

Schools Forum

MONDAY 17th OCTOBER 2016 AT 2.30PM
AT OLDBURY COUNCIL HOUSE, COMMITTEE ROOM 2

Agenda

(Open to Public and Press)

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Members to declare any interest in matters to be discussed at the meeting.
3. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 20th June 2016 as a correct record.
4. Election of Vice Chair
5. High Needs Block update – verbal update Matthew Sampson
6. Fair Funding Update
7. Pupil Number Growth – Additional Needs
8. Pupil Number Growth Criteria Review
9. Free Schools Recoupment Consultation
10. Schools that work for Everyone Consultation
11. DSG Allocation 2016/17
12. Education Services Grant 2017/18
13. Schools Funding 2017/18 Consultation

Next Meeting:

Date, venue and time to be confirmed.

Schools Forum Distribution to Members:

Head Teachers Advisory Forum - Primary Schools (6)

Mr R Kentish, Mr P Jones, Ms K Bickley, Mr A Orgill, Ms C Walsh,
Ms P Thompson.

Head Teachers Advisory Forum – Secondary Schools (4)

Mr P Shone, Mr A Burns, Mr D Redmond, Ms M McMahon

Head Teachers Advisory Forum – Special School (1)

Mr N Toplass

School Governors (4)

Mr B Patel, Ms. C. Gallant, Mr J Smallman, Mr N Edge,

Trade Union (1)

Mr. D Barton

Early Years Partnership (1)

Ms A Sahota

14-19 Provider (1)

D Holden

Pupil Referral Unit (1)

T Lecointe

Agenda prepared by Prakash Patel
Secretary to the Schools Forum
Tel No: 0121 569 8174
E-mail: Prakash_Patel_Env@sandwell.gov.uk

Minutes of the Schools Forum

Held on Monday 20th June 2016 at 2.30 p.m.
Room Green 2, Jack Judge House, Oldbury

Members Present: D Barton, B Patel, D Whitehouse, T Lecointe, P Thompson, J Smallman, P Jones, C Walsh, A Orgill, D Holden, P Shone, N Edge, M McMahon, A Burns, K Bickley

Officers Present: R Kerr, C Ward, P Patel, D Carter

Apologies: C Gallant, N Toplass, D Redmond, R Kentish, A Sahota, A Timmins

Observers: C Sandland, S Farquharson

20/16 **Agenda Item 1 - Apologies**

As Above.

21/16 **Agenda Item 2 – Declaration of Interest**

Andrew Burns

22/16 **Agenda Item 3 – Minutes Of previous Meeting**

The minutes for the forum held on the 21st March 2016 were agreed.

23/16 **Agenda Item 4 – Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Members were asked to nominate a Chair for the forthcoming year Schools Forum. R Kentish nominated P Jones via email and C Gallant nominated herself also via email. Forum members were asked to vote on their preferred choice of Chair and P Jones was elected Chair with the majority of votes. Vice Chair nominations

Schools Forum –
IL0 unclassified

were not discussed and will be bought back to the next Forum meeting.

24/16 **Agenda Item 5 – School Forum Constitution Review and Update**

R Kerr outlined the report highlighting that the new panel now consists of 20 members.

C Ward outlined that at present there were too many primary Governors, and one more secondary governor was required. The primary governors would resolve the issue prior to the next meeting of the Forum.

P Jones queried how the schools governors will be nominated and agreed. C Ward indicated that SIPS would co-ordinate this via Association of Sandwell Governing Body (ASGB). Schools are not required to be members in order to submit and vote on nominations. It was agreed that one voting ballot and three votes per governing body.

25/16 **Agenda Item 6 – School Budget 2015/16 and Budget Plans 2016/17**

R Kerr outlined the report and informed Schools Forum members the schools balances as at the end of 2015/16. C Ward informed members that advisors would be speaking to Head Teachers who have large balances to discuss their spending plans.

J Smallman asked about schools that held small balances and if any action was being taken by the authority. R Kerr informed the group that meetings were taking place with schools that are anticipated to experience financial difficulties.

26/16 **Agenda Item 7- Special Educational Needs High Needs Block Analysis 2015/16 Outturn and 2016/17 Budget**

26/16 C Ward outlined the report and informed the forum that responses to any questions would be sent out to forum with further

Schools Forum –
IL0 unclassified

clarification, if required. The questions raised by the forum are as follows;

J Smallman queried why the Out of Borough Placement budget has increased by 42% and how was it calculated

P Jones asked who was responsible for High Needs, C Ward informed the group that Kevin Rowland is the Inclusion Manager. P Jones asked if it would be beneficial if a member of High Needs attended the next forum so questions could be asked directly. P Jones also asked for clarification on the how the Central Recharges budget of £678,000 is calculated and also the £500,000 Contribution to Childrens Services. M McMahon requested the High Needs report that was circulated to JEG to be available to forum members. It was later made clear that it is the expectation that this report will be an updated version of the report to that presented at JEG. P Jones also asked about the expansion of the Hard to Place Team, C Ward confirmed that the project would start and funding had been allocated, but was unsure at the time of the exact heading under which it was happening.

27/16

Agenda Item 8 – Early Years DSG Underspend – Proposed Uses

R Kerr outlined the report identifying the proposed uses for using the DSG underspend. The proposals were reported to the forum and members were asked to vote on each proposal.

- Pupil Number Growth Contingency overspend of £0.792m to be met from the Early years underspend.

The recommendation was approved based on the following vote:

12 in Favour. 0 Against. 0 Abstention

- Childrens Centres - £1.400m

A Orgil asked how the £1.400m contribution to Childrens Centres will be measured in terms of impact and effectiveness. It was agreed that further information for Childrens Centres will be emailed to members who will vote via email.

[ILO: UNCLASSIFIED]

Schools Forum –
IL0 unclassified

- Early Years Engagement Team - £0.563m

The recommendation was approved based on the following vote:

12 in Favour. 0 Against. 0 Abstention

- Release target budget to fund Phase Transition Manager and Professional Development Manager - £0.288m

The recommendation was approved based on the following vote:

12 in Favour. 0 Against. 0 Abstention

28/16

Agenda Item 9 – Scheme for the Financing of Schools - Updates

R Kerr outlined the report highlighting the updated DFE guidance and discretionary local authority updates.

A circular will be issued to schools with a link to the proposed updates to the Scheme for the financing of Schools.

The recommendation was approved for the updates to the Scheme for the Financing of School providing there are no significant objections from schools as part of the consultation process. The votes were as follows.

12 in Favour. 0 Against. 0 Abstention

29/16

Agenda Item 10 – Forward Plan 2016

R Kerr outlined the report informing members of the future dates for Schools Forum. Members were also informed of a new time of 2.30pm for future Schools Forum meeting. The plan is to hold all future meeting at Sandwell Council house.

30/16

Agenda Item 11 – Pupil Number Growth Allocations

R Kerr gave a verbal update on the Q3 Langley project informing

[IL0: UNCLASSIFIED]

Schools Forum –
IL0 unclassified

the group the estimated cost for 2016/17 would be £0.431m. This would be paid to the school by giving them a lump sum payment of £50k, followed by monthly claim submissions.

Members were also informed that Q3 Langley build project will be completed over a number of phases and pre-opening costs and diseconomy of scales costs will be incurred over a 3 year period. Estimated costs for this period were included amounting to £0.519m. Further work will be undertaken on confirming these estimates, prior to final figures being approved.

Seven schools requested Pupil Number Growth funding which totalled £0.267m

The recommendation for the proposed allocations from Pupil Number Growth funding was approved based on the following vote:

11 in Favour. 0 Against. 1 Abstention

The meeting was called to a close at 4.10pm

Schools Forum –
IL0 unclassified

Contact Officer:
Prakash Patel
Schools Strategic Finance Unit (SSFU)
Prakash_patel_env@sandwell.gov.uk
0121 569 8174

DRAFT

Agenda Item 6

Schools Forum

September 2016

Scheme for Financing of Schools – Consultation Feedback

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Approve the additional minor update to the Scheme for Financing of Schools following consultation with schools.

2. Purpose

3. To gain approval from Schools Forum members for the additional minor update to the Scheme for Financing of Schools following consultation with schools.

4. Links to School Improvement Priorities

- 4.1 School leaders and the relevant committee of governing bodies and academy boards should take note of proposed changes and how they impact on management of school budgets.

5. Report Details

- 5.1 At the Schools Forum meeting on 20th June it was agreed that the proposed updates to the Scheme for Financing of Schools would be made providing there are no significant objections from schools as part of the consultation process.

- 5.2 The following minor change has been made as a result of the consultation with schools: -

- Sections 1.5 and 2.3 differed regarding which committee/body should approve a school's budget plan. Both sections have now been altered to state the same: -

- The budget plan should be approved by the full governing body or a committee of the governing body. Where it is approved by a committee, this must be ratified by the full governing body as soon as possible after.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1 That Schools Forum members approve the additional minor update to the Scheme for Financing of Schools following consultation with schools.

Rebecca Maher, Finance Business Partner – Children’s Services

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rebecca Maher

Tel No: 0121 569 8460

Schools Forum

17th October 2016

Pupil Number Growth – Additional Needs

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Approve the payment of Pupil Number Growth – Additional Needs to the schools as detailed in Section 4.4 of the report.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To obtain approval from Schools Forum members for the payment of Pupil Number Growth – Additional Needs to the schools as identified in the report.

3. Links to School Improvement Priorities

- 3.1 The Local Authority has experienced a growth in pupil numbers of 26% over the last ten years. This has placed significant pressures on primary school places and is now affecting secondary school places. As a result of overall increases in pupil numbers schools are dealing with a higher number of pupils with additional needs. This report is written to support the allocation of additional funds to support this growing number of children with additional needs.

4. Report Details

- 4.1 School Forum members agreed at its meeting on 23rd February 2015 to set up a “Pupil Number Growth Fund – Additional needs”. One million pounds was allocated to the fund which could be distributed to schools experiencing significant increase in pupils with additional needs.

- 4.2 Expenditure approved in 2015/16 was £115,208 leaving an end of year balance of £884,792.
- 4.3 The schools listed in section 4.4 have previously been allocated funding from the Pupil Number Growth fund – Basic and wish to be considered for the additional needs funding.
- 4.4 Census information for January and May 2016 has been used to calculate the funding for pupils with additional needs. The funding is calculated up to March 2017. The schools below meet the criteria for additional needs and therefore would attract funding as detailed below:

School	Funding
Crocketts Community Primary School	£24,542
Holly Lodge School	£20,059
Ormiston Forge Academy	£10,947
Phoenix Collegiate	£81,155
Uplands Manor Primary School	£42,630
Grand Total	£179,333

- 4.5 No further funding allocations will be made once the £1m original budget has been fully used.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That Schools Forum

Approve the payment of Pupil Number Growth – Additional Needs to the schools as detailed in Section 4.4 of the report.

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Agenda Item 8

Schools Forum

17th October 2016

Pupil Number Growth Criteria Review

This report is for decision.

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 The proposed amendments to the “Pupil Number Growth Fund – Basic” criteria.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To obtain approval from Schools Forum members for the proposed amendments to the “Pupil Number Growth Fund – Basic” criteria.

3. Links to School Improvement Priorities

- 3.1 Sandwell has been experiencing a significant increase in the number of children entering the education system over the last seven years. The increase in school population creates pressures on school resources and has the potential to impact on standards. The allocation of in year financial support to school through the Pupil Number Growth Fund is designed to mitigate reorganisation, staffing and educational resource costs for schools.

4. Report Details

- 4.1 The Pupil Number Growth Fund and its criteria were initially introduced in 2013/14 as part of the implementation of the reformed schools funding. A number of updates have been made to the criteria to provide a tighter definition of “significant pupil number increase” as well as strengthen the provision of financial

information; to include schools financial outturn for the previous 2 years preceding the application for Pupil number growth funding.

- 4.2 In October 2013 it was agreed to fund those schools that agreed to exceed their PAN at the request of the authority. The funding would be based on the Basic Entitlement for the time period between September and March of the relevant financial year.
- 4.3 The Authority has in recent years experienced significantly increasing pupil numbers. Although birth rate increases have been taken into consideration when planning for new schools and extensions; it is difficult to plan for mid-year admissions. Mid-year admissions have also increased quite significantly over the last few years and in some circumstances the authority has had to ask schools to take on bulge classes mid-way through the academic year.
- 4.4 The authority has undertaken an initial review of the criteria as it was felt the current system of payments is unsustainable going forwards.
- 4.5 Officers for the authority have met and are therefore proposing the following criteria for consideration:

4.5.1 LA requested PAN/Bulge Class

If a school increases its PAN or has a bulge class; the school would receive Basic entitlement/AWPU funding until the pupils are counted in the next October census and forms part of the schools DSG Schools Block funding. This could result in pupils being funded for one academic year, which would cross over two financial years. (Year 1 7/12ths; Year 2 5/12ths)

4.5.2 “Excepted Pupils” over PAN

If a school accepts additional pupils over PAN; the school would receive 50% Basic Entitlement/AWPU until the pupils are counted in the next October census and it forms part of the schools basic funding. Currently these pupils attract 100% Basic Entitlement for the dates falling between October and March of the financial year. The reason for the proposed reduction is that the school is unlikely to need to set up a new class and therefore will not incur the same costs as where there is a PAN increase.

4.5.3 Mid-Year Admissions

If a school has a minimum of 30 pupils net increase over the previous October census; the school will receive 50% Basic Entitlement/AWPU until the pupils are counted in the next October census and it forms part of the schools basic funding.

4.6 **Application forms**

The Authority would automatically calculate the funding for all schools meeting the criteria as detailed in 4.5.1 to 4.5.3 so there would no longer be a requirement for schools to complete application forms in these instances.

It is anticipated that schools meeting the criteria set out in section 4.5.1 would be paid from September of the relevant financial year. Schools meeting the criteria in section 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 would be paid in March.

- 4.7 If a school experiences significant pupil number growth outside of the above circumstances then an application form would need to be submitted.

5. **Recommendations**

That Schools Forum approve

- 5.1 The proposed amendments to the “Pupil Number Growth Fund – Basic” criteria.

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Agenda Item 9

Schools Forum

17th October 2016

Free School Recoupment Consultation

This report is for information

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

1.1 Note the contents of the report.

2. Purpose

2.1 To notify School Forum members of Sandwell's response to the consultation on free schools recoupment.

3. Links to School Improvement Priorities

3.1 The impact of recoupment on the amount of funding available to schools is particularly critical whilst the LA is going through a period of rapid pupil place expansion in both the primary and secondary sectors. It is key for the LA to work with the Regional Schools Commissioner and Free Schools to only deliver places that are needed in the right areas of the borough. This will ensure that the delivery of extra pupil places will not have a detrimental impact on schools' budgets.

3.2

4. Report Details

4.1 The Department for Education (DfE) were seeking views on proposals to change local authority recoupment arrangements for mainstream free schools.

- 4.2 The DfE issued a consultation document on 21st July for local authorities finance officials to respond to by 21st September 2016.
- 4.3 The results of the consultation and the DfE response will be published in Autumn 2016.
- 4.4 The consultation document proposed amendments to the funding of local authorities for pupils in mainstream free schools

What is recoupment?

- 4.5 The DfE gives funding for schools to local authorities through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This is initially calculated based on all pupils attending schools in the local authority area, irrespective of the type of school, whether maintained, academies or free schools. Local authorities are responsible for the schools funding formula for their area and maintained schools will receive their funding from the local authority whereas academies and free schools receive theirs directly from the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The EFA pay this by deducting funding for those pupils from the DSG it gives to local authorities; this process is called recoupment.

Recoupment for free schools

- 4.6 Local authorities receive their funding for a financial year on a lagged basis, using pupil numbers from the previous October census. Maintained schools (through local authorities) and most academies and free schools (through the department) are funded on a lagged basis. The DfE will sometimes fund new free schools and some academies using estimates of pupil numbers in the first few years of operation, to give them “sufficient funding as they grow.”
- 4.7 The DfE has stated “*As free schools are funded directly by the department, the local authority has fewer pupils to fund when a new free school opens. Under the current system, the local authority will still receive funding for pupils expected to move to the free school for a further 7 months (from the pupils starting school in September to the end of the financial year in March).*”
- 4.8 Free schools are established in one of two ways:

- where the local authority has identified the need for a new school in the area (known as the presumption process)
 - where an application to open a free school is made directly to the DfE by a proposer (known as the centrally delivered process)
- 4.9 Where a mainstream free school is established through the presumption process, recoupment starts from the first year. If it is established through the centrally delivered process, recoupment starts for the second year that the school is open. The DfE believes that there is inconsistency in the recoupment arrangements for different types of new free schools.

DfE Proposal and rationale

- 4.10 In 2014, the DfE consulted on making mainstream centrally delivered free schools recoupable in every year except the first year of opening, and as a result free schools became recoupable. The DfE are now proposing to remove the “inconsistencies” in the recoupment system for mainstream schools.
- 4.11 The DfE have proposed recouping funding for all new mainstream free schools for every financial year, including the first financial year the free school opens. Neither local authorities nor schools would see any increase in their DSG funding as a result of this change.

Consultation Questions

- 4.12 The consultation questions were:
- Do you agree with the proposal to recoup funding for all mainstream free schools from the first year of opening?
 - Do you think there is any particular support the department could give local authorities to help them estimate pupil numbers for new mainstream free schools, or any other support which would make recoupment fairer or simpler?

Consultation response

- 4.13 **Do you agree with the proposal to recoup funding for all mainstream free schools from the first year of opening?**

No

Comments:

If a free school has been set up which is not required for basic need by the local authority, the LA should not be penalised by having DSG funding recouped which it may not have received in the first place as explained below.

The example; provided on page 6 of the consultation document; of a local authority showing 100 pupils in the October 2015 census and of a free school established through a centrally delivered process; assumes the 30 pupils would all come from one particular local authority area and the DfE would therefore look to recoup funding for all 30 pupils from that local authority. However the pupils could come from any local authority area, and as such the LA in which the free school is located would be penalised as the funding for the full 30 pupils will be recouped. This dilutes the funding for the original 100 pupils. Conversely, the LA where the pupils are registered on the census will benefit because their funding will not be adjusted as a result of those pupils attending the free school.

- 4.14 **Do you think there is any particular support the department could give local authorities to help them estimate pupil numbers for new mainstream free schools, or any other support which would make recoupment fairer or simpler?**

Comments:

a).The department should send the authority the estimated pupil numbers agreed with the proposer, this will ensure there is consistency of information between the DfE, the proposer and the authority.

b).When a free school is established through a centrally delivered process, the government should fund the first 7 months (September to March) of a new intake until the school has been opened for all year groups. This type of school does not meet the needs of the area and local authority/Pupil funding should not be affected by an external decision to set up a school. Also the dilution of funding would not be in the best interest of the area, especially if it is a highly deprived area.

C).If the DfE implement the proposal to recoup funding for all mainstream free schools from the first year of opening, then they should consider the following:

When the actual pupils attending the free school are known, it will be easy to establish which local authority they come from and an updated recoupment calculation should be undertaken and adjustments made to the following financial year's recoupment figure.

5. Recommendations

That Schools Forum

5.1 Note the contents of the report.

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Schools Forum

17th October 2016

Schools that work for Everyone Consultation

This report is for decision

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Agree to set up a working group to respond to the consultation on “Schools that work for everyone”.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To notify School Forum members of the Government consultation on “Schools that work for everyone” and gain agreement to set up a working group to respond to it.

3. Links to School Improvement Priorities

- 3.1 The drive within current DfE policy is to develop a self-sustaining system for school improvement. The consultation report highlights some areas which can support improvement across the sector, drawing on the resources of key partners within education.

4. Report Details

- 4.1 The government issued a consultation document “Schools that work for everyone” on 12th September 2016.
- 4.2 The consultation covers proposals in four key areas:
- Independent schools directly assisting the state-funded sector, through creating more good places, and giving more choice and control for parents.
 - Universities playing a direct role in improving school quality and pupil attainment.

- Selective schools providing more school places, and ensuring that they are open to children from all backgrounds.
 - Faith schools delivering more good school places, while meeting strengthened safeguards on inclusivity.
- 4.3 The consultation will close on 12th December 2016. The results of the consultation and the Department's response will be published in Spring 2017.

5. Recommendations

That Schools Forum

- 5.1 Agree to set up a working group to respond to the consultation on "Schools that work for everyone".

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Agenda Item 11**Schools Forum****17th October 2016****Dedicated Schools Grant 2016/17**

This report is for information

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

- 1.1 Note the contents of the report.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 To notify School Forum Members of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation for 2016/17.

3. Report Details

- 3.1 The DSG allocation for 2016/17 is set out in the table below broken down into its specific blocks.

Description	Schools Block £m	High Needs Block £m	Early Years Block £m	Non Block £m	DSG Total £m
Before Recoupment	237.046	36.318	16.471	0.071	289.907
Recoupment	(89.412)				(89.412)
Adjustments		(0.068)	1,059		0.991
After recoupment	147.634	36.250	17.530	0.071	201.486

& adjustments					
------------------	--	--	--	--	--

3.2

4. Recommendations

That Schools Forum

4.1 Note the contents of the report.

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 11/10/2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Agenda Item 12

Schools Forum

17th October 2016

Education Services Grant 2017/18

This report is for information

1. Recommendations:

That Schools Forum members:

1.1 Note the contents of this report.

2. Purpose

2.1 To make School Forum members aware of the governments proposed changes to the Education Services Grant from 2017/18

3. Links to School Improvement Priorities

3.1 The Education Services Grant has been integral to the funding for elements of school improvement work in the LA. Forum members will note the report highlights the significant reductions in ESG over the last three years and the potential for further significant reductions in the coming year. School improvement services will be required to move on to a different financial footing to ensure continuation in service delivery within the next twelve months if timelines are adhered to in the proposed funding schemes.

3.2

4. Report Details

4.1 The Education Services Grant (ESG) was introduced in 2013 to replace the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant. ESG is paid to local authorities and academies on a per pupil basis as an un-ringfenced grant.

4.2 The grant paid to local authorities can be broken down into two elements:

- Retained Duties rate – This is paid to local authorities for every pupil both at maintained schools and academies
- General funding rate – This is paid to local authorities for pupils in maintained schools

4.3 Academies receive the general funding rate and an academy top-up rate which is paid to them directly.

4.4 In 2016/17 Sandwell’s allocation for ESG was £3.700m, compared to funding of £5.128m in 2013/14.

4.5 The £3.700m is made up of the following two amounts:

Description	Per pupil amount	Total Funding £m
General Funding	£77 Maintained Schools £327 Special Schools £288 PRU’s	£2.874
Retained Funding	£15 all pupils	£0.826
Total		£3.700

DfE plans for removal of ESG Funding

4.6 The government announced in the 2015 Spending Review, a saving of £600m from the Education Services Grant (ESG) general funding rate by 2019/2020. Local authorities will receive transitional ESG funding from April to August 2017. The general funding will be removed from September 2017 and the retained duties element of the ESG will be added to the schools block for 2017/18.

4.7 The government have stated they “*will say more about the transitional protection in respect of general funding rate later in the year*” and “*we recognise that local authorities will need to use*

other sources of funding to pay for education services once the general funding rate has been removed.”

- 4.8 The government has also stated it will amend regulation to allow local authorities to retain some of their schools block funding to cover the statutory duties that they carry out for maintained school which were previously funded through ESG. Details of the duties to be included under this arrangement will be included in its consultation on changes to the School and Early Years Finance Regulations.
- 4.9 The ESG is an un-ringfenced grant and it is at the discretion of local authorities how the funding is spent. Different local authorities will have different needs and therefore make different choices about how to use their ESG funding.
- 4.10 The DfE have however stated that ESG is intended to fund the following statutory local authority duties:
- School Improvement - performance standards, safety warnings, governing body intervention.
 - Statutory and regulatory duties - strategy, finance, provision of information to the Secretary of State, procurement, audit services, back office functions, health and safety.
 - Education welfare services – attendance, child performance and employment, right to inspect school registers.
 - Central support services – pupil support (clothing grants), music services, outdoor education. **Local authorities have no statutory obligation to fund these services, but they can choose to provide them.**
 - Asset Management – general landlord duties
 - Premature retirement and redundancy costs – a local authority must fund redundancy costs of school staff from maintained schools unless there is good reason not to fund them centrally.
 - Therapies and other health-related services – speech, physiotherapy and occupational therapies. A duty to

jointly commission services with local health bodies to support disabled children and young people and those with special education needs.

- Monitoring national curriculum assessment

- 4.11 ESG duties are more fully described in appendix A.
- 4.12 As illustrated in sections 4.9 local authority duties is a mixture of those applying to all schools including academies and those applying just to maintained schools. This has implications in terms of Schools Forum voting arrangements, to the extent that funding for these services will be determined by schools Forum votes.
- 4.13 To the extent that funding for these duties has to be found from DSG, it also potentially becomes a reduction in resources for schools, particularly maintained schools, academies ESG allocations are to degree protected until 2020.
- 4.14 The DfE has not committed itself to any particular deadline for the consultation and until the precise details of these arrangements are published, the authority is unable to present proposals to the Forum.

5. Recommendations

That Schools Forum

- 5.1 Note the contents of this report.

Rosemarie Kerr, Principal Accountant – Schools

Date: 7th October 2016

Contact Officer: Rosemarie Kerr

Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Annex A: Statutory and regulatory duties

These are the statutory and regulatory duties included in ESG funded services as described in the section 251 budget statement.

- the Director of Children’s Services and the personal staff of the director:
- planning for the education service as a whole;
- functions of the authority under [Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1999](#) (Best Value) and also the provision of advice to assist governing bodies in procuring goods and services with a view to securing continuous improvement in the way the functions of those governing bodies are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness;
- revenue budget preparation; the preparation of information on income and expenditure relating to education, for incorporation into the authority's annual statement of accounts; and the external audit of grant claims and returns relating to education;
- administration of grants to the authority (including preparation of applications), functions imposed by or under [Chapter 4 of Part 2 of the 1998 Act](#) and, where it is the authority’s duty to do so, ensuring payments are made in respect of taxation, national insurance and superannuation contributions;
- authorisation and monitoring of:
 - (i) expenditure that is not met from schools’ budget shares; and
 - (ii) expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets, and all financial administration relating thereto;
- formulation and review of the methods of allocation of resources to schools and other bodies;
- the authority’s monitoring of compliance with the requirements of their financial scheme prepared under section 48 of the 1998 Act, and any other requirements in relation to the provision of community facilities by governing bodies under section 27 of the 2002 Act;
- internal audit and other tasks necessary for the discharge of the authority’s chief finance officer’s responsibilities under section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972;
- the authority’s functions under regulations made under [section 44 of the 2002 Act](#);
- recruitment, training, continuing professional development, performance management and personnel management of staff who are funded by expenditure not met from schools’ budget shares and who are paid for services carried out in relation to those of the authority’s functions and services that are referred to in other paragraphs of [Schedule 1 to the School Finance \(England\) Regulations 2012](#). This relates to staff centrally funded and whose work falls within the scope of the LA Budget;

- investigations that the authority carries out of employees or potential employees of the authority or of governing bodies of schools, or of persons otherwise engaged or to be engaged with or without remuneration to work at or for schools;
- functions of the authority in relation to local government superannuation, which it is not reasonably practicable for another person to carry out, and functions of the authority in relation to the administration of teachers' pensions;
- retrospective membership of pension schemes and retrospective elections made in respect of pensions where it would not be appropriate to expect the governing body of a school to meet the cost from the school's budget share;
- advice, in accordance with the authority's statutory functions, to governing bodies in relation to staff paid, or to be paid, to work at a school, and advice in relation to the management of all such staff collectively at any individual school ("the school workforce"), including in particular advice with reference to alterations in remuneration, conditions of service and the collective composition and organisation of such school workforce;
- determination of conditions of service for non-teaching staff and advice to schools on the grading of such staff;
- the authority's functions regarding the appointment or dismissal of employees;
- consultation and functions preparatory to consultation with or by governing bodies, pupils and persons employed at schools or their representatives, or with other interested bodies;
- compliance with the authority's duties under the [Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974](#) and the relevant statutory provisions as defined in section 53(1) of that Act in so far as compliance cannot reasonably be achieved through tasks delegated to the governing bodies of schools; but including expenditure incurred by the authority in monitoring the performance of such tasks by governing bodies and where necessary the giving of advice to them;
- the investigation and resolution of complaints;
- legal services relating to the statutory functions of the authority;
- the preparation and review of plans involving collaboration with other local authority services or with public or voluntary bodies;
- provision of information to or at the request of the Crown and the provision of other information that the authority are under a duty to make available;
- expenditure incurred in connection with the authority's functions pursuant to regulations made under [section 12 of the 2002 Act](#) (supervising authorities of companies formed by governing bodies);
- expenditure incurred in connection with the authority's functions under the discrimination provisions of the Equality Act 2010 in so far as compliance cannot reasonably be achieved through tasks delegated to the governing bodies of schools; but including expenditure incurred by the authority in monitoring the

performance of such tasks by governing bodies and where necessary the giving of advice to them;

- expenditure on establishing and maintaining electronic computer systems, including data storage, in so far as they link, or facilitate the linkage of, the authority to schools that they maintain, such schools to each other or such schools to other persons or institutions;
- expenditure in connection with the authority's functions in relation to the standing advisory council on religious education constituted by the authority under [section 390 of the 1996 Act](#) or in the reconsideration and preparation of an agreed syllabus of religious education in accordance with [schedule 31 to the 1996 Act](#);
- Expenditure in respect of a teacher's emoluments under [section 19\(9\) of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998](#) except such expenditure that falls to be met from a school's budget share;
- expenditure in respect of the functions of an appropriate body under regulations pursuant to [section 19\(2\)\(g\) of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998](#);
- expenditure on the appointment of governors, the making of instruments of government, the payment of expenses to which governors are entitled and that are not payable from a school's budget share and the provision of information to governors;
- expenditure on making pension payments other than in respect of schools; and
- expenditure in relation to the exclusion of pupils from schools or pupil referral units, excluding the making of any provision of education to such pupils, but including advice to the parents of an excluded pupil.

Schools Forum**17th October 2016****Schools Funding 2017/18 Consultation**

This report is for decision

1. Recommendation

That school forum members approve:

- 1.1 The Schools Funding 2017/18 Consultation document to be issued to schools and academies.
- 1.2 The additional School Forum meeting dates as set out in section 3.3.

2 Purpose

- 2.1 To present and get approval of the Schools Funding Consultation document to be issued to schools and academies.

3 Links to School Improvement Priorities**4 Report Details**

- 3.1 The Department for Education issued its operational guide on Schools revenue funding much later than previous years. The document states the funding arrangements for 2017/18 are broadly similar to last year. The main changes 2017/18 are:
 - The DSG blocks have been rebaselined to reflect current spending patterns.
 - Funding for ESG retained duties (£15 per pupil) will be transferred into the schools block for 2017 to 2018.
 - The removal of the post 16 funding factor, but with protection through the minimum funding guarantee (MFG).

ILO

- That local authorities will be able to retain funding from the DSG from maintained schools, including special schools and pupil referral units (PRUs), for statutory duties previously covered by the ESG.
- Using a national weighting for secondary low attainment figures.
- Using new bandings for the index of deprivation affecting children (IDACI).
- That local authorities are submitting one Authority Proforma Tool (APT) in January 2017.

3.2 The DfE have stated that the split of former ESG duties to be funded from centrally retained schools block funding (for all pupils) and from de-delegated services for maintained school pupils only) will be set out when they consult on the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations. The funding to cover these duties needs to be agreed by School Forum members. However the authority is unable to present any proposals at this stage until the consultation paper has been published.

3.3 The authority has therefore decided to consult with schools in 2 stages and is proposing additional school forum meetings to be able to manage the process of consultation.

Additional Meeting Dates	Meeting Outcome
14 th or 28 th November 2016	Approve issue of consultation document 2
2 nd January 2017	Consider consultation responses. Recommendation to Cabinet Member.

3.4 The Schools Funding 2017/18 Consultation document is attached. (Appendix 1) **The deadline for stakeholders to respond is noon on 16th December 2016.**

3.5 The consultation questions cover the following:

3.5.1 Capping Gains, this is to ensure the costs of providing the minimum funding guarantee protection are covered.

3.5.2 De-delegated proposals, there are 7 de-delegated proposals to be considered by maintained schools.

Further information

3.6 The DfE have consulted on changes to the arrangements for free school recoupment. The deadline for submission was 21st September 2016. The outcome of this consultation could have an impact on schools funding. Sandwell's response is included in a separate report. (Agenda item 9 – Free School recoupment.)

Name: Rosemarie Kerr Position: Principal Accountant Tel No: 0121 569 8318

Date: 11/10/2016



Schools Revenue Funding 2017/18

Consultation Document 1

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18

CONTENTS

Foreword.....	2
Section 1 – Introduction.....	4
Section 2 - Pupil Number Growth Fund.....	9
Section 3 – Exceptional Premises Factor.....	10
Section 4 – Capping Gains.....	12
Section 5 – De-Delegated Budgets.....	13
Section 6 – Primary to Secondary Ratio.....	14
Section 7 - Consultation Process Timetable.....	17

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18

Foreword

The Government is committed to introducing a national funding formula for schools, high needs and early years.

The first stage consultations on a national funding formula for schools and high needs were published in March 2016. The Early Years consultation on a national funding formula was published in August 2016.

The government's full response to the first stage of the schools and high needs consultations and their proposals for the second stage are due to be published in the autumn. The government intend to make final decisions about the national formula early in the New Year.

The government has confirmed that in 2017/18 no local authority will see a reduction from their 2016/17 funding (adjusted to reflect local authorities most recent spending patterns) on the schools block of the Dedicated School Grant (DSG) or the high needs block . They have also stated their intention to apply an uplift for high needs funding; the exact amount to be announced later in the year.

The government has confirmed it will retain the current minimum funding guarantee (MFG) for schools, so that no school will face a funding reduction of more than 1.5% per pupil in 2017/18.

The government has delayed its proposal to create a new central schools block, allow local flexibility on the MFG or to ring-fence the schools block with the DSG. They intend to cover these proposals for 2018/19 and beyond in their response to the first stage consultation.

The government has undertaken an exercise to re-baseline the blocks of the DSG for each authority so that the starting point is based on the pattern of planned spending by local authorities, rather than how central government initially allocated funding in 2013.

The schools block baseline for 2017/18 will reflect the amounts authorities put in for both the schools block and the central schools block as part of the baseline exercise. It will also include funding for Education Services Grant (ESG) retained duties which has been transferred into the schools block. At this point the DfE has

not defined the retained duties of the local authority and it is unclear whether the amount calculated by the DfE to cover these duties will meet their actual costs in the borough. The LA will seek to adjust its operating model to meet the new duties and work within the financial parameters that will be agreed with Schools Forum for the new financial year.

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18
CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18
INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) issued the “Schools Revenue funding 2017 to 2018 – Operational Guide” in July 2016.
- 1.2 The funding arrangements for 2017/18 are broadly similar to last year. The main changes for 2017/18 are:
- The DSG blocks have been re-baselined to reflect current spending patterns.
 - Funding for ESG retained duties (£15 per pupil) will be transferred into the schools block for 2017/18.
 - The removal of the post 16 funding factor (This was not applicable to Sandwell).
 - Local authorities will be able to retain funding from the DSG from maintained schools including special schools and pupil referrals units for statutory duties previously covered by the ESG.
 - Using a national weighting for secondary low attainment figures.
 - Using new bandings for the index of deprivation affecting children (IDACI).
 - Local authorities are submitting one Authority Proforma Tool (APT/ Schools funding model) in January 2017.

- 1.3 Final funding allocations to each authority will be made in December, in line with the latest data on pupil numbers.
- 1.4 The allowable funding factors to schools with a description of each is set out in the table below:

Factor	Further information
1. Basic Entitlement A compulsory factor	Funding allocated based on age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU). Minimum £2,000 primary age pupils and £3,000 secondary age pupils.
2. Deprivation A compulsory factor	Local authorities can choose to use free school meals and/or the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI). Sandwell’s formula uses IDACI bandings. Please refer to section 1.5 to 1.7 for additional information on IDACI bandings.
3. Prior Attainment An optional factor (although used by almost all local authorities)	Applied for primary pupils not achieving the expected level of development within the early years foundation stage profile (EYFSP) and secondary pupils not reaching the expected standard in KS2 at either English or maths Please refer to section 1.8 to 1.10 for additional information on the prior attainment factor.
4. Looked-after children An optional factor	Applied for any child who has been looked after for at least one day as recorded on the LA SSDA903 return at 31 March 2016.
5. English as an additional language (EAL) An optional factor	EAL pupils may attract funding for up to 3 years after they enter the statutory school system. Sandwell’s formula allocates funding for the first 2 years.
6. Pupil Mobility An optional factor	This measure counts pupils entering school during the last 3 academic years, but did not start in August or September, Not used in Sandwell

	formula.
Proportion allocated through pupil-led factors	Local authorities must allocate at least 80% of the delegated schools block funding through pupil-led factors (factors 1 -6 above)
7. Sparsity	Not relevant to Sandwell
8. Lump sum An optional factor	Local authorities can set different lump sums for primary and secondary schools. The maximum lump sum is £175,000.
9. Split site An optional factor	This is to support schools which have unavoidable extra costs because the schools buildings are on separate sites.
10. Rates An optional factor	This must be funded at the authority's estimate of the actual cost
11. PFI An optional factor	To support schools which have unavoidable extra premises cost because they are a PFI school
12. London Fringe	Not applicable/relevant to Sandwell
13. Exceptional premises factor	Local authorities can apply to the EFA to use exceptional factors relating to premises.

New IDACI Bands for 2017/18

- 1.5 The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) dataset is updated every five years by Government. The most recent update to the dataset, issued in December 2015 and was used as a basis for calculating schools funding in 2016/17, showed a markedly different distribution to the previous 2010 dataset. The government have acknowledged that the 2015 update created unexpected and unhelpful turbulence in budgets, towards the latter stages of the local formula-setting process. Sandwell dealt with this by introducing rates for IDACI band 2 in an effort to stabilise individual schools funding.
- 1.6 The government have considered the concerns raised by local authorities and have decided to update the IDACI banding methodology to return the IDACI bands to a roughly similar size as in 2015/16. (i.e. the proportion of pupils in each band). The revised bands are named "A" to "G" with the most

deprived neighbourhoods being captured by band “A” previously bands 6 and 5. The government intends to set out plans for managing the change in data by adjusting the band boundaries more promptly for future data updates.

- 1.7 The following table shows the proportion of pupils in each IDACI band in the 2015/16 schools block dataset (column V) and the 2016/17 schools block dataset (column W). Column Z set out the 2016/17 dataset mapped onto the new IDACI bands.

Bands used in 2015-16 and 2016-17	IDACI score	% pupils in each band (2015-16)	% pupils in each band (2016-17)	New bands for 2017-18	IDACI score	% pupils in each new band (2015 October census)
T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
6	Between 0.60 and 1.00	3%	1%	A	Between 0.50 and 1.00	3%
5	Between 0.50 and 0.60	6%	3%	B	Between 0.40 and 0.50	8%
4	Between 0.40 and 0.50	10%	8%	C	Between 0.35 and 0.40	7%
3	Between 0.30 and 0.40	12%	14%	D	Between 0.30 and 0.35	8%
2	Between 0.25 and 0.30	7%	9%	E	Between 0.25 and 0.30	9%
1	Between 0.20 and 0.25	8%	10%	F	Between 0.20 and 0.25	10%
0	Less than 0.20	53%	56%	G	Less than 0.20	56%

- 1.8 A modelling exercise was undertaken using 2016/17 agreed factor funding rates to assess the overall financial impact on schools of using the new IDACI bandings. The results showed that additional funding of £0.806m would be required to ensure the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) would remain cost neutral. Further modelling was therefore required to ensure the authority kept within the available funding envelope of £233.950m and that the MFG was cost neutral.
- 1.9 Tables demonstrating the changes to 2016/17 schools funding when using the updated IDACI Bandings whilst keeping with the available funding envelope are included as appendices:

Appendix 1 – Basic Entitlement Amended

In this scenario all factor funding rates have been maintained at the approved 2016/17 rates except the Basic Entitlement rate which has been amended to keep within the available funding envelope of £233.950m.

The following adjustments to the factor rates were made:

Primary Rate £2,986 from £3,003

Secondary Rate £4,180 from £4,204

Capping has changed to 1.75% from 0.38%

Appendix 2 – IDACI Band 2 rates amended :

In this scenario all factor funding rates have been maintained at the approved 2016/17 rates except the IDACI Band 2 rate which has been amended to keep within the available funding envelope of £233.950m.

The following adjustments to the factor rates were made:

Primary rate £132 from £225

Secondary rate £242 from 412

Capping changed to 1.66% from 0.38%

This is to demonstrate the effect of changing the band 2 rate whilst maintaining all other factor rates at 2016/17 agreed levels to keep within the total available funding envelope.

Prior Attainment

- 1.10 The 2016 KS2 assessments are the first which assess the new national curriculum. At a national level, a higher number of the year 7 cohort in financial year 2017/18 will be identified as having low prior attainment. The Government intend using a national weighting to ensure that this cohort does not have disproportionate influence with the overall total.
- 1.11 The weighting will be confirmed in advance of finalising 2017/18 allocations and included in the schools funding model issued by the DfE in December, having taken account of the latest data about year 7 pupils in the October census. Local authorities will not be able to change the weighting, but will be able to adjust their secondary low prior attainment unit values. The government believe this would enable local authorities to maintain their low prior attainment factor at previous levels without significant turbulence.
- 1.12 Low prior attainment funding will be allocated to all pupils identified as not reaching the expected standard at the previous phase, regardless of their year group.

Creation of Funds

- 1.13 Local authorities may create a growth fund to support schools which are required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need. A growth fund has been agreed annually since the inception of the schools funding reform in 2013/14. Proposals for the amendment to the current criteria are included in a separate report to Schools Forum for their consideration.
- 1.14 An estimate of the funding required for 2017/18 will be included in the next consultation report, which is due to be issued by the end of November 2016.
- 1.15 Local Authorities may also create a fund to cover temporary falling rolls in advance of a population bulge but only for good or outstanding schools or academies. Schools Forum must approve the criteria, be consulted on allocations and these allocations must relate to place planning decisions. The falling roll fund cannot be used for unpopular or failing schools. Differing proposals to create a fund has been consulted in previous years, however they have never been approved. The Authority does not intend to put forward a proposal for consideration for 2017/18.

Mainstream Free School Recoupment

- 1.16 The government are consulting on proposals to make all mainstream free schools recoupable from the first year of opening from 2017/18. The deadline for submission was 21st September 2016. Sandwell's responses to the consultation are included in a separate report.
- 1.17 If the government proceed with this proposal it would mean the responsibility for funding would shift from the government to the local authority. This would result in a dilution of the funding to schools.

Protections and gains

- 1.18 The pre- 16 minimum funding guarantee (MFG) for mainstream schools will continue to be set at minus 1.5% in 2017/18. The proposal is to limit gains to ensure the MFG is cost neutral. Further details on this is set out in section 3

Two stage consultation process

- 1.19 The authority's school funding consultation will be in 2 stages due to the fact that the DfE have not yet published local authority's statutory responsibilities in relation to the ESG. (Please refer to School Forum Papers on 17th October 2016 - Agenda item 12 – Education Services Grant). This first stage of the consultation will therefore concentrate on the following:

- Whether to continue with the arrangement of capping gains in order for the MFG protection to be cost neutral. (MFG protection continues at - 1.5% per pupil).
- De-delegated Budgets

1.20 The second stage consultation will include proposals for the following:

- ESG consultation.
- Pupil Growth Contingency Fund.
- Historic Commitments.
- Primary/secondary Ratio
- Review of the secondary Prior attainment rates as a result of the proposed changes to use a national weighting for secondary low attainment figures to ensure; as best as possible; the stability of individual school funding.

1.21 This consultation is applicable for one year only (2017-18).

1.22 The Schools Forum met on 17th October 2016 and approved the options for wider consultation with schools.

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18

IDACI BANDING CHANGES

2. IDACI Banding changes

- 2.1 The IDACI banding proportion changes are described in Section 1.5 to 1.9; which in summary describes how the DfE have adjusted the IDACI 2015 dataset to similar proportions as that used for the IDACI dataset 2010.
- 2.2 As a result of these new changes a review of the Band 2 rates will be required.
- 2.3 Appendices 1 and 2 demonstrate the financial impact on individual schools of 2 different scenarios:
- IDACI Band 2 rates remaining at 2016/17 levels and amending the Basic Entitlement rates.
 - IDACI Band 2 rates changing whilst all other funding rates remain at 2016/17 levels.
- 2.4 This analysis is based on the IDACI band proportion changes only and does not reflect any other data or formula changes that are yet to be given/agreed for 2017/18 eg prior attainment for secondary pupils data, ESG changes to funding and local authority statutory responsibilities.
- 2.5 The authority is concerned that there a number of proposed changes that are yet to be assessed and the factors rates may need consideration individually and overall in order to assess the impact on individual school funding. The authority is therefore seeking views on schools preference at this stage.

Consultation Question 1

In order for the formula to be affordable following the changes to the IDACI bandings, would you prefer to amend: -

1. The Basic Entitlement funding rate OR
2. The IDACI Band 2 funding rate

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18

CAPPING GAINS

3. Capping Gains

- 3.1 The EFA have announced that the pre-16 MFG for mainstream schools will continue to be set at minus 1.5% per pupil in 2017 to 2018. For the avoidance of doubt the MFG calculation for mainstream schools applies only to schools block funding. Funding from the early years block, high needs block or from the EFA for post-16 pupils are excluded from the calculation.
- 3.2 Protection is still required for some schools as a result of the funding reforms. To ensure the formula is affordable, the overall gains for individual schools will have to be capped and scaled back.
- 3.3 For 2016-17 it was agreed that the amount schools could gain through the revised formula should be capped at a level which would cover the cost of providing MFG protection at the required -1.5% per pupil.
- 3.4 We are asking schools whether this arrangement should continue. The alternative to this would be to topslice the amount required for MFG protection from the total Dedicated Schools Grant before the formula is calculated. This would reduce the amount available for all schools.

Consultation Question 2

Do you agree that we should continue to cap the amount that schools can gain in order to cover the cost of providing MFG protection?

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18

CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18

DE-DELEGATED BUDGETS

4. De-Delegated Budgets

- 4.1 **Appendix 3** summarises the de-delegated budget proposals that are being consulted on for 2017-18.
- 4.2 Proformas explaining each proposal are available on the Schools Strategic Finance Unit Virtual Office – please follow the link below: -

Consultation Question 3

Please indicate the de-delegated budget proposals you agree with.

SCHOOL FUNDING 2017-18**CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS 2017-18****5. - CONSULTATION PROCESS TIMETABLE**

The following consultation process timetable includes key stakeholder group meeting dates and local authority deadlines:-

Meeting	Date
Schools Forum (Document 1)	17th October 2016
Schools Forum (Document 2)	14 th or 28 th November 2016
Document 1 issued to schools	19 th October 2016
Document 2 issued to schools	30 th November 2016
Primary Partnership	24 th November 2016 and/or 5 th December 2016?
Secondary Partnership	17 th November 2016 and/or 5 th December 2016?
Joint Union Panel	6 th December 2016
ASGB	7 th December 2016
Cabinet Member briefing (Initial Briefing report)	13 th December 2016
Deadline for Schools responses to consultation	16 th December 2016
Schools Forum (Consideration of Outcome and recommendation to Cabinet Member)	2 nd January 2017
Cabinet Member for Children & Families (For Final Proposals)	11 th January 2017
School Forum (Final Funding model)	16 th January 2017

1. Officers will seek to provide answers to stakeholders who want clarification on any of the issues during the consultation period. Please contact Rose Kerr on 0121 569 8318 or the email address below and we will endeavour to respond within 2 working days.
2. The deadline for schools to respond to the consultation is **12 noon on Friday 16th December 2016**. Consultation responses should be **emailed** back to **schools_financialservices@sandwell.gov.uk** entitled “**School Budget Consultation 2017-18**”.

Proposals for DSG De-delegated Budgets 2017-18

REF	NAME	LEAD OFFICER	2017-18	Primary	Amount per Pupil	Secondary	Amount per Pupil
	De-delegated Budgets (Maintained Schools)		Pupil No				
			FSM				
	Behaviour Support Services						
1	Behaviour Support Team	Kuldip Berdesha	414,300	352,200		62,100	
2	Preventing Primary Exclusions Team	Kuldip Berdesha	152,500	152,500		0	
	Total Behaviour Support Services		566,800	504,700		62,100	
	FSM Eligibility						
3	Free School Meals Eligibility	Joy Djukic	59,000	44,300		14,800	
	Museum and Library Services						
4	School Libraries	Andrew Timmins	26,800	21,600		5,200	
	Licences/Subscriptions						
5	Health and Safety Licenses and Subscriptions	Andrew Timmins	24,000				
6	EVOLVE Annual Licence Fee	Bob Brooks	6,100	3,050		3,050	
	Total Licences/Subscriptions		30,100	3,050		3,050	
	Staff Costs Supply Cover						
7	Union Facilities Time	Bob Brooks	199,000	199,000		48,000	
	TOTAL DE-DELEGATED - MAINTAINED SCHOOLS		881,700	772,650		133,150	



Sandwell
Metropolitan Borough Council

Schools Funding Consultation 2017/18

De-Delegated Proposals 2017/18

DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2017-18		NO: 01
Title of Proposal	Behaviour Support Team	Date 08.09.16
Lead Officer	Kuldip Berdesha	Contact Tel.
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18
		£414,317.38
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?	Primary	Secondary
	✓	✓
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.	Primary	Secondary
	85% £352,169	15% £62,147
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)	Yes	No ✓
N/A		
How has this proposal been calculated?		
<p>The seven teachers in BST provide a full service to every maintained school and all Academies in Sandwell. The BST provides: specialist casework; critical incident cover; INSET for schools; NQT INSET-surgeries-clinics; restraint training (MAPA); direct work with parents; advice to school staff; transition work; support for schools in special measures and notice to improve; whole school behaviour audits. The BST provides a comprehensive service: prevention; early intervention and specialist support. 85% of the costs are salaries for seven teachers, plus, 15% on-costs for travel, accommodation, management, ICT, training, and resources etc.</p>		
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)		
<p>All schools will continue to receive high quality support as part of an integrated delivery team (Inclusion Support) working across Learning Communities. Ongoing assessments allow a pupil's progression to be measured and evaluated. In 2015-16 the BST undertook 180 initial assessments, 912 consultations with school staff and/or parents, attended over 885 reviews and provided over 65 training events in Sandwell. The BST is integral to responding to critical incidents in schools (e.g. providing counselling in secondary schools) as well as delivering NVCI training. The BST provides support for pupils transferring to and from PRUs and specialist provision. Inclusion Support's school's survey demonstrates an increase in ratings for the BST.</p>		
What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)		
N/A		
What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?		

There will be no integrated or coherent programme of behaviour support and training across all schools, including the loss of support for schools dealing with difficult families and through difficulties, such as critical incidents and challenging OfSTED judgements. There is likely to be an increase in exclusions and non-attendance. The PPE team will be discontinued and there will be a loss of support for schools in relation to transitions. Loss of direct support for NQTs.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)	85%	
Services (£)	15%	
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

The funding primary relates to salaries and associated on-costs and is monitored monthly.

How will impact be evaluated?

Casework is measured by the Behaviour Tracker system. Impact of trackers for individual cases with 85% having a positive outcome. Improvement in the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people. Improvement in the overall attainment of Sandwell pupils. Annual schools survey results and evaluations from casework and training.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

All income generated has been used to further develop training materials and publications such as behaviour recovery and BLISS. Cover for staff absence and paying for ongoing professional development. Any residual is carried forward for BST purposes and additional staff to add capacity within the team.

DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2017-18		NO: 02	
Title of Proposal	Preventing Primary Exclusions Team	Date	08.09.17
Lead Officer	Kuldip Berdesha	Contact Tel.	
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18	
		£152,490	
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?		Primary	Secondary
		✓	
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.		Primary	Secondary
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)		Yes	No ✓
N/A			
How has this proposal been calculated?			
<p>Funding for the PPE Team was originally taken from the Area Based Grant. Since then the team has been funded via Central Holdback / DSG. The salaries for six full-time specialist staff amounts to £132,600. An additional £19,890 is calculated as 15% on-costs for, travel, administration, resources, management and supervision, continuing professional development, contribution for to the rent at Connor Education Centre, ICT equipment and on-line services etc.</p>			
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)			
<p>The PPE Team achieve over a 80% success rate in preventing primary school children being excluded from school. The use of the new Behaviour Tracker System means that the progress of children's behaviour improvement can measured, monitored and evaluated ensuring that their work satisfies OfSTED requirements regarding the measurement of pupil progress for behaviour. The PPE Team also contribute to capacity building in schools through mentoring, training and contributing to INSET with other members of the Inclusion Support Service.</p>			
What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)			
N/A			
What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?			
If the funding ends then specialist direct 1-1 support for primary-aged children with social,			

emotional and behavioural difficulties will cease. There will be a loss of expertise that is currently shared across schools in supporting children, families and school staff in supporting children with severe behavioural difficulties.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)		
Services (£)		
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

As the funding mainly covers salary expenditure this will be monitored sufficiently through monthly financial returns by the team manager, Inclusion Support's business manager and the Inclusion Support's Principal Educational Psychologist.

How will impact be evaluated?

The work of the team is monitored monthly re. output and outcomes in relation to 1) levels of activity; 2) numbers of children prevented from exclusion; 3) improvements in the quality and appropriacy of provision (reported annually). Schools' annual survey (evaluation).

Please detail any income generated by the service?

None

DSG DE-DELEGATED PROPOSAL 2017-18		NO: 03	
Title of Proposal	Administration of Free School Meals Eligibility	Date	August 16
Lead Officer	Joy Djukic	Contact Tel.	0121 569 8329
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18	
		£59k	
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?		Primary	Secondary
		✓	✓
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.		Primary	Secondary
		75%	25%
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)		Yes	No
There is a statutory duty for eligibility for FSM to be checked			
How has this proposal been calculated?			
<p>Calculations based on the number of pupils in maintained schools eligible for FSM's as at October 2015. Funding will be deducted from each school based on the number of pupils eligible for FSM.</p> <p>Academies will be charged separately cost of service per eligible pupil.</p>			
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)			
<p>Administration for FSM eligibility will be undertaken by Education Benefits Team and the team's performance targets are to increase FSM eligibility and maximise Pupil Premium for Sandwell Schools.(Score Card Target)</p> <p>Provides an auditable system to schools that has reduced the bureaucracy for schools administrators regarding FSM eligibility applications</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> FSM eligibility is determined and instant eligibility checks done for schools/families, removing requirement for benefit evidence to be produced. Education Benefits check all FSM claims each month to ensure continuous auditable eligibility for schools. Schools are updated weekly, using secure data transfer systems, of new and discontinued eligibility to FSM's No renewal/checking system for schools to administer. No need for families to reapply and claim continues until pupil leaves school if parent/carer remains in receipt of eligible benefits. Those families that are not eligible will continue to be checked on a monthly basis so that if circumstances change and they become eligible, school/family will be notified and there will be no need for family to make another application. Weekly updated eligibility lists to schools. on-line application facility available for parents/carers Schools benefit from the increased FSM applications which have been generated by the following initiatives : 			

- In house data filtering system (Govtec) that identifies families eligible to FSM's when applying for Council Tax and Housing Benefits and a new FSM application is generated.
 - School Clothing Scheme now generates FSM applications for those families who apply for clothing vouchers and do not have a current live FSM's claim. (629 New FSM apps 15/16 generating £675,000 in Pupil Premium for Sandwell's schools)
- h) Continued awareness campaign and promotion of FSM's at events throughout the Borough.
- i) **Universal FSM's** for all KS1 pupils – eligibility checks on all KS1 pupils to ensure that all Pupil Premium pupils can be identified for those families entitled to a Universal meal.

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

Schools will have to administer an auditable system for new FSM applications and all revisions of current applications.

Evidence/proof of benefits will need to be obtained by school to determine eligibility.

Schools will not benefit from the increased eligibility to FSM created by initiatives managed by the LA/Education Benefits Team (See (g) above)

Secondary Schools would not have the benefit of continuous claims from the Primary to Secondary transition and the previously traditional 'drop-out rate' could recur and reduce eligibility.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)	£57k	
Services (£)	£2k	Maintenance of Govtec data base (see (g) above)
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

Ongoing budget monitoring procedures

How will impact be evaluated?

Numbers eligible to FSM's and Pupil Premium generated

Please detail any income generated by the service?

Academies are charged for service and costs to maintained schools are reduced pro rata

DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2017-18			NO: 04
Title of Proposal	Schools Library Service	Date	September 2016
Lead Officer	Andy Timmins	Contact Tel.	0121 569 8302
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18	
		£26,800	
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?		Primary	Secondary
		✓	
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.		Primary	Secondary
Is the service provided a statutory function?			No
N/A			
How has this proposal been calculated?			
This proposal has been calculated on the costs required to provide the service to schools.			
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)			
<p>The benefits this proposal brings to schools are primarily around introducing additional reading resources to their children.</p> <p>The DfE document “Reading the next steps – supporting higher standards in schools” outlines the benefits of being able to read and become a proficient reader and learner. P18, paragraph41 of the document states:</p> <p>“Reading for pleasure is not only important because it improves performance in reading tests: it has a much wider significance for children’s education. Schools will be able to choose from a range of services which will enable them to choose a combination of services which are personalised to their needs. Research shows that it brings benefits to help pupils achieve across the whole curriculum. These include a broad vocabulary, text comprehension, grammar and general knowledge. Reading for pleasure has also been found to be linked to greater progress in spelling and mathematics skills. Recent longitudinal research found the impact of reading for pleasure on progress in vocabulary, arithmetic and spelling between the ages of 10 and 16 to be four times greater than the impact of having a parent with a degree.”</p> <p>Schools will be able to choose from the following range of services which will enable them to choose a combination which are personalised to their needs</p> <p>Loan Services: (schools may choose one of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading for Pleasure Boxes (the latest fiction and non-fiction for wider reading) • Genre boxes • Author Boxes • Phonics matched boxes • Class set Boxes • Hi Lo boxes • More Able boxes • Artefacts boxes 			

- Intervention boxes
- Bi-lingual boxes
- Access to eBook library for an equivalent number of pupils (equivalent to a box of books), we have a KS1, KS2, KS3, KS4/5 platforms and a teacher platform.

Schools can request which type of box/eBook library and they will be personalised to the age of pupils 3-19 years.

Pupil Events: (Schools may choose one of the following):

- Participation in our book quizzes (new books/new format/new questions)
- Author events
- Reading Detective events
- Reading groups
- Book Awards
- Writing workshops and competition
- Poetry Slam

Different events for KS1/2/3/4/5

Teacher events (Schools may choose one of the following):

- Whole school CPD (reading/writing/libraries)
- Book banding
- Bespoke to all key stages

Parent Events (Schools may choose one parent workshop e.g. e-reading, developing reading etc.)

All schools are entitled to:

- One free Advisory Visit
- Discount on Network Events (networks cover a range of CPD with external speakers, goodie bags and book themed refreshments)
- Discount on CPD events (libraries)

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

N/A

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

“The best way to promote developing mature readers is by instilling in children a passion for reading. Children who love reading will read more and, over time, choose literature which is more demanding and suitably stretching. It creates a virtuous circle: as the amount a child reads increases, their reading attainment improves, which in turn encourages them to read more. All reading makes a difference, but evidence suggests that reading for pleasure makes the most.” (Paragraph 37 p17 of Reading: the next steps).”

Schools, families and learners will not be able to access our new stock, our eBook library, network events, CPD days, parents workshops, pupil events, advice, support and guidance.

Our new service lines are very popular and we are increasing in the number of events we put on and partners we have, all of which impact upon reading experience, confidence, fluency and

pleasure.

We are offering an increasingly vibrant and bespoke service (schools pick which loan service they would like, which pupil event, parent event etc. they would like to receive meaning that schools are in the driving seat) at the very same time that public libraries are contracting and that the DfE are encouraging wider reading as previously mentioned.

The libraries service is closely aligned to the teaching and learning service. This has allowed improved support for schools and access to experts in phonics, teaching and learning, reading and writing. The eBook Library is unrivalled amongst school library services locally.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)	£20,000	Monies for salaries will enable us to provide experts to deliver quizzes, CPD, networks, Advisory visits, process boxes and e-platform usage, staff and facilitate pupil events such as author events, book banding visits, writers awards, library detectives
Services (£)	£6,800	New stock e.g. phonics matched boxes, payment of authors , delivery costs, e-book log ins, more bilingual books e.g. Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian etc.
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

Half termly to include update and impact

How will impact be evaluated?

Impact will be monitored by evaluation forms. Qualitative data will be kept on take up of service and books borrowed

Please detail any income generated by the service?

No income is generated by services funded by the de-delegated budget although DSG schools will be asked to pay a small amount towards refreshments and room hire if they attend events such as CPD when rooms are hired and food provided

DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2017-18			NO: 06
Title of Proposal	Health and Safety Licences and Subscriptions	Date	July 2016
Lead Officer	Andy Timmins	Contact Tel.	0121 569 8302
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18	
		£24,000	
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?		Primary	Secondary
		✓	✓
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.		Primary	Secondary
		£0.83	£0.79
		Services 1 and 2 to be shared amongst all schools equally. Service 3 to be apportioned on an amount per pupil, subject to confirmation of 2016-2017 subscription formula from CLEAPSS.	
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)		Yes	
As detailed in the 'benefits to schools forum' section below			
How has this proposal been calculated?			
<p>This proposal has been calculated based on the subscription and licence costs for the services outlined below, with a support element (salary costs) to administer the associated functions. Please note that costs included in this proposal have been estimated, based on 2016-17 subscription rates as costs for 2017-18 have not yet been confirmed, so may be subject to change:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. European Education Consultants (EEC) H&S Risk assessment and self-audit software; full access to the risk assessment function; annual self-monitoring audits with feedback and action plans to aid improvement and maintenance of H&S standards within the school 2. In the line of Fire e-learning package: licence to the e-learning training package for the forthcoming year 3. CLEAPSS: subscription to the national school science and design and technology advisory body. 			
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)			
<p>EEC Software: risk assessments for applying to all activities and areas within the school environment: Head Teachers can be more confident that their risk assessments are 'suitable and sufficient'</p> <p>Self-audit function provides a benchmark to ensure schools are compliant in the areas assessed, with action plans to assist you in improving standards where identified as necessary</p>			

In the line of fire: contributes to meeting statutory duties under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order (RRFSO) which requires all staff to receive fire safety training. "In the Line of Fire for Schools" has been specifically designed for Sandwell Teaching Staff and Non-Teaching Staff, with an additional area that can also be utilised by pupils.

CLEAPSS; membership allows access to termly newsletters, a wide range of free safety publications, model risk assessments, and a telephone helpline. An additional element of the subscription for Secondary schools meets the statutory duties as required by the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999, of having an appointed suitable Radiation Protection Advisor (RPA) and ensuring the safe management of radioactive substances.

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

N/A – all elements of the licences and subscriptions proposal relate to statutory requirements

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

Schools will not be able to 'do nothing' as they will fall foul of Health and Safety Law and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order, which could result in action being taken by the Enforcing Authorities (Health and Safety Executive and Fire Service) against the Head Teacher and Governing Body.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)	£4500	
Services (£)	£19500	
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

Expenditure will be monitored by Andy Timmins, on behalf of the schools.

How will impact be evaluated?

The proposal facilitates the provision of tools to aid the improvement and on-going maintenance of H&S standards within schools, particularly in the areas of risk assessment, fire safety awareness amongst all staff, and specialist advice and support for safe Design & Technology and Science curricular activities across both primary and secondary phases.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

N/A

DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2017-18		NO: 06
Title of Proposal	Payment for EVOLVE licence fee for Educational Visits	Date 27/7/16
Lead Officer	Bob Brooks	Contact Tel. 0121 569 8385
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18
		£6,100
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?		Primary Secondary
		Yes Yes
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.		Primary Secondary
		50% 50%
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)		Yes No
Yes. There is a statutory duty on the local authority to provide Health and Safety advice to all of its employees.		
How has this proposal been calculated?		
Proportionate use of licence by Primary & Secondary phase		
What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal? (Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)		
Was agreed in 2013-14 without the inclusion of VAT. VAT now included and will pay for the licence for the LA and all schools to access the computerised EVOLVE system for Educational Visits		
What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only? (Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)		
The request is for the licence fee to meet the statutory requirements of the service.		
What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?		

The level of advice, support and provision for supporting & advising schools on educational visits will be severely compromised.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)		
Services (£)	£6,100	Payment of the Evolve licence, including VAT
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

One off payment monitored by LA finance team

How will impact be evaluated?

By ensuring that schools in the LA have access to the EVOLVE system.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

The Educational Visits Advisory team is entirely self-funded through traded service agreements with non- community/VC schools. The licence fee amounts to 12% of the cost of the service.

DSG CENTRALLY RETAINED PROPOSAL 2017-18		NO: 07
Title of Proposal	Central arrangement for union facilities time, including health and safety	Date
		27/7/16
Lead Officer	Bob Brooks	Contact Tel.
		0121 569 8385
Annual Funding Proposal (£)		2017-18
		£199k
		£48k
Which phase of school does this support (✓)?	Primary	Secondary
	yes	yes
What proportion will each phase bear? Please state as an amount per pupil.	Primary	Secondary
	(£8.73)	(£8.73)
Is the service provided a statutory function? (Please provide detail below if yes)	Yes	No
<p>Facilities time is for 'trade union representatives' i.e. "employees who have been elected or appointed in accordance with the rules of [their] union to be a representative of all or some of the union's members in the particular company or workplace, or agreed group of workplaces where the union is recognised for collective bargaining purposes." (ACAS)</p> <p><u>The legal position:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Union representatives have a statutory right to reasonable paid time off from employment to carry out trade union duties and to undertake trade union training." (ACAS) • "You must give appointed [by a trade union] safety representatives the paid time necessary to carry out their functions [and to] undergo training in these functions, as is reasonable under the circumstances." (Health & Safety Executive) <p>There is no definition of "reasonable" other than that it should be enough time for representatives to "perform effectively", taking into account factors such as the size of the organisation and its workforce ,and the need for workers to be able to access their union representatives.</p>		
How has this proposal been calculated?		
<p>The spend in 2012-13 was £350k. For 2013-14 and 2014-15, Schools' Forum decided that it would de-delegate £238k (Primary phase only) and £0k (Secondary phase). This meant a one-third reduction in the overall funding available to fund facilities time (since 2012-13) and also meant 100% of the central arrangement was funded by the Primary phase. In 2015-16 & 2016-17, this was reduced to £199k.</p> <p>The proposal is to retain the same funding for 2017-18 of £199k for the Primary phase and figures have been included for the Secondary phase should they decide to resume their UFT funding .</p> <p>The JUP have recently agreed a re-distribution of funding within the unions. This takes account of union membership numbers and a commensurate allocation of facilities time for representatives that reflects those numbers.</p>		

**What will be the benefits to schools in Schools Forum agreeing this proposal?
(Please give any details of previous proposals of a similar nature or specific details of requirements such as staffing and services)**

The benefit to Primary and Secondary schools of agreeing to de-delegate funding is that it will enable a single central arrangement to be administered by the LA on behalf of all schools in Sandwell. Local officials have local knowledge and are available quickly. The current 'local officials and a central arrangement' provides a mechanism for resolving issues at a local level that could otherwise escalate.

**What will be the impact if School Forum agree to purchase the statutory element of the service only?
(Please give details on the total cost for the year, cost per pupil for each phase, service delivered)**

The statutory aspect of this policy relates to the facilities time that union representatives are entitled to. Please see below for impact if forum do not agree to the proposal.

What will be the impact if Schools Forum do not agree to this proposal?

The impact would be that LA maintained schools where the governing body is the employer – Trust and Voluntary Aided schools - have sole responsibility for providing “reasonable” union facilities time but may choose to exercise this through participation in a centrally-run system.

For Community and Voluntary Controlled schools, funding and employer powers rest with governing bodies whilst the LA remains ‘employer of last resort’ – therefore there is a joint responsibility to ensure “reasonable” facilities time.

If Schools Forum do not agree to fund a central arrangement, each school would become individually responsible for meeting the legal requirement to give union officials representing their staff reasonable paid time off for their union duties.

School-level union representatives are not necessarily accredited by their unions to carry out the full range of union duties. If school reps without appropriate accreditation are used to represent members during a dispute this can adversely affect both the member and the school. The union has the responsibility to ensure that the rep is correctly accredited or they leave themselves vulnerable to being sued by their members for incorrect support and advice.

The loss of area reps, who have local knowledge of and relationship with both members and school leaders would push the work onto the regional reps who do not have those relationships or time to provide the service that the current system allows for.

The LA would still need to maintain a much smaller 'residual function' covering Community and VC schools ie a central forum for borough-wide policies so funding for this would have to come from reducing funding for other services, as there is no other alternative funding source.

How will the amount be deployed?

Salaries (£)	100% on salaries	The LA would allocate this funding amongst the unions in accordance with the agreed funding allocation.
Services (£)		
Schools (£)		

How will expenditure be monitored?

The salaries and on-costs are maintained in a single cost centre and subject to quarterly monitoring.

How will impact be evaluated?

- The proposed central arrangement enables employers and those with delegated employer responsibilities to fulfil their legal responsibilities in a simple and cost effective way.
- The arrangement also enables union officials to perform their essential duties as defined by ACAS.

Please detail any income generated by the service?

None