



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

A Meeting of the **SCHOOL FORUM** will be held in
**DAVID HICKS 1 - CIVIC OFFICES, SHUTE END,
WOKINGHAM RG40 1BN ON WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY
2019 AT 10.00 AM**

Heather Thwaites

Heather Thwaites
Interim Chief Executive
Published on 8 January 2019



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Vision

A great place to live, an even better place to do business

Our Priorities

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

The Underpinning Principles

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL FORUM

Schools Representatives

Helen Ball	Primary Head - Polehampton Infant
Ali Brown	Primary Head - Nine Mile Ride Primary
Emma Clarke	Primary Head - Farley Hill Primary
Sally Hunter	Primary Head - Wescott Infant
Brian Prebble	Primary Head - Rivermead Primary
Elaine Stewart	Primary Head - Aldryngton Primary
Corrina Gillard	Primary Head - Emmbrook Infant
Lou Slocombe	Primary Head - Radstock Primary
Sylvia Allen	School Business Manager - Hawkedon Primary
Julia Mead	School Business Manager - St Sebastian's CE Primary
Carol Simpson	School Business Manager - Colleton Primary
Ginny Rhodes	Academy Head - St Crispins School
Paul O'Neill	Secondary Head - Emmbrook School
Derren Gray	Academy Head - Piggott School
Janet Perry	Academy Business Manager - Holt School
Kerrie Clifford	Maintained Nursery Head - Ambleside Centre
Jay Blundell	Pupil Referral Unit Head - Foundry College
Sara Attra	Special School Head - Addington School
Ben Godber	Academy Head - Bohunt School
Jonathon Peck	Director of Finance and Operations - Maiden Erlegh School
Maggie Callaghan	Free School Head - Oakbank School
Paul Miller	Governor - St Crispins - Chairman
John Bayes	Governor - Foundry College - Vice-Chair

Non School Representatives

Marion Standing	Oxford Diocese
Vacancy	Roman Catholic Diocese
Shahid Younis	WBC Representative
Paul Doherty	Assistant Director Education
James Taylor	Wokingham and Bracknell College
Karen Edwards	Early Years Representative
Ian Morgan	Early Years Representative

Observers

Funding Reform Team Education Funding Agency, Maintained Schools Division

From the Primary Representatives only 10 votes are allowed.

From the Secondary Representatives only 2 votes are allowed.

From the Academy Representatives only 5 votes are allowed.

From the Special School Representatives only 1 vote is allowed.

From the Early Years only 2 votes are allowed.

From the Pupil Referral Unit only 1 vote is allowed.

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
----------	------	---------	----------

24		MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 December 2018.	7 - 16
25		MATTERS ARISING To consider any matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2018.	
26		DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest.	
27	None Specific	HIGH NEEDS BLOCK UPDATE To consider a verbal update on the High Needs Block.	Verbal Report
28	None Specific	REVENUE MONITORING REPORT To consider schools' current financial position.	17 - 24
29	None Specific	18-19 CONTINGENCY BREAKDOWN To consider an update on the 18/19 Contingency Breakdown.	To Follow
30	None Specific	19-20 CENTRALLY RETAINED BLOCK REPORT To consider a report on the 2019/20 Centrally Retained Block.	25 - 30
31	None Specific	19-20 DE-DELEGATION REPORT To consider items to be de-delegated for the 2019/20 budget.	31 - 42
32	None Specific	19-20 SCHOOLS BLOCK BUDGET To consider a report on the 2019/20 Schools Block Budget.	To Follow
33	None Specific	19-20 EARLY YEARS INCLUDING CENTRALLY RETAINED To consider a report on Early Years funding for 2019/20.	43 - 48
34	None Specific	EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM To discuss the effectiveness of the Schools Forum using the self-assessment tool.	49 - 52
35		FORWARD PROGRAMME To consider the Forum's work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.	53 - 54

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent

A Supplementary Agenda will be issued by the Chief Executive if there are any other items to consider under this heading.

Luciane Bowker,
Tel
Email
Postal Address

CONTACT OFFICER
Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
0118 974 6091
luciane.bowker@wokingham.gov.uk
Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCHOOL FORUM
HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2018 FROM 10.00 AM TO 12.15 PM**

Schools Representatives

Emma Clarke	Primary Head - Farley Hill Primary
Brian Prebble	Primary Head - Rivermead Primary
Elaine Stewart	Primary Head - Aldryngton Primary
Corrina Gillard	Primary Head - Emmbrook Infant
Lou Slocombe	Primary Head - Radstock Primary
Julia Mead	School Business Manager - St Sebastian's CE Primary
Carol Simpson	School Business Manager - Colleton Primary
Ginny Rhodes	Academy Head - St Crispins School
Derren Gray	Academy Head - Piggott School
Janet Perry	Academy Business Manager - Holt School
Jay Blundell	Pupil Referral Unit Head - Foundry College
Sara Attra	Special School Head - Addington School
Ben Godber	Academy Head - Bohunt School
Paul Miller	Governor - St Crispins - Chairman
John Bayes	Governor - Foundry College - Vice-Chair

Non School Representatives

Shahid Younis	WBC Representative
James Taylor	Wokingham and Bracknell College
Ian Morgan	Early Years Representative

Also Present

Luciane Bowker, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Piers Brunning, Senior Specialist (People and Place) Strategy and Commissioning
Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Paul Doherty, Assistant Director for Education
Jim Leivers, Interim Assistant Director for Education
Coral Miller, Interim Senior Finance Specialist, Schools
Lynne Samuel, Senior Finance Specialist, People Services
Katherine Vernon, Finance Specialist, Schools

13 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Sylvia Allen, Ali Brown, Maggie Calagham, Paul O'Neill, Jonathan Peck, Gail Prewett and Marion Standing.

14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 October 2018 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to the change below, and signed by the Chairman.

Janet Perry asked that the sentence stating that '*academies paid much reduced business rates in relation to maintained schools*' be deleted. The Chairman stated that the sentence was not inaccurate but agreed to have it deleted.

15 MATTERS ARISING

School Admissions Benchmarking

Jim Leviers, Interim Assistant Director for Education asked Schools Forum if there was funding available to commission this piece of work.

The following comments were made during the discussion of this item:

- Schools Forum had been asking for benchmarking for the last two years in order to understand how the service provided by the Local Authority compared, financially, with other local authorities;
- Jim Leviers asked Schools Forum to consider how important this piece of work was and if members wished to invest in commissioning it;
- Paul Miller stated that the school admissions service cost approximately £450k, however it was not known how this compared with other local authorities;
- In response to a question Coral Miller stated that the budget for school admissions had reduced from previous years;
- It was not clear how this piece of work would be funded and if it was worth spending the necessary money to carry out the work.

Paul Doherty, Assistant Director for Education stated that he would look into undertaking the benchmarking exercise with resources from within his department. He stated that the volume of school admissions work was variable, and that mid-year school admissions created a lot of work. He stated that he would update Schools Forum at the next meeting.

Members noted that with the new houses around the Borough there had been an increase in the number of mid-year school admissions.

High Needs Block

It was reported that a High Needs Block Task and Finish Group had now been set up and that this would be discussed later in the Agenda.

Catering contract

Lynne Samuel, Senior Finance Specialist, People Services explained that the schools catering contract was operated as a traded service, therefore individual schools had the option on whether to buy in or not, as such any retender would not fall under the criteria set out in the Schools Forum powers and responsibilities guidance published by the Department for Education (DfE).

Lynn Samuel stated that there was no agreed rate per meal, therefore it was unclear where the quoted 12p was derived from.

Lynn Samuel stated that the Council funded the maintenance and upkeep of kitchens for schools who bought in to the contract through the management charge levied for the service and an element of non-ring-fenced capital funds. The supplier operated a profit share (rebate) with the Council based on the overall performance of the contract each year. This was completely independent of the management fee paid by schools. The level of rebate received from the contract in the last financial period did not exceed the investment made by the Council under the current contract.

Lynne Samuel stated that as with the catering contract, both Broadband and ICT operated as a traded service where schools made individual decisions to buy in or not.

Lynne Samuel stated that the briefing note would be circulated with the minutes and she offered to speak to any school who had bought into the contract who wished further clarifications.

Corrina Gillard asked what rebate rate was received last year and who made the decision as to how much the contract cost, she felt that the purported 8k charge to draw up the contract was expensive. Lynne Samuel agreed to find out who the contractor was and report back to Schools Forum.

16 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Julia Mead, School Business Manager at St Sebastian's CE Primary declared a personal interest on the Growth Fund item, on the basis that the Keys Academy Trust had submitted a bid for the new Shinfield West School.

Derren Gray, Headteacher at the Piggott School declared a personal interest in relation to the Draft 2019-20 Schools Block Budget item, on the basis that his school was an all-through school.

17 2018/19 HIGH NEEDS BLOCK UPDATE

Jim Leviers presented the 2018/19 High Needs Block (HNB) update. He stated that the anticipated overspend in the HNB was likely to increase rather than decrease in the future, and he pointed out that there was no immediate solution to the current situation.

Jim Leviers informed that in Wokingham there were:

- 867 young people with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) whose needs varied, of which 750 had significant needs;
- Of these 867 young people, 340 were placed in special schools;
- Of the 340 pupils in special schools, 133 were placed outside of the Borough in specialist places (this number had gone up every year).

Jim Leviers stated that the number of young people coming into the system was increasing and the Local Authority had failed to address the anticipated increase in demand.

Jim Leviers stated that this was a national issue and that many other local authorities faced similar challenges in relation to HNB deficit. There had been a national increase in the production of EHCP of 35% since the introduction of the Families Act 2014. The national HNB deficit would exceed 250 million this year. The government had indicated that they would be looking to address this deficit, however they were asking Local Authorities to provide details of plans to tackle the issues.

Jim Leviers stated that there was an indication that the home to school transport budget in Wokingham would be overspent by £600k by the end of this financial year.

Jim Leviers stated that some ideas had already been identified by senior officers to start to address the HNB deficit, mainly around increasing the number of specialist places within the Borough.

It had been proposed that Addington School be expanded by approximately 50 places. However, this was time lagged and the impact of the expansion would not be seen until the 2020 financial year.

Foundry College, although not specialising in High Needs, had a number of High Needs pupils, therefore the Local Authority was also proposing to expand Foundry College by approximately 30-40 places. This was pending planning application and refurbishment works, and would impact on the 2020 financial year.

Jim Leviers stated that another issue in relation to local provision was that Northern House School, which had converted to academy status 18 months ago, had recently undergone an Ofsted inspection and the resulting report was very damning. This represented a challenge for the Local Authority and a huge problem for the children and education in Wokingham.

Jim Leviers reported that out of the 72 places available in Northern House, Wokingham used approximately 30 places at any one time. Removing these children would potentially cost 2-3 million, therefore, given the current financial situation, it was not viable. As a consequence of that, a decision had been made at senior level not to place any new children in the Northern House School until such a time as the Local Authority was satisfied that the children would be safe there.

Jim Leviers stated that the Regional Schools Commissioner was considering whether to seek out a different sponsor for the school. Jim reported that the Local Authority had had conversations with the new headteacher, who was already taking some positive steps towards improvement.

Jim Leviers stated that there was a service level agreement between the Local Authority and Northern House which would expire on 31 December, and this needed to be re-negotiated. It had been agreed to retain the status quo until March 2019, under a new service level agreement in which the Local Authority would insert a number of performance measures to hold the school to account. Jim explained that the Local Authority did not want to risk the sponsors walking away as this would increase the pressure on the HNB.

Jim Leviers stated that previous agreements with the Northern House had been generous to the school, he assumed this was because there had been a need for places at the school. This agreement needed to be re-thought through and he was going to be working on it.

Jim Leviers stated that the conclusion that came out of the Resource Places Review was that most schools were under resourced, in the region of around £100k per school, and would need more funding which would have to come out of HNB. There was also a recognition that unless local schools could provide places, the costs to HNB would continue to go up.

Jim Leviers stated that this area was much neglected in education and local authority engagement, as this should have been tackled over the last three years and it was important to do something about it now.

Jim Leviers informed that the Addington expansion report was going to be submitted to the Executive for formal approval in January, and Foundry College expansion was being progressed.

Jim Leviers stated that 0-25 Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Strategy was in the process of being updated and would soon go out to consultation with schools and key partners.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- Lynn Samuel stated that the Local Authority was waiting for confirmation from central government on what the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) was going to be, so the HNB Block Budget for 19/20 was not yet finalised;
- Ginny Rhodes felt burdened about the impact the HNB deficit was having on individual children's education. She worried that the financial situation was influencing panels decisions in relation to awarding EHCPs;
- Members recognised that it was positive to see some strategic development in the right direction, however, it was worrying that the Budget would continue to increase;
- Jim Levers stated that local authorities could not continue to pick up the increased cost of HNB caused by the 2014 legislation, he believed the government would have to help local authorities;
- Coral Miller stated that all local authorities in the south were working together and bidding the government for more funding;
- Paul Doherty stated that as well as working collectively with other local authorities, Wokingham would be asking for a separate meeting with the DfE, specially taking into account the fact that Wokingham was the worse funded local authority in the country;
- In response to a question Lynne Samuel stated that the Local Authority had already started discussions with the DfE at a recent meeting;
- Jim Levers informed that an application had been made to the DfE to set up a new free school;
- Paul Miller stated that a HNB Task and Finish Group had been set to look in more detail at possible solutions to the HNB deficit;
- Councillor Younis stated that the first meeting had taken place and they were in the process of setting up priorities, dates for future meetings were being identified;
- In response to a question Jim Levers stated that Council leaders and elected Members were acutely aware of the current situation;
- In response to a question Coral Miller stated that the Local Authority had an obligation to submit a balanced Budget to the DfE;
- The Chairman suggested that officers should concentrate on working out a 'real' budget;
- In response to a question Jim Levers stated that the decision to overspend was for the Local Authority to make.

The Chairman thanked officers for the report, which had provided transparency and enabled a better understanding of the challenges faced by the Local Authority in relation to the HNB deficit.

In response to a question Jim Levers stated that he had arrived in Wokingham to cover the post of Children's Services Director, which Carol Cammiss had now been appointed to permanently. He had then covered the post of Assistant Director for Education, which now Paul Doherty had been appointed to permanently.

Carol Cammiss, Children Services' Director stated that there was a serious commitment within the senior leadership team to get it right and to be more transparent. She stated that the team wanted to work together with Schools Forum and asked members to contact her or Paul Doherty if any clarification was needed.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

18 REVENUE MONITORING REPORT

Coral Miller presented the 2018/19 Schools Revenue Monitoring report which was set out in Agenda pages 16-19.

Coral Miller stated that as of 31 October 2018, an overspend of £2,432 million was anticipated in the DSG, this worked out at 1.78% of the total Budget, of which £2.3 million related to the HNB.

Coral Miller stated that Appendix A contained a summary of the 18/19 School Revenue Monitoring Report and Appendix B contained a detailed breakdown of 18/19 revenue monitoring.

In response to a question, Lynne Samuel confirmed that £125k deficit from the centrally retained block was in relation to licences, this was as a result of clarification from the DfE as to which block the licences should relate to. It was confirmed that the Central Block was for every child, including those at academies.

Some members felt that academies were not aware that the Central Block was for every child.

Carol Cammiss asked members to report directly to herself or to Paul Doherty if the communication between schools and the Council needed improving.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

19 18-19 CONTINGENCY BREAKDOWN

Coral Miller presented the 18/19 Contingency Breakdown report which was set out in agenda pages 21-24.

Coral Miller stated the report contained information about how the contingencies fund was being spent. This fund was available, if needed, to maintained schools only.

Coral Miller stated that there had been two claims approved in this financial year. Further to the previous report to Schools Forum, a claim had been approved for a school which had had a business rate adjustment which was unexpected by the school of approximately £51k. This school had already lost a significant number of pupils from 2017/18 which resulted in a significant reduction in its budget for 2018/19. The Local Authority decided that this was an exceptional situation and agreed to fund it for one year only.

In response to a question Coral Miller stated that this money would be recovered next year.

Coral Miller stated that there was £81k in the contingencies fund not yet committed.

In response to another question Coral Miller stated that she had not received further proposals from schools to convert to academy status this year, therefore, even if the schools that had benefited from this fund now, applied to convert, it would not affect this financial year.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

20 GROWTH FUND UPDATE AND 2019/20 REQUEST FROM SCHOOLS BLOCK BUDGET

Piers Brunning, Senior Specialist (People and Place), Strategy and Commissioning presented the Growth Fund Update and 2019/20 request from Schools Block Budget report which was set out in agenda pages 25-29.

Piers Brunning stated that the Local Authority had a statutory duty to provide school places for the residents in the Borough. He explained that there was a conflict of interest in the national arrangements, in that Schools Forum did not have direct responsibility for the provision of school places, however it was responsible for agreeing the Growth Fund Budget. He stated that without the Growth Fund agreement it was not possible for the Local Authority to plan the increase in additional capacity in the Borough.

Piers Brunning stated that, despite a reduction in birth rates, one of the pressures that were identified was in relation to primary school places, due to the exceptional rate of new house building in the Borough.

Piers Brunning stated that the new developments were concentrated in certain areas of the Borough.

Piers Brunning stated that the Shinfield West School could have opened in temporary accommodation in 2016, however due to publicity around that time, around 30 children that could have been placed at Shinfield West were placed at other schools. Last year all the school places in local schools in the Shinfield area were filled, and the Local Authority was in need of a new school in that area.

Piers Brunning stated that a few years ago there had been a shortage of school places in the Earley area, with children at the time having to be diverted out of the area. The political view was that it was not acceptable to have to send children to schools out of their area of residence.

Piers Brunning informed that there was no data as to who moved into new houses, however the new houses that were being built were family homes, therefore there was an expectation that the demand for school places would increase. He stated that GP registration information was not a reliable source of data, as people sometimes did not register their family with a new GP.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- Members asked if Piers Brunning had taken into account the fact that people were living longer and were having fewer children;
- Piers stated that he had taken that into account and pointed out that there was a significant cost to school transport if children had to be transported to a school far away from their residence;
- Members asked if there had been a consideration of the impact of building new schools to existing schools;
- Piers Brunning stated that there had been a consultation on the plans for new schools;
- In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that academy schools were their own admission authorities and therefore could set their own admission numbers;
- Piers Stated that the current legal advice was that schools were not obliged to carry on with their Published Admission Number (PAN) through all school years;

- Members were worried that there was an assumption that families with young children were moving into the new houses, and that may not be the case;
- Piers Brunning explained that capital decisions had to be made to plan for the future, however it was impossible to be completely accurate with predictions, and this was acknowledged in the Primary School Strategy;
- Piers Brunning stated that the actual number of school applications for entry into September 2019 would not be known until 15 January, very late in the budget setting process;
- Members were informed that there was a very small window of opportunity to change the Budget if there was an indication that setting up a new school would be disastrous for existing schools;
- Some members felt anxious about the accuracy of predictions based on the last 3-4 years, when schools were perhaps opened too early, having a catastrophic effect on admission numbers of existing school;
- Members questioned if it was cost effective to open a number of small schools rather than investing in bigger schools;
- Some members stated that it might be useful to see an analysis of how accurate predictions had been in the past;
- Jim Levers was interested to know if members could offer a better model to predict numbers;
- In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that there had been a Borough wide debate about the infrastructure around the building of new communities and consultation about the proposed new schools;
- Piers Brunning added that some of the existing schools had site constraints which limited their expansion, including in relation to lack of car parking.

Members asked that Piers Brunning be invited to attend all meetings where Growth Fund was due to be discussed.

Carol Cammiss stated that she was aware of the pressures and understood the concerns that Schools Forum had raised. She offered to discuss these issues with the Executive Member and bring back a review to Schools Forum for further discussion.

In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that the £800k Growth Fund Budget for 2019/20 was for a range of planned expansion of school places, for both current commitments and new schools. He explained that should a decision be made not to proceed with a new school, this would be credited back to the Growth Fund.

RESOLVED That Schools Forum approves the Growth Fund Budget of £800,000 for 2019/20.

21 DRAFT 2019-20 SCHOOLS BLOCK BUDGET

The Chairman explained that the report contained options for the 2019/20 School Block Budget which had been reviewed by the Task and Finish Group. There would be a further opportunity to look at the model just before its submission to the DfE in January 2019.

Coral Miller stated that the Task and Finish Group had looked at various options. The first option was to keep the Funding Formula the same, with small adjustments, mainly around Minimum Per Pupil Funding which was £3,500 for primary school and £4,800 for secondary school. She stated that most local authorities were using this option.

Coral Miller stated that another option was to go straight to the New Funding Formula (NFF), however it was felt that option allocated too much money for deprivation areas, and Wokingham was not a deprivation area according to the DfE.

Coral Miller stated that it was not certain when the NFF would come into effect, and that there was an extension of another year.

Coral Miller stated that the Task and Finish Group was recommending the adoption of option 1, which was described in detail on page 33 of the agenda. Option 1 protected schools with a minimum funding guarantee per pupil, this option was recommended until there was more clarity around the proposed NFF, and was consistent with the funding approach applied in 2018/19.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- The Chairman explained that an issue had been identified in relation to the guidance given by the DfE to calculate the funding for all-through schools. Instead of using the number of primary children times £3,500 and the number of secondary children times £4,800, the DfE was using an average of £4,000 per pupil, and this disadvantaged schools with a larger number of secondary school pupils in relation to the number of primary school pupils. This presented a challenge for the only all-through school in the Borough which had approximately 10 secondary pupils to 2 primary pupils. There was a process called 'disapplication' in which Schools Forum could instruct Coral Miller to apply to the DfE asking for this rule not to be used in this case. If the DfE did not agree to this disapplication and Schools Forum decided to tweak the model, every school would incur in a reduction in its funding;
- Coral Miller tabled a paper containing a model based on the 'fairer' calculation of £3,500 per primary pupil and £4,800 per secondary pupil, which was dependent on applying for disapplication and the DfE agreeing to the disapplication;
- The Chairman reiterated that if the DfE did not agree to the disapplication the reallocated money would have to be found from the Schools Block Budget;
- Coral Miller informed that she had contacted the DfE and they said that in order to apply for disapplication the Local Authority would have to demonstrate the impact on other schools, the rationale for the proposal and carry out a consultation with affected schools; also, it was noted that a disapplication application should have been made by 20 November;
- Members believed that it seemed disproportionate to penalise all-through schools that had a small primary phase;
- In response to a question Derren Gray stated that he was considering his options, including 'divorcing' the primary school;
- In response to a question Coral Miller drew attention to the last two columns in appendix B which showed that relative to the proposed option 1 model of funding, some schools were getting more than the minimum per pupil funding, it was those schools that would likely see a reduction in funding compared to the model funding if the DfE did not agree to the disapplication.

Members were not completely clear with the numbers and asked that the Task and Finish Group looked at the three models again, taking into account the possible disapplication. Members also instructed Coral Miller to carry out the Consultation in order to apply for disapplication. It was noted that there was urgency in this work as the Budget would have to be submitted on 23 January.

In response to a suggestion Coral Miller stated that the Local Authority was not allowed to have a contingency in the Budget.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The Task and Finish Group would meet again to discuss possible models, including the effect of the possible disapplication;
- 2) A consultation would be carried out to find out the schools' opinion around the funding arrangements;
- 3) That the Local Authority would apply for disapplication; and
- 4) The Task and Finish Group would make a recommendation on a preferred option to Schools Forum in January 2019.

22 2019-20 PROPOSED DE-DELEGATION BUDGET

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

23 EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOLS FORUM

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

24 INDUCTION FOR NEW MEMBERS

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

25 FORWARD PROGRAMME

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 28

TITLE Revenue Monitoring report

FOR CONSIDERATION BY School Forum on 16 January 2019

WARD (All Wards);

DIRECTOR Director of Children's Services - Carol Cammiss

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

Schools Forum are asked to note the content of this report

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The report shows the 2018/19 forecast income and expenditure of the schools budget as at 31st December 2018.

This reflects an anticipated overspend of £2.9m at year end, an increase of £516k from the October 2018 report. The movement is in relation to an increased number of individual placements for children and young people with SEND funded by the High Needs Block.

2018/19 Schools Revenue Monitoring Report January 2019

.01 Purpose of the Report

This report provides the Schools Forum with details of the revenue budget position as at 31st December 2018.

.02 Suggested Action

The Forum is asked to note the contents.

.03 Background

This report shows the expected outturn for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in the financial year 2018/19.

Figures reported previously anticipated a year end deficit of £2.4m at 31st March 2019, primarily due to pressures within the High Needs Block. This included a £527k deficit brought forward from 2017/18.

.04 Forecast Movement

The increase from October to December forecast is £516k, due to movements in relation to the High Needs Block.

The movement is in respect of 10 children / young people with SEND now placed in out-borough high cost, specialist provision.

.05 Financial Summary

The forecast as at 31st December 2018 shows the following projected overspend, against budget of £136,925k (2.1% of the budget).

Description	£000
Brought forward from 2017/2018	£527
Estimated overspend in 2018/2019	£2,421
TOTAL	£2,948

The total increase in expenditure from last month is £516k.

Please refer to:

Appendix A - Summary of 18/19 Schools Revenue Monitoring Report.

Appendix B - Detailed breakdown of 18/19 revenue monitoring.

Coral Miller
Interim Senior Finance Specialist - Schools
January 2019

Bob Watson
Lead Specialist - Finance (deputy s.151 officer)
January 2019

Appendix A		as at 31st December 2018				
Summary of 1819 school revenue budget monitoring						
INCOME						
Ref	Description	A	B	C	D	E
		Budget	Forecast	Forecast	Last Mth	
		2018-19	October	December	Variance	Variance
		2018-19	2018-19	2018-19	(C - B)	(C - A)
		£	£	£	£	£
SCHOOL BLOCK BUDGET						
	Brought Forward Deficit/Surplus		(7)	(7)	-	(7)
	School Block Budget is the allocation to school based in the number of children in the school, the areas the children live i.e. rate of deprivation, children on free school meals, school academic achievement etc. This produces a unit cost per child per school and that unit cost is times by the number of children in that school.	(99,543)	(99,543)	(99,543)	-	(0)
A	Academy Allocated budget	46,318	46,318	46,318	-	-
A	School allocated budget excluding 6th form funding	51,031	51,031	51,031	-	-
F	School block budget - De-delegated items from maintained schools to council for central services like insurance for school, staff cover for maternity in schools etc.	1,393	1,400	1,400	-	7
G	Centrally retained activities - Growth fund.	800	798	798	-	(2)
	TOTAL SURPLUS/DEFICIT	0	(3)	(3)	-	(3)
HIGH NEEDS BLOCK						
	Brought Forward Deficit/Surplus		527	527	-	527
	High needs Block funding is for funding Special needs children in all our education establishments this includes commissioned services from other boroughs and independent schools.	(18,083)	(18,029)	(18,029)	-	54
D	High need grant allocated budget	18,083	19,811	20,327	516	2,244
	TOTAL SURPLUS/DEFICIT	0	2,310	2,826	516	2,826
EARLY YEARS BLOCK						
	Early Years Block Allocation including funding for Education of Children under 5s in Private/voluntary/independent settings as well as nursery provision and Primary schools with nursery provision.	(11,105)	(11,105)	(11,105)	-	-
E	Early year including EYPP grant	10,683	10,683	10,683	-	-
H	Centrally retained activities for Early years statutory duties.	421	421	421	-	-
	TOTAL SURPLUS/DEFICIT	(0)	(0)	(0)	-	-
CENTRALLY RETAINED BLOCK						
	Centrally Retained Block - Contribution to pay for the council's statutory duties.	(944)	(944)	(944)	-	-
G	Centrally retained activities for both Academies and Maintained schools like school improvement, council statutory duties etc. School admissions, School Forum costs, ESG and Growth fund. Support	944	1,069	1,069	-	125
	TOTAL SURPLUS/DEFICIT	-	125	125	-	125
Government specific grant the the LA pass to the schools on behalf of DFE						
	Estimate for other grants like PE grant (actual allocation will be announce nearer October)	(2,193)	(2,193)	(2,193)	-	-
	UIFSM Revenue / Start Up	(2,227)	(2,227)	(2,227)	-	-
	Pupil Premium excl Academies	(2,167)	(2,167)	(2,167)	-	-
	6th form funding from EFA for Secondary school with a 6th form.	(664)	(664)	(664)	-	-
	Teacher Pay Grant (September 18 to March 19)		(296)	(296)	-	(296)
B	Grant allocation to schools	7,251	7,547	7,547	-	296
	TOTAL SURPLUS/DEFICIT	0	0	0	-	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURE FORECAST		136,925	139,600	140,116	516	3,190
TOTAL INCOME FORECAST		(136,925)	(137,167)	(137,167)	-	(242)
Various						
Surplus () Deficit +		0	2,432	2,948	516	2,948

APPENDIX B - Schools Budget 2018/2019					
	A	B	C	D	E
S251 title	2018/19 Budget	October Forecast 2018-19	December Forecast 2018-19	Variance against C-B changes from last month	Variance against C-A change against the forecasted budget
SCHOOL BLOCK					
Schools Block Allocation excl Academies net of de-delegated funds including HNB allocations	51,031	51,031	51,031	-	-
Academy Recoupment from Schools Block	46,318	46,318	46,318	-	-
Total allocated to schools	97,349	97,349	97,349	-	-
De-delegated					
Carried forward income from last year		(7)	(7)	-	(7)
School-specific contingencies	107	176	176	-	69
insurance	453	453	453	-	-
Licences and subscriptions	147	147	147	-	-
Staff Costs - supply cover	299	237	237	-	(62)
Support to under-performing ethnic minority groups and b	118	118	118	-	-
Behaviour Support Services	269	269	269	-	-
Sub total of De-delegated	1,393	1,393	1,393	-	(0)
Pupil growth/ Infant class sizes	800	798	798	-	(2)
Total School Block Budget Expenditure	99,543	99,540	99,540	-	(2)
Total School Block Budget Income	(99,543)	(99,543)	(99,543)	-	(0)
Variance	-	(3)	(3)	-	(3)
CENTRALLY RETAINED BLOCK					
Strategic and Regulation function	350	350	350	-	-
SACRE	7	7	7	-	-
School Asset Management	81	81	81	-	-
1.6.2 Education welfare service	141	141	141	-	-
Statutory I.T. , census and information.	72	72	72	-	-
School admissions	289	289	289	-	-
Servicing of schools forums	4	4	4	-	-
Licences		125	125	-	125
Total of Centrally Retained Block Expenditure	944	1,069	1,069	-	125
Total Centrally Retained block income	(944)	(944)	(944)	-	-
Variance	-	125	125	-	125
EARLY YEAR'S BLOCK					
Early Years Block Allocation including Providers reserve fund inc exp for Education of Children under 5s in Private/voluntary/independent settings	10,641	10,641	10,641	-	-
Early years Centrally Retained for statutory LA duties	421	421	421	-	-
Pupil Premium 3-4 years	42	42	42	-	-
Total Early Year's block Expenditure	11,105	11,105	11,105	-	-
Total Early Year's block Income	(11,105)	(11,105)	(11,105)	-	-
Variance	-				

S251 title	2018/19 Budget	October Forecast 2018-19	December Forecast 2018-19	Variance against C-B changes from last month	Variance against C-A change against the forecasted budget
HIGH NEEDS BLOCK					
High needs academy recoupment	1,386	1,386	1,386	-	-
High Needs Block allocations	7,427	7,790	7,790	-	362
Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	1,819	2,269	2,269	-	450
Fees for pupils at independent special schools & abroad	5,542	6,584	7,100	516	1,558
Pupil Referral Units	470	470	470	-	-
Education out of school	638	674	674	-	36
SUB TOTAL	17,282	19,172	19,688	516	2,406
Centrally retained high needs block					
Moderating Panels	150	158	158	-	8
Provision for pupils with SEN, provision not included in line 1.2.1	20	20	20	-	-
Support for inclusion - HNB	401	231	231	-	(170)
SEN transport	230	230	230	-	-
SUB TOTAL	801	639	639	-	(162)
TOTAL of High Need Block Expenditure	18,083	19,811	20,327	516	2,244
Brought Forward High Needs block (surplus) /Deficit balance	-	527	527	-	527
TOTAL of High Need Block Income	(18,083)	(18,029)	(18,029)	-	54
Variance	0	2,310	2,826	516	2,826
GRANTS					
UIFSM Revenue / Start Up	2,227	2,227	2,227	-	-
6th form funding from EFA	664	664	664	-	-
PE Grant - Additional school grants	2,193	2,193	2,193	-	-
Pupil Premium allocated to schools - mainstream	2,167	2,167	2,167	-	-
Teacher's Pay Grant		296	296	-	296
Total GRANTS EXPENDITURE TOTAL	7,251	7,547	7,547	-	296
INCOME					
PE Grant	(2,193)	(2,193)	(2,193)	-	-
UIFSM Revenue	(2,227)	(2,227)	(2,227)	-	-
Education Funding Agency 6th Form Funding	(664)	(664)	(664)	-	-
Pupil Premium 5-16 years	(2,167)	(2,167)	(2,167)	-	-
Teacher Pay Grant - NEW (Sept to March) maintained		(296)	(296)	-	(296)
Total GRANTS INCOME TOTAL	(7,251)	(7,547)	(7,547)	-	(296)
Variance	-	-	-	-	-
Summary of the Variances					
SCHOOL BLOCK	-	(3)	(3)	-	(3)
EARLY YEAR'S BLOCK	-	-	-	-	-
HIGH NEEDS BLOCK	0	2,310	2,826	516	2,826
CENTRAL BLOCK	-	125	125	-	125
GRANTS	-	-	-	-	-
Deficit\Surplus ().	0	2,432	2,948	516	2,948

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE	19-20 Centrally retained block report
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	School Forum on 16 January 2019
WARD	(All Wards);
DIRECTOR	Director of Children's Services - Carol Cammiss

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

The Schools Forum are asked to support the proposed allocation of the 2019/20 Central Schools Services Block Budget (CSSB).

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The Department of Education (DfE) has set a separate block within the Dedicated Schools Grant to support the local authority in delivering educational statutory duties. The grant is a contribution to the total cost of the central statutory service which is approx. £2m.

In 2018/19 the CSSB had a budget of £944k which has increased to £946k for 2019/20.

During the course of 2018/19 the DfE clarified that the Council now has to fund copyright licences from this block, placing additional pressure on already stretched resources. The funding available to fund the Council's statutory duties has therefore now been reduced by £129k to accommodate licence costs, with £817k therefore remaining to be allocated towards the cost of statutory duties for 2019/20.

The allocation proposed in this report therefore reflects contributions towards the overall cost of statutory duties funded by the Council, with reductions in CSSB funding from 2018/19 not reflecting any planned reduction in services provided.

2019/20 Central School Services Block (CSSB)

January 2019

.01 Purpose of the Report

This report is to ask the Schools Forum to support the Council's proposed allocation of the Central School Services Block as contributory funding for the statutory education functions that must be delivered for 2019/20.

.02 Recommendations

The Schools Forum is asked to support the proposed allocation of the 2019/20 Central School Services Block.

.03 Background

The Department of Education (DfE) introduced a new block known as the Central School Services Block (CSSB) in 2018/2019, to fund local authorities for the statutory duties they hold for both maintained schools and academies.

The CSSB brought together funding previously allocated through the retained duties element of the Education Services Grant (ESG) and funding for ongoing central functions, such as admissions, previously top-sliced from the schools block.

The DfE has confirmed that the Wokingham allocation for 2019/20 for the CSSB is £946k which is a small increase of £2k from the current year's level of funding.

This CSSB does not fund the full cost of the statutory services provided by the Council, which are approx. £2m. A significant proportion of costs (£1.2m, 60%) is therefore funded from the general fund (local taxpayers).

.04 2019/20 Proposed Budget Allocation

The Council proposes to use the CSSB to fund statutory services largely in line with that approved by Schools Forum for the current financial year.

The main change to the 2018/19 budget arrangements is in relation to copyright licences. As previously reported to Forum the DfE expect this to be funded from the CSSB, which was not identified at the time of 2018/19 budget setting.

While the overall level of the CSSB block funding has therefore remained fairly static year on year, the inclusion of licences from the funding reduces the 2018/19 budget level for other services by £129k.

The proposed allocation of the CSSB is included in Appendix A. Given there is a reduced level of funding available, and the figures do not represent the full cost of each service, the table represents an internal allocation of contributions only. The council are not proposing to reduce the service offered to schools in relation to statutory duties for 2019/20.

There are many education services offered to schools like educational psychology, various therapies and other services which were previously funded by the Education Support Grant, that the Council continues to provide without any additional funding from the DSG.

School improvement is not included in the arrangements set out above. Local authorities receive a separate grant covering their statutory intervention functions and monitoring and commissioning of school improvement support. This grant is expected to continue into 2019/20 although individual LA allocations have not yet been confirmed. The Grant last year did not cover the full cost of this service.

.05 **Summary**

The Central School Services Block (CSSB) covers funding allocated to LAs to carry out central functions on behalf of pupils in both maintained schools and academies.

The 2019/20 allocation for Wokingham is £946k, a £2k rise on that received for 2018/19, and it is proposed to allocate on a similar basis, while recognising the additional cost pressure of licences. This provides an additional pressure on the Council's General Fund, to ensure teams providing statutory duties are maintained.

Coral Miller
Interim Senior Financial Specialist – Education
January 2019

Bob Watson
Lead Specialist – Finance (deputy s151)
January 2019

Appendix A

Responsibilities held	Description of Service	Budget 2018/19 £000	Proposed Budget 2019/20 £000
Statutory & regulatory duties	Director of Children's Services, education staff and planning for the education service as a whole.	230	208
	Revenue budget preparation, preparation of information on income and expenditure relating to education, and external audit relating to education. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure not met from schools' budget shares. Formulation and review of local authority schools funding formula. Internal audit and other tasks related to the authority's Chief Finance Officer's responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 except duties specifically related to maintained schools.	120	119
	Health & Safety	13	12
	Standing Advisory Committees for Religious Education (SACREs).	7	7
	Provision of information to or at the request of the Crown other than relating specifically to maintained schools.	72	62

Responsibilities held	Description of Service	Budget 2018/19 £000	Proposed Budget 2019/20 £000
Education Welfare	<p>Functions in relation to the exclusion of pupils from schools, excluding any provision of education to excluded pupils.</p> <p>School attendance.</p> <p>Responsibilities regarding the employment of children</p>	141	119
Asset Management	<p>Management of the Local Authority's capital programme including preparation and review of an asset management plan, and negotiation and management of private finance transactions</p> <p>General landlord duties for all buildings owned by the local authority, including those leased to academies</p>	68	40 10
Other ongoing	Copyright licences	0	129
	School Forum servicing	4	4
	School Admission - duties relating to the admissions process	289	236
TOTAL		944	946

TITLE 19-20 De-delegation report

FOR CONSIDERATION BY School Forum on 16 January 2019

WARD (All Wards);

DIRECTOR Director of Children's Services - Carol Cammiss

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

The Schools Forum maintained school members are asked to support the following proposed de-delegated item on a line by line basis for 2019/20 budget by phases, i.e. primary representatives approve the primary de-delegated and secondary representatives, the secondary items.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The services that the Council provides on behalf of schools needs to be approved by the maintained schools representative(s) of the Schools Forum each year.

This report provides details of the proposed services and support to be approved for 2019/20. In addition the report provides details of the revised allocation methodology which, for some items, is now based on individual school roll numbers rather than a flat rate as used in previous years.

The Task and Finish group (maintained only) has reviewed the calculations and agreed that the contingency and licences should be kept on a flat rate basis and the other de-delegated items should be adjusted to the number on roll.

2019/20 Proposed De-delegation Budget January 2019

.01 Purpose of the Report

This report is to seek approval from the maintained primary schools and maintained secondary schools for each proposed de-delegated item, and to agree the recommended basis of cost allocation.

.02 Recommendation

The Schools Forum maintained school members are asked to support the following proposed de-delegated item on a line by line basis for 2019/20 budget by phases, i.e. Primary reps approve the primary de-delegated and secondary reps, the secondary items.

.03 Background

De-delegated services are for maintained schools only; funding for de-delegated services must be allocated through the formula but can be passed back, or 'de-delegated', for maintained mainstream primary and secondary schools with Schools Forum approval.

The Schools Forum asked the Schools Block Task and Finish group (maintained only) to review the 2019/20 de-delegation proposals which was completed on 13th November 2018 with the Council.

The group reviewed 2 options, no change to the basis of allocation used in 2018/19 and changing the allocation based on the number on roll. After reviewing the impact, the schools representatives (Colleton and Bulmershe) decided that the allocation based on the number on roll would be most appropriate for all items except contingency and licences which will be kept on a flat rate basis.

Table A at the end of this report, shows the impact for individual schools.

The school business managers that attended the Bursar's briefing on 22nd November 2018 were informed of the proposed changes in the allocation, with opportunities given to discuss this change.

.04 **De-delegated items detailed summary**

The services which the Council are allowed to de-delegated for 2019/20 are listed below:

1. Contingencies (including schools in financial difficulties and deficits of closing schools)

The contingency is to support schools in financial difficulty not of the school's own making i.e. falling rolls, exceptional circumstances and to fund closing schools that still have a deficit.

Any school that would like to access this fund will need to state the issue and will need to meet with the School's Finance Manager, so that the situation can be assessed as an exceptional case or not. An example of a special case could be a fraudulent activity in the school, which the school are pursuing in legal procedure that has resulted in a loss of funding, and this was not due to negligence within the school.

Any decision will need the agreement of the Assistant Director for Education and will be communicated to the Schools Forum. This will be a standing item at all Schools Forum meetings.

Schools that are struggling to manage their budget should contact Schools Finance for support at the earliest opportunity to minimise the ongoing impact and to apply for a licence deficit if applicable.

2. Behaviour support services, service commissioned from Foundry for primary maintained schools.

3. Support to underperforming ethnic groups and bilingual learner. Please See **Appendix A** for more detail on the service offered.

4. Staff costs supply cover (for example, long-term sickness, maternity, trade union and public duties). Please see **Appendix B** for more information.

5. Licences and Subscriptions:

Please see table below:

Capita ONE Module name	Service Provided	Cost
Attendance	Attendance monitoring and analysis – data supplied by schools through SIMS	£3,299
Exclusions	Exclusions monitoring and analysis – data supplied by schools through SIMS	£2,799
Bases	Core info about school sites needed to support the other modules	£3,462
B2B Student	Manages the transfer of student and attendance data from SIMS to ONE	£10,157
Governors	Supports schools with Governors administration	£2,650
System & Capita tech support	Fixed costs for technical licenses and customised support (e.g. for upgrades, service packs, bug fixes)	£43,175
TOTAL		£65,542

6. Insurance. Budget for maintained schools only. Academies have indemnity rather than insurance which is underwritten by the taxpayer. The DfE doesn't allow maintained schools to be part of that scheme, therefore the council has to go out into the general market to private companies for insurance cover.

Through economies of scale, the council is able to commission more favourable rates than individual schools are likely to receive if they went out to the general market themselves. If schools source their own insurance, the council will need to approve the cover to ensure at an acceptable level to mitigate any risks for the council.

.05 **Financial Summary**

The proposed de-delegated budget provision for 2019/20 financial year is £1,312,582 please see Table A below.

Coral Miller
Interim Senior Finance Specialist - Schools
January 2019

Bob Watson
Lead Specialist – Finance (deputy s.151 officer)
January 2019

APPENDIX A

Ethnic Minority Achievement funding

This funding currently supports a well-regarded and strong service, which works with schools to develop provision and improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils, as well as pupils learning EAL, and pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds.

The de-delegation and central use of this funding enables:

- **The LA Teaching and Learning Adviser to support schools to diminish differences for disadvantaged children, children learning EAL and those from minority ethnic groups.** Support includes:
 - Training courses and termly network meetings for EAL and pupil premium, and input to Headteacher briefings, 'Getting to Good' meetings, SENCO and early years network meetings.
Central training courses delivered on an annual basis are:
 - Supporting new arrivals with EAL in primary schools. [Feedback rates the course overall as 85% 'very good'](#).
 - Leading EAL provision: Effective ways to meet the needs of EAL pupils in your school. [Feedback rates the course overall as 80% 'very good'](#).
 - EAL in the EYFS. [Feedback rates the course overall as 100% 'very good'](#). [23 teachers/ TAs attended these courses this year.](#)
 - In addition, an annual pan-Berkshire pupil premium conference has been organised for the last two years. [In summer 2018, 40 Wokingham teachers attended the conference. 81% of delegates reported that the conference provided information they could take back to school and use.](#)
 - A pupil premium 'Ideas Exchange' event for secondary schools has been held for the last two years, in partnership with Wellington College. [Almost every Wokingham secondary school has been represented at these meetings, and feedback has been very positive.](#)
 - During the last academic year, a course was offered on 'Tilt for writing/ Talk for writing: Improving writing outcomes for pupil premium and all pupils' [Feedback rated the course overall as 66% 'very good'](#). [A recent Ofsted report for one school that participated in the course included this comment: 'Disadvantaged pupils are offered strong support to improve their writing. Teachers offer these pupils precise feedback on their work which helps them to improve.'](#)
 - In-school support for EAL and pupil premium, including: support for pupil premium leaders and EAL co-ordinators; support for teaching assistants who champion pupil premium children and who support EAL pupils; staff meetings on EAL and pupil premium; pupil premium reviews; and EAL surgeries.
[During the academic year 2017-18, 13 EAL training sessions were delivered in schools, including a cluster session. 5 pupil premium training sessions were delivered in schools, including a cluster session. Pupil premium sessions included those which focussed on 'tilting' the teaching of writing to support disadvantaged pupils.](#)

[During 2017-18, other in-school PP support included meetings with PP leaders at 10 schools; regular support in three schools for TAs acting as PP champions; PP reviews in two primary schools and PP review meetings at four secondary schools. Other in-school EAL support included 9 meetings with staff to discuss EAL provision, an EAL surgery session, and support for three schools with refugee pupils.](#)

- General advice and guidance via email/ telephone and access to guidance and resources on the Wokingham Schools Hub for EAL and pupil premium. The EAL pages on the Wokingham Schools Hub are some of the most visited pages on the website.
- Other school improvement support and projects, for example:
 - Partnership work with the secondary federation and primary Headteacher association to support schools to strengthen KS2-3 transition. Termly transition network meetings are facilitating the sharing of good practice, and leading to borough-wide initiatives, including events such as transition teach meets.
 - Support for schools to develop pupils' speaking and listening skills, including staff meetings, and the Voice 21 pan-Berkshire oracy CPD programme, which 17 Wokingham teachers are participating in.

Further evidence of impact of Teaching and Learning Advisor support

Feedback on support provided to schools is extremely positive.

Pupil premium network meetings are particularly well attended and well received. 25

Wokingham schools were represented at the last meeting. Ideas shared at pupil premium network meetings have been widely adopted by schools, for example, the '5 a day' initiative and the concept of 'tilt'. Comments from feedback forms from recent meetings include:

'Very inspiring'

'Idea of 'tilt' useful – will share with colleagues and ask teachers to think about.'

'Will have a PP focus in all staff meetings'

'I will double the length of my planned PP staff meeting to incorporate all the ideas I have gained.'

'Emily always runs very useful meetings, challenging our practice, and pushing forward in developing excellence'

Feedback from the pupil premium 'Ideas Exchange' events for secondary schools includes these comments:

'Extremely interesting and very thought provoking'

'Excellent event for networking and sharing'

'Gained good ideas I can take back to school'

Feedback comments on other courses and staff meetings include:

A very informative and useful session.

Great training. Lots of useful resources.

I will use the Racing to English resources to support new arrivals.

I will create time for teachers to have 1-1 discussions with PP children in their class.

Pupil premium will be on the agenda at all FGB meetings.

One of the best courses I have ever been on. I will re-think our approach to teaching writing as a result.

Other feedback from staff who have received support includes:

'Emily was extremely supportive when I started as a new PPG lead, coming to support our 'direction review' and providing useful feedback as to next steps. She is always fast to respond to queries, offers effective support, runs well designed, useful meetings, and allows me to feel that there is someone 'there' who will be able to help! (Teacher, May 2018)

'Emily has been a massive support in my first year as PP leader for my school. She has helped me to develop the leadership of such an important area in our school. It really helped me when she came on a learning walk with me in school. I feel far more confident about doing this by myself now.' (Teacher, June 2017)

'A clear lead on good practice for improving the performance of pupil premium children.' (Headteacher, June 2017)

Recent Ofsted inspection reports include many positive comments about provision and outcomes for disadvantaged children. Below are comments from reports of inspections of schools that have received in-school support from the Teaching and Learning advisor:

- *'Staff have taken on board the comments and suggestions made by the local authority. One example of the improvements already made is the expenditure of additional funding for disadvantaged pupils.'* (March 2018)
- *'disadvantaged pupils ... now make progress in line with that of other pupils nationally.... many teachers focus their questioning to ensure that particular groups of pupils, such as the disadvantaged, are fully engaged in lessons... The school makes good use of its pupil premium funding.'* (November 2017)
- *'There is clear evidence...that the majority of disadvantaged pupils and most-able disadvantaged pupils presently at the school are making strong progress and diminishing the difference between themselves and other pupils nationally.'* (October 2018)
- *'I explored how leaders use the pupil premium funding and found that it makes a very positive difference to pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds. You and the 'pupil-premium champion' know all the eligible pupils and their families exceptionally well. ...you have devised a wide range of successful strategies that support these pupils well and help them to make strong progress across the curriculum.'* (November 2018)
- *'Disadvantaged pupils achieve particularly highly by the end of Year 6... Leaders and governors ensure that pupil premium funding is used extremely well'* (October 2018)

The model of PP Champions developed in the borough has been cited as good practice in Ofsted reports:

- *"'Pupil premium champions' meet with disadvantaged pupils on most days to encourage them to achieve their best and help them with any learning they have found tricky. As a result, disadvantaged pupils make strong progress.'*
- *'Teaching assistants support learners well. .. Many act as champions for individual learners, ...keeping a sharp oversight in lessons to make sure pupils have understood and make good progress.'*

Outcomes for PP pupils have improved in many of the schools provided with PP support. For example, below is outcomes data for two schools that have been provided with significant support for pupil premium:

School 1:

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in reading, writing and maths has increased from 30% to 63.6% in the last three years, with significant improvements in progress scores for writing and maths.

School 2:

The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard in reading, writing and maths has increased from 22.2% to 57.1% in the last three years, with a very significant improvement in writing progress, which has been a focus of the support.

LA outcomes data:

Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in the borough for the last three years show an improving trend. At KS2, the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in reading, writing and maths has increased by 10.5% in the last three years and is now above the national equivalent outcome. At KS4, the overall average Progress 8 score for disadvantaged pupils has improved in the last three years from -0.46 to -0.24. The average Attainment 8 score for disadvantaged pupils is now in line with the national equivalent score.

Outcomes for EAL pupils in the borough are very strong and improving. In summer 2018, EAL pupils performed better than other pupils in the borough on every assessment measure from the phonics screening test to KS4, with just a small achievement gap of 3% in the early years in terms of GLD attainment. On almost every assessment measure, outcomes for EAL pupils in Wokingham were better than for EAL pupils nationally, in many cases significantly so. At KS2, the percentage of EAL pupils in the borough achieving the expected standard in reading, writing and maths has improved in the last three years by 12 percent. At KS4, the average Progress 8 score for EAL pupils in the borough has improved in the last three years from 0.39 to 0.74. The LA has raised awareness over the last few years of the need to improve outcomes for Mixed White and Black Caribbean pupils. The average Progress 8 score for this group has improved from -0.29 to -0.22 in the last three years. At KS2, progress in writing for this group has improved from -2.38 to -1.19.

- **The two LA Bilingual Teaching Assistants to support newly arrived Polish and Arabic speaking pupils in maintained schools.** The Bilingual Teaching Assistants are in great demand, and schools have reported on the huge impact that their support has had for pupils who are at the early stages of learning EAL. Arabic and Polish continue to be two of the languages most spoken by new arrivals admitted to Wokingham schools. The two TAs support around 20-25 pupils each year, as well as one-off visits to support schools in their assessment of children's needs.

Feedback from schools includes:

'The TA has produced a great number of resources...she has been a godsend.'

'Support during Literacy lessons ensured that L's grasp of the language developed very quickly. The TA made a tremendous impact on L's ability to access the national curriculum.'

'P got a grade C in her exam which is worth 25% of the GCSE. Many thanks for all your hard work in helping her achieve this grade!'

'The TA contributes in a significant way to the development of these pupils.'

Pupils supported by the TAs make good progress in 'catching up' with their native English speaking peers and have achieved well in KS2 tests/ GCSE exams relative to the length of time they have been learning English. As well as impacting on children's learning, feedback from schools indicates that the TAs have a significant impact on children's social interactions and emotional well-being. They also have an impact on the school staff that they work with, and on the resources available in school, which children continue to benefit from after their support has ended.

The funding currently enables the LA to provide all pupil premium and EAL support free of charge to maintained schools. (It is possible that this may need to be reviewed in light of the reduction in funding due to academisation.)

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF STAFF COSTS SUPPLY COVER

Maternity Leave	
Description	Funding
Teaching Staff	
6 weeks pay	Full pay
33 week maternity pay	Approx. £140 per week
12 weeks Occupational pay	Half pay
Support staff	
6 weeks pay	90% Full pay
13 weeks maternity pay	Approx. £140 per week
12 weeks Occupational pay	Half pay

Paternity Leave – 2 week full pay.

Trade union cover – one full time post, funding to support schools that need to cover trade union duties.

Public duties – supply cover for Jury service.

These costs for maintained schools are charged directly to the Council rather than the school.

Background

Analysis of Issues

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Council faces severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of the austerity measures implemented by the Government and subsequent reductions to public sector funding. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions in excess of £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context.

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)			
Next Financial Year (Year 2)			
Following Financial Year (Year 3)			

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

Cross-Council Implications (how does this decision impact on other Council services, including properties and priorities?)

Reasons for considering the report in Part 2

List of Background Papers

Contact Coral Miller	Service Education
Telephone No Tel: 07825522639	Email coral.miller@wokingham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE	19-20 Early years including centrally retained
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	School Forum on 16 January 2019
WARD	(All Wards);
DIRECTOR	Director of Children's Services - Carol Cammiss

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Not Applicable

RECOMMENDATION

The Schools Forum is asked to approve the centrally retained element of the 2019/20 Early Years Budget, which will be used to fund the associated statutory duties of the Local Authority.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The Schools Forum is asked to approve the Early Years' centrally retained funding for 2019/20 which will be used to deliver the statutory responsibilities of the Council.

It is proposed that 5% is retained centrally, equating to £506k for 2019/20. This reflects an increase of 1% on that retained for the current financial year, ensuring 95% is still available to fund Early Years' providers, in line with DfE guidance.

The proposed increase in centrally retained funding does not represent an increase in central costs within the Council, but a change to DSG block allocation for SEN Early Years Inclusion. Cost of this provision is approx. £160k and was previously funded from the High Needs Block. Retaining 5% for 2019/20 allows £100k of these costs to be more appropriately funded from the Early Years Block rather than the High Needs Block.

From the census and budget information available, early indications are that this approach would allow for an increase in the hourly rate of 7p for 3&4 year olds, with 2 year old funding being held at the current hourly rate. However work on the January census remains ongoing. The hourly rate for providers cannot be confirmed until all information is received and verified.

Confirmation of rates to Schools with Early Years provision will be notified by 28th February 2019, with other Early Years' providers no later than 31st March 2019.

2019/20 Early Years Budget January 2019

.01 Purpose of the Report

This report provides the Schools Forum with details of the 2019/20 Early Years' Budget, and the proposed level of centrally retained element to fund the Local Authority's statutory duties.

.02 Recommendations

The Schools Forum is asked to approve the centrally retained element of the 2019/20 Early Years Budget, which will be used to fund the associated statutory duties of the Local Authority.

.03 Background

Since its introduction in April 2017, the Early Years' National Funding Formula (EYNFF) has set the hourly funding rates that each local authority is paid to deliver the universal and additional free entitlements for three and four year olds.

Local authorities are **required to pass 95%** of their three and four year old funding from Government onto Early Years' providers. This pass-through requirement ensures that the vast majority of Government funding reaches providers so that they can deliver the free entitlements.

The '5%' retained by the local authority is to fund the following:

- Centrally retained funding to support the administration of the Early Years' structure. This provides direct support to settings in line with fulfilling the Local Authority's statutory obligations, and supports the specialist SEND services from the SEN Inclusion Fund;

In previous years Wokingham has set the centrally retained budget at 4%, or 1% below the 5% allowed in the guidance, allowing for a higher level of funding to be passed on to providers.

.04 2019/20 Budget Setting

The Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF) has not changed from 2018/19, with the nationally set rates behind the budget being held at £5.74 for 2 year olds, and £4.97 for 3 to 4 year olds.

The Council therefore intends to keep the 2 year old funding at £5.54 as per the current year but increase the 3 & 4 year old funding by 7p from £4.39 to £4.46.

In respect of the centrally retained element to fund the Council's statutory duties, it is proposed to hold the maximum of 5% to support the SEN EY inclusion service. This still allows for an increase 7p/hour increase in 3 & 4 year olds provision.

The proposed increase in centrally retained funding does not represent an increase in central costs within the Council However it does reflect a change to DSG block allocation for SEN Early Years Inclusion. The cost of this Early Years Inclusion provision is approx. £160k and this was previously funded from the High Needs Block. Retaining 5% for 2019/20 allows £100k of these costs to be more appropriately funded from the Early Years Block rather than the High Needs Block which is under very significant pressure.

The Early Years team provides the following services:

- Provider Agreement with Terms and Condition to all Early Years providers which includes PVis, Schools with Nursery provision, Childminders and maintained nursery.
- Direct work with settings, to support quality - ensuring that the Council meets its statutory obligations under the Early Education and Childcare Statutory Guidance document (2017)
- Training to providers
- Support to settings to ensure inclusive provision for all children
- Moderation of EYFSP data, in line with the STA's requirements
- Cluster groups to support Early Years' providers
- Presentation and briefing at Early Years' Forum
- Monitoring the termly adjustments and verifying census information from providers to enable the correct funding to go to providers.
- Financial management of supplements and free entitlement.
- SEN Early Years inclusion.

Some of the other support to the Early Years' Team which is required for the delivery of the service include:

- Leadership support;
- Finance, I.T., HR, Legal and other support costs;
- Property services etc.

In order to appropriately fund the above, it is proposed that recommended 5% is retained centrally from 3 & 4 year olds, with a similar figure from 2 year old funding, equating to £506k for 2019/20.

.05 Financial Summary

A summary of the Early Years' Budget proposal for 2019/20 is contained in Appendix A.

Table A – shows the compliance funding for 3&4 year olds, demonstrating 95% has been “passed through” to providers.

Table B – shows the Early Years 2019/20 indicative allocation.

Table C – shows the breakdown of the 2019/20 allocation of the Early Years Budget.

Coral Miller
Interim Senior Finance Specialist - Schools
January 2019

Bob Watson
Lead Specialist – Finance (deputy s151)
January 2019

TABLE A - Shows Compliance		
2019-20 Early years budget		
Checklist on 3 to 4 year olds		
This calculation is set out as a worked example in the table below: Calc Line Description Amount		
Line no.	Description	Amount
1	Anticipated budget for base rate (including funding to MNS) for 3 and 4 year olds	8,577,383
2	Anticipated budget for MNS lump sums for 3 and 4 year olds	50,000
3	Anticipated budget for supplements for 3 and 4 year olds: Deprivation (including funding to MNS)	33,698
4	Anticipated budget for supplements for 3 and 4 year olds: Quality (including funding to MNS)	326,610
5	Anticipated budget for supplements for 3 and 4 year olds: Flexibility (including funding to MNS)	
6	Anticipated budget for supplements for 3 and 4 year olds: Rurality (including funding to MNS)	
7	Anticipated budget for supplements for 3 and 4 year olds: EAL (including funding to MNS)	
8	Anticipated budget for 3 and 4 year old SEN inclusion fund (top up grant element)	100,000
9	Anticipated budget for 3 and 4 year old contingency	203,376
	SUB TOTAL	9,291,067
10	DfE initial quantum allocation to local authority of MNS supplementary funding	0
11	Planned total base rate hours for universal 15 and additional 15 hours for 3 and 4 year olds	1,968,780
12	Equivalent average rate to providers for entitlement hours for 3 and 4 year olds	4.72
13	LA EYNFF hourly rate for 3 and 4 year olds (published alongside this document, or in DSG tables in future)	4.97
14	Test of meeting requirement	95.0%
	Minimum amount	95%
	Positive (compliant) and Negative (non compliant)	0.0%

Table B - Provisional Income						
2019-20 Early Years budget table - December 2018						
Estimated income using January 2018 census			Updated in Dec 2018 and July 2019.			
DESCRIPTION	Estimated Numbers (PTE)	PTE hours	No. of weeks	Total number of hours	Rate	Allocation
2 year old funding	111	15	38	63,270	5.74	363,170
Early year National funding formula (EYNFF)						
3 & 4 funding	2,746	15	38	1,565,220	4.97	7,777,966
3 & 4 funding working parent	717	15	38	408,690	4.97	2,030,189
						10,171,326
Other funding to EY Providers						
EY Pupil Premium						38,000
Disability Living Allowance						23,000
Maintained Nursery supplement						3,000
Total Allocation						10,235,326

Table C
2019-20 Early Years budget table - Option chosen for 18-19 (need to be update) use January 2018 census
Income from the DfE

DESCRIPTION	Estimated Numbers (PTE)	PTE hours	No. of weeks	Total number of hours	Rate	Allocation
2 year old funding	110	15	38	62,700	5.54	347,358
Support to fund Early years team relates to 2 years old						13,894
Support SEN inclusion service - 2years						25,000
						386,252
Early year National funding formula (EYNFF)						
3 & 4 funding including working parent	3,374	15	38	1,923,180	4.46	8,577,383
Maximum amount to Providers after Providers reserves	80	15	38	45,600	4.46	203,376
Teacher supplement	2,865	15	38	1,633,050	0.20	326,610
Deprivation supplement				1,923,180	0.02	33,698
Maintained Nursery supplement					0.02	50,000
Early year inclusion					0.05	100,000
						510,308
Other funding to EY Providers						
EY Pupil Premium					0.02	38,000
Disability Living Allowance					0.01	23,000
						61,000
Support to fund Early years team relates to 3&4 years old						392,959
Support EY SEN inclusion service						75,000
						467,959
Est. Expected "recoupment" June 2020						
2 year old variance	1	15	38	570	5.74	3,272
3&4 year olds	9	15	38	5,130	4.97	25,496
Total expected recoupment - DfE						28,768
Total Allocation						10,235,046
Actual allocation as per DfE						10,235,326
Variance						-279



Schools forum self-assessment toolkit

This toolkit provides local authority officers and elected members with a framework for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their schools forum. The toolkit is designed as a set of questions which can be considered by individuals or the forum as a whole.

Question	Score 0 - 10	Notes
1. Are meeting dates set in well advance and details (including time and venue) published in an accessible manner to enable interested parties to plan their attendance?		
2. Are meetings timed to coincide with key dates? (e.g. reporting of funding formula)		
3. Are meetings held in an accessible venue to enable observers to attend easily?		
4. Is there a dedicated website link for schools forum, is it current and regularly updated?		
5. Are the agenda and papers publicly available on the authority's website at least 6 working days in advance of the meeting?		
6. Are the papers published as a single document, so that users can download easily?		
7. If papers are tabled at the meeting, are they published on the website promptly after the meeting?		
8. Are draft minutes published a reasonable time (e.g. within 2-3 weeks) after the meeting, rather than waiting until the following meeting?		

Question	Score 0 - 10	Notes
9. Are the minutes clear and unambiguous, with sufficient detail to illustrate the discussions, without reporting verbatim every point made?		
10. Is the constitution clear and appropriate? Including eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a clear process for ensuring proportional representation - the process for electing members and their tenure - the timescale for review is clearly set out - the process for dealing with repetitive non attenders 		
11. Is there an induction pack or training programme available for new members?		
12. Is the election process clear and transparent? i.e. representatives are elected only by the group they are representing, whether phase-specific for maintained schools, or by the proprietors of academies for academy members.		
13. Do the papers contain clear recommendations and indicate in a consistent manner whether the item is for information, consultation or decision?		
14. Is it clear to observers who attendees at the forum are representing? (eg by use of name plates, indicating sector)		
15. Does the chair manage the meeting well, ensuring that all are able to contribute to the agenda items, that no bias towards any sector is evident and that no single person or organisation is able to dominate the discussion?		
16. Is there inclusive participation in discussions for all phases and types of members?		

Question	Score 0 - 10	Notes
17. Do members actively canvass views and objectively represent their whole peer group at the forum and provide feed back after meetings?		
18. Where votes are required, is it clear who is eligible to vote for different items?		
19. Where votes are required, are the arrangements for recording the votes clear and unambiguous?		
20. Is there a system in place for a decision if votes are tied?		
21. Is the operational & good practice guide used to regularly review the forum's adherence to good practice?		

© Crown copyright March 2015

Please note: column 2 has been changed from Yes and No to Score 0 to 10.

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum Forward Plan

2018 /19

6 th	March	Revenue Monitoring
		High Needs Block update
		Contingencies breakdown (if applicable)
		Consultation on the High needs block 19-20
		19-20 Combined Schools budget report

2019/20

	June/July	Revenue Monitoring
		Contingencies Breakdown
		Out-turn 1819 report
		Update of Scheme for financing schools
		Consultation on the Recovery Plan report to the DfE on balancing the DSG overspend.
		Growth Fund out-turn, 19-20 forecast and 20-21 projection.
		Schools Admissions (Benchmarking)
		Update on 1920 High Needs Block from the indicative budget
		Update on 1920 Early Years from the indicative budget

This page is intentionally left blank