

## **CALDERDALE SCHOOLS FORUM**

**25<sup>th</sup> January 2010**

**PRESENT:** Mr C Rushworth (Chair)

Miss H Gaunt

Mr A Hardy

Mr D Hetherington

Mrs J Ingham

Ms H Lennie

Ms L Lynch

Mr P Rushworth

Ms K Sanderson

Mr A Thripland (substitute for Mr M Imeson)

Mr P Townend

Ms G Young

### **Other Members of the Forum who were unable to attend**

Councillor Collins (apologies submitted)

Councillor Whittaker (apologies submitted)

Mr W Carpenter

Mrs A Craven

Mr A Evans (apologies submitted)

Mr M Imeson (apologies submitted)

Ms J Shaw (apologies submitted)

Mr D Warbrick (apologies submitted)

#### **1 MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

**IT WAS AGREED** that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be not excluded from the meeting for the items of business on the agenda.

#### **2 MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 30<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2009**

**IT WAS AGREED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009 be approved as a correct record.

#### **3 MATTERS ARISING**

In relation to Minute Number 5 (School Revenue Balances) the issue was raised regarding an article which had appeared in the press regarding the issue of school revenue balances which was discussed at the last meeting, and concerns were expressed that the information contained in the press article was incorrect and misleading. Discussions took place on the way information from this Forum was passed to the press, and the Secretary advised that, as meetings of the Forum were open to the press and public, all reports were forwarded to the press at the same time as they were forwarded to members of this Forum unless the report was exempt.

**IT WAS AGREED** that officers be requested to give consideration to the best means of avoiding a similar situation in the future. The Council's Press Officer should be consulted for his thoughts as part of these considerations. In any event, an explanation should be provided to the press when future reports on school revenue balances are released to the press.

#### **4 CHILDREN'S TRUST CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

The Forum was provided with a copy of the Children's Trust consultation document advising that Calderdale Children's Trust members wished to review the arrangements which were currently in place. This was very timely as the statutory guidance on co-operation arrangements, including the Children's Trust and the Children and Young People's Plan was published in November 2009 for consultation. Also in October, the Audit Commission published a briefing paper on improving financial management in Children's Trusts. These two documents had been used to formulate the proposals for the Calderdale Children's Trust co-operation arrangements outlined in the document.

The consultation document contained two models which were being presented for consultation, resulting from studying the DCSF and Audit Commission guidance and using models of good practice from other Children's Trusts around the country. The arrangements must have a clear framework for delivering on four functions:

- Executive Function
- Strategic Function
- Commissioning Function
- Operational Function

Each function had certain elements which could be delivered in a number of ways. The two models presented illustrated two options for delivering which were modelled on other Children's Trusts arrangements and guidance.

Members were informed at the meeting that this issue was due to be considered by the Children's Trust in January but due to the bad weather that meeting was cancelled, and this would now be considered by the Trust in February before formal consultations took place with partners. The Forum considered that without having more details it was not possible to choose a model at this time.

#### **IT WAS AGREED that**

(a) officers be requested to resubmit the consultation document to the next meeting of this Forum on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010 after it has been considered by the Children's Trust and by the Primary Heads Association and CASH; and

(b) the Chair of this Forum should be a member of the Executive.

#### **5 EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA**

##### **(A) IMPLEMENTATION PLANS**

The Forum was provided with a report the purpose of which was (i) to receive consultation feedback on Calderdale's proposals for an early years single funding formula for all providers and (ii) to express a view on the Authority's plans to delay implementation until April 2011 but to distribute the PFI budget from April 2010 based on the proposals.

The views of the Early Years Reference Group, representing PVI providers, were outlined at the meeting, and that Group would be willing to accept the following:

- Hourly rate to increase to £3.40 for this year only instead of £3.56
- Supplement for deprivation
- Supplement for quality

The Group requested the following conditions:

- Quality supplement to be paid only to the PVI for this period
- Admissions policy not to be changed until 2011 (i.e. until EYSFF across the whole sector)
- Confirmation that EYSFF to start from 2011
- Transitional funding to be allowed for 1 year only (as the schools are getting an extra 12 months of funding on place-led rather than participation-led).

**IT WAS AGREED** that

(a) in relation to the maintained sector:

- (i) the single funding formula be delayed until April 2011. It may be amended by any learning from the pilots and new pathfinders in 2010. In 2010/2011 Council nurseries are provided with funding allocations on the existing basis;
- (ii) governing bodies receive the final recommendations and the indicative budget that they would have received until the single funding formula and be asked to consider the implications of how they would manage the future situation; and

(b) in relation to the PVI sector:

- (i) where possible the PVI budget be distributed from April 2010 to PVI providers to reflect the single funding formula. The extent to which this can be achieved will be limited by the funds available in the overall PVI budget;
- (ii) a quality supplement be paid of 23p per child per hour for those providers who can demonstrate they employ a graduate leader;
- (iii) a deprivation supplement be paid of 41p per child per hour for those children living in the 25% most deprived areas (as defined by IMD);
- (iv) there is only enough funding left to give the base rate an inflationary increase for those providers who may not benefit from the quality or deprivation supplement. The proposed rate is £3.40 (the current rate is £3.36);

- (v) into the future the release of funding from unfilled places should allow for the base rate of £3.40 to be increased to £3.56 per child per hour for all providers, including Council maintained nurseries.

### **(B) RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING CONSULTATION**

The Forum was provided with a report on the final conclusions to the recent consultation exercise to introduce a single funding formula for early years providers from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010. The report explained changes to the original proposals and the rationale for them.

**IT WAS AGREED** that the report be noted.

## **6 INDEPENDENT SAFEGUARDING AUTHORITY REGISTRATIONS**

The Forum was provided with a report advising that, since the checking of criminal convictions through the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) was set up in 2002, all schools had paid for CRB Disclosure Checks for their own employees through their school budget. The cost of an enhanced CRB Disclosure was currently £36.00.

With effect from July 2010, new employees or people moving roles who had contact with children, would be able to apply for Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) registration. The application for an ISA registration for posts in schools would be inclusive of a CRB Disclosure. The cost of the registration was £64.00. This would be a significant increased cost on school budgets, as set out in the report. The Forum was requested to express a view on how the costs should be funded in Calderdale.

**IT WAS AGREED** that

- (a) the Forum supports schools funding this cost through their school budget; and
- (b) officers be requested to seek clarification on the position regarding the need for schools to obtain CRB checks every three years.

## **7 ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT GRANT**

The Forum was provided with a report the purpose of which was (i) to consider ways of funding schools supporting children with English as an Additional Language, in particular Eastern European children, and (ii) for the Forum to express a view on how any additional funding might be distributed to those schools in most need.

The Forum had considered a report at the last meeting on the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG). The main issue for the Forum was to try and provide more funding support for those schools with increasing number of Eastern European children. It was agreed that the pupil data collection in Calderdale (PLASC) did not currently allow for the separate identification of these children. It was proposed that the definition, English as an Additional Language, may be a good proxy for indicating need not only where Eastern European children were concerned but for all children. The Forum asked officers to identify a sum of money when allocating the DSG for 2010/11 (the

headroom) that could be considered further for supporting these schools. The latest allocation of DSG showed all funds fully committed. In a separate exercise a one-off sum of £306,000 had been identified for use from the Schools Contingency (£150,000) and from the DSG in 2009/10 (£156,000) arising from final pupil numbers. The Forum could consider re-prioritising current commitments within the DSG for 2010/11 where they thought this issue was more important to increase the overall resources available for this distribution.

Using the suggestion that English as an Additional Language (EAL) may be a good proxy for distributing any funding, officers explored what data was available. PLASC data provided regularly by all schools showed all pupils with EAL. The number of pupils in all Calderdale schools and total EAL pupils were shown in Appendix 1. Appendix 1 also showed how the funding could be distributed based on four different models using EAL data. The first model distributed funding to all schools with EAL pupils, pro-rata to the number of EAL pupils. The next three models targeted funding at those schools in most need by using thresholds that included only those schools with more than 10%, 25% or 50% of EAL pupils on roll.

The current distribution of EMAG funding of £825,000 was originally agreed by the Forum and would end in March 2011. There was the option of putting both the EMAG funding of £825,000 and this new funding of £150,000 into one pot and distributing it simply on one of the EAL funding models. It was possible that a school who received EMAG funding under the current distribution, may receive less funding. Alternatively, Members of the Forum may wish to let the current EMAG distribution run for its final year in its current form.

Concerns were expressed at the meeting that the suggested means of allocation went against what the Forum wanted, and the way of distributing the funding was flawed. Concerns were raised that there were different tiers of help and support required which had not been taken into account. The need was expressed for a more refined form of data, particularly as there were children coming into this country who could not speak English and these children required intensified support. This group of children, who had significant language needs, should be taken into consideration, and additional money should be targeted at the right place.

**IT WAS AGREED** that

(a) officers, in consultation with headteachers, be requested to work up criteria before working with schools to collect appropriate data for funding to be allocated; and

(b) an interim report be submitted to the next meeting of this Forum before the funding is allocated.

## **8 ALLOCATION OF DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2010/11**

The Forum was provided with a report the purpose of which was (i) to provide Members with the latest allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2010/11, (ii) for Forum Members to express a view on how any growth in the

DSG was being allocated in 2010/11, and (iii) for the Forum to approve a technical breach of the Central Expenditure Limit in relation to Holy Trinity Senior School.

**IT WAS AGREED** that

(a) the Forum supports the allocation of the increase in DSG for 2010/11 as detailed in the report;

(b) the Forum approves the technical breach of the Central Expenditure Limit in relation to Holy Trinity Senior School; and

(c) the Head of Human Resources be requested to supply information to this Forum in relation to the position on equal pay claims.

## **9 SAFEGUARDING IN SCHOOLS**

### **(A) OFSTED REQUIREMENTS AND IMPACT**

The Forum was provided with a report advising that the Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) at a meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2009 had considered a report advising that in recent months it had become apparent that new Ofsted inspection arrangements placed an increased emphasis on the issue of safeguarding in schools. There was genuine concern that as a result of this issue, a significant number of schools would be “down graded” or placed in a category. The report submitted to the Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) stated that whilst some of the concerns regarding safeguarding were comparatively easily resolved, there were other aspects which were not readily resolvable without significant financial resources. The varied nature of school sites meant that some were readily made secure in terms of access including vehicular access, however, many Calderdale school sites were either impossible to make secure or would be impossible to secure without significant financial expenditure.

The Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) requested, amongst other things, that:

*“(a) details of the Ofsted requirements and how they are impacting on schools in Calderdale;*

*(b) a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Schools Forum identifying all sources of additional funding that schools can access to address the issue;*

*(c) it be recommended that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Asset Management Group identifying sources of additional funding that schools could access; and*

*(d) a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) detailing the outcomes of the discussions at the Schools Forum and the Asset Management Group.”*

The report submitted to this meeting addressed the issues in part (a) above.

**IT WAS AGREED** that the report be noted.

**(B) SOURCES OF FUNDING**

The Forum was provided with a report in response to a minute of the Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) to consider Ofsted's safeguarding requirements and their impact on schools in Calderdale. The report addressed the issues referred to in parts (b) and (c) of the resolution of the Employees Forum (Education Staff Unions) (as detailed in Part (A) of this minute).

**IT WAS AGREED** that, in view of the information contained in the report, the report be noted.

**10 WORK PROGRAMME 2009/10**

A paper was submitted setting out the Schools Forum's Work Programme for 2009/10.

**IT WAS AGREED** that

(a) the Work Programme be noted; and

(b) officers be requested to include more detail in the report on how funding is being used on the Schools Causing Concern monitor.

**11 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was noted that future meetings would take place as follows:

Monday, 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010

Monday, 26<sup>th</sup> April 2010

Monday, 7<sup>th</sup> June 2010