

## YORK SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

**MONDAY 3<sup>RD</sup> JULY 2017 – 1.00pm – 4.00pm**  
in the Snow Room – GO35 – West Offices

**Key**

	Information and routine business
	Decision
	Consultation

	Item	Item leader	Purpose	Paperwork
1.	Welcome	Chair	Routine business	
2.	Apologies	Chair	For information	
3.	Membership update – welcome to Debbie Glover and Adam Booker	Chair	For information / discussion	Attached
4.	Minutes of the Schools Forum meeting of 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2017	Chair	For approval	Attached
5.	Action Plan and matters arising not on the agenda	Chair	For information	Attached
6.	Maintained School Outturn Balances 2016/17	Paul Shepherd	For consultation	To follow
7.	DSG and Schools Budget 2017/18	Richard Hartle	For information	Attached
8.	Future national education funding – including update on National School Funding Formula and LMS Formula review	Richard Hartle	For information / consultation	Attached
9.	School Improvement Commissioning Fund update	Maxine Squire / John Thompson	For information	Attached
10.	Schools Forum forward plan	Richard Hartle	For information	To follow
11.	Any Other Agreed Business	Chair		
12.	Date and time of next and future meetings	Chair	For decision	To follow

Please send apologies to Salli Radford by email to [salli.radford@york.gov.uk](mailto:salli.radford@york.gov.uk) or by calling York 554210.

## YORK SCHOOLS FORUM – MEMBERSHIP 2016/17 – FROM JUNE 2017

		<b>Name</b>	<b>Term of office – three years in all cases</b>
<b>Schools members: 13</b>	<b>Four</b> maintained (including VA and VC) primary school members including a governor representative  <b><i>Maintained school / academy representation to be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with regulations.</i></b>	Tracey Ralph (Westfield Primary)	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
		Andy Herbert (Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary)	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
		Ben Rich (Governor representative)	13/06/16 – 12/06/19
		Debbie Glover (Poppleton Road Primary)	04/04/17 – 03/04/20
	<b>Three</b> maintained (including VA and VC) secondary school members	Bill Scriven (All Saints RC School (VA))	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
		Lorna Savage (Fulford School)	01/04/15 – 31/03/18
		Richard Crane (The Joseph Rowntree School)	30/09/16 – 29/09/19
	<b>Three</b> academy members	Brian Crosby (Hope Learning Trust)	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
		Trevor Burton (South Bank Multi Academy Trust)	19/09/16 – 18/09/19
		Andrew Daly (Pathfinder Multi Academy Trust)	20/03/17 – 19/03/20
	<b>One</b> special school member	Adam Booker (Applefields Special School)	01/06/17 – 31/05/20
	<b>One</b> maintained nursery school member	Nicola Fox	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
	<b>One</b> PRU member	Tricia Head	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
<b>Non-schools members: 2</b>	<b>One</b> 16-19 representative	Alison Birkinshaw	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
	<b>One</b> PVI early years representative	Ken McArthur	01/12/14 – 31/11/17
<b>TOTAL MEMBERS: 15</b>		<b>15</b>	

<b>Invitees:</b>	Executive member for Education, Children and Young People / Appointed Member	Cllr Stuart Rawlings Cllr Carol Runciman	
	Director of Children's' Services, Education and Skills	Jon Stonehouse	
	Assistant Director, Education and Skills	Maxine Squire	
	Head of Finance	Richard Hartle	
<b>TOTAL INVITEES: 5</b>		<b>5</b>	

Updated June 2017

# CITY OF YORK SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the Schools Forum held on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017 at 9.00am

## Attendance list:

### Members:

Brian Crosby	Academy Representative and Chair
Andrew Daly	Academy Representative
Tricia Head	Pupil Referral Unit Representative and Vice Chair
Trevor Burton	Academy Representative
Caroline Hancy	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Glyn Jones	FE Representative (deputising for Alison Birkinshaw)
Tracey Ralph	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Lorna Savage	Maintained Secondary Headteacher

### Observers / Advisors:

Jon Stonehouse	Director of Children, Education & Communities
Richard Hartle	Head of Finance, City of York Council
Maxine Squire	Assistant Director, Education and Skills
Julia Massey	Learning City Partnership Manager [from 10.30am]
Salli Radford	Coordinator and Clerk

## 1. Welcome and update on membership

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Andrew Daly was welcomed to his first meeting. It was noted that Glyn Jones was deputising for Alison Birkinshaw.

## 2. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received with consent, from Alison Birkinshaw – FE Representative (Glyn Jones deputising), Nicola Fox – Maintained Primary Representative, Andy Herbert – Maintained Primary Headteacher, Cath Hindmarch – Special School Representative, Ken McArthur – Early Years Sector Representative, Cllr Stewart Rawlings – Elected Member for Education, Children and Young People and Ben Rich – Maintained Primary Governor Representative. Bill Scriven – Maintained Secondary Headteacher (VA school), was absent from the meeting.

## 3. Minutes of the York Schools Forum meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017

Previously distributed.

It was agreed that the decision under item 5, Traveller Service De-delegation for 2017/18, required further clarification as there had been a clear difference in view between the primary and secondary phases. Richard Hartle advised that the de-delegation had been presented as a single decision rather than a split decision between phases, as the LA was clear that it wasn't economically viable to provide the service to one phase only. It was acknowledged that this had not been made clear by the minute. The minute relating to the decision was amended to read:

***The Schools Forum approved the de-delegation of £171k of funding for the Traveller Education Service for 2017/18. This decision was made on behalf of all***

***maintained schools and members agreed to vote on this basis, with both phases content to abide by the overall majority decision.***

*In favour*            4  
*Against*             2  
*Abstentions*        0

The minute for item 7, School Funding and the Dedicated School Grant, required further clarification to explain that this meant that the remaining DSG funding would be directed towards increased high needs pressures. The amended minute to read:

***The Forum confirmed their agreement to maintain the LA's centrally retained budgets at their current levels and for the remaining available DSG funding to be directed towards the increased high needs pressures previously discussed.***

**The Forum agreed to the LA's proposals for the retention and de-delegation of former Education Services Grant funding that has transferred into the DSG in 2017/18.**

With this amendment the minutes of the meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

*Trevor Burton joined the meeting at 9.15am.*

#### **4. Action Plan and Matters Arising**

With reference to the action plan:

Point 1 – To be taken to the July meeting.

Point 2 – Response submitted on 22<sup>nd</sup> March. Richard Hartle would provide an update under item 6.

Point 3 – Completed. It was noted that Richard Ludlow had been unable to attend the meeting.

Point 4 – The scheme had been published without further revision.

Point 5 – Completed.

Point 6 – Richard advised that the Teachers Panel de-delegation would cease on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017. Richard offered to invite Teachers Panel representatives to the July meeting to update the Forum on their developing offer, but this was declined by the forum. The Forum discussed the update, noting that the Panel's intention would be to operate as a traded service via York Education from September 2017.

Matters Arising:

In response to a question regarding the funding information provided in relation to item 5, Traveller Service De-delegation for 2017/18, Richard confirmed that the de-delegated amounts were calculated on a formulaic basis, taking account of deprivation and low prior attainment as well as overall pupil numbers.

#### **5. School Improvement Strategic Commissioning Fund 2017/18**

Previously distributed. The Chair brought members' attention to the funding allocations made during 2016/17:

- £226k was paid through a contract to Pathfinder TSA for the provision of a citywide CPD offer
- £350k was allocated through a contract to Ebor TSA for the provision of school to school support

- £200k was allocated to the LA for schools causing concern, supporting interventions in the most serious cases
- £125k was allocated to supporting School Wellbeing Workers (£65k), funding to school clusters (£30k) and for projects considered by the School Improvement Commissioning Group (£30k)
- £65k was returned to the Schools Budget for carry forward into 2017/18

The Chair highlighted the three options being presented for debate by the Forum for the 2017/18 academic year:

1. No central resource – the centrally-retained funding would be returned to schools for them to commission their own school improvement provision.
2. A transitional model – reducing the amount of centrally retained funding (and so returning part of the retained funding to schools as above). This would involve a new model of provision providing a reduced core CPD offer and funding for school-to-school support allocated to the LA (for maintained schools) and to the MATs (for their academies and maintained schools in the process of conversion to join them).
3. Maintaining the existing allocations from centrally retained funding but amend the delivery and accountability arrangements in light of experience from September 2015 to April 2017.

The Chair thanked Andrew Daly for the information relating to the support provided by Pathfinder and circulated with the agenda.

The Chair outlined the reductions in levels of funding to Pathfinder and Ebor Teaching School Alliances (TSAs) already implemented.

In response to a question regarding the decision required, the Chair advised that members must choose one of the three options or refine an option that they would be happy to endorse.

John Thompson advised that a questionnaire had been arranged via Survey Monkey, with responses showing most support for option 2. It was noted that the secondary headteachers' forum had met on 24<sup>th</sup> March and had unanimously expressed support for option 2. It was noted that further detail on implementation was required from the group.

**The Forum unanimously supported option 2, the transitional model that reduced the amount of centrally retained funding.**

The Chair advised that detail relating to option 2 was included in the paper. John advised that the sub-group had met to discuss options and that the transitional model had evolved from this work, with the paper being circulated to working group members for comment prior to finalisation. It was noted that £65k remained available to fund the Wellbeing Worker roles and had been taken out of the funding de-delegation block as this had been agreed by a separate decision.

The Chair advised that the working group had considered option 2 in detail, with Andrew Daly working to develop a CPD offer in line with this financial model. Andrew advised that Pathfinder TSA had intended to evolve their offer in line with a reduction in funding, though a core CPD offer would be required during the transition period. Andrew advised that in addition to this core there would be a range of additional CPD

that schools would wish to access via the open market, though the core city-wide offer devised by Pathfinder was based on a needs-analysis used to identify the skills required across the city.

The Chair thanked Andrew for the detailed paper, advising that a fully-traded CPD offer would be required by the start of 2019/20. It was noted that the working group had agreed that a core offer should be retained in the interim period.

The Chair drew the attention of members to Appendix 1, which outlined the funding allocations to individual schools to enable CPD to be sourced or for other school improvement work.

John Thompson advised that the funding illustrated by Appendix 1 was currently retained for school improvement work and would therefore need to be returned to schools on the basis of pupil numbers and not as part of the funding formula allocation. Maxine Squire advised that any funding returned on this basis would need to be allocated to school improvement as it had been retained for this specific purpose.

In response to a question regarding the option to backfill school budget deficits, Maxine advised that the funding should be used for school improvement activity.

John advised that the conversion of maintained schools to academy status took considerable time and that current projections into 2019 had been based on published Academy Orders. It was noted that this information had been reflected in funding projections.

John advised that MATs should define and commission school improvement support as appropriate once a school had made the decision to convert, with the Forum noting that this arrangement was already in place in a number of schools across the city. It was noted that the suggestion had therefore been made to split the £400k School Improvement funding allocation equally between maintained schools and those already converted or on the conversion journey. John advised that the working group had considered this option on the assumption that 50% of schools would have converted or have initiated the conversion process by the end of 2017/18. It was noted that the completion of all currently-proposed conversions would take until the end of 2018/19. John advised that it seemed logical for MATs to take responsibility for school improvement in settings joining their structures, though an LA allocation would still be required in the short term. It was noted that the funding model for option 2 included £30k of cluster funding and £30k for groups of schools addressing city-wide priorities, with the working group proposing retention of both funding allocations. John summarised the allocations proposed by the working group under option 2:

Pathfinder CPD programme	£150k
MAT / LA School Improvement support	£400k
Cluster work	£ 30k
City-wide sector-led improvement	£ 30k
Individual School Allocations	<u>£291k</u>
	<b>£901k</b>
<i>Plus Wellbeing Workers agreed separately</i>	<u>£ 65k</u>
	<b><u>£966k</u></b>

It was noted that the proposed funding arrangements would require MATs to discuss issues with the LA to enable its role in providing independent oversight and the distribution of £200k within the city's MATs. John advised of the need to recognise that sponsored conversions attracted some Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) funding

and that this would need to be taken into account when planning, though the restrictions attached to this funding would also need to be noted.

In response to a question regarding a proposed reduction in funding to Ebor TSA in line with the reduction to funding for the Pathfinder TSA CPD offer, John advised that the overall funding allocation for school improvement would not be reduced at this time and that the LA may use part of this funding to commission Ebor TSA to deliver aspects of school improvement.

In response to a question regarding paragraph 19 and reference to development of a "local resource", John advised that this project was open to debate, with a view having been provided by Richard Hartle that the city might be able to influence the DfE regarding the future of school improvement funding but would need to build an evidence base to support this process. It was noted that there were no guarantees regarding future funding but that a city-wide aspiration, shared by the MAT CEOs, to develop a collaborative system which evidenced the value for money delivered by the local school network could be helpful.

Richard advised that such an evidence base might help the city retain funding which currently sat outside the proposed national funding formula arrangements, further advising that the DfE expected to unwind commitments and remove funding from LAs by 2019/20. It was noted that if this central school improvement funding were to be transferred into the LMS Funding Formula for 2017/18, then its benefit to schools would be removed rapidly once the new National Funding Formula was introduced. The possible retention of funding for school improvement across the city through the development of an evidence-base showing value for money and positive outcomes was therefore desirable.

The Chair advised that Ebor TSA had a role to play in recruiting SLEs and in working with the LA to oversee projects. It was noted that this work needed to be quality-assured and for a system to be in place to enable evaluation of the use of the £200k allocated to the LA. It was noted that no other funding would be available to the LA to support school improvement, with the Chair observing that the most complex schools within the city were currently within the academy system or in the process of conversion, increasingly shifting need into the MATs. It was noted that the RSC would provide some funding to support schools judged to be Grade 4. Maxine advised that some transitional funding being provided only partly replaced reduced ESG funding in the short term, with regional allocations being made by a national panel. It was noted that the DfE budget had been reduced overall, impacting funding available on a bid basis.

In response to a question regarding the Wellbeing Worker role and the long-term future funding for this project, currently supported by a £65k allocation, Jon Stonehouse advised that this funding had been allocated by a separate Schools Forum decision. Jon further advised that it was unclear what funding mechanism would be in place in future for the project, though mental health was currently viewed as a city-wide priority. It was noted that the Forum could discuss funding options for the project over the next two-years.

In response to a question regarding funding for school improvement in the 2017/18 de-delegations; Richard advised that this was a separate issue as the new de-delegation related specifically to the ESG transferred to the DSG in 2017/18, was neutral in schools' budgets and helped fund the LA's core school improvement team.

Further discussion followed, with the point being made that it would be helpful to see the allocation of school improvement funding between the LA and MATs for the current year. It was noted that the TSAs played a key role in the delivery of school improvement and that the working group had clearly understood the Pathfinder CPD offer and the 34% reduction in funding. It was noted that the allocation to Ebor TSA had been reduced by 27%, with the suggestion being made that this reduction also be increased to 34%, with the balance being redirected to schools. It was suggested that school-to-school support work be put to tender, with discussion of options following.

John suggested that the Forum received quarterly reports from the MAT CEOs and LA School Improvement team showing budget spend and impact. It was noted that the School Improvement Commissioning Fund had been underspent in the last two years. It was noted that the city currently retained flexibility in its response to Schools Causing Concern (SCC), with a question being asked regarding how SCC might be addressed in-year should funding be split between the LA and MATs as proposed. The Chair advised that MATs would need to build their own school improvement teams, with each MAT building capacity through allocation of its own top-slice. Maxine advised that funding would be based on the LA's risk assessment process.

The Forum further discussed the detail of Option 2, with the Chair advising that the current support model was based on planning on an academic year basis whilst funding was currently allocated on a financial year basis beginning 1<sup>st</sup> April. The suggestion being that it would now be sensible for funding to also move to an academic year allocation.

Andrew Daly advised that LA intelligence and the deeper understanding of issues developed within MATs would need to be brought together to determine funding allocations. It was noted that the LA would retain a role in quality assuring intervention and support work. The Chair advised that MATs would need to be able to address emerging issues in schools with weak data but not identified through a formal process and therefore attracting additional funding.

The view was expressed that the agreed transitional arrangement would need to be thought through due to its limitations, with a desired outcome being the continuance of the strong co-operation currently evident across the city. Maxine advised that the funding available to MATs was not sufficient to allow the development of individual school improvement functions and that a collaborative approach would be the most resilient model for future working. It was noted that overall funding would remain inadequate and would not cover base costs.

In response to a question regarding the critical mass at which MATs became sustainable, John advised that the top-slice applied by MATs would only generate a portion of required funding and that the LA was keen to see the development of city-wide provision that all MATs could access to ensure adequate support. It was noted that collaborative working between MATs would be necessary to deliver this. Maxine advised that York children would move between MATs during their education and that the system would need to ensure the delivery of quality to all.

The Forum discussed this proposed approach, with Jon Stonehouse advising that few LAs were considering a collaborative solution. Jon advised that the proposed model offered a very different solution to the issues of inadequate funding and limited capacity. It was noted that the continuance of city-wide discussion was key to development of the model.

Jon advised that the clear preference for Option 2 must be underpinned by funding detail which delivered the maximum funding back to schools but retained a central fund for maintained schools as well as funding for MATs. Jon asked members to consider the overall level of funding outlined in Option 2 and to be mindful that the decision was being made based on relatively new arrangements. Jon suggested a cautious approach, with Richard advising that an adjustment of funding back to schools could be made in-year if the allocation for school improvement was made at this point and was not required in total.

The Chair sought the view of the Forum on the allocations to Pathfinder and Ebor TSAs. Following further discussion Maxine advised that school-to-school support provided by Ebor was difficult to predict in comparison to the CPD offer and that needs could change significantly during the year. It was noted that the overall allocation of £400k offered flexibility. Maxine advised that the model had been reviewed, with John advising that funding would not all be allocated via Ebor and that any underspends would be returned to schools.

In response to a question regarding the 2016/17 underspend; Richard advised that this would be carried forward as part of the overall DSG balance into 2017/18.

The Forum further discussed funding allocations, noting that the overall funding allocated to the SICG had already been reduced. It was noted that a MAT sponsoring a school in Special Measures needed to account for the additional RSC funding allocation to ensure positive outcomes.

The Chair advised that MATs would need to discuss with the LA situations in which school leaders had been identified as a barrier to improvement, with the point being made that MATs were better-able to address leadership issues given their structures.

**The Chair proposed that funding totalling £125k pa be approved through to the end of the 2017/18 academic year for the Wellbeing Workers, cluster funding and city-wide projects as discussed:**

- **School Wellbeing Workers (£65k)**
- **Funding to school clusters (£30k)**
- **Projects considered by the School Improvement Commissioning Group (£30k)**

**This was unanimously agreed.**

**The Chair proposed that funding of £150k be approved for the Pathfinder TSA 2017/18 academic year CPD offer. This was unanimously agreed.**

**The Chair proposed that funding of £400k be approved as the total school improvement fund for the 2017/18 academic year, with further detail on how this would be allocated to be considered by the working group and brought back to the Forum. This was unanimously agreed.**

In response to a question regarding the continuance of the SICG, John provided context to the Forum. It was suggested that membership required review and that thought could usefully be given to the involvement of headteachers in the group.

*The meeting adjourned for a five-minute break at 10.25am.*

*Julia Massey joined the meeting at 10.30am.*

It was agreed that item 7 would be taken at this point in the agenda.

## 7. The Apprenticeship Levy

Previously distributed. Julia Massey outlined her role as Learning City Partnership Manager, supporting schools as employers.

Julia advised that the government's apprenticeship levy of 0.5% would be applied to payrolls of over £3m pa from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017, with this being taken as a monthly deduction. It was noted that this fund could then be accessed to support training for new apprentices and staff. It was noted that (non VA) maintained schools were included in the overall LA payroll and would all therefore be subject to the levy, even if an individual school's payroll was less than £3m pa. VA schools, stand alone academies and MATs were not included in the LA payroll total and would be separately subject to the levy based on their own annual payroll costs. Julia advised of the need to maximise benefit from the proportionate levy contribution being made by schools.

It was noted that the LA aimed to offer an independent apprenticeship brokerage that might be of benefit to schools.

Julia tabled a draft guide and toolkit, advising that this explained the levy in greater detail.

The Chair advised that a MAT with a combined payroll of over £3M would need to pay the levy but would be able to access training for an apprentice. Julia advised that in this situation the MAT would pay for the apprentice, with the levy funding the training element. It was noted that 15 training funding bands had been established and that banding information was available via the LA's website, which provided estimated costs for apprenticeships.

The Forum noted the principles for the use of the levy pot included in the guidance notes:

- Whilst the CYC payroll and levy account will not separate out CYC 'core' and 'schools', CYC will set up a system to track indicative values for levy collection and demand on spend by CYC 'core' and schools
- CYC Education and Skills Team to work with schools to scope potential demand against the schools' 'pooled' levy pot
- Agree a principle of access to the levy pot by schools in relation to demand and need not in proportion to levy paid
- Schools' levy funds (at risk of expiring) can be used elsewhere in CYC to support the costs of apprenticeship training for new recruits or existing staff, and vice versa
- If a school converts to become an academy:
  - The academy's governing body or trust will be responsible for the apprenticeship levy from this point
  - The levy contributions already made via CYC are not transferable
  - The liability of any outstanding training costs for staff undertaking apprenticeship training (either as a new starter or existing staff development) are transferred to the academy or Trust
  - New apprentice recruits will be subject to TUPE legislation and transferred into the new employing entity along with all other school employees
- If the cumulative levy funds of CYC (core + schools) is at risk of expiring, a pragmatic approach to manage under-spend will be applied, with CYC seeking to retain levy investment within the local economy, exercising the opportunity to use

10% of levy payments to support training costs of our supply chain (from April 2018)

- If demand for accessing apprenticeship funds exceeds the levy pot, CYC / schools can access co-investment, whereby government pays 90% of the training and assessment costs and a 10% contribution is required from the school or CYC service area

Julia advised of the need to agree the principle that schools access funding in proportion to need and not based on their contribution. It was noted that this would need to be agreed as a maintained group of schools.

It was noted that funding was available to support existing staff, as well as newly appointed staff. Julia advised that new TA standards, standards for Initial Teacher Training and for School Bursars were in development.

The Forum discussed the paper, with Julia providing further information on training providers. It was noted that MATs could access a range of established providers via the procurement process, with LA procurement principles having been adopted and trainers being accessed via York Learning. It was noted that maintained schools could access this information via the LA.

In response to a question regarding schools in the process of converting to academy status, Julia advised that this situation was covered by the principles already outlined, suggesting that the levy could not be repaid but that the LA would maximise value. It was noted that existing training relationships would transfer to the academy, with references to this process included in the TUPE guidance.

Tricia Head shared some experiences of apprentice recruitment, with Julia advising of the work being done to address “supply side” issues through the engagement of young people and parents and that the quality of applicants had significantly improved.

In response to a question regarding the information provided to headteachers, schools and governors, Julia advised that information would be shared more widely shortly, with the opportunity to make comments available for a short time. It was noted that Julia could arrange an online survey to gauge interest and that project leads could visit schools to support their understanding of needs.

In response to a question regarding teacher apprenticeship opportunities, Maxine Squire advised that these would be made available in time. In response to a question regarding the fit with teacher training, Maxine advised that aspects of the programme could be made available to serving teachers to support the improvement of aspects of their role. Julia advised that lobbying could be undertaken if a specific need were identified.

In response to a question regarding a cap on the training contribution, Julia advised that central government would pay up to 90% of training costs if a group met 10% of the total.

It was noted that information would be taken to the summer term headteacher and governor briefing sessions and that a governor training event would be organised. The Chair asked that the information be shared with SBMs.

In response to a question regarding the level held by an applicant when applying for an apprenticeship and the apparent need to be working below the level of the placement, Julia advised that the level could already have been achieved but that the applicant

could be seeking to learn new skills at the current level. Julia highlighted the need for transferable skills in these cases, with an emphasis on a change in career direction. It was noted that graduate apprenticeship roles were planned for the future.

**Julia invited comments from Forum members in advance of the summer term briefings.**

Glyn Jones requested an update on the influence of HR and CPD policy to a future meeting. Julia would consider this request.

*Julia Massey left the meeting at 10.55am.*

**6. National Funding Formula Consultation update**

Richard Hartle advised that he had submitted the LA's response to include the following points:

- Basic amount per pupil - An increase in the basic amount per pupil had been requested, particularly in relation to the balance between the targeted and basic amounts
- Impact on small rural schools - The impact of the reduction in the lump sum and removal of sparsity funding would require local discretion to be available to address losses
- Funding floor – the maximum 3% loss per pupil would perpetuate inequalities and the floor should be reviewed
- Overall level of resources should be increased

Richard highlighted the national debate now taking place, with a central government response awaited. It was noted that schools anticipating an increase in their funding via the proposed model were still unhappy with the proposed levels, and that discussion of current and future cost pressures were being conflated with the National Funding Formula review in the press, with this being unhelpful in terms of understanding the implications of the proposed formula.

The update was noted.

**8. Schools Forum forward plan**

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle outlined the items included in the plan, which was noted. The inclusion review would be added.

In response to a question regarding the possible delay to the National Funding Formula and associated consequences, Richard advised that the city anticipated an overall gain of c£4.5M, though this could be delayed or lost if the proposed model was rejected. Richard advised of other possible implications to retained budgets, though he expected as a minimum that flat cash allocations would continue.

Maxine advised that the general election timeline would apply if called.

**9. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**10. Date and time of the next meeting**

The next meeting would take place on 3<sup>rd</sup> July at 1.00pm.

The meeting closed at 11.10am.

---

Chair Date

DRAFT

## SCHOOLS FORUM ACTION PLAN / ACTIVITY LOG – 2016 / 17

Minute reference	Action	Outcome	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
7 13/02/17	The Inclusion Review: Report on how the DSG High Needs funding is currently used in York – item to be taken to the July Schools Forum meeting.	Full consideration is taken of review outcomes to allow strategic planning for the 2017/18 academic year.	Chair / Clerk	03/07/17	In progress
8 13/02/17	Comments on the School and High Needs National Funding Formula DfE consultation are forwarded to Richard Hartle in advance of the consultation deadline of 22/03/17.	The Forum's views are included in the LA's consultation response.	All	22/03/17	Completed
11 13/02/17	Establish and arrange a meeting of a working group to consider the allocation of the School Improvement Commissioning Fund in 2017/18.	A new operating model is presented to the Forum for approval.	Maxine Squire	03/04/17	Completed
13 13/02/17	Comments on the revisions to the York LMS Scheme for Financing Schools are forwarded to Richard Hartle by 31/03/17.	The Forum's views are taken into account before finalisation of the revised scheme.	All	31/03/17	Completed
5 26/9/16	Information on the proposed de-delegation in support of the Traveller Education Service to be produced for the next Forum meeting.	The Forum is able to understand how de-delegated funds will be used to support the service.	Richard Hartle / Catherine Hemmings	13/02/16	Completed
7 26/9/16	A new traded business model to be requested from the Teachers Panel that takes into account the changes within the city and is accessible to academies.	The Forum is able to cease the de-delegated funding of the Panel whilst ensuring that the new traded model meets the needs of schools and academies.	Maxine Squire	13/02/16	In progress

Updated July 2017

---

**York Schools Forum**

**3 July 2017**

Report of the Director Children, Education & Communities and the Director of Customer & Corporate Services

**DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG) & SCHOOLS BUDGET 2017/18**

**Summary**

- 1 This report provides the forum with an analysis of the Schools Budget for the 2017/18 financial year. The report sets out how the budget has been allocated to the budget lines within the statutory Section 251 Statement that the Local Authority (LA) is required to provide for the DfE. A brief description of the expenditure and activity funded by each budget line is then provided. This should provide the forum with an overview of the expenditure funded from the DSG, and then if necessary to request further information on individual budget areas be provided at future meetings.

**Background**

- 2 At its meeting in February the forum made a number of strategic decisions about the allocation of budgets funded from the DSG for 2017/18. The majority of these decisions focused on the marginal or incremental changes to budgets required from 2016/17 to 2017/18. As part of the discussions the forum asked that a further report be presented setting out the resulting overall DSG funded budgets for 2017/18.

**The Schools Budget 2016/17**

- 3 Annex 1 presents the LA table from the Section 251 submission that the LA has submitted to the DfE. This shows that the total estimated Schools Budget for 2017/18 is £124.618m. Further analysis and description of the individual budget lines is set out in the following paragraphs.

Line 1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget (£107.461m)

- 4 The Individual Schools Budget (ISB) includes all of the LMS formula funding for York's maintained schools/academies and funding for early years settings delivered through the Early Years Single Funding Formula. In addition the basic guaranteed £10,000 per place funding for special schools, ERCs in mainstream schools and alternative provision schools (Danesgate) comes under the ISB heading. Sixth form funding allocations are also included within the ISB.

Lines 1.1.1 to 1.1.10 De-Delegated Items (£0.434m gross)

- 5 This represents the funding that schools have agreed (via the Schools Forum) to hand back to the LA to allow the LA to provide a small number of services to maintained primary and secondary schools. Funding cannot be de-delegated directly

from academies but academies are free to buy into these services (except contingency) on an individual basis if they wish. The de-delegated services for 2017/18 are:

- General Schools Contingency (Primary £42k / Secondary £22k)
- Behaviour Support Outreach Service (Primary £150k)
- Traveller Support Service (Primary £93k / Secondary £68k)
- Free School Meals Eligibility Service (Primary £23k / Secondary £20k)
- School Trade Union Facility Time (Primary £11k / Secondary £6k)

#### Lines 1.2.1 to 1.2.3 High Needs Top Up Funding (£9.041m)

6 High needs top ups are allocated for all pupils where the cost of funding the needs of the pupil exceeds the core funding provided for such a pupil within the ISB allocation for the school or setting, for example:

- Mainstream pupils whose SEN costs exceed £6,000 per year (c12.5 LSA hours per week)
- Special School or ERC pupils whose total costs exceed £10,000 per year
- Alternative Provision (Danesgate pupils) whose total costs exceed £10,000 per year.
- Post 16 SEN provision.

7 Unlike ISB funding which is only allocated to York schools, the LA is required to fund the high needs top ups of all York pupils wherever their provision is based. This includes providing funding to other LA schools and independent out of city special schools where appropriate.

#### Line 1.2.4 Additional Targeted High Needs Funding for Mainstream Schools & Academies (£0.209m)

8 This funding is allocated to mainstream schools and academies to meet additional high needs support costs below the £6,000 threshold where the high needs element of the school funding formula is deemed insufficient for schools with higher than expected numbers of SEN pupils. Previously schools were required to make bids against this SEN contingency budget. However, from 2014/15 the LA has been required to allocate this on a transparent and predictable basis. The current allocation methodology is as follows:

*Funding will be allocated to schools based on the number of statemented pupils (excluding ERC pupils) triggering LA top up funding above an annually agreed threshold. Separate thresholds will be set for primary schools (1% for 2017/18) and secondary schools (2% for 2017/18). The calculations will be based on pupil number and statement data at the time of the preceding October Census (i.e. October 2016 for the 2017/18 financial year). Each fte statemented pupil above the threshold will generate an additional £6,000 of funding for the school.*

*Example 1:*

*A primary school with 5 statemented pupils and 250 pupils on roll at the October 2016 census:*

$5 / 250 \times 100 = 2\%$  *statemented pupils*  
 $2\% - 1\%$  *primary threshold = 1% above the threshold*  
 $1\% \times 250$  *pupils = 2.5 pupils above the threshold*  
 $2.5$  *pupils*  $\times \pounds 6,000 = \pounds 15,000$  *of additional funding*

*Example 2:*

*A secondary school with 25 statemented pupils and 1,000 pupils on roll at the October 2016 census:*

$25 / 1,000 \times 100 = 2.5\%$  *statemented pupils*  
 $2.5\% - 2\%$  *secondary threshold = 0.5% above the threshold*  
 $0.5\% \times 1,000$  *pupils = 5 pupils above the threshold*  
 $5$  *pupils*  $\times \pounds 6,000 = \pounds 30,000$  *of additional funding*

#### Line 1.2.5 SEN Support Services (£1.943m)

- 9 SEN support services covers the costs of non-delegated centrally retained specialist SEN support for statemented and non-statemented pupils. It includes the following:
- Visual & Hearing Impairment
  - Autism Support
  - Physical Impairment
  - Specialist Teaching including early years
  - Mental Health Support for Schools
  - Portage
  - Early Support
  - YILTS
  - LAC Teacher
  - Contribution to The Glen respite care centre
  - General SEN Support

#### Line 1.2.6 Hospital Education Services (£0.2206m)

- 10 This budget funds the costs of educating children in hospital settings.

#### Line 1.2.8 Support for Inclusion (£0.426m)

- 11 Support for inclusion includes centrally retained budgets funding expenditure in the following areas:
- Nurture Groups
  - Integrated Services for Disabled Children
  - SEN Transitions Team
  - Special School Outreach

#### Line 1.2.12 Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) Allowances (£0.005m)

- 12 This covers the estimated cost of the purchase of CRC allowances in relation to PRUs in the LA's area (only Danesgate for York). PRUs, unlike other maintained schools and academies, will remain part of the CRC scheme in 2017/18.

#### Line 1.2.13 Therapies and Other Health Related Services (£0.052m)

- 13 This covers the costs associated with the provision of special medical support for individual pupils which is not met by the NHS.

#### Line 1.3.1 Central Expenditure on Children Under 5 (£0.404m)

- 14 This line covers the total funding that is centrally retained to support 2, 3 and 4 year old provision in both maintained and PVI settings. This represents 5% of the total Early Years DSG allocation for 2017/18, below the maximum 7% allowed under the revised Early Years funding regulations introduced in April.

#### Line 1.4.1 Contribution to Combined Budgets (£1.966m)

- 15 Under the school finance regulations schools can agree (through the Schools Forum) to allow the LA to use DSG funding to support certain central services that have a wider educational benefit or generate a net overall saving to the Schools Budget. These contributions are now limited to a maximum of the amounts agreed up to 2012/13 and no new contributions are allowed.
- 16 A significant proportion of this funding relates to former standards fund grants that were mainstreamed in 2011/12. At that time a total of £12.494m of standards fund grants were transferred into the DSG. Of this £11.303m was delegated directly to schools or other settings through the LMS formula or other mechanisms. As the remaining £1.191m of standards fund allocations were supporting central services the Schools Forum agreed to allow this to continue in the following areas:
- School Improvement Service (£0.641m)
  - Children's Centres on school sites (£0.355m)
  - Contribution to Schools Broadband Contract (£0.195m)
- 17 The remaining funding retained under the combined budget heading relates to three specific decisions made prior to 2012/13 by the Schools Forum:
- **Children Looked After** (£0.400m). This is used to support a combined budget for managing education and care placement costs for the city's CLA population, and the development of a high quality local fostering programme. This followed a report on the placement strategy for CLA that was presented to the lead Member for Children's Services in 2006. This report set out the advantages both for the individual children's care and education and financially of the approach being taken. This contribution, towards a totalling fostering budget of £3.4m, has allowed the LA to significantly reduce the number of children in out of city placements. Local placements and their associated education costs are significantly lower than more expensive external placements. This has resulted in significant savings to the Schools Budget for the education element of these placements with an estimated on-going annual saving of over £1.8m achieved since 2006/07.
  - **Safeguarding Advisor (Schools)** (£0.050m). This funding, agreed in 2009/10, allows the LA to employ an additional post within the Safeguarding Unit with a

specific role of supporting schools to deliver on their safeguarding duties.

- **Schools Causing Concern** (£0.200m) / **School Improvement Topslice** (£0.125m). Although this funding is initially retained centrally by the school improvement service it is all ultimately either allocated to individual schools or spent on activity supporting improvement at individual schools.

18 The forum will note that in respect of the budgets for School Improvement (£641k), Schools Causing Concern (£200k) and School Improvement Topslice (£125k), totalling £966k, the forum has made a further set of decisions on how this funding should be used in 2017/18:

- School to School Support & Intervention £400k
- City Wide CPD Offer via Pathfinder TSA £150k
- Cluster Funding £30k
- City Wide Improvement Projects £30k
- School Wellbeing Workers £65k
- Allocated Direct to Schools for Improvement Work £291k

#### Line 1.4.2 School Admissions (£0.178m)

19 This budget contributes to the costs of the LA's statutory functions in respect of the schools admissions processes.

#### Line 1.4.3 Servicing of Schools Forums (£0.042m)

20 This covers the costs of the School Forum meetings including officer time in preparing reports and attendance, and other associated costs such as consultations linked to specific School Forum related decisions.

#### Line 1.4.4 Termination of Employment Costs (£0.383m)

21 School redundancy and early retirement costs where the revenue savings achieved by the termination of employment to which they relate are greater than the costs incurred. The costs charged to this budget only relate to decisions made prior to 2013/14. For information, the total expenditure incurred by the LA on school staff redundancy was in excess of £1m in 2016/17.

#### Line 1.4.7 Prudential Borrowing Costs (£0.605m)

22 This budget is set aside to fund the repayment of loans for school building capital works where the investment contributes towards an overall net revenue saving to the Schools Budget. This is another area where the tightening of the regulations means that further expenditure above this level will not be permitted. Contributions to the following schemes are covered by the current budget provision:

- York High School (Merger of Lowfield and Oaklands Secondary Schools)
- Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary School (Merger of Clifton without Junior and Rawcliffe Infants Schools)
- Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Primary School (Merger of Our Lady's and English Martyrs Primary Schools)

- Burnholme Community College closure – provision of additional secondary school places at other schools

#### Line 1.4.10 Pupil Growth & Infant Class Sizes (£0.800m)

- 23 A budget of £350k is provided to fund unavoidable growth in pupil numbers at individual schools due to demographic or other factors that are supported by the LA. The criteria for applying the funding is set out at annex 2.
- 24 In 2016/17 the following allocations were made from the growth fund totalling £173k, with the balance of £177k carried forward to 2017/18 as part of the overall DSG balance:
- |                              |         |
|------------------------------|---------|
| Archbishop Holgate's Academy | £98,628 |
| Acomb Primary                | £19,151 |
| Joseph Rowntree Secondary    | £16,902 |
| Scarcroft Academy            | £10,484 |
| St Mary's Primary            | £9,425  |
| Dunnington Primary           | £8,960  |
| Carr Junior                  | £8,591  |
| Fulford Secondary            | £418    |

- 25 At the request of primary schools a budget of £450k was transferred from the LMS Funding Formula to allow more targeted allocations of funding to be made to help support schools to deliver on their statutory requirement to maintain infant class sizes at 30 or fewer. Funding is allocated to schools in year on an academic year basis following the publication of the actual October census numbers – see annex 2 for full details.

#### Line 1.4.11 SEN Transport (£0.400m)

- 26 This relates to the strategy around reducing the number and cost of out of city placements and is linked to the local fostering contribution described at paragraph 17. The rationale for charging the costs to the Schools Budget is that as external placements are reduced, and more children are retained within the city, then significant savings accrue to the Schools Budget for the education element of the provision. However a knock on consequence is that as education provision is made within York inevitably the local transport costs for this group of high needs children increases.
- 27 Overall, as referred to in paragraph 17, it is estimated that on-going annual savings to the Schools Budget of over £1.8m have been delivered through the placement strategy. Therefore, after taking account of the increased charges to the Schools Budget of £0.4m for local fostering and £0.4m for SEN transport, the strategy has still delivered a net Schools Budget saving of a least £1m per year.

#### Line 1.4.13 Exceptions Agreed by the Secretary of State (£0.110m)

28 This budget is retained centrally to fund the costs of a number of school copyright licence agreements that are now negotiated nationally by the DfE for all publicly funded schools and charged to LAs rather than to individual schools. For 2017/18 these are:

- The Copyright Licensing Agency licence
- The School Printed Music licence
- The Newspaper Licensing Agency Schools licence
- The Educational Recording Agency licence
- The Public Video Screening licence
- The Motion Picture Licensing Company licence
- The Performing Right Society licence
- The Phonographic Performance licence
- The Mechanical Copyright Protection Society licence
- The Christian Copyright Licensing International licence

Line 1.5.1-3 Former ESG Retained Budgets - Central Schools Budget (£0.375m)

29 This new line has been added to reflect the changes relating to services formerly funded by the education services grant (ESG). LAs are able to retain funding centrally within the schools budget for services which they provide for all schools, including academies (previously funded by the “retained duties” element of the ESG). The services covered include; education welfare service, management of the LA’s capital programme, management of private finance transactions, general landlord duties for buildings including those leased to academies, the director of children’s services and office, planning for the education service as a whole, revenue budget preparation and accounts, external audit, formulation and review of local authority schools funding, internal audit and other tasks related to the LA’s chief finance officer’s responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972, consultation costs, standing Advisory Committee for Religious Education.

Line 1.6.1-6 Former ESG General Budgets - Maintained Schools Funded (£0.612m gross)

30 This new line has been added to reflect the changes relating to services formerly funded by the education services grant (ESG). LAs are able to deducted funding from maintained school budgets in a similar way to de-delegation for services which they provide for maintained schools only (previously funded by the “general duties” element of the ESG). The services covered include; clothing grants, music tuition, performing arts, outdoor education centres, education welfare services, general landlord duties, statutory health and safety duty, management of the risk from asbestos, procurement advice, budgeting and accounting functions relating to the financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with requirements in relation to the scheme for financing schools and the provision of community facilities by governing bodies, internal audit and other tasks related to the authority’s chief finance officer’s responsibilities under Section 151 of LGA 1972 for maintained schools, Consistent Financial Reporting, investigations of employees, functions related to local government pensions and administration of teachers’ pensions in relation to staff working, statutory HR duties, consultation costs, functions under the

Equality Act 2010, appointment of governors, redundancy costs, monitoring of national curriculum assessments.

### Recommendations

- 31 Members of the forum are asked to note and comment on the budget information contained in this report. In particular the forum is asked to identify any further more detailed information it would like to receive on individual budget lines or areas. The expectation is that this further information would help inform the forum ahead of decisions and recommendations required in setting the 2018/19 Schools Budget.

<b>Contact Details</b> <b>Author:</b>	<b>Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:</b>		
Richard Hartle Head of Finance: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Director of Children, Education & Communities Tel: 01904 554200  Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Corporate Services Tel: 01904 551100		
	<b>Report Approved</b>	√	<b>Date</b> 20 June 2017
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>			

**Annex 1 - S251 Schools Budget Summary 2017/18 – DfE Return**  
**Annex 2 - Pupil Growth Funding Criteria 2017/18**

**S251 SCHOOLS BUDGET SUMMARY 2017/18**

Line Ref.	Description	Early Years £	Primary £	Secondary £	Special £	Alternative Provision £	Post School £	Gross £	Income £	Net £
	<b>ISB</b>									
1.0.1	Individual Schools Budget (before Academy recoupment)	8,973,650	48,214,895	45,942,544	2,530,000	1,800,000		107,461,089		107,461,089
	<b>DE-DELGATED ITEMS</b>									
1.1.1	Contingencies		41,720	21,896				63,616	(63,616)	-
1.1.2	Behaviour support services		149,900	0				149,900	(149,900)	-
1.1.3	Support to UPEG and bilingual learners		93,038	68,402				161,440	(161,440)	-
1.1.4	Free school meals eligibility		22,761	19,505				42,266	(42,266)	-
1.1.5	Insurance		0	0				0	0	-
1.1.6	Museum and Library services		0	0				0	0	-
1.1.7	Licences/subscriptions		0	0				0	0	-
1.1.8	Staff costs – supply cover excluding cover for facility time		0	0				0	0	-
1.1.9	Staff costs – supply cover for facility time		11,056	5,802				16,858	(16,858)	-
1.1.10	School improvement		0	0				0	0	-
	<b>HIGH NEEDS BUDGET</b>									
1.2.1	Top-up funding – maintained schools	35,628	547,136	557,938	2,340,000	1,500,000		4,980,702	0	4,980,702
1.2.2	Top-up funding – academies, free schools and colleges	0	359,693	214,394	0	0	490,338	1,064,425	0	1,064,425
1.2.3	Top-up and other funding – non-maintained and independent providers	94,372	0	0	2,313,450	0	601,760	3,009,582	(14,140)	2,995,442
1.2.4	Additional high needs targeted funding for mainstream schools and academies	0	202,200	7,200				209,400	0	209,400
1.2.5	SEN support services	459,287	837,835	619,135	15,411	10,963	0.00	1,942,631	0	1,942,631
1.2.6	Hospital education services				220,305	0		220,305	0	220,305
1.2.7	Other alternative provision services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
1.2.8	Support for inclusion	0	196,654	151,176	78,025	0	0	425,855	0	425,855
1.2.9	Special schools and PRUs in financial difficulty				0	0		0	0	-
1.2.10	PFI/ BSF costs at special schools, AP/ PRUs and Post 16 institutions only				0	0	0	0	0	-
1.2.11	Direct payments (SEN and disability)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
1.2.12	Carbon reduction commitment allowances (PRUs)					5,000		5,000	0	5,000
1.2.13	Therapies and other health related services	971	28,665	21,182	527	375	0	51,720	0	51,720
	<b>EARLY YEARS BUDGET</b>									
1.3.1	Central Expenditure on Children Under 5	403,589						403,589	0	403,589
	<b>CENTRAL PROVISION WITHIN SCHOOLS BUDGET</b>									
1.4.1	Contribution to Combined Budgets	35,764	1,112,801	784,204	19,417	13,814		1,966,000	0	1,966,000
1.4.2	School Admissions	3,343	98,691	72,930	1,815	1,291		178,070	0	178,070
1.4.3	Servicing of Schools Forums	3,413	21,518	15,901	396	282		41,510	0	41,510
1.4.4	Termination of Employment Costs	7,187	212,175	156,790	3,902	2,776		382,830	0	382,830
1.4.5	Falling Rollls Fund	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	-
1.4.6	Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA)	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	-
1.4.7	Prudential Borrowing Costs	0	82,000	523,000	0	0		605,000	0	605,000
1.4.8	Fees to Independent Schools Without SEN	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	-
1.4.9	Equal Pay - Back Pay	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	-
1.4.10	Pupil Growth & Infant Class Sizes	0	600,000	200,000	0	0		800,000	0	800,000
1.4.11	SEN Transport	0	0	0	400,000	0	0	400,000	0	400,000
1.4.12	Exceptions Agreed by the Secretary of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
1.4.13	Other Items	2,065	60,965	45,051	1,121	798	0	110,000	0	110,000
1.5.1-3	Former ESG Retained Budgets - Central Schools Budget							630,670	(255,940)	374,730
1.6.1-6	Former ESG General Budgets - Maintained Schools Funded							612,304	(612,304)	-
1.7.1	Other Specific Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		-
1.8.1	<b>TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET (Before Academy Recoupment)</b>	<b>10,019,269</b>	<b>52,893,702</b>	<b>49,427,051</b>	<b>7,924,369</b>	<b>3,335,299</b>	<b>1,092,098</b>	<b>125,934,762</b>	<b>(1,316,464)</b>	<b>124,618,298</b>

### PUPIL GROWTH FUNDING CRITERIA 2017/18

#### Basic Need Growth

Additional funding for basic need growth will be made available to schools that are subject to a significant (i.e. >1%) increase in pupil numbers under the following circumstances:

- the LA (or the school at the request or with the support of the LA) carries out a formal consultation and approves an increase in the capacity of a school
- the LA requests a school to increase its published admissions number
- the LA requests a school to admit significant additional pupils as part of a reorganisation or school closure

Funding will not be allocated to a school in the following circumstances:

- the school has surplus places and then takes additional pupils up to its PAN outside of the circumstances described above
- the school admits pupils in excess of their PAN at their own choice
- the school is directed/requested to admit additional pupils as a result of errors, appeals, fair access protocol, SEN, LAC etc.

Depending on circumstances, funding will be calculated based on the number of relevant (i.e. whole school, specific year groups, geographic areas etc.) additional pupils admitted as per the autumn census data for each year, multiplied by the appropriate AWPU value and pro-rated for the period that the pupils will be unfunded (normally 7 months for maintained schools and 12 months for academies) in the main school funding formula allocation. With the maximum pupil growth allocation being capped at an amount equivalent to that attributable to the school's total increase in reception to year 11 pupils in excess of 1%.

#### Infant Class Size Funding

To maintain class sizes at no more than 30 pupils, Infant Class Size funding will be allocated based on the actual autumn census numbers for each school, i.e. autumn 2017 for an allocation for the 2017/18 academic year. Schools will be allocated a sum equivalent to the class teacher element of the primary AWPU to provide funding to support a teacher for each infant class, with reductions to take account of the economies of scale available to larger schools.

The total number of reception, year 1 and year 2 pupils at each school is divided by 30. The remainder (after whole classes of 30 have been accounted for) is deemed to be the size of the "last class". The amount of funding for the "last class" then depends on its size.

The formula calculates the total amount of class teacher funding already allocated to the school within the AWPU sum for each pupil in the "last class" (for 2017/18 £1,304 is included in the primary AWPU for class teachers). This sum is then deducted from the assumed cost of a class teacher (£33,983 in 2017/18). The result of this calculation is the top-up amount required to support a full time equivalent teacher for the "last class". The table below shows the amount of the top up depending on the size of the "last class":

Size of "Last Class"	Top-up Funding £	Size of "Last Class"	Top-up Funding £	Size of "Last Class"	Top-up Funding £
0	0	10	20,943	20	7,903
1	32,679	11	19,639	21	6,599
2	31,375	12	18,335	22	5,295
3	30,071	13	17,031	23	3,991
4	28,767	14	15,727	24	2,687
5	27,463	15	14,423	25	1,383
6	26,159	16	13,119	26	79
7	24,855	17	11,815	27	0
8	23,551	18	10,511	28	0
9	22,247	19	9,207	29	0

Each school then receives a proportion of this top-up funding depending on the total number of infant pupils in the school (this is to try and recognise that larger schools are likely to have more flexibility in organising class structures than smaller schools). The table below shows the percentage of the top-up funding actually received:

Number of Infant Pupils	Funding Percentage
1 to 90	100%
91 to 120	80%
121 to 150	60%
151 to 180	40%
181 and above	20%

No retrospective adjustments are made even if pupil numbers change during the year.

Example:

- Autumn Census = 100 infant aged pupils
- Size of "last class" = remainder of 100 / 30  
= 10
- Top-up funding from table 1 = £20,943
- Percentage of top-up from table 2 = 80%
- Infant Class Size Funding = £20,943 x 80% = **£16,754**

---

**York Schools Forum**

**3 July 2017**

Report of the Director Children, Education & Communities and the Director of Customer & Corporate Services

**SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA REVIEW**

**Summary**

- 1 This report asks the Schools Forum to decide whether it now wishes LA officers to prepare a draft document and detailed modelling on possible changes to the York LMS Funding Formula, to be signed off in September, consulted with schools during the autumn term and for implementation from April 2018 if government further delays its own National Funding Formula (NFF) proposals.

**Background**

- 2 The DfE is currently considering its response to submissions received on its stage two NFF consultation which closed on 22 March. Their original intention (prior to the general election) was to publish the outcome of the consultation in summer 2017 in time for Implementation from April 2018 (2018/19 financial year).
- 3 In light of the continued uncertainty around the introduction of a new NFF, the forum took the decision last year to establish a small working group of headteachers to review the existing York LMS Funding Formula. In particular, to consider the impact of the introduction of pupil premium funding for deprivation, and whether this warranted any reduction in the level, or distribution, of deprivation funding within the York LMS formula.

**Reminder of DfE Proposals**

- 4 Members of the forum are recommended to refer to previous reports to the forum for full details and analysis of the DfE's proposals for a NFF. However, in summary, the high level impact on the LA and York schools was as follows.
  - Schools Block: +£4.717m or 5.4% (national average +1.1%). York moves from 2nd lowest funded LA (out of 150) to 10th lowest.
  - High Needs Block: No change (national average +3.4%). York moves from 76th lowest funded LA to 65th lowest.
  - Central Services Block: -£0.022m or 3.2% (national average – no change). York moves from 67<sup>th</sup> lowest funded LA to 4<sup>th</sup> lowest.
- 5 For York secondaries all schools would see funding increases that range from:
  - +1.3% to +6.0% per pupil (York average = +3.6%)
  - +£60 to +£286 per pupil (York average = +£168)
  - +£59k to +£295k per school (York total = +£1.408m)

- 6 For York primaries the funding changes would range as follows:
- -2.2% to +12.8% pupil (York average = +6.8%)
  - -£103 to +£387 per pupil (York average = +£238)
  - -£15k to +£212k per school (York total = +£3.235m)
- 7 Following the consultation the conservative party manifesto gave a commitment to implement the NFF but with additional resource provided to enable a funding floor to be introduced ensuring that no school would lose funding as a result.

### **Work of the LMS Formula Review Sub-Group**

- 8 The sub-group consisted of four headteacher representatives supported by LA officers. The remit of the sub-group was to review elements of the existing York LMS Funding Formula. In particular, in light of the introduction of pupil premium funding for deprivation in 2011 that is allocated outside of the funding formula.
- 9 At its first meeting the sub-group agreed that the following areas of work would be progressed:
- a) Following the introduction of the pupil premium; model options for reducing the amount of funding allocated through the LMS Funding Formula for deprivation (FSM, LAC & EAL). Redirect the funding released to the Basic Entitlement (AWPU) factor.
  - b) Model the impact of allocating any remaining deprivation funding within the formula via the IDACI indicator rather the FSM indicator.
  - c) Review the balance of funding allocated to the primary and secondary sectors taking account of:
    - i. the average position in other LAs
    - ii. the level of surplus/deficit balances reported by schools at 31 March 2016 and in their 2016/17 budget plans..
- 10 At its second meeting the sub-group considered the results of various modelling options for workstreams a) and b). The sub-group's preferred option was a 50% reduction in funding allocated through deprivation factors within the formula (redirecting the funding released into the AWPU factor), and replacing FSM with IDACI for the remaining 50%.
- 11 The sub-group found no evidence that the balance of funding between primary and secondary sectors was materially different to the national picture, or that the current pattern of surplus and deficits suggested a change in the balance of funding was justified. As a result no further work was commissioned on this element of the review. .

### **Recommendations**

- 12 Members of the forum are now asked to decide whether, in light of the current position on a NFF, they would like LA officers to prepare a full and detailed consultation document in line with the recommendations of the LMS Formula Sub-Group.

<b>Contact Details</b> <b>Author:</b>	<b>Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:</b>			
Richard Hartle Head of Finance: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Corporate Director of Children, Education & Communities Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Corporate Director of Customer & Corporate Services Tel: 01904 551100			
	<b>Report Approved</b>	√	<b>Date</b>	20 July 2017
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>				

---

**Schools Forum**

**3<sup>rd</sup> July 2017**

**The School Improvement Commissioning Fund**

**1. Summary**

1.1 This report provides members of Schools Forum with information about the use of funding to support school improvement in 2017-18.

**2. Background**

2.1 In April 2017 Schools Forum agreed to the continued use of funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to support sector-led school improvement arrangements in York. Previously this was achieved through the commissioning of school to school support from the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance and the commissioning of continuing professional development from the Pathfinder Teaching Schools Alliance. In 2017-18 it has been agreed to allocate funding differently, based on the need to maximise the impact of funding on the city's most significant school improvement priorities and to strengthen accountability by presenting monitoring and evaluation reports at each meeting of Schools Forum during 2017-18. This will ensure that there is a clear and transparent audit trail in place.

2.2 When Schools Forum met on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017 it considered three options for the use of funding to support school improvement in 2017-18. These were:

**Option 1:** No centrally held school improvement fund. Centrally retained school improvement funding to be returned to schools for them to commission their own school improvement provision.

**Option 2:** Transitional model. Reduce the amount of centrally retained funding, with the balance being returned to schools on a per pupil basis. Pathfinder teaching schools alliance to provide a reduced core CPD offer and funding for schools causing concern/at risk being allocated to the LA and MATs to support school-to-school support. Maintain cluster

funding, but at a reduced allocation and continue to support city-wide school improvement projects through a project fund of £30k.

In total the funding to support option 2 would be allocated as follows:

Element	Allocation
Pathfinder core CPD programme	£150k
Schools causing concern funding (LA/MATs)	£400k
Cluster funding	£30k (£5k per cluster)
City wide school improvement projects	£30k
School Improvement funding returned to schools on a per pupil basis	£291k
School Well-being workers – previously agreed	£65k
<b>Total</b>	<b>£966k</b>

**Option 3:** Maintaining the existing allocations from centrally retained funding but amendments to be made to the delivery and accountability arrangements in light of experience from September 2015 to April 2017.

2.3 Schools Forum **unanimously agreed** to support **option 2**.

### **3. How will centrally retained funding be used to support school improvement in 2017-18?**

3.1 Pathfinder teaching schools alliance will provide a core CPD offer on behalf of the city during 2017-18.

3.2 The allocation of schools causing concern funding needs to be done equitably to ensure that money is being used to address the highest priorities for school improvement in the city. This means that the funding received by individual schools will not be distributed either equally or widely, but will be closely targeted according to need and based on the sharing of detailed risk assessment information between the local authority and the chief executives/chief accounting officers of the multi-academy trusts.

3.3 In order to ensure that a robust accountability framework is in place, with a clear line of reporting back to Schools Forum, representatives of the local authority and multi-academy trusts have established a cycle of meetings which is developing the mechanism for ensuring that the funding to support schools causing concern is allocated equitably to maximise the impact of interventions to bring about school improvement. This group (York Schools and Academies Board) has now met five times. It has:

- developed terms of reference (see Appendix 1)
- developed a process to ensure that risk assessment information is being used consistently to identify those schools at most significant risk of poor outcomes
- identified the need to develop a consistent due diligence process to underpin the risk assessment process when support for schools is planned
- agreed to develop a framework for the use of funding based on addressing schools with the greatest need/most significant risks recognising the allocation of funding needs to be equitable not equal
- agreed that funding allocated should take account of other resources available, such as any funding received by MATs from the RSC for particular schools and any uncommitted balance in a school's budget

3.4 The work of the York Schools and Academies Board will ensure that all decisions about the use of funding for the purposes of school to school support are transparent, underpinned by principles of best value and that the impact of work is rigorously evaluated and reported to Schools Forum.

3.5 During 2017-18 it has been agreed to maintain funding to the six geographical clusters as part of the transitional model. Each cluster will receive £5k to support collaborative school improvement work. As in previous years, cluster chairs will be accountable for the use of this funding. Each year cluster chairs are required to produce a cluster improvement plan (Appendix 2) and a cluster evaluation report (Appendix 3). In order to strengthen the audit trail related to the use of cluster funding both cluster evaluations and cluster improvement plans will be shared with Schools Forum in 2017-18.

3.6 £30k has been allocated to support city-wide school improvement projects during 2017-18. This funding will be allocated to schools

through a bidding process (Appendix 4) and bids will be evaluated by the LA and cluster chairs. An example of a successful project during 2016-17 has been the KS2 writing project. The outcomes of this project will be disseminated through a CPD event open to all schools in September.

3.7 £291k is being returned to schools on a per pupil basis. As this money was retained centrally to support school improvement it has to be used for the same purpose by schools.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix 1:** Terms of Reference for the York Schools and Academies Board

**Appendix 2:** Cluster improvement plan proforma

**Appendix 3:** Cluster evaluation proforma

**Appendix 4:** School Improvement projects bid proforma

## **Recommendations**

This paper is for information only; there are no recommendations arising from it.

## **Contact Details**

### **Author:**

Author's name:

Maxine Squire

Title:

Assistant Director,  
Education and Skills

Tel No.

01904 553007

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## **York Schools and Academies Board: Terms of Reference**

### ***No school, No child or young person left behind***

#### **Context and Purpose**

The York Schools and Academies Board (YSAB) will bring together the key partners in the city's school system into a coherent and effective strategic partnership. It will aim to maximise outcomes and improve life chances for children and young people, promote inclusion and reduce inequalities. Critically, it will ensure that no school and no child or young person will be left behind.

#### **Key functions**

- To provide a regular forum to share intelligence about the York school system including strengths, areas for improvement, risks and concerns.
- To secure system led school improvement arrangements through focused and inclusive arrangements designed to strengthen outcomes for all children and young people and to maximise the impact of available resources.
- To agree the disbursement of centrally retained funding to deliver improvement in schools causing concern, to hold commissioned providers and supported schools to account and to provide impact reports to Schools Forum (five per year).
- To provide an interface between the city's school system and local and regional stakeholders ensuring that the potential benefits of programmes and policies are realised to the greatest effect.
- To ensure that all partners present a shared analysis and united position to key pillars of national arrangements, especially the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), Ofsted and Department for Education (DfE).

#### **Expectations of members**

This partnership recognises that we can only maximise the impact of different system leadership groups and organisations for the benefit of all York's children and young people by aligning our efforts. It is recognised that members will both contribute to, and benefit from, the work of the partnership. However, individual interests will be secondary to the interests of the children and young people we serve.

#### **Working principles**

The York Schools and Academies Board aims to ensure that the life of every child and young person is enhanced to the full by the provision of first class education. To this end our key principles are:

- Work with shared moral purpose and strategic vision
- Recognise our different roles and accountabilities
- Understand that, in a local system covering a tight geographic area, acting alone can have unintended consequences for other institutions and their learners
- Be aware of the differing perspectives, interests and responsibilities of other influential stakeholders including RSC, Ofsted, DfE, Dioceses and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)



## 2017-18 Cluster Improvement Plan for schools in the \*\*\*\*\*Cluster

### CONTEXT

Name of Schools in the Cluster	Current Ofsted Grade	Date of last inspection

The focus of the cluster's work during 2016-17 will be:

**Cluster to add the above and any other context**

The collaborative cluster work has the following strands:

- School improvement
- Capacity building to sustain improvement
- Closing the Gap
- Mutual support and sharing good practice

**Cluster to add any more relevant to the cluster**

#### **CLUSTER PRIORITIES**

- To improve/and or maintain the current Ofsted judgements so all pupils in the cluster attend a school that is good or better
- To raise attainment and progress so that they are above national for all groups of pupils
- To implement strategies that will secure good for all schools, and move good ones to outstanding
- To improve the quality of teaching so that it is consistently good or outstanding in all schools
- To support strong transitions so that all children are able to make and sustain good progress as they move through different ages and stages
- To ensure that all pupils including those in vulnerable groups make better than expected progress

Cluster to add any more or sharpen the ones above according to their need

#### **OUTCOMES**

- For good schools to embed good and take actions to move to outstanding
- For schools currently requiring improvement, coasting or at risk of losing a good judgement to have robust improvement plans in place to rapidly secure good and to maintain good
- To have teaching that is consistently good or better
- All groups of pupils make better than expected progress

Cluster to add any that refer to their additional priorities above

#### **EVIDENCE OF OUTCOMES BEING MET**

- Cluster data analysis shows improving trends across the cluster and for individual schools
- Evidence from cross cluster peer evaluation
- Evaluation clearly links collaborative work to measurable outcomes
- Schools' self evaluation evidence
- Ofsted judgments

Cluster to add any that refer to their additional priorities above

#### **ROLE OF THE CLUSTER CHAIR/ LEAD HEADTEACHER**

The Cluster Chair/ Lead Headteacher will be responsible for

- Co-coordinating and leading meetings between all cluster schools that will focus on collaborative work in the cluster e.g. work on school improvement initiatives and identifying where good practice is from each school and the sharing of that good practice
- Ensuring that cluster evaluation reports and improvement plans have been written and sent to the Assistant Director, Education and Skills
- Attending termly Cluster Chairs meetings to report on the progress of collaborative cluster activities
- Facilitating opportunities for schools to work with and support each other
- Accountability to Schools Forum for the use of cluster funding and evaluation of the impact of cluster improvement work

Other specific roles are

- Cluster to add

#### **HOW AND WHEN WILL THIS BE REVIEWED?**

The Cluster Chair is responsible for reporting to the Assistant Director, Education and Skills on a termly basis on progress towards each of the outcomes, use of funding and hours spent by the Lead and any Support Headteachers in or with schools. In addition any schools causing concern in the cluster are invited to School Improvement Panel meetings to monitor the impact of school improvement actions including support from the cluster.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY

The cluster has collective responsibility for school improvement outcomes for all schools within the cluster. However, the LA has a statutory role for monitoring of school performance and intervention where schools are causing concern. Therefore the final accountability rests with the LA and they reserve the right to intervene in cases where insufficient progress is not being made.

The cluster improvement work does not preclude any other networks and partnerships e.g. multi-academy trusts either in the cluster, across the City or outside of the City. The Cluster Chair/Lead Headteacher may wish to use cluster funding to commission support from outside the City or from the teaching school alliances for particular aspects of the cluster improvement plan.

If there are common issues across the City rather than a cluster, then this need would be met City-wide due to economies of scale. This would mean that the LA is accountable for commissioning the high quality delivery of this element of school improvement.

Schools requiring improvement or in a category may need additional support outside of their cluster and this also needs to be recognised. This would mean additional support for that school which would be agreed and monitored by the York Schools and Academies Board (YSAB).

#### FUNDING AVAILABLE

In 2016-17 all geographical clusters will receive **£5,000** from centrally retained funding to support cluster based collaborative school improvement activity. Cluster funding could be used for support, release time, backfill, costs of delivery of specific school improvement initiatives, etc **but cluster will need to account to the Schools Forum for how the funding is spent**

**CONTEXT: Cluster:**

Name of schools in the cluster	Current Ofsted grade	Date of last inspection

**The focus of the cluster's work during 2016/17 was :**

Cluster improvement activities 2016-17	Evaluation of impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcomes – what difference did this activity make?</li> <li>What evidence do you have that cluster activity supported school improvement?</li> </ul>	How was cluster funding used to support this activity?
Cluster Funding carried forward from 2014/15	Held by	£
Cluster Funding 2016/17	Held by	£5,000
Balance	£	
Available funds for 2017/18	£	

## School Improvement Project Fund: application guidance

Applications to the School Improvement Project Fund (SIPF) can be made by individual schools or groups of schools. The fund will be administered by the **Cluster Chairs Group** who will receive and evaluate the bids. Schools submitting successful bids will be notified in writing by the Assistant Director, Education and Skills on behalf of the Cluster Chairs.

Feedback on unsuccessful bids will be provided in writing by the Assistant Director, Education and Skills on behalf of the Cluster Chairs.

All applications for project funding must meet the criteria outlined below and must be grounded in the principles of evidenced based practice.

### How will bids be evaluated?

Question	Evidence Required
1. What will your project focus on?	<b>Provide a brief outline of your project</b> – why have you decided to run this project and what evidence did you use to identify this project as a priority in your school/schools. Your evidence could include similar projects in education, or beyond, to support your application or draw upon research evidence from other sources e.g. similar EEF research projects
2. What are your anticipated outputs from doing this project and what outcomes are you looking for?	What will be the products from your project e.g. developing new resources, a project report, case studies etc  What do you anticipate the outcomes to be e.g. improvements in the quality of teaching, pupil progress etc
3. Who will be involved in your project?	List the participants (with their roles and school/schools)
4. How will you measure the success of your project and evaluate the difference it has made?	Details of how you will measure the impact of your project. Provide details of the metrics you will use to measure impact – these can be both qualitative and quantitative. How will objectively evaluate the success/ impact of your project? This could include independent or ‘critical friend’ evaluation.
5. How will you share the findings from your project so other schools/teachers can benefit from your learning?	Outline how you will share the findings from your project and who with.

6. What is your delivery plan? (including key milestones)	Provide a brief timeline for your project (start and end dates) and any milestones. What contingency plans do you have in place to manage slippage to your timeline?
7. What are the costs of your project (please provide a breakdown to evidence how the costs are broken down to support elements in your project)	Provide a breakdown of what you will use the funding for and also provide details of the total funding you are asking for.  <b>NB: funding from the SIPF will only be allocated to support projects which are not receiving funding from other sources e.g. cluster funding, funding from external agencies e.g. teaching schools or the regional schools commissioner.</b>

All applications should be submitted using the attached pro-forma and should be sent to Maxine Squire at maxine.squire@york.gov.uk and should be shared with your cluster chair.

**Cluster Chairs 2017-18**

**LA members:** John Thompson, Maxine Squire, Stephanie Windsor

### School Improvement Project Fund Pro-forma

<b>Description of your project</b>	<i>A brief description of your project and what its aims are</i>
<b>School/Schools involved</b>	
<b>Who will be your research lead for this project?</b>	
<b>What are your intended outputs and outcomes from doing this project?</b>	
<b>How will you measure the success of your project?</b>	
<b>How will you share the findings from your project?</b>	
<b>Delivery Plan</b> – please attach a brief timeline outlining your project plan and milestones	
<b>Costs of the project:</b> How much funding are you applying for and how will you use the funding?	

#LÊ# #13E# "a 11 #æ ø13ó~æ ~1-#13Ø"-# °1.#

---