

Swindon Borough Council

Schools Forum

Tuesday, 27 January 2009

Committee Room 6, Civic Offices, Swindon at 4.00 p.m.

(Light refreshments will be available from 3.40 pm in Committee Room 5)

School Members:

Nick Capstick, Primary Headteachers

Lauren Connor, Primary Headteachers

Chris Davis, Primary Headteachers

Debbie Kalyuka, Primary Headteachers

Terri Menham, Primary Headteacher

Paul Boyles, Primary Governor

Mr David Easter, Primary Governor

Heidi Teague, Primary Governor

Steve Colledge, Secondary Headteacher

Steve Flavin, Secondary Headteacher

Rachael Matthey, Secondary Headteacher

Peter Wells, Secondary Headteacher

Bob Walker, Special Headteacher

John Newman, Secondary Governor

Kevin Gray, Secondary Governor

Non-School Members:

Sally Inskip, Diocese Representative

Rhian Cockwell, Diocese Representative (Deputy)

Phil Baker, Trade Union Representative

Debbie Waldron, Early Years Representative

Cathy Parker, Early Years Representative (Deputy)

Jan Downie, 14-19 Partnership

Committee Officer: Helen Harris

Telephone: 01793 463604 Email: hharris@swindon.gov.uk

Swindon Borough Council can be contacted at the Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN1 2JH (Telephone 01793 445500)

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Minutes** (Pages 1 - 6)
To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2008.
- 3. Feedback from Meeting on 16 October 2008** (GDC) (Pages 7 - 10)

4. **Schools Block Budget Monitoring 2008/09** (GDC) (Pages 11 - 22)
5. **Funding of Special Equipment** (GDC) (Pages 23 - 28)
6. **Set-Up Funding for New Schools** (GDC) (Pages 29 - 40)
7. **BESD (Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties) Review** (GDC) (Pages 41 - 58)
8. **Review of the Support for Ethnic Minority Achievement in Swindon** (GDC) (Pages 59 - 72)
9. **Early Years Flexible Offer** (GDC) (Pages 73 - 84)
10. **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009-10** (GDC) (Pages 85 - 94)
11. **Standards Funds 2009/10** (GDC) (Pages 95 - 100)
12. **Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Forum will be held on 21 April 2009 at 4.00 pm.

Date of Despatch: 19 January 2009

Key:

Officers:

CE	-	Chief Executive
GDC		Group Director: Children
GDHSC	-	Group Director: Housing & Social Care
GDER	-	Group Director: Environment & Regeneration
GDBT	-	Group Director: Business Transformation

Access Arrangements – *The Venue is wheelchair accessible and an infrared receiver hearing system is provided. If you would wish to attend the meeting but have any special requirement to enable you to do so please contact the Committee Clerk above, as soon as possible prior to the date of the meeting.*

If you would like to receive any of the pages contained in this agenda in a larger print size please contact the Committee Officer whose name appears on the first page of this agenda.

SCHOOLS FORUM

THURSDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2008

PRESENT: -

School Members:

Nick Capstick, Primary Headteachers
Lauren Connor, Primary Headteachers (**Chair**)
Chris Davies, Primary Headteachers
Debbie Kalynka, Primary Headteachers
Terri Menham, Primary Headteacher
Paul Boyles, Primary Governor (**Vice-Chair**)
Rachael Matthey, Secondary Headteacher
Peter Wells, Secondary Headteacher
Bob Walker, Special Headteacher
Peter Crockett, Special Headteachers
Kevin Gray, Secondary Governor

Non-School Members:

Sally Inskip, Diocese Representative
Phil Baker, Trade Union Representative

Officers:

Ian Bickerton (Director Access and Provision), Paddy Bradley (Director Schools and Learning), Sue Wald (Director Strategy and Commissioning), Karen Murray (Group Finance Manager Children Services), Nicki Archer (Deputy Group Finance Manager Schools), Anne English (Principal Human Resources Officer), Carmel Burton (Sure Start Partnership Manager)

Apologies for absence were received from David Easter (Primary Governor), Steve Flavin (Secondary Headteacher), Debbie Waldron (Early Years Representative), Cathy Parker (Early Years Representative (Deputy)) and Jan Downey (14-19 Partnership).

11.

Minutes

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2008, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

12.

Feedback from Meeting on 17 June 2008

Ian Bickerton (Director of Access and Local Provision) presented a report by the Group Director Children to provide feedback on the recommendations made at the previous meeting.

It was commented that CRB checks were still very slow, taking about six weeks to clear. Reference was also made to the possibility of industrial action by the CRB unit, but there was no further information at present.

Frank Knight (Project Manager, Workforce Modernisation) sent his apologies for the meeting but confirmed that he would attend the next one to give an update on Single Status. Should any urgent issues arise in the meantime a special Forum meeting would be arranged.

The Chair provided an update on the recruitment of Parent Support Advisers. Chris Davis (Primary Headteacher) was concerned at the general lack of communication and Sally Inskip (Diocesan Representative) commented that clusters met infrequently and she felt that the process was being rushed.

Members noted that the item on place funding for education other than in school would be on the January agenda.

13. Schools Block Budget Monitoring

The Forum considered a report by the Group Director Children, as presented by Karen Murray (Group Finance Manager Children Services), on the latest budget monitoring information to the end of August 2008 in respect of the Schools Block Budget for 2008/09.

Of particular concern was the £238k projected overspend by the Special Educational Needs Allocation Resource Panel (SENRAP). Paddy Bradley (Director Schools and Learning) advised that one of the main contributory factors was the specific, complex needs that had to be addressed. He stated that funding was provided as demand required but commented that it may become necessary to move away from that approach.

Bob Walker (Special Headteacher) advised that currently all the special schools were full and although an additional three pupils would trigger extra funding, there was no scope to expand at present. He remarked that when Swindon first took over from Wiltshire County Council the cost for out of Borough placements was much higher than it was now. Mr Bradley stated that he was aware that many other councils were trying to reduce these types of placements and he was working with SENRAP to try and reduce the number.

Nick Capstick (Primary Headteacher) enquired whether any benchmarking against other councils had been carried out and how we compared with the cost of out of borough placements. It was noted that there were no residential schools in the town so the pressures would be different to those of a council that did have residential facilities.

Mrs Murray stated that about half the Challenging Circumstances budget had been distributed and the balance was provisionally allocated to set against the overspend. This could be altered at any time and the overall situation would be continuously monitored, but the main focus was to reduce the overspend.

Resolved – (1) That the 2008/09 financial projections in respect of the Schools Budget for the current financial year be noted.

(2) That the Group Director, Children continue rigorous and robust monitoring of the Schools Block budget for 2008/09 and bring budget monitoring reports to future meetings of Schools Forum.

Karen Murray (Group Finance Manager Children Services) presented a report by the Group Director Children regarding the final allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2008/09. It was explained that a small amount of surplus was always anticipated but the final figures for 2008/09 provided an amount of £961k and a proposed allocation was set out in Appendix A.

Members considered each of the proposals and discussed the following specific points:

Item 2, set-up costs for PS7 – the new school would be ready for September 2010 but it would operate in temporary accommodation from September 2009. New furniture and equipment would be required before that date though to ensure it was ready for the new term. Terri Menham (Primary Headteacher) stated that Reception and Year 1 were the most expensive year groups to set-up and an allocation of £70k would be very tight. It was suggested that funding be allocated for two years, 2008/09 and 2009/10, with any surplus being rolled forward to the new school or to East Wichel Primary, which, as an additional new school, would also require set-up funding. The proposal was generally accepted although it was queried why the set-up costs had not been taken into account in the original budget but were only now being addressed. It was suggested that the Sub Group should consider the general principles surrounding the funding for set-up costs to ensure there was consistency in every situation and the implications were fully understood. At present, set-up funding was only available through the DSG for additional schools in growth areas and the Sub Group was therefore asked to consider whether this approach should be extended to new builds where there were predecessor schools, particularly as this had been formally raised with the Authority. The Forum also asked for the Sub Group to come back with a programme for future set up costs that would fall on the DSG.

Item 7, Forest School initiative – Lauren Connor (Chair and Primary Headteacher) explained that she had proposed this item because of the benefits to be gained from the initiative and also to ascertain whether it was an appropriate way to bring an item to the Forum. Members enquired whether the proposed funding was to cover the organiser's post, or to support the training of Forest School Leaders and also raised several queries regarding possible funding for future years. It was agreed that a full report should be submitted to the next meeting and that the sum of £45k would remain unallocated until the subject had been properly examined and decided. It was also agreed that in the future similar issues should be submitted through the Group Director for the Forum's consideration.

Item 8, Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme – it was noted that this would be an ongoing requirement and Mrs Murray explained that the service provider had been asked to provide a business case for submission to the Forum. In the meantime it was agreed that funding would be provided until March 2010 when it would be reviewed.

Item 10, Health and Safety – members recognised the importance of continuing training or briefing sessions but it was commented that there were different issues relating to PFI schools, so training needed to be specifically tailored to requirements. Ian Bickerton (Director Access and Provision) stated that although there were differences, the basic legislation applied across the board. He explained

that costs for the two planned events could either be met by a charge to the schools or by setting aside funds from the surplus DSG. The second option was preferred and he advised that it would also be helpful to set aside an amount in future years to fund events. It was appreciated that the £20k proposed was only an estimate, but any unused funding would be returned to the budget.

Resolved – (1) That it be noted that items 4, 5, the first part of item 6 (£20k) and the first proposal for item 12 detailed in Appendix A to the report have previously been agreed.

(2) That the allocation of funds, as set out in Appendix A to the report and detailed below, also be agreed:

- Item 1 - £55k
- Item 2 – set-up costs of £70k for two years, 2008/09 and 2009/10.
- Item 3 - £50k
- Item 6 – part 2 - £100k
part 3 - £35k
part 4 - £14k
part 5 - £30k
- Item 8 - £40k – on the understanding that it was fixed until 2010 and would then be reconsidered.
- Item 9 - £80k
- Item 10 - £20k

(3) That the Sub-Group consider and examine the general principles regarding the funding of set-up costs to schools to ensure consistency and that all implications were fully understood and to suggest a programme for future set-up costs that would fall on the Dedicated Schools Grant.

(4) That a report be submitted to the next meeting regarding the Forest Schools initiative to fully explore the funding issues for this and future years.

15. Early Years Flexible Offer

Carmel Burton (Sure Start Partnership Manager) presented a report by the Group Director Children to advise of the progress made in the delivery of the flexible offer for early education. She explained that the report was to address the issues that members had raised at the previous meeting. From September 2009, the increased and more flexible early education provision would be introduced for the 25% of children in the most disadvantaged areas before it became generally available in September 2010. To identify the relevant children for September 2009, it was proposed that the location of the nursery or care provision should be used, as explained in paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 of the report.

Resolved – That the progress made with the project plan for the delivery of the flexible offer for early education be noted and the selection process for the children to receive additional funding and flexibility in September 2009 be approved.

16. Review of Local Authority Provision for Pupils with Behaviour, Emotional and Social Development 2008/09

This item had been incorporated within item 5 on the agenda Final Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/09 (Minute 14) and therefore no separate decision was made.

17.

Extended Services Funding

Carmel Burton (Sure Start Partnership Manager) presented a report by the Group Director Children to inform the Forum of changes to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) guidance concerning the funding of extended services in academies.

Although the funding arrangements for extended services had been agreed, the DCSF had issued revised guidance in September 2008, which excluded existing academies. As Swindon allocated funding based on clusters, two options were put forward as a way of revising the allocation in line with the new guidance.

Members were concerned that the Academy should not receive double funding and also considered that the other schools within the cluster should be asked for their views on the process.

Resolved – That a report be submitted to the next meeting with further information and proposals to specifically address the concerns referred to above.

18.

Dates of Future Meetings

It was noted that future meetings would be held on 27 January and 21 April 2009.

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools' Forum
Feedback from Meeting on 16 October 2008

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To provide feedback on the recommendations made at the last meeting of the Schools' Forum on 16 October 2008

Recommendation

The Schools' Forum is requested to note this report.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 The Schools' Forum has requested that feedback is provided at the following meeting on each occasion regarding the outcome of recommendations made by the Forum at its previous meeting.
- 1.2 This report, therefore, provides feedback about recommendations made at the last meeting of the Schools' Forum.

2. Detail

- 2.1 A copy of the notes of the last meeting of the Schools' Forum, on 16 October 2008, is attached to the Agenda.
- 2.2 Feedback on each of the Agenda items considered at the last meeting is as follows:

- Schools' Block Budget Monitoring

As agreed at the last meeting, rigorous and robust monitoring of the Schools' Block Budget for 2008/09 has continued and the latest position is set out in the report attached to the Agenda.

- Final Dedicated Schools' Grant 2008/09

The £961k surplus DSG for 2008/09 has been allocated as agreed at the last meeting. The £214k that was allocated to schools' budgets will be paid through the monthly budget share from November 2008 up until the end of the financial year. The budget monitoring report attached to the Agenda also includes a section on the additional £747k allocated to non-schools' budgets at the last meeting.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Schools' Forum

Feedback from Meeting on 16 October 2008

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

The Schools' Forum asked the Sub-Group to examine the general principles regarding funding of set-up costs to schools, to ensure consistency and that all implications are fully understood. They also asked for a programme for future set-up costs that would or are likely to fall on the DSG. These issues have been considered at two meetings of the Sub-Group and a report on this matter is attached to the Agenda.

In addition, at the last meeting, the Forum did not support the proposal on the Forest Schools Initiative and asked that further consideration should be given to this issue. Discussions have since taken place and, particularly in view of the pressures on the DSG (as reported elsewhere), it has been decided, in consultation with the Chair of the Forum, not to pursue this proposal further.

- Extended Services' Funding

In 2008/09 Swindon Academy did not receive a separate allocation of the provision of extended services. The share for the Academy remains within the overall Standards Fund allocation for Swindon. Therefore, there is no change to allocations for the financial year 2008/09. Discussions are taking place with the DCSF over the allocation of funding for extended services for 2009/10. Final confirmation has not yet been received and officers will be able to update Schools' Forum verbally at the meeting.

- Parent Support Advisers

In June 2008 the Schools' Forum allocated funding to each extended services cluster for the provision of Parent Support Adviser services. A number of clusters (Kingsdown, Greendown, Commonweal and Ridgeway) have approached the Local Authority asking for the Local Authority to provide the services on their behalf. The arrangement would be the subject of a Service Level Agreement between each extended services cluster and the Local Authority. The Local Authority would provide the line management of the relevant Parent Support Adviser through the Senior Parent Support Adviser South and Senior Parent Support Adviser North. In addition, the Catholic Cluster has approached Drove School (Churchfields cluster) asking for line management support for their Parent Support Adviser from the Senior Parent Support Adviser Central South.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Schools' Forum

Feedback from Meeting on 16 October 2008

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

Alternative Options

The Schools' Forum requested this report to go to each meeting of the Forum and, therefore, no alternatives have been considered.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

There are no direct financial considerations for this report but, of course, there are for the individual items referred to above.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

None directly applicable to this report.

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45: "We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community."

Consultees

The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law & Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

Background Papers and Appendices

Reports considered and Minutes arising from the last meeting of the Schools' Forum, on 16 October 2008

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget Monitoring 2008/09

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To provide Schools Forum with the latest budget monitoring information to the end of November 2008 in respect of the Schools Block Budget for 2008/09.

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is requested to:

- Note the 2008/09 financial projections in respect of the Schools Budget for the current financial year.
- Ask the Group Director, Children Services to continue rigorous and robust monitoring of the Schools Block budget and to bring budget monitoring reports to future meetings of Schools Forum Sub Group.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Schools Forum in October a budget monitoring report on the schools block budget as at the end of August 2008 was presented. This report provides an update on the position as at the end of November 2008, highlighting any significant changes.

2. Detail

- 2.1 The budget monitoring report presented to Schools Forum in October 2008 projected a year-end over spend of £276k. The projected year-end over spend has increased to £511k as at the end of November 2008, an increase of £235k. Appendix A provides a breakdown of the individual budget variations that make up this position.
- 2.2 A new pressure of £492k has been identified on the recoupment budget. This budget includes costs for Swindon children out in other local authority schools and also includes income from other local authorities for their children that are in Swindon schools. The net budget is £292k of income and the budget runs a year in arrears. In previous financial years income has exceeded expenditure. However, current estimates indicate that there will be a pressure of at least £492k. This is due to a combination of a variation between the estimated year-end creditor provision and the actual commitment and a reduction in the level of income being received from other local authorities due to some Swindon schools being full and more

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Budget Monitoring 2008/09

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Swindon children going into Swindon schools than in previous years. The full extent of the pressure is not yet known and the current £492k projection may increase following further detailed work being carried out in this area.

- 2.3 On 16th October, Schools Forum agreed an additional £747k of DSG funding on the non-schools budgets. This significant increase on the non-schools budgets has resulted in the Central Expenditure Limit being in breach on the Section 52 Statement 2008/09 budget. This increase is included in the current budget monitoring report however all allocations, except for the Schools Meal Project Manager, are currently projected to be fully spent by year-end.
- 2.4 Appendix B provides an update on expenditure and further potential year-end savings and progress of projects related to these allocations. The potential savings identified against these allocations totals £92k. This would reduce the current projected overspend from £511k to £419k. Appendix C provides a detailed update on the progress on the Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme (SYEP) since receiving their allocation in October 2008.
- 2.5 The Schools Finance Regulations 2006 allow for the balance of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) at 31 March to be carried forward to the next financial year. If the projection for the year-end remains as an over spend at the end of the financial year it will be deducted from the DSG allocation for 2009/10.
- 2.6 If the year-end position is an under spend then this will be available for distribution with the DSG allocation for 2009/10. It must be noted that any under spend can only be used as a one off funding allocation and must not be used for recurring spend.
- 2.7 For the 2009/10 budget the additional funding agreed by Schools Forum on 16th October 2008 for primary and secondary schools will be incorporated into the Age weighted pupil unit and will no longer be shown as a separate factor. For special schools from 2009/10 the additional funding will be incorporated into the 'central delegations' factor.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Budget Monitoring 2008/09

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

The budgets and expenditure referred to within this report are all contained within the ring-fenced dedicated schools grant.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

None

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45: "We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community."

Consultees

- The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.
- The Chair of Schools Forum

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A – Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/9 Revenue Budget Monitoring as at end of November 2008.
- Appendix B – Progress on Additional Budget Allocations agreed in October 2008.
- Appendix C – Detailed Progress on the Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme (SYEP)

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/09 Revenue Budget Monitoring as at November 2008

Change since Aug 08 report	Variance as at end Nov 08	Explanation of Year End Position of £311k overspend
£'000	£'000	
235	511	
(22)	(29)	Children & Young People Primary Behaviour Support are now projecting an underspend of £29k due to salary savings of £25k arising from a restructuring of the establishment, £10k from additional and enhanced income streams from Primary National Strategy and Surestart funding and a £6k pressure on supplies and services budgets.
52	290	Schools & Learning The SENRAP budget is under considerable pressure, the previous monitoring report forecast an over spend of £229k. Over the past few months there has been an increasing number of Statemented Children requiring support and this has increased the budget pressure by a further £61k.
0	(29)	The Hillside Centre for pregnant teenagers and teenage mothers has a higher level of income than budgeted for due to an increase in 'Care to Learn' income.
0	(72)	Pupil Referral Unit are forecasting an underspend of £72k consisting of increased costs for learning packs to meet demand of £9k and transport costs which will also increase by £20k but this will be offset by anticipated income of £101k by year-end. This will be generated from miscellaneous income including pupil allowance.
0	(102)	CAMHS are currently forecasting an overspend on staff costs of £28k at year end but it is anticipated that this will be more than offset by an increased level of income resulting in an overall underspend of £102k. Marlborough House has achieved a high level of excellence award for the services they provide, which has resulted in a high level of placements from outside the borough by other authorities. The budget pressure on staff costs has occurred due to the vacancy factor being applied to the budget, which is not achievable, and this pressure will be addressed in the 2009/10 budgets.
0	7	Increased staff costs £24k due to extra cover required for a suspended Teaching Assistant offset by additional income £17k from SENAT for special educational needs child which will result in an overall overspend of £7k on Riverside.
0	9	Increased staff costs have also resulted in a budget pressure on Great Western Hospital of £9k.

0	4	An overspend of £4k also on staff costs has been currently reported within the Secondary Behaviour Support Team but it is anticipated that savings will be made on staff costs due to the retirement of the team leader and recruitment delay of two new support assistant posts which will offset this budget pressure.
0	41	The Stratton Education Centre is reporting a budget pressure on staff costs due to temporary cover for a suspended teacher.
0	42	Home Tuition are currently forecasting an overspend of £42k on staff costs due to high numbers of children receiving home tuition.
(125)	235	The Out of Borough Placements budget pressure has reduced since the last Schools Forum report. There are 7 children that have still not yet been placed in an out of borough provision. Therefore the projection has been reduced to reflect this delay as it is assumed that these children will not be placed this term. This underspend may increase if the remaining 7 children are not placed at the beginning of next term and this will be reviewed for December Budget Monitoring.
0	(215)	To help contribute to the out of borough provision the directorate has frozen any further expenditure on the schools in challenging circumstances budget. This is not a sustainable option for future years, however it will allow us some time to understand what the outcome of the alternative provision review will mean in terms of stabilising educational support.
(171)	(171)	The match funding that was required to support the broadband standards fund grant is no longer required. This is being offered up to contribute towards the savings within the SENRAP and Placement budgets.
4	4	There is a small pressure on the Travellers Children budget due to incremental salary costs.
24	24	There are a further 6 children who require speech and language therapy outside of the contractual agreement with the PCT, this has caused a pressure of £8k on the Therapy budget. In addition to this a new pressure has been identified in this area due to the Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the PCT being higher than anticipated. The higher SLA charges result in an additional budget pressure of £16k for the current financial year.
6	6	Support costs within the Playing for Success area were not included in the budget and as a result a £6k overspend is now being reported.
492	492	Detailed work has been undertaken on the Recoupment budget this month to establish an accurate year-end position. This budget includes costs for Swindon children out in other local authority schools and also includes income from other local authorities for their children that are in Swindon schools. The net budget is £292k of income and the budget runs a year in arrears. In previous financial years income has exceeded expenditure. However, current estimates indicate that the expenditure will

		<p>exceed the income and therefore there will be a budget pressure of £492k. This is due to a combination of a variation between the estimated year-end creditor provision and the actual commitment and a reduction in the level of income being received from other local authorities due to some Swindon schools being full and more Swindon children going into Swindon schools than in previous years.</p>
6	6	<p>Children & Families</p> <p>Due to the nature of the Education Support Service there is a requirement to employ specialist teaching staff, unfortunately these posts have proven difficult to recruit to and as a result the posts are currently being filled by consultants at a higher rate which will cost an additional £29k. A one-off contribution from Area Based Grant of £23k has been made to offset the increased budget pressure on salaries.</p>
11	11	<p>Wiltshire CC are no longer contributing toward a teaching post in the Portage budget therefore, there will be a shortfall of £9k in the income target. Due to late confirmation from Wiltshire the team was unable to reduce the hours of this post until September. There is a new pressure of £2k due to the increase in teacher's salaries in September 2008 being slightly above what had been budgeted for at the start of the financial year.</p>
50	50	<p>The Special Equipment budget has recently transferred to Children's and Families from the Schools and Learning Directorate. A piece of work has been undertaken recently to look at the adequacy of the existing budget provision for special equipment for the 2009/10 budget. This piece of work has identified a potential budget pressure in the current year of £50k.</p>
(4)	(4)	<p>Access & Provision</p> <p>The Trade Union Facilities budget is currently forecasting a £4k under spend; this projection is based on current demand.</p>
(1)	(1)	<p>Other minor variations.</p>
8	8	<p>New pressure in Admissions due to additional postage charges of £12k, this is offset by savings on salaries, printing and stationery and the Admissions Forum, resulting in a net pressure of £8k.</p>
(41)	(41)	<p>Limited expenditure has been incurred on the Schools Forum budget and as a result of the budget freeze a potential saving of £41k has been identified.</p>
(54)	(54)	<p>There are savings on a new DSG allocation, Targeted School Meals Grant, due to budgeted expenditure being covered from a Standards Fund grant that was carried forward from 2007/08.</p>
		<p>Finance Overview</p> <p>The projected year-end overspend on the Schools Block is £511k.</p>

Further work has been carried out on the Recoupment budget following the identification of a budget pressure of £492k, which is highlighted above. This has identified a significant additional budget pressure in this area, however; further detailed work is needed to be able to accurately state the full amount of the pressure. This will be available for the next monitoring report.

Penhill Primary School will be transferring to Swindon Academy from 1st January 2009. This will mean that the Academy will receive full funding at £3,775 per pupil for the remaining 3 months of the financial year, whereas the local funding formula results in a lower amount of funding per pupil for Penhill and the remaining funding per pupil contributes to DSG non-school budgets. This will mean that there is a potential pressure of around £30-35k as a result of Penhill transferring to an Academy. Further work is also ongoing to establish the current financial position of Penhill Primary when it transfers to the Academy. If there are any surplus balances then these will be returned to the Local Authority and could potentially compensate for the pressure highlighted above.

Information has been received recently that indicates that some additional funding was agreed to support a special school and an SRP but that funding had never been allocated from existing budgets. It had been agreed that Even Swindon would receive a lump sum top up payment of £5k to recognise the larger size of the provision and that Brimble Hill would be funded for 2 additional places, costing around £30k, to reflect their support for Redoaks SRP.

If the year-end position remains as an overspend this will be deducted from 2009/10 allocation of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

Appendix B

Proposals Agreed at Schools Forum on 16/10/08	Budget £000s	Current Position (as at end of Dec 08)	Year End Forecast £000s	Additional Saving (not in App A) £'000
Proposal 1 - School Meals	£55,000	This allocation was agreed to fund a School Meals Project Manager post when a specific grant ceases from April 2009. It is anticipated that the allocation for the current year will not be needed so has been offered up as a saving to reduce the potential overspend on the DSG budget. This saving is included in Appendix A. It was agreed at Schools Forum that this would be an ongoing allocation and the budget will be needed for next financial year.	£0	£0
Proposal 2 - PS7 Set up costs	£70,000	It is anticipated that this allocation will be unspent at the end of the current financial year. This budget will be needed to be carried forward into the next financial year in preparation for the opening of the PS7 Temporary Accommodation in September 2009 as the full £140k allocation over 2 years is needed to fully equip the School.	£0	£0
Proposal 3 - Looked After Children	£50,000	This was allocated to the Secondary Behaviour Support Team to appoint 2 Education Behaviour Key Workers. The Children Services Leadership Team have recently agreed these posts can be advertised and adverts will be placed in January 2009. There will therefore be a saving on the £50k allocation for 2008/09. This will be included in the next budget monitoring report and should help to reduce the overall budget pressure on the DSG.	£10,000	£40,000
Proposal 4 - Early Years PVI providers	£92,000	This contribution to the Early Years costs has helped to reduce a budget pressure in the current financial year. There is a pressure of £150k that has been reduced to £58k following the agreement of the £92k funding at the October Schools Forum. Please see Appendix A for further details	£92,000	£0
Proposal 5 - EAL Contingency	£96,000	The independent review on BME has now been completed and has reported to the Children Services Leadership Team. This budget allocation of £96k has been fully spent on the review.	£96,000	£0
Proposal 6 - Alternative Provision	£199,000			
<i>Alternative Provision Consultant</i>	<i>£20,000</i>	The Consultant has undertaken a review of Alternative Provision within the Borough and has reported to the Children Services Leadership Team, therefore this allocation will be fully spent.	<i>£20,000</i>	<i>£0</i>
<i>Out of Borough Pressure</i>	<i>£100,000</i>	The additional £100k funding for the Out of Borough budget has helped to reduce the budget pressure for the current financial year. Please see Appendix A for further details on this budget pressure.	<i>£100,000</i>	<i>£0</i>
<i>Youth Education Project</i>	<i>£35,000</i>	This funding is being used to support the running costs of the Youth Education Project. A recent successful weeks residential has just taken place for the young people at the project and this has been one of the first calls on this funding. The team at the Centre will manage this budget on a day to day basis. It is anticipated that this funding will be fully spent by the end of the financial year.	<i>£35,000</i>	<i>£0</i>

Appendix B

Proposals Agreed at Schools Forum on 16/10/08	Budget £000s	Current Position (as at end of Dec 08)	Year End Forecast £000s	Additional Saving (not in App A) £'000
<i>Project aimed at reducing permanent exclusion at KS3</i>	£14,000	This funding supports placement of pupils on a four week intensive course run by Stepping Forward called 'Take 5'. For each pupil placed on the course a school will pay £300 and the LA will pay £200 to Stepping Forward. The total amount is calculated on up to 70 pupils accessing the course each year. The first course ran during November/December 2008 and 10 pupils took part. It is anticipated that there will be a saving of at least £7k on this allocation in the current financial year. This saving will be reflected in next months budget monitoring report.	£7,000	£7,000
<i>Therapeutic Support - St Lukes and Stratton</i>	£30,000	A meeting will be held in January with colleagues from Nyland School, St Lukes and PRU to plan the use of this funding with the main aim of supporting pupils to remain in the Borough by allocating resource for therapeutic intervention. Please note that the budget allocated may be passed to a school base as part of the management of the funding.	£30,000	£0
Proposal 7 - Forest School	£45,000	This proposal was not agreed at the Schools Forum meeting in October and due to the current pressure on the DSG budget will now not be allocated in 2008/09 so is a saving on the budget.	£0	£45,000
Proposal 8 - Tranquility Zone	£40,000	See Appendix C which provides a detailed update on this project.	£30,000	£0
Proposal 9 - SENRAP	£80,000	This allocation has helped to absorb some of the current year financial pressure on the SENRAP budget. However, increasing numbers of children are receiving statements and as reported in Appendix A there is still a significant budget pressure in this area.	£80,000	£0
Proposal 10 - Health & Safety	£20,000	Premises Managers Training took place in December 2008 at a cost of £4,700. Asbestos Training is scheduled for February 2009 at a cost of £1,284. Therefore the total that will have been spent by 31 March 2009 is £5984.	£6,000	£0
	£747,000		£506,000	£92,000

Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme (SYEP) Report for the Schools Forum

Since receiving the first payment from the Schools Forum in November 08, the SYEP team has entered a developmental phase of the project, including revising the training course, and developing some new promotional materials including a slide presentation and poster.

The SYEP Manager also met with Paddy Bradley, Director of Schools and Learning, to explore how we can contribute to the current school improvement strategy. The advice Paddy gave at this meeting has informed our planning and priorities for the last few months:

1. To think about 'disciplined innovation' and to initially just focus on a small number of schools where we can build strength and capacity to sustain the programme and consolidate the approach of developing a healthy human spirit, and then gradually expanding it.
2. To develop a more systematic way of measuring the impact of the programmes.
3. To focus on both the higher achieving schools as well as schools in socially deprived areas, as SYEP is not just for dispirited or disadvantaged children.

1. Consolidation of SYEP

(i) Secondary Schools: Churchfields

As part of the strategy to consolidate SYEP at Churchfields, we have focused on developing a stronger partnership with the school. This involves supporting the five facilitators through regular meetings, phone calls and emails, and working directly on a weekly basis with one of the facilitators who is facilitating sessions with asylum seekers, to see how SYEP can meet the needs of these students. A total of 55 students – which includes pupils at risk and/or emotionally vulnerable, and some asylum seekers - completed the full course last term at the school. Four of these students have asked to train as SYEP facilitators. Perhaps the best summary of the impact of SYEP at this school is from Russell Langdown, Graduated Response Manager at Churchfields said recently the exclusion rate was reduced by half or two thirds, and that SYEP has made a significant contribution to this reduction.

(ii) Primary Schools: Moredon, Drove, Lawn, Lainesmead, Penhill

SYEP has kept in regular contact with the facilitators at these five primary schools to try and establish a sustainable system where programmes can be run and monitored throughout the year.

Approximately six disadvantaged or vulnerable children benefit from the programme each term at these schools, except at Lainesmead, where Year 6 teachers are experimenting with a whole class approach, currently working with 60 children. Progress reports and evaluation sheets are available on request.

2. Evaluation

We have started to explore how to improve our current systems of facilitators capturing relevant data, and measuring the impact of the programme more effectively. Another meeting has been arranged with Paddy Bradley to discuss this on 23rd January.

3. Focus on higher achieving schools

The SYEP manager recently met the Head of Commonweal, who is very interested in an experimental approach, in training some Year 10 peer tutors to facilitate the Zones at the school for other students.

Plans for January – 31st March 2009

In summary, our plans for the next 3 months are mainly to consolidate the programmes at five schools – Churchfields, Moredon, Drove, Lawn, Lainesmead. We hope to achieve this by: further development and simplifying our training programme and the SYEP foundation

course for children to be able to meet the needs of asylum seekers; closer partnership with the school improvement team; three more facilitator training days; orientation sessions for staff; assisting to set up Tranquillity Zones where support is needed; developing a simpler and more effective method of evaluation, and continuing to develop our partnership with each of these schools through regular visits, monitoring and supporting the facilitators. We also plan to establish the programme in at least three more schools – Nova Hreod, Commonweal and Oaktree.

SYEP funding from Swindon Borough Council, Children Services

Costs paid by Children Services in November & December 08

Staff salaries and costs	6551
Telephone/broadband	153
Other	162
TOTAL	6866

Estimated cost paid by Children Services from January - 31 March 2009

* Staff Costs	13284
SYEP trainer/facilitator (contract basis)	1000
Promotional material design (contract basis)	1500
Facilitator training: material, resources, lunch & refreshment	500
Volunteer costs	178
Capital Equipment (purchase of data projector & white screen)	750
Room & office rent	1520
Telephone/broadband	180
Tranquillity Room set up in schools and maintenance of TZ room in Project office	2000
Promotional, stationary, postage, office supply	600
Account Auditing & Professional fees	1400
TOTAL	22912
TOTAL anticipated costs paid by Children services from November 2008 – March 2009	29778

TOTAL COST OF SYEP	Paid by Children Services	Paid by other Funders	Total
TOTAL SYEP expenses April - December 2008	6866	26258	33124
TOTAL anticipated expenses January 09 - 31 March 2009	22912	0	22912
TOTAL anticipated expenses April 2008 to 31 March 2009			56036

* Both staff are on full time employment from January 09

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To inform Schools Forum of the increasing pressures on the budget to fund special equipment for children and young people with disabilities.

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is requested to:

- Recommend to the Local Authority an increase in the Special Equipment budget to £143,000 for the 2009/10 budget, an increase of £73,000 from the 2008/09 budget. This decision must only be made once the DSG Budget 2009-10 Report has been considered later on the Agenda due to the competing demands on the DSG budget in 2009-10.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 At a meeting of the Schools Forum Sub-Group in November 2008 this report on the funding of Special Equipment was presented to the Group for consideration for additional funding in the 2009-10 DSG budget. The Group decided that this report should go forward to the Schools Forum for consideration alongside other requests for additional funding competing demands on the 2009-10 DSG budget as will be discussed in the report later on the Agenda.
- 1.2 There are increasing pressures on the budget to fund special equipment for children and young people with disabilities. The reduced use of Out Borough placements, more inclusion in mainstream schools, an increase in the school population, and medical and equipment developments, have all contributed to these pressures.
- 1.3 Actual budget spends over the past few years have been bolstered by a short-term capital grant and large overspends. The Government grant was given on the understanding that the money would continue to be found within the Local Authority when the grant ceased in 2005. This has not happened. Since then, it has been difficult to find consistent funding for this budget. The recent allocation of part of this budget to the Integrated Community Equipment Services (ICES) project has further complicated matters.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

- 1.4 Over recent years survival rates for babies with profound and multiple learning difficulties have improved, as has the equipment that is available to help these children. Therefore, there are increasing numbers of children and young people requiring an increasing number of sophisticated and expensive special equipment in order to access Education.

2. Detail

Historical Budget Information

- 2.1 Since 1997, when Swindon became a Unitary Authority, it was agreed that Wiltshire would allocate £31,000 for children and young people with physical disabilities in Special Schools in Swindon. The Access Initiative provided a budget for children and young people in mainstream schools. Since then, in response to increasing demands, there have been developments in Alternative and Augmentative Communication (AAC) and in the role of the Advisory Teacher for SEN / ICT / AAC.
- 2.2 From 2002 to 2006 the Government Communication Aid Project (CAP) supported Local Authorities to provide ICT and AAC equipment to children and young people. Swindon received approximately £20,000 a year for equipment for the 4 years. The Government ended this support in 2006.
- 2.3 Until 2005 Swindon also received funding from the Government's Access Initiative. In 2002/03, the Access Initiative budget was £224,909. In 2003/04 the budget was increased to £389,616. The expenditure against this money was overseen and scrutinised by a committee who met regularly. The breakdown of allocations was:
- 50% for Specific (building adaptation) Projects, which were agreed by an inter-departmental team who identified and prioritised specific needs;
 - 30% for a Rolling Programme of building adaptations to implement a generic standard of access provision across the Borough and to implement a strategic plan to improve access to school buildings;
 - 20% for Specialist Equipment for mainstream school pupils identified on a case-by-case basis by Education Support Service staff i.e. £77,000.
- In 2005, due to competing demands the Council decided that it could not continue supporting the Access Initiative funding.
- 2.4 In the financial year 2005 / 06, the Actual Spend from the special equipment budget was £95,434.97, but no budget was identified apart from the original £31,000, which was originally just for Special Schools. There was no extra funding available e.g. for alterations or special

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

equipment in mainstream schools. Subsequent annual spends have been in line with this figure.

Present Situation

- 2.5 In the financial year 2008/09, Schools Forum agreed to increase this funding to £70,000, but £45,000 of this budget has gone into the Integrated Community Equipment Services (ICES) project. This is to support our legal requirements to service equipment to meet Health and Safety requirements for regular cleaning and testing and to be able to replace the equipment earlier. 17% of this budget is for increased on-costs.
- 2.6 The ICES Service Level Agreement at the present time covers Special Schools, Brimble and Uplands, and any equipment required for children and young people with physical disabilities in mainstream school (it does not cover equipment for visual impairment and hearing impairment, or any ICT equipment or AAC).

Projected Costs for the 2008/09 Financial Year

- 2.7 The 2008/09 projected spend because of above pressures listed below will be in the region of £120,000.

	Year 2008/09	Year 2009/10
ESS SEN / ICT	£23,500 Based on spending so far this year and previous years	£25,000
ESS SEN / AAC	£43,990 Based on known pupils needing AAC this year	£46,200
ESS Hearing Impairment	£5,200 4 pupils	£10,000 6 pupils plus Soundfields
ESS Visual Impairment	£1,500	£10,000 Based on known pupils
ESS + Special schools Physical Disability (through ICES)	£49,140 Based on previous figures in previous years, spending so far this year, and known children who will need significant amounts of	£52,000

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

	equipment.	
Total projected spend	£123,330	£143,200

2.8 Providing special equipment to enable children and young people to stay in Borough either in Special Schools or mainstream is cost effective e.g. a child at Brimble Special School on Band F would cost over £21,000 and be able to pick up on the transport systems already in place in Swindon. An Out Borough placement for a similar child would cost over £60,000, plus the cost of school meals, transport and special equipment. The more children and young people that we are able to educate in Swindon schools with the appropriate equipment, the more costs will be incurred by this special equipment budget, but with overall savings on the Out Borough budget.

2.9 Pressures on the budget:

- The numbers of children and young people with SEN and Disabilities are increasing with the
 - expansion of the town,
 - developments in medical outcomes
 - inclusion in mainstream schools
- Newcomers to Swindon.
- A substantial number of the children and young people in the SRPs would, in previous times, have gone to out of borough placements. Special equipment (seating, changing plinths, ICT + AAC) has played a part in making it possible for these children and young people's needs to be met in Swindon schools. The levels of disability and learning needs being catered for in Swindon schools has increased, without the equipment supplied from the special equipment budget the out of borough numbers would be even higher.
- Those with a change of need following assessment, changes to their condition, or increased need with age and progression through school key stages.
- Trauma cases
- Dual placements – equipment needs to be ‘doubled up’.
- Different types of cochlea implants and new radio receivers to fit the implant (£1000)

2.10 Costs have increased because of:

- Raised standards of Health and Safety maintenance (an increase of 17% to cover on-costs to be able to replace the equipment earlier, regular cleaning and testing)
- Increased numbers of children and young people requiring this support

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

2.11 Increased Equipment Costs – Types of Equipment:

- ICT equipment
- AAC equipment
- Special Software
- Seating
- Hoists
- Adjustable furniture
- Soundfield Systems (£1000 per classroom, 39 rooms done at Ridgeway, a potential need at any school)
- Eye Gaze equipment (£12,000 to £20,000)
- Set up costs for the equipment for blind students to start secondary school (in Sept 05 costs was approx. £7,500)
- Greater demand for laptops and software especially for those with Aspergers and higher functioning Autism.
- Repairs over £50
- Radio aids and consumables

2.12 In view of continuing pressure on the current budget and the increases in equipment costs it is proposed that the special equipment budget for 2009/10 is set at £143,000 per year with an annual inflation adjustment thereafter.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

The financial implications are set out throughout this report. However, this report needs to be considered alongside the DSG Budget 2009-10 Report. It must also be noted that this is a demand led budget and therefore is subject to volatility.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) states that every child in the UK is entitled to over 40 specific rights, this includes the right to life, survival and development and the right to education.

Legal implications may arise if there are Tribunals following the failure of the Local Authority to provide equipment. The Local Authority also has a responsibility to comply with objectives in a child's statement; these may include the supply of appropriate or specific equipment. There may also be Disability Discrimination Act compliance implications.

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45 "We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community"

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Funding of Special Equipment

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Consultees

The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

Background Papers and Appendices

- None

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To consider the provision of set-up funding for new schools

Recommendations

- 1 The Schools' Forum is asked to note the future programme of new and additional schools that will require set-up funding to be made available, as set out in Paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 and **Appendix 1** of the report.
- 2 The Schools' Forum is asked to consider the recommendations of the meeting of the Sub-Group on 10 December regarding the possible widening of the existing definition of schools eligible for set-up funding, in the context of the broader financial implications for the DSG . The recommendations of the Sub-Group are as follows:
 - To support Options 1 and 2 in Paragraph 2.9(a) for extending the eligibility for set-up funding;
 - To support Option B in Paragraph 2.9(b) and **Appendix 3** for funding schools eligible under any agreed wider definition. This could be at **either** 50% **or, alternatively**, 25% of the "full" rate;
 - That any recommended changes, subsequently agreed, be introduced from 1 April 2009 and not be retrospective, as set out in Paragraph 2.9(c) of the report. In relation to schools that may or may not currently be eligible, this could apply to those "new" schools **either** (a) where both the school reorganisation and the rebuilding work took place after 1 April 2009 **or, alternatively**, (b) where just the rebuilding work was completed after that date (see Paragraph 2.9(c)).
- 3 That any changes recommended under 2 above which involve the widening of the definition of schools eligible for set-up funding be reviewed by the Schools' Forum annually, bearing in mind the financial implications for the DSG.
- 4 That this proposal must be considered along with other proposals detailed on the Agenda and existing budget pressures, ensuring that the total commitment does not exceed the overall DSG allocation for 2009/10, particularly bearing in mind that, if 2 above is supported, this would place a further commitment on the DSG.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

1. Reasons

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Schools' Forum on 16 October 2008, the Sub-Group was asked to consider and examine the general principles regarding the funding of set-up costs for schools, to ensure consistency and that all implications were fully understood, and to suggest a programme for future set-up costs that would fall on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- 1.2 There have since been two meetings of the Schools' Forum Sub-Group where this matter has been considered. The outcomes of these two meetings are set out below.

2. Detail

Background

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Schools' Forum on 16 October 2008, in recommending set-up funding of £140k for the temporary accommodation at the new Oakhurst primary school from September 2009, the Forum asked the Sub-Group to consider:
 - other new and additional schools that would require set-up funding, so that there is a future programme in place and the financial implications are clear;
 - the position of those schools that have predecessor schools and, therefore, have not received or will not receive set-up funding if the present approach is continued.

New and Additional Schools – Future Programme

- 2.2 The new and additional schools that it is known will be established within the next two years are as follows – see also **Appendix 1 attached**:

- a) New School at Oakhurst (PS7)

As indicated above, the Schools' Forum has now agreed set-up funding of £140k for the temporary accommodation of two double mobiles for Reception and Year 1 pupils, from September 2009 to be provided in advance of the permanent build. The permanent build will be open for pupils from September 2010. It is estimated that the additional funding required for the new build (on the basis that furniture, equipment, etc, are transferred from the temporary accommodation) is £290k.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

b) East Wichel Primary School

It has now been agreed by the Schools Adjudicator that the opening of East Wichel Primary School will be delayed from September 2009 to September 2011. The estimated set-up funding required for the permanent accommodation is £320k. However, this could potentially be phased to reflect the expectation that the school will fill gradually as the housing comes on stream.

c) Catherine Wayte and Abbey Meads Primary Schools

It has been previously agreed by the Local Authority that the above two Schools will expand to two forms of entry from September 2011. In each case this will require two additional classrooms. The overall estimated set-up funding required for the two Schools is £120k.

d) St Francis Primary School

Since the most recent meeting of the Sub-Group, capital funding has been identified for the construction of an extension at St Francis Primary School to enable it to become a permanent two-form entry school. This new extension is expected to be available from September 2011, at the latest. The School have had a double mobile on site from September 2008, which enabled them to admit two forms of entry on a temporary basis until 2010. It may, therefore, be necessary for a further single mobile to be made available for 2010/11 until the permanent extension is available. The overall set-up funding still required is estimated at £30k, as the successful bid to the DCSF for this Voluntary-Aided school included some funding for this purpose.

2.3 In addition to the above schools, in the medium/longer-term there are expected to be further new and additional schools required to respond to the need for extra places as a result of housing growth. Therefore, over the next ten to fifteen years there is expected to be a requirement for additional schools particularly in the following parts of Swindon:

- Wichelstowe (two further primary schools in addition to East Wichel Primary School)
- Eastern Development Area (this could include a requirement for seven new primary schools and two secondary schools)
- Northern Sector (there may be a requirement for further primary/secondary provision in the medium/longer-term)

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

- Central Area (there may be a requirement in the longer-term for additional primary places)
- 2.4 A detailed study on longer-term school place planning is currently underway and this will provide further information on future requirements. A further report on this issue will be brought to the Schools' Forum in due course.

Set-Up Costs – Possible Extension of Eligibility

- 2.5 The other issue referred to the Schools' Forum Sub-Group was the approach taken by the Local Authority and Schools' Forum in relation to those schools eligible for set-up funding, bearing in mind the wider financial implications for the DSG.
- 2.6 The School Finance (England) Regulations 2008 require that set-up funding for new schools be provided through the DSG. Set-up funding covers finance to pay for furniture, equipment, stationery, ICT, etc, in new schools. Recent examples of where this funding has been provided and agreed by the Schools' Forum are Isambard and the temporary accommodation for the new primary school at Oakhurst. A copy of the relevant extracts from the Regulations is **attached** to this report as **Appendix 2**.
- 2.7 Until now, the Local Authority has taken the approach that this funding is provided **only** for new and additional schools or buildings, ie, where no predecessor school buildings exist. Examples of these are set out in Paragraph 2.2 above. Therefore, where schools have been rebuilt or extended, regardless of whether or not they have also been reorganised (eg, amalgamation), no funding has normally been provided for furniture, equipment and ICT. The approach has been that this equipment will be transferred from existing buildings to new buildings and any enhancement will be paid for by the school itself, normally through Devolved Formula Capital. On the basis that the LA's approach for a number of years has been that set-up funding is normally only provided for "new and additional" schools, what is being considered would potentially widen the eligibility of schools entitled to set-up funding.
- 2.8 The Sub-Group meeting on 14 November 2008 considered the arguments for and against extending this approach to include other schools where there had been a school reorganisation followed by major building work. The Sub-Group was sympathetic to this change but referred the detail to a "special", smaller meeting of the Sub-Group. This meeting took place on 10 December 2008. It was the strong view of the Sub-Group that any wider definition of schools that would be eligible for set-up funding needed

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

to be clear, unambiguous, seen to be equitable/consistent and must take into account the wider financial implications for the DSG.

- 2.9 At the “special” meeting of the Sub-Group on 10 December, the following issues were considered:

(a) *Options for extending eligibility of set-up funding*

The Sub-Group considered the options set out below for potentially extending eligibility:

Option 1	Where a school(s) has been “closed” and a “new” school has been established through a school reorganisation process. In addition, where the “new” school is being entirely rebuilt.
Option 2	Where a school(s) has been “closed” and a “new” school has been established through a school reorganisation process. In addition, where the “new” school is being partially rebuilt.
Option 3	Where a school(s) has been “closed” and a “new” school has been established through a school reorganisation process but where no significant building work is taking place.
Option 4	Where a school reorganisation has taken place where one school is “closed” and another school “extended”. In addition, where the “extended” school is being entirely or partially rebuilt.
Option 5	Where there is no school reorganisation involved but a school is being fully or partially rebuilt.

The Sub-Group gave these options careful consideration and took the view that only Options 1 and 2 above should be eligible for set-up funding on the basis that a major school reorganisation had taken place and major building work was being undertaken. However, the Sub-Group also considered that the funding made

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

available should be at a lower level than for “new and additional” schools.

In relation to Option 2, the Sub-Group considered that, for the sake of clarity, the definition of “partially rebuilt” should be that at least 50% of classrooms were being replaced or added to the “new” school.

If Options 1 and 2 above were implemented, then currently one school (Millbrook Primary School) would potentially be eligible for set-up funding under Option 1 and no schools would be eligible under Option 2. However, this is dependent on the definition of the implementation date (see (c) below). It is, of course, very likely that there will be other schools in the future that would be eligible.

(b) *Funding*

The Sub-Group also examined options for the method and level of funding were eligibility for set-up funding to be extended, bearing in mind the wider financial implications for the DSG.

The Sub-Group, on 10 December 2008, particularly focused on the following funding options:

Option A	Funding could be at the same level as for setting up “new and additional” schools. This is likely to be in the region of £300k for a primary school and £500k for a secondary school.
Option B	Funding could be at a lower level, based on the pupil number capacity of a school, eg, 420 pupils for a two-form entry primary school.
Option C	Funding could be at a lower level, based on a proportion of a school's Devolved Formula Capital allocation.

The Sub-Group did not consider that the funding should be at the same level as for “new and additional” schools as there would be equipment available in predecessor buildings. Their view was that Option B was the most objective and clearest way forward. The funding that this could potentially generate could be at **either** 50%

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

or 25% of the "full" rate for new and additional schools, and details are set out in **Appendix 3** attached.

The 2009/10 DSG Budget Report will be presented later on the Agenda. This proposal will need to be considered along with priorities and existing budget pressures.

As mentioned above, the DSG is under considerable pressure and cannot financially support all of the proposals and existing budget pressures. Therefore, the Schools' Forum is asked to make a recommendation on what are considered to be priority areas, ensuring that the overall financial commitment does not exceed the total DSG. It needs to be borne in mind that there are already significant financial commitments for providing funding for set-up costs for "new and additional" schools, as indicated in Paragraph 2.2 above. If the eligibility criteria are extended, then this will mean further commitments for the DSG.

(c) *Timing*

The Sub-Group took the view that any changes recommended by the Schools' Forum should be effective from the beginning of the next financial year, ie, 1 April 2009, and should not be retrospective.

In terms of any schools that could currently become eligible for set-up funding, there are two alternative approaches that could be taken, as follows:

- (i) This only applies to those schools where both the reorganisation and the rebuilding work take place after 1 April 2009.
- or**
- (ii) This only applies to those schools where just the rebuilding work takes place (or is completed) after 1 April 2009.

If (i) above is applied, then no schools are currently eligible. If (ii) above is applied, then one school (as referred to earlier) is currently eligible.

Conclusions

- 2.10 The special meeting Sub-Group held on 10 December 2008 is recommending, therefore, as follows:

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

- Eligibility – the definition of “new” schools eligible for set-up funding is extended to those that would fit with Options 1 and 2 above. The definition of ‘partially rebuilt’ (Option 2) is as set out above.
- Funding – the funding be on the basis of Option B above, as set out in **Appendix 3**. This could be at **either** 50% or, **alternatively**, 25% of the “full” rate.
- Implementation date – the implementation date be 1 April 2009 and not retrospective. In terms of schools that could currently be eligible, this could apply to **either** (a) those “new” schools where reorganisation and the rebuilding took place after 1 April 2009 **or, alternatively**, (b) where just the rebuilding work was completed after that date.

2.11 The Schools' Forum is asked to consider these recommendations, particularly bearing in mind:

- the needs/requirements of individual schools in these circumstances;
- the wider financial implications for the DSG.

2.12 It is also proposed by the Sub-Group that regular reviews are carried out of this issue, bearing in mind the potential longer-term impact on the DSG of the programme of future school building.

Alternative Options

The report sets out different Options that can be considered for future set-up funding for “new” schools. In addition, the Schools' Forum is able to recommend to the Local Authority that, at the present time, no changes should be made to the current arrangements, particularly bearing in mind the impact of any changes on the DSG, which is already very committed.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

The financial implications are set out throughout this report.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

The Regulations that are relevant to set-up funding are attached as **Appendix 2**.

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45: “We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community.”

Consultees

The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

Background Papers and Appendices

- Reports considered at the last meeting of the Schools' Forum and the meetings of the Schools' Forum Sub-Group on 14 November 2008 and 10 December 2008.
- **Appendix 1** – Summary of New and Additional Schools' Set-Up Costs
- **Appendix 2** – Extracts from The School Finance (England) Regulations 2008
- **Appendix 3** – Funding on the basis of Option B in the report

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

APPENDIX 1

Summary of New and Additional Schools Set Up Costs

School Site	Financial Year	Status	Estimated Amount £000
Oakhurst Primary School – Temporary Accommodation	2008/09	Agreed by Schools Forum on 16/10/08	£70
Oakhurst Primary School – Temporary Accommodation	2009/10	Agreed by Schools Forum on 16/10/08	£70
St Francis Primary School	2010/11	To be agreed for 2010/11 budget	£30
Oakhurst Primary School – Permanent Accommodation	2010/11	To be agreed for 2010/11 budget	£290
East Wichel Primary School – Permanent Accommodation	2010/11	To be agreed for 2010/11 budget	£320
Catherine Wayte and Abbey Meads Primary Schools – new classrooms	2011/12	To be agreed for 2011/12 budget	£120

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

APPENDIX 2

Extracts from The School Finance (England) Regulations 2008:

Delegated budgets for new schools

- (1) A new school must have a delegated budget from the appropriate date.
- (2) Subject to paragraphs (3) and (6), the appropriate date is either—
 - (a) the date which is fifteen calendar months before the opening date of the new school; or
 - (b) the date upon which a temporary governing body is constituted for that school,whichever is the later.
- (3) A local education authority must determine the amount of a new school's delegated budget for the period from the appropriate date to the opening date as an amount which is sufficient to fund the appointment of staff and to enable the purchase of any goods and services necessary in order to admit pupils.

After the opening date, a school's delegated budget must be determined in accordance with the local education authority's formula for the relevant funding period.

- a. For the purposes of these Regulations, proposals for the establishment of a school have been fully implemented when the number of pupils admitted to the school in each age group has, in the opinion of the local education authority, reached either—
 - i. the number of pupils indicated, when proposals for the establishment of the school were published, as the number of pupils to be admitted to each age group when the proposals were fully implemented; or
 - ii. if no such number was indicated, such number as the authority may determine.

Set-Up Funding for New Schools

Schools' Forum

27 January 2009

APPENDIX 3

Funding Options – Set Up Costs

The “full” rate for new and additional Schools is £300k for a primary school. This is based on 2FE and Nursery provision. This would be broken down as follows, depending on the forms of entry:

	£'000
Nursery	10
1FE	145
1.5FE	218
2FE	290

The following options at 50% or 25% of the “full” rate could apply to the “new” schools if it was decided to extend eligibility for set-up funding. A £ per pupil figure, based on full capacity, is included for reference.

Option (1)

50% of “Full” Funding	£'000	Pupil No	£350 per pupil
1FE	73	210	73,500
1FE & Nursery	83	210	83,500
1.5FE	109	315	110,250
1.5FE & Nursery	119	315	120,250
2FE	145	420	147,000
2FE & Nursery	155	420	157,000

Option (2)

25% of “Full” Funding	£'000	Pupil No	£175 per pupil
1FE	36	210	36,750
1FE & Nursery	46	210	46,750
1.5FE	54	315	55,125
1.5FE & Nursery	64	315	65,125
2FE	73	420	73,500
2FE & Nursery	83	420	83,500

NB. The above would apply both to new schools that were “entirely” rebuilt and to those that were “partially” rebuilt. In the case of the latter, the funding generated (either at 50% or 25%) would be based on the number of classrooms replaced or added (must be at least 50%) – e.g., if this were 7 classrooms, funding would be based on 1FE.

If a secondary school were to fall into this extended category for set-up costs, then it would receive the same amount of funding per pupil as indicated above in either Option 1 or Option 2 (whichever is agreed by the Schools' Forum).

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Ian Bickerton on 01793 465724 or Email ibickerton@swindon.gov.uk.

BESD (Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties) Review

Schools Forum

Date: 27/01/09

Author: Cabinet Member for Children and Group Director Children

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

- To inform the members of the Schools Forum of the outcomes of the review into provision and support for children and young people with Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties (BESD) in Swindon.

Recommendation

Schools Forum is requested to:

- Note the contents of the report into provision and support for children and young people with Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties (BESD) in Swindon (Appendix A).
- Endorse the proposed actions in response to the report (Appendix B).

1. Reasons

- 1.1 The Group Director, Children commissioned a review into provision and support for children with BESD.
- 1.2 The budget for provision for children with BESD is under pressure and the indications are that the demand is increasing.

2. Detail

- 2.1 The report attached as Appendix A is complete in its own right, including an analysis of the situation and questions to prompt debate.
- 2.2 The report deliberately does not include specific recommendations, but rather raises issues for the local authority and schools to solve together.
- 2.3 On the 8th December, the report's initial findings were discussed in a forum containing a wide representation of schools and local authority officers.
- 2.4 The meeting on the 8th December resulted in the finalisation of the draft report and the set of actions attached as Appendix B.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Paddy Bradley on 01793 465744 or Email pbradley@swindon.gov.uk.

BESD (Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties) Review

Schools Forum

Date: 27/01/09

Alternative Options

- The report's structure raises issues and does not specify a particular way forward. This leaves opportunities for schools and the local authority to develop a joint strategy.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

- The report outlines the financial implications of the current rise in demand leading to an increase in expenditure from £6.6m in 2008 to £18.45m in 2011-12. Further work is required to develop a strategy with Schools to address this financial situation as it is not sustainable.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

- The report raises the issue of meeting the needs of all young people and the concerns which could arise if we are not able to fulfil our statutory requirements.

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

- Meeting the needs of all young people contributes to raising educational standards and the Swindon 2010 promise no. 20.

Consultees

- Representatives of schools
- Director, Schools and Learning
- Finance Manager, Children
- The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and the Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted on all reports.

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A – Report
- Appendix B – Actions

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Paddy Bradley on 01793 465744 or Email pbradley@swindon.gov.uk.

Appendix A

Review of Provision and Support for Students with Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties (BESD) in Swindon

Introduction

I would like to commence by outlining the nature of my engagement. Unlike the approach adopted by many consultants, which entails identifying the issues, capturing them in a report, providing a list of clever solutions and then disappearing from the scene, my approach and brief is totally different. John Gilbert, the Director of Children's Services, has commissioned me to not only identify the issues but to work with headteachers and officers to jointly agree solutions and to support their implementation.

When addressing BESD and related SEN issues they should never be viewed out of context. Problems emerging within these areas are a reflection of the broader educational, social and cultural landscape in which they are found. Therefore, aspects of this 'landscape' feature heavily in this report in an attempt to arrive at realistic, effective and lasting solutions.

To stimulate thinking regarding potential solutions I have passed 'comment' after most of the issues highlighted in the following report. At a meeting organised for the 8th December 08, all the headteachers and officers I interviewed to produce this report will be invited to attend to discuss and agree future actions. It is important to stress that John wants to fully engage these colleagues in this process since he firmly believes that a 'shared ownership' approach is best to successfully resolve the challenges that lie ahead and determine the future shape of alternative provision in Swindon.

In addressing the issues in question I believe we have to start by being realistic about the challenge children with BESD present. Whilst fully acknowledging that such children have needs that must be addressed and that their difficulties often result in them being 'at risk' or 'vulnerable', we must also recognise the enormous challenge they present to headteachers and local authority officers. Their behaviours can induce high-levels of stress in teachers, significantly disrupt the learning of their peers and disproportionately drain budgets when trying to provide for their needs. This is the reality of the situation and far too often, in my opinion, the approach taken is to conveniently ignore this and compel already beleaguered headteachers to conform to some DCSF regulation or subject them to some form of moral blackmail. Neither is a good or sustainable way forward.

Also, the basis for all future action has to be on an understanding of the 'one pot' principle. Quite simply, this principle requires everyone in Children's Services to recognise that a finite amount (one pot) of money has to be shared between schools and services. Given that the allocation to schools is based on a per-pupil formula (AWPU) and that each SEN/BESD pupil can cost anywhere between 3 to 100 times as much to accommodate outside mainstream schools, I would urge you to be judicious in how you respond to this challenge. This is particularly relevant for Swindon at present since there is also a marked escalation in the number of

pupils being placed out-of-borough in specialist provisions at huge cost. If this trend continues (which is inevitable unless solutions are agreed internally) the external placement budget will impact on the schools' budget, reducing it dramatically.

To put the previous factors in stark perspective, if the current trend (annual %age increase) continues the total spend on Alternative Provision will rise from £6.6 million (2008/9) to £18.45 million in 2011/12.

In conducting this review I would like to state how I was initially taken aback by the lack of consistency in the views being expressed by those I interviewed. In other settings where I have undertaken similar reviews, the key themes, issues or messages quickly emerge. This was not the case in Swindon. After about 12 interviews, mostly with mainstream headteachers, I had formed quite an extensive list of issues but they were largely disconnected to one another. In contrast, when I later interviewed special school headteachers and those in charge of specialist provisions, they were consistent in their views and appeared to benefit from the camaraderie they shared.

However, overall there appeared to be a lack of real joined-up thinking and collaborative practice. Schools, particularly secondary schools, appeared to operate in an isolated fashion from their neighbours. In sharing this assumption with headteachers I subsequently interviewed it revealed, in my opinion, a significant weakness that seriously restricts the enormous potential that resides within Swindon's educational community. In stating this opinion I must confess to having been influenced by work I was engaged in on behalf of the National College for School Leadership and the Innovation Unit supporting Next Practice in System Leadership. This entailed working with some of the most advanced collaborative partnerships in the country.

As you know, the nation is facing a major shortfall in school leaders over the next few years and Trusts, Federations and Collaborations offer a potential solution whereby the expertise of various partners or stakeholders in these networks can be harnessed to benefit all learners. The results of such close partnership working or collaboration can be remarkable. Former single institutions facing all manner of challenges in isolation (and often failing as a consequence) can be transformed into vibrant learning centres, engaging multi-agency, community and parents in primary schools whilst secondary schools are supported by the business community and further/higher educational institutions. Working to achieve an agreed vision in these settings, despondency is replaced by enthusiasm as colleagues support one-another in their joint quest. Collective challenges like early intervention, inclusion, exclusion, the 14-19 agenda and school re-organisation are addressed with ease in a new spirit of mutual understanding and co-operation.

Having witnessed the many benefits of collaborative working I would encourage headteachers, officers and all relevant stakeholders in Swindon to seriously consider adopting such an approach in order to plan and deliver a legacy of high quality education and family support for future generations.

Kelvin Peel

November 2008

Creating a New Relationship

In my introduction I talked about the need to confront reality when addressing the needs of children with BESD. A further reality is that a system which merely removes a 'problem child' from one setting to another without considering the impact upon both the child's life and the new setting, or that fails to provide successful intervention, will rapidly become unmanageable given the growing numbers of children who fall into this category.

Swindon sits on the brink of its existing systems/provisions being capable of managing future demand. The time has clearly arrived to take stock and then action to prevent a massive escalation in costs for out-of-borough provision, to improve Key Performance Indicators, to support schools with their quest to raise achievement whilst also responding to the needs of these challenging children and to reduce the stress upon all involved in an increasingly over-burdened system.

To be effective in addressing the needs of these children there has to be a collective harnessing of energies, expertise and resources. In discussing the best way of achieving this with headteachers and local authority officers, it was recognised that a collaborative approach was required with all involved working together in true partnership, understanding each others stresses and needs, being honest and transparent in their actions and committed to supporting jointly agreed strategies. However, whilst fully acknowledging that this was desirable, it was also seen as a major challenge given some of the historical, cultural and current factors that prevail in Swindon.

A starting point to create such a collaborative approach to address the issue of children with BESD (and arguably all other joint educational, health and social ventures in Swindon) would be to identify and agree a set of common principles to which all stakeholders can subscribe, that then form the basis for all future strategic planning. Building upon these principles there needs to be a jointly constructed and agreed vision for learning throughout Swindon. Since headteachers and local authority officers (and possible other key agencies and partners) would work together to agree this vision, it would secure ownership from those involved and remove the possibility of someone else's vision, should there be one, being imposed.

Given the many recent changes that have occurred in leadership within the LA and in schools, the above approach/actions appear timely. If emerging from this are answers to the questions, "What are we collectively working together to achieve for all learners in Swindon?" and, "What can I personally do to support the delivery of our common vision for learning in Swindon?" it will provide a sense of purpose and direction that will both reduce the feelings of isolation that currently exist and, hopefully, motivate colleagues to work more positively together in the future. It will also provide a new context in which to jointly plan and implement any new approaches that address the needs of children with BESD.

Issues/Challenges/Comments

1. Almost everyone acknowledges that the present system (both for children with BESD and other categories of SEN) is overstressed and needs to change. Views on the changes required are polarised. Those running provisions/special schools and most LA officers would like to see more children have their needs addressed in mainstream schools – or units/outreach in mainstream supported by specialists - whilst many mainstream headteachers feel that more segregated provision is required. Ironically, whilst many headteachers expressed the view that more specialist segregated provision is required, they also acknowledged that such provisions would rapidly fill and then even more would be required – which they knew to be undesirable and damaging in how Swindon LA would be judged externally. **Comment:** Are the all the children currently in specialist provision within Swindon correctly placed? Peter Crockett at Crowdys Hill Special School and Zoe Latimer at St Luke's School believe not and suggest that stronger links with mainstream to allow for supported reintegration would reduce some of the present pressures. Also, Peter argues strongly for the creation of a satellite provision for pupils with learning difficulties in a mainstream school (see attached paper). Steven Luke at Oaktree Primary School would also like to create an integrated facility to support children with BESD. It appears that there is already a willingness to move in a new direction that, after some initial realignment, would increase capacity and reduce the high level of segregation that currently exists. It is also worth noting that authorities have found it more acceptable to gain BSF if their Strategy for Change outlines proposals to co-locate all their special schools on mainstream sites. Clearly this allows for ease of integration for SEN/BESD pupils when appropriate.
2. There are suspicions of an uneven playing field existing across Swindon's schools in how they respond to BESD. All headteachers claim they are doing the best they can for their cohorts and only exclude when all interventions have failed or such is the seriousness of a 'one off' incident that exclusion is the only option, in other words they are 'left with no choice'. Ironically, many headteachers feel that certain of their colleagues do not operate in the same way and are prone to exclude before applying the same level of intervention and/or for lesser 'crimes'. **Comment:** To address this issue some authorities have established Headteacher Panels that are supported by officers to oversee managed moves and ensure jointly agreed protocols are strictly followed.
3. A general lack of trust among headteachers fuels a 'self-defensive' and/or 'self-preservation' culture. Whilst many deputy headteachers have formed strong collaborative partnerships and sound relationships, largely through working together on the Behaviour and Attendance Group and co-operating on Managed Moves, headteachers do not share the same bond to the same

degree. **Comment:** Given events in Swindon over the last decade and the government's determination to judge schools almost entirely by their examination results, it is easy to understand how this culture has developed. But 'times are changing' and nearly all the challenges schools and the Authority now face (14-19 Curriculum, ECM agenda, securing BSF by defining an agreed Strategy for Change, etc) are better addressed collectively, which requires the old culture to be replaced with one built upon mutual respect, understanding and trust.

4. Also contributing to the above culture is the split between foundation and community schools across Swindon. Adding to the mix is the new Academy. Headteachers are quick to point out the perceived advantages or disadvantages of the nature of the cohorts in these different categories of schools and any social and funding differences. **Comment:** In the introduction to this report I extolled the virtues of partnership working and how I have witnessed the many benefits of schools forming a Federation, Collaborative or Trust. In some instances, the motive for developing these structures was to gain independence from the local authority. However, nearly all these structures soon realised that total independence cannot be achieved and they had to negotiate new working arrangements that were mutually beneficial to both parties. Monitoring school performance and intervening when schools fail, overseeing child protection matters (likely to increase in the light of Baby P and proposed new Children's Trust Boards), ensuring provision for children in public care, administering the DSG, overseeing admissions and 'fair access' protocols and many other activities still legally remain the responsibility of the local authority. With one of the former secondary community schools in Swindon now moving to foundation status and the potential for other schools to form Trusts, a new 'mature' relationship must be developed between schools and the local authority to prevent tensions arising. (The term 'mature' implies a relationship in which each party fully appreciates the demands or expectations placed upon them and seeks to assist one another in their achievement)
5. Almost every headteacher viewed funding as a major issue of concern. Whether former GM schools being disadvantaged under new formulas or the low DSG allocated to Swindon LA or the level of 'top up' given to statemented children, funding dominated all interviews. The recent 35% increase in the number of statements issued over the last 3 years exacerbates this issue. Also, of major consternation to heads is the top-slicing of £42K from all secondary budgets to fund YEP, especially since accessing this resource has been delayed. **Comment:** Having already drawn attention to the 'one pot' principle earlier I won't labour the point but £42K will be a drop in the ocean compared to the funding that will have to be taken from schools in forthcoming years unless significant changes occur.
6. Alongside funding sits the issue of schools having to focus on raising attainment. Given past failings in the LA, a heavy focus on raising attainment has dominated school leadership. Such an emphasis is seen by many heads as posing a tension with also being inclusive. Whilst some heads and many officers believe that 'good practice' in all areas of school improvement will raise overall standards, not everyone is convinced. **Comment:** Examples exist of schools making a concerted effort to apply

whole-school behavioural and learning strategies and in doing so seeing overall standards of attainment rise.

7. Emerging from the above point, many heads wished that other measures of success beyond the benchmark KS SATS or 5 GCSE's could be recognised and believe it would dramatically change attitudes to inclusion. Such 'measures' would see a greater recognition given to achievement rather than attainment. Heads would welcome performance targets being adjusted to reflect an influx of later entries into their schools, particularly in KS4, where 'achievement' (relative to the child's level of ability and time left in school) can be made but 'attainment' (GCSE results) is unlikely. **Comment:** One large federation of schools has gained the Power to Innovate to publish results collectively, thereby preventing individual institutions from being identified. This approach has reduced the tensions caused by competition and vastly improved attitudes towards inclusion.
8. Heads believe that unless there is an overall strategy to address the needs of children with BESD combining all the elements within Children's Services, that their energies alone will not succeed. They know many of the difficulties surrounding these children result from their home/social backgrounds and they want to see a unified strategy which focuses support into homes and the community to complement efforts being made in schools. **Comment:** See No. 17
9. There is a highly respected, robustly operated and well-administered system for the identification of children with SEN/BESD that results in a Statement of SEN. The drawback of the system is that many schools view obtaining a Statement as a quest for extra resources and will spend many hours engaged in the bureaucratic process it entails ('jumping through the hoops' as some termed it) rather than focusing the expertise of the Senco and the Educational Psychologist on addressing the child's needs. **Comment:** Estimates vary regarding the administrative cost (time of EP/Senco/Case Officer/etc) entailed in producing a Statement from around £12K - £18K. Some Statements issued to secondary age children 'gain' less in resources than the cost of their production. Is it worth it?
10. The Educational Psychology Service is highly regarded with almost all headteachers wanting more time/support from the Service. However, both psychologists and many headteachers admit that the service is often used to secure Statements of SEN rather than fully utilising the expertise in the Service by providing early intervention, broadening the skills of teachers or developing new approaches to meet the needs of children with SEN. It is worth stressing the obvious corollary that the more psychologists are used to write Educational Advices, which is currently the case with referrals rising and the Statementing rate increasing, the less time they can offer to supporting teachers and directly intervening in the learning needs of children.
11. Alongside the above point, the EPS has visionary leadership which would willingly support any radical changes that would liberate its expertise from the hugely time-consuming 'Statement dependent' system that prevails at present. **Comment on 9, 10 & 11:** There has been a 35% increase in the number of Statements issued over the last 3 years. If this trend continues it will lead to EP's spending ever-increasing amounts of time writing Educational Advices and less time working to support children in schools,

soaring costs that risk spiralling out of control, already overflowing provisions flooding into out-of-borough schools and growing dissatisfaction and frustration amongst all involved. Against such a backdrop the question has to be asked, "Why retain this system?" Increased delegation of funding supported by rigorous monitoring – to ensure the needs of children are being addressed - would provide more EP time/support to schools, target Senco time more easily on direct intervention and allow officers to spend more time in schools assisting them and be more cost-effective.

12. Special schools and Pupil Referral Units are well run and receive good reports from Ofsted. The majority of headteachers recognise this and they respect the work being undertaken by their leaders, with whom they often have excellent relationships. However, this yet again serves to perpetuate the current system and increase the strain it is under. Many headteachers would like to see the capacity of both the special schools and the PRUs increased, whilst the leaders of these institutions feel that they are at the 'tipping point' of maintaining the quality of service they provide. **Comment:** Extremely important decisions have to be taken to resolve this issue, which is at the heart of the matter. Quite simply, the question to resolve is whether to expand the whole 'out of school' provision/capacity at very high cost (with the certain knowledge that it would soon overflow in the future unless changes occur to the 'supply chain') or find an alternative solution that limits the flow of children out of schools? An alternative question to ask is if a balance can be struck which allows for some increase to 'out of school' capacity whilst determinedly increasing the capability of schools to address the needs of BESD/SEN children? It is also worth pointing out that compared to the 14 other regional local authorities, over the last year Swindon tops the league table for issuing new statements that result in special school placement. External judgement of the Authority's performance would take account of such contextual information and such a variation from neighbouring authorities would not be viewed favourably.
13. To eliminate the mistrust between schools/heads some headteachers suggested that School Improvement, under its new leadership, should develop a new and equitable process for monitoring schools. Clearly heads would like to agree the terms of this approach and how data was used in measuring performance but if established in this manner they felt it would be valuable. **Comment:** Findings from the Secondary Standards Review should provide direction that is relevant to this issue.
14. Nylands Special School for primary aged BESD children is concerned at the ever-increasing number of younger children joining the school. Given that movement out of Nylands back into mainstream rarely happens and, therefore, most children transfer into St Luke's Special School at Yr 7, it means that an increasing number of children are receiving nearly all of their education in segregated provision. **Comment:** There is a real ethical issue to be considered here. Although national statistics highlight an alarming rise in the number of exclusions of under-5s and primary colleagues would no doubt cite many instances of the growing misbehaviour of young children, is permanently segregating these children into special schools always the right action to take? One of the main reasons for the misbehaviour of such children is a lack of 'good example' set at home or by peers in their immediate community. Whilst few people would argue against some degree

of withdrawal from the setting they are disturbing, permanently segregating such young children must be challenged. John Gilbert and I have personal experience of closing down a poorly functioning totally segregated provision and, with support, reintegrating these young children back into their local mainstream schools with considerable success. Steven Luke, headteacher at Oaktree Primary School, has proposed the development of a less segregated and more flexibly accessed 'withdrawal' provision. His model would keep children in touch with their home schools but allow for short-term intervention to address both their learning (if contributing to...) and behavioural needs. Such an approach is also in-line with the Authority's commitment to Connecting People, Connecting Places.

15. Clustering of multi-agency support, whilst commenced, needs further development to match some of the more advanced models across the country. Related to an earlier point, most heads expressed the view that if multi-agency 'team around the child' meetings could be more quickly facilitated and intervention offered into the child's life beyond school, it would make a significant difference. Currently, many heads seek to address difficult issues with children by drawing heavily on their own resources and see external resources as either being difficult or slow to access. **Comment:** Telford pioneered and successfully delivered a highly regarded model of multi-agency working based around locality 'clusters' of schools and services. John Gilbert masterminded this development and one of his colleagues, Sara Tough, who heavily supported this and related CAF developments, has recently been appointed to the Authority. Their joint expertise should lead to significant developments in the near future.
16. The Managed Move process received mostly favourable responses. Echoing an earlier point, most deputy headteachers were operating this quite effectively until a recent issue created tension in the system. Interestingly, and reflecting the divisions referred to previously, some foundation school heads advocated two 'protocols'; one for their schools and one for community schools. Related to this issue, there was universal respect among headteachers for the officer who supported the operation of this protocol. **Comment:** Whilst there is logic in certain categories of schools collaborating in the manner they have considered, parental choice and the local authority's responsibility to ensure fair access cannot be ignored and this would prevent any 'ring-fenced' arrangement from operating.
17. The Year 11 Protocol came in for heavy criticism. Headteachers would like to see children assessed (where relevant) before being placed in schools so that they could be steered towards appropriate courses where appropriate. They were really annoyed at the damaging effect such children can have upon their results/performance outcomes. In some schools an additional 2 low performing pupils can seriously skew results and for both high and low performing schools this can make an alarming difference. **Comment:** The potential to offer an assessment process is prevented by existing provisions being full and having long waiting lists. The government are also demanding authorities to produce a similar protocol for Year 10 pupils which will no doubt prove as unpopular.
18. There was universal praise for SCEP. Headteachers thought it an excellent provision that delivered good results. Nearly all headteachers wanted to

see an increase to the numbers accessing this provision. The leader of this provision felt that the numbers could increase but he would like to see a somewhat broader ability profile admitted. Currently, SCEP needs to secure new accommodation and it would be logical to establish future capacity and intake issues before it relocates.

19. Heads expressed concern about other alternative provisions (Stepping Forward and Close to Home) and since they are now becoming YEP, which has been dogged by funding and building issues, efforts must be made to ensure its future success.
20. All heads would like to see more alternative provision provided at KS4 and some at KS3. Heads felt that if such provision was available from the start of Yr 9 it would reduce the escalation of behaviours some children display as they become disaffected by the traditional academically based curriculum, which choosing Options often highlights. **Comment on 18.19 & 20:** Good collaborative working in other authorities between schools, colleges and external providers has resulted in the creation of a range of alternative provisions or work-based experiences that students can access both part and full-time.
21. Relating to the above point and that of multi-agency support or clustering arrangements, many heads requested the creation of a Rapid Response Team. They felt that there were often clear pre-cursors leading up to the exclusion of some children and that because the 'system' was slow to respond they were left with no alternative but to exclude. **Comment:** Getting professionals together quickly to consider the case of an individual child threatened with exclusion can be achieved. However, the unpredictable nature of such occurrences often necessitates these professionals abandoning scheduled work, which itself can create other problems. Therefore, this consequence has to be fully understood and accepted by schools before such a system can be developed.
22. The internal systems established within schools to support children with BESD/SEN are not always cohesive. In dealing with schools, officers report that 'learning support' staff do not always know about or support efforts being made by 'pastoral' staff. **Comment:** Some schools have a unified overall structure (often called, "Care and Guidance") which combines the two systems. In such school they have also adopted a very analytical or scientific approach to addressing the needs of BESD children. They will use attendance data, assessment scores, lesson observations and questions parents to identify the underlying causal factors. They will, if necessary, engage other agencies and carefully implement and monitor all supportive strategies employed. Moving away from a purely disciplinary approach and applying the principles of personalisation to restore desirable responses in the learner can be very effective. Also, the use of 'intelligent data' to identify trends in individual pupil behaviour can prevent problems from escalating or even starting in the first place.

Final Comment:

Although many factual challenges have been presented, their solution lies more in the hearts and minds of colleagues than in any hard measures that might be taken. The dominant mindset that has prevailed in the past has not only led to the present

situation but, unless changed, will reduce the effectiveness of any potential solutions. I would, therefore, urge colleagues to put the past behind them and embrace John Gilbert's invitation for schools to work with the Local Authority to create a new relationship based upon jointly agreed principles, a shared vision for learning, mutual respect and genuine co-operation. Such a relationship would allow for more effective and lasting solutions to be found to the issues raised in this report and provide the foundation for building greater community cohesion in the future.

Kelvin Peel
November 2008

This page is intentionally left blank

ACTION PLAN – Progressing issues/areas identified on 8th December 08 relating to BESD/SEN

Purpose	Objectives	Actions	Timescale Priority	Key Success Criteria
1. Provision development	To maximise the use of existing provisions and determine the size, nature and location of any new provision	Audit/evaluate existing provisions against needs/future trends. Consider potential for realignment of existing cohorts (eg. Mainstream, SRP, Special, Out of Authority) Produce proposals, supported by statistical and financial evidence, of the type and location of new provisions required.	Immediate High	All stakeholders agreeing that new provision matches need and is correctly located
2. Targeted early intervention	To identify 20 (approx) dysfunctional/troublesome families (5 per area) and to make them the focus of joined-up multi-agency support/intervention in order to improve their engagement in learning	Identifying and bringing together schools and those agencies/personnel with the knowledge to identify the families in question. Sharing (and creating new improved systems if necessary) data to determine needs. Planning joint/holistic interventions and monitoring progress.	Medium High	An improvement in the behaviour and learning outcomes of children from these families
3. Improving transition	To focus on primary to secondary transfer and to identify and propose improvements which maintain engagement and in learning	To identify and share current best practice/s To consider curriculum alignment in Years 6 and 7 To examine and suggest recommendations to improve cohesion between in-school learning support and pastoral support systems	Medium Medium	Children settling into secondary better supported (where necessary) and able to access the curriculum as appropriate

Appendix B

Purpose	Objectives	Actions	Timescale Priority	Key Success Criteria
4. Improving 14-19/Alternative provision (note this task should link closely with the Provision Development group above)	To identify improvements to the use of existing provisions and to propose areas for expansion	<p>To evaluate the use of existing provisions and suggest improvements (eg QA, reintegration, tracking of pupil progress, etc)</p> <p>To consider how financial incentives might be applied to enhance current and any new provision/s</p> <p>To explore the potential of FE to enhance existing provisions</p> <p>To explore the expansion of provision by engaging with private/voluntary/joint partners</p> <p>Propose recommendations resulting from the above actions</p>	Immediate High	The development of a wider range of provision offering quality learning (academic and vocational) opportunities to more students which are closely linked to their home schools
5. Improving support for BESD pupils in schools	To consider the benefits of moving away from issuing new Statements of SEN in secondary schools	<p>To establish the financial and practical benefits of moving away Statements in secondary where the primary need is BESD</p> <p>To evaluate the benefits of the above against possible drawbacks/external pressures to retain the current dependency</p> <p>If thought achievable and worthwhile to make proposals to change current practice/existing system</p>	Medium Medium	EP and Senco time freed up to offer earlier intervention and direct support to pupils and staff

It was agreed at the meeting on the 8th December 08 that working parties would be formed to support the above activities. As part of developing a new relationship between schools and the local authority it is essential that both groups are represented on these working parties. Also, since concern was expressed about the demand upon headteachers' time it was agreed that deputies or appropriate staff might be nominated to represent schools with full decision-making authority. To further reduce the time

commitment of colleagues, attempts have been made to integrate these activities into the work of existing groups wherever possible.

In order to get these working parties functioning as quickly as possible, certain officers have been identified to co-ordinate meetings and they are named in the first box. They will initially approach colleagues who are well-placed to support the activity but once the group is formed their role is to participate rather than lead. There is no restriction on any headteacher (or their representative) joining any of the working parties if they are particularly interested in the issue being addressed. The "Actions" listed serve to give some direction to the groups but it is recognised that once established they may wish to undertake other/further actions to ensure effective outcomes. Since outcomes from these working parties will be jointly agreed and then jointly implemented (as appropriate), I would urge colleagues not to miss out on this opportunity to shape such crucially important future developments.

I am aware that some colleagues are sceptical about initiatives being followed through to completion, which seems to be a feature of the past. In order to show my commitment to addressing the issues identified it is important to establish clear reporting mechanisms. I want colleagues to be kept informed of developments on a regular basis. It is my intention to discuss this issue with the Chairs of SAPH, SAAASH and SASH in the hope that these forums might be the means of communicating key developments to all staff in schools as appropriate. Colleagues outside of these forums will be identified and I will seek alternative means of communication in these instances.

I would like to close with a sincere request that you support my endeavours to create a new climate of collaborative working in Swindon. By giving your support to the working parties we will be able to move forward together with a shared understanding and ownership of the issues and actions that need to be taken. Working together in this way will provide the basis for developing our Strategy for Change for BSF and addressing any future challenges or maximising any opportunities that may come our way.

May I take this opportunity to wish you all a very happy and successful New Year!

John Gilbert

This page is intentionally left blank

Review of the Support for Ethnic Minority Achievement in Swindon

Schools Forum

Date: 27/01/09

Author: Director of Schools and Learning

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

- To inform the members of the Schools Forum of the outcomes of the review into support for ethnic minority achievement in Swindon.

Recommendation

Schools Forum is requested to:

- Note the contents of the report into support for ethnic minority achievement in Swindon.
- Establish a working party to develop options for providing support for ethnic minority achievement in response to the recommendations of the review.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 In the summer 2008 Director, Schools and Learning commissioned a review into provision and support for ethnic minority achievement.
- 1.2 The review was prompted by knowledge of the changing demography of Swindon and a desire to ensure that provision is able to meet the needs of service users.

2. Detail

- 2.1 The review attached as Appendix A is complete in its own right, including an analysis of the situation and recommendations for action.
- 2.2 A key feature of the review is the message that the local authority and schools need to work together to agree a comprehensive strategy to raise achievement of ethnic minority pupils.
- 2.3 In order to respond appropriately to the outcomes of the review, it is proposed that Schools' Forum establishes a working group of head teachers and officers to develop options for providing support to raise ethnic minority achievement.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Paddy Bradley on 01793 465744 or Email pbradley@swindon.gov.uk.

Review of the Support for Ethnic Minority Achievement in Swindon

Schools Forum

Date: 27/01/09

Alternative Options

- The proposed working party is tasked to develop options for future models and provision.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

- Funding for provision is from Central Government Grants. Alternative models of provision will not be funded from core SBC funding. Funding will be derived from resources from the existing Central Government Grant and, potentially, income from service level agreements from schools.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

- None

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

- Children and Young People Plan 2006-1009.

Consultees

- The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and the Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted on all reports.
- Group Director, Children.

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A – Review into Support for Ethnic Minority Achievement in Swindon.

SUPPORT FOR ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT IN SWINDON

A REVIEW

Janet Mokades. November 2008

CONTENTS	PARAGRAPHS
Introduction	
Context	1-6
Ethnic Minority Achievement In Swindon - the current picture.	7-10
Current Provision - the team and its work	11-14
The View From Schools DEMA input The issues	15 16-23
What Schools Want And Need	24-26
The Role Of The Local Authority	27-28
Value For Money	29-33
Conclusion	34-37
Recommendations 1-15	pages 11,12

SUPPORT FOR ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT IN SWINDON; A REVIEW.

INTRODUCTION

This review report was commissioned by the Director of Schools and Learning for Swindon local authority. The brief was to assess current arrangements for raising standards of achievement by minority ethnic groups, including their efficacy, value for money and match to the needs of schools. In the light of that assessment, the overall purpose of the review was to make recommendations as to how the local authority might improve its strategy for raising standards of ethnic minority achievement as well as securing better value for money.

Evidence for the review was drawn from documentation, interviews and meetings and visits to schools. The fieldwork included visits to one infant school, three primary schools, three secondary schools and one college. School visits involved discussions with head teachers and other key staff, perusal of additional documentation, visits to classes and discussions with groups of pupils. It also included a visit to the Resource Centre. A discussion took place with the chair of the Schools Forum. There were interviews with key local authority staff including the heads of inclusion and school standards, national strategy leads, and the head of the ethnic minority achievement team as well as an extended discussion with the team as a whole.

The recommendations of the review are informed by a range of national publications chiefly but not exclusively from Ofsted and by knowledge and experience of arrangements nationally.

CONTEXT

1. This review was commissioned at a time of rapid change in the demography of Swindon. The most recent population profile produced by Swindon Children's Services shows a rapid increase in the diversity of the Swindon population.
2. As of October 2007 15.1% of children in primary schools were from minority ethnic communities and diverse backgrounds (risen from 13.9% in January 2007). The rise has been mirrored, though less dramatically, in secondary schools, where the rise was from 11% in January 2007 to 11.9% in October 2007. However, the increase in the primary phase will soon be replicated in the secondary phase as the current primary pupils feed through into secondary.
3. This change was not anticipated or planned for and relatively little is known about the families and children in question. What is known, is that the overwhelming majority come from two groups with very

different backgrounds. They are Polish and Goan and they have one thing in common. That is English as an additional language. Since current funding arrangements make it worth their while to do so, schools collect and can produce basic information about pupils for whom English is an additional language. But these data do not differentiate between different stages of language acquisition, nor indeed between a fluent English speaker and an absolute beginner. The extent to which they may include British children, for instance of Asian heritage, is not clear.

4. From the points of view of both the local authority and the schools, there is only the shakiest of bases for planning and providing for their rapidly changing rolls because there is so little reliable information about the current and future pupil population.
5. Thus some schools find themselves in the middle of very rapid change for which they are ill prepared. In these circumstances, they need to be able to draw on very good expertise and support. Failing this, in the primary phase, the good and hard won improvements to achievement may be perceived to be at risk, whilst in the secondary phase, where a solid improvement trend over both key stages has yet to be established, schools might be tempted to view increasing diversity as an unwelcome additional challenge. Such perceptions can in their turn contribute to polarisation.
6. Clearly, the rapidly changing scene in Swindon has the potential to lead to racial tension and some unpleasant incidents have already occurred. In this context, it is doubly important that schools play their part in promoting and modelling racial equality, developing community cohesion and ensuring ethnic minority achievement. Equally important is the role of the local authority in ensuring that they are well equipped to carry out these duties and do so effectively. Thus this review is timely.

ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT IN SWINDON

The current picture.

7. Current data on ethnic minority achievement in the borough is limited and broad-brush. Such data as there is on achievement broken down by group is said to be statistically unreliable because the cohorts are so small and the mobility high. Overall achievement of pupils from black and ethnic minority communities is lower than the borough average in all subjects at KS1, KS2, KS3. At KS4 it is slightly above the borough average for five plus A-C* at GCSE, but falls five per cent below when English and Maths are included.
8. There is no evidence to show an improvement trend. Moreover, the KS4 picture, which is encouraging on the overall headline figure, does

not reflect the changing population now moving up into and through the secondary phase. It cannot therefore be presumed that this performance will be sustained. Moreover, the college visited reports that black and ethnic minority young people who are not newcomers but have been schooled in Swindon are arriving in college with lower levels of achievement than their peers.

9. There is currently no explicit strategy or plan for raising ethnic minority achievement across the authority. It is subsumed within the overall strategy for raising standards. Nor would it be easy to develop a credible plan without better baseline information about the current state of play.
10. Work in the fields of equalities and community cohesion is clearly important in developing and maintaining a good climate for learning in schools. So work in these fields also impacts on achievement. Quantifying the impact of this work is not easy and the local authority does not currently have measures in place to do so.

CURRENT PROVISION; the team and its work

11. The current Swindon Developing Ethnic Minority Achievement (DEMA) team is very small and covers a wide range of functions. Traveller education, education for refugees and asylum seekers raising ethnic minority achievement, supporting, developing and monitoring racial equality in schools and supporting community cohesion all fall within its brief. Two members of the team have very specific briefs specifically for traveller education and support for refugees and asylum seekers. For the purposes of this review, the arrangements for traveller education were not given detailed scrutiny. That is because the rapidly changing demography does not impact fundamentally on the work of the service. This follows a well established pattern with clear priorities and is well regarded in the authority. One team member works particularly within the Early Years sphere, where her work is closely integrated with that of the national strategies and linked into the multi-agency teams. That leaves only two members to work more broadly on all the functions identified above.
12. In the absence of an overall strategy or plan, the work of rest of the team has developed in a reactive manner. Their time is largely deployed in response to events or requests. There is currently no clear rationale for the division of time between work on equalities, community cohesion and raising achievement.
13. The team's "service improvement plan" currently lists twenty three disparate areas of work and no priorities. This is a very small team with a key role to play at a difficult moment. Without a much sharper focus, the impact of their work is likely to be small.

14. Where equalities are concerned, it is evident that the team have been instrumental in improving the authority's arrangements for monitoring and responding to racist incidents in schools. There are arrangements in place for ensuring that refugee and asylum seeker children and families have access to education and are supported within it. Traveller education is well supported. Recent arrangements for closer integration with the national strategies are designed to equip schools and learning consultants with the understanding and confidence to integrate equalities, community cohesion and support for ethnic minority achievement within all their work. However, without a clear plan, priorities and goals and with the team working on a disparate range of things in different schools, it is difficult to measure their overall impact on achievement.

THE VIEW FROM SCHOOLS.

DEMA input.

15. Schools have varying views about the impact of DEMA work. Two of the schools visited were amongst those where the intake has only very recently become diverse. Both of these schools felt like "beginners" with regard to their new diversity. They had drawn on both practical support and advice from the DEMA team and rated both as useful. One school was very positive about the support it had received from DEMA for equalities and community cohesion. Two referred to valuable Early Years training and advice. Where specialist members of staff had attended DEMA network meetings, all considered them to be good in principle and variably useful, though several would have liked less rigid agendas and more space for networking. Where customised training had been arranged, it had not been felt to be appropriate. This was due, in part at least, to poor needs analysis.

The issues.

16. Schools identified one overwhelming issue in relation to raising standards of achievement amongst ethnic minority pupils: English language acquisition. Particularly for those schools unaccustomed to a diverse roll, the question of organising learning in the best possible way for these pupils and their peers was of pressing and immediate concern. Schools would like access to up to date and practical expertise on this and do not consider that the current team are equipped to provide it. The team lacks recent experience of EAL in very diverse schools, and their specialist knowledge and understanding of specific linguistic issues is variable.
17. Additional issues for which schools would have liked practical help varied from phase to phase. At the infant level, lack of pre-school experience was seen as a difficulty. So too was identification of special educational needs in children with very little or no English.

18. At both primary and secondary levels, some schools identified previous educational experience in systems very different from that of the UK as an issue. In particular, children accustomed to rote learning and very formal approaches had to be taught to question, participate and think laterally.
19. Initial assessment was seen as tricky by most schools and a variety of different approaches were being developed and used. Given the levels of internal mobility, some schools would like a standardised approach across the authority. On going assessment and tracking were also being developed in varying ways.
20. Some schools have developed very good relationships with parents and carers of children from diverse backgrounds. In some cases these schools run or host classes for parents. These schools communicate effectively with parents and help them to support their children's learning. In a school where this was not the case, the view was that the parents did not support their children's learning.
21. Given the rapidity and scale of the change that has taken place in schools, the range of issues identified by schools and the variable levels of satisfaction with the support they can access from the local authority, it is hardly surprising that schools have embarked on a range of ad hoc initiatives to improve their situation. These include developing bi-lingual support and offering it to other schools on an outreach basis, bringing in expertise in the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL), training staff in TEFL, running Saturday schools and developing a proposal for a language centre.
22. These initiatives are generally too recent or too embryonic for their impact to be evaluated. In the primary school that has traditionally had a diverse roll, a decision was made to build on the bi-lingual expertise that had been developed and to invest in specialist training. Both ethnic minority and mainstream achievement is improving in this school.
23. One of the secondary schools that has seen a rapid rise in the diversity of its intake has developed responses using a mixture of limited withdrawal (three periods a week) for specialist language teaching coupled with other support mechanisms such as reading clubs. The specialist teaching is closely linked to national curriculum requirements and planned jointly by the bi-lingual language teacher and subject specialists. Pupils who have experienced this programme are articulate and highly enthusiastic about it. They readily enumerate both what they have learned and its benefits.

WHAT SCHOOLS WANT AND NEED

24. All the schools would like additional resources to enable them to respond to their changing populations. That aside, their top priority is access to high level but practical expertise on English as an additional

language. This clear priority translates into a number of subsets. All are adamant that they want practical help, not advice. Most would like clear guidance on assessment and tracking, particularly initial assessment. All would like access to proven good practice in other local authorities or schools. Many would like on-line access to information, good practice, resources on “Simply Click”. A few would like specific inputs on programmes to close the gap. One would like regular courses from “people well versed in schools” and another, twilight training for newly qualified teachers (NQTs)

25. On the wider front, schools worry about the general impact of the changing demography. They would like to have more knowledge and a better understanding of the current picture as well as some sense that trends were being monitored and forecasting done. They would then be in a better position to plan. They would like the local authority “to recognise what’s happening in Swindon”. Overall, they are not convinced that the local authority as a whole has a firm grip on the evolving picture or is taking a lead in the way that they would like.
26. Senior and other staff in schools are well aware of the need to update or increase their own knowledge and understanding in order to respond better to the changing face of Swindon. National experience demonstrates clearly¹ that strong leadership from the top for diversity and for effective EAL arrangements are key. So too is overall strong management of learning. Whole school awareness of what needs to be done to support the learning of EAL pupils, so that good practice permeates all subject teaching, is critical. This implies whole school specialist training and awareness raising. Thus schools have strong needs to set alongside the wants they themselves identify.

THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

27. There are key questions too concerning the role of the local authority. It employs an ethnic minority achievement team whose role, by definition, is to help raise the achievement of ethnic minority pupils. Raising standards overall is at the heart of what Swindon needs to do as defined by both external regulators and central government. As diversity in schools increases, so raising ethnic minority achievement becomes ever more important for improving standards overall.
28. Yet this team is currently dividing its time in a reactive way between this work and other aspects of the council’s overall role. It is not sufficiently large or influential to be effective in taking a strong lead on equalities or community cohesion on the council’s behalf. There are good grounds both for moving to integrate and embed these functions within all the work of the national strategies as Swindon has already

¹ See “Managing Support for the Attainment of Pupils from Minority Ethnic Groups”, Ofsted, Oct 2001

done and to mainstream the functions within the council in a way that would support and circumscribe the DEMA team's contribution. This would enable the team to focus much more sharply on specific priorities.

VALUE FOR MONEY

29. Swindon is not a well funded authority and the budget for ethnic minority achievement work is small. The total grant is £227,643. £77,643 of this is devolved. Thus the total retained funding is £150,000. £140,000 of this is spent on salaries.
30. These figures are not generally known to schools. In some cases they have unrealistic ideas about the extent of the funding available to the local authority for this work. These misapprehensions can impact on the thinking in schools about the EMA arrangements.
31. There is currently neither a strategy nor a plan for raising minority ethnic achievement. There are no measurable goals or targets. School satisfaction measures are currently used to a degree as a proxy for impact. These need to be very sharp and explicit to provide valid evidence for evaluating value for money and they are not currently.
32. There is clear evidence that key statutory processes such as analysis and follow up of racist incident reporting, and liaison with refugee and asylum seeker families and children to ensure admissions and initial support are being carried out effectively. The costs are not excessive and value for money appears to be satisfactory.
33. On the more general responsibility to support the raising of ethnic minority achievement, the lack of planning and the absence of a clear view of what the impact of the work should be, make it impossible to establish its efficacy. Furthermore, the expressed priority needs of the schools are not currently being met. Nor are those of the local authority, inasmuch as there is no clear and measurable overall improvement in ethnic minority achievement. Current arrangements cannot therefore be said to represent good value for money.

CONCLUSION

34. Thus it is clear that there is a mismatch between the current arrangements and what the evolving situation requires. This being the case, the local authority is not getting good value for money.
35. The existing DEMA team is fulfilling its traditional and statutory responsibilities in a strategic and planning vacuum. It lacks the capacity to respond to the very rapid change that is underway. Faced with schools taking unilateral action to try and do the best for their pupils, there has been a tendency for the team to retreat into theoretical positions.

36. The lack of detailed data or trend forecasting has resulted in schools too being taken by surprise and doing the best they can in an ad hoc way. This is certainly not cost effective. Drawing on relevant national experience and expertise would prevent reinvention of the wheel and potentially costly failures.
37. This immediate situation requires urgent attention within the context of a wider and better informed look at the evolving face of Swindon. That look should inform the development of an overall strategy and plan for raising minority ethnic achievement, developed in consultation with schools and in response to their wants and needs. Good partnership between schools and the local authority should be at the heart of a new approach.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the short term, the local authority should;

1. Prioritise the building of capacity in schools to equip them to deal with the changing pupil population. Focus this work in the short term on effective support for EAL arrangements in schools.
2. Ensure that the support offered to schools meets their needs for high level EAL expertise. Possible approaches could be through;
 - brokerage of support from another local authority that has significant experience and expertise
 - brokerage of twinning arrangements between Swindon schools and schools elsewhere
 - development of EAL ASTs in-borough
 - provision of on-line resources
3. In consultation with schools, establish clear immediate priorities for raising ethnic minority achievement. Allocate resources accordingly.

In the medium term, the local authority should;

4. Develop more sophisticated, appropriate and accurate systems of data collection and analysis that distinguish different categories of learner.
5. Through pulling together existing information and drawing on new information sources including those within local communities, build capacity for forecasting demographic trends.
6. Drawing on evidence from enhanced data collection and analysis systems and in consultation with schools, develop an overall strategy and plan for raising ethnic minority achievement.
7. Ensure that the plan incorporates the priorities agreed with schools and identifies intended outcomes.
8. Assess the value for money of the work done by evaluating its impact on outcomes.
9. Develop knowledge and awareness of successful practice elsewhere. Build on and refine current in borough networking arrangements to include dissemination of information on local and national good practice.
10. Develop a public dialogue with schools about what works in raising achievement for bi-lingual pupils in order to move all concerned away from entrenched positions.

11. Give critical consideration to;

- creating customised EMA training that draws on a range of national materials but contextualises them to fit the local situation
- developing forms of EMA training other than courses, including on-line individual learning

12. Track carefully the impact of current initiatives and approaches in individual schools and where there is evidence of success, disseminate and build on it.

13. Ensure that equalities work and support for community cohesion are mainstreamed within children's services and the wider work of the local authority.

14. Work with elected members to ensure that the local authority takes a lead on diversity matters.

15. Strengthen the links between work on raising ethnic minority achievement and other aspects of the children's services agenda. In particular, focus on work with parents and communities through children's centres, extended schools and the multi-agency teams.

Early Years Flexible Offer

Schools' Forum

Date: 27th January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

- To report on the consultation on proposed changes to funding early years free entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds.

Recommendation

- Schools' Forum is requested to note the consultation on proposed changes to funding early years free entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds and approve the proposals outlined in the report (proposals will be circulated in advance of the meeting once the consultation has ended).

1. Reasons

- 1.1 The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) requires Local Authorities to revise their funding mechanisms for early education to ensure that they are consistent, fair and equitable across the private, voluntary and maintained sectors.
- 1.2 Parents' entitlement for funded early education will be increased from the current 12.5 hours to 15 hours from September 2009 for children in the 25% most disadvantaged areas and for all children from September 2010.
- 1.3 Additionally parents will have the right if they so choose to access their entitlement more flexibly rather than in 2 and a half hour sessions as now.
- 1.4 The duty on local authorities is to make this offer available, it does not mean that any particular setting has to offer this flexibility or the increased entitlement. In addition, local authorities are required to introduce a common funding methodology for all early years provision that is to be based upon participation.

2. Detail

- 2.1 Consultation with providers of early years education commenced 5 January 2009 and is due to close on 23 January 2009. A copy of the consultation proposals is attached at Appendix A. The results of the consultation will be circulated in advance of the meeting once the consultation has ended.

Early Years Flexible Offer

Schools' Forum

Date: 27th January 2009

- 2.2 The consultation process will involve three seminars at which providers of early years education will be able to ask officers and members of the early years reference group about the proposals.
- 2.3 Funding to support the delivery of the flexible offer is available from the DCSF through Standards Fund. Swindon has been allocated £234,254 for 2009-10 and £ 979,711 for 2010 –11. Inflation pressures on the core early years budget and demographic pressures are highlighted on the budget 2009/10 report elsewhere on the agenda.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications –

The DCSF has allocated standards fund grant of £1,213,965 to support local authorities in delivering the extended provision and greater flexibility. Therefore the costs relating to the delivery of the extended provision and greater flexibility will be funded through this grant at no additional cost to the Council. Inflation and demographic pressures on the core early years budget will need to be contained within the overall DSG allocation for 2009/10. There are no procurement implications.

*Legal / Human Rights Implications –*The provision of early education is a statutory responsibility on local authorities. Section 7 of the Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on local authorities to provide free early years provision of a prescribed description. This is the legislative basis for the government's commitment to flexibility.

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises) – Children are at the heart of the Corporate Plan and the Children & Young People's Plan. Promise 45 encapsulates the support for parents "we'll provide even more support for families to help them maintain their independence".

Consultees

- The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and the Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted on all reports.

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A: Consultation Proposals

Consultation Document

Proposed Changes to the Method of Funding Early Years Free Entitlement for 3 and 4 Year Olds from 2009/2010 & 2010/2011

The Extension to the Free Entitlement Offer

From September 2010 every local authority must offer 15 hours of free early years education to all 3 and 4 year olds over a minimum of 38 weeks. The offer must be made available flexibly to meet parental demand over a minimum of three days.

The first step towards this is from September 2009 all local authorities must make the offer available to 25 per cent of their most disadvantaged 3 and 4 year olds. The offer will then be made available to all 3 and 4 year olds from September 2010.

Current Entitlement

Parents are currently entitled to access 12½ hours of free early learning and care across a minimum of 3 days over 38 weeks a year.

Extended Offer

The extended offer is predicated on clear evidence that shows involvement in high quality early years education can lead to better educational and social outcomes for all children – which last through primary school. There are particular benefits for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Implementation of a Single Funding Formula for Early Years

To support the extension and increased flexibility of the free entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds and to address inconsistencies in how the offer is currently funded across the maintained and PVI sectors the government announced in June 2007 that local authorities will be required to use a single local formula for funding early years provision in the maintained and PVI sectors from 2010/11. Authorities can choose to implement the changes from April 2009.

The proposals in respect of a single funding formula that are contained within this consultation paper take into account the following operational requirements that were set out in the guidance issued to local authorities by the DCSF in July 2008:-

Appendix A

- The same factors should be taken into account when deciding the level of funding for each sector;
- Decisions must be transparent and any differences between the sectors should be justifiable and demonstrable;
- The level of funding should be broadly cost-effective and all the main cost elements should have been considered explicitly;
- There should be no perverse incentives and any change in the formula must not endanger sufficiency of provision;
- The formula must be based on common cost information from both the PVI and maintained sectors and all costs and public sources of income should be considered;
- Settings should be funded on the basis of participation, not places of similar factors. Any exceptional use of place funding should be based on clearly defined local imperatives such as sufficiency and sustainability;
- The formula must take into account the sustainability of all settings giving sufficient stability to all sectors to plan for the future and improve quality;
- Transition from the current funding mechanism to the future funding mechanism must be planned and managed carefully and based on a clear impact assessment;
- The application of formulae in different settings should be based on common operating principles wherever possible.

Early Years Funding – Initial Findings and Proposals

The review of early years funding across Swindon involved a survey of private, voluntary, independent (PVI) providers and a survey of maintained provision. The survey of the PVI sector focussed on the shape of provision and sought information from settings on the numbers of children receiving the free entitlement and the proportion of free hours that are provided compared to total hours. This survey built upon the cost of provision survey that was undertaken in summer 2006 that resulted in the setting of a standard rate per hour payable to all PVI settings for the free entitlement of 12½ hours. Information was also sought on the hours each setting is open. Settings were also invited to state whether they have capacity to extend hours of provision. The survey of the maintained provision focussed on cost of provision. The results of the surveys were analysed and discussed with both the 'Early Years Reference Group' and the 'Nursery Head Teachers Group'. The outcome of both the analysis of the surveys and discussions with the two groups has led to the following proposals being made. **Please note all proposals have been prepared in line with guidance issued by the DCSF. The regulations governing changes to early years funding are to be issued by the DCSF by Spring 2009. It is possible the final regulations may differ from the guidance presently in use.**

List of Proposals

Page No

1. Basic Entitlement

3

Appendix A

2. Extended Provision Entitlement	6
3. Deprivation Flat Rate	7
4. Qualified Flat Rate	8
5. Flexible Flat Rate	9

Proposal 1 – Basic Entitlement

The current rate per hour paid to PVI settings will be the Basic Entitlement payable for all free provision across PVI and maintained settings.

The survey of costs that was undertaken of all PVI settings in summer 2006 revealed that the general cost of provision was even across different settings in the private, voluntary and independent sectors. Consequently Schools Forum approved a rate payable to all settings for early years free provision. The survey of costs that was undertaken of all local authority maintained nurseries in summer 2008 revealed that the general cost of provision was similar to the current place-led budget allocations.

Current Method of Allocation

All PVI providers of free early years education are paid for each hour of free entitlement that is delivered up to a maximum of 12½ hours per week for 38 weeks a year. In the maintained sector schools receive via the funding formula for Swindon schools a nursery flat rate and funding for 26 full time places (52 pupils) regardless of number of children in the setting. Under the current PVI funding regime schools would require 47 pupils to attract the equivalent amount of funding as they receive via the formula. A school with more than 47 pupils would attract more funding than at present and a school with less than 47 pupils less funding than at present.

Reasons for Change

All local authorities must make available the extended offer to all 3 and 4 year olds from September 2010 and to the 25% most disadvantaged from September 2009. In addition all local authorities must ensure there is a common funding formula based on participation for early years free entitlement from 2010/11. Local authorities can chose to implement common funding formula in 2009/10.

Detail of Change

Under this proposal there is no change to the funding of PVI settings. PVI settings have been funded on a per-pupil basis (participation basis) since the introduction of the free early years entitlement and will continue to be funded in this way. For schools the change is from funding on a fixed amount per place with an additional flat rate to a per pupil (participation) basis. To protect

Appendix A

schools from sudden changes in funding there are two options over the implementation of the changes. In addition there is a transition mechanism in the proposal that helps to 'smooth' the implementation of this change. The transition bands are shown in the table below.

Level of Funding	Lower Level	Upper Level
Transition Band 1	0	16
Transition Band 2	17	23
Transition Band 3	24	26
Transition Band 4	27	32
Transition Band 5	33	46
Transition Band 6	47	52

The transition bands will fund schools depending on how many children they have in the nursery. For example a school with 29 pupils on roll will fall into Transition Band 4 and will receive funding based on 32 pupils over the implementation period detailed below. Over the implementation period it is possible for a school to move up or down to different transition bands depending upon pupil numbers. For more information on changes to pupil numbers see '*Pupil Numbers*' below.

Implementation

Option 1

2009/10 - Schools extending provision from Sept 2009 will receive current nursery flat rate for whole year plus 5/12 of per place funding to cover the period Apr 2009 to Aug 2009, plus 7/12 of per place funding increased by 20% to reflect increased hours from 12½ to 15 to cover the period from Sept 2009 to Mar 2010. Schools extending provision from Sept 2010 will continue with current nursery funding.

2010/11 - Schools extending provision from Sept 2009 to be funded full year using transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 38 weeks. Schools extending provision from Sept 10 to be funded using transition number of pupils for up to 12½ hours per week for 5/12 of year to reflect period Apr 2010 to Aug 2010 plus transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 7/12 of the year to reflect period Sept 2010 to March 2011.

2011/12 - All schools to be funded transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 38 weeks.

2012/13 - All schools to be funded transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 5/12 of the year to reflect Apr 2012 to Aug 2012. For 7/12 of the year transition funding ceases and schools are funded for actual pupil numbers for up to 15 hours per week.

2013/14 – All schools to be funded for actual pupil numbers for up to 15 hours per week.

Appendix A

Option 2

2009/10 - Schools extending provision from Sept 2009 to receive current per place funding and flat rate for 5/12 of the year to reflect period from Apr 2009 to Aug 2009. For 7/12 of the year schools will be funded on transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours a week at basic entitlement rate. For schools extending provision from Sept 2010 will continue to receive current place funding for 5/12 of the year. For the remaining 7/12 of year will be funded on transition number of pupils for up to 12½ hours per week at basic entitlement rate.

2010/11 - Schools extending provision from Sept 2009 to be funded full year using transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 38 weeks. Schools extending provision from Sept 2010 to be funded using transition number of pupils for up to 12½ hours per week for 5/12 of year to reflect period April 2010 to August 2010 plus transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 7/12 of the year to reflect period Sept 2010 to March 2011.

2011/12 - All schools to be funded transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 38 weeks.

2012/13 - All schools to be funded transition number of pupils for up to 15 hours per week for 5/12 of the year to reflect April 2012 to August 2012. For 7/12 of the year transition funding ceases and schools are funded for actual pupil numbers for up to 15 hours per week.

2013/14 – All schools to be funded for actual pupil numbers for up to 15 hours per week.

Numbers of Pupils

In both options 1 and 2 above the level of participation to be funded will be the number of pupils in a setting that will be counted at the beginning of each term. This will mean if the pupil numbers in the early years setting change on a term-by-term basis then the funding will also change if in the transition period schools move between transition bands. Once the transition period ends schools will be funded in the same way as all other settings on a term-by-term basis on participation. This will mean the funding schools receive may increase or decrease throughout the year as actual participation changes. Annex A shows in detail the amounts each school will receive under the two options. The figures shown in annex A for each school assume that pupil numbers remain constant throughout the year and for each year shown. The tables below show a summary of the amounts each school receives under Option 1 and Option 2 for 2009/10 and 2010/11. The amounts shown are all full year figures at 2008/9 prices so will all be subject to inflationary increases.

Appendix A

Allocations 2009/2010						
School	Actual Pupil Numbers	Transition Pupil Numbers	Start of Extended Offer	Current Funding	Option 1	Option 2
Drove	52	52	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	95,851
Even	52	52	Sep 2010	81,072	81,072	85,506
Goddard	22	23	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	61,234
Gorse Hill	52	52	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	95,851
Moredon	47	47	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	89,883
Mountford	33	46	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	88,689
Oak Tree	52	52	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	95,851
Oliver Tomkins	40	46	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	88,689
Orchid Vale	52	52	Sep 2010	81,072	81,072	85,506
Penhill	42	46	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	88,689
Red Oaks	52	52	Sep 2010	81,072	81,072	85,506
Sevenfields	48	48	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	91,076
St Francis	52	52	Sep 2010	81,072	81,072	85,506
Toothill	20	23	Sep 2009	81,072	88,561	61,234

Allocations 2010/2011					
School	Actual Pupil Numbers	Transition Pupil Numbers	Start of Extended Offer	Option 1	Option 2
Drove	52	52	Sep 2009	106,408	106,408
Even	52	52	Sep 2010	99,018	99,018
Goddard	22	23	Sep 2009	47,065	47,065
Gorse Hill	52	52	Sep 2009	106,408	106,408
Moredon	47	47	Sep 2009	96,176	96,176
Mountford	33	46	Sep 2009	94,130	94,130
Oak Tree	52	52	Sep 2009	106,408	106,408
Oliver Tomkins	40	46	Sep 2009	94,130	94,130
Orchid Vale	52	52	Sep 2010	99,018	99,018
Penhill	42	46	Sep 2009	94,130	94,130
Red Oaks	52	52	Sep 2010	99,018	99,018
Sevenfields	48	48	Sep 2009	98,222	98,222
St Francis	52	52	Sep 2010	99,018	99,018
Toothill	20	23	Sep 2009	47,065	47,065

Proposal 2 – Extended Provision Entitlement

A new extended provision entitlement to be paid on top of the basic entitlement for settings providing more than 8 hours provision a day for 48 weeks or more a year.

Appendix A

The survey of costs and provision that was undertaken in summer 2008 revealed that settings that provide full day care in addition to free entitlement under the extended entitlement are likely to have 2½ hours of paid provision replaced with 2½ hours of basic entitlement. As a consequence such providers would be at a financial disadvantage of extending the level of free entitlement on offer. The proposal to introduce the extended provision entitlement is aimed at removing this financial disadvantage.

Current Method of Allocation

Under the current funding of free entitlement all PVI providers receive the current basic entitlement for all free early years education up to 12½ hours per week for 38 weeks per year. There are no additional payments that reflect type of setting.

Reasons for Change

All local authorities must make available the extended offer to all 3 and 4 year olds from September 2010 and to the 25% most disadvantaged from September 2009. Providers of early years education are not obliged to increase provision, however, there is a duty on local authorities to ensure there is suitable and adequate provision to meet parental demand across the local authority area. The introduction of the extended provision entitlement is aimed at removing the financial disadvantage that some providers would face from extending the free entitlement from 12½ hours to 15 hours.

Detail of Change

Under this proposal an additional entitlement will be introduced and payable to settings that provide the extended free entitlement and are open 8 hours or more per day and over 48 weeks or more per year. The new entitlement will be based upon the difference between the average charges for provision in such settings over and above the basic entitlement. The new entitlement will be paid to qualifying providers for each hour of free early years education that is delivered.

Implementation

The extended provision entitlement will start to be paid to providers of free early years education from Sept 2009 for providers in the 25% most disadvantaged areas and from Sept 2010 for all qualifying providers. Annex B shows the expected rates that will be payable.

Proposal 3 – Deprivation Flat Rate

A new flat rate will be payable to settings in areas of deprivation.

Appendix A

To recognise the additional need of pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds a new deprivation flat rate will be payable to settings that are in the 10% most disadvantaged areas within Swindon as measured by indices of multiple deprivation (IMD).

Current Method of Allocation

The current funding for early years provision does not include funding specifically targeted at areas of disadvantage.

Reasons for Change

At meetings held with stakeholders during the preparation of the proposals there was clear local support for recognition of disadvantage and deprivation. In addition the DCSF guidance on single funding formula for early years free education indicates that the regulations when published in Spring 2009 will contain a requirement that all local authorities must have in their local funding arrangements a recognition of disadvantage and deprivation.

Detail of Change

Early years settings that are within the 10% most disadvantaged areas within Swindon will qualify for the deprivation flat rate.

Implementation

The deprivation flat rate will be payable to qualifying settings from Sept 2009. Settings qualifying for the deprivation flat rate will receive 7/12 of the allocation shown in Annex B in 2009/10. The first full year payment will be payable to qualifying settings in 2010/11. Deprivation flat rate will not be payable to a setting receiving transition funding during the first year of transition funding.

Proposal 4 – Qualified Flat Rate

A new flat rate will be payable to settings that employ qualified staff.

To recognise the additional cost of settings that employ qualified staff a new flat rate will be payable to settings that employ qualified staff. The flat rate will be payable to settings that have a member of staff either enrolled on a foundation degree (with a commitment to achieve early years professional status) or already qualified as a teacher or an early years professional and the majority of the settings staff are qualified at least at level 3.

Current Method of Allocation

The current funding for early years provision does not include funding specifically targeted at settings with qualified staff.

Appendix A

Reasons for Change

At meetings held with stakeholders during the preparation of the proposals there was local support for recognition of settings employing qualified staff. In addition the DCSF guidance on single funding formula for early years free education indicates that the regulations when published in Spring 2009 will encourage local authorities to include in their local funding arrangements recognition of qualified staff.

Detail of Change

Early years settings that employ qualified staff will be eligible for the qualified staff flat rate.

Implementation

The qualified staff flat rate will be payable to eligible settings from Sept 2009. Settings eligible for the qualified staff flat rate will receive 7/12 of the allocation shown in Annex B in 2009/10. The first full year payment will be payable to eligible settings in 2010/11. Qualified staff flat rate will not be payable to a setting receiving transition funding in the first year of transition funding.

Proposal 5 - Flexible Flat Rate

A new flexible flat rate will be payable to settings that offer greater flexibility by opening a minimum of 6 hours per day.

To encourage more flexible provision a new flat rate will be introduced that will be payable to settings that offer greater flexibility by opening a minimum of 6 hours per day.

Current Method of Allocation

The current funding for early years provision does not include funding specifically targeted at settings that offer more flexible provision.

Reasons for Change

One of the requirements from the DCSF for local authorities when implementing the extended provision is to ensure that the provision is flexible. To encourage more flexible provision a flat rate is proposed.

Detail of Change

Early years settings that open for up to 6 hours per day will be eligible for the flexible flat rate.

Implementation

The flexible flat rate will be payable to eligible settings from Sept 2009. Settings eligible for the flexible flat rate will receive 7/12 of the allocation shown in Annex B in 2009/10. The first full year payment will be payable to eligible settings in 2010/11. Flexible flat rate will not be payable to a setting receiving transition funding in the first year of transition funding.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To provide Schools Forum with a draft Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget for 2009/10.

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is requested to:

- Consider the proposed components of the overall Schools Budget, particularly the new additional budget proposals for 2009/10 and the related detailed papers on these proposals, and make recommendations as appropriate.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 The 2008/09 DSG budget was the first year of a 3 year settlement from the Government which gives all schools a minimum funding guarantee increase of 2.1% per pupil per annum. The items that the DSG can be spent on are prescribed by legislation and primarily represent funding for maintained schools, although certain centrally retained items are also included. It is a requirement that the Schools Forum is consulted on DSG budget proposals for 2009/10.

2. Detail

School Formula Budgets

- 2.1 There was wide consultation on the formula used to allocate the DSG to individual schools last year and the current agreed formula will remain until a review of the DSG in 2011/12 when the DCSF are expected to propose changes.
- 2.2 The figures in Appendix A are based on the pupil numbers from the autumn 2008 pupil census and are subject to change following the Pupil Level Annual Schools Census (PLASC) in January 2009. A 'Contingency for further changes' line has been included in the summary to ensure a prudent approach is being taken to cover any other potential increases in budget when more up to date information is available following the January PLASC. In previous years the Free School Meals (FSM) data has increased between the autumn census and the January PLASC and we anticipate this trend to continue this year.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

- 2.3 The first section of Appendix A shows a potential increase on the Delegated Schools Budget of £3.086m. The increase includes £802k targeted money for New Ministerial Priorities (Personalised Learning) and also includes provision of £129k for the new PS7 school that is due to open in temporary accommodation in September 2008.
- 2.4 A previous draft version of this report that went to Schools Forum Sub Group in November 2008 identified increases in the budget for the new East Wichel School, which had been due to open in temporary accommodation in September 2009. The Schools Adjudicator has now agreed that the opening of this school can be delayed until September 2011 due to the slowing down of the Wichelstowe development and the budget for East Wichel in 2009/10 has now been removed.
- 2.5 The following table summarises the changes in pupil numbers based on the pupil numbers received in the autumn census and the anticipated increase in DSG (pupils at the academy are not included).

	2008/9	2009/10	Difference
Pupil Numbers			
Nursery	269	269	0
R	2,236	2,287	51
1	2,124	2,267	143
2	2,146	2,124	-22
3	2,139	2,149	10
4	2,306	2,177	-129
5	2,319	2,306	-13
6	2,330	2,338	8
	15,869	15,917	48
7	2,137	2,140	3
8	2,055	2,147	92
9	2,108	2,070	-38
10	2,090	2,106	16
11	2,095	2,094	-1
	10,485	10,557	72
Special	396	416	20
Nursery	1,044	1,082	38
Total Pupil Numbers	27,794	27,972	178
DSG per pupil (£)	3,775	3,913	
Total DSG (£)	104,919,293	109,448,842	4,529,549

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

Retained DSG Budgets

- 2.6 The pupil number information from the autumn census results in an estimated increase in the DSG for 2009/10 of £4.53m. There is currently a projected overspend on the retained DSG budget for 2008/09 of £511k. The first call on the increase in the DSG in 2009/10 would be any budget overspend from the previous financial year (or in the event of an under spend the available DSG would be increased). Therefore if the current budget monitoring predictions are realised then the £511k overspend would reduce the increase in DSG budget available to just over £4m.
- 2.7 There are a number of unavoidable pressures and some identified savings on the retained DSG budgets that are detailed in Appendix A. The main items are inflation and increments on salaries and inflation on contracts, income and grants. In 2009/10 there is a saving of £200k on the set up costs budget for Isambard as the full budget commitment to Isambard will have been fulfilled. The net increase in the retained budgets is £56k. The following table summarises the position shown in Appendix A:

	£000
Forecast Overspend on the 2008/09 Budget	511
Increase on Delegated Schools Budget	3,086
Non Schools Budget Unavoidable Pressures and Savings	56
Total Increase in 2009/10 Budget	3,653
Estimated Increase in DSG	(4,530)
Remaining Budget to be Allocated	(877)
Ongoing 2008/09 Net Budget Pressures (appendix B)	1,212
Deficit on 2009/10 Budget	335

- 2.8 The table shows that if all of the recurring pressures continue into 2009/10 then the financial position would be a deficit budget of £335k. A cautious view has been taken at present on the expected level of DSG and as a result when the final DSG is announced in July there maybe additional resources that will help address this financial issue. Although it must be noted Local Authorities cannot set deficit budgets therefore, some further decisions will need to be made to ensure that the budget is balance at the start of the financial year. The net budget pressures of £1.212m are shown in detail in Appendix B. These figures above do not include any increases in the budget for any of the proposals that are elsewhere on the agenda. If any of these proposals are agreed then the deficit on the 2009/10 DSG budget will increase.
- 2.9 As the DSG budget is becoming more challenging due to the increased pressure on the demand led budgets such as Out of Borough, SENRAP

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

and Recoupment, it is proposed that in future years Schools work more closely with other Council departments, such as Procurement and Corporate Finance, and share their knowledge and experiences of driving down costs to help drive out further efficiencies within the DSG.

Early Years Funding

- 2.10 Elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting is a report that covers the current review of early years funding. At the time of preparing this report a consultation is being undertaken with all early years stakeholders on proposals for the extended and flexible provision for early years that must be introduced by local authorities from September 2009 in the 25% most disadvantaged areas and from September 2010 universally. The results of that consultation are expected to be made available to members of the Schools Forum ahead of this meeting. As early years funding is part of the DSG the financial implications of the proposals currently out to consultation are included in the budget proposals covered by this report.

2.11 **Social Deprivation Funding**

In setting the Schools delegated budgets for 2008/9 the School Forum sub group considered the proportion of funding within the schools budget that is deemed to be in support of social deprivation. Whilst DCSF had not set firm targets for local authorities to achieve they had indicated that the proportion spent on social deprivation of the amount included within the DSG for social deprivation should be around 80%. In the budget for 2008/9 level of spend on social deprivation in actual support of social deprivation within schools delegated budgets was 77% as recorded in the return to the DCSF. 77% was considered to be suitably close to the indicative 80% level and would be a starting point for discussion between the DCSF and the local authority. A DCSF advisor was expected to visit Swindon to discuss the matter with the Group Director during the autumn term 2007. As yet no meeting has taken place.

Following the setting of the final delegated schools budget for 2008/9 and the submission of the social deprivation return to the DCSF the DCSF have made amendments to items that can and cannot be included as counting towards social deprivation. These changes are as follows:

- AWPUP Funding Assistant Head - amount included has been increased. This change has been made by the DCSF to allow for consistency across all local authorities.
- All other AWPUP funding has been disallowed by the DCSF on the basis that all pupils in an age group receive the same funding regardless of their need so the funding cannot be said to be reaching

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

just the deprived pupils. Again this is being applied consistently across all local authorities. This means over £1.25m has not been allowed in the Swindon return.

- Behaviour support service - the DCSF are allowing the amount shown in the section 52 line 1.3.2 2007/8 (£1,509,362 is shown in version F24 of the SBC statement) multiplied by % FSM multiplied by 1.5 (14%). For Swindon this will mean approximately £211k being included.

The overall result of these changes has reduced the amount shown being spent on deprivation from 77% to 65%. This is below the 'target' of 80%. The changes that have been made by the DCSF are before any discussion between the DCSF advisor and the Group Director despite an expectation that this discussion would take place.

The local authority in early October asked the DCSF advisor for a discussion about these changes before any figures are published. In the absence of a response to that request a follow up was sent at the end of October.

2.12 ***Strategy on Out of Borough***

The review into provision for learners with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties is beginning to highlight the difficulties that the authority will face if we continue to manage placements in the current manner. The expenditure on Out of Borough placements is rising. There is a very limited number of special school places available and there is insufficient re-integration from alternative provision, including the PRU to free up space in the system.

Officers are investigating a number of ways to reduce Out of Borough spending by providing better options within Swindon. These include outreach models, expansion of SRPs and models to enrich after school provision for our most vulnerable pupils. The rationale behind this work is that expenditure on improving provision in Swindon may cost hundreds of thousands of pounds, but it would eventually become an overall saving when Out of Borough costs are frequently in the region of £70k per learner. The investigation at the moment is looking at whether we have strong business cases for local options and how soon expenditure in this area would lead to savings in the Out of Borough budget. At this stage no budget provision has been made over and above existing levels of resources within the DSG.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget 2009/10

Schools Forum

27th January 2009

2.13 **Single Status**

The implementation of Single Status will have a direct impact on school budgets during 2009/10. The Local Authority will work with schools to ensure significant cost variances can be cashflowed over a number of years through school reserves and rollovers. Where schools have insufficient reserves the Council will support by using Council's reserve on a pay back basis.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

The budgets and expenditure referred to within this report will need to be contained within the ring-fenced dedicated schools grant.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

None

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45: "We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community."

Consultees

The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.

The Chair of Schools Forum

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A – Summary of Draft 2009/10 DSG Budget
- Appendix B – 2008/09 Budget Pressures ongoing into 2009/10

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

DSG Budget	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000
Carry Forward Overspend / (Underspend) From Previous Year (1)	511	0
School Budgets		
Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) Increase at 2.1%	2,061	2,088
Demography	(126)	131
Flat Rate Saving – Covingham Park & Millbrook	(80)	(60)
New Ministerial Priority	802	1,508
New Swindon School - PS7	129	
Change in Split Site	(57)	
DSG Adjustment for Academy (Penhill)	107	
Contingency for further changes resulting from final PLASC data (eg FSM, EAL, AEN)	250	
Total Movement on Delegated Schools Budget	3,086	3,667
Unavoidable Non Schools Budgets Pressures		
Salary Inflation – this is the estimated cost of inflation on salary budgets that are met from the DSG	74	
Cost of Increments / Re-grading of salaries in year (2008/09)	56	
Increased Salary costs offset against the increase in income on Marlborough House	45	
Contract Inflation – includes inflation on out borough placements at 3%	172	
4 Year Old Education increase due to demographic growth and extending provision	121	
Increased Management Fees on the Recoupment budget	15	
Kingsdown SRP top up - based on amount paid from the OoB budget in 0809	13	
Set up costs for new schools – cost of fitting out new schools once they are opened (2)	0	640

DSG Budget	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000
Non Schools Budgets – Reductions / savings		
Increase in income from grants – inflationary increase	(82)	(84)
Increase other income by inflation	(16)	(16)
Increase income for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Budget due to increased income for Marlborough House	(102)	
Saving arising from the school set up costs budget from Isambard now that the full commitment has been fulfilled	(200)	
Removal of 2008/09 One-off budgets (3)	(40)	
Total Movement on Non Schools Budget – Unavoidable Pressures and Savings	56	540
Provisional Increase in DSG	(4,530)	
Remaining Budget to be Allocated	(877)	
Ongoing 2008/09 Net Budget Pressures	1,212	
Cumulative Position – Shortfall in budget / (surplus)	335	

Notes:

- 1 Removal of the 2008/09 forecast outturn position.
- 2 Allocation for fit out budget for new schools; 10/11 £320k East Wichel (permanent accommodation), £290k PS7 (permanent accommodation), £30k St Francis; 11/12 £120k Catherine Wayte and Abbeymeads (temporary accommodation).
- 3 Removal of one-off budgets agreed in 2008/09 – Alternative provision consultant £20k, Health & Safety briefing sessions £20k.

Variance Nov 08	Explanation of Year End Position of £511k overspend	One-off	Ongoing	Already included in 2009/10 Budget
£'000	Children & Young People	£'000	£'000	£'000
-29	Primary Behaviour Support are now projecting an underspend of £29k due to salary savings of £25k arising from a restructuring of the establishment, £10k from additional and enhanced income streams from Primary National Strategy and Surestart funding and a £6k pressure on supplies and services budgets.	-29		
	Schools & Learning			
290	The SENRAP budget is under considerable pressure, the previous monitoring report forecast an over spend of £229k. Over the past few months there has been an increasing number of Statemented Children requiring support and this has increased the budget pressure by a further £61k. The full overspend is offset by £171k of one-off funding in 2008/09		461	
-29	The Hillside Centre for pregnant teenagers and teenage mothers has a higher level of income than budgeted for due to an increase in 'Care to Learn' income.	-29		
-72	Pupil Referral Unit are forecasting an underspend of £72k consisting of increased costs for learning packs to meet demand of £9k and transport costs which will also increase by £20k but this will be offset by anticipated income of £101k by year-end. This will be generated from miscellaneous income including pupil allowance.	-72		
-102	CAMHS are currently forecasting an overspend on staff costs of £28k at year end but it is anticipated that this will be more than offset by an increased level of income resulting in an overall underspend of £102k. Marlborough House has achieved a high level of excellence award for the services they provide, which has resulted in a high level of placements from outside the borough by other authorities. The budget pressure on staff costs has occurred due to the vacancy factor being applied to the budget, which is not achievable, and this pressure will be addressed in the 2009/10 budgets.			-102
7	Increased staff costs £24k due to extra cover required for a suspended Teaching Assistant offset by additional income £17k from SENAT for special educational needs child which will result in an overall overspend of £7k on Riverside.	7		
9	Increased staff costs have also resulted in a budget pressure on Great Western Hospital of £9k.	9		
4	An overspend of £4k also on staff costs has been currently reported within the Secondary Behaviour Support Team but it is anticipated that savings will be made on staff costs due to the retirement of the team leader and recruitment delay of two new support assistant posts which will offset this budget pressure.	4		
41	The Stratton Education Centre is reporting a budget pressure on staff costs due to temporary cover for a suspended teacher.	41		
42	Home Tuition are currently forecasting an overspend of £42k on staff costs due to high numbers of children receiving home tuition.	42		
235	The Out of Borough Placements budget pressure has reduced since the last Schools Forum report. There are 7 children that have still not yet been placed in an out of borough provision. Therefore the projection has been reduced to reflect this delay as it is assumed that these children will not be placed this term. This underspend may increase if the remaining 7 children are not placed at the beginning of next term and this will be reviewed for December Budget Monitoring.		235	
-215	To help contribute to the out of borough provision the directorate has frozen any further expenditure on the schools in challenging circumstances budget. This is not a sustainable option for future years, however it will allow us some time to understand what the outcome of the alternative provision review will mean in terms of stabilising educational support.	-215		
-171	The match funding that was required to support the broadband standards fund grant is no longer required.	-171		
4	There is a small pressure on the Travellers Children budget due to incremental salary costs.	4		
24	There are a further 6 children who require speech and language therapy outside of the contractual agreement with the PCT, this has caused a pressure of £8k on the Therapy budget.		24	
6	Support costs within the Playing for Success area were not included in the budget and as a result a £6k over spend is now being reported.	6		
492	Detailed work has been undertaken on the Recoupment budget this month to establish an accurate year-end position. This budget includes costs for Swindon children out in other local authority schools and also includes income from other local authorities for their children that are in Swindon schools. The net budget is £292k of income and the budget runs a year in arrears. In previous financial years income has exceeded expenditure. However, current estimates indicate that the expenditure will exceed the income and therefore there will be a budget pressure of £492k. This is due to a reduction in the level of income being received from other local authorities due to some Swindon schools being full and more Swindon children going into Swindon schools than in previous years.		492	
	Children & Families			
6	Due to the nature of the Education Support Service there is a requirement to employ specialist teaching staff, unfortunately these posts have proven difficult to recruit to and as a result the posts are currently being filled by consultants at a higher rate which will cost an additional £29k. A one-off contribution from Area Based Grant of £23k has been made to offset the increased budget pressure on salaries.	6		

Variance Nov 08	Explanation of Year End Position of £511k overspend	One-off	Ongoing	Already included in 2009/10 Budget
11	Wiltshire CC are no longer contributing toward a teaching post in the Portage budget therefore, there will be a shortfall of £9k in the income target. Due to late confirmation from Wiltshire the team was unable to reduce the hours of this post until September. There is a new pressure of £2k due to the increase in teacher's salaries in September 2008 being slightly above what had been budgeted for at the start of the financial year.	11		
50	The Special Equipment budget has recently transferred to Children's and Families from the Schools and Learning Directorate. A piece of work has been undertaken recently to look at the adequacy of the existing budget provision for special equipment for the 2009/10 budget. This piece of work has identified a potential budget pressure in the current year of £50k.		Included in a separate report on the agenda	
	Access & Provision			
-4	The Trade Union Facilities budget is currently forecasting a £4k under spend; this projection is based on current demand.	-4		
-1	Other minor variations.	-1		
8	New pressure in Admissions due to additional postage charges of £12k, this is offset by savings on salaries, printing and stationery and the Admissions Forum, resulting in a net pressure of £8k.	8		
-41	Limited expenditure has been incurred on the Schools Forum budget and as a result of the budget freeze a potential saving of £41k has been identified.	-41		
-54	There are savings on a new DSG allocation, Targeted School Meals Grant, due to budgeted expenditure being covered from a Standards Fund grant that was carried forward from 2007/08.	-54		
511		-478	1212	-102

Standards Fund 2009-10

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Author: Group Director, Children Services

Parish / Wards Affected: All

Purpose

To provide Schools Forum with updated Standards Fund allocations for 2009/10.

Recommendation

The Schools Forum is requested to:

- Note the revised Standard Fund allocations for 2009/10 and 2010/11 that are provided in Appendix A.

1. Reasons

- 1.1 In January 2008, Schools Forum was provided with Standards Fund allocations for the 3-year funding period from 2008/09 to 2010/11. This report provides updated figures from the Department for Children, Families and Schools (DCSF) for the 2009/10 allocations.

2. Detail

- 2.1 The DSG Budget Report that went to Schools Forum on 22nd January 2008 provided details regarding each Standards Fund, what it could be used for, and how it was allocated to schools. The report covered the full 3-year funding period from 2008/09 to 2010/11. Therefore, the individual Standards Funds have been allocated using the same methodology as was used in 2008/09. Appendix A provides a summary of the Standards Fund Grant allocations for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

School Lunch Grant

- 2.2 The School Lunch Grant was introduced in 2008 to keep the price of a school meal down to try and persuade parents to buy in to the school lunches provided. The grant can only be used for any of the direct costs of a school lunch. This includes not only ingredients but also the increased costs of additional hours to prepare fresh food, increased rates of pay for employees with higher skills levels or for small pieces of extra equipment needed to provide a hot meal. It can also be used to purchase menu analysis software and the expertise to use it.
- 2.3 The School Lunch Grant Standards Fund was allocated to schools in 2008/09 as follows:

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Standards Fund 2009-10

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

- £1,000 was allocated to Schools with in-house catering provision for the purchase / set up of software relating to nutritional information.
 - The remaining grant was split out to all schools with a meals provision, using the pupil numbers on roll as a basis for the allocation.
 - Those schools with no meal provision did not receive any of the grant as they would not have been able to spend the money in accordance with the grant guidance.
- 2.4 It is proposed that the same methodology be used for apportioning the 2009/10 School Lunch Grant.
- Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG)**
- 2.5 The EMAG has increased by £101,851 in 2009/10 to £329,494. In 2008/09, the EMAG was £227,643; £77,643 was devolved to schools and £150,000 was retained centrally by the Local Authority. It is proposed that the EMAG is allocated in the same way in 2009/10 with £150,000 being retained by the LA and the remainder of the grant (£179,494) being devolved to schools. As in previous years, the grant will be devolved to schools on the basis of the percentage of pupils with English as an Additional Language with a 10% trigger applied.
- 2.6 The outcome of a recent review into the provision of services for Ethnic Minority Achievement has not yet been presented to the Local Authority. The outcome of this review may result in the £150,000 that is currently retained being used differently. This will be reviewed when the information becomes available.

Risk Management

Financial and Procurement Implications

The financial implications are set out throughout this report.

Legal / Human Rights Implications

None

Links to Corporate Plans and Policies (in particular to Swindon 2010 Promises)

Promise 45: "We will make sure that schools will be at the heart of each community."

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

Standards Fund 2009-10

Schools Forum

27 January 2009

Consultees

- The Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) and Director of Law and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) are consulted in respect of all reports.
- The Chair of Schools Forum

Background Papers and Appendices

- Appendix A – Summary of Standards Fund Allocations 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Further information on the subject of this report can be obtained from Karen Murray on 01793 465794 or Email kmurray@swindon.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of Standards Fund Allocations 2009/10 – 2010/11

Grant		Allocations			Devolved to Schools
		2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	
1.1	School Development Grant	5,976,867	6,052,224	Spring 2010	100%
1.2	School Lunch Grant *	300,161	292,591	292,591	100%
1.3	Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant *	227,643	329,494	278,786	Minimum of £179,494
1.4	Targeted Improvement Grant	Announced as projects are agreed			Retained centrally
1.5	Making Good Progress	65,230	492,397	Autumn 09	Retained centrally
1.6	Extended Schools – Sustainability *	275,113	509,041	709,305	Retained centrally
1.7	Targeted Support for Primary Strategy	894,355	740,598	Autumn 09	Allocated to schools for specific purposes
1.8	Targeted Support for Secondary Strategy	376,250	386,656	Autumn 09	
1.9	City Challenge	Announced as projects are agreed			As individual programmes
1.10	Early Years: Extending and increasing the flexibility of the entitlement for 3-4yr olds	-	273,092	979,711	Retained centrally
1.11	Music *	376,200	377,300	376,200	Retained centrally
1.12	Playing for Success – DCSF grant	65,000	80,000	Autumn 09	Retained centrally
	Playing for Success – Local Authority match funding	25,000	25,000	Autumn 09	

* Final allocations for 2009/10 may be subject to adjustments where an LA has allocated grant to an academy opening in 2008-09

In addition schools will also receive School Standards Grant (SSG) and School Standards Grant – Personalisation (SSGP).

This page is intentionally left blank