



SCHOOLS FUNDING FORUM AGENDA

8.30 - 11.00 am	7 July 2016	CEME, Room 233, Main Entrance
------------------------	--------------------	--

Members: 26 Quorum: 10

MEMBERSHIP:

Representative Groups

Head Teachers (13):

Emma Allen, Special
Margy Bushell, Primary
Kirsten Cooper, Primary
David Denchfield, Primary
Malcolm Drakes, Primary
Julian Dutnall, Academy
Bill Edgar, Secondary
Nigel Emes, Primary
Chris Hobson, Primary
Simon London, Academy
Gary Pocock, Academy
Keith Williams, Academy
Tim Woodford, Academy

Governors (6):

Sheila Clarke, Primary
Bernard Gilley, Primary
John McKernan, Academy
Derek Smith, OBE, Secondary

**Non-School
Representatives (3):**

Maria Thompson, Post 16
Joanna Wilkinson, Early Years/PVI Sector (substitute)

Trade Unions (3):

John Giles, UNISON
Keith Passingham, NASUWT
Ray Waxler, NUT

For information about the meeting please contact:
David Allen david.allen@havering.gov.uk 01708 433851

If you are unable to attend please contact your named substitute or ask David Allen to do so on your behalf.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS OR OBSERVERS

2. MEMBERSHIP

- i. To note the resignation of Daren Jackson, primary schools governor representative.
- ii. To note that Wayne Chretien is no longer eligible to serve as the maintained special schools' representative. Maintained Special Schools and Academy Special Schools continue to be represented on the Forum.

3. TO AGREE THE NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 April 2016 (Pages 1 - 6)

The notes are attached at Appendix A.

4. MATTERS ARISING

5.

5. HIGH NEEDS BUDGET OUTTURN 2015-16 AND FORECAST 2016-17 (Pages 7 - 8)

6. REPORT ON EXPENDITURE OF CENTRALLY RETAINED DSG BUDGETS 2015-16 (Pages 9 - 20)

7. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE PROVISION FUNDING FROM SEPTEMBER 2016 (Pages 21 - 25)

8. NEXT MEETINGS

Meeting dates for the academic year 2016/17 to be arranged.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCHOOLS FUNDING FORUM
CEME
28 April 2016 (8.30 - 10.50 am)**

Present:

Representative Groups

Teachers: Emma Allen, Special (EA)
Margy Bushell, Primary (MB)
Kirsten Cooper, Primary (KC)
David Denchfield, Primary (DD)
Bill Edgar, Secondary (BE)
Nigel Emes, Primary (Chairman) (NE)
Chris Hobson, Primary (CH)
Simon London, Academy (SL)
Gary Pocock, Academy (GP)
Keith Williams, Academy (Vice-Chairman) (KW)
Tim Woodford, Academy (TW)

Governors: Sheila Clarke, Primary (SC)
Bernard Gilley, Primary (BG)
John McKernan, Academy (JM)
Derek Smith MBE, Secondary (DS)

**Non-School
Representatives:** Maria Thompson, Post 16 (MT)
Joanna Wilkinson, Early Years/PVI Sector (JW)

Trade Unions: Ray Waxler, NUT (RW)

Officers in Attendance: David Allen (DA)
Dennis Brewin (DB)
Trevor Cook (TC)
Sue Imbriano (SI)
Paul Tinsley (PT)

167 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS OR OBSERVERS

Apologies were received from Wayne Chertien, Malcolm Drakes, Julian Dutnall, Daren Jackson and John Giles.

168 TO AGREE THE NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendments:

Minute 164 – Final paragraph of section1 (Proposals for a schools national funding formula), second line to read ‘on behalf of the Council’ rather than as stated.

Minute 166 – Second paragraph, third line to read ‘their opposition’ rather than as stated.

169 **MATTERS ARISING**

It was noted that the issue of the timing of payments was recognised and had been raised at the Council.

170 **ALLOCATION OF THE DSG CARRIED FORWARD FROM 2015/16**

It was noted that the DSG account had been closed earlier than usual. A total of £1.324 million was unspent, principally due to some agreed projects not having started.

The projects had been funded from DSG underspends carried forward from the previous financial year. They included projects for vulnerable two-year olds which had started late but had proved successful. Additional Resource Provisions, a budget to pay late recoupment claims from other LAs and adjustments to business rates.

Early years and high needs were overspent while the schools block was underspent by £874k. The overspend in Early Years was partially due to the mismatch in the payments made during the year for which Early Years Grant was not received until the following financial year. DA would bring to the next meeting a breakdown of the high needs overspend.

The underspend in pupil growth was due to the late start of the anticipated bulges and expansions in pupil numbers. The School Partnership budget had underspent and had been reduced for 2016-17. It was noted that a payment had been missed for the public private partnership applied for three schools for energy conservation work; these arrangements were ending in about two years’ time. The budget for termination of employment costs was not spent and was no longer included in the 2016-17 budget. There was a slight overspend on the School Admissions budget. From the de-delegated budgets there had been a missed payment on the trade union facility time budget and an underspend in the budget to support schools in financial difficulty which would be needed in 2016-17.

Carry-overs requested for 2016-17 were for the continuation of the vulnerable two year olds project, the residual costs of the case officers and assistant educational psychologists for EHCPs, funding to support Additional Resource Provision and residual costs of the professionals’ portal.

DA would take back that several schools were still writing their own EHCPs. JW felt it was frustrating that early years/SEND staff were undertaking the work of the Council re SEND. The early years service received no financial help for SEND children and an hourly rate had to be funded that was less than the maintained sector.

SI suggested that Carline Penfold could meet with the forum. Early years was a national issue and the points re funding needed to be forcefully made to Government. JW felt it was important to transition a SEND child to the primary sector with the right funding so that the child did not struggle in school. KC added that she would no longer allow her SEND staff to do the paperwork for EHC Plans as there were Council officers for this.

SL explained that he had not yet had any support for a business case for ASD facilities at Hall Mead. A similar situation existed at Redden Court. Hall Mead was expecting an additional four statemented children from September but had not received the required funding as yet and hence did not have the infrastructure for this. SI would contact SL and Redden Court direct regarding these issues. There was a need for a process and system to be established between schools and asset management. A carry forward of £521k had been requested from the previous year's projects. Two other schools had come forward to take part in the behavioural pilot although no schools had come forward as yet for the higher level of the step-up model. .

The requested carry forward was **AGREED** by the Forum but more assurance and details of expenditure were requested. Also **AGREED** by the Forum were the use of carry forwards for payments due in 2016-17 as shown in table 6.2 of the report and the roll forward of de-delegated budgets as shown in table 6.3.

DA would bring a report to the next meeting on schools unable to set a balanced budget and it was noted that increased pension and National Insurance contributions had led to a deficit for some schools. One option for schools to make savings could be to federate with another school in order to share costs.

It was hoped that a revised allocation of the DSG from 2017/18 would result in a better allocation for Havering. DA would also report to the next meeting on schools with large carry overs

171 **SECTION 251 BUDGET STATEMENT 2016-17**

DA explained that the Council was required to publish the annual statement of planned expenditure on Children's Services (including schools) on its website. The majority (£176 million) of the overall budget went to individual schools, including academies and early years providers. De-delegated amounts from maintained schools were also listed. The largest of these related to insurance. High needs funding included top-up funding for both

maintained schools and Academies. All these budgets areas were funded by the Direct Schools Grant (DSG).

Non-DSG expenditure was funded by the Council and the Education Services Grant. This grant was expected to end in 2018/19. These areas included £1.1m for statutory services, and also for school improvement, education welfare and asset management. Central expenditure also included £662k for the educational psychology service and £2.2m for SEN transport.

The statement also showed planned expenditure on Children's Social Care as follows: Looked After Children and associated costs,£14 million; social work and child protection areas,£11 million. The overall budget for education services was £205 million and with the inclusion of children's social services, this increased to £241 million.

The capital expenditure figure of £43 million covered planned maintenance, early needs and devolved capital.

DA would clarify the position on how much of the early years pupil premium allocation was utilised.

The Forum **RECEIVED** the Section 251 budget statements.

172 **DFE FUNDING REFORMS - CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

DA explained that this was the first stage of a two-stage consultation and draft responses had been circulated previously. The Forum **NOTED** the responses to the consultation that had been submitted on its behalf. The Chairman recorded thanks to DA for his work on the responses.

173 **DFE CHILDCARE CONSULTATION**

The Forum noted that the Government was looking to review hourly funding rates for childcare and wished to improve the overall quality of childcare.

It was proposed that there would be an extension of childcare up to 30 hours per week for 'working families' and that this term was now clearly defined. It would be the responsibility of parents to self-declare that they would meet thresholds. If a parent lost their job, childcare would be funded to allow it to continue for a grace period of half a term.

It was proposed that childcare would be offered from 6 am to 8 pm but there remained a maximum of 10 funded hours per day. It was also proposed to enhance SEN provision on a case by case basis.

These changes would mean new responsibilities for the Local Authority but the process would be streamlined. Parents would need to be made aware of the revised offer through both on-line and off-line channels.

JW pointed out that Havering only received £3.56 of an £4.12 average hourly rate and that it was important to invest in early years. There were current concerns about both the quality and staffing of early years provision with fewer students entering the sector.

NE added that he felt that schools were educators rather than nursery care providers and that the nursery at his school could not continue to be subsidised. JW felt that that any response to the consultation should reflect concerns that it was unclear what the 30 hour model of childcare would look like.

It was felt that rates may have to be raised by £1.50 - £2 per hour in order to meet the new national average. DA confirmed that the Council funded an hourly rate but received one of the lowest allocations in London to do this.

It was **AGREED** that JW would meet with TC and the Early Years Reference Group on 10 May in order to agree a response. Providers were also encouraged to report separately and TC would share responses submitted by the Local Authority.

174 **SCHOOL KITCHEN EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE**

Following the raising of the matter at the previous meeting of the Forum, DA explained the rationale for school kitchen equipment being the responsibility of schools. Reference was made back to the Section 251 statement and it could be seen that that there was no budget line to record kitchen maintenance. Also, the Education Funding Agency had confirmed that this funding was delegated to schools. NE and others stated that they had not had any notification of this policy.

DB responded that Havering Catering Services had previously been expected to meet the costs of repairs that were not its responsibility such as the repair of fences and pavements in schools and this also extended to the repair of kitchen equipment. Catering Services was running a deficit and, while this was reducing, expenditure on kitchen equipment could not be justified.

DB had met with heads and school business managers and offered 0.7% of income or £500 to schools to go towards maintenance costs. While some money was available to modernise school kitchens initially, it was agreed that kitchen equipment was heavily used and expensive. DB wished to reach an amicable agreement on these issues.

Academies had found it difficult to find an alternative provider of kitchen equipment and DB was pleased that extensions, with a clear Service Level

Agreement, had been agreed with schools such as Frances Bardsley and Hall Mead. DB felt that Catering Services' offer was competitive compared to other organisations.

An asset register had been sent to all schools and DB would arrange for this to be resent. In cases where two schools shared a kitchen, the school with the kitchen would receive 0.7% of income or £750, whichever is the greater and schools with just a server would receive up to £250. Any costs above this would need to be agreed between the two schools. Health and safety issues would normally be the responsibility of the catering company.

Members of the Forum felt that the service offered by Catering Services was very good but that it was important to achieve best value. NE felt that there had been an issue of communication in making schools aware that catering equipment was now their responsibility and felt that this change would not be cost neutral to schools.

175 **RAVENSBOURNE SCHOOL**

It was noted that Ravensbourne School became an academy on 1st April 2016 as part of the Hornbeam Academy Trust.

176 **NEXT MEETING**

It was **AGREED** that the next meeting would be held on Thursday 7 July at 8.30 am at CEME.

177 **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business raised.

Chairman

Schools Funding Forum 7th July 2016

ITEM 5

Subject Heading:

**High Needs Budget – outturn
expenditure 2015-16 and forecast
expenditure 2016-17**

Report Author:

**David Allen – Strategic Finance
Manager**

Eligibility to vote:

All members

SUMMARY

This report provides the Schools Funding Forum with the outturn position for 2015-16 expenditure from the High Needs Budget and a forecast of expenditure for 2016-17.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Funding Forum notes the report.

REPORT DETAIL

The figures are provided in the report attached.

HIGH NEEDS - OUTTURN 2015-16, FORECAST EXPENDITURE 2016-17

	Actual Expenditure 2014/15 £	Number of Placements	Actual Expenditure 2015/16 (Provisional) £	Number of Placements	Forecast Expenditure 2016/17 £	Number of Placements	Difference 2015/16 to 2016/17 £
1. PRE-16							
a) Mainstream Schools (LA Maintained Schools and Academies)	2,225,441	531	2,908,491	560	2,637,953	553	-270,538
- New and Additional Statemented Support	1,265,055	174	1,042,604	171	1,181,239	64 + new intake	138,635
b) High Needs Units or Resourced Provision in LA Mainstream Schools	1,116,347	95	1,449,502	109	1,751,830	125	302,328
c) Special Schools	5,321,256	256	4,682,333	264	4,268,855	264	-413,478
d) Non-Maintained & Independent Special Schools NMSS - Element 3 Top Up Independent Schools - Element 1 & 2 & Element 3 Top Up	1,352,403	107	2,073,971	104	2,151,887	91	77,916
2. POST-16							
a) SEN Post 16 budget provision (sections (a) to (f) above) LBH Mainstream & OoB Mainstream and Special Schools - Element 3 Top Up NMSS - Element 3 Top Up Independent Schools - Element 1 & 2 & Element 3 Top Up Further Education Colleges - Element 2 (new enrolments) & 3	1,646,689	224	1,549,543	253	1,500,000	200	-49,543
b) Havering Special Schools - Element 3 Top Up	289,498	23	379,546	25	502,205	35	122,659
3. ALTERNATIVE PROVISION							
a) Pupil Referral Service	2,620,027	134	2,373,333	134	2,465,000	134	91,667
b) Hospital Education	86,388		73,046		78,150		5,104
c) Home Education Central Support	14,565		23,209		26,220		3,011
d) Inclusion Service Central Support	100,269		150,928		152,920		1,992
e) Social Inclusion Support	-63,096		132,978		178,180		45,202
f) PRU Transport	118,331		147,738		143,880		-3,858
4. CENTRAL HIGH NEEDS EXPENDITURE							
Central SEN & AP support	2,057,213		1,740,913		1,678,660		-62,253
TOTAL	18,150,386		18,728,135		18,716,979		-11,156
Budget	18,158,640		17,906,313		18,891,678		985,365
Variance	8,254		-821,822		174,699		996,521

Schools Funding Forum 7th July 2016

ITEM 6

Subject Heading:

Use of Central budgets 2015-16

Report Author:

**David Allen – Strategic Finance
Manager**

Eligibility to vote:

All members

SUMMARY

Prior to the start of each financial year the LA may request that some funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant may be retained centrally for a limited number of specific purposes. The LA is required to report back to the Forum on the use of these funds. This is a report to the Forum of expenditure against the budgets retained centrally in 2015-16

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Funding Forum notes the contents of this report.

REPORT DETAIL

1. Operational Guidance

The following is an extract from the relevant section of the operational guidelines on 2016-17 revenue funding.

Centrally retained services

64. Funding for some services can be centrally retained before allocating the formula, with the agreement of the schools forum. A number of these services are subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increases in expenditure from 2015 to 2016 and schools forum approval is required each year to confirm the

amounts on each line. The table below sets out which services can be retained centrally, and what approval is required.

Approval required	Services covered
<i>Schools forum approval is not required (although they should be consulted)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>high needs block provision</i> • <i>central licences negotiated by the Secretary of State</i>
<i>Schools forum approval is required on a line-by-line basis.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>early years block provision</i> • <i>funding to enable all schools to meet the infant class size requirement</i> • <i>back-pay for equal pay claims</i> • <i>remission of boarding fees at maintained schools and academies</i> • <i>places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils</i>
<i>Schools forum approval is required on a line-by-line basis. The budget cannot exceed the value agreed in the previous funding period.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>admissions</i> • <i>servicing of schools forum</i>
<i>Schools forum approval is required on a line-by-line basis. The budget cannot exceed the value agreed in the previous funding period and no new commitments can be entered into.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>capital expenditure funded from revenue (ie no new projects can be charged to the central schools budget)</i> • <i>contribution to combined budgets</i> • <i>existing termination of employment costs (ie no new redundancy costs can be charged to the central schools budget)</i> • <i>prudential borrowing costs</i> • <i>SEN transport costs</i>
<i>Schools forum approval is required on a line-by-line basis, including approval of the criteria for allocating funds to schools.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth, including new schools set up to meet basic need, whether maintained or academy</i> • <i>funding for good or outstanding schools with falling rolls where growth in pupil numbers is expected within three years</i>

2. 2015-16 Expenditure report

From the services listed above for which budgetary provision was agreed for 2015-16, expenditure is reported as below.

2.1 Early years

Budget £506,424

Expenditure £497,985

	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
	£	£	£
Central Services (Early Years QA)	326,030	317,591	-8,439
Contingencies	180,394	180,394	0
Total	506,424	497,985	-8,439
Overspend in Early Years 2, 3 and 4 year old provision			341,611
Total overspend in Early Years			333,172

2.2 School Admissions

Budget £499,670

Expenditure £516,470

Variance £16,800 Salary overspend reported at the last meeting

2.3 Servicing of Schools Forum

Budget £43,250

Expenditure £43,250

Variance £0

2.4 Capital Expenditure from Revenue

Budget £87,490

Expenditure £56,825

Variance £30,665 Missed payment, cfwd agreed at last meeting

2.5 Contribution to Combined Budgets (School Partnership Fund)

Budget £236,000

Expenditure £192,426

Variance £43,574

See Appendix A for details of expenditure.

This budget has been reduced to £200,000 in 2016-17.

2.6 Termination of employment costs

Budget £39,000

Expenditure £6,480

This budget has been withdrawn in 2016-17.

2.7 Pupil growth Fund

Budget £2,821,822

Expenditure £2,321,533

Variance £500,289

New permanent expansions - 2 schools, 1 form of entry each	135,581
Cohorts moving through from previous year permanent expansions - 12 schools Funding for 345 additional places (11.5 forms of entry)	497,129
Funding of 7 bulge classes for 180 pupils in September 2015	380,917
Commitment to schools for unfilled bulge classes from previous year - 19 schools	1,031,962
Allocations to meet infant class size regulations - 2 schools	78,256
Previous year growth in secondary schools and academies (25 places) in September 2015	56,423
Funding for Academies Expansion Apr-Aug	141,266
	<u>2,321,533</u>
Budget	2,700,000
Recoupment for academy growth (summer term)	121,822
Revised Budget	<u>2,821,822</u>
Underspend	500,289
2014-15 expenditure (for comparative purposes)	2,363,107

2.8 Schools with falling rolls

Budget £500,000

Expenditure £500,000

Variance £0 Allocation details provided at the last meeting

REPORT ON USE OF 2015-16 DSG SCHOOLS PARTNERSHIP AND SCHOOLS CAUSING CONCERN BUDGET

School A Supporting School	School B Supported School	Purpose/ focus	Monitoring/ reporting arrangements	LA officer	Start/ end date	Funding	Focus/outcomes/evaluation	Total Cost
Crowlands	Gidea Park	Improved teaching interventions for PP pupils	QA Visits	JP	Jan 2015 – Mar 2015	£1,500 Gidea Park £1,500 Crowlands	To improve outcomes at all key stages for disadvantaged pupils To share strategies for the use of the PPG	£3,000
Scotts	Brady	<p>Provide targeted coaching and mentoring for specific staff, particularly subject leads to support improvements to quality of teaching.</p> <p>Support the SENCO with immediate changes needed as part of Code of Conduct Support the new approach for Brady with SEND in line with new guidelines.</p> <p>Support the development of a collegiate approach to teaching of Maths: phonics and Literacy</p> <p>Facilitate moderation of marking, feedback and assessment</p>	<p>PRMs</p> <p>HT Report</p> <p>QA Meetings</p>	GS	Jan 2016 – Mar 2016	£6,750 Brady £3,000 Scotts	<p>Following an initial joint staff meeting, subject leads and year groups partnered up and meet to discuss action plans for the partnership. The focus was on 2 NQTs being effectively supported, 1 weaker teacher having good practice modelled, and the new Middle Leaders being coached in establishing their roles.</p> <p>A midpoint joint staff meeting, held on 9th May at Brady, reviewed progress to date and evaluated action plans from these partnerships.</p> <p>A final evaluation is scheduled for Monday 4th July, where staff will feed back outcomes and draw up a tentative programme of further</p>	£9,750

		<p>To support and peer mentor class teachers that require support as necessary.</p> <p>Work with Brady SLT on individual development plans to support specific teachers in improving the quality of teaching and learning</p> <p>Provide release for Brady and Scotts staff so that best practice can be shared between the schools</p>					<p>support needed for 2016/17.</p> <p>Quality of Teaching and Learning – through joint observations, team planning and teaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2014/15 : 40% Good or better consistently - 2015/16 : 86% Good or better consistently (with projected 100% for 2016/17) <p>Revised and reworked Self Evaluation Summary and School Improvement Plan, which subject and phase leaders take responsibility for and evaluated by link governors. This has had significant input from the Scotts partnership.</p>	
R.J.Mitchell	Wykeham	<p>Teachers not yet consistently good are selected for a systematic and time bound cycle of coaching, including joint planning, team teaching and evaluation;</p> <p>One teacher with consistently good teaching, is selected for coaching programme in order to add capacity.</p> <p>The activities are chosen as</p>	Monitoring and evaluation through termly impact reports from LA Progress Review meetings, LA QA visits, SIP, core consultant reports and Wykeham senior leadership	SS	Oct 15- Mar 16	£4,200 R.J.Mitchell £4,100 Wykeham	<p>By December 2015, specified teachers will have successfully completed a cycle of coaching which has been moderated with the partner school and the LA. <i>Outcome: this was completed and there was improvement shown in all but one of the coaching participants.</i></p> <p>By December 2015, 80% of teaching will be consistently good over time triangulated with the latest data and progress evident in books with NQTs on track to</p>	£8,300

		<p>the key areas which require rapid improvement in order to recover Wykeham to good within the Ofsted timetable.</p> <p>Teaching is to be improved by:</p> <p>Using an increasing number of teachers within the school to share good practice, timetabled and with specific targets</p> <p>Incorporate coaching roles in teachers' PM objectives and in career level expectations</p> <p>Define Wykeham expectations in terms of all adults' personal accountability for professional development, reflective practice and contribution to a learning community.</p> <p>Making sure that work in lessons accurately reflects pupils' abilities, effectively challenges pupils and engages them fully in learning;</p> <p>Ensuring pupils have time</p>	<p>cycle of monitoring and evaluation.</p>				<p>achieve the teachers' standards; <i>Outcome: there has been substantial turnover in staff. NQTs</i> By April 2016, 100% of teaching will be consistently good over time triangulated with the latest data and progress evident in books; <i>Outcome : Ofsted inspection evidenced that this is not met, although recognised improvements and that the improvement strategy itself is working- evidenced by the grade 2 for leadership. As of June 16 .</i> <i>The quality of marking is improved. This was not an issue at inspection. Recent interviews with teachers suggests that the coaching programme is viewed very positively by staff and that it has increased bot staff cooperation and cohesion and individuals' confidence.</i> Work has been done collaboratively with RJ Mitchell staff at middle leader level to ensure phase leaders are able to discharge their duties and make accurate judgements regarding children's outcomes. <i>Outcome: recent moderation activity between the cluster of schools suggests staff have a clear view of progress. This was corroborated through inspection.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--

		to act on advice given by teachers through marking; Class teachers carry out assessment accurately and use this in daily teaching.						
Broadford	Mead	<p>Release time for middle leaders to be coached by Broadford middle leaders</p> <p>Joint staff meeting 2x per term. MW and MD to liaise about which meetings would be most appropriate</p> <p>Release time for teaching staff to moderate work with Broadford teachers</p> <p>Release time for teaching staff to observe good practice at Broadford</p> <p>Release time for both head teachers to conduct monitoring visits at the other school</p>	PRMs		Sept 15- Mar 16	£13,350 Broadford £10,800 Mead	<p>Developing awareness of accountability element of the role Raised expectations of teaching staff. <i>Outcome: very clear shared systems of accountability are in place across the two schools. Middle leaders understand and discharge their roles well and teachers understand the accountability processes. Recent interviews with middle leaders show good capacity.</i></p> <p>Sharing of good practice with a focus on teaching and learning. Each teacher to be paired up with a colleague at Broadford. Sharing of good practice Joint practice development <i>Outcome: Teaching practice and middle leaders have shared extensively all areas of curriculum, classroom management, and pedagogy. Teaching is now overwhelmingly good. There are common practices in place for managing classroom behaviour, a common phonics scheme has been introduced and curriculums are being aligned.</i></p>	£24,150

							<p>Increased accuracy of assessments <i>Outcomes: Recent moderation of writing showed. The school has undertaken a whole raft of moderation activity with Broadford, symphony schools, the Harold hill cluster and with the LA. Book scrutiny suggests that teachers are undertaking effective formative assessment and marking as well as tracking for timely interventions.</i> <i>The school was formally moderated by the LA and was found to be accurate in its judgements June 16.</i></p>	
LA	Gaynes	<p>To commission a Pupil Premium review in order to provide recommendations to support the school in the narrowing of PP gaps</p> <p>To commission a S.175 Safeguarding Review to support the school in developing its action plan.</p> <p>To commission 5 days of additional SIP advisor to support improved progress for all students by meeting in small groups of teaching staff to review their evidence of differentiation in student work.</p>	PRMs to scrutinise school's monitoring and evaluation	IG	Mar 16 – July16	<p>£825</p> <p>£500</p> <p>£2,800</p>	<p>Intended outcomes: OFSTED recognise that the school is improving the outcomes for PP students.</p> <p>School judgements are externally validated and recommendations are made for further areas of improvement.</p> <p>To secure outcomes for students that are at least securely good. All staff move their practice on following access to strong in-school CPD activities. The school develops reflective practitioners</p>	£4,125
LA	Royal	NQT coaching support from	PRMs to	IG	Mar 16 –	£2,250	Improvement in QoT & student	£25,050

	Liberty	<p>Frances Bardsley Academy External review of maths department carried out by FBA</p> <p>Development of PiXL resources for maths and student conference on approaching GCSE maths exams.</p> <p>Training/support for new Data Manager in operating new assessment and tracking systems.</p> <p>Provide a temporary associate school leader to lead maths and to cover the leadership deficit in SLT, timetabling and maths as a result of sickness, restructure and resignations.</p>	scrutinise school's monitoring and evaluation		July16	<p>£600</p> <p>£800</p> <p>£600</p> <p>£20,800</p>	<p>outcomes</p> <p>Current action plan updated to address all issues; updated SoW & assessment; improved student tracking and GCSE outcomes.</p> <p>Appropriate PiXL resources identified & used in targeted fashion. All Yr. 11 students have personalised learning checklists & areas for intervention. Improved GCSE outcomes.</p> <p>School is more able to track progress, predict outcomes and target interventions in order to raise outcomes.</p> <p>Effective options process and timetable written for 2016-17; development of middle leaders; strengthened maths department; school use of new assessment systems embedded.</p>	
LA	Sanders	<p>Support for Key stage 3 English delivery: in adapting and differentiating lesson materials to extend and support all learners; standardisation/moderation of assessments across the whole team; support for non-specialists in dept.</p> <p>Support for middle leaders to develop their leadership and carry out effective monitoring and evaluation of their teams, including</p>	PRMs to scrutinise school's monitoring and evaluation	IG	Mar 16 – Dec 16	<p>£3,850</p> <p>£3,575</p> <p>£500</p>	<p>Intended outcomes:</p> <p>Improved QoT in core subject and increased confidence in the specialist pedagogy for non-specialist staff, leading to increased progress for KS3 (and KS4) students</p> <p>Ofsted recognise improved leadership at middle tier and Ofsted key issue has been improved.</p> <p>School judgements are externally</p>	£7,295

SCHOOLS CAUSING CONCERN		
Wykeham Primary	to support additional leadership costs	£34,236
Manor Green College	to support additional leadership costs	£28,320
Dame Tipping	to support additional leadership costs	£15,000
TOTAL		£77,556

TOTAL ALLOCATED	£192,426
------------------------	-----------------

2015-16 BUDGET	£236,000
-----------------------	-----------------

UNDERSPEND	£43,574
-------------------	----------------

Schools Funding Forum 7th July 2016

ITEM 7

Subject Heading:

**Proposed Alternative Provision
Funding from September 2016**

Report Author:

**Paul Tinsley – Education Inclusion and
Support Manager**

Eligibility to vote:

All Members

SUMMARY

The need for academisation of the Havering PRS has been set out in previous reports. This report sets out the possible funding implications in relation to the proposed new arrangements around support for vulnerable pupils at risk of exclusion or who have been excluded from school. It provides details of current funding allocations and how this would differ with the proposed new funding model. Given that the Olive AP Academy provision will be limited in terms of places available, it also provides possible options for supporting pupils at risk that would not be supported via this provision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That approval be given to the de-delegation of £300k to support an enhanced LA Behaviour Support/Outreach team for primary provision
2. That approval be given to the LA retaining sufficient funding to allow for the commissioning of places out of borough for permanently excluded pupils
3. That, in the light of the Education Excellence Everywhere White Paper, consideration be given to devolving funds to secondary schools to explore models for supporting excluded/at risk pupils, thus reducing the need to purchase additional places out of borough.

REPORT DETAIL

At the time of writing, negotiations with Olive Academies Trust are nearing a conclusion and therefore the signing of an Academy Order is imminent. If academisation is held up beyond the planned September start date, the designated HMI has advised she will return with a view to a second full inspection, leading to closure of the Havering PRS. In addition to the reputational damage for the Borough, this action would incur major costs in relation to staff redundancies and leave the LA without a facility to accommodate pupils who are permanently excluded.

The LA is currently working closely with Olive Academies Trust with a view to the signing of an academy order for the transfer of our KS3 and KS4 provisions. The proposal is to offer Olive Academies Trust a long lease on the Birnam Wood site for a facility, initially for up to 35 pupils who are either excluded or at risk of exclusion and a separate KS3 intervention facility from Petersfield Depot (subject to planning and satisfactory refurbishment of the site). The Trust is willing to take over responsibility for running the PRS from September, provided they receive 'a letter of comfort' from the Council to confirm that the above facilities will be available and that the LA will pay for the agreed number of places to be commissioned for KS3 and KS4 pupils.

Following negotiations with the Trust, the cost per pupil place was agreed at a level suggested in discussions with secondary head teachers, and represents a saving as compared with current costs of commissioning places from the Havering PRS. The proposed costs range from £15k per place to £18k per place. The current cost of a place in the Havering PRS is £19k per place. Some research has been undertaken as to the costs of a place at other LA PRUs and it would appear that the funding model proposed by the Trust is in line with the lower end of the current market rate.

In addition to the KS3 and 4 provisions commissioned from Olive, it will be necessary for the LA to retain some of the current PRS budget as there may be a need to commission some places out of borough where pupils are permanently excluded and cannot be accommodated in borough. This is the case in relation to primary pupils, as there will be no primary PRU, and also secondary pupils in respect of space limitations that will restrict the number of pupils Olive can support. It is also proposed that some element of the existing PRS budget is devolved to secondary schools to support intervention work with pupils at risk of exclusion. This approach could be supported by the LA's Alternative Provision Commissioner and is in line with current proposals in the White Paper, 'Educational Excellence Everywhere'. Paragraph 6.76 of the White Paper states, in relation to AP in future that:

'We will change accountability arrangements so that a pupil's mainstream school will retain accountability for their educational outcomes and will take a lead role in commissioning their provision, including when they have permanently excluded the pupil but the pupil has not subsequently enrolled at a different mainstream school. Mainstream schools will support AP providers to deliver a broad

and balanced curriculum and high quality teaching by sharing subject specialists and facilities that smaller alternative providers would otherwise find hard to access.

The suggestion is that mainstream schools will need to be far more involved in decisions around commissioning alternative provision and in working alongside such providers.

With regards to primary provision, the Primary PRU (based at the James Oglethorpe School site) will be replaced by a new model, which will focus on early intervention and building behaviour confidence in all our primary schools. The LA will continue to provide outreach support and training for primary schools to this end. The current budget for the Primary PRU would be used to support an enhanced outreach service. Three children's centres would be made available for primary schools to refer pupils for part time intervention and support work off site. The current budget could be used to redeploy existing Primary PRU staff with experience in teaching pupils with challenging behaviour. Two early help officers could also be appointed to address any parenting/family issues in relation to these pupils.

A budget of £300k would be de-delegated to the LA to support this inclusive approach and enhance the existing Behaviour Support team so that an outreach service could be provided to primary schools. The focus of the primary model would, in essence, be on early intervention/prevention and building confidence/skills across all schools to deal with more challenging behaviour from pupils. A new member of staff has been employed within the LBH education inclusion team to support primary schools in their dealing with vulnerable pupils and families. Funding would also need to be held centrally by the LA to pay for the education of any permanently excluded primary pupils. There have been two permanent exclusions of primary pupils this year and this is in line with average rates across outer London boroughs. A threshold framework has been developed so that all schools are held accountable to a common framework around supporting pupils in school before considering a permanent exclusion.

With regards to the Medical Needs provision, Frances Bardsley Academy has agreed to take on the responsibility of hosting this provision from September, including the TUPE responsibilities for appropriate staff. A new build would be provided at the school site in due course (see financial implications) and 18 places commissioned at a cost of £16k per place. Frances Bardsley Academy is willing to take on responsibility for operation of the Medical Needs provision from September 2016 at the current facility, subject to agreement to fund a new build.

Financial implications and risks:

Revenue

The current cost of funding the PRS (Pupil Referral Service) in 2016-17 is £2,285,000 potentially rising to £2,465,000 if all places are filled. The funding is comprised of place-led funding of £10k per place (x 134 places = £1,340,000) and £9,000 per pupil on roll (reduced by 50% for dually registered pupils who attend the medical provision). The pupil-led cost for 2016-17 is £945,000 potentially rising to £1,125,000 if all places are filled.

These costs are met from the High Needs Block of the DSG. The High Needs Block is under considerable pressure from the costs of increasing number of placements of children with special education needs and disabilities. The Schools Funding Forum and secondary school head teachers would need to be advised of any increased costs of this provision as it could impact on other funding streams.

The national funding arrangements of Pupil Referral Units and Alternative Provision Academies allocates £10,000 per place with an additional per pupil amount charged by the provider. On top of the £10,000 place funding, Olive Academies Trust is currently proposing to charge the following for the agreed number of places:

From September 2016 – March 2017 (As at present)

KS	Category	Places	Per Place	Per Pupil	Total Charge	Total Funding
KS3	Exclusion	6	£10,000	£9,000	£19,000	£114,000
KS3	Intervention	19	£10,000	£9,000	£19,000	£361,000
KS4	Exclusion	20	£10,000	£9,000	£19,000	£380,000
KS4	Intervention	15	£10,000	£9,000	£19,000	£285,000
Total		60				£1,140,000

From April 2017 (new funding model)

KS	Category	Places	Per place	Per pupil	Total charge	Total funding
KS3	Exclusion	6	£10,000	£5,000	£15,000	£90,000
KS3	Intervention	19	£10,000	£5,000	£15,000	£285,000
KS4	Exclusion	20	£10,000	£8,000	£18,000	£360,000
KS4	Intervention	15	£10,000	£6,000	£16,000	£240,000
Total		60				£975,000

In relation to excluded pupils funding would be transferred from the excluding school based on a proportion of the AWPU (age weighted pupil unit)

In addition to these costs the Medical Needs Provision would be £388,000, plus £34,000 for transfer of Hospital Education Service staff. Primary provision would be £300,000 and 18 places (year 11 later arrivals) would cost £180,000.

Distribution of places would be:

- Olive Academy Trust – 60 places
- Frances Bardsley – 18 places
- Primary Model – 18 places
- Year 11 late arrivals (formerly PRU 20) – 18 places

With 134 places available for place led funding by EFA, this would leave 20 places to allow for some additional places to be commissioned out of borough (permanently excluded pupils) and some funding to be delegated to schools to support pupils who would be at risk of permanent exclusion.

One possible model is as follows:

Primary permanent exclusions: 4 x places @ £25,000 per place = £100,000

KS3/4 additional intervention permanent exclusion places commissioned from schools: 8 places @ £15k per place = £120,000

KS4 permanent exclusion places, funding retained by LA: 8 places sourced out of Borough @ £25k per place = £200,000

The total cost across all provision, from April 2017, would therefore be £2,263,000 compared to a current total cost (when full) of £2,465,000. Additional funds of £202,000 could therefore be allocated to the Social Inclusion Fund, which is used to encourage schools to undertake innovative work with pupils at risk of exclusion/disengaging from learning