, the Schools Forum should also consider additional communication processes. These could include:

- a. an annual report on the proceedings of the Schools Forum;
- b. the reporting back by Schools Forum members to their 'parent' group of the business of the forum. This can be a particularly useful method of ensuring that Schools Forum members have an ongoing dialogue with the constituents of their group or sub-group and are therefore well able to represent their views at Schools Forum meetings;
- c. attendance by the chair, or other Schools Forum member, at other relevant consultative or management groups such as any capital working group; or senior management meetings of the Children's Services Department; or
- d. a brief email to all schools and other stakeholders after each Schools Forum meeting informing them of the discussions and decisions with a link to the full papers and minutes for further information.

## **SECTION 3**

### **INDUCTION AND TRAINING**

#### **Induction of new members**

3.1. When new members join the Schools Forum appropriate induction materials should be provided. These might include material relating to the operation of the Forum together with background information about the local and national school funding arrangements. Typically they might comprise:

- a. the constitution of the Forum
- b. a list of members including contact details and their terms of office
- c. any locally agreed terms of reference explaining the relationship between the Schools Forum and the local authority
- d. copies of minutes of previous meetings
- e. the programme of Schools Forum meetings for the year
- f. the local Schools Forum web address (where appropriate)

3.2. This Operational and Good Practice Guide, suitably supplemented by local material, should also be provided to new members on their appointment.

3.3. Where there is sufficient turnover of School Forum members in any particular year the authority may wish to organise a one-off induction event to brief new members. Such an event would usefully include an outline of the role of the Schools Forum and the national funding arrangements for schools and local authorities. It might also include an explanation of the local funding formula and any proposals for review. The opportunity could also be taken to explain the main reporting requirements for school and local authority expenditure.

#### **Training**

3.4. Ideally Schools Forum members should be able to use some of the budget set aside for Schools Forum running costs for accessing training activities. Some training will be provided by officers of the local authority but members may wish to attend national or regional events, the costs of which where necessary can be supported from the Schools Forum budget.

3.5. Training will need to be provided in response to any changes in the role of the Schools Forum and national developments in respect of school funding.



### *News updates*

3.6. Most, but not all, members of the Schools Forum will already be in receipt of regular information on school funding matters from the local authority and DfE. Other Schools Forum members should be copied into such information flows so that they can be kept abreast of developments between meetings.

3.7. Many local authorities have already established dedicated Schools Forum websites on which they post key information for Schools Forum members and other interested parties. Consideration also needs to be given to the provision of hard copy news updates for all members of the forum and particularly for those who do not have ready access to the web.

## **SECTION 4**

### **FURTHER INFORMATION AND CONTACT DETAILS**

#### Web links

4.1. The Department's website contains details of all the announcements, documents and other information relating to school funding and Schools Forums. This website also has a range of useful links to other sites that may be of relevance to Schools Forum members.

4.2. The following address links to the main school funding page which has links to the latest news items on schools funding and all the latest information.

[\*Schools revenue funding - The Department for Education\*](#)

4.3. The following address links to the dedicated Schools Forum pages on the website.

[\*Schools forums - The Department for Education\*](#)

#### Contact details

4.4. There is a dedicated email address for members of Schools Forums or other stakeholders to send in queries questions or requests for information.

The email address itself is:

[Schools.Forums@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Schools.Forums@education.gsi.gov.uk)

4.5 In addition to this dedicated email box, members of the Funding Policy and Efficiency Team in the Department are able to provide advice and guidance on the operation of Schools Forums:

Keith Howkins

Tel: 020 7227 5163

[Keith.howkins@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Keith.howkins@education.gsi.gov.uk)

The postal address of the Department is:

Funding Policy and Efficiency Team

Department for Education

Sanctuary Buildings

Great Smith Street

Westminster

London

SW1P 3BT

## **SUGGESTED MODEL FORMAT FOR SCHOOLS FORUM PAPERS**

A useful format is one that contains, as a minimum:

- a. a short introduction outlining the issue under discussion;
- b. a summary of the key points;
- c. a clear signal of the recommendations and what action needs to be taken in response to the paper – e.g. is it for information, decision or comment etc;
- d. a background/discussion section expanding on the summary and action required;
- e. reference to previous related papers;
- f. consistent style and language (for instance in the use of acronyms);
- g. a clear numbering system which as a minimum allows members to identify the date at which the paper and any attached annexes were discussed and the agenda item number to which they relate.

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCHOOLS' FORUM MEMBERSHIP as at 1st December 2010

## Appendix A

Group	Name	Category of Membership	SCHOOL	Date of Election	Date of renewal	Address Type	Mailing Name	Address1	Address 2	Address 3	Address 4	Postcode	E-MAIL
Schools	Steve Dainty	Primary Headteacher (Vice)	St Joseph's Birkenhead	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mr S Dainty		139 Upton Road	Moreton	Wirral	CH46 0SQ	<a href="mailto:headteacher@stjosephs-birkenhead.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@stjosephs-birkenhead.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Nigel Greathead	Primary Headteacher	Manor Primary	Sep-08	Aug-12	School	Mr N Greathead	Manor Primary School	Beechwood Drive	Greenfields	Wirral	CH43 7ZU	<a href="mailto:headteacher@manor.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@manor.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Morag Kophamel	Primary Headteacher	Greenleas Primary	Sep-08	Aug-12	School	Mrs M Kophamel	Greenleas Primary School	Green Lane	Wallasey	Wirral	CH45 8LZ	<a href="mailto:headteacher@greenleas.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@greenleas.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Chris Penn	Primary Headteacher	St Peter's CE Heswall Primary School	Jun-10	May-14	School	Mr C Penn	St Peter's CE Heswall Primary School	Thurstaston Road	Heswall	Wirral	CH60 4SA	<a href="mailto:headteacher@stpeters-heswall.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@stpeters-heswall.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Gillian Zsapka	Primary Headteacher	Heygarth Primary	Sep-08	Aug-12	School	Mrs G Zsapka	Heygarth Primary School	Heygarth Road	Eastham	Wirral	CH62 8AG	<a href="mailto:headteacher@heygarth.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@heygarth.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Margaret Bevan	Primary Governor	The Priory CE Primary	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mrs M Bevan		27 Farnon Way	Prenton	Wirral	CH43 2NW	
Schools	Irene Davies-Foo	Primary Governor	Heswall Primary	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Ms I Davies-Foo	Hedgelea	3 Quarry Road East	Heswall	Wirral	CH61 6XD	
Schools	Ken Frost	Primary Governor	New Brighton Primary	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Mr K Frost		7 Stourcliffe Road	Wallasey	Wirral	CH44 3AE	<a href="mailto:kb.frost@talktalk.net">kb.frost@talktalk.net</a>
Schools	Lyn Ireland	Primary Governor	St Werburgs Catholic Primary	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Lyn Ireland	29 Storeton Road		Oxton	Wirral	CH43 5TN	<a href="mailto:lyn.ireland@talktalk.net">lyn.ireland@talktalk.net</a>
Schools	John Weise	Primary Governor	Well Lane Primary	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Mr J Weise		19 Duncansby Drive	Bromborough	Wirral	CH63 0NY	<a href="mailto:john.weise@ntlworld.com">john.weise@ntlworld.com</a>
Schools	Paula Dixon	Secondary Headteacher	Prenton High School	Sep-09	Aug-13	School	Paula Dixon	Prenton High School	Hesketh Avenue	Prenton	Wirral	CH42 6RR	<a href="mailto:headteacher@prentonhighschool.co.uk">headteacher@prentonhighschool.co.uk</a>
Schools	Steve Peach	Secondary Headteacher	Oldershaw School	Sep-10	Aug-14	School	Mr S Peach	Valkyrie Road		Wallasey	Wirral	CH45 4RJ	<a href="mailto:headteacher@oldershaw.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@oldershaw.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Phil Sheridan	Secondary Headteacher	Pensby High School for Boys	Sep-10	Aug-14	School	Mr P Sheridan	Pensby High School for Boys	Irby Road	Heswall	Wirral	CH61 6XN	<a href="mailto:headteacher@pensbysportscollege.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@pensbysportscollege.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Elaine Cogan	Secondary Headteacher	Wirral Grammar School for Girls	Sep-09	Aug-13	School	Elaine Cogan	Wirral Grammar School for Girls	Heath Road	Bebington	Wirral	CH63 3AF	<a href="mailto:headteacher@wirralgrammar-girls.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@wirralgrammar-girls.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Ian Cubbin	Secondary Governor	Oldershaw	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Dr I Cubbin	Rock Villa	Wellington Road	New Brighton	Wirral	CH45 2NS	
Schools	Brian Cummings	Secondary Governor	St Anselm's College	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mr B Cummings		42 Wirral Gardens	Bebington	Wirral	CH63 3BH	<a href="mailto:brian.cummings@hotmail.co.uk">brian.cummings@hotmail.co.uk</a>
Schools	Betty Renshaw MBE	Secondary Governor	Woodchurch High School	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mrs B Renshaw MBE	82 Ennisdale Drive	Newton	West Kirby	Wirral	CH48 9UA	<a href="mailto:renshawbet@woodchurch-high.wirral.sch.uk">renshawbet@woodchurch-high.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Sandra Wall	Special Governor	Hilbre High School	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mrs S Wall		5 Kirby Park	West Kirby	Wirral	CH48 2HA	<a href="mailto:sandra.wall@aol.com">sandra.wall@aol.com</a>
Schools	Andre Baird	Special Headteacher	Foxfield School	Oct-10	Sep-14	Home	Mr A Baird		350 Hoylake Road	Moreton	Wirral	CH46 6DF	<a href="mailto:headteacher@foxfield.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@foxfield.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Schools	Richard Longster	Nursery Representative	Wirral Hospital School	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Mr R Longster		18 Elm Road	Birkenhead	Wirral	CH42 9NY	<a href="mailto:richardlongster@ntlworld.com">richardlongster@ntlworld.com</a>
Schools	Mary Mitchell	Academy Rep	Leasowe Early Years Birkenhead High School Academy	Jun-10	May-14	School	Mrs M Mitchell	Leasowe Early Years Birkenhead High School Academy	Twickenham Drive	Moreton	Wirral	CH46 2QF	<a href="mailto:marymitchell@wirral.gov.uk">marymitchell@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Schools	Chris Mann	Forum Representative	Governors Forum	Sep-10	Aug-11	School	Ms C Mann		86 Devonshire Place	Prenton, Birkenhead	Wirral	CH43 1TY	<a href="mailto:cmann@birks.adst.net">cmann@birks.adst.net</a>
Schools	Jane Owens	Non-teacher representative	Hilbre High School	Jun-10	May-14	Home	Mrs J Owens	24 Lea Road	Wallasey		Wirral	CH44 0DU	<a href="mailto:jane@cassowens.freeserve.co.uk">jane@cassowens.freeserve.co.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Shaun McNamara	Teacher representative	South Wirral High School	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Mr S McNamara	Hilbre High School	Frankby Road	West Kirby	Wirral	CH48 6EQ	<a href="mailto:mcnamaras@hilbre.wirral.sch.uk">mcnamaras@hilbre.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Neville Reilly	Teacher representative	St Joseph's Primary (Upton) Church of England Diocese	Dec-10	Nov-14	Home	Mr N Reilly		4 Devizes Drive	Irby	Wirral	CH61 4YJ	<a href="mailto:wirral@naswt.net">wirral@naswt.net</a>
Non-Schools	Julie Kenny	Church of England Diocese	St Joseph's Primary (Upton) Church of England Diocese	Sep-07	Aug-11	School	Miss J E Kenny	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	Moreton Road	Upton	Wirral	CH49 6LL	<a href="mailto:headteacher@stjosephs-upton.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@stjosephs-upton.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Gillian Peters	further education PVI Early Years Providers	Dawpool CE Primary	Jan-07	Jan-11	School	Ms G Peters	Dawpool CE Primary School	School Lane	Thurstaston	Wirral	CH61 0HH	<a href="mailto:headteacher@dawpool.wirral.sch.uk">headteacher@dawpool.wirral.sch.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Mike Potter CBE	further education PVI Early Years Providers	Wirral Metropolitan College	Jun-09	May-13	School	Mr M Potter	Carlett Park Campus		Eastham	Wirral	CH62 0AY	<a href="mailto:MIKE.POTTER@wmc.ac.uk">MIKE.POTTER@wmc.ac.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Denise McDonald	further education PVI Early Years Providers	Wirral Metropolitan College	Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mrs D McDonald		20 Kingsmead Road North	Oxton	Wirral	CH43 6TB	<a href="mailto:kingfisherdav@yahoo.co.uk">kingfisherdav@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Non-Schools	Simon Davies	Observer		Sep-08	Aug-12	Home	Mr S Davies		13 Thornfield Way	Spital	Wirral	CH63 9JT	<a href="mailto:CDZODIAC.SUPPORT@btconnect.com">CDZODIAC.SUPPORT@btconnect.com</a>
Observer	Cllr Paul Hayes	Observer					Councillor Paul Ha C/O Wallasey Town Hall						
Observer	Cllr P A Smith	Observer					Councillor P A Smi C/O Wallasey Town Hall						

Group	Name	Category of Membership	SCHOOL	Date of Election	Date of renewal	Address Type	Mailing Name	Address1	Address 2	Address 3	Address 4	Postcode	E-MAIL
Observer /Officer	Cllr Tom Harney	LA Observer					Councillor Tom Ha C/O Wallasey Town Hall						
Observer /Officer	Cllr Sheila Clarke MBE	Cabinet Member					Councillor Sheila C FOR INFORMATION		C/O Wallasey Town Hall				
Observer /Officer	Cllr Chris Meaden	LA Observer					Councillor Chris M C/O Wallasey Town Hall						
Observer /Officer	Evelyn Epton	PVI Observer				Home	Ms E Epton		40 Budworth Road	Oxon	Wirral	CH43 9TW	<a href="mailto:winstonsplaces@wirralchristiancentre.com">winstonsplaces@wirralchristiancentre.com</a>
Observer /Officer	David Armstrong	Interim Director				Work	David Armstrong	Interim Director	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:davidarmstrong@wirral.gov.uk">davidarmstrong@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Sue Talbot	Head of Service				Work	Sue Talbot	Head of Service (Early yrs & Primary Education)	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:suetalbot@wirral.gov.uk">suetalbot@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Mark Parkinson	Head of Service				Work	Mark Parkinson	Head of Service (Learning & Achievement)	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:markparkinson@wirral.gov.uk">markparkinson@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Peter Edmondson	Head of Service				Work	Peter Edmondson	Head of Service (Participation and Inclusion)	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:peteredmondson@wirral.gov.uk">peteredmondson@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Andrew Roberts	Principal Manager - Finance				Work	Andrew Roberts	Principal Manager - Finance	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:andrewroberts@wirral.gov.uk">andrewroberts@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Nancy Clarkson	Head of Planning & Performance				Work	Nancy Clarkson	Head of Planning & Performance	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:nancyclarkson@wirral.gov.uk">nancyclarkson@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Sue Ashley	Principal Officer LMS				Work	Sue Ashley	Principal Officer LMS	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:sueashley@wirral.gov.uk">sueashley@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Carolyn Warburton	Data & Funding Formula Analyst				Work	Carolyn Warburton	Data & Funding Formula Analyst	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:carolynwarburton@wirral.gov.uk">carolynwarburton@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Ken Owen	Principal Officer Customer Services				Work	Ken Owen	Principal Officer Customer Services	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:kenowen@wirral.gov.uk">kenowen@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Mark Lightburn	Group Accountant				Work	Mark Lightburn	Group Accountant	Finance Department	Treasury Building			<a href="mailto:marklightburn@wirral.gov.uk">marklightburn@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	John Bulmer	Strategic Service Manager - Access				Work	John Bulmer	Strategic Service Manager Access	CYPD	Hamilton Building			<a href="mailto:johnbulmer@wirral.gov.uk">johnbulmer@wirral.gov.uk</a>
Observer /Officer	Louise Parnell	Business Manager, Birkenhead Academy				Work	Ms L Parnell	Birkenhead Academy	86 Devonshire place	Prenton	Wirral	CH43 1TY	<a href="mailto:lparnell@birkhsgadst.net">lparnell@birkhsgadst.net</a>
Observer /Substitute	Jeffrey Bevan	Substitute Teacher Rep											

# DfE – Issued December 2010

## Scheme for Financing Schools

### SUMMARY OF SCHEME CHANGES 2011/12

This note outlines and explains the changes to the DfE guidance on local authority schemes for financing schools, effective from 1 April 2011. Updated detailed guidance is now available on the DfE website at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/adminandfinance/financialmanagement/schoolsvenuefunding/financeregulations/a0070286/local-authority-schemes-for-financing-schools>

Changes from the previous version, published in October 2006, are underlined within the detailed guidance. In making any changes to their schemes, local authorities must consult all schools in their area and receive the approval of their schools forum.

The changes are set out below. References are to the section number in the previous guidance.

New List of matters which must be contained within schemes, as set out in the draft School Finance Regulations 2011.

- 1.3 Confirmation that the scheme, and any amendments to it, must be published on a website accessible to the general public. The date on which any amendments take effect must also be published. Annex A is also amended.
- 1.4 Approval of schemes – removal of reference to the Secretary of State and inclusion of schools forum role.
- 2.4 Removal of the requirement for schools to submit a statement of Best Value with their budget plan. The government believes that it is important for schools to achieve value for money, but that this can be demonstrated in other ways than a written statement
- 2.11 Removal of exceptions to requirement that schools must be allowed to opt out of LA contracts. The government believes that schools are best placed to make their own purchasing decisions and should not be constrained in their ability to do so.
- 2.13 Clarification and updating definition of eligible expenditure for the “purposes of the school” to include pupils at other maintained schools and community facilities.
- 2.15 Removal of the section relating to the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS). The Secretary of State announced on 15 November 2010 that the Financial Management Standard for Schools (FMSiS) would no longer be a requirement, and would be replaced by a new simpler standard during 2011. A directed revision to schemes requiring schools to meet FMSiS was introduced in 2007. Local authorities should no longer enforce this requirement. The Department will consult in the proposed replacement early in 2011.
- 3.5.1 Removing the requirement for there to be at least ten banks on the approved list for school bank accounts and replacing this with a requirement to be consistent

with the LA's Treasury Management policy, given the turbulence in the banking system in the last couple of years.

3.6 Encouragement of the use of procurement cards as these reduce transaction costs and can enable schools to benefit from significant discounts.

4.2 It will no longer be a requirement for schemes to have a balance control mechanism. The revised paragraph reads:

*“The scheme may contain a mechanism to clawback excess surplus balances. Any mechanism should have regard to the principle that schools should be moving towards greater autonomy, should not be constrained from making early efficiencies to support their medium-term budgeting in a tighter financial climate, and should not be burdened by bureaucracy. The mechanism should, therefore, be focused on only those schools which have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances and/or where some level of redistribution would support improved provision across a local area.”*

LAs should, therefore, consider removing or relaxing their existing mechanism with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011.

4.8 Amendment to balances of closing schools to reflect the provisions of the Academies Act 2010.

4.9 Removal of reference to School Standards Grant in relation to licensed deficits

4.11/ Removal of references to ex GM schools.

12

6.2 Enabling LAs to charge schools whose withdrawal from a cluster arrangement into which they entered voluntarily results in additional costs to the other schools in the cluster or to the LA; this is to remove disincentives to the employment of shared staff in clusters and partnerships. At present schools can agree to share the cost of a member of staff for, say, three years but one school can then withdraw without notice putting extra costs on the school actually employing the member of staff.

6.2.8 Inclusion of the Environment Agency in the list of regulatory bodies, to reflect their role in the Carbon Reduction Commitment scheme. This would enable LAs to pass through to schools any costs arising from non-compliance with the scheme.

11.6 Strengthened wording on Chief Finance Officer's right to attend relevant governing body meetings – schemes “should” not “may” permit this right.

11.13 Deletion of paragraph on school meals – not relevant to a financial scheme.

11. Inclusion of guidance in new Annex relating to how costs of redundancies and early retirements should be funded; this information is frequently requested and will be increasingly relevant in a tighter financial settlement. The 2002 Education Act states that the cost of redundancies should normally fall to the local authority while the cost of premature retirements should normally fall to the school's delegated budget. There can, however, be locally determined exceptions to these, and it is also the case that costs can be charged to the central part of the schools budget if there are resultant savings to the schools budget and the schools forum agree. It is important that any exceptions to the norm are clearly defined by LAs and discussed with schools forums.



13. Removal of Annex B outlining the recommended respective responsibilities of schools and LAs in relation to maintenance, which was useful when these budgets were first delegated but is less relevant now.
14. Amendment of the section on community facilities to reflect the change in the law enabling schools to spend their delegated budget for this purpose. This takes effect from April 2011.

This page is intentionally left blank