

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 PSAs.</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>	