

AGENDA

Meeting: Schools Forum
Place: Council Chamber - Council Offices, Browfort, Devizes
Date: Thursday 19 January 2012
Time: 1.30 pm

Briefing Arrangements:

Briefing will be held at 11.00 am in the Council Chamber, Browfort and will focus on Budget Proposals 2012/13

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Marie Gondlach, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 713 597 or email marie.gondlach@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

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

Membership:	Representing:
Mr N Baker	PHF, Christ Church CE Primary School
Mr Peter Biggs	WGA, Secondary School Governor Representative
Mrs Julia Bird	PHF, Southwick Primary School
Mr David Cowley	Academy Schools, The Wellington Academy
Mrs A Ferries	WGA, Primary Governor Representative
Mrs Judith Finney	PHF, Dilton Marsh Primary School
Mrs Jane Franchi	Salisbury Diocesan Board of Education
Mr Tim Gilson	WASSH, Malmesbury School
Mrs Carol Grant	WASSH, Pewsey Vale
Mr John Hawkins	Teacher representative
Mr Michael Keeling	Maintained Schools with Nursery Representative
Rev Alice Kemp	WGA, SEN Governor Representative
Ms I Lancaster-Gaye	WASSH, SEN Sector, Rowdeford School
Dr Tina Pagett	14-19 Group Representative
Mr J Proctor	Early Years Representative (PVI)
Vacancy	WGA, Primary Governor Representative
Mr M Watson	WASSH, Lavington School
Mrs C Williamson	PHF, Mere Primary School

AGENDA

PART I

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

1. **Apologies and changes to membership**

2. **Minutes of the previous Meeting** (*Pages 1 - 12*)

To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 01 December 2011 (copy attached).

5. **Declaration of Interests**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests.

4. **Chairman's Announcements**

5. **Wiltshire Music Education Hub** (*Pages 13 - 16*)

To consider a report outlining the Council's proposal to seek additional music grant funding and the outcomes to be achieved.

6. **Children and Young People's Trust Board Update**

To receive a verbal update from the Service Director for Commissioning and Performance, Department for Children and Education.

7. **Budget Monitoring** (*Pages 17 - 20*)

To receive budget monitoring information against the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the financial year 2011/12 as at 30th November 2011.

8. **Reports from Working Groups**

To receive a verbal update from the Schools Services Working Group.

There have been no meetings of the:

- School Funding Working Group
- Early Years Reference Group

9. **Carbon Reduction Commitment - Consultation Response** (*Pages 21 - 26*)

To consider a report of the results of the consultation on a proposal to change the Local Authority's Scheme for Funding Schools to incorporate the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRC scheme).

10. **South West Grid for Learning Broadband Connectivity and Services for Wiltshire Schools** (*Pages 27 - 28*)

To consider amendments to the formula.

11. **Young People Support Service budget**

To receive confirmation of the budget to be devolved in 2012/13 and

consideration of an activity led funding model for Pupil Referral Units. – *Report to Follow*

12. **Schools Funding Settlement and Schools Budget Proposals 2012/13**

To consider the revenue budget proposals for the Dedicated Schools Budget for 2012/13 and agreement of the recommendation to be made to Cabinet – *Report to follow*

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

To confirm the dates of future meetings, as follows:

Thursday 1 March 2012	Council Chamber, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER
-----------------------	--

Thursday 21 June 2012	Council Chamber, Bradley Road, Devizes, BA14 0RD
-----------------------	---

Thursday 4 October 2012	Venue to be confirmed
-------------------------	-----------------------

Wednesday 21 November 2012	Venue to be confirmed
----------------------------	-----------------------

14. **Urgent Items**

Any other items of business, which the Chairman agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

Part II

Item(s) during consideration of which 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 1 DECEMBER 2011 AT COMMITTEE ROOM III - COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE.

Present:

Mr N Baker, Mr Peter Biggs, Mrs Julia Bird, Mr Andy Bridewell (Substitute), Mr P Cook (Substitute), Mrs C Grant, Mr J Hawkins, Mr M Keeling, Rev. A Kemp, Mr J Proctor, Mr M Watson and Mrs C Williamson

Also Present:

Mr Ted Hatala, Cllr Alan Macrae and Cllr Bill Moss

178. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

Mrs Rosheen Ryan, WGA, Secondary School Governor Representative

Mrs Ann Ferries, WGA, Primary School Governor Representative

Dr Tina Pagett, 13-19 Partnership

Mr Tim Gilson, Malmesbury, WASSH

Mrs Jane Franchi, Salisbury Dioceses

And also from;

Cllr Lionel Grundy

Carolyn Godfrey

179. **Minutes of the previous Meeting**

Resolved:

To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2011, subject to the inclusion of Mr John Proctor under item no.162, Apologies, and the following amendment:

The final sentence of minute number 170 (School Revenue Balances) to read as follows: "It was pointed out that three schools had failed to assign their excess surplus balances in accordance with the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme and would therefore be sent letters advising them that they would have the excess balance removed, subject to appeal."

Matters arising:

The Head of Finance, DCE, provided figures in relation to Health contributions to Independent Special School placements, as requested at the previous meeting (minute no.168 refers).

Total number of Independent Special School placements:	86
Total cost:	£6.157 million

of which:

Funded wholly by Dedicated Schools Grant	63
Funded by DSG & Social Care	14
Funded by DSG, Social Care and Health	9

The total cost of those 9 placements is £1.198 million, split as follows:

Cost to DSG (Independent Special School budget)	£484,510
Cost to Social Care	£468,448
Cost to Health	£244,545

180. **Declaration of Interests**

None.

181. **Chairman's Announcements**

Cllr Alan Macrae announced that following a re-structure of Portfolio Holders to be announced imminently there will no longer be a portfolio with the dedicated responsibility for Schools. A single portfolio holder will operate across all elements of the Children's Services and Education service area, under the direction of the Cabinet Member Lionel Grundy. Cllr Macrae took the opportunity to thank the Schools Forum for their engaging and welcoming attitude and wished the Forum well in its future work.

In reply the Chairman, on behalf of the Schools Forum thanked Cllr Macrae for his work on the Schools remit and for the positive impact he had made.

182. **Children and Young People's Trust Board Update**

Julia Cramp, Service Director Commissioning & Performance, DCE gave a verbal update on recent work undertaken by the Children and Young People's Trust Board Update.

- **11-19 Commissioning Strategy**

This Strategy had been approved by the Executive at Cabinet in September 2011, following comprehensive consultation across Wiltshire and across age ranges. Implementation will be overseen by the 13-19 Partnership. A highlight of the strategy is the establishment of Youth Advisory Groups in each Community Area.

- **Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Strategy**

A key point for Schools relating to this strategy were the new training being rolled-out across the County to on mental health – which bore the name of the ‘Mental Health First Aid Kit’ – indicative of its nature. All those involved with secondary schools in particular were urged to attend.

A second key development was the launch of guidelines on deliberate self-harm which all those present were urged to note.

- SEN and Disability Pathfinder

The Service Director for Commissioning and Performance, DCE emphasised her willingness to engage schools using WASSH and PHF as the vehicle for communication. She highlighted the possible impact of the government’s aspiration to expand the use of personal budgets for children with special education needs, disabilities and long-term health conditions – stressing that Schools will be key players in the process.

183. Budget Monitoring

The Head of Finance, DCE, Liz Williams outlined the budget position as it stood at the end of October. At this point in the year an underspend of £1.626 million is projected against the overall schools budget. Any underspend at year-end will be rolled forward into the next financial year.

Key pressures and potential areas of underspend are:

- a) Independent Special School Placements

This budget is currently projected to underspend by £0.955 million. This is based on all current and agreed placements. The underspend arises from reduced numbers of placements and the increased number of pupils catered for in Wiltshire Schools.

A further underspend of £0.373 million is projected against the budget for placements in other local authority schools, again based on all current and agreed placements. Changes to charging for special and mainstream placements to be agreed in December may affect this position.

- b) Other Targeted Services

Underspends within the EMAS and Traveller Education Service have arisen due to vacancies and due to the maximisation of the Standards Funds within the EMAS Team.

- c) Early Years Free Entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds

An underspend of £0.175 million is projected against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. This projection is updated termly based on the uptake of the free entitlement across settings.

- d) Premature Retirement Costs

The PRC budget is expected to overspend by £0.122 million based on redundancy cases up to 31st August. This overspend is expected to increase through the year.

- e) Personal Education Plans (Looked After Children)

It is projected that the budget for PEPs will overspend by £0.053 million.

It was confirmed that the £0.175m underspend against the Early Years Free Entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds was projected using a model which reflects each provider's summary statement. Officers replied that that the model does include weightings per the funding formula based on expected take up of places through the year.

Resolved:

To note the Budget monitoring position at the end of October 2012

184. **Reports from Working Groups**

a) **School Funding Working Group**

Officers provided an update on the issues debated by the group and their recommendations. It was explained that with effect from April 2011 the DfE removed the requirement for Local Authorities to have a Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme in place. However, Regulations allow Local Authorities to have a 'Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme' if they wish.

In response to a question it was confirmed that for maintained Schools, contingency funds were within the scope of the clawback as they were considered as part of the balance as a whole. For Academy schools different thresholds and rules applied. It was also confirmed that where funds were *devolved* to schools then clawback was not an issue, however *delegated* funds can form part of a clawback where schools exceed the permitted threshold.

Resolved:

That Schools Forum:

- a. **note the recommendation made by the Schools Funding Working Group to continue with a Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme in 2012/13.**
- b. **Agree to the clawback of excess revenue balances from the two schools who failed to submit an appeal.**

b) **Early Years Reference Group**

The Head of Business and Commercial Services, DCE reported that central Government was developing a new national code of practise for Early Years settings and was currently in a consultation phase.

A key point was the significant expansion of funding for placements for 2 year-olds with the expectation that the number of funded places will increase during 2012/13 until it becomes statutory provision in September 2013. Nationally the target is 40% of all children who meet free school meal eligibility criteria.

The Reference group and officers recognised that existing training and professional development schemes would need to be developed in anticipation of the free entitlement for (two) and three year olds, being implemented.

Resolved:

To note the update from the Early Years Reference Group

c) Schools Services Working Group

The Schools Forum received a verbal update on the topics considered by the Schools Services Working group which had met ahead of the meeting.

Regarding the supply pool insurance scheme, to be considered later in the agenda, the group considered the options and had put forward a recommendation to refund 100%.

It was explained that the group discussed proposals to review the “Right Choice for your School” document. The aim of the changes is to provide a single brochure to send to all Wiltshire Schools which will set out all the services available to various schools, which fall into the following three categories:

- Chargeable to maintained schools
- Chargeable to Academies
- Free to all schools (Centrally Funded)

It will also be advantageous to extend the flexibility that currently exists in contracts for academies (the ability to change / begin / terminate at any point in the year) to maintained schools.

Members of the forum queried at what level the demand for services would be below such a point that the ‘critical mass’ necessary for the local authority to provide services was not present. It was explained that this point would vary depending upon which service was being considered. Custom packages would be made available to Schools once the capacity to deliver these had been developed.

It was noted by the Chairman that the principles behind changes to schools services were flexibility and offering a menu of choices.

Resolved:

To note the verbal update provided

185. **Early Years Single Funding Formula**

The Head of Business and Commercial Services, DCE outlined his report.

The EYSFF was introduced in Wiltshire from 1 April 2010. The formula provided for childcare providers to receive a payment for the provision of free entitlement childcare based upon a sum for each hour delivered plus supplements (if applicable) for the inclusion of children from deprived homes and for settings located in rural areas

The reference group undertook a survey of the EYSFF in autumn 2010. On analysing the responses, the group noted that the formula had been in operation for only six months and considered that unless there was an overwhelming rationale for change the present arrangements should continue to avoid any potential confusion which could result from changes to arrangements which were only just beginning to be understood. The group agreed to

recommend that two detailed amendments be made to the scheme and these were approved by the Schools Forum at its meeting on 3 December 2010.

Members of the council's Early Years' Team, and members of the Early Years Reference Group have received many comments relating to the complexity of the EYSSFF and difficulties providers have in calculating the income they will receive. Considerable work has been done to advise and support settings but many such comments continue to be received.

In light of this a consultation was launched, and results showed that 30% of providers were satisfied with the status quo, whilst the remaining 70% were split between options for change.

It was also noted that Childminders received a rate which seemed excessively high relative to the prices on the open market

The Government allowed local determination of the EYSSFF model it was explained, and the recommendation of the Early Years Reference group was to move to a model with only one rate per type of provider. This proposition would have an adverse impact on smaller settings, but it was noted that the previous years' changes and the extension of free entitlement for two year olds would help cushion the impact of any negative change.

No inflationary assumptions were assumed in the model.

It was explained that the differential between the proposed hourly pay rates for maintained providers and PVI settings arose due to the obligation upon maintained schools to employ qualified teachers on national pay scales.

Regarding potential further changes to the EYSSFF in 2013, officers expected no major changes other than further simplification, but a proposal for a 0.5% reduction across all DSG funded budgets would be considered later on the agenda for this meeting within the 2012/13 budget report.

The Head of Business and Commercial Services confirmed that there were no transitional arrangements in place for the arrangements proposed.

Resolved:

That as recommended by the Early Years Reference Group, the EYSSFF be amended to provide for a single hourly rate for each type of provider irrespective of size and to reduce the payment to accredited childminders with the savings being reallocated to support the rate for private, voluntary and independent settings to offset the loss which smaller settings will suffer. Thus the basic hourly rate payment (at 2011-12 prices) will be as shown below:

Early Years Single Funding Formula – Basic Hourly Rates
(Supplements will apply as applicable)

no children	of	no. of hours per session of 12½ hours	Basic Hourly Rate 2011-12	Proposed Hourly Rate 2012-13

Maintained Nursery Classes			
up to 26	up to 325	£4.10	£4.07
39	325.1 to 487.5	£3.96	£4.07
52	487.6 to 650	£3.89	£4.07
65	more than 650.1	£3.58	£4.07
Private, Voluntary and Independent Providers			
16	up to 200	£3.86	£3.71
24	200.1 to 300	£3.59	£3.71
32	300.1 to 400	£3.40	£3.71
40	400.1 to 500	£3.33	£3.71
48	500.1 to 600	£3.25	£3.71
56	600.1 to 700	£3.22	£3.71
64	700.1 to 800	£3.17	£3.71
72	more than 800.1	£3.16	£3.71
Childminders			
3	up to 37.5	£8.56	£6.50
6	37.6 to 75	£7.14	£6.50
9	more than 75.1	£6.67	£6.50

186. **Resource Base Formulae**

With the Chair's permission this and the following item were taken together.

187. **Special School Banding Moderation outcome**

The Manager for Inclusion, DCE presented the results of the banding moderation and planned places exercise for Special Schools, Enhanced Learning Provision (ELP) and Resource Bases. Revised formulae for Resource Bases for Hearing Impaired and Physically Impaired pupils were also tabled.

It was explained that after a number of years work, officers had developed a single clear and consistent system for various types of specialist educational provision.

Key figures for Enhanced Learning Provision were as follows:

- The total number of ELP 1 for 2012/13 is 253 (down from 2011/12 by 13 places)
- The total number of ELP 2 for 2012/13 is 88 (increase of 1 place from 2011/12)

Regarding planned places it was recommended for the overall number of planned places in all of Wiltshire special schools is increased by 1 place as below:

Springfields – increase by 1 place - from 69 to 70 places
Downland – no change – 69 places including 22 residential
Rowdeford – no change – 130 places including 23 residential
Larkrise – no change – 85 places
Exeter House – no change – 99 places
St Nicholas – no change - 72 places

These developments gave rise to the following financial implications for both planned places and banding moderation:

1. Special schools place funding will increase by £0.100m in 2012/13
2. Residential funding will decrease by £0.018m.
3. Downlands transitional protection will reduce by £0.097m.
4. The overall special schools quantum for 2012/13 will therefore reduce by £0.015m compared to 2011/12.

2011/12 will be the first year that the full year effect of the formula changes for complex needs, ASD and S&L Resource Bases will apply. Formula changes for Hearing Impairment and Physical impairment Resource Bases have now been developed in line with the other resource bases would be applied from September 2012.

For Resource Bases – Complex Needs the banding moderation took place on 4 November 2011. Please note, the original protection of funding for each resource base according to their capacity numbers is due to end and from September 2012 numbers of places need to be agreed via the planned places process. At the time of the moderation 51% of all places were taken up.

Planned places - It is recommended that the overall number of planned places is reduced by 19. As a result of this reduction the overall occupancy level has increased to 79%.

It was reported that at the moderation and banding meetings some schools raised concerns about the level of funding generated through the current formula. The Local Authority and schools representatives agreed to re-consider the current formula. The outcomes of this work will be reported back to Schools Forum in the Autumn 2012.

Additionally it was explained that in view of significant capacity issues the Local Authority will investigate options for a change of the type of special educational needs for some of the resource bases.

Questions from members of the Forum focused on the longer-term viability and occupancy levels of the resource bases, and officers replied that work had reduced costs of the remaining resource bases to a minimum - the cost of a teacher plus fixed costs. Some were down to 4/5 places, which in the long term may not prove viable.

The meeting was reminded also that every single moderation exercise had an appeal mechanism in place for individual children. There was support for the process as fair overall from those in the room.

It was recognised by officers and members of the Forum that if the assumed Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) of -1.5% did not materialise, then the Schools Forum would have to revisit the transitional arrangement for Rowdeford school.

Thereafter members discussed the need for a further review of the number of resource bases and planned places, in light of the SEN Review in 2010 and the Cabinet decision which followed it.

In response to a question from a member of the forum, it was confirmed that increasing the number of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) places remained an

aim, but that there was a lack of room to expand in the existing centres and some difficult geographical issues to address before progress could be made. However the aim remained to more closely integrate Speech & Language provision and ASD provision.

The need to build a review of the change to the resource base formulas into any task group on the 2012-13 DSG was made clear by the Chair.

Resolved:

- 1. To approve the financial implications of the planned places and banding moderation process for specialist provision in 2012/13. The overall financial impact of £24,405 will be built in to the budget assumptions for 2012/13 in line with previous Schools Forum decisions relating to treatment of cost pressures arising from banding moderation.**
- 2. To approve the formula change for ASD Centres to increase the number of TA cover built in to the formula.**
- 3. To approve the revised formulae for Resource Bases for Hearing Impairment and Physical Impairment to bring the funding for these types of provision in line with other Resource Bases. The revised formulae will be implemented from September 2012.**
- 4. That from autumn 2012 the moderation process for all Communication and Interaction Resource Bases (ASD and S&L) be brought together in to a single process.**
- 5. A review process is to be set up to be invited to review the revised formula for resources bases, their operation and the number of places therein. This is to be included in the DSG funding task group (see minute no.188)**
- 6. The Task group on DfE funding changes should include a Special School representative.**

188. DSG Estimate 2012/13 & Schools Budget Proposals

The Head of Finance, DCE outlined the latest DSG estimate for the 2012/13 year based on the October 2011 pupil census and January 2011 numbers for 3 to 4 year olds.

It was explained that central government had confirmed that the current schools funding system would remain unchanged for the 2012/13 year, with comprehensive changes expected thereafter. The current methodology for LACSEG recoupmnt and calculation of DSG and academy budgets was also expected to remain unchanged.

Officers highlighted that the projections were work-in-progress and were based on a number of assumptions in the absence of specific announcements.

A key assumption was that there will be no cash inflation for the GUF and that there will be a negative Minimum Inflation Guarantee of -1.5%. It is therefore

assumed at this point that the GUF for 2012/13 is £4.592.87 per pupil. It was confirmed by officers that every pupil brought in the same amount of GUF (Guaranteed Unit of Funding).

A number of demographic and cost pressures were identified which can be found on the appendix 2 to the report – Summary of Potential cost pressures and potential savings.

In particular a need to work on the services provided through the DSG where LACSEG applies was needed to quantify the impact of the movement of many schools to Academy status.

The requirement for Independent Early Years Providers to have a Single Funding Formula would remain, with a different funding process in place for the 86 Special School placements currently being managed by the Council.

The Chairman highlighted the most salient point - a £1.9 million shortfall remained even if the savings identified in the paper were adopted.

It was clarified that in relation to recent government guidance on QES / Risk Assessments, Health and Safety legislation remained in place and control and security of school remained the local authority's responsibility.

Resolved:

- a. **To note the estimate of DSG for 2012/13 and the potential budget gap.**
- b. **That Schools Forum supports the potential options for savings identified in Appendix 2 and confirms they should be taken forward in to the detailed budget calculations.**
- c. **To note that Schools Forum must indicate any areas that should be considered for further savings at the January meeting.**
- d. **A Formula Review Task Group is established to lead the work on reviewing the Wiltshire Funding Formula in line with the proposals for a new funding system from April 2013. This will be set up as per the report, with the addition of representatives from Special Schools in Wiltshire in addition to Primary and Secondary Schools representatives nominated by PHF and WASSH.**
- e. **To note that officers will re-examine the census figures for Special schools to ensure their accuracy.**

189. **Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme**

The Schools Forum received a report by Phil Cooch, Schools Accounting & Budget Support Manager, which considered whether the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme should continue in 2012-13.

Following the recommendation of the Schools Funding Working Group made at their meeting on 15th November 2011, and discussions earlier in the meeting (see minute no.184), it was; **Page 10**

Resolved:

That the Controls on Surplus Balances scheme continue for the 2012-13 year, as detailed in the report.

190. **Sickness Supply Pool Insurance Scheme**

The Schools Forum considered a paper by the Manager, School Accounting & Budgets. Following a short discussion it was,

Resolved:

- 1) That the Sickness Supply Pool is in a position to continue with previous enhancements
- 2) That 2012/13 Premiums should be offered at a 0% increase on 2011/12's prices.
- 3) That Cashback payments should continue.
- 4) That the basis of the cashback calculation, as set in the 2011/12 policy, be increased from 50% to 100% (option a as set out in the report).

191. **Schools Funding Regulations Consultation**

The Manager, Schools Accounting and Budgets outlined the limited changes to the School Financial Regulations which will be effective for the 2012-13 financial year only.

Regarding the transfer of the Pupil Premium for excluded pupils, clarification had been sought from the DfE to establish whether both the free meals and the service school elements (age-weighted pupil unit) move with the pupil. No response had been received at the time of the meeting.

Resolved:

The Schools Forum noted the changes to the School Financial Regulations 2012.

192. **Section 251 Benchmarking**

The meeting of the Schools Forum received details of the Section 251: Comparison of Local Authority Spending 2011/12.

Questions were received regarding the potential for savings in areas where Wiltshire was spending above the benchmark level. In particular the Schools Budget – SEN, and the level of spending on School improvement were highlighted as examples.

In response officers pointed out that expenditure on SEN retained centrally within DSG is now in line with the national average. Reductions in spending over the last few years are mostly as a result of reductions in spending on external placements and increased delegation of SEN funding to mainstream schools.

By contrast school improvement is a key part of the Council's business plan and thus will remain an area where Wiltshire Council's spending benchmarks above its statistical neighbours.

The members of the schools forum took the opportunity to congratulate the DCE Finance team for their hard work.

Resolved:

- 1) To note the Section 251 Benchmarking paper.
- 2) To bring the Section 251 Benchmarking paper to the next meeting to consider further alongside any proposals for savings.

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

The Forum confirmed the dates of future meetings as listed on the Agenda.

194. **Urgent Items**

None.

(Duration of meeting: 1.30 - 4.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Liam Paul, of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 713 597, e-mail marie.gondlach@wiltshire.gov.uk

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

Wiltshire Music Education Hub

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to:
 - i. inform Schools Forum of recent developments in Music Education;
 - ii. seek approval for Wiltshire Music Service and key partners to lead the development of a Music Education Hub for Wiltshire;
 - iii. seek approval to submit an application for funding to deliver the National Plan for Music Education with schools in Wiltshire;
 - iv. invite recommendations on the delivery of the core and extension roles outlined in the National Plan for Music Education.

Background

2. In late November 2011 the government published the National Plan for Music Education based on recommendations from the Henley Review earlier that year. The plan and funding arrangements aim to ensure consistency, transparency and accountability of public funding for music education.

National Plan for Music Education (NPME)

3. The plan requires Schools, Local Authority Music Services, Arts Council England (ACE) client organisations and other recognised delivery organisations to work together to create Music Education Hubs in each Local Authority area. Hubs will receive ring-fenced central government funding to deliver Music Education their Local Authority area.
4. Funding will be allocated according to a Department for Education (DfE) national funding formula on a per-pupil basis, with a weighting for free school meals, to ensure parity of government funding across all areas by 2014-15.
5. Funding will be distributed by ACE and prospective Music Education Hubs are required to bid to ACE, which will be responsible for distributing funding, by 17 February 2012.
6. Formal accountability for DfE funding will be via the Arts Council, which as fund holder, will monitor hubs and hold them to account for delivery against agreed plans.
7. The National Plan for Music Education (NPME) states:
 - i. Schools cannot be expected to do all that is required of music education alone: a music infrastructure that transcends schools is necessary. Building on the work of local authority music services, this will be provided by music education hubs from September 2012, following recommendations in the Henley review.
 - ii. Hubs will augment and support music teaching in schools so that more children experience a combination of classroom teaching, instrumental and vocal tuition and input from professional musicians. Hubs will be able to deliver an offer to children that reaches beyond school boundaries and draws in the expertise of a range of education and arts partners, such as local orchestras, ensembles, charities and other music groups.

- iii. Local areas will develop their own pattern of music education within a broad framework set by this National Plan. Music education hubs in every area will help drive the quality of service locally, with scope for improved partnership working, better value for money, local innovation and greater accountability.
 - iv. Music education hubs will have partnership working at their core. This will enable them to establish sustainable provision with adequate breadth and capacity. Such partnership working should see arts-based and education-based organisations working much more closely together, pooling their resources through a shared interest in improving children's music education.
8. Government has set core and extension roles for hubs to ensure national consistency and equality of opportunity.

Core roles

- a) Ensure that every child aged 5-18 has the opportunity to learn a musical instrument (other than voice) through whole-class ensemble teaching programmes for ideally a year (but for a minimum of a term) of weekly tuition on the same instrument.
- b) Provide opportunities to play in ensembles and to perform from an early stage.
- c) Ensure that clear progression routes are available and affordable to all young people.
- d) Develop a singing strategy to ensure that every pupil sings regularly

Extension roles

- e) Offer CPD to school staff, particularly in supporting schools to deliver music in the curriculum.
- f) Provide an instrument loan service, with discounts or free provision for those on low incomes.
- g) Provide access to large scale and / or high quality music experiences for pupils, working with professional musicians and / or venues. This may include undertaking work to publicise the opportunities available to schools, parents/carers and students.

Implications for Schools

- 9. Schools will continue to have primary responsibility for delivering music as part of the National Curriculum for all five to fourteen year-olds. Each school can decide how to organise their local curriculum to fulfil the statutory programmes of study for music which set out what is to be taught. All schools should provide high quality music education as part of a broad and balanced curriculum.
- 10. From summer 2012, the Teaching Agency will develop a new Initial Teacher Training add-on module to boost new teachers' skills and confidence in teaching music, and in networking with hubs. This new module also has potential to be delivered as continuing professional development for serving teachers, thereby increasing its reach and impact.
- 11. The music education workforce is fundamental to ensuring all pupils experience high quality music teaching, both in and out of school. Alongside school-to-school support, hubs will provide opportunities for continuing professional development and strengthening leadership practice.
- 12. Ofsted has already sharpened the focus of its music inspections on the contribution that external music organisations make to the quality of music in each school.

- Sing Up will offer access to resources and training on a subscription basis. WMS will be the area provider for Sing Up. Schools currently accessing the Wider Opportunities grant for singing will no longer be able to do so.

Implications for the Music Service

- Wiltshire Music Connect partnership has a proven track record in delivering the core priorities of the NPME. It has built a good relationship with schools and has a well established infrastructure for out of school ensemble and performance opportunities.
- It has developed a network of national and local partner organisations (including South West Music Schools and Sing Up) that can support schools in the delivery of the NPME. The Wiltshire Music Connect Partnership jointly and independently has gained considerable levels of funding for music education in Wiltshire.
- Shared leadership and joint strategic planning as the Wiltshire Music Education hub would enable it to maintain a clear oversight of the range and breadth of opportunities in Wiltshire and support schools and young people in achieving the aims of the NPME.

Financial Implications

- Funding will be allocated to the Music Education Hub and not automatically to the Local Authority. However if WMS and partners are successful in their bid to ACE WMS (therefore the LA) will hold the budget.
- Wiltshire received a low level of funding through the Standards Fund for Music when compared with other authorities. The Music Education Grant allocation had sought to redress the imbalance between LAs. However, the rise in grant for 2011-12 and 2012-13 will settle marginally above the 2009-10 level by 2013-12. The fluctuation in the grant will need to be managed carefully.

2009-10	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
£476,850	£538,511	£561,596	£484,542	£492,920

Proposal

- Wiltshire Music Service (WMS), Wiltshire Music Centre (WMC) and Wiltshire Youth Arts Partnership (WYAP) further develop the partnerships of the Wiltshire Music Connect project of 2009-10 to provide a Music Education Hub for Wiltshire.
- WMS, WMC and WYAP form a strategic core for the hub and WMS, as the lead organisation, prepares a funding application for submission to ACE. Further partnerships are developed with a range of music and arts organisations to ensure the core requirements of the Music Education Hub are met.
- Alongside school-to-school support the Wiltshire Music Education Hub develops CPD opportunities for schools.
- Schools Forum supports the Wiltshire Music Connect partnerships in its application to ACE for funding to deliver the National Plan for Music Education in Wiltshire.

Reason for Proposal

23. If accepted this proposal will ensure that Wiltshire Schools, children and young people access high quality music education in and out of school within the framework of the National Plan for Music Education.
-

Report Author: Valerie Hayward,
Head of the Music Service
valerie.hayward@wiltshire.gov.uk
01225 713866

Background Papers

[The Importance of Music - Department for Education](#)

<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/.../DFE-00086-2011.pdf>

<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/apply-for-funding/music-education-hubs>

Dedicated Schools Budget – Budget Monitoring 2011/12

Purpose of the Report

1. To present budget monitoring information against the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the financial year 2011/12 as at 30th November 2011.

Main Considerations

2. Appendix 1 to this report outlines the budget monitoring summary as at 30 November 2011. At this point in the year an underspend of £1.584 million is projected against the overall schools budget. Key variances are as follows:
 - a. *Independent Special School Placements* – this budget is currently projected to underspend by £0.916 million. The forecast is based on all current placements and includes young people for whom a placement has been agreed by the Joint Complex Needs Panel but which may not yet be in place. The underspend arises from reduced numbers of placements and reflects the increased number of pupils who can be provided for within Wiltshire schools. A further underspend of £0.357 million is projected against placements made in other local authority schools, again this is based on agreed expenditure and income schedules to date and will be continually updated.
 - b. *Education Other Than at School Recoupment (EOTAS)* – whilst not projected in the November figures an overspend of £0.103 million has been identified against the EOTAS recoupment budget. This had not been projected earlier in the year as charges from hospitals and other settings are in arrears and are not received until later in the financial year. This will be investigated and reported more fully to the March meeting however it is raised here as it potentially impacts on the initial savings proposals for 2012/13 brought to the previous meeting. This will be addressed in the budget proposals report elsewhere on this agenda.
 - c. *Other Targeted Services* – underspends within the EMAS and Traveller Education Service have arisen due to vacancies and due to the maximisation of the standards funds within the EMAS Team.
 - d. *Early Years Free Entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds* – an underspend of £0.196 million is projected against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. This projection is updated termly based on the uptake of the free entitlement across settings. Indications are that this forecast underspend will reduce slightly based on the December projection however it will still be underspent.
 - e. *Premature Retirement Costs* – as previously reported the PRC budget is expected to overspend by £0.122 million based on redundancy cases up to 31st August. Costs up to the end of August would normally represent the bulk of the spend against this budget however indications from HR are that there will be further costs incurred through the year and thus this overspend is expected to increase.
 - f. *Personal Education Plans (Looked After Children)* – it is projected that the budget for PEPs will overspend by £0.053 million.

3. No variance is currently projected against the budget for the Young People's Support Service (YPSS). Due to the number of vacancies within the service it is expected that the budget will be underspent however this underspend will need to be earmarked to contribute towards any redundancy costs that may arise from the proposed closure of the service in September 2012. Cabinet has agreed that redundancy costs will need to be provided for between the underspend within the service and the corporate redundancy budget.
4. Any underspend against the Dedicated Schools Grant will be rolled forward in to the next financial year.

Proposals

5. Schools Forum is asked to note the budget monitoring position at the end of November 2011.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report Author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (Children's Services)

Tel: 01225 713675 e-mail: elizabetha.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

Financial Monitoring

Service Areas	Approved Budget £m	Projected Outturn for £m	Variation for Year £m
1 Funding Schools			
DSG Funded Expenditure	221.974	221.974	0.000
Total	221.974	221.974	-
2 Schools & Learning Branch			
Independent Special Schools	4.507	3.591	-0.916
Named Pupil Allowances	2.135	2.182	0.047
Special Recoupment	1.577	1.220	-0.357
Specialist SEN Service	0.820	0.733	-0.087
Sensory Service	0.519	0.487	-0.032
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service	0.489	0.387	-0.102
Travellers Education Service	0.234	0.187	-0.047
Local Collaborative Partnerships	0.124	0.124	0.000
Young People's Support Services	2.659	2.659	0.000
Behaviour Support	0.924	0.918	-0.006
Other Targeted Services	0.464	0.464	0.000
Total Targeted Schools & Learner Support	14.454	12.952	-1.502
School Buildings & Places	0.037	0.037	0.000
Admissions Service	0.266	0.229	-0.037
Other School Improvement Services	0.025	0.025	0.000
Total School Improvement	0.328	0.291	-0.037
Early Years Single Funding Formula	14.626	14.430	-0.196
Other Early Years Services	1.117	1.117	0.000
Total Early Years & Childcare	15.743	15.547	-0.196
Business & Commercial Services	0.175	0.175	0.000
Total Schools & Learning	30.700	28.965	- 1.735
3 Commissioning & Performance			
Schools Maternity Costs	0.838	0.812	-0.026
Schools PRC - New Cases	0.496	0.618	0.122
SIMS Licence	0.199	0.201	0.002
Other services	0.281	0.281	0.000
Total	1.814	1.912	0.098
4 Safeguarding			
Child Protection in Schools	0.040	0.040	0.000
Total	0.040	0.040	-
5 Social Care & Integrated Youth			
QES	0.042	0.042	0.000
Assisted Places Scheme	0.048	0.048	0.000
Looked After Children Education Service	0.150	0.203	0.053
Total	0.240	0.293	0.053

6 DSG Within Corporate Services			
Gross Expenditure	3.492	3.492	0.000
Total	3.492	3.492	-
	258.259	256.675	- 1.584

Note POSITIVE variances = OVERSPEND

324.134

Notes

- 1 Independent Special Schools based on placements to dates and soft projections for expected placements.
- 2 Ethnic Minority Achievement Service and Travellers Service projected to underspend due to vacant posts. Maximisation of Standards Funds also contributing to EMAS position.
- 3 Projected overspend on Schools PRC cases based on cases to 31st August 2011. HR indicated that further estimates have been given and therefore further costs expected.

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

19 January 2012

Results of the consultation on the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme and Schools

Purpose of the Paper

1. To report the results of the consultation on a proposal to change the Local Authority's Scheme for Funding Schools to incorporate the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRC scheme).

Background

2. The Climate Change Act 2008 aims to enable the United Kingdom to become a low carbon economy and gives ministers powers to introduce the measures necessary to achieve a range of greenhouse gas reduction targets. Introduced in response to this, the CRC scheme is a mandatory energy efficiency scheme for large organisations aiming to incentivise the public and private sectors to reduce their carbon emissions. It features a range of reputational, behavioural and financial drivers to encourage participating organisations to develop energy management strategies that promote a better understanding of, and ultimately a reduction in, energy usage.

The scheme commenced in April 2010 with participating organisations being required to gather data on energy consumption and report back to the Environment Agency who administer the scheme. 2010/11 was a reporting year only but from 2011/12 organisations are required to purchase allowances to cover every tonne of carbon dioxide they emit. The first payment will be made retrospectively in July 2012 when emissions will be charged at £12 per tonne. Charges will be set annually in Government's April budget, and are expected to rise at around £2 per tonne per year.

3. With school emissions accounting for in excess of 50% of Wiltshire Council's total carbon footprint in 2010/11, and expected to rise to 61% in 2011/12, it is vital to actively engage schools in this agenda and the CRC scheme specifically.

The cost incurred for 2011/12 will be borne corporately by the Council but schools will be expected to take on their financial liability for the CRC scheme from 2012/13. Regulations allow local authorities to "top slice" the schools portion of the CRC scheme from the Dedicated School Grant although this could compromise the incentive for schools to tackle energy efficiency as they would not derive financial benefit proportional to any reduction in their individual emissions.

4. It is proposed to amend the LA's Scheme for Funding Schools to incorporate a mechanism whereby schools take ownership of their individual financial liability for the CRC Scheme as opposed to "top slicing" the Dedicated Schools Grant to cover the total liability - question 1 of the consultation refers.

In addition consideration must also be given to how the monies would be recovered from schools should the decision be taken to pass the cost on to them. This would either be by invoice or deduction from the monthly budget share payments – question 2 of the consultation refers.

Results of the Consultation

5. A summary of the responses received is given below.

Question1:

Phase	Agree	Disagree	Total
Primary	28	3	31
Secondary	3	4	7
Special	0	0	0
Total	31	7	38

Question 2:

Phase	By invoice	By deduction from monthly SBS payments	Total
Primary	9	21	30
Secondary	4	3	7
Special	0	0	0
Total	13	24	37*

* One school abstained from responding to question 2

6. Several schools made comments and these are included in Appendix 1 attached to this report.

Other considerations

7. Some schools have expressed concern that their efforts to implement energy saving initiatives to reduce their emissions are being compromised by the decline in capital grant. The lack of available resource to tackle the issue will be exacerbated if they are expected to address their individual financial liability.
8. If schools take on their individual financial liability for the CRC scheme, this may not be perceived as being fair and equitable given the diverse range of school buildings in use.
9. The consultation drew a limited response from schools which could be indicative of a general lack of knowledge regarding the carbon agenda and the inherent implication for schools. Consideration should be given to additional support and methods that could be employed to further engage schools.
10. The Academies Act 2010 separates local authorities from academies but the CRC scheme requires councils to be responsible for scheme administration and purchasing allowances for such trust corporations. The effect is that councils will have to meet the cost imposed by academies with no means of controlling the liability (local authorities cannot require action to reduce carbon emissions).

Concerns have been raised on the grounds that local budgets for maintained schools will effectively be subsidising academy related CRC allowances.

Since the CRC scheme began in 2010, a number of aspects have been criticised by stakeholders and a simplified scheme will be introduced from phase two onwards (April 2013). In early 2012, draft legislative proposals for formal public consultation are to be published which will amend the existing CRC scheme including the treatment of academies.

Although the Commercial Transfer Agreement for recent academy conversions includes a clause to enable the local authority to recharge academies for allowances and fines, in the case of the earlier conversions this was not a consideration and the local authority will have to rely on goodwill.

Proposal

11. That the Local Authority's Scheme for Funding Schools is amended to require schools to take ownership of their individual financial liability for the CRC Scheme as opposed to "top slicing" the Dedicated Schools Grant to cover the total liability.
12. That the associated school's costs are recovered by deduction from the monthly budget share advances in one lump sum annually.

Recommendations

13. That the proposed amendments to the Scheme for Funding Schools are adopted.

CAROLYN GODFREY
Corporate Director

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

Report Author: Phil Cooch, Children's Services Finance Team
Tel: 01225 713814, e-mail: phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendices:
Appendix 1- comments from schools

This page is intentionally left blank

	Question 1		Question 2		Comments
	Yes	No	(a)	(b)	
1 Primary	✓			✓	We are keen to take responsibility for our own carbon reduction as we are an energy efficient school
2 Primary	✓			✓	The site at our School is very complicated with 5 users. The school must not pay the costs for the rest of the site. How will this be achieved?
3 Primary		✓	✓		It is not clear on whether the starting point is fixed for all schools based on type or whether this is about improvement to the existing CO2 emissions. If it is fixed this is potentially unfair as building structure, insulation, type and age of heating all have an impact on the CO2 emissions. Is this only considering CO2 emissions for the physical building or the total CO2 for the entity of the school?
4 Primary		✓	✓		We strongly feel that individual charging of schools is an unfair way of gathering CRC costs because; Schools with older buildings will be unfairly penalised as they will have poorer insulation and less efficient heating/lighting systems; Schools that have already reduced carbon use (like us) will receive no credit for our actions taken over the last two years; There is little LA support to help us analyse our carbon usage and to make further savings. eg ongoing support for the Energy Saving Dashboard
5 Primary	✓			✓	Although currently as a school we would probably benefit more financially by ticking 'No' to question (1), as our school is old, heating inefficient, therefore carbon emissions greater than some more modern schools, we believe schools will be more committed to reducing their emissions if directly accountable for same. This, in turn, will reduce overall costs to the LA, which should hopefully benefit everyone.
6 Primary	✓		✓		If schools have to pay directly from their budget, it will make them more likely to monitor consumption and work to reduce usage
7 Secondary		✓		✓	The whole scheme is flawed. There is no incentive to reduce financial liability.
8 Secondary (Academy)	✓		✓		I think Academies would have to be invoiced but if another cheaper payment method could be introduced I would be in favour of it – anything to keep costs down.
9 Secondary (Academy)		✓	✓		While we are taking all steps to reduce our energy consumption and save our carbon footprint eg with solar panels, this is a very old school with disproportionately high energy costs because: there is no double glazing in much of the school, there is minimal thermal insulation in the older roofs, there are only 316 students for a school that can accommodate 535, The impact on the school of the preferred option will therefore be disproportionately large.
10 Secondary	✓			✓	We would appreciate being a part of any discussion and/or consultation that will result in energy savings. We would, for example, very much appreciate assistance with the installation of PV's and other such technology that will reduce consumption and potentially generate an income stream for the School. Being within a deficit budget makes such an investment extremely difficult to achieve despite its merits.
11 Secondary		✓		✓	There are two reasons for our stated views. Firstly, there is a lack of transparency about the way in which the burden of this levy is being distributed on all schools (including those who are applying for, or who have received academy status). Secondly, there is a significant difference in the energy efficiency of schools owing to the location and quality of build and age of schools. Clearly this gives rise to potential inequities where the thermo efficiency of some schools supports the inefficiency of others.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

19 January 2011

South West Grid for Learning Broadband Connectivity and Services for Wiltshire Schools

Introduction

1. At its meeting held on 2 December 2010, Schools Forum agreed to adopt a method for charging schools for the cost of broadband connectivity from 2011/12 and that the charges should be treated as a cashless item on the school funding certificate.
2. It is recommended that this method be reviewed to remove the disparity between the actual cost of provision and the charges made which has led to a shortfall of income from academies.

Background

3. The method for charging agreed by Schools Forum is based upon an equal flat rate charge to all schools of approximately £3,158.78 plus a per pupil charge of £14.86. This charge bears no relation to the actual cost of provision for the services received from SWGfL but as the charges were matched by delegated budget provision and deducted centrally this had no material effect on schools' budgets.
4. Schools which have converted to academies have a duty to evidence value for money from their procurement decisions and to consider alternative suppliers. While all academies were keen, in principle, to maintain their SWGfL services, and they acknowledged the potential effect upon other schools if they chose an alternative supplier, they had to assess the price they were being asked to pay on a value-for-money basis.
5. The formula method tends to charge large schools significantly more than the actual charge for the service from SWGfL while charging less than the cost of provision to small schools. To enable academies to make a valid comparison of costs with other suppliers and to avoid the penalties which would be due from them opting out of the council's contract with SWGfL academies have been charged the actual cost of provision from the date of their conversion.
6. This has led to a shortfall in income to meet the total charges from SWGfL, as shown in the appendix below. However, this is much less than the cost would have been if academies had opted out of the contract. To regularise the position and to avoid any further costs from new academy conversions, it is recommended that all schools be charged the actual cost of provision.
7. The council's contract with SWGfL is due to end in June 2013 and it is expected that schools will be able to contract direct with SWGfL after that date.

Recommendation

8. That the method for delegating funds to, and charging schools for, the cost of broadband connectivity from 2012/13 replicate the charges made by SWGfL as closely as possible and that the charges should be treated as a cashless item on the school funding certificate.

Report Author: Simon Burke
Head of Business and Commercial Services
Schools and Learning

Contact: Tel.: 01225 713840
simon.burke@wiltshire.gov.uk

APPENDIX

Provision of SWGfL services to academies

	Formula cost Full Year	Actual SWGfL Cost	Difference
Secondary School Academy	29,922	13,043	-16,878
Secondary School Academy	27,603	13,153	-14,450
Secondary School Academy	25,538	12,902	-12,636
Secondary School Academy	24,364	13,153	-11,211
Secondary School Academy	24,305	12,902	-11,402
Secondary School Academy	22,655	13,153	-9,502
Secondary School Academy	21,645	12,902	-8,742
Secondary School Academy	20,991	12,902	-8,089
Secondary School Academy	17,959	13,148	-4,812
Secondary School Academy	17,603	12,902	-4,701
Secondary School Academy	16,295	13,297	-2,998
Secondary School Academy	14,690	12,902	-1,788
Secondary School Academy	13,828	13,153	-675
Secondary School Academy	13,382	12,902	-480
Secondary School Academy	13,249	16,859	3,610
Primary School Academy	11,599	11,166	-433
Secondary School Academy	8,196	12,902	4,706
Primary School Academy	6,175	4,221	-1,954
Primary School Academy	6,116	7,145	1,029
Primary School Academy	5,447	5,933	486
Primary School Academy	5,358	7,145	1,787
Special School Academy	4,140	4,221	82
Total	351,060	252,009	-99,052