



Wirral Schools Forum

Date:	Tuesday, 27 September 2011
Time:	6.00 pm
Venue:	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. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM (Pages 1 - 10)
5. ACADEMY UPDATE (Pages 11 - 18)
6. TRANSFER OF SEN POST 16 FUNDING (Pages 19 - 20)
7. COMMISSIONING SPECIALIST PLACES FOR PUPILS WITH STATEMENTS (Pages 21 - 22)
8. CHANGES TO THE LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN'S EDUCATION SERVICE (LACES) (Pages 23 - 26)
9. PROVISION OF INSURANCE SERVICES TO SCHOOLS (Pages 27 - 28)
10. HARMONISATION AND £250 PAY AWARD UPDATE (Pages 29 - 34)
11. SCHOOL REDUNDANCIES UPDATE (Pages 35 - 36)
12. EARLY YEARS FORMULA REVIEW (Pages 37 - 38)

- 13. DSG FINAL GRANT NOTIFICATION AND CENTRAL LIMIT (Pages 39 - 40)**
- 14. FORUM MEMBERSHIP (Pages 41 - 42)**
- 15. WORKPLAN (Pages 43 - 44)**

WIRRAL COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM – 27th SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 A detailed consultation paper has been issued by the Department for Education with proposals to introduce a new national funding formula for schools and academies (with local flexibility) and to make changes for the funding of High Cost Pupils and distribution of the Pupil Premium.

A working group of the Schools Forum met on 19th September to agree the initial response to the questions asked in the consultation paper. This is attached for discussion at the meeting.

2.0 MAIN CONSULTATION POINTS

2.1 Timescale

A new system could be introduced either in 2013-14 or 2015-16 at the start of a new funding period.

The current system for distributing the Dedicated Schools Grant (known as "Spend Plus") will continue until 2012-13. As a result local decisions will need to be taken before the budget is finalised, regarding the distribution of former grants within the formula (such as School Development Grant) and if formula elements (such as Free School Meals) should be up-dated.

2.2 National Funding Formula for each school

The position regarding a National Funding Formula has changed. School funding will continue to be paid to Local Authorities, who will agree with the Schools Forum the funding for schools and academies. The local schools formula and amounts will not be nationally determined.

Local funding formulae will have fewer formula factors which may require some changes – admissions, looked after children and school meals are not elements within the current proposals.

2.3 Academies

Academies will be funded by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). Academy budgets will no longer be lagged – data will be consistent with maintained schools. These may in future be calculated by local authorities.

It is proposed that the EFA have a regulatory roll in schools funding and formulae.

2.4 Funding Formula

The National Funding Formula to Local Authorities will consist of 4 blocks which will not be ring-fenced:

1. Schools Block – made up of the delegated budget to schools and some central budgets such as Behaviour Support, MEAS and Contingency. This block will be used by the DfE to calculate a notional budget for each school or a notional pupil budget (to use as a comparison with actual schools budgets).
It will replace the need for the Schools Budget element within the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) for Academies. Maintained schools can also receive funding for support services or agree that funding can be retained centrally (via the Schools Forum).
2. High Needs Block – made up of delegated budgets to special schools and central SEN spend.
3. Early years – delegated budgets to early years providers and central costs.
4. Central block – this is a small block covering non delegated school items such as admissions.

The new formula will move funding between schools and local authorities. It will be introduced with transition (floors and ceilings). The level of MFG will determine how quickly the changes are introduced (and the level of turbulence experienced). If a limit of minus 1.5% (MFG) is used then progress will be slow. There is no information available to show the impact of changes on schools or LA's.

2.5 Schools Forum

The Schools forum is currently a consultative body . The paper outlines proposals to ensure the Forum is representative of all schools and to give decision making powers over funding formulae and allocations.

2.6 LACSEG

This was part of an earlier consultation over the summer, seeking views about the top slice from all authorities in 2011-12 and 2012-13 and whether this should be amended to take more account of academy numbers in different areas. The outcome from this is not yet known, locally the view was that changes now would introduce a level of uncertainty in the budget cycle and therefore the current proposals should remain.

With the introduction of a new schools formula the DfE propose that LACSEG for LEA services is also changed. In future this may match the formula distribution to LA's

2.7 Special Schools and Alternative Provision

This area looks at place funding and asks questions about if there should be a move to pupil funding or a hybrid model. This would help to tackle surplus places (and any unfair incentives to fill special schools).

It is recognised that costs in this block have increased significantly, would initially be based on levels of historic spend and that formula for SEN should take more account of Disability Living Allowances and less account of Deprivation.

2.8 Pupil Premium

The Pupil Premium will remain separate from the main funding formula. Future years allocations will increase (although this may not be in a straight line). Distribution will change to cover either pupils who have received Free School Meals in the last 3 years or the last 6 years – the latter measure may disadvantage primary schools. This change will however broaden the entitlement to a pupil premium and may reduce the proportion of grant received in Wirral.

3.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That the Forum note the report and respond to the consultation paper as outlined.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM: PROPOSALS FOR A FAIRER SYSTEM

1. THE NATIONAL FUNDING SYSTEM

- 1: Would you prefer the formula to be based on**
a) a notional budget for every school; or
b) the pupils in each local authority area?

A notional budget would give the impression of being the 'correct' budget which would be illusory, therefore we would favour option B. It is difficult to see how either approach significantly improves transparency. Funding through "blocks" will inevitably result in the "notional budget" for any one school differing from its actual budget.

2. THE SCHOOLS BLOCK-SYSTEM

- 2: Do you agree that these are the right formula factors to retain at local level?**

The formula is fairly straightforward. These factors seem reasonable.

- 3: What other factors, if any, should be able to be used at local level or could any of these factors be removed?**

It may be desirable to provide for a further incentive for Looked After Children beyond the Pupil Premium.

- 4: Do you think that setting a range of allowable primary/secondary ratios around the national average is the right approach to ensure that there is consistency across the country?**

This seems reasonable. The balance between funding for pupils of different ages is among the most contentious of issues. Some national guidelines based upon valid research data would seem sensible.

- 5: Do you think we should implement option (i) [LA calculates] or (ii) [EFA calculates] when calculating budgets for academies?**

Option 1 seems the most sensible, and least bureaucratic.

- 6: Do you think these options would help to achieve greater representation and stronger accountability at a local level?**

Giving decision making powers would make little difference in practice where authorities already effectively delegate decision making to forums. A requirement for any decision to be approved separately by each group on the forum would weaken its authority. We would therefore suggest that Schools Forums should have decision making powers but that there should be no separate requirement for each group to agree proposals.

- 7: Do you think we should implement option (i) [EFA check formula compliance], (ii) [EFA are review body to investigate issues raised by schools], both or neither?**

There would seem to be no problem with the EFA checking formula compliance. However, the EFA have yet to establish credibility and trust that it would be impartial between all types of school. It is inappropriate that decisions made by democratically elected bodies should be overruled by officials of an agency. At the least there should be an appeal process to the Secretary of State. There is potential risk of conflict and judicial review unless such processes are transparent.

- 8: If we introduce the new system in this spending review period, do you think that Free Schools should remain on the Free School methodology for 2013-14 and 2014-15 or move straight away to the overall funding system?**

Wirral has no experience of Free Schools, therefore no comment is made.

3. THE SCHOOLS BLOCK-FORMULA

9: Are these the right factors to include in a fair funding formula at national level?

The factors seem reasonable.

10: Do you agree that we should use Ever FSM to allocate deprivation funding in the national formula? Should this be Ever 3 or Ever 6?

There have been anomalies in the use of straight FSM data, but using Ever 6 would have the effect of broadening the definition of disadvantage and being less focussed on disadvantaged groups. Ever 3 might therefore be a sensible compromise.

11: If we have a school-level formula, do you agree that £95,000 is an appropriate amount for a primary school lump sum?

£95,000 seems reasonable.

12: Do you agree that the lump sum should be limited to schools with Year 6 as the highest year group?

Wirral does not have middle schools, therefore no comment is made.

13: If we have a local authority level formula, should we use a primary school lump sum or the sparsity measure?

A fairly densely populated authority may still have some parts where it is desirable to maintain a “small” school. Therefore we would favour a primary school lump sum over a sparsity measure within a local authority-level formula.

14: If we have a sparsity measure, do you think we should narrow the sparsity threshold as described above?

No comment.

15: Which option should we use to calculate the ACA: the current GLM approach or the combined approach?

Wirral is not affected by the ACA, therefore no comment is made.

16: Do you agree that we should use an EAL factor in the national formula?

We recognise that children entering school with limited English has resource implications for a school, but these would seem to be short term and simply using EAL is too blunt a factor. It is difficult to conclude from the evidence presented that an EAL factor is necessary.

17: Do you agree that this should cover the first few years only? How many years would be appropriate?

If such a factor is included then it should be very limited. Funding allocated through this factor is inevitably diverted from deprived pupils where the evidence appears to show a much stronger link with under performance.

18: Do you think we should:

- a) continue with a maximum decrease of -1.5% per pupil each year and accept that this will mean very slow progress towards full system reform; or
- b) continue with a -1.5% per pupil floor in 2013-14 but lower it thereafter so that we can make faster progress?

Minimising turbulence should be the priority therefore we would support Option A

4. CENTRAL SERVICES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

19: Do you agree that some of these services could be retained centrally if there is local agreement by maintained schools?

Yes. Experience in Wirral, supported by several consultation exercises with schools, has shown that smaller schools in particular find it very beneficial for unpredictable costs to be pooled and managed centrally on their behalf.

20: Do you agree that the split of functions between the blocks is correct? If not, what changes should be made?

We agree that the split is correct and are not suggesting any changes.

5. FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR LACSEG

21: Do you think the funding for local authority LACSEG should be moved to a national formula basis rather than using individual LA section 251 returns?

It is difficult to see how a national formula basis would maintain the principle of equity of funding between schools of different types within a local authority. However, the section 251 return was not designed for this purpose and is cumbersome. The Department should undertake work to simplify it and make it more fit for purpose.

22: Do you think the distribution mechanism should be changed to one that more accurately reflects the actual pattern of where academies are located?

This may seem more logical but it would produce undesirable turbulence in funding. A more detailed explanation was set out in our response to the Consultation on the Basis for the Decision on the Appropriate Amount of Academies Funding Transfer for 2011/2012 and 2012/2013.

6. CHILDREN REQUIRING HIGH LEVELS OF SUPPORT

23: Is this the right set of principles for funding children and young people with high needs?

Principle 5 would have the effect of replicating the current status quo, so far as, for example, speech therapy provision is concerned. This is unsatisfactory as it varies substantially between areas.

Principle 9 would require a definition of an “unsuccessful” institution. It will happen sometimes that numbers in a school designed for very specialised needs will dip, but this does not necessarily mean that the school is not needed or is in any way unsuccessful.

A further principle that “the commissioning body should be provided with a sufficient share of overall resource to enable it to meet its responsibilities” could be a useful addition.

24: Would it be appropriate to provide a base level of funding per pupil or place to all specialist SEN and LD/D settings, with individualised top up above that?

This seems reasonable.

25: Is £10,000 an appropriate level for this funding?

This is similar to the base level within Wirral.

26: Is the idea of a base rate of funding helpful in the post-16 context?

Yes.

27: Should local authorities be directly responsible for funding high level costs over £10K for young people in post-16 provision in line with their commissioning responsibilities?

The important issue is that funding between the blocks is commensurate with responsibilities.

28: Do the proposed funding arrangements create risks to any parts of the post-16 sector?

The biggest risk is a disjunction between responsibility and resourcing. We have a strong concern, based on current and historic experience, of being left with responsibilities for which the appropriate funding has not been transferred.

29: Should institutions providing for high needs children and young people be funded on the basis of places or pupil numbers?

The funding of schools on the basis of pupil numbers has always had a “market” function: that schools should be encouraged to be sensitive to parental perceptions. This has never been considered appropriate for special schools. Wirral’s position of predominantly place-related funding, with some marginal additional funding where pupil numbers rise, has been broadly successful. Wirral has a large and highly regarded range of provision for children with high needs. The most appropriate way of sharing resources has been the subject of much consideration over a number of years and we believe that the current arrangements enjoy the confidence of schools and parents, who would be loathe to see any disruption.

30: Are any of options a-d desirable?

Of the options B seems the most attractive, but with the longer period of at least 3 years. Stability is of particular importance in special schools.

31: For the longer term, should we fund Special and AP Academies and Free Schools:

- a) with all funding coming direct from the commissioner?
- b) with all funding coming through the EFA and recouped from the commissioner?
- c) through a combination of basic funding from the EFA and top-up funding for individual pupils direct from the commissioner?

We would favour the least bureaucratic and complex approach. We have concerns in Wirral regarding the additional cost of the EFA.

32: If we go for the combination funding approach, should we pass all funding through the EFA for a limited period while the school is establishing itself before moving to this approach?

No comment.

33: Given there is no absolute method of determining which pupils have high needs, and given local variation in policy and recording, is this approach to determining proxy variables acceptable?

It is difficult to see a better alternative.

34: Do you agree that deprivation is linked more to AP rather than the wider SEN needs?

Probably.

35: Do you agree that in the short term we should base allocations to local authorities for the high needs block largely on historic spend?

Again probably but the experience is of irresistible growth in the “high needs sector”.

36: Do you agree that post-16 funding should also become part of the local authority’s high needs block over time, but that there might be a particular need for transitional arrangements?

Probably yes.

37: What data should ideally underpin the funding allocations both initially and for a potential high needs block arrangement?

If pre-16 funding allocations will be based on historic spend and DLA data, then post-16 funding should be allocated on the same basis to provide some consistency, recognising the limitations there might be as a result of deprivation.

39: Should AP continue to be treated alongside high needs SEN for funding purposes? What differences between them need to be taken into account?

Yes for the time being. Much will depend on the outcome of the trial described in 6.54. Ideally it would discourage perverse incentives if the school remained responsible for funding AP in respect of its pupils.

7. EARLY YEARS

40: Do you agree that we should aim for a simpler EYSFF? If so, how?

Wirral’s formula has been in place for one term. Any suggestions for change should follow the review.

41: How could we refine the EYSFF so that it better supports disadvantaged children?

Find some way of applying the pupil premium.

42: Do you agree we should allocate funding to local authorities on the basis of a formula?

Yes. The paper acknowledges elsewhere the limitations of spend plus.

43: Do you agree a formula should be introduced based largely on the same factors as the schools formula?

In theory yes - but an alternative to Free School Meals is needed.

44: We would be grateful for views on whether anything else can be done to improve transparency.

This should be a feature of the review. Each setting should be asked if they understand how their funding has been allocated.

8. PUPIL PREMIUM

45: What is your preferred option for determining eligibility for the Pupil Premium from 2012-13? Should it be based on the Ever 3 or Ever 6 measure?

We would suggest that at least to begin with the “Ever 3” measure be adopted.

46: What is your preferred approach for calculating the Pupil Premium?

The Pupil Premium should be a single, flat rate with no adjustments. This is the simplest and most transparent way of calculating the Premium which gives schools a clear understanding of the funding that they will receive for eligible pupils. The funding formula should be the mechanism for addressing differences in the system, not the Pupil Premium.

The Looked After Children pupil premium is difficult and costly to administer. The DfE should revert to collecting relevant data through the census which should then be the basis of the allocation.

9. TIMINGS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

47: Do you think we should implement the proposed reforms in 2013-14 or during the next spending period?

These are significant changes. It is important that those implementing the changes and schools who will be affected by them have time to manage the process effectively. We think it would be wiser to plan to implement the changes from the beginning of the new spending period.

WIRRAL COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM – 27th SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

ACADEMY UPDATE

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report updates members on the current position with regard to academies, the overall financial transfers to the DfE and a recent consultation paper on Academy Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG).

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Academies, when they are created, are schools that are independent from the local authority. They are funded from the Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA), using allocations based on Wirral's existing school funding formula. In addition an academy is funded for a range of services which it previously may have received without being charged, such as teacher maternity costs, school improvement, premature retirement costs and a share of the departments legal and statutory costs.

3.0 ACADEMY CONVERSIONS

- 3.1 At 1st September there were 8 Secondary academy schools in Wirral and it is expected that there will be a further 5 by the end of the financial year. This is likely to transfer delegated budgets and central costs from Wirral's Schools Budget as follows:

	£000	£000 (Full year)
Secondary Delegated Budget	29,379	52,770
Central Schools Budget	272	528
Total	29,651	53,298

The central school budgets that will transfer (£272,000) are in respect of:

Behaviour Support (costs in academy schools would be charged or the central programme reduced)

Licences (academies will be offered at cost a share of the local authority subscription rates)

Redundancy costs (academies will receive a share of the budget created to support the redundancy process in secondary schools).

Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (a share of the costs of this service in Secondary schools).

On average, using existing rates, an academy will receive £60,000 (excluding SEN) in respect of the central services included in the Schools Budget

In addition academies are funded for LEA Services (top sliced from overall grant allocations to Local Authorities). This is to cover the following areas:

Education Social Welfare Service
School Improvement
Asset Management
Oaklands
Speech Therapy
Statutory Department Costs

On average an academy will receive about £220,000 in respect of the above. Wirral has been top sliced by £800,000 in 2011-12 and a further £900,000 is proposed in 2012-13.

In both the Schools Budget and the LEA budget where it is agreed that services should continue to be provided this will need to be on a traded basis. A small group led by the Consultant Secondary Headteacher will look at these areas in more detail this term. This will include services within the department (such as School Improvement) and across the Council (such as IT.) It is intended that this will then be included in Traded Service Agreements and EQ.

4.0 DFE CONSULTATION

Over the summer the DFE issued a short consultation paper (ending on 11th August), on the transfer of funding for the Academy services referred to above and funded through LACSEG.

The consultation asked for authorities views on the national top slice and whether it should “more accurately reflect the numbers, location and growth of academies and free schools”. Wirral’s response favoured the continuation of a sum fixed in advance. This gives more certainty and provides greater stability in funding services to support schools. The response is attached to this report.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the report is noted.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children’s Services

Interim DirectorHamilton Building,
Conway Street,
Birkenhead,
Wirral
CH41 4FD

to Laura Street
Funding Policy Unit
Department for Education
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
LONDON SW1P 3BT

date 11 August 2011

your ref
my ref
service Children's Services
tel 0151 666 4313 Please ask for Mr David Armstrong
fax 0151 666 4338
email davidarmstrong@wirral.gov.uk

Dear Ms Street

**CONSULTATION ON THE BASIS FOR THE DECISION ON THE APPROPRIATE
AMOUNT OF ACADEMIES FUNDING TRANSFER FOR 2011/2012 AND 2012/2013**

I will begin by expressing some disappointment regarding the timing and length of the consultation on this matter. I appreciate the reasons given for this, but there are some important issues here regarding equity of resourcing between academies and schools in the Local Authority maintained sector. It is unfortunate that there is no opportunity to discuss these matters with schools before responding. I have discussed this response with the Chair of our local Schools Forum who in the circumstances has endorsed the approach taken.

The comments I shall make in this letter upon the proposals are related almost entirely to whether their impact will bear fairly and equitably upon schools within different categories. Here in Wirral we will have significant numbers of children in academies as well as within local authority maintained schools. My concern is that all of these children should receive the best possible support in their learning, and that resourcing available should be fairly and equitably distributed amongst the schools that serve them.

I welcome wholeheartedly the commitment on the part of the Department set out in paragraph 2 that "academies and maintained schools are funded fairly and equitably". I also welcome the commitment of the Department to listen to the views of local authorities set out in that paragraph and repeated in paragraphs 26 and 27 with

reference to the application of the New Burdens Doctrine. Paragraph 27 states with regard to this doctrine that “it also makes clear that Departments should discuss any transfers relating to changes in responsibilities between local and central government with the local authority associations”. I will send a copy of this response to the Local Government Association and hope that it may be useful in informing these discussions.

The consultation document only specifically invites comment from local authorities on one matter: “the relative merits of certainty of funding compared with uncertainty of funding but with a distribution mechanism that more accurately reflects the numbers, location and growth of academies and free schools”. I will therefore comment firstly upon this issue, before raising a number of queries as to whether the department and local authorities can be confident that the effects of these proposals in detail properly reflect the principle of equity.

My first comment would be that I acknowledge the dilemma that has been created by the Academies Act. Effectively this has introduced a dual system of education and is a radical departure from the previous purpose of academies. It would not be surprising if the structural and administrative costs of running two systems in parallel were to exceed those of running one. I also acknowledge, however, the financial circumstances facing both national and local government and the need to be stringent in minimising, where possible, any double funding. It would not, however, be fair on pupils in LEA maintained schools if the transfer of funding to provide support services to academies left local authorities without sufficient resources to continue to provide equivalent services to them.

Given the unpredictable nature of the growth of academies it is understandable that local authorities who have had, so far, relatively little interest shown by their schools in becoming academies should be concerned regarding the “top slicing” approach. However, it is also critical that we are all able to plan our services in line with predicted resources. If resourcing available for existing services were to be reduced in a piecemeal and unpredictable way the consequences could be chaotic. It does seem to me that the system and mechanisms which have been introduced through the Academies Act make it impossible to satisfy both the principles of equity of funding and to enable local authorities to manage services properly, without incurring significant additional costs. Faced with a choice between two unpalatable alternatives I am bound to say that we would favour an approach which at least guarantee a degree of certainty in funding in order to provide future stability for individual schools.

I will now make a number of comments on aspects of the proposals where it appears to me there is some risk of inequity and, perhaps, unintended consequences. I make these comments with reference to specific paragraphs within the document.

Paragraph 30

In this paragraph the department claims that there is “very little evidence of a direct link between pupil numbers and spend per pupil, as reported by local authorities in the Section 251 Budget Return. For example in relation to spend on statutory and regulatory duties and asset management the size of a local authority explains only 3% and 1% of the variance in spend per pupil respectively”. This is important as the department interprets this as evidence that an authority can reasonably reduce its central costs in line with pupil

numbers. If this contention is true then Authorities should be able to continue to provide services to LA maintained schools equivalent in value to the cash transferred. Study, however, of section 251 statements shows wide variation between authorities. This implies that a degree of caution ought to be taken when considering the usefulness of the averages shown. In practice it must be problematic for authorities to make proportionate reductions in expenditure in line with reduced responsibilities for pupils as the paper suggests. A number of costs are “lumpy” and are not easily reduceable in this way. It will not cost any less, for example, to manage the authority’s accounts or to pay for their audit, simply because there are fewer schools for which the authority is responsible. Other services which may depend upon small numbers of expert staff are clearly not easily reduceable other than in a stepped way which implies, at the very least, a “drag” between the reduction of resource and the ability to reduce costs. The analogy between bigger and smaller authorities, even if it is sound in itself, does not hold when considering this issue of drag. The strong likelihood is that pupils in LA maintained schools will be disadvantaged as a consequence.

Paragraphs 31 to 34

The paper concludes that it is not unreasonable to expect authorities to continue to provide services to its maintained schools with the resources remaining to it following transfer. My main worry, however, greater than that of “lumpy” costs and drag described above, relates to the consequences of the imbalance between secondary and primary schools within the “academies sector” and the LEA maintained sector. We anticipate in Wirral that the national imbalance will be reflected here, with in pupil number terms, Academies being overwhelmingly a secondary school sector whilst the great majority of primary age pupils will remain in local authority maintained schools for at least a number of years. In order to maintain any reasonable degree of equity it is essential that any transfer of resources for the provision of services to schools reflects this position. At present I have concerns as to whether this is the case. I would invite the Department in their discussions with the local authority associations to clarify this matter and provide any appropriate assurances.

In order to illustrate the questions and concerns I have, it would probably be easiest if I now comment on individual services set out in Annex A of the document as being the ones which are LACSEG relevant and therefore proposed to be included in the transfer. I will not attempt to comment upon every item but will select certain key ones as being particularly important and illustrative of my concerns.

Item 2.1.9 School Improvement

This represents the largest single cost to the authority of those items included in the budget table. It is currently heavily skewed towards early intervention in general and the primary sector in particular. This reflects both the policy of the Council and the encouragement of successive Secretaries of State. It would be illogical in principle, unfair to primary schools and detrimental to efforts to raise standards if resources which currently fund this essential support were to be transferred to academies who do not currently receive it and do not need it. It is not clear to me from my reading of the proposals how this may be avoided.

Item 2.2.1 Asset Management - Education

It appears to me that it may be wise to suspend any decisions on transferring funding in this area pending the outcome of consultations on the James Report.

Item 7.0.1 Statutory/Regulatory Duties

I have referred briefly to these above but will repeat here that these include a number of costs which are not reduceable in line with pupil numbers either at all, or only in steps. Since these costs are unavoidable any shortfall would have to be met by reductions in services elsewhere within support provided to LA maintained schools, or the Council would have to make reductions in its provision of other services.

Item 7.0.2 Premature Retirement Costs/Redundancy Costs

My understanding is that the costs referred to here apply to all premature retirements and redundancy costs incurred since 1999. Academies are not responsible for meeting the costs of such premature retirements even if they relate to staff employed at their school prior to its becoming an academy. It is difficult to understand why they should receive a proportion of the resources required to meet these costs while the liability remains wholly with the local authority. Furthermore, much of the cost has been incurred as a consequence of school closures as reorganisations were required during the period of falling rolls. Again it is difficult to see the logic of transferring a share of that resource to academies. Again the point made above about the impact of any shortfall in resourcing whilst liabilities continue applies.

I will briefly summarise the main points of this response.

- 1) The position has been created where it is impossible to maintain all three of the following desirable principles:
 - a) certainty and predictability of resourcing for local authorities following the transfer to the DfE to fund LACSEG;
 - b) fairness between local authorities in applying the reduction in a way which reflects the number of academies within those authorities; and
 - c) the avoidance of significant double funding.

In this unfortunate position this authority would favour certainty over unpredictability.

- 2) The evidence that local authorities can reasonably be expected to reduce costs proportionately and in line with reduced responsibilities for pupils as schools become academies is, so far as it is represented in the consultation paper, rather weak. It would seem more likely, and more logical, to expect that as certain costs remain unchanged and others prove difficult to reduce smoothly there will be a shortfall of resourcing available to directly support children in

local authority maintained schools, placing them at a disadvantage compared with pupils in academies.

- 3) I am concerned, if I have understood the process correctly, that key areas of funding will be transferred purely on the basis of pupil numbers without reflecting the current purpose and focus of such funding. Since the great majority of pupils in academies will be in schools that are in the secondary phase, are deemed better than satisfactory, and include, for example, grammar schools, whereas school improvement services are focused on early intervention in schools causing concern and upon primary schools there is a danger of outcomes which appear perverse and would seriously undermine standards.
- 4) It appears to be proposed that resources which currently fund premature retirement costs in respect of schools staff who have retired since 1999, many as a result of school closures, could be transferred on the basis of pupil numbers to academies. It is difficult to understand the justification for this.

I hope the outcome of the consultation will help to improve the current arrangements for the transfer of funding to academies and remove some of the problems outlined above.

Yours sincerely



David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services



Richard Longster

This page is intentionally left blank

WIRRAL COUNCIL

WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM 27th September 2011

REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY AND FUNDING FROM THE YOUNG PEOPLES' FUNDING AGENCY (YPLA) TO THE LOCAL AUTHORITY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS/LEARNERS WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTES AND DISABILITIES POST 16

Executive Summary

Responsibility for funding young people with special educational needs/learners with learning difficulties and disabilities (SEN/LLDD), over the age of 16 years and up the age of 25 years, transfers to local authorities from April 2013. The arrangements are part of two national consultations about the reform of school funding and the SEN framework.

Background

For learners with SEN and LLDD post 16 there are currently three budget pots and all with different rules and regulations.

- The SEN block grant to local authorities from the YPLA for SEN in schools.

The SEN Block grant for 2011-12 is £1,434,857. The allocation is in respect of costs of SEN provision in special schools, school 6th forms and some independent school providers. However funding is related to changes in the 16 and 17 year old population not changes in SEN proxy data. There is budget pressure in this area, costs significantly exceed resources.

- The YPLA budget for additional learning supporting (ALS) in the further education sector or sixth forms that is paid on historical numbers.

Currently £600,000 is spent by the YPLA at the local college and sixth form college for ALS. Last year Wirral fortunately received extra discretionary funding, for one year only, of just under £400,000 to support local provision. Budgetary pressure is likely to remain in this area.

- The YPLA budget for Independent Specialist Provision (ISP) to which local authorities apply, such provision is not usually the home borough and so is often residential.

Historically Wirral has seen relatively larger numbers of young people attend ISPs compared to neighbouring authorities and consequently draw on larger

sums of money from the YPLA than other authorities. Eighteen students left their ISP placements in July 2010 and were replaced by six learners. In July 2011, 11 learners left IPS placements and will be replaced by 3. The authority has worked hard to develop local approaches and reduce the numbers attending ISPs. The pressure will remain to do so as a fixed budget becomes a reality in April 2013. The notional budget is currently £1.7million and the current spend is at this limit. In the previous year the overall allocation was over £1.7 million.

From the consultations that are underway the government intends to develop new funding approaches and apply the same principles to pre and post 16 populations and across both schools and further education sector providers.

The YPLA is already working towards providing local authorities with a single budget for high needs learners up to the age of 25 years. This would give local authorities discretion and allow them to build local provision which would give choice to young people and their parents and allow students to live at home, participating in their community and work placements where they wish to do so. Also, the YPLA have been paying social and health care costs while the young person is at an ISP and is exploring options with relevant departments to ensure that a consistent approach is taken.

Recommendation(s)

The Forum is asked to note:

- the government's intention to create a single funding framework and budget for the local authority for post 16 learners up to the age of 25 with SEN/LLDD;
- the budgetary pressures that are likely to remain.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

WIRRAL COUNCIL

WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM 27th September 2011

REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

COMMISSIONING SPECIALIST PLACES FOR PUPILS WITH STATEMENTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SSEN)

Executive Summary

At the Schools Forum in July 2011 £120,000 was identified and agreed to be used to commission specialist places for pupils with SSEN for Social Communication Difficulties/Autistic Spectrum Disorders (SCD/ASD).

This paper seeks agreement to commission these places from Clare Mount Special School and consult with secondary schools and academies on this proposal.

Background

Clare Mount Secondary Special School meets the need of pupils with moderate learning difficulties and, in addition, has Resourced Provision to meet the needs of pupils with SCD/ASD. Clare Mount currently provides 30 places in its Resourced Provision, 10 from historic funding and a further 20 have been created over the last 2 years, with the Forum's agreement, to convert funding from 17 MLD places into 10 ASD places each year. Clare Mount has also received additional monies to develop this Resourced Provision. This process has run in parallel to the development of Resourced Provision in mainstream secondary schools for pupils with MLD.

Both of these developments have proved popular with parents. There are currently no empty places for Resourced Provision at Clare Mount School.

The demand for specialist SCD/ASD places continues to grow locally and nationally. As such places can cost at least 2 to 3 times in the non-maintained sector the proposal is about developing local provision.

Recommendations

The Forum is asked to:

- Support the proposal to consult all secondary schools that the £120,000 be placed in Clare Mount School's budget in April 2012 to secure 8 further places in its Resourced Provision for SCD/ASD bringing its total number in the provision to 38.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

This page is intentionally left blank

WIRRAL COUNCIL

WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM 27 September 2011

REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Changes to The Looked after Children's Education Service

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The way in which the Looked after Children's Education Service (LACES) is delivered and supports the education of children in the Councils care has been reviewed.

The report informs Schools Forum of the changes to the Wirral Looked after Children's Education Service (LACES) in assisting to discharge the local authority's statutory duty to promote the educational achievement of young people in care.

Introduction

The LACES team has worked closely with schools over a number of years to promote the education attainments of children in Local Authority Care through provision of direct teaching, through supporting children with emotional barriers to learning, and by facilitating personal education planning.

Until December 2010 the team was managed by the Virtual School Head and consisted of four teachers (plus one permanently seconded to the Fostering Futures Program), four full time equivalent learning mentor posts, one learning support assistant and two admin assistants. A subsequent EVR round saw two teachers, 1 learning mentor and the Virtual School Head leave the service by June 2011.

The role of the teachers has been to work closely with schools' Designated Teachers and social workers to monitor the attainments of each child in care and to organise additional support according to their needs.

They support the Personal Education Planning process according to a protocol jointly agreed with schools and social care. They allocate the work of the learning mentors and organise additional tuition paid for through the PEA Budget.

One of the teachers has responsibility for monitoring pupils who are looked after by Wirral but placed outside the area.

The Learning Mentors give direct support in their schools to children who have fallen behind, who are having difficulties with their behaviour, who have difficulties with organisation (e.g. with homework or coursework), or whose attainments are suffering as a result of the emotional consequences of their situation.

Statutory Guidance

The Children Act 2004 places a statutory duty on local authorities to promote the educational achievement of children in care.

This requires local authorities to:

- Rigorously track and monitor the school placement and educational performance of each child in care.

- To ensure that their education is seen as a priority by all those who work with them
- To act, where necessary, to address underachievement and to promote improvement in outcomes
- To ensure that heads and designated teachers in schools know who is looked after and what can be done to support and enhance their attainment and to ensure access to any initiatives which will help with this
- Ensure that they have a high quality PEP
- Share effective practice with colleagues to improve behaviour, and attendance, and to promote improved outcomes and school stability and address barriers to learning.
- Lead on devising and delivering training about the needs of looked after children, current legislation and guidance for all local authority staff and schools
- Ensure that the achievements of looked after children are recognised and celebrated

“Discharging the duty on a day to day basis means that the local authority should do at least what any good parent would do to promote their child’s educational aspirations and support their achievements”

The Statutory Duty on Schools Governing Bodies

- The Children and Young Person’s Act 2008 “places a duty on the governing bodies of maintained schools to designate a member of staff as having responsibility to promote the educational achievement of looked after children who are registered pupils at the school. This includes those aged between 16 and 18”. The Regulations requires that this person should be a senior teacher (The Designated Teacher)
- The governing body must ensure that the Designated Teacher undertakes appropriate Training
- The role of the Designated teacher “needs to be understood as part of the wider responsibilities on local authorities for looked after children both in terms of their care and to promote their educational achievement”

Designated teachers lead within the school in promoting the educational achievements of children in care by ensuring that their “personal, emotional and academic needs are prioritised. As well as this strategic role they have a duty to ensure that Personal Education Plans are effective and that they are implemented within the school. They are the primary contact co-ordinating the work of external agencies in relation to promoting the educational achievement of looked after children on the school’s role.

New arrangements

The roles and responsibilities within the LACES team have been reviewed to more closely reflect the council’s statutory duties and a formal restructuring process with the existing team is taking place. New arrangements will be formally in place from January 2012. Moving forward the LACES team will consist of one Virtual School Head teacher, two senior progress officers (one to be seconded to Fostering Futures), three progress officers and two admin assistants. The focus of their roles will be to:

1. Track, Monitor and Challenge

The Progress Officers will complete with schools' designated teachers a termly tracking and review of educational progress. The results of these reviews will be shared with social workers to enable them to update the Personal Education Plan between annual PEP Meetings.

2. Personal Education Planning

The statutory responsibility for Personal Education Planning is shared by schools and social workers.

Social workers will manage Personal Education Plans using the new social care database ICS (Integrated Children's System) and they will liaise directly with schools' designated teachers. In exceptional circumstances, if invited by the social worker or schools designated teacher, The LACES team will support the completion of the PEP.

There is statutory requirement to monitor the quality of the Personal Education Plan. This role will be performed by the LACES Team.

3. Training

The Virtual School Head will commission and deliver training that supports the educational needs of children in care for school and local authority staff (Designated Teachers, social workers and foster carers etc

4. Supporting Pupils

Schools requiring a service that delivers direct support to pupils, such as that formerly delivered by the learning mentor, may wish to purchase a bespoke service direct through the LA traded service EQ.

Arrangements will remain in place to allocate and distribute the PEA (Personal Education Allowance) for those children who have fallen behind considerably and who need additional support programmes beyond those normally available in school.

Funding

The LACES budget for 2011-12 is £304,800. It is funded as follows:

	£
Schools Budget	185,500
Childrens Services	<u>119,300</u>
Total	<u>304,800</u>

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Wirral Schools Forum notes the changes to the Looked after Children's Education Service.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

This page is intentionally left blank

WIRRAL COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM - 6th JULY 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

PROVISION OF INSURANCE SERVICES TO SCHOOLS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarises the insurance and ancillary services currently made available to schools. It explains how charges are calculated and describes some of the future influences on the services.

BACKGROUND

For many years the authority has offered schools a package of insurance and ancillary services (such as claims handling, plant inspection and risk management support). With the delegation of the relevant budget several years ago, insurance is now provided as a traded service. The package of covers has been improved and extended over time and now includes -

- Liability (Public / Employers / Officials Indemnity / Libel and Slander)
- Property (Buildings and contents)
- Equipment
- Business Interruption (increased cost of working and loss or revenue)
- Money
- Fidelity Guarantee
- Engineering (Inspection and Insurance)
- Personal Accident
- Motor
- Glazing

Additional services have also been introduced. These include a 'risk ranking' programme supported by the Department for Education through which schools are visited to assess their management of a range of insurable risks. The assessment is scored, resulting in each school being ranked against the others. An individual report is also prepared highlighting areas of good practice and issues requiring improvement.

CURRENT POSITION / UPDATE

At present all primary (both controlled and voluntary aided) and special schools purchase their insurance through the authority. All secondary schools also buy the authority's insurance services, with the exception of 4 former grant maintained schools.

Under the Governments 'Academies' programme a number of secondary schools have converted to academy status or are in the process of doing so. The legal status of such schools means that they cannot participate in the

authority's existing insurance programme. However, a proposal has been created under which the authority's Risk & Insurance team support academies in procuring cover from respected insurers and continue to assist with claims handling and the provision of insurance and risk management advice in a similar way to before.

More schools are expected to become academies in the coming years. Whilst this should reduce the exposure to loss under the authority's insurance programme, the effect is not necessarily pro-rata. So charges for those schools that remain in the common 'pool' could increase as economies of scale reduce.

FUNDING

Individual charges are calculated for each type of insurance for each school. The method of calculation has been refined over the years to ensure equity for each school. For the major classes of business the premium comprises two main elements - the value at risk (such as building values or payroll) and the school's claims experience. For some minor classes of business (such as glazing) the premium is essentially determined by the claims history. For secondary schools only the total premium is adjusted by the school's position in the risk ranking table. A 5% discount is given to the best performing schools and a 10% loading is added to those at the bottom of the table. The Risk & Insurance team recovers its charges by adding an on-cost (currently 10.5%) to each school's total premium.

Having fallen sharply in the past 2 years, insurance costs for schools overall are now broadly stable (because all major policies are subject to Long Term Agreements until April 2014). However it should be borne in mind that the charges for an individual school can fluctuate from one year to the next according to its size, claims history and position in the risk ranking table. As indicated above the growth in academies could also place upward pressure on charges.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

Ian Coleman
Director of Finance

Governing Body Agenda – Report on Job Evaluation and Harmonisation

1 Background

In 1997 the JCC for Local Government Services contractually required all organisations employing staff on 'Green Book' conditions of service to job evaluate all 'Green Book' posts, and harmonise all 'Green Book' terms and conditions of service. All school support staff are employed on 'Green Book' term and conditions of service and grading.

Following the disbanding of the School Support Staff Negotiating Body in Oct 2010 Schools/ Local Authorities needed to evidence how they have effectively addressed equal pay issues. As a result the Local Authority have been working with the trade unions and headteachers to find an proposal that would minimise any equal pay claims against the School/Local Authority and be affordable for schools.

The key elements of the job evaluation and harmonisation proposals cover

- Job evaluated pay grades for all staff school support staff
- Same conditions of service for all school support staff
 - Annual leave
 - Hours of work per week
 - Types of Contracts
 - Allowances
 - Monthly pay

2. Consultation Process

The Local Authority have carried out detailed consultation with recognised trade unions, over a number of years to develop this proposal, which the Local Authority feel meet the requirements for Greenbook Staff to have their job evaluated through a equality checked JE scheme, and conditions of service harmonised.

The local authority has also provided briefings to Headteachers to inform them of progress and highlight potential issues and concerns at an early stage. In addition the Local Authority have consulted with the Church of England and Roam Catholic Diocese for the area, who fully support the proposals outlined above.

3. Job Evaluation Proposals

The proposal is to assimilate all school support staff under SCP 34 * (current value £28,636) on to Authority's new grading structure, back dated to April 2007. Most non teaching school support staff will be assimilated across from current SCP on old pay scales to new pay bands. Teaching Assistant grades have shifted significantly upwards as a result of Job Evaluation (see appendix 1a) however due to the impact of harmonised conditions of service, the impact on the overall pay bill in reduced.

4. Harmonisation of Condition of Service Proposals

The proposal is that all school support staff will have their term and conditions harmonised, back dated implementation to August 2008. This is in line with the date harmonised conditions of service were implemented in the Local Authority.

*All school support staff above SCP 34 to await completion of third phase of Job Evaluation.

The table below outlines current and proposed to changes in conditions of service, and is based on staff employed full time and full year contract

NB where appropriate conditions of service will be pro rata for part time/part year contracts e.g. term time only

Condition	Current - Manual	Current - APTC	Proposed
Working Week	37 hour	35 hour	36 hour
Annual Leave			5 years 27 days Over 5 years 32 days 8 statutory Bank Holidays
Pay period	Weekly	Monthly	Monthly pay for all staff
Additional Payment	Complex arrangements for any additional payments e.g. overtime		Simplified pay arrangements for all staff
Weeks worked per annum	Inconsistent approach to the payment received for weeks worked per year e.g. TAs work 42 weeks max and get paid for 52, all other support staff only get paid for weeks e.g. catetaker works 52 less annual leave and public holidays		All staff paid for weeks worked plus paid allowance for annual leave and bank holidays

5. Impact of job evaluation and harmonisation in 'Take Home Pay'

As a consequence of job evaluation, harmonisation e.g. applying working time contracts using the new formula (see appendix 1b) and the loss of some allowances e.g. retainer the proposal result in

- 73% of staff gaining additional pay
- 2% of staff remaining on the same pay rate
- 25% of staff losing pay - up to a max of £500 per annum.

For those staff that will lose financially it is **proposed** is that all staff will be given the opportunity to receive the same take home pay through either

- Increasing weekly hours (if part time) or
- Increasing the number of working weeks (if full time).

There is a significant impact on Senior Supervisory Assistants in Special Schools where the Special Schools Allowance means they have been paid more than their counterparts in mainstream but JE does not identify any differences on the role. It is **proposed** to protect the salary of these posts for three years.

The cost of implementing the proposal is

- £5.5 million back pay which the local authority and schools forum will pay
- £1.8 million going forward from 1st April 2011, which schools were been notified of in the last financial year

*All school support staff above SCP 34 to await completion of third phase of Job Evaluation.

6. Impact of backdating Harmonised conditions of service

As a result the proposal to back date the implementation of harmonised conditions from August 2008 means that some school staff will be

- entitled to take additional annual leave or payment equivalent
- entitled to work reduce hours per week

A detailed presentation for Governors will be offered in early September to provide an opportunity to fully explain the impact of the proposed changes

NB Schools who do not implement may be subject to pay the costs for any equal for equal value pay claims against the Governing Body (not supported by the Local Authority).

7. Job Evaluation Appeal Process

Staff will have the opportunity to appeal against the grade assigned to their job role, and can appeal up to 3 months from the date of implementation. In order to ensure a fair and consistent process the Local authority will manage the process on behalf of schools and will ensure that all appeal panels are provided with advice from current senior staff working in a school or Governors.

Any recommendations made by the panel will be referred back to the governing body for confirmation and approval.

8. JE/Harmonisation Briefing Sessions for Governors (and Headteachers)

A number of briefing sessions will be run for Governors (and Headteachers) to give the opportunity to discuss the proposals outlined in more detail and answer any questions. It is proposed that the briefing sessions will run in late September/Early October, details of sessions will be issued in the near future.

Recommendations

- 1. Governing bodies agree to the implementation of the locally negotiated job evaluation and harmonisation proposals. *NB As the ultimate employer in Community Schools, Wirral Borough Council expect governing bodies to agree this proposal.***
- 2. Governing Bodies agree to the proposals for managing the appeals processes (outlined above paragraph 7)**

*NB Where governing bodies decided not to implement the job evaluation and harmonisation proposals the Local Authority would **not***

- *Provide funding to school to pay staff that would be entitled to back pay from April 2007, following the application of robust job evaluation scheme, agreed with the locally recognised trade unions.*
- *Provide funding to school to pay staff that are entitled to back pay from August 2008, following the application of harmonisation of conditions of service*
- *Provide for any legal /HR support or pay any compensation for school support staff who were successful in winning an equal pay for equal value claim at an Employment Tribunal. Equal Pay claims can be pursued for up to 6 years.*

*All school support staff above SCP 34 to await completion of third phase of Job Evaluation.

Appendix 1a

Current and Proposed Grading Structure for teaching assistants

Level	Current Spinal Column Point Range	Revised Grade /Spinal Column Point Range
TA Level 1	SCP 5-7	Grade C SCP 12-14
TA Level 2	SCP 8-13	Grade D SCP 15-17
TA Level 3	SCP 14-21	Grade F SCP 22-25
TA Level 4	SCP 21-25	Grade G SCP 26-30

Appendix 1b

Proposed pay calculator for School Support staff

Employee Group/contract type	Standard working weeks per annum	Paid weeks (less than 5 years service)	Paid weeks (more than 5 years service)
Full year	52 weeks (less annual leave)	52 (100%)	52 (100%)
Term time Only	38 weeks (incorporating pay for annual leave)	43.89 (84.18%)	44.89 (86.08%)
Teaching Assistants	39 weeks (incorporating pay for annual leave)	45.05 (86.39%)	46.07 (88.35%)
0.917 Contracts	41 weeks (incorporating pay for annual leave)	47.36 (90.82%)	48.43 (92.88%)

*All school support staff above SCP 34 to await completion of third phase of Job Evaluation.

Briefing for Governing Bodies

£250 pay award for school support staff paid less than £21,000 per annum

All school support staff are covered by the NJC for Local Government Services and pay rates for staff working in this area are negotiated between the Local Government Employers (on behalf of Local Authorities) and recognised trade unions.

The Cabinet of Wirral Borough Council agreed:

- (a) Employees whose full-time equivalent salary is less than £21,000 per annum be offered a non-consolidated additional lump sum of £250 for 2011-12.
- (b) To compensate the schools for the additional cost of providing £250 (net of tax, national insurance and pension contributions) it was agreed that an amount of £190,000 be transferred from the General Fund Budget to the Schools Budget
- (c) To ensure no one is disadvantaged by the payment of this sum.

All school staff employed by the Governing Body of Community, Voluntary Controlled and Special Schools and Wirral Borough Council (ultimate employer), currently earning less than £21,000 (full-time equivalent) annual salary **will** receive a payment of £250 (net of income tax, national insurance and pension contributions), which will be paid no later than December 2011.

Governing Bodies of other maintained local authority and non maintained schools i.e. foundation, voluntary aided, trust and academies will need to notify the Local Authority if **they do not wish to make this payment to staff by 14th October 2011**, as the Governing Body are the ultimate employer of those staff.

The additional costs associated with this payment will be reimbursed by the local authority to all schools which make recommended payment to staff.

Schools have previously been notified of the potential costs and have taken them into account when preparing budgets for 2011-12.

Recommendation

- 1 It is recommended that Governing Bodies agree to make the payment of the £250 non consolidated pay award to all staff whose FTE salary is less than £21,000 per annum.

NB All part time, part year/term time staff will receive £250 pro rata. Staff working in more than 1 post will receive up to a max of £250.

This page is intentionally left blank

WIRRAL COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

SCHOOL REDUNDANCIES UPDATE

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 This report updates the Forum on the latest redundancy costs in schools, the agreement received for capitalisation and the proposed redeployment scheme.

2.0 Redundancies

The anticipated number and costs in 2011/12 are summarised below:

	Number of Teachers	Number of Support Staff	Costs in 2011-12
			£000
Primary	5.0	3.4	98
Secondary	34.9	29.5	745
Music Service	10.5	-	242
	50.4	32.9	1,085

The changes since the last report have arisen because of:

- the inclusion of teaching staff within the Music Service who have taken early retirement/severance in order that the service can be restructured and delivered in a more efficient and effective way.
- a number of staff have secured alternative appointments, or final decisions have been deferred by schools (there are 13 fewer teachers above than reported previously).

3.0 Capitalisation

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) approved Wirral's request to capitalise redundancy costs. The statutory redundancy costs of employees (up to £400 per week) may be capitalised. These costs are estimated to be £500,000 and a provision for this is being made within the Children and Young People's Department Capital Programme.

The Music Service statutory redundancy costs may also be capitalised.

When the current year's costs are adjusted for capitalisation they are as follows:

	Redundancy Costs	Less Capitalisation	Adjusted Cost
	£000	£000	£000
Primary	98	54	44
Secondary	745	426	319
Music Service	242	79	163
	<u>1,085</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>526</u>

Resources:

Redundancy/Lump Sum	380
Closing Schools	<u>326</u>
	<u>706</u>

4.0 Redeployment Scheme

A draft voluntary redeployment scheme has been drawn up and is being discussed with Professional Associations and Governing Bodies. The scheme would enable school vacancies to be advertised in schools subject to downsizing, prior to an external advert, giving opportunities for all staff in those schools affected to be considered.

5.0 Outlook 2012-13

The position for 2012-13 will become clearer after the January Census. At this time the indications are:

	Pupil Change	Average Pupil Funding	Amount
		£	£000
Primary School Roll	340	-	
Secondary 11 – 15 school roll	(340)	3,600	1,224
Secondary 16 – 18 school roll	(130)	4,500	585
16 – 18 Phased formula Changes			<u>1,000</u>
			<u>2,809</u>

This may equate to a net reduction of 70 teaching staff, pressure on available resources will therefore continue in 2012-13.

6.0 Recommendations

The Forum note the report and review in 12 months time.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Childrens Services

WIRRAL COUNCIL

WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM – 27th SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

EARLY YEARS SINGLE FORMULA REVIEW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) was introduced in April 2011 to fund the Free Entitlement to early years provision for 3 and 4 year olds across all sectors. DfE guidance indicated that the formula should be reviewed six months after implementation.

BACKGROUND

LAs were required by the DfE to develop a single funding formula to fund the free entitlement to early years provision for 3 and 4 year olds across all sectors. The DfE issued practice guidance in July 2009 setting out what LAs must and should do. One of the requirements of this document was the LAs must review the new formula six months after implementation.

Wirral's EYSFF was implemented in April 2011 and is therefore due for review.

REVIEW

The DfE guidance includes a requirement for LAs to revisit the cost survey and typical cost model as part of the review to ratify their formula and ensure that any changes can be implemented in time for the next financial year. It does not give any further guidance on how the review should be carried out.

It is important that all providers have the opportunity to feed into the review process. We therefore propose writing to all those in receipt of the EYSFF seeking their views on the impact of the new formula. The Schools Forum Early Years Working Group will need to meet to consider the responses from providers and whether any changes need to be made to the formula for 2012.

The review will take place between September and December 2011, with a report to the Forum at the January 2012 meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That:

(1) the Forum supports the proposal to involve all providers in the review of the EYSFF

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

This page is intentionally left blank

WIRRAL COUNCIL

SCHOOLS FORUM – 27th SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

DSG, FINAL 2011-12 GRANT NOTIFICATION AND CENTRAL LIMIT

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report confirms the amount of Dedicated School Grant received in respect of 2011-12 is £229,425,000 (before any academy adjustments.). There is an additional amount of £165,000 which will be carried forward and included in the budget for 2012-13. In addition the report confirms a breach in the Central Expenditure Limit for 2011-12.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Forum agreed to carry forward any DSG grant balances until the end of the 2008-11 funding period. At the 31st March 2011 this totalled £0.8 m plus a £1 m underspend in year. These amounts have been earmarked for Harmonisation back pay in schools.

DSG for 2011-12 is calculated from January 2011 PLASC and Early Years Census Data. This information can not be finalised before the budget process has been completed and was finally confirmed by the DFE on 13th July.

The Schools Budget was set using an expected level of DSG of £229,260,200. This represented estimated pupil numbers (including Early Years) of 45,642 and a Guaranteed Unit of Funding (GUF) of £5,023.01 The pupil data and GUF have now been agreed nationally for all authorities, allowing the DFE to set final DSG allocations.

3.0 DSG 2010-11

The census data for Wirral has a pupil count of 45,626 (16 fewer) and a GUF which is £5,028.39 (£5.38 higher). The combined effect of these changes will result in £165,000 more grant.

4.0 Central Limit

The Central Expenditure Limit is the limit the authority can retain from the Schools Budget and spend centrally on behalf of schools. The increase (or decrease) should match overall increases or decreases in delegated school budgets, unless a change has been agreed by the Schools Forum.

Although a breach was not intended at the time the budget was set, the limit has been exceeded. The reasons are largely due to technical adjustments between the Schools Budget and the Children's Services Budget and as a result of mainstreaming School Budget Grants in a way that is similar to previous years.

On a relatively small central budget these result in significant percentage increases.

The net percentage increases are as follows:

Schools Budget minus 1.5%

Central Expenditure plus 27.5 %

The actual changes in central expenditure are summarised below:

	£000	%
Transfer of the PFI Affordability Gap (together with local authority funding – not DSG)	1,973	10.5
Transfer of School PPM budgets (together with local authority funding – not DSG)	649	3.5
Central funding for mainstreamed grants (AST's, City Learning Centres, MEAS)	2,055	10.9
Provision for additional delegated Early Years Costs	762	4.0
Provision for Harmonisation loan repayment	450	2.4
Carbon Reduction Costs	189	1.0
Net Reduction in SEN, School Meals, Behaviour etc	915cr	(4.8)
Net Increase	5,163	27.5

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

The additional DSG of £21,622 is carried forward and included in the budget for 2012-13.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

WIRRAL COUNCIL

WIRRAL SCHOOLS' FORUM 27th September 2011

REPORT OF THE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Wirral Schools Forum Membership

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report informs the group of the current make up of the Schools Forum membership.

1. Current Representation

5	Primary Headteachers
5	Primary Governors (1 vacancy)
1	Secondary Headteachers
2	Secondary Governors (1 vacancy)
4	Academy Headteacher Rep
2	Academy Governor Representative
1	Special Headteacher
1	Special Governors
1	Nursery Representative
1	Wirral Governors Forum
23	Total Schools Membership
1	Non-teacher representative
1	Teacher representative
1	Catholic Diocese
1	Church of England Diocese
1	14- 19 Representative
2	PVI Early Years Providers
7	Total Non-Schools Membership
30	Total Membership

2. Vacancies

There are 2 vacancies, one secondary governor and one primary governor rep. The nomination papers have been sent out to all primary and secondary schools to forward to all governors. The nomination forms must be returned by Monday 31st October. If there are more nominations than required then elections will take place. Representatives will be appointed before the next forum meeting.

3. Membership Renewal

September 2011 - the Catholic Diocese Representative will be discussed at the Catholic Primary Heads Group.

January 2012 – Secondary Academy Representative will be discussed at WASH.

4. Secondary Representation

The balance of representation between secondary schools and academies will be referred to WASH.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Forum notes the report.

David Armstrong
Interim Director of Children's Services

WIRRAL SCHOOLS FORUM – 27th SEPTEMBER 2011

WORKPLAN

Meeting Date

Tuesday
24th January 2012

Wednesday
28th March 2012

Tuesday
3rd June 2012

Tuesday
25th September 2012

Finance

Schools Settlement
Schools Budget
Pupil Premium

Budget update

Schools Outturn
School Balances
Final DSG Calculation
Central Limit

Final DSG Calculation

Updates

School Finance Regulations
Scheme for Financing Schools
Hospital School
Academies
Special School agreements

School Redundancies
Funding Formula

SEN / Home Tuition / LACES
16-19 SEN National Allocations
Hospital School Primary Provision
Insurance

Consultation

Outcome of Local Formula Consultation
Outcome of National Formula Consultation
School Finance Regulations

Funding Formula changes
WASP delegated Budget

Working Groups

Early Years Formula review
Traded Services
Funding Formula

Traded Services
Academy services

This page is intentionally left blank