

AGENDA

Meeting: Schools Forum
Place: Council Chamber – Council Offices, Bath Road, Devizes,
Wiltshire, SN10 2AT
Date: Thursday 23 June 2011
Time: 1.30 pm

Briefing Arrangements:

Briefing will be held at **11.30** am in **Council Chamber, Browfort, Devizes** and will focus on the Final DSG Settlement, *if this information is forthcoming from the Department for Education in advance of the meeting*. An email will be circulated to Forum members, in advance of the meeting to confirm that the briefing will go ahead.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Liam Paul, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718376 or email liam.paul@wiltshire.gov.uk

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Membership:

Secondary School Headteachers

Mrs C Grant
Mr M Watson
Mr C Dark

Primary School Headteachers

Mr N Baker
Mrs Julia Bird
Mrs J Finney
Mrs C Williamson

SEN School Headteacher

Ms I Lancaster-Gaye

Academy Representative

Mr David Cowley

Maintained School w/Nurseries Rep.

Mr M Keeling

School Governor Representatives

Mrs A Ferries
Mr J Foster
Vacancy
Vacancy

Diocesan Representative

Mrs A Davey

Teacher's Representative

Mr J Hawkins

14-19 Group Representative

Dr Tina Pagett

Early Years Representative

Mr J Proctor

AGENDA

PART I

Items to be considered whilst the meeting is open to the public

1. **Public Participation and Questions**

The Council welcomes contributions from members of the public.

Those wishing to ask questions or make a statement at this meeting on any item on this agenda are required to give notice of any such questions in writing to the officer named above no later than 5pm on Friday 21 June.

Please contact the Democratic Services Officer named on the first page of this agenda for further advice. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.

2. **Apologies**

3. **Minutes of the previous Meeting** (*Pages 1 - 10*)

To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 03 March 2011 (copy attached)

4. **Declaration of Interests**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests.

5. **Chairman's Announcements**

8. **Update from Children's Trust Board**

To receive a verbal update from the Service Director, Commissioning & Performance, DCE on the Children's Trust Board.

7. **Young People's Support Service (YPSS) Update**

To receive a verbal update from Martin Cooper, Manager for Behaviour & Attendance, on the progress of changes to the Young People's Support Service (YPSS).

8. **SEN Forward Plan** (*Pages 11 - 12*)

To receive details of the time table of activity around SEN issues and to give members of the Schools Forum sufficient notice and information about what is going to be presented between June and December this year.

9. **SEN Equipment Budget** (*Pages 13 - 20*)

To receive details of the SEN Equipment budget for the 2011-12 year.

10. **Dedicated Schools Budget Final Outturn 2010/11** (*Pages 21 - 24*)
To report on the final outturn position for the dedicated schools budget.
11. **Maternity Costs - Keeping in Touch (KIT) Days** (*Pages 25 - 26*)
To consider a report by Phil Cooch, Principal Accountant (Schools), Children & Education, Finance Team and decide whether KIT days should continue to be funded out of the Maternity Budget or by individual schools.
12. **Early Years Reference Group - Membership** (*To Follow*)
Report is not available at time of publication – to follow
13. **Final DSG Settlement / DSG Update** (*To Follow*)
To consider the finalised DSG Settlement from the Department for Education, if available. This item will also include proposals for the Music Grant and the Looked after Children Pupil Premium.
14. **Schools Funding Consultation Response** (*Pages 27 - 60*)
To bring to the attention of Schools Forum the two consultations published by the Department for Education (DfE) and to summarise Wiltshire's response.
15. **Intended Use of Revenue Balances (IURB) Monitoring 2009/10** (*Pages 61 - 62*)
To update Schools Forum on the use of reserves carried forward from 2009/10 in respect of those schools that exceeded the permissible revenue rollover threshold.
16. **Report of the School Funding Working Group** (*Pages 63 - 68*)
17. **Confirmation of dates for future meetings**
To confirm the dates and location of future meetings, as follows:

13 October 2011 – *Council Offices, Browfort, Devizes*
01 December 2011 – *location to be confirmed*
19 January 2011 – *location to be confirmed*
18. **Urgent Items**
Any other items of business, which the Chairman agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

PART II

Items during whose consideration it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed.

None

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING HELD ON 3 MARCH 2011 AT COMMITTEE ROOM III - COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE.

Present:

Mr N Baker, Mrs Julia Bird, Mr C Dark, Mrs A Davey, Mrs A Ferries, Mrs J Finney, Mr J Foster, Mr Tim Gilson (Reserve), Mr J Hawkins, Mr M Keeling, Ms I Lancaster-Gaye, Dr Tina Pagett, Mr J Proctor, Mr M Watson and Mrs C Williamson

Also Present:

Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE, Rev. Alice Kemp and Cllr Alan Macrae

129. **Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

None

130. **Apologies**

Ted Hatala (reserve)
David Cowley
Carol Grant (substituted by Tim Gilson)

131. **Minutes of the previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 02 February were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record, and sign the minutes of the Schools Forum meeting held on 02 February 2010.

132. **Declaration of Interests**

None

133. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman explained that updates from Wiltshire's Children & Young People's Trust Board would be a standing item on the agenda henceforth. Updates would take the form of a short report and/or verbal update from Julia Cramp, Service Director Commissioning & Performance. This would reflect the strong links between the work and objectives of both bodies and allow Schools' Forum decisions to be as informed as possible.

134. **Budget Monitoring**

Liz Williams updated the Forum on the projected budget monitoring position for 2010/2011 and gave an update on the Budget for the 2011/2012 financial year.

Budget Monitoring 2010/2011

The budget figures project an underspend against DSG of £2.499 million. Any variance against the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be carried forward in to the next financial year. Schools Forum previously agreed that £1.536 million should be utilised to fund priorities in 2011/12.

Key pressures and potential underspends are:

Maternity Costs

Based on payroll data this budget is projected to overspend by £114,000.

Special Educational Needs Services

Underspends are projected against the Independent Special Schools (ISS) budget and the Special Recoupment budget which funds placements in other local authority maintained special schools. From 2011/12, underspend against these budgets will be released in to the delegated budget to increase the amount delegated to mainstream primary schools for SEN.

The Named Pupil Allowance (NPA) budget is not yet fully committed however it is expected that there will be further NPA allocations through the remainder of the year and it is therefore projected to be on target at this stage.

Early Years Budgets

Early Years budgets are projected to underspend by £1.8 million. Of this £1.5 million is against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. This projection is an estimate based on one term's data and will be updated for the January pupil count when this is available.

Young Person's Support Service

At the December meeting of Schools Forum it was agreed that £91,000 should be allocated from the projected underspend to fund cost pressures within the YPSS.

Budget Update 2011/12

The Head of Finance explained that the budget for 2011/12 had been considered by Cabinet and passed by Council at their 22nd February meeting. Key points were as follows:

- Roadshows have been held for Head Teachers, Governors and schools finance staff to outline the main issues within the budget. These have been well attended.
- Proposals for the variation of the minimum funding guarantee have been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration. The response to these submissions forms the basis of Agenda item no.9.
- Data from the pupil census has now been collated and checked by the Research and Statistics team and work has commenced on detailed budget calculations at school level.
- The financial planning software has been updated for the provisional AWPU and other values and is now being tested by the Accounting & Budget Support Team prior to issuing to schools in early March.

Resolved:

To note the revenue budget monitoring position for 2010/11 and the progress on finalising individual schools budgets for 2011/12.

135. Council Business Plan (including Early Intervention Grant)

The Head of Finance, DCE summarised her report which sought to update the Schools' Forum on the Council's Financial Plan 2011-2015 as it affects Children's Services and to share detail on how the Early Intervention Grant has been prioritised in 2011/12.

The Financial Plan & Children's Services

It was explained that the local authority settlement was for two years as opposed to the schools settlement (DSG) which was for one year only. Key points were as follows:

- A reduction in the number of specific grants with some rolled into the formula grant and others rolled into new specific grants.
- A reduction in formula grant from the government of 14.3% after transitional funding.
- Funding equivalent to a 2.5 % increase in Council Tax for 2011/12

The key aims of the financial plan are:

- ✓ Protecting and safeguarding vulnerable adults and children
- ✓ Investing in priority services – including children's attainment
- ✓ Making savings

Investment will continue to help protect and safeguard vulnerable children and to help increase children's attainment. This includes a £0.650 million investment in 2012/13 to develop a small in-house residential crisis resource to provide a safe environment for children whilst they are assessed prior to placement and further investment of £0.270million rising to £1million in 2011/2012 to enhance school-to-school support, identification of vulnerable groups, and capacity-building in schools.

Savings will also be achieved through cross-cutting service reviews which will include the Passenger Transport Service. These will focus on protecting the vulnerable whilst finding procurement, management and building savings. The way services are delivered will be reviewed, taking advantage of opportunities for income generation.

Early Intervention Grant (EIG)

The EIG replaces a number of discrete grants such as Sure Start funding, short breaks for disabled children, and Area Based grants. Wiltshire received £17.957 million for these grants in 2010/2011.

It was explained that there has been a significant reduction in this grant to £14.66 million in 2011/12 and £15.5 million in 2012/13.

The grant is not ring fenced although there are indicators to how it can be spent, such as statutory guidance and press releases from DCLG. The Council's financial plan provides for the full amount of EIG to be spent within Children's Services.

The council is to maintain 30 Sure Start Children's Centres. The core offer of short breaks for disabled children will also be retained for 2011/2012.

Officers were requested to undertake work comparing levels of EIG for Wiltshire's statistical neighbours for Children's Services.

Resolved:

- a. **To note the impact of the Council's financial plan on services for children and young people.**
- b. **To note the prioritisation of the early intervention grant for 2011/12.**

136. **Devolved Formula Capital**

The Head of Business and Commercial Services, Simon Burke invited Schools Forum to consider future arrangements for the distribution of the Devolved Formula Capital grant (DFC) to non-Voluntary Aided schools in Wiltshire.

The national formula for DSG provides only a single flat rate to each school irrespective of whether schools have split sites through reorganisation or amalgamation. Schools Forum had agreed that a flat rate should be allocated to each site, thereby upholding the principle that amalgamated schools should not be worse off by amalgamating. These additional flat rate payments have been funded from the DfE allocations made for schools which have closed or by reducing the formula allocation to all schools. This principle has not been applied to amalgamated VA schools which receive their DFC allocation direct from DfE.

The key considerations for schools forum were:

- A significant reduction in the maximum level of flat rate funding per school – from £18,500 to £4,000 in the national formula allocation for 2011-12.
- 8 Schools currently receive the flat rate of funding.
- The funding can be used for any Capital purpose.
- DFC is provided by the DfE by a formula which is based upon the numbers of schools and pupils reported in the school census of the January of the preceding calendar year.
- The aim of the arrangement is to remove any disincentive based on site restrictions for schools to Federate/Amalgamate when this is necessary.

A discussion ensued where the following points were debated:

- The definition of a split-site school – i.e. those which serve two or more communities and must remain on two sites due to site constraints.
- School's Forum's previously affirmed principle of funding for the future rather than on the basis of historical allocations.
- The continued necessity of the scheme, in the view of Officers.
- The desirability of parity between otherwise comparable schools, regardless of VA/Maintained/Academy status.

Resolved:

- 1) That DFC should be allocated to schools in line with the allocation of funding from the DfE. This would:**
 - **allocate grant with reference to the preceding year's pupil numbers (e.g. January 2010 for 2011/12)**
 - **provide a double flat rate element to schools which had amalgamated during the preceding year (and a single flat rate in subsequent years).**
- 2) The arrangement would be reviewed again for the 2012/13 funding settlement.**

137. **Minimum Funding Guarantee Variations**

A report was tabled by the Manager, Schools Accounting & Budgets, DCE, which updated Schools Forum on responses received from the DfE to requests to vary the MFG to date.

At its meeting on the 2 February Schools Forum agreed that a number of adjustments should be applied to vary the normal operation of the DfE's Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) where not to do so would lead to inappropriate MFGs. Three of these adjustments were then sent to the Secretary of State for approval.

It was explained that the following baseline adjustments have been permitted following consideration by the Secretary of State:

- a) Where a Specialist Learning Centre is to close, to remove the associated funding from the Baseline.
- b) In respect of increased SEN delegation; to add to a school's baseline the appropriate amount of devolved funding it received in 2010-11.

In respect of 1 2 1 tuition, the initial request (to allocate this funding through KS 2 and KS 3 AWPU) has been refused. Officers relayed to the Forum that the Secretary of State will not allow the LA to remove the funding from the baseline "unless the funding is allocated including a significant weighting for deprivation or low attainment".

A discussion ensued surrounding the best possible choice for allocation of this grant funding. Points for consideration included:

- Using the 1-2-1 tuition funds for their original purpose: to address low attainment rather than deprivation
- The possibility of retaining a certain percentage of the funds, to be allocated on an AWPU basis.
- Consistency across phases and types of schools
- A wish to ensure all schools received some funds, but not necessarily equal amounts.
- Personalised learning measure would closely replicate AWPU, and maintain consistency across phases.
- Personalised learning (deprivation) uses MOSAIC indices of deprivation and as such would likely come close to replicating the distribution of the Pupil Premium.

Resolved:

- a. **That in respect of the allocation of the former 1-2-1 Tuition Grant, the following actions be taken:**
 - i. **To appeal the decision of the Secretary of State if possible.**
 - ii. **That if any appeal fails/is not possible, then permission be sought to allocate the £2.1 million as follows:**
 - **40% via AWPU and 60% via prior attainment measures using the Personalised Learning KS1 SATS formula**

**driver for Primary Schools and the Secondary SENA
formula driver for Secondary schools**

- iii. **If this proposal is still refused, to allocate the £2.1 million 100% on prior attainment (same drivers as above)**
- b. **To seek the Secretary of State's permission to adjust the MFG Baseline of those schools that have received the in-year pupil increase ("trigger") funding in 2010-11 by an amount equal to the funding allocated in 2010-11.**
- c. **To seek the Secretary of State's permission to adjust the MFG Baseline of those special schools that received transitional protection by an amount equal to the funding allocated in 2010-2011**

138. Controls on Surplus Balances Schemes - Options for 2011/12 onwards

Phil Cooch, Schools Accounting & Budget Support Manager, updated those present on the results of a consultation with Wiltshire Schools regarding the continuation and form of the Controls on Surplus Balances scheme. This follows revisions to the Scheme for Financing Schools published December 2010, which imply a relaxation or removal of clawback schemes.

He began by sketching out what decisions other Schools' Forums in the South West had made about their clawback mechanisms. Most had not yet reached a decision. On the day of this meeting, Somerset Schools' Forum were also to make their decision, whilst South Gloucestershire had decided to remove their clawback scheme, but keep a monitoring scheme in place.

A discussion emerged, and members of the forum considered the advantages and disadvantages of the current scheme and also the government's direction of travel regarding this area of schools policy. Forum members felt strongly that the scheme had helped to change the culture amongst Wiltshire Schools for the better, and had led to informed decision making and increased accountability. Officers were asked to quantify the resources spend working on the scheme, which equated to approximately two officers working for 6 weeks. They believed this to be worthwhile.

Resolved:

- 1) That Wiltshire will continue with a Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme for 2011/12**
- 2) That the scheme in its entirety will be reviewed in the autumn (the October meeting).**
- 3) That only those schools which exceed the permitted thresholds will be required to submit a Controls on Surplus Balances monitoring statement (all other schools can be monitored when rollover balances come to Schools' Forum as part of the report on schools revenue balances for 2010/11).**
- 4) That the scheme not be amended (as previously proposed) to require justification of the whole revenue balance for those schools who exceed the permitted thresholds.**

139. **Results of the Consultation on a change to the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme**

Resolved:

Following discussions regarding the Controls on Surplus Balances scheme under the previous item, it was agreed to defer this item to the Autumn meeting of the Schools Forum in October, when a full review of the scheme will be considered.

140. **Confirmation of dates for future meetings**

Members of the Forum noted the dates of upcoming meetings.

The next meeting will take place on 23 June 2011. A briefing will precede the meeting, and the items for consideration will be the YPSS Funding formula and the Final Budget figures for 2011/2012

141. **Urgent Items**

At the Chairman's discretion Simon Burke, Head of Business and Commercial Services, DCE, updated the Forum on recently received changes to the Music Funds available to the Council. In 2010-11 Wiltshire Council received a grant of £476,850 for music as part of the Standards Fund programme. £183,850 of this sum was devolved to schools to support the provision of music education at Key Stage 2.

Allocations for 2011-12 will be made on the basis of the numbers of primary school-aged children in the local authority area with an 11% weighting applied for those children eligible for free school meals. This will be paid by the Federation of Music Services in two instalments – April and December, and is intended to be used solely to fund music education. The allocation for Wiltshire for 2011-12 is £528,511.

The Head of Business and Commercial Services explained that whilst the increase in grant is welcomed, and helps address funding which has historically been low compared to other authorities, the change in the purpose and conditions of the grant has implications for the way the grant is allocated and managed in Wiltshire.

Resolved:

- i. That one third of £183,850 be allocated to schools on the current basis to represent the cost of maintaining the provision of music education for Key Stage 2 for terms five and six**
- ii. To consider future arrangements for the Music Grant at the next meeting of the Schools Forum.**

(Duration of meeting: 1.40 - 3.45 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Liam Paul, of Democratic Services,
direct line 01225 718376, e-mail liam.paul@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23 June 2011

Work Plan for SEN Issues June – December 2011

Purpose of the paper

The purpose of this paper is to present the time table of activity around SEN issues and to give members of the Schools Forum sufficient notice and information about what is going to be presented between June and December this year.

Timetable

June

Specialist equipment for pupils with SEN

This paper sets out the context and background of legal obligations under the new equalities legislation for schools and the Local Authority. It proposes to establish more clarity on how such equipment should be provided in the future.

October

SEN review - update on developments for HI and PI resource bases

SLAs, funding formula and the moderation process for Resource bases for Autism, S&L and Complex Needs were considered and agreed by the Schools Forum last year. The principles of these processes are being currently applied to developing the same systems, funding and SLAs for HI and PI centres. This work will be completed in the Autumn 2011.

SEN review - update on development for support service reviews

The SEN review recommended a review of a range of support services. This recommendation was subsequently agreed by the Cabinet. This review will also need to be carried out in the context of the savings to be identified in central DSG budgets required for 2012/13, and the increasing number of schools converting to academy status in Wiltshire. For the range of reasons outlined above the Local authority is currently undertaking a review of all support services within Targeted School and Learner Support. This will involve consultations with PHF and WASSH in June/July and a report to Schools Forum with options and recommendations in the autumn

December

Moderation activity

This year, for the first time, the moderation process will affect the whole range of specialist provision in Wiltshire including special schools, ELP and all resource bases

Karina Kulawik
Manager for Inclusion, Central SEN Services, DCE
Tel. 01225 713655
Email: karina.kulawik@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23rd June 2011

SEN Equipment Budgets

Purpose of report

1. To update Schools Forum on the process for provision of specialist equipment used to support children & young people with access needs in Wiltshire settings.

Main considerations for School Forum

2. Attached at Appendix 1 is a report from the Inclusion Manager which clarifies the provision of specialist equipment used to support children and young people who require additional specialist equipment to support their access to the curriculum in Early Years and maintained. This paper has been considered by WASSH & PHF.
3. The School Funding Working Group has reviewed the paper and agreed that it should be brought to Schools Forum for confirmation of the process.

Proposals

4. That Schools Forum confirm that process for provision of specialist equipment to support children & young people with access needs in Wiltshire settings.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)
Tel. 01225 713675
Elizabeth.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Provision of equipment to support c&yp with physical access needs in Wiltshire settings.

This document aims to clarify the provision of specialist equipment used to support children and young people who require additional specialist equipment to support their access to the curriculum in Early Years setting and maintained schools in Wiltshire.

Background

Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (as amended by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001) schools and local authorities must make reasonable adjustments to ensure students with a disability are not treated less favourably without justification and must make reasonable adjustments to ensure they are not disadvantaged compared to their peers. For schools the reasonable adjustments duty does not apply to the provision of auxiliary aids and services which currently lies within the SEN Statutory duties. Following a period of consultation it is likely that the Equalities Act 2010 will amend this and require schools to provide auxiliary aids and resources.

Regional arrangements

Information from authorities in the south west indicates that the majority of authorities operate a scheme where schools have to pay the first £250-£500 for each item of equipment. Some authorities operate different schemes for primaries and secondaries whilst others operate the same system across the board. Some authorities also have agreements with health about joint funding of the most expensive equipment. A number of authorities are part of an Integrated Community Equipment Store (ICES) through which large items of equipment are loaned to schools, funded from centrally held funding.

Wiltshire - current situation

In Wiltshire funding for specialist equipment has been retained centrally and managed by individual specialist services. Whilst these services have each developed guidance on what they each would expect settings to provide there has been no formal agreement with schools and settings. There are no formal agreements with Health about what they will provide or joint fund.

Wiltshire - Future options

It is very likely that future equalities legislation will require schools to provide auxiliary aids and resources. It is therefore necessary to consider how this duty will be met by Wiltshire schools. This will clarify existing expectations and ensure equity across Wiltshire.

1. Schools will be expected to purchase all auxiliary aids, including high value items, required under the reasonable adjustments duty to include a pupil with SEN and Disability. All current DSG related budgets to be delegated
2. Schools will be required to pay for auxiliary aids to support inclusion as per attached list. (See attached list) and high value items will be provided by the LA. This option will require continuation of a centrally retained equipment budget.

High value items of equipment that would be provided by the local authority (examples)

Specialist seating e.g. Lecky Chair

One standing frame – R82 Rabbit

Height adjustable changing table

Specialist toilet seats – Blue Wave toilet system

Toilet frames

Hoist and slings

Dynavox High Tech communication aid

Eye-gaze ICT system

ICT packages including specialist peripherals + specialist software package for children and young people with complex sensory and communication needs

High tech AAC equipment

Note:

Insurance and relocation within the school to be the responsibility of the school

Relocation between schools, maintenance and repair will be covered by the local authority

Items of equipment that would be provided by schools (examples)

ICT SEN Entitlement (examples)

Provision by Primary Schools	
Hardware	
Laptop/Desktop system.	The following peripherals:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USB Optical Mouse • Single button mouse • GlidePad touch pad • Mouse Trackerball • Jumbo XL Keyboard • Jumbo XL Keyguard
Software	
Suggested strategies for using the software have been included.	
Clicker 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T A allocated time for making Template grids to input current words needed for a lesson • TA allocated time (30 mins a week) to download Clicker grids from the Internet for use in lessons
Acceleread /Accelewrite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making use of text-to-speech to aid reading skills
Nessy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set tasks and challenges from the games • Set the appropriate level for the pupil to use • Needs to be used regularly
Textease CT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make use of word banks to aid pupil's recording • Make use of text to speech to encourage reading skills
Wordshark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily practice of current IEP targets for literacy • Monitoring and changing levels to ensure progression and progress
Numbershark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily practice of current IEP targets for numeracy • Monitoring and changing levels to ensure progression and progress

Provision by Secondary Schools	
Hardware	
Laptop/Desktop systems.	<p>The following peripherals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USB Optical Mouse • Single button mouse • GlidePad touch pad • Mouse Trackerball • Jumbo XL Keyboard • Jumbo XL Keyguard
Software	
	Suggested strategies for using the software have been included.
Texthelp Read and Write Gold for Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access “anytime, anywhere” in the school • Pupils need to be shown which tools might be helpful to their needs • Don’t use all the tools if it isn’t necessary
SMARTNotebook 10 or Promethean Inspire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of tools that can aid pupils who need basic skills in Maths and English • Gallery contains interactive games and resources that pupils can use effectively • Copies of lessons on Interactive Whiteboards can be accessed by the pupils to help with memory and revision
Wordshark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily practice of current IEP targets for literacy • Monitoring and changing levels to ensure progression and progress
Numbershark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily practice of current IEP targets for numeracy • Monitoring and changing levels to ensure progression and progress

Provision by Special Schools or District Specialist Centres
Hardware
<p>Laptops/Desktop systems and Peripherals</p> <p>For most pupils who attend an SLD special school or District Specialist Centre it is expected that the setting will provide the hardware and software. The Adviser for ICT SEN is able to loan some equipment for a period of no longer than 3 months to help with assessing a piece of equipment suitability for a child.</p>
Software
Schools should have specialized software to meet their pupils needs.

Sensory Impairment (examples)

All Schools to provide	
Laptop	The following peripherals:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USB Optical Mouse • Jumbo XL Keyboard • Flatbed scanner • Magnifying mouse
Other	
Touch Typing software English Type Junior English Type Senior Iota touch typing with speech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning to touch type as advised
PE Equipment for visually impaired Footballs with bells/lead shot High contrast balls, cones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As advised by Advisory Teacher or Children's Mobility Officer
Consumables Heavy lined paper/exercise books/graph paper Batteries for radio aids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase details to be provided
Large/Accessible Print Dictionaries book or CD Thesaurus book or CD Costs of obtaining PDF format text books from publisher Reading scheme DVDs for HI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase details to be provided

Note:

Insurance, relocation, maintenance and repair is the responsibility of the school

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23rd June 2011

Revenue Budget Final Outturn Report 2010/11 – Dedicated Schools Budget

Purpose of the Paper

1. To report on the final outturn position for the dedicated schools budget.

Main Considerations

2. Appendix 1 shows expenditure as at 31st March 2010, the figures show an **underspend against DSG of £2.899 million**. This is a favourable movement of £0.400 million compared with the previous report to Schools Forum. There have been a number of movements in the position since the projection at the end of January and the main variances are outlined below.

Premature Retirement Costs

3. The premature retirement costs budget was underspent by £0.113 million. This reflects the position after the contribution from the council's corporate fund for redundancy costs to fund the additional cost of the LGR severance policy. It is important to note that the Council's severance policy has now changed and there will no longer be a central contribution from the Council to support redundancy costs for support staff in schools.

Special Educational Needs Services

4. The Independent Special Schools budget underspent by £0.343 million. The recoument budget (for placements in other local authority special schools and non-school placements) was also underspent by £0.723 million giving an overall underspend on placement budgets. These budgets have been reduced for 2011/12 in order to fund the additional delegation of SEN funding to primary schools.
5. Expenditure on Named Pupil Allowances showed a small underspend of £0.049 million.

Early Years

6. Early Years budgets underspent by £1.603 million. This underspend, against the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSS) for the free entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds, had been projected through the year and reflects a shortfall in take up of places against the estimate. Take up will be closely monitored in 2011/12.

Young Person's Support Service

7. The YPSS overspent by £0.051 million in 2010/11 following a decision by Schools Forum to allow further expenditure on temporary staffing to meet the statutory provision for excluded pupils.

Other Issues 2010/11

8. Any under or overspend against the Dedicated Schools Grant is to be carried forward in to the following financial year. The underspend of £2.899 million will therefore be rolled forward in to 2011/12. Schools Forum agreed in January that £1.536 million be allocated to fund priorities in the 2011/12 budget. In addition to this, a shortfall in the management review savings estimated to be achieved from DSG budgets reduces the remaining DSG rollover in 2011/12 to £0.969 million.
9. **Standards Funds** – The DfE wrote to Local Authorities in March stating that the final payment of 2010/11 standards funds would not be made to LAs as the funding was now included in the DSG for 2011/12. LAs disagreed with this approach and the non payment does in fact represent a reduction in grant in 2010/11. For Wiltshire the reduction is £1.088 million.
10. Following representations from the LGA and ADCS the DfE then wrote again to LAs in late April confirming that they should set up a debtor in the 2010/11 accounts to reflect the 2010/11 standards funds instalment being made as part of the 2011/12 DSG, and then also accrue at the end of 2011/12 to reflect the funding of 2011/12 grant as part of the 2012/13 DSG. In Wiltshire we have complied with this guidance and set up a debtor for £1.088 million in the 2010/11 accounts. The risk of this approach is that the money will not be forthcoming in 2012/13 and therefore the Council will face a reduction in schools funding in that year.
11. E-mail correspondence from other LAs indicates a variety of approaches being taken. Not all authorities are following DfE advice and are, instead, trying to deal with the reduction in funding in 2010/11 and write off the loss now from DSG underspend. In Wiltshire we have committed up to £1.9 million of the 2010/11 DSG underspend to supporting the 2011/12 budget. Based on the final outturn figure that still leaves £0.969 million uncommitted. This remaining underspend could be used to write off the loss of standards funds in 2010/11 however the risk of this approach is that we do not yet know the final grant settlement for 2011/12, nor the full impact of academy recouperment for in year conversions.
12. My recommendation at this stage would be to leave the standards funds debtor in the accounts until the final DSG settlement for 2011/12 is known and then review options for any remaining 2010/11 underspend. A report will need to be taken to Schools Forum at that stage. It is hoped that the final DSG settlement will be received prior to the Schools Forum meeting on 23rd June.

Proposal

13. The Schools Forum is asked to:
 - a) Note the outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Budget in 2010/11
 - b) To note the issues relating to the 2010/11 standards funds and to consider this further once the final DSG settlement for 2011/12 is confirmed.

Report Author:

Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)

DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN AND EDUCATION
Dedicated Schools Budget Outturn 2010/11

Financial Monitoring

Service Areas	Approved Budget 2010/11 £m	Outturn 2010/11 £m	Variation for Year £m
1 Funding Schools			
DSG Funded Expenditure - Delegated budgets & contingency	209.551	209.635	0.084
Total	209.551	209.635	0.084
2 Schools & Learning Branch			
Independent Special Schools	5.426	5.082	-0.343
Named Pupil Allowances	3.625	3.576	-0.049
Special Recoupment	1.727	1.004	-0.723
Learning Support Team	0.534	0.540	0.006
Other SEN	0.411	0.229	-0.182
Total SEN	11.723	10.432	-1.291
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service	0.430	0.431	0.001
Travellers Education Service	0.283	0.267	-0.016
Local Collaborative Partnerships	0.153	0.140	-0.014
Other School Improvement Services	0.019	0.019	0.000
Total School Improvement	0.885	0.857	-0.029
Early Years Single Funding Formula	11.442	9.839	-1.603
Other Early Years Services	1.372	1.372	0.000
Total Early Years	12.814	11.211	-1.603
School Buildings & Places	0.341	0.262	-0.080
Total Schools & Learning	25.763	22.761	- 3.002
3 Targeted Services			
YPSS	2.246	2.297	0.051
Behaviour Support	0.991	0.997	0.006
EOTAS Recoupment	0.123	0.186	0.063
PASISS Teams	0.923	0.901	-0.022
Other Targeted Services	0.180	0.211	0.031
Total Targeted Services	4.463	4.592	0.129
4 Commissioning & Performance			
Schools Maternity Costs	0.911	0.919	0.008
Schools PRC - New Cases	0.507	0.394	-0.113
SIMS Licence	0.199	0.199	0.001
Other services	0.275	0.258	-0.017
Total	1.891	1.770	- 0.121
5 Safeguarding			
Child Protection in Schools	0.040	0.040	0.000
Total	0.040	0.040	-
6 Children's Social Care			
Looked After Children Education Service	0.150	0.259	0.109
Total	0.150	0.259	0.109
9 DSG Within Corporate Services			
Gross Expenditure	3.535	3.438	-0.097
Total	3.535	3.438	- 0.097
Total Dedicated Schools Grant	245.393	242.495	- 2.899

Note POSITIVE variances = OVERSPEND

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23 June 2011

Keeping in Touch Days (KIT days)

Purpose of the paper

1. To decide whether KIT days should continue to be funded out of the Maternity Budget or by individual schools.

Background

2. Under current legislation KIT days enable an employee on maternity leave to do up to a maximum of 10 days work as long as both the member of staff and the manager have agreed for this to happen and agreement has been reached on what work will be undertaken during this time. The type of work may be normal day to day activity to assist the return to work process, enabling attendance at a conference, undertaking a training activity or attending a meeting for example.
3. Payment for KIT days is at normal daily rate and can be taken in either full or half days. If the employee is still receiving SMP it will cease for each KIT day worked and will be replaced with normal pay based on the number of hours worked. Payment for KIT days will not exceed normal full pay. If maternity pay has reduced to half plus SMP, the employees pay will cease and be replaced with normal pay based on the number of hours worked during the KIT day. If she is in the unpaid period of maternity leave payment will be made at the normal hourly rate for all hours worked during the KIT day. This arrangement only applies to KIT days
4. The cost of KIT days in 2010-11 was £24,842. The number of schools claiming was 45 with one school claiming £2,033.

Main Considerations

5. When KIT days were introduced there was no discussion as to whether the costs should be borne centrally or by individual schools.
6. As the arrangements for KIT days rests with schools and each individual, it could be argue that the cost should be met by schools. On the other hand KIT days are beneficial to an organisation and, if schools were to bear the cost, this could lead to KIT days not being agreed, for instance where a school budget is under financial pressure.

Proposal

7. That Schools Forum considers the above and decides how KIT days should be funded.

Recommendation

8. That Schools Forum decides whether to continue to fund KIT days centrally or to charge individuals schools.
9. If Schools Forum decides that schools should bear the cost individually, it is recommended that the effective date of this change is the 1 April 2011.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Department for Children & Education

Unpublished documents relied upon in the production of this Report: NONE

Environmental impact of the recommendations contained in this Report: NONE
KNOWN

Report Author:

Phil Cooch, Principal Accountant (Schools), Children & Education, Finance
Team

Tel: 01225 713814

e-mail: phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23rd June 2011

Consultation on School Funding Reform

Purpose of Report

1. To bring to the attention of Schools Forum the two consultations published by the Department for Education (DfE) and to summarise Wiltshire's response.

Background

2. In the White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* the Government set out its view that the current school funding system is opaque, full of anomalies and unfair and therefore in need of reform. The White Paper signalled the Government's intention to consult on the merits of moving towards a national funding formula which ensures clear, transparent and fairer funding for all schools, including Academies and Free Schools, based on the needs of pupils.
3. Following this the DfE has published two consultation documents:
 - *A consultation on school funding reform: Rationale and Principles*
 - *Academies pre-16 funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year*

Main Considerations

4. The closing date for both consultations was 25th May 2011 and Wiltshire's responses are attached as Appendices 1 and 2 to this report. In each case the response is a joint response from the Council and Schools Forum. The Schools Forum response was agreed at a meeting of the Schools Funding Working Group on 20th May and it should be noted that the views of the group include the views of head teachers from both maintained schools and academies in Wiltshire.

A Consultation on School Funding Reform: Rationale and Principles

5. This represents the first stage in the consultation on funding reform and invites views on the aims and objectives of a school funding system and high level principles for any reform. It is expected that a more detailed consultation will be published in the summer to look at the operation of any national formula.
6. The document outlines the key difficulties with the current funding system which are:

- It is opaque and extremely complex
 - It is unfair as it leads to schools with similar intakes receiving very difficult levels of funding
 - It fails to reflect need accurately
 - It does not support the new school system
7. Wiltshire would agree with all of these points. The table included in response to question 3 (Appendix 1) illustrates the differences in per pupil funding received under the current funding regime in Wiltshire compared with its neighbouring authorities. These differences are historical and without a needs led formula can no longer be explained.
8. The consultation document then goes on to consider the idea of a national fair funding formula for schools and to seek views on the degree of local flexibility that should be allowed within such a formula.
9. A key issue for Wiltshire is that any formula needs to reflect issues associated with rurality. For Wiltshire schools this may mean reflecting the existence of pockets of deprivation within villages, the number of small schools and the potential for federated and amalgamated schools operating from more than one site. Our current local formula also recognises the difficulties for service schools of high levels of turbulence in pupil numbers. For this reason the response notes that we would support a degree of local flexibility. In order to ensure that academies, free schools and maintained schools are funded on an equal footing, which is a stated objective of the consultation, the response stresses that per pupil funding coming in to Wiltshire for each type of school should be the same under any national formula even if local authorities then have a degree of flexibility in the formula for maintained schools.
10. The consultation also highlights issues relating to the funding of high cost pupils with special educational needs or who are disabled. It should be noted that the consultation questions are the same as those included in the DfE consultation document *Support and aspiration: a new approach to special needs and disability*. The proposals explore the idea of a national banded funding framework to ensure that the descriptors of need are consistent across all areas however it is not proposed that funding values would be ascribed to these bands at a national level, rather that local leaders would have the flexibility to meet the needs of disabled young people and in their own area. This indicates that the DfE intends for a degree of local flexibility around special educational needs funding.
11. Finally the document looks at potential timescales for change and the potential level of change that schools could manage. Wiltshire would be keen to move towards a fair funding mechanism that better reflects the relative needs of pupils in the county. In the response we have identified that the work should begin in 2012/13 for implementation in 2013/14.

Academies Pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year

12. This document looks specifically at the model for funding academies in the 2012/13 financial year, reflecting the DfE view that the current model is

unsustainable and will need to be changed for the 2012/13 year regardless of whether a national fair funding formula is in place. Within the document the following difficulties with the current academies funding model are identified:

- The process is not transparent
- It does not quickly reflect local circumstances
- There is a risk of error in the process of replicating local authority formulae
- The process becomes more difficult with the increasing number of academies
- It is not sustainable
- It is not administratively efficient

13. Again, Wiltshire would agree with all of the difficulties highlighted. Academies are funded on a lagged basis in which the local authority formula for the previous financial year is replicated by the DfE and updated for September pupil numbers. This is administratively burdensome as the DfE needs staff to replicate and understand the funding formula for each local authority whilst Councils also need to calculate a budget for each academy in order to inform the DfE on the amount to recoup from the Dedicated Schools Grant each year.

14. The document proposes 3 potential funding systems for academies in 2012/13:

- **Roll forward** – this is the DfE’s preferred option and would result in the per pupil funding received by each school in the current year being rolled forward in to 2012/13, with budgets being updated for pupil numbers. It is argued that this is the simplest method however it results in the funding for academies being even less reflective of local circumstances as it would still be based on per pupil funding in the 2010/11 local authority formula.
- **A fair funding formula for academies only** – this could give an opportunity to trial a fair funding formula however would result in academy funding moving away from comparable maintained schools in the same area.
- **Local Authority based calculations** – this would require local authorities to calculate budgets using the formulae they already hold. Wiltshire has responded that this would be our preferred approach as it is administratively more straightforward and these calculations are already being done at local authority level.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

15. None identified.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

16. A core principle of the two consultation documents is that pupils should be funded according to need and that differences in funding between comparable schools should be minimized. It is also a stated principle that

different types of schools ie, maintained schools, academies and free schools should be funded on an equal footing.

Risk Assessment

17. No specific risks are identified arising from the responses to these initial consultation documents. The implications of the detailed changes in the phase 2 consultation document will require detailed analysis to establish the impact on funding for schools and support services in Wiltshire.

Financial Implications

18. This report outlines the response to consultations on school funding reform. At present only the rationale and principles are explored and it is expected that financial implications will be clearer once the DfE finalises the proposals for the next stage of the consultation. The financial implications of any changes to the school funding regime will impact on all schools in Wiltshire and on funding for support services currently funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Legal Implications

19. None identified.

Proposal

20. Members are asked to note the responses to the consultations on schools funding reform.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report Author:

Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)
Elizabeth.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk , 01225 713675

Date of report: 27 May 2011

Background Papers

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – A consultation on schools funding reform: rationale and principles. Response from Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire Schools Forum

Appendix 2 – Academies pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year. Response from Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire Schools Forum

A consultation on school funding reform: rationale and principles

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is:

25 May 2011

Your comments must reach us by that date.

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Children, Schools and Families consultation website www.education.gov.uk/consultations

The information you provide in your response will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations, which allow public access to information held by the Department. This does not necessarily mean that your response can be made available to the public as there are exemptions relating to information provided in confidence and information to which the Data Protection Act 1998 applies. You may request confidentiality by ticking the box provided, but you should note that neither this, nor an automatically-generated e-mail confidentiality statement, will necessarily exclude the public right of access.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Name Elizabeth Williams

Organisation (if applicable) Wiltshire Council & Wiltshire Schools Forum

Address: Wiltshire Council
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
BA14 8JB

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either

Juliet Yates on: Telephone: 020 7340 8313 e-mail: juliet.yates@education.gsi.gov.uk,
or

Ian McVicar on: Telephone: 020 7340 7980 e-mail: ian.mcvicar@education.gsi.gov.uk

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Consultation Unit by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk, by Fax: 01928 794 311, or by telephone: 0870 000 2288.

Appendix 1

Please tick the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> School	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Trade Union / Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Early Years Setting
<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent / Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

If 'Other' Please Specify:

This is a joint response between the LA and Schools Forum in Wiltshire

1. Do you agree with the stated characteristics of an ideal school funding system? (Section 2)

X All Some None Not Sure

Comments:

A school funding system should have the characteristics outlined in the document, ie.,

- Distribute money in a fair and logical way
- Distribute extra resources to the pupils who need them most
- Be transparent and easy to understand and explain
- Support a diverse range of school provision on a level playing field
- Provide value for money and ensure proper use of public funds

The funding system should be able to ensure that funds are directed to need but it is more difficult for the system itself to ensure that all funds are spent appropriately.

It is important that the methodology used to determine that resources are directed towards need are understood to be fair so that relative differences between LA areas and schools can be understood.

2. Are there further characteristics the system should have? (Section 2)

X Yes No Not Sure

If 'Yes', what are they?

Previous funding systems have included stability and predictability as aims, these are not stated here.

Some recognition of local needs for example, rurality, for example small schools and different types of federation and amalgamations with split sites, and service schools, specifically needs not reflected in the pupil premium for service pupils, for example the fluctuations in pupil numbers within this type of school.

3. Do you agree with the analysis of how the current system falls short of these aims? (Section 3)

X Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

We would agree that the current system, at a high level, has the flaws identified in the document, ie.,

- It is opaque and complex
- It is unfair as comparable schools in different parts of the country receive different levels of funding
- It fails to reflect need accurately
- It does not support the new school system

Within these constraints LAs have been able to reflect local need within their formulae however this is within the overall quantum set by the national allocation of funding. This has been the role of Schools Forum in partnership with the local authority.

Under the current system Wiltshire has consistently received lower levels of funding than its neighbouring authorities with little transparency as to how this reflects levels of need. An example of the impact can be seen in the table below which compares the Guaranteed Unit of Funding in Wiltshire compared with neighbouring authorities:

Pupils per DSG Calculator		63895			
Local Authority	GUF 2011-12	Difference	Total increased GUF if Wiltshire funded at the same level	Potential extra funding that a 200 pupil primary school would receive	Potential extra funding that a 1000 pupil secondary school would receive
Wiltshire	4593	0	£0		
Hampshire	4648	55	£3,514,225	£11,000	£55,000
BANES	4788	195	£12,459,525	£39,000	£195,000
Glos	4661	68	£4,344,860	£13,600	£68,000
Swindon	4696	103	£6,581,185	£20,600	£103,000
Dorset	4683	90	£5,750,550	£18,000	£90,000
North Somerset	4677	84	£5,367,180	£16,800	£84,000
Somerset	4668	75	£4,792,125	£15,000	£75,000

4. Do you agree with the case for reforming the system?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

The current system is based on “spend plus” and therefore perpetuates a historical funding position. A formula would be more responsive to the level of need in a particular area. See the analysis in the response to Q3 to indicate the impact of this.

5. Do you agree that the aim of ensuring all deprived pupils get the same level of funding no matter where they live is the right one? (Section 4)

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

The amount of funding for deprivation coming in to a LA area has been difficult to identify and has been based on the position in 2005/06, the position in Wiltshire has changed since then and recent SOA data suggests that levels of deprivation in Wiltshire are increasing. This proposal would ensure that the funding Wiltshire receives for deprived pupils is the same as in other parts of the country.

The allocation of a level of funding for schools based on individual pupils is a mechanism for ensuring that schools are funded for the needs of the pupils in the school at that time. It would be necessary to ensure that funding coming in to the LA also includes an element of deprivation to enable services to reflect need. Currently pupils from deprived areas get the same level of additional funding but the base funding for deprivation is in the overall allocation of DSG to the LA and is not consistent between areas.

Wiltshire Schools Forum would also stress that an appropriate measure of deprivation needs to be used – currently the Wiltshire formula is felt to be more responsive to need through the use of post code data rather than the FSM measure used for the

pupil premium.

6. Do you agree the underlying funding formula needs to change to meet this aim more quickly and effectively?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:
What is meant by the “underlying formula”
There may be transitional issues if funding shifts from a per pupil basis to more funding being allocated on the basis of deprivation.
Wiltshire does not support the use of FSM data as the basis for allocating funds for deprivation.

7. Do you think the school funding system should be based on a purely national formula? Or should there be flexibility for local decisions about funding levels? (Section 5)

Purely National Some local flexibility A lot of local flexibility Not Sure

Comments:

A purely national formula would limit Schools Forum's role in determining the allocation of resources across schools in a LA area.

Para 5.3 suggest a national formula that stated the aggregate level of funding for maintained schools in each authority but allowed LAs to vary the actual budgets for schools to meet local circumstances or locally agreed priorities. The advantage of this proposal is that the national allocation of funding to a LA area could be reformed whilst still allowing LAs and Schools Forums to agree and reflect local priorities. A disadvantage would still be the difficulty in making comparisons between comparable schools in different areas and a potential difference in levels of funding for academies and maintained schools in an area plus the impact of the increasing number of academies in any LA area. If the underlying level of funding per pupil for academies and maintained schools were the same in any LA area then differences between the funding formula for each type of school would have less impact and could be perceived as fair.

8. If so, should that flexibility be limited, and if so how? (Section 5)

Yes

No

X Not Sure

How?

Flexibility is currently limited by the constraints of the overall funding total and by the overarching priorities.

9. If there is local flexibility, what should the roles of local authorities, schools and the Schools Forum be in decision making? (Sections 5 and 6)

Local authorities:

Local authorities will set strategy and priorities in partnership with Schools Forum and other schools within the area

Schools:

Schools will still be responsible for meeting the needs of the pupils on their roll

Schools Forum:

Schools Forum will work in partnership with the local authority to set strategy around funding and to allocate funding for schools in the LA area including academies and free schools

Comments:

10. If there is local flexibility for maintained schools, how should Academies and Free Schools be funded? (Section 5)

Through the fair
funding formula

Taking into account
local decisions

X Not Sure

Comments:

It is a stated aim of the funding system that academies and free schools should be funded on a level playing field so that no type of school is financially advantaged or disadvantaged by the system. In order to achieve that it would be necessary to take in to account the elements of local flexibility in the funding of non maintained state schools.

If the per pupil funding coming in to Wiltshire is the same across all types of school then it would still be possible to have flexibility for maintained schools whilst applying a national fair funding formula to academies and free schools in the area. This could still be perceived as fair. If the level of per pupil funding coming in to the county varies across types of schools then this would create more problems in applying differential formulae.

11. How do you think SEN support services might be funded so that schools, Academies, Free Schools and other education providers have access to high quality SEN support services? (Section 7)

Comments:

A core level of service should be provided by the local authority. It is more important to define the level and type of service than how it should be funded.

12. How do you think a national banded funding framework for children and young people with SEN or who are disabled could improve the transparency of funding decisions to parents while continuing to allow for local flexibility? (Section 7)

Comments:

A concern might be that if a national framework of descriptors is developed but funding levels are agreed locally parents will not be able to understand the differences between funding levels in different LA areas or between types of schools when they are apparently funding the same level of need.

Should the banding framework include funding for health needs and social care?

13. How can the different funding arrangements for specialist provision for young people pre-16 and post-16 be aligned more effectively to provide a more consistent approach to support for children and young people with SEN or who are disabled from birth to 25? (Section 7)

Comments:

Funding for post 16 pupils in 6th forms needs to be updated from the 2000/01 position on which it is based.

It would be important to consider not just the alignment of pre and post 16 funding but also funding streams for health and social care to reduce the bureaucracy in allocating funding for pupils with complex needs.

14. How successfully has the EYSFF been implemented? How might it be improved? (Section 8)

X Very Fairly A little Not at all Not Sure

Comments:

Wiltshire's EYSFF has been in place since April 2010 and has already been reviewed with some minor changes implemented following consultation.

There is a tension between the complexity of the formula and the principle of fairness – some providers consider that the formula is too complicated but that has to be balanced with the need to reflect a wide range of providers plus other issues including rurality and sustainability.

15. How important is an element of local flexibility in free early education funding? What might alternative approaches look like? (Section 8)

Very Fairly A little Not at all Not Sure

Comments:

The national rate included within the funding for 2 year olds is well understood by providers. This suggests that it would be possible to implement a national formula for 3 and 4 year olds but some element of local flexibility would be required, eg for rural settings.

A national formula that included rates for 3 different providers – maintained nurseries, PVI settings and childminders – could be combined with a smaller degree of local flexibility.

The question of how to meet the needs of high cost pupils within the EYSFF has not been answered in Wiltshire with funding being allocated to settings outside of the main formula. Would it be possible to include Early Years in the national banding framework?

16. How should we identify the total amount of funding for early years and free early education for three year olds and four year olds not in reception from within the overall amount of 3-16 funding? (Section 8)

Comments:

If there is a formulaic approach to schools then a similar approach could be taken for the funding of the free entitlement in early years settings. There is overlap with maintained nurseries so a consistent approach may be easier to understand and explain.

17. Should the formula include only pupil led factors or also school led factors? (Section 9)

Only pupil-led factors

Include school-led factors

Not Sure

Comments:

Include school led factors

The Wiltshire formula currently includes site specific factors, for example the split site allowance, small school curriculum protection and a service schools factor which reflects the additional challenges from turbulence in pupil numbers. The Wiltshire formula also recognises significant in year increases in pupil numbers.

18. What factors should be included? (Section 9)

Comments:

Any funding formula should take in to account rurality and associated issues such as small schools and split site schools (arising from federations and amalgamations).

19. What is the right balance between simplicity and complexity? (Section 9)

Comments:

The current spend plus system of funding is simple however it is not perceived as fair or transparent.

There needs to be enough complexity to enable the formula to be responsive to the relative differences in need between areas

20. What level of change in budgets per year can schools manage? (Section 10)

Comments:

It is difficult to specify a level without considering transition periods. It is also dependent on the degree of predictability associated with the change and also stability in not having significant swings in funding from year to year.

21. How much time do schools need to plan for changes in their funding? (Section 10)

3 months 3 – 6 months 6 – 12 months More than 1 year Not Sure

Comments:

**22. When is the right time to start moving towards a fair funding formula?
(Section 10)**

X	2012 – 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	2013 – 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	2014 – 15	<input type="checkbox"/>	2015 – 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Sure
---	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	-------------

Comments:

It would be important to start moving towards a fair funding formula in 2012/13 for implementation in 2013/14

23. Have you any further comments?

Comments:

A key issue for Wiltshire is the recognition of the needs of pupils in rural areas and the additional costs of providing services for example small village schools.

Wiltshire is keen to move towards a fair funding formula and away from a historical method of funding as differences between funding for schools in Wiltshire and neighbouring authorities cannot be understood.

The views from the Wiltshire Schools Forum in this response reflect the views of both academies and maintained schools in Wiltshire.

Appendix 1

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 794304 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 25 May 2011

Send by e-mail to: schoolfunding.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

Send by post to:

Ian McVicar
Funding Policy and Efficiency Team
4th Floor
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT

Academies Pre-16 Funding: Options for the 2012/13 Academic Year

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is: 25 May
2011

Your comments must reach us by that date.

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Education e-consultation website (<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>).

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Reason for confidentiality:

Name Elizabeth Williams
Organisation (if applicable) Wiltshire Schools Forum
Address: c/o Wiltshire Council
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire BA14 8JB

Appendix 2

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either:

Annie Raw (telephone: 020 7340 8143) or Victoria Ismail (telephone: 020 7783 8682)

e-mail: AcademiesFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

If you have a query relating to the consultation process you can contact the Consultation Unit by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Appendix 2

Please mark ONE box that best describes you as a respondent

<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input type="checkbox"/> School applying for academy status	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained School
<input type="checkbox"/> Academy Sponsor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Union/Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

Please Specify:

Appendix 2

1 Do you agree with our analysis that the current system is not appropriate to fund an increasing number of Academies in a fair and transparent way? (see section 2 in the consultation document)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

The current system is administratively inefficient for both the DfE and for LA staff and there is considerable duplication.

The funding of Academies on a lagged basis means that the budget for an academy may not be reflective of local conditions and of the local funding formula, meaning academies are not funded on a consistent basis with neighbouring schools – this may be to their advantage or disadvantage.

The current funding system is not sustainable as LACSEG adjustments will be on an ever decreasing base.

2 Do you agree with the principles for an alternative method of funding Academies in 2012/13? (see section 3 in the consultation document)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All	<input type="checkbox"/> Some	<input type="checkbox"/> None
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure		

Comments:

Appendix 2

3 Are there other aims we should have for the Academy funding system in the absence of cross-system reform, such as a Fair Funding Formula? If yes, what are they?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Savings and efficiencies could be achieved through reducing the administrative burden of the funding system. This could go as far as requiring LAs to calculate budgets for academies, which would reduce the need for replication of the formula at DfE level and reduce the lag in reflecting local circumstances.

4 Do you agree with the broad analysis of how each option might work? (see section 4 in the consultation document)

All

Some

None

Not Sure

Comments:

Roll Forward – this method rolls forward the per pupil school budget share from the previous year's budgets, prior to MFG application. The benefit of this method is that it is simple and easy to explain. It also minimises turbulence in budgets for academies which is important in an interim funding regime. A potential disadvantage is that academy funding becomes further removed from that of maintained schools in the same area because it will still be based on the 2010/11 formula, meaning that funding is not equivalent between all types of schools.

Fair Funding Formula for Academies – a single formula would be developed for academies. This would mean academies are funded in a consistent way and is a potential way of trialling a fair funding formula. A risk may be that the current number of academies may not reflect the overall school population in terms of numbers and needs – for example there are significantly more

Appendix 2

secondary academies than primary academies. An extensive consultation would still be required with all schools to develop a fair funding formula for all schools – which may cause further turbulence for academies with successive changes in funding regime.

Local Authority Based Calculations - this would involve LAs calculating academy budgets based on their current formulae. The advantage of this option would be to remove the lagging from the current system and reduce the bureaucracy of needing to replicate LA formulae at DfE level. There is little implication for LAs in this option as authorities already calculate budgets for academies in order to determine the recoupment amount from the DSG settlement. It could be argued that this option would result in academies being more reliant on the LA and its formula although a counter argument to this could be that it creates a level playing field between schools in an area and could reflect local circumstances more consistently.

We disagree that this would mean academies would receive later notification of their funding than they currently do, because in practice converting academies have not yet received notification of indicative budgets for 2011/12.

5 Which option do you think is the best way of funding Academies in 2012/13? (see section 4 in the consultation document)

<input type="checkbox"/> Roll forward	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair funding formula for Academies only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local authority based calculations
<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure		

Comments:

LAs already carry out the calculation and this would be the method with the least administrative burden.

6 Are there potential advantages and disadvantages in implementing each option that we have not considered? If yes, what are they?

Appendix 2

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

Increase in lag to academy budgets if the roll forward option is implemented could mean more turbulence when a fair funding formula is implemented across all sectors.

7 Are there changes you think we should consider to the way the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) is calculated for FY2012/13? If yes, what are they? (see section 5 in the consultation document)

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

The current LACSEG methodology does not reflect the need or usage of a particular service.

The LA funded element of the LACSEG has already been taken in to account in the 2012/13 funding settlement and so could not be changed.

Would a straight % deduction be a more straightforward method of calculating the LACSEG?

8 What factors would you want us to take into consideration if we were to make changes?

Appendix 2

Comments:

Keep the interim model simple and ensure a quick move towards a national formula

9 Have you any further comments?

Comments:

The views from the Wiltshire Schools Forum in this response reflect the views of both academies and maintained schools in Wiltshire.

This response also reflects the views of Wiltshire Council and is a joint response.

Appendix 2

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

Appendix 2

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 738212 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 25 May 2011

Send by post to: Annie Raw, Academy Funding and Finance Team, Department for Education, Level 3, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT.

Send by e-mail to: AcademiesFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23 June 2011

Controls on Surplus Balances – Intended Use of Reserves 2009/10 Update

Purpose of the paper

1. To update Schools Forum on the use of reserves carried forward from 2009/10 in respect of those schools that exceeded the permissible revenue rollover threshold.

Background

2. The Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme came into effect in the 2006/07 financial year.

3. The Scheme prescribes limits on schools revenue balances carried forward from one year to the next. Primary and Special Schools may carry forward 8% or £10,000, whichever is the greatest, and Secondary Schools may carry forward 5%.

4. Under the rules of the scheme schools may assign revenue balances in excess of the allowable thresholds for specific purposes as set out in the scheme, i.e. for projects of a capital nature and ring fenced grants.

Update on current position

5. There were fifty one schools, at the end of 2009/10, who had balances in excess of their prescribed threshold. As part of the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme monitoring process, the schools were required to confirm by 31st March 2011 that they had utilised the excess reserves for the purposes they had originally stated. If they had not, they were asked to describe how those reserves had or would be used.

6. Forty two schools were asked to complete an Intended Use of Revenue Balances Monitoring Return, or respond in writing, for the financial year 2009/10.

The remaining nine were not required to submit a return as follows:

- a) Closure – *one school*
- b) Conversion to academy status – *one school*
- c) Reserves assigned to trigger allocations made late in the 2009/10 year – *two schools*
- d) Reserves assigned to continuity of staffing as agreed in 2008/09 – *one school*
- e) Excess balance deemed immaterial – *one school*
- f) Reserves clawed back following an unsuccessful appeal to Schools Funding Working Group 2008/09 – *two schools*
- g) Referred to Schools Funding Working Group, decision deferred – *one school*

7. Responses from the forty two schools who were requested to confirm that they had utilised their excess reserves for the purposes they had originally stated can be summarised as follows:

a) Forty one schools have confirmed that their reserves have been/or will be used as intended with eight reporting that expenditure is either delayed or ongoing

b) One school advised that they were the banker school for the ICE cluster Collaborative Partnership Activities. The balance, which is unspent, will be returned to the Trowbridge Area Partnership.

Conclusions

8. The returns indicate that schools have used, or intend to use, their reserves for the purposes they were originally intended with no reassignments being reported.

Recommendations

9. Schools Forum is recommended to note the contents of this report.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Department for Children & Education

Unpublished documents relied upon in the production of this Report: NONE

Environmental impact of the recommendations contained in this Report: NONE KNOWN

Report author:

Phil Cooch., Principal Accountant (Schools), Children & Education Finance Team,
Resources Department
Tel: 01225 713814
e-mail: phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

23rd June 2011

Report from the Schools Forum School Funding Working Group

Purpose of report

1. To report on the meeting of the School Funding Working Group held on 13th June 2011

Main considerations for School Forum

2. The draft minutes of the meeting are attached at Appendix 1.
3. The School Funding Working Group made the following recommendations:

4. ***SEN Equipment Budgets***

Having considered a report on the provision of specialist equipment used to support children and young people with access needs in Wiltshire settings it was agreed that the report should be taken to Schools Forum.

5. ***Keeping in Touch (KIT) Days***

It was agreed that a paper detailing the regulations relating to KIT days should be brought to Schools Forum to enable a decision on the funding.

6. ***Pupil Premium for Looked After Children***

The group recommended that the preferred method of payment should be to link the pupil premium with the payment of funding for the Personal Education Plan (PEP) for each child.

Proposals

7. That Schools Forum note the recommendations made by the Schools Funding Working Group.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)
01225 713675
Elizabeth.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Schools Forum Schools Funding Working Group

Minutes – 13th June 2011

Present: Liz Williams, Martin Watson, Phil Cooch, John Hawkins, Catriona Williamson,

		Action
1	<p>Apologies Judith Finney, Carol Grant, Neil Baker, Tristan Williams, John Kimberley</p>	
2	<p>Minutes from Previous Meeting The minutes from the meeting of 7th January 2011 were agreed. There were no matters arising.</p>	
3	<p>SEN Equipment Budgets A report from Karina Kulawik outlining the provision of specialist equipment used to support children and young people with access needs in Wiltshire settings was considered by the group. The paper had already been considered at WASSH and PHF and following those meetings lists had been appended to the paper outlining what equipment the local authority should provide and what equipment the setting should provide.</p> <p>It was agreed that the paper should be taken to Schools Forum for consideration.</p>	
4	<p>Revenue Budget Outturn 2010/11 EW tabled a paper summarising the revenue outturn position for 2010/11 for the Dedicated Schools Budget. The report showed a final underspend of £2.899 million against the DSG for 2010/11, an increase of £0.4 million since the previous report to Schools Forum.</p> <p>The main changes from the January position were a reduction in the overspend against the maternity budget and an underspend against the PRC budget which had previously been projected to overspend. The group considered the position on the PRC budget, EW outlined that there had been difficulties in accessing details of transactions on the PRC and maternity budgets since the implementation of SAP payroll and the projection had been based on the numbers of estimates provided by HR through the year – it was likely that not all of these had actually been implemented. EW noted that there had been a significant number of estimates provided for the current financial year but that was partly because of the late issue of budgets which may have led schools to enter in to redundancy processes that they may not now have had to complete.</p> <p>The group requested that a summary of schools budgets for 2011/12 compared with 2010/11 be produced for Schools Forum as part of the final DSG paper.</p> <p>EW outlined the position with respect to Standards Funds for 2010/11 and the late notification from the DfE that the final instalment would</p>	PC

	<p>not be paid. Wiltshire Council has complied with DfE guidance in the 2010/11 accounts to provide for the final 2010/11 instalment being paid as part of the 2011/12 DSG however this gives a potential risk in 2012/13 if the instalment is not paid. The group considered the risk and agreed that we should await the final DSG settlement before considering whether the risk could be reduced in the current year. CW asked whether programmes such as the Every Child programmes could be reduced this year in order to reduce the potential deficit.</p>	
5	<p>Keeping in Touch (KIT) Days The group considered the issue of KIT days which EW highlighted were currently funded from the central maternity budget. the total costs for 2010/11 were £24,824 with the highest payment to any single school being £2,033. Nationally the guidance is unclear as to whether these costs should be borne centrally or by individual schools.</p> <p>It was requested that a paper be brought to Schools Forum to consider how KIT days should be paid for.</p>	EW/PC
6	<p>Schools Financial Value Statement (SFVS) Consultation PC outlined the details of the recent consultation on the proposed Schools Financial Value Statement (SFVS) which is proposed as a replacement to the FMSiS which has now ceased to be a requirement for schools.</p> <p>The statement is based on a self assessment questionnaire that is to be completed and signed off by the school governing body. There is no external assessment however the Chief Financial Officer for the LA is required to sign an assurance statement that the SFVS is being used to inform the authority's audit programme for schools.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council had responded to the consultation stating that the main concern is that there is no requirement for schools to provide evidence to back up the final statement. EW and PC also fed back that they had commenced work with the Internal Audit Team to look at the implications for the Council's audit programme for schools.</p>	
7	<p>Pupil Premium for Looked After Children EW informed the group that no payments had yet been made to schools in respect of the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children (LAC). Technical guidance had now been issued outlining which LAC should be included in the scope for the grant. The grant allocation is to be based on the number of children who had been looked after for more than 6 months continuously in the year ending 31 March 2011 – the technical guidance confirmed that pupils could become eligible for the premium at any point during the year and could also cease to be eligible. This means that unlike the main pupil premium grant the funding is associated with individual young people and therefore it will be possible to under or overspend against the grant each year depending on the numbers of children eligible through the year.</p> <p>EW outlined that two potential methods of payment have been considered for the premium for LAC. Firstly a termly payment (3 terms) based on a census of eligible LAC in which one third of the</p>	

	<p>£430 premium would be paid to the school attended by each eligible child at the start of each “old” term. The second proposal is that the premium be linked to the Personal Education Plan for each LAC and paid once the PEP has been agreed. This second option was thought by the group to be less of an administrative burden as the Looked After Children Education Team already has an established system for making payments to schools for the PEP.</p>	
8	<p>Funding for Parent Support Advisers (PSAs) In the budget setting for 2011/12 it was agreed that funding for PSAs should continue to be paid to those schools who were employing the staff. It was further agreed that from 2012/13 the funding should be delegated to all schools on a per pupil basis meaning that schools within each cluster would need to reach agreement on the continued funding of PASs.</p> <p>Questions have been raised as to whether the funding could continue to be separately identified in future years. The group confirmed its view that funding should be delegated from 2012/13 as previously proposed</p>	
11	<p>Any Other Business JH asked about the review of the YPSS – EW confirmed that a verbal update would be brought to the next Schools Forum meeting. It was requested that an updated on principles for the funding model be brought at the same time.</p>	EW/PC
9	<p>Date & Time of Next Meeting Date of Next Meeting Friday 30th September 2011, 8:30am at County Hall</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank