

YORK SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

MONDAY 14TH DECEMBER 2015 – 1.00pm – 3.00pm
in the Severus Room – F032 – 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.	Minutes of the Schools Forum meeting of 29 th September 2015	Chair	For approval	Attached
4.	Matters Arising not on the agenda	Chair	For information	
5.	Schools Budget 2016/17	Richard Hartle	For decision	Attached
6.	Trade Union Facility Time De-delegation 2016/17	Richard Hartle Steve Smith (ASCL)	For decision	Attached
7.	Appointment of sub-group to consider de-delegations for 2017/18 and the Services for Schools offer	Chair	For decision	
8.	Review of School Funding Formula	Richard Hartle	For information	Verbal update
9.	Early Implementation of 30 hours Free Childcare	Maxine Squire	For information	Attached
10.	Special School Place Funding Values	Jess Haslam / Mike Barugh	For decision	Attached
11.	SEN Inclusion Review	Maxine Squire	For information	Verbal update
12.	Update on new school improvement arrangements and implementation of the annual commissioning plan	Maxine Squire	For information	Attached
13.	Schools Forum forward plan – update	Richard Hartle	For information	Attached
14.	Any Other Agreed Business	Chair		
15.	Date and time of next and future meetings: 11 th April at 1.00pm 5 th July at 9.00am	Chair	For information	

Please send apologies to Salli Radford by email to salli.radford@york.gov.uk or by calling York 554210.

CITY OF YORK SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the Schools Forum held on Tuesday 29th September 2015 at 1.00pm

Attendance list:

Members:

Tracey Ralph	Maintained Primary Headteacher and Chair
Trevor Burton	Maintained Secondary Headteacher
Brian Crosby	Academies Representative
Cath Hindmarch	Special School Representative (deputising for George Gilmore)
Caroline Hancy	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Tricia Head	Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Andy Herbert	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Ken McArthur	Early Years Sector Representative
Lorna Savage	Maintained Secondary Headteacher
Karen Tatham	Maintained Primary Headteacher

Observers / Advisors:

Cllr Jenny Brooks	Elected Member for Children and Young People
Richard Hartle	Head of Finance, City of York Council
Maxine Squire	Assistant Director, Education and Skills
Jon Stonehouse	Director of Children's Services, Education and Skills
Salli Radford	Coordinator and Clerk

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received, with consent, from Alison Birkinshaw – Further Education Representative, Nicola Fox – Maintained Nursery Representative, Richard Ludlow – Academy Representative and Bill Scriven – Maintained Secondary Headteacher (VA school).

David O'Brien – Governor Representative was absent from the meeting.

3. Minutes of the York Schools Forum meeting of 7th July 2015

Previously distributed.

The minutes of the meeting of 7th July 2015 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

4. Matters Arising

With reference to item 9, Inclusion review pilot projects, Tricia Head advised that she had met with primary headteachers in the west of the city and agreed that basing a pilot at the Hob Moor site was desirable. It was noted that a meeting would take place at York High School on 1st October to consider the original intent of the pilots, with feedback to be shared afterwards.

Jon Stonehouse stated that there was nothing preventing the pilot being located at the Children's Centre at Hob Moor, with this to be progressed by Tricia and Cath Hindmarch.

With reference to discussion of the role of the York Learning Partnership (YLP) in monitoring work of the Teaching School Alliances under item 12, Any Other Business, Maxine Squire advised that a meeting of the YLP would take place on 2nd October and that the remit of this group would be reviewed at this stage. Jon advised that it was questionable whether this strategic board was needed as the decision-making powers of the YLP were limited.

The Chair advised of the need for all partners to understand the purpose of the YLP Board which acted as a representative group, taking the view of clusters via a consultation process.

With reference to item 4, Matters Arising, it was noted that a number of primary headteachers were concerned by the Schools Forum decision not to review the Local Funding Formula due to the continuing disparity between the ten highest and ten lowest funded schools. Richard Hartle advised that the Forum had agreed not to review the Local Funding Formula for 2016/17 but to consider a local review should a national review be delayed beyond 2017.

It was noted that a review could not now be arranged for 2016/17 as development work would have needed to be undertaken during summer 2015 for consultation during the autumn term. It was noted that a new National Funding Formula was expected for 2017/18. Richard advised that the latest point at which the Forum could decide to implement a revised 2017/18 Local Funding Formula was the December 2016 meeting. This would require development work during summer 2016, though an earlier decision would enable longer consideration.

The Forum discussed options, noting that the final decision rested with the Executive Member for Education, Children & Young People, though the Forum could request officers to undertake a review on their behalf. Richard advised that consultation with the Forum and all schools was a mandatory requirement.

Further discussion followed, with Richard advising that any revision was likely to result in a redistribution of funds rather than an increase in overall available funding.

Richard agreed to produce a draft timeline and scope for a review that could be considered at the next meeting, in the event that the DfE announced further delay in the national review beyond 2017/18.

Following further discussion it was noted that, although a revision to the National Funding Formula might bring an increase in overall funding to York, at individual school-level it was likely that some schools could still lose whilst others gained.

The action plan would be updated to reflect progress.

5. Early Years Reference Group report

Ken McArthur advised that Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) funding had been introduced during the summer term, at a rate of £300 per pupil. This equated to c£0.53 per hour. Ken advised that underfunding remained an issue, though the process of administration of EYPP was simple and effective. Ken thanked the LA for consulting with settings and supporting PVI nurseries during introduction. It was noted that there

was no entitlement to funded meals in the PVI sector, removing the funding implications for Pupil Premium of universal FSM in primary schools.

Ken advised that Pupil Premium often duplicated inclusion and deprivation funding, bringing additional funding for an identified group of children. It was noted that this funding was top-sliced from the Early Years budget and could bring additional funding of £0.93 per hour to some settings with Pupil Premium and Deprivation Factor eligible children.

Richard Hartle advised that consultation with the Forum and Early Years settings had taken place but could be reviewed, advising that the deprivation factor caused the same issues for nursery settings as for schools due to its role within the funding formula.

Ken advised that EYPP and deprivation funding was being distributed to a small number of settings and could usefully be reviewed.

Ken advised that SEN processes had changed and a meeting for SENCOs had noted that the work involved in claiming SEN funding was now significant. It was noted that no additional salary funding was available for EY SENCOs and that SENCO time was factored in to child / worker ratios making it difficult for them to find time to undertake this work. Concern had been expressed that EY SENCOs might leave or that recruitment might become challenging. Ken advised that the process had been reconsidered and that a meeting on 28th September had identified ways of supporting SENCOs in this work.

Ken advised of the potential increase in funded hours from 15 to 30 for “working families” and the implications of this. It was noted that the national funding average for this time was £3.90 per hour whilst in York it was £3.38 per hour.

Ken stated that meetings with the LA to determine capacity to enable an increase in hours were taking place, though an increase would impact on maintained and PVI settings. It was noted that any increase in entitlement was likely to reduce the total number of children accessing EY provision.

Ken advised that expressions of interest for a pilot for the proposed increased entitlement were being invited, with this to run in September 2016. Roll-out was anticipated in September 2017.

In response to a question regarding the impact of the introduction of the Living Wage, Ken advised that the government was currently reviewing funding rates for the 15 hours of entitlement and were consulting on the application of an additional 15 hours. It was noted that the Living Wage was higher than the current average EY salary, though higher quality settings generally set higher rates of pay. It was noted that EY work was a lower-paid profession and that increases in pension and National Insurance contributions would impact on operating costs.

6. School Balances 2014/15

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle advised that no recommendations were being made for the LA to withdraw any reserves above the permitted thresholds at the end of 2014/15. It was noted that Annex 6 detailed school requests to retain reserves in exceptional circumstances, with the LA recommending that these officer decisions be approved.

In response to a question regarding secondary school outturns and the impact of falling rolls and of lagged funding for schools undergoing expansion, Richard advised that the LA would allocate funding via the Growth Fund agreed by the Forum. It was noted that successful schools were seeking to expand and that lagged funding impacted on the ability to accommodate a rising roll, whilst schools with a falling roll could be left with a surplus at the year-end. Richard advised that this was caused by the funding lag and that the schools currently carrying a surplus would incur an in-year deficit beyond 2015/16. Richard further advised that funding could be allocated from the Growth Fund for those schools experiencing increased numbers in line with LA demographic growth planning.

Richard advised that the Growth Fund had been set by the Forum along with a criteria for its allocation. It was noted that the current year Growth Fund had been set at £800k, including £450k of Infant Class Size Funding protection for primary schools.

Cath Hindmarch asked that Special Schools be considered alongside mainstream settings as rolls were increasing.

Richard advised that there was a separate funding regime for Special Schools. This was based on a agreed annual number of places commissioned by the LA, and then in year top ups based on the actual number of pupils attending, so the issue of pupil growth would be dealt with by default.

In response to a question regarding the allocation of the Growth Fund, Richard advised that this contingency had been allocated and detailed in a paper earlier in the year. It was noted that the Growth Fund was allocated annually and that any surplus was rolled forward to the following year.

In response to a question regarding Osbaldwick Primary School, Richard advised that the merger with Derwent Schools had included an agreement for additional protection which saw a reduction in funding over time. It was noted that the protection had been agreed up front before the current funding arrangements had become effective.

The Forum considered and accepted the officer recommendations regarding carry-forward school balances at the 2014/15 year end.

7. School Start Budgets 2015/16

Previously distributed. The Forum noted the start budget balances and deficits.

In response to a question regarding the forecasts for 2016/17 and 2017/18 and whether school financing was becoming unsustainable, Richard Hartle advised that the forecasts were assessments and that a significant majority of schools were predicting in-year deficits, suggesting that additional funding or remedial action would be required.

The start budget information was noted.

8. School Budget De-delegations 2016/17

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle reminded the Forum that it had requested further information on a number of proposed de-delegations at its last meeting:

- Behaviour Support Outreach Service
- Traveller Education Service
- Teachers' Panel Union Facility Time

Richard advised that the paper included information on the Behaviour Support Outreach Service and Traveller Education Service, though the Teachers' Panel had not met during the summer and would now review Facility Time prior to the December Forum meeting. It was noted that this timescale would not be problematic as de-delegation relating to the Teachers' Panel had been agreed to 31st August 2016 and that future de-delegation could therefore be considered on 14th December.

The Forum considered all of the de-delegation recommendations included in the paper:

Schools General Contingency – Maxine Squire advised that the Schools General Contingency has been set at £4.00 per pupil and was adequate for the current year. It was noted that the number of employment tribunal cases had increased recently with complex issues resulting in costly processes. It was noted that this expenditure was not predictable but was currently covered by the allocated contingency.

The Forum considered and approved the continuance of the current de-delegation at a rate of £4.00 per pupil during 2016/17.

Free School Meal Eligibility Assessment Services – The Forum considered and approved the continuance of the current de-delegation during 2016/17 at the rates specified in the report. .

Traveller Education Service – The Forum discussed the information provided on the service, noting that Danesgate, Special Schools and academy settings could access the service on a traded basis as they did not fall within the scope of the de-delegation.

In response to questions from the Forum regarding the availability of detail relating to team structure and outcomes and to funding support for implementation of the Prevent agenda, Jon Stonehouse suggested that a sub-group had been established to analyse the current de-delegations and Services for Schools offer in detail.

Further discussion followed, with it being noted that secondary headteachers had not discussed the Traveller Education Service for some time. It was acknowledged that the service included a high level of expertise though not all headteachers currently engaged with the service making evaluation more challenging.

In response to a question regarding targets for the service, Jon advised that schools would have established targets and would work with the service to achieve these. Maxine advised of the need to consider the capacity of other support services available to schools seeking to address significant issues when reviewing this de-delegation.

In response to a question regarding possible refugee placements, Jon advised that the LA was working with Migration Yorkshire regarding funding and need. It was noted that Mark Ellis, Head of School Services, was involved in this process, with representatives of Children's Social Care. Jon advised that further information would be brought to headteachers and the Forum as required.

Jon proposed that the de-delegation for the Traveller Education Service be approved for 2016/17 at the rates specified in the report, with a sub-group to take a forensic view of services before the next de-delegation round. This was agreed.

Behaviour Support Outreach Service – The Forum considered the proposed de-delegation, querying the sufficiency of capacity. Tricia Head advised that an increased capacity would be used up as it became available, further advising that the service was

seeking to build capacity through a pilot in the west of the city and through encouraging the allocation of Behaviour Support Workers in schools.

The Forum approved the continuance of the current de-delegation during 2016/17 at the rates specified in the report.

9. School retainer payments

Previously distributed. **The Forum considered and approved the recommendation to end school retainer payments following a final distribution in October 2015.**

10. Schools Forum forward plan

Previously distributed. The forward plan was noted and would be updated following the meeting.

11. Any Other Business

In response to a question regarding academy conversions and financial impact on the local authority and Forum stakeholder groups, Jon advised that the impact of change would underpin the rationale behind the work of the Services for Schools sub-group.

It was noted that between £2M and £3M would be lost from LA budgets were all schools to convert, with officers being aware of this potential impact. Jon advised that it was difficult to be specific regarding the role of the Forum in managing this change. It was noted that the LA was considering its Services for Schools offer and that the majority of schools and academies bought LA services, indicating that there was a need for these to be retained in any future structure. It was noted that good relationships between the LA and settings was key.

The Forum discussed this information, noting the limitations of the Education Services Grant. Jon agreed to provide a paper to the next meeting outlining the services and responsibilities that transfer to academies on conversion.

It was noted that some academy financial information was in the public domain, although this was not as comprehensive as the information available for maintained schools.

12. Date and time of the next meeting

14th December 2015 at 1.00pm
11th April 2016 at 1.00pm
5th July 2016 at 9.00am

The meeting closed at 2.35pm.

Tracey Ralph
Chair

Date

SCHOOLS FORUM ACTION PLAN / ACTIVITY LOG – UPDATED DECEMBER 2015

Minute reference	Action	Outcome	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
8 29/9/15	Sub-group to be established to consider Services for Schools and 2017/18 de-delegations in detail	The Forum is better able to make informed decisions regarding de-delegations and understands the impact of academy conversions on LA Services for Schools	Chair	Appoint sub-group on 14/12/15	
10 7/7/15	Information on de-delegated behaviour support outreach service, traveller support service and use of Teachers' Panel time to be provided	The Forum is better able to understand how de-delegated funds are used prior to making decisions for 2016/17	Richard Hartle	29/9/15	Taken and agreed under agenda item 8 on 29/9/15 Teachers' Panel information to go to meeting on 14/12/15
6 13/4/15	Information regarding SEN provision, including funding detail, is brought to the next meeting	Clarify funding mechanisms for SEN support across the city	Richard Hartle / Jess Haslam	7/7/15	Taken under agenda item 7 on 7/7/15
5 13/4/15	Clarify terms of office of Schools Forum members	Ensure that all stakeholder groups understand terms of office, that appointment processes are transparent and that succession planning is enabled	Chair of Primary Heads Forum and Secondary Heads Group	7/7/15	Terms of office agreed as three years for all stakeholder groups
5 13/4/15	Review of membership to ensure compliance with regulations	Membership changes to reflect recent academy conversions	Salli Radford	7/7/15 and as an ongoing review	In progress, with alterations made summer term 2015 to ensure continued compliance

Schools Forum

14 December 2015

Report of the Director Children's Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

SCHOOL FUNDING AND BUDGETING 2016/17

Summary

- 1 This report provides the Schools Forum with an update on school budgets and funding for the 2016/17 financial year. As full details of the government funding allocation for 2016/17 are not now expected until later this month, the report focuses on some key decisions and principles that the forum now needs to agree on, in order for budgets for both schools and local authority (LA) maintained services to be set. Following confirmation of the national funding allocations, a further meeting in mid January may be required to finalise the budget for 2016/17.

Background

- 2 The financial context for the 2016/17 budget continues to be impacted by the government's on-going commitment to reduce the national deficit as first outlined in the Comprehensive Spending Reviews (CSR) published in October 2010 and November 2015, which have led to unprecedented reductions in public sector spending.
- 3 To some degree the government has attempted to protect schools from the full effect of their spending reductions when compared to other parts of the public sector, and the remainder of local government services in particular. The key features of the Schools Settlement for 2016/17 are expected to be:
 - Another one-year only settlement for 2016/17?
 - Only a small number of very minor additional changes to the system of allocating funding to schools and other providers for both mainstream and high needs pupils?
 - A continued flat cash per pupil allocation for York's core school funding?
 - Continued pressure on the LA budgets for Education and Children's Services outside of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- 4 The DSG is ring-fenced for funding the provision of education for pupils in schools (maintained, PRUs, PVI nurseries or externally purchased places). As such it covers funding delegated to individual LA maintained schools, academies and PVI providers through the LMS & Early Years Funding Formula, plus funding for other pupil provision which is retained centrally by the LA (e.g. SEN, PRUs, Behaviour Support, Home & Hospital Tuition, School Contingencies etc.). It is distributed according to a formula that guarantees a minimum per pupil increase for each LA (0% for York in 2016/17).

- 5 The LA itself cannot use the DSG for any purpose other than schools block funding, although with the permission of the Schools Forum limited contributions are being made to the following areas:
- Combined budgets supporting Every Child Matters objectives where there is a clear educational benefit.
 - Prudential Borrowing, where overall net savings to the Schools Budget have been demonstrated.
 - Some SEN transport costs, again only where there is a net Schools Budget saving.
- 6 There are also strict limits (Central Expenditure Limits) on the amount of the DSG that the LA can retain centrally to either fund pupil costs outside of mainstream schools, or use to provide targeted allocations during the financial year to maintained schools. The recent funding reform changes have tightened these regulations, continuing to reduce LA flexibility.

DSG Allocation for 2016/17

- 7 The actual DSG allocation from the DfE is not now expected to be announced until Mid December. However, as York was not one of the LAs due to receive additional funding in 2016/17 following the governments establishment of minimum funding levels, the only variation expected will be due to changes in pupil numbers. This means that for 2016/17 the amount of funding per pupil allocated through the DSG is expected to remain at:
- £4,209.24 per fte Reception to Year 11 pupil
 - £3,443.79 per fte 3/4 year old early years pupil
 - £4,607.50 per fte 2 year old early years pupil

LA Proposals for 2016/17

- 8 In advance of receiving the full formal funding announcement from the DfE for 2016/17, the LA is not proposing any changes to centrally retained budgets within the overall Schools Budget. The forum received a comprehensive report on all budget lines within the Schools Budget at its meeting in April enabling full scrutiny of all of the centrally retained budgets.
- 9 This means that for 2016/17 the forum is now asked to formally agree that the following centrally retained budgets are maintained at the current 2015/16 levels:
- Pupil Growth & Infant Class Size Fund: £800k
 - Falling Rolls Fund: £nil
 - Early Years Support: £266k
 - School Admissions: £178k
 - Servicing of Schools Forum: £42k
 - Contributions to Combined Budgets (School Improvement, Schools Causing Concern, Integrated Children's Centres, Broadband Contract, Local Fostering Programme, Safeguarding Advisor): £1,966k

- Termination of Employment Costs: £383k
- Prudential Borrowing Costs: £605k
- SEN Transport: £400k

Schools Funding Formula Allocations for 2016/17

- 10 The LA is not proposing to make any significant changes to the local formula funding factors for 2016/17. The current 2015/16 funding rates are shown at Annex 1.
- 11 However, the LA is suggesting that the forum allows it the discretion to adjust the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) element by up to a maximum of 1% to account for any variation in the overall DSG allocation when it is finally announced. Any variation required in excess of this would have to be the subject of a further report to the forum in January, prior to the LA's formal submission to the Education Funding Agency.
- 12 In addition the maximum percentage ceiling increase will continue to be set at a level sufficient to fund the minimum funding guarantee and no more.

Early Years Single Funding Formula

- 13 Again, the LA is proposing no changes to the funding rates for 2016/17. The current 2015/16 rates are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: EYSFF Funding Rates

	Base Rate £/hour	Deprivation Rate £/hour	Nursery School Lump Sum £
3/4 Year Olds	3.38	0.40	135,568
2 Year Olds	4.85	Nil	Nil

However, if the government allocates additional funding specifically for early years settings then this additional funding will be reflected in increased base funding rates.

Recommendations

- 14 Members of the forum are asked to:
 - note and comment on the report.
 - confirm their agreement to maintaining the centrally retained budgets at the current levels (paragraph 9).
 - agree the LA's proposals for school formula funding (paragraphs 10-12)
 - agree the LA's proposals for the early years single funding formula (paragraph 13)

Contact Details Author:	Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:			
Richard Hartle Finance Manager: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Director of Children's Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100			
	Report Approved	√	Date	26 November 2015
For further information please contact the author of the report				

Annex 1 – Provisional LMS Formula Funding Factors for 2016/17

Provisional LMS Funding Formula Factors and Values for 2016/17

All data is derived from the October 2015 Pupil Census unless otherwise stated.

Age Weighted Pupil Units

Primary Pupils (Reception, KS1 & KS2)	£2,321.82
Secondary Key Stage 3 Pupils	£3,551.82
Secondary Key Stage 4 Pupils	£4,201.82

Deprivation

Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals:

Primary	£2,141
Secondary	£2,175

Looked After Children

LAC Pupils based on the March 2015 return	£377
---	------

Low Prior Attainment

Primary Pupils who achieved fewer than 78 points on the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile or equivalent	£1,403
--	--------

Secondary Pupils who did not achieve level 4 at Key Stage 2 in English or Maths	£1,557
---	--------

English as an Additional Language

Primary pupils with EAL at the time of any of the three latest October Census (2015, 2014, 2013)	£667
--	------

Secondary pupils with EAL at the time of any of the three latest October Census (2015, 2014, 2013)	£1,787
--	--------

Pupil Mobility

Where the number of pupils whose start date (at current school) is within the last 3 academic years and whose start month was not in August or September (and January for reception pupils) exceeds 10% of the total pupil numbers for the relevant school, then each pupil in excess of the 10% threshold will attract funding at the following rate:

Primary & Secondary	£711
---------------------	------

Lump Sum

A fixed amount for each school regardless of its size:

Primary	£150,000
Secondary	£175,000

Split Sites

Schools qualify for split site funding if they are based on more than one site and two sites are at least 250m apart by the shortest vehicle and safe walking route. Reception to Year 11 teaching must take place on both sites and at least 10% of the school's R-Y11 pupils must be based on each site. Separate administration, sporting facilities, nursery units, special units or 6th forms will not be taken into account.

Funding amount per pupil

£198

Rates

Schools will be funded for the actual costs of business rates for school buildings and land.

Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Charges

The PFI top up is calculated as the difference between the actual PFI charge for the school and a notional premises amount deemed to be included in the formula allocation. The notional premises amount is based on a lump sum of £19,862, plus an amount per pupil of £156.

Formula Transition Damping

Minimum Funding Guarantee (Floor)

- 1.5% per pupil

Limit on Gains (Ceiling)

maximum % increase to be agreed

York Schools Forum

14 December 2015

Report of the Director Children's Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

TRADE UNION FACILITY TIME DE-DELEGATION FOR 2016/17

Summary

- 1 This report provides the forum with the additional information that they previously requested from the Teachers' Panel, and asks the forum to make a formal decision on whether to agree to de-delegation for the 2016/17 academic year.

Background

- 2 The teachers' panel arrangement is the primary mechanism for the LA, on behalf of schools, to consult with teaching staff across the city. Each trade union is represented on the panel, with the bulk of the budget being spent on funding the salaries of panel members, or backfill arrangements in the individual home schools of the panel members.
- 3 This de-delegation was the subject of significant discussions during the 2014/15 budget setting process. As a result the forum agreed an approach to reducing the level of de-delegation by approximately 50% by the start of the 2015/16 academic year. To deliver this the teacher's panel have reviewed the time allocations for each trade union that are funded from the de-delegated budget. The table below sets out the agreed reductions in allocations from the 2013/14 academic year to the 2015/16 academic year.

Teachers Panel Backfill Funding 2013-16

	2013/14 Academic Year	2014/15 Academic Year	2015/16 Academic Year	
ATL	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0.20 fte	1 Day per Week
NASUWT	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0.20 fte	1 Day per Week
NUT	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0.20 fte	1 Day per Week
NAHT	6 Days pa	4 Days pa	3 Days per Year	
ASCL	6 Days pa	4 Days pa	3 Days per Year	
Unison	0.75 fte	0.50 fte	0.40 fte	2 Days per Week
GMB	0.09 fte	0.06 fte	0.05 fte	1 Day per Month
Panel Secretary	0.35 fte	0.25 fte	0.20 fte	1 Day per Week
Estimated Cost	£86,980	£63,170	£44,740	

- 4 The figures above equate to a funding requirement for the 2015/16 financial year of £53,100, or the equivalent of £2.79 per pupil. If the forum agreed to continue with the de-delegation this would then reduce further to an estimated £46,980 for the 2016/17 financial year (£2.50 per pupil).

Additional Information

- 5 The forum has requested further information from the panel on their work and its benefit to schools before making a decision. Attached at Annex 1 is a letter to all members of the forum from the teaching unions represented on the teachers' panel. In addition, members of the panel are expected to be in attendance at the meeting to take questions from the forum.

Recommendations

- 6 Members of the forum are asked to consider, by primary and secondary phase, whether they wish to continue with the trade union facility time de-delegation for the 2016/17 academic year:

Contact Details Author:	Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:		
Richard Hartle Head of Finance: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Director of Children's Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100		
	Report Approved	√	Date
			26 November 2015
For further information please contact the author of the report			

Annexes

Annex 1: Letter from Teacher Unions to Schools Forum

LETTER FROM TEACHER UNIONS TO SCHOOLS FORUM

Tracey Ralph Chair,
Schools Forum
City of York

21 November 2015

Facilities Funding re Professional Associations, City of York

Dear Tracey,

We are writing to all members of the Schools Forum in order to make representations with regard to the value to be had for all concerned in retaining the Facilities Fund. As members may be aware the decision was made at a meeting of the YEP to cut the Facilities budget by 50 % with effect from 1 September 2015. We are aware that the delegation of the Facilities Fund is due to be reviewed once more. In addition we understand that this has been included in the Services to Schools document sent out to all Headteachers for 2015/16. Our concern is that if this is delegated back to schools then a number of schools may see this as a false economy at a time when all budgets are under severe pressure as not all Headteachers understand the benefits of paying into this fund or what they will lose if they opt out.

Consequently we ask that the Schools Forum elects to de-delegate the Facilities fund back to the LA. The formula is equitable across all schools, whether Academy, Maintained, Primary or Secondary and I understand that this will be calculated at a rate of £2.50 per pupil for 2016/17. In writing to you and the members of the Schools Forum about this we thought it would be helpful to point out the work undertaken by Negotiating Secretaries and the benefits that all schools receive in return for their payment.

Firstly, they are either teachers for four days of the week, with all that entails, or are retired. The time needed to perform that task hardly varies throughout the year, obviously it means that for four days of every week teachers are not available during the day. It also means that their availability immediately after school is limited as there are commitments they will have at their own school, often in Directed Time. If retired, then they should not be asked to attend meetings except for the day that has been agreed.

Secondly as Local Secretaries they are the first port of call for any member in their association, they are the link between members and regional office, they organise and run meetings, provide and produce information for members and regional and national offices. In addition they have training needs of their own and it is essential that they are up to date in the latest developments regarding education initiatives, of which recently there have been many, and have a good understanding of employment legislation. It would be fair to say there are 'busy weeks' and 'not so busy weeks' – increasingly fewer of the latter it must be said.

There are constant phone calls and e-mails from members asking about a range of issues, pay, pensions, conditions of service etc., some of which may lead to contact with a school or the Local Authority, many just where the member needs guidance or reassurance. It is very hard to put a

'time' on these activities, but there is rarely any day when members are not in contact with the Secretary, whether it is a "facility day" or not.

All Unions have Local Association meetings which the Secretary organises and attends, meetings at regional/national offices for briefings, these are planned well in advance but are an essential part of any Local Union organisation. In addition the Secretary is responsible for recruitment and is involved with Universities and Colleges as well as visits to schools and being responsible for promoting the Union with NQTs.

Finally there are the activities for which Secretaries receive facilities time. Issues which arise from policies such as capability, disciplinary, attendance etc. require not only time in school but time spent with members, time in discussion with Regional Officers, often conversations with HR and a great deal of time spent in preparation for meeting, if one is required in a given situation.

There should be no need to go through the issues that require the presence and input of a Local Secretary but it needs to be said that an issue such as redundancy is not just about the hour or so spent at the meeting but the time spent in preparation and in the follow up required. These sorts of issues unfortunately do not happen at convenient intervals, again there are busy times and very busy times and Secretaries have to use their time appropriately.

OJM meetings with Local Authority occur on a regular basis and have the advantage of being planned well in advance but again it is not just the meeting, there is often a considerable amount of work involved pre and post meeting. In addition there are meetings about policies which have to be fitted in and although there are not many of these they do require planning and discussion outside of the actual meeting. All LA policies that schools subscribe to are discussed at OJM with the representatives of all the teaching and support staff unions including ASCL and NAHT representatives. Consequently schools have the peace of mind in knowing that once they adopt a LA policy it is one that all the unions have signed up to and has been checked by both Headteacher representatives. A large proportion of the work undertaken by all York Negotiating Secretaries is not just related to individual case work as a fair amount of time is taken up reading through a wide variety of policies before meetings, putting forward alternative suggestions and then talking through the various nuances of these at the meetings with the Assistant Director, HR representatives and LA officers in order to arrive at policies acceptable to all concerned.

Key issues related to Health and Safety in schools is also discussed at these meetings with Cliff Fitzgerald in attendance. As you can imagine, following on from recent high profile cases, this has a much sharper focus from a LA point of view in order to avoid, what was described in a court judgement of a local incident as a "tick box mentality". As part of this the teacher unions are represented on the LA Health and Safety Committee.

If Headteachers have a serious issue, e.g. staff disciplinary or a redundancy hearing, then all staff will be represented, including members of senior leadership teams, including Headteachers, by local representatives. All staff in York schools in the various respective professional associations can contact their local Negotiating Secretary for advice over a number of issues which is often reassuring for them and thus demonstrates the school's concern for the welfare and well-being of all staff.

Should schools believe that the service does not provide value for money and therefore are not willing to buy in to the Facilities Fund then the professional associations will have no option but to contact their respective members in such schools to inform them that as a result they will not be able to represent them at any management, disciplinary or redundancy meetings. Consequently they will be represented by a Regional Officer and that will only serve to delay matters for both schools and staff as well as probably creating additional issues for Headteachers who will thus be dealing with a full time Regional representative rather than the local Negotiating Secretary.

Should schools not buy into this service resulting in further reductions then it may be that Secretaries would have to consider whether it was possible to continue in the role and may step down. Replacements, hard to find as they already are, would also probably consider one day of facilities time insufficient and be unwilling to step in, thus leaving a Union with no Local Secretary. This may result in schools and the LA having to deal with Regional Officials on the many and varied issues. Another option might be that Regional Officers from ATL, NUT and NASUWT would be unable to do this and so would devolve this to school based representatives who would all require 10 days training out of school in order to fulfil their obligations. For a number of schools this would negate any "savings" achieved by not buying into the scheme. Moreover it would mean losing the relationships built up between Secretaries, the Schools and the LA. Often this enables matters to be dealt with quickly and, sometimes, quietly, as the Local Secretaries have understanding of the schools and their situation. It is also a fact that Regional Officials often deal with huge geographic areas and do not have the flexibility to call into a school for a hastily-arranged meeting as is the case with the present facilities arrangement.

Issues in school to do with capability, discipline, redundancy, attendance and pay are not going to go away or lessen in occurrence, with more 'power' being devolved to schools there will be more issues to deal with and there will be a need for Unions, through their Local Secretary, to be involved.

The system as it stands at the moment works very well, matters are dealt with promptly and there are generally very good working relations between the parties involved. We hope that on reading this all members of the Schools Forum will have a greater understanding of the service that teaching staff and schools receive via Facilities funding. We understand that in addition to this submission the Schools Forum is prepared to listen to representations from a member of the professional associations in order to reinforce the benefits that the Facilities Fund brings to York schools and to answer any questions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Steve Smith	ASCL
Ann McKeown	NAHT
Fiona Barclay	ATL
Barbara Reagan	NUT
Andy Sutton/Lee Bowles	NASUWT



Department
for Education

Early Implementation: 30 hours of free childcare

Expressions of Interest: Funding Application Form

October 2015

Making a proposal

All prospective bidders should read this form in conjunction with the supporting guidance, recently published policy statement and frequently asked questions document before completing the attached application form.

Deadline

All completed applications must be received by the Department for Education **by email by noon on Friday 20th November.**

Your local authority name and the words 'early implementers funding bid' should be included in the email "subject" header.

Completing your bid

A limit on the number of words is stated for each section in brackets next to the title. Any text that exceeds the stated limit will not be assessed.

All applications should be countersigned by the Director of Children's Services.

Submitting your application

Please email a single **Word** version of your completed proposal to: Early.IMPLEMENTERS@education.gsi.gov.uk . To note, hard copy completed proposals will not be considered.

When you have sent the Department your application form, you will receive an automatic email response letting you know that your application has arrived with us.

Late proposals will not be considered

The Department will not be able to consider applications that miss this deadline as to do so would be to unfairly discriminate against those applicants who submitted their application within the allowed timescale.

Your Proposal

1) Summary of Your Proposal.
(500 words max). Maximum scoring 20 (weighting x4)

(expanding box)

Evidence shows existing excellent childcare in York is a key factor in businesses choosing to locate to the City. We would like to build on this further to unlock the full economic potential of the city. 30 hours reduces the cost of childcare and is an incentive for York parents/carers to seek work, increase their hours or improve their career prospects. This in turn will create a culture of a strong work ethic to role model to future generations so that children will aspire to work, gain positive life earnings and contribute to sustaining a thriving economy.

Existing and potential childcare providers will create new business or expand their existing business to provide more places, job opportunities and job security for the childcare workforce.

York has a strong infrastructure to support providers and an excellent track record for working with them as a pathfinder LA steering key national programmes/ pilots before they are rolled out nationally. Examples include wraparound care, three year old places, 12.5 hours to 15 hours and Two Year Old places.

York's award winning 'Shared Foundation Partnerships' provide a strong model for childcare partnerships across the whole city to plan for additional hours. York is part of the national 'Childcare Hub' programme with 3 pilot hubs and has already tested, evidenced and shared new ways of working to increase availability and flexibility of places whilst improving quality. This has included the development of;

- An online widget tool for parents to find suitable childcare within a locality
- An ages and stages document supporting transition between settings
- Partnership Inclusion templates to clearly show the full range of support and skills available to children with SEND, within a Shared Foundation Partnership.

York's latest Annual Report on Childcare Sufficiency 2015 shows a strong childcare market and overall there are sufficient places to meet demand from working parents. It offers 91% 'good' and 'outstanding' provision (national average 85%).

York's unique model to Assess Childcare Sufficiency gives an ongoing and accurate picture that identifies potential supply gaps, provides local solutions and minimises risk to the LA.

The Family Information Service (FIS) provides a comprehensive brokerage service to meet families individual needs. Our personalised brokerage support has a 98% success rate.

York's latest take up figure for Two Year Olds is 72% (national average 65%). At least 97% of Three and Four Year Olds receive their funded place with a 'good' or 'outstanding' setting (national average 85%).

York has already achieved 88% take up of early years pupil premium in the first term

of implementation demonstrating our fast, flexible and effective systems.

Four providers have indicated their interest in being involved in early implementation and supporting a joint bid with the LA. These are;

- Funfishers Out of School Club
- Haxby Road Primary Academy
- Heslington Pre-School
- Happy Jays Day Nursery

However, we intend to include all York providers depending on available funding for capital, project support, SEND and places.

As part of the assessment for question 1, please include any key facts on:

- Why you want to be an early implementer – what do you hope to achieve and gain?
- Your track record of driving innovation and ensuring sufficiency in your LA area, in particular to make sure your local market meets the need of working parents.
- How all or part of the additional 15 hours could be provided to act as a work incentive and should parents choose, offered in more flexible ways.
- Your track record of delivering for diverse needs and areas e.g. deprivation, rurality, children with SEND, in working homeless families and BME communities.
- Your track record on two-year-old delivery, and;
- Evidence that this is a joint bid between an LA and providers

2) Project delivery and outcomes (800 words max) Maximum scoring 2 (weighting x4)

(expanding box)

York's unique model for Assessing Childcare Sufficiency provides a more effective and accurate picture of the childcare market. Through the model York will be analysing anecdotal information, annual childcare audits and local and national demand data to make predictions to drill down and give the most up to date picture of a local area and the city as a whole. York's Shared Foundation Partnerships are part of the new model to understand any levels of demand from families within the partnership locality.

York works to meet the gaps in childcare demand, including, but not limited to;

- Market forces where childcare providers are active themselves in identifying demand and seek to set up new provision
- Direct stimulus where there is active encouragement of new providers to the market (or existing providers to expand) in targeted areas including recruitment of childminders.
- Maintaining a diversity of supply of childcare, so that parents have a choice about where to find childcare
- Supporting childcare providers through advice and guidance to remain financially viable so that they remain open.
- Linking with planning and contributing to the planning consultation processes so that we are aware of applications for new provision/expansion and are able to advise as to whether there is known demand within an area.

Therefore, in most cases additional capacity will be created through a combination of commercial market forces, stimulation and support in which York has strong experience. This may involve a commissioning process for the delivery of new childcare and York has a clear procurement process in place as well as Childcare Guidance for schools considering delivering childcare.

Providers are encouraged to assess demand for flexible childcare into days and times to meet the needs of local families and how this is met effectively with other partners to ensure it is financially sustainable. York has a Childcare Business Support Strategy in place underpinned by an annual Childcare Business Support Survey that gauges the business confidence levels of local providers along with the desire for expansion across the city. The results of this survey already provide a foundation to build from in relation to the 30 hours offer.

To enhance flexibility we will investigate out of school provision where appropriate. We have robust categorisation systems in place to support the quality of our out of school provision.

A key factor in flexible childcare is encouraging employers to offer family friendly working practices and we will explore best ways to do this.

A provider survey is drafted, ready to go out to all providers alongside a parental survey, the combined analysis of which will be used to support an effective delivery plan for the roll out of the 30 hours, highlighting the key areas of the city where support, both capital and other, should be targeted to ensure effective implementation.

Disabled Children access to childcare is a high priority for the city and close working with providers and York's Parents and Carers Forum (Candi) have supported increasing parents confidence to access their early education places. The Schools Forum understand the importance of early intervention and have recently contributed to an increase in funding for two, three and four year olds with complex needs to access their early education place.

(See response to Question 1 regarding Brokerage for meeting the needs of local communities.)

Administration of the funded places is extremely efficient and flexible for both parents and providers, using an integrated online portal. In addition to reducing the administrative burden for providers, the online portal allows very flexible delivery of

funded places. Providers can submit their actual take up figures late in the term and claim on a half termly basis hence children can move settings during the term if this supports flexibility for parents. It does it without affecting providers sustainability or causing unnecessary additional expenditure to parents. Children can access their entitlement across two providers, and take their place with a range of providers types. Families in York can access a funded place in a very flexible way to meet their needs whilst also supporting low income families to access their full entitlement and keep childcare costs to a minimum. The imminent introduction of other modules including a Free School Meals Module will provide further efficiencies and build on an already reformed delivery model.

York has a dedicated team of early years advisers and teachers who support all settings including childminders contributing to the rising standards across all settings as evidenced by recent Ofsted inspections. Support from the team is also contributing to high quality provision in schools. Effective strategies include Early Language Development, Well-Being and Involvement processes and bespoke support according to need.

Copies of all existing and relevant strategies/models and plans referred to in this application form are available on request.

As part of the assessment for question 2, please set out how you intend to:

- Ensure sufficient childcare places are available, including your plans for mapping demand and supply; how you will fill supply gaps.
- Work with providers to develop additional places with the flexibility that working parents need, including those needing childcare during school holidays and in non-standard hours.
- Meet the needs of particular communities including those in deprived neighbourhoods; rural communities, children with SEND; homeless working families; BME communities; families on low incomes.
- Drive efficiency and innovation into a reformed LA delivery model
- Deliver 'high quality childcare' for all participating three- and four-year-olds;

3) Monitoring, evaluation, and shared learning (300 words max) Maximum scoring 15 (weighting x3)

(expanding box)

Building on the success of the Two Year Olds a strategic 30 hours board will be established to oversee

- Implementation of a Delivery Plan with clear actions, responsibilities, timescales, success criteria and risk mitigation.
- Implementation of a Communication Plan (see below)
- Performance on take up via termly headcount returns
- Clear and fair criteria to target capital/trajectory funding effectively.

Membership will be broad and include representatives of local childcare provision, children's centres, SEND, FIS, Child Poverty, Health Visitors and Job Centre Plus and be chaired by the Head of Childcare Strategy. The Board will be accountable to the Assistant Director, Education and Skills and with regular updates to the Executive Member.

Learning will be cascaded through the existing forums including the Childcare Providers Leaders and Managers Forum, termly training for Shared Foundation Partnerships, childminder and out of school network meetings, Children's Centres Management Group meetings and Childcare Voluntary Management Committee Network meetings and Health Visitor sessions.

The Communication Plan will set out clearly how key messages to encourage take up will be done effectively with partners and providers and building on York's strong social media presence. FIS has a very active social media campaign with over 1,300 followers on Facebook and over 1,000 followers on Twitter. York is leading the way in using such platforms. FIS also supports a network of 'virtual champions' who are active members of the public running pages on social media for local families. York will develop this network even further.

York is willing to participate in national evaluation and has extensive experience delivering at regional and national meetings/conferences and more recently with 4 Children for the Childcare Hub programme. Impact case studies are already captured on York's website and will be built on for 30 hours. York regularly contributes to national childcare research.

As part of the assessment for question 3, please set out:

- How you plan to monitor take-up among working parents and how this will be carried out
- How you will work with others (e.g. health care professionals, practitioners, children's centres, schools, CMAs and providers) to share your learning and experiences from early implementation.
- Please also confirm that you would be willing to participate in a process of national evaluation with other areas to share your learning and experience from the early implementer trials. This is likely to include asking parents who receive a 30-hours funded place to, on a voluntary basis, provide information about how their working patterns changed (or not) when they access a place.

4) Staffing, Governance and Risks – (200 words max.) Maximum scoring 15 (weighting x3)

(expanding box)

Barbara Mands, Head of Childcare Strategy is the named contact for the Department and shared learning activities. (See response to Q3 for details of 30 Hours Board on management and governance).

Key risks such as finance and reputation will be clearly identified and included within the Council Risk Register with detail on mitigation. An example of mitigation includes an existing business support programme to reduce the risk of childcare business closure through lack of business skill.

Administration of the early education funding is audited by an external auditor, who confirms that the funding is effectively and appropriately administered, arrangements for managing risk are already good and an effective control environment is in operation, providing substantial assurance.

A Community Impact Assessment (CIA) will be developed to identify positive and negative impacts based on the 10 protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. Impact on particular communities will be assessed and steps to be taken such as addressing imbalances, under-representation and targeting of particular groups.

Safeguarding policies are already robustly in place in childcare settings. The focus of the early implementation will be continuing to work with providers on the wider early years offer to identify vulnerability earlier and seek support.

As part of the assessment for question 4, please set out how you plan to manage the trial, including:

- Management and governance arrangements, including who would be responsible for contact with the Department and shared learning activities.
- Key risks including your outline plans for managing and mitigating them. These should include arrangements to meet your equality duties and safeguarding vulnerable children (where this is applicable); and
- How you will involve local providers and/or partnerships in management and governance arrangements.

DECLARATION

I confirm that the information given in this application is true and complete and that, if successful, the local authority will administer any grant in accordance with the letter supplied by the Department for Education.

Name (block capitals):	BARBARA MANDS
Position (Job Title):	Head of Childcare Strategy
Date:	19 th November 2015
Contact details including email address:	Barbara.mands@york.gov.uk 01904 554371
Signature:	
Countersigned (by the DCS):	 Jon Stonehouse

York Schools Forum

14 December 2015

Report of the Director Children's Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

SPECIAL SCHOOL TOP-UP (ELEMENT 3) FUNDING CHANGES FROM 2016/17

Summary

- 1 This paper outlines the proposed new Top-Up (or element 3) funding values which have been developed for use from the 1st April 2016 to allocate funding for pupils at Applefields and Hob Moor Oaks Special Schools under the High Needs funding system introduced by the Department for Education in 2013/14.

Background

- 2 Maintained special schools receive place funding based on an agreed number of places for the financial year. This is then provided through the Education Funding Agency (EFA) at £10k per place, and equates to the element 1 and 2 for mainstream schools. In addition, schools then receive top-up funding at an individual pupil level, paid by the commissioning LA.
- 3 Top-up Funding (Element 3) in York is currently paid through a formula based on a medical model where funds are given according to diagnosis. Additional funding is provided for those children where a complexity of need is recognised at one or two higher levels:- 'plus' and 'exceptional need'. There are 13 different funding categories, across 5 diagnoses, and these are listed below
 - Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) / MLD plus / MLD exceptional need
 - Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) / SLD plus / SLD exceptional need
 - Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD) / EBD exceptional need
 - Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (PMLD) / PMLD exceptional need
 - Autism / Autism plus / Autism exceptional need
- 4 These levels equate to a funding system that provides adequate funding overall. However, the levels do not always match the needs of individual pupils. Two young children both described as having autism may have very different levels of need and while the two extra categories attempted to recognise this, the system is quite crude.

Development of thresholds for special schools

- 5 The new banding thresholds have been developed to provide a robust and transparent method of allocating resources to the two special schools to better reflect

the needs of individual pupils. A working party with staff from the special schools and central staff from SEN, led by Carmel Appleton developed and tested the banding thresholds. The following information is summarised from the detailed guidance.

- 6 Children and young people who attend Hob Moor Oaks and Applefields School will:
- experience life-long learning difficulties
 - benefit from specialised provision, with personalised programmes of support delivered by
 - have access to staff with a high level of knowledge and expertise
 - have an Education, Health & Care Plan or a Statement of Special Educational Need
 - have cognition and learning needs and are likely to have a range of additional issues and a combination of layered needs. Additional needs may include some or all of the other 3 broad areas of special educational needs identified in the Code of Practice 2014. i.e. communication and interaction; physical and/or sensory; social, emotional and mental health.
- 7 Funding to support all children and young people who attend Hob Moor Oaks and Applefields Schools will be provided within BAND 5 of the City of York SEN Thresholds. The descriptors in this document will be used to describe a child/young person's needs and the support and provision they require in Section 3 of the York Education, Health and Care Plan.

Descriptors of SEN and Specific Support Needs

- 8 The types of children and young people who are supported within York Special School settings include three broad areas of ability: moderate learning difficulties, severe learning difficulties and profound and multiple learning difficulties (these categories are identified in the SEND Code of Practice 2014, Section 6.30).
- 9 Support for specific needs for each of the areas above are described under the following headings:

Support Area
Cognition & Learning
Social, Emotional and Mental Health
Communication & Interaction: which includes speech, language and communication needs and needs on the autistic spectrum
Sensory / Physical: Physical and Medical Needs
Sensory / Physical: Visual and Hearing Impairment
Sensory / Physical: Personal Care and Life Skills
Inclusion: where support is provided by special school staff to facilitate inclusion (i.e. not dual placements).

- 10 Element 3 funding will be allocated according to the support needs of individual learners. The needs of each child or young person is considered and recorded individually based on teacher assessed need. In order to develop the model the assessments were triangulated across the two schools.

New Top-up Rates

- 11 The new top-up rates have been calculated based on TA hourly rates and are detailed in Annex A. The rates have been derived by calculating average hourly rates across TA support grades.
- 12 The core levels do not refer to specific TA grades therefore the average hourly rate for all TA levels has been calculated and used to derive the basic top-up levels.
- 13 The additional top-ups for Personal Care are based on the average hourly rate for TA Level 1.
- 14 The TA supplements are based on either TA Level 2 or an average of TA Level 2 and 3.
- 15 Under the current system, top-up values differ between the two special schools due to historic cost differentials which were built into these rates at the point of transition to the national system of place and top-up funding introduced from 2013/14. Analysis of these costs suggests that the totality of these costs are similar across both schools therefore it is reasonable to apply consistent top-up funding values.

Modelling the Impact of New Top-Ups

- 16 The new rates have been applied to all the pupils in each of the two Special Schools in the summer term of the academic year 2014/15 (including pupils of other local authorities placed at the schools). The results of this exercise have then been used to assess the financial impact of the new funding model, both against the overall funding envelope currently allocated to both schools as top-up funding, and on each school individually.
- 17 The total top-up funding allocated to the pupils assessed under the new model, compared to the amount allocated to the same pupils under the current model is a reduction of 0.95%. This change of less than 1% in the total amount being allocated for all pupils assessed under the new model demonstrates that there is not expected to be a significant impact on the overall funding being distributed to the schools in top-up. As top-up funding is allocated on an individual pupil basis this will always change depending on the needs of individual pupils in the school at a particular point in time.

Use of York Top-Ups for other LA pupils in York Schools

- 18 Although each local authority is free to decide on their own top-up funding arrangements, we will be recommending that when placing their pupils in York special schools, all LA's should use the process and funding values developed in York for allocation of top-up funding.

Enhanced Resource Provision Units in Mainstream Settings

- 19 Initially, it was intended that these top-up rates would also be applied across the four Enhanced Resource Units in York schools. However, it has become clear that the nature of the units, and their relationships with the mainstream settings in which they are placed, means that the above model cannot be easily mapped to provision in these settings. It is therefore proposed to work on an amended model for the units to be implemented from 1st April 2017. This work has already begun.

Future Developments

- 20 The banding is now being adapted for Early Years and post maintained education settings to develop a comparable transparent threshold banding that supports high quality provision and fair and transparent allocation of funding.

Recommendations

- 21 The Forum is requested to approve the new banding methodology and the top-up rates described above and detailed in Annex A to be used in the allocation of top-up funding to York Special Schools from 1st April 2016.

Contact Details Authors:	Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:			
Mike Barugh Principal Accountant Customer and Business Support Tel: 01904 554573 email: mike.barugh@york.gov.uk Jess Haslam Head of Disability and Special Educational Needs Children's Services, Education and Skills Tel: 01904 554322 email: jess.haslam@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Director of Children's Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100			
	Report Approved	√	Date	26 November 2015
For further information please contact the authors of the report				

Proposed Special School Top-Up Rates

Main Point Scale				
Support Level	Main Point Scale	Staff Ratio	Percentage of average TA cost	Basic top-up £
Core	1	1 : 5	20.00%	4,109
Enhanced	2	1 : 4	25.00%	5,136
Enhanced plus	3	1 : 3.5	28.57%	5,870
High	4	1 : 3	33.33%	6,848
Intensive	5	1 : 2.5	40.00%	8,218
Intensive Plus	6	1 : 2	50.00%	10,273

Personal Care / Life Skills Supplement				
Support Level	Level	Staff Ratio	Hours	Supplementary top-up £
Personal Care 1	PC1	TA1	7.5	2,938
Personal Care 2	PC2	TA1	15.0	5,876

Additional TA Support Supplement				
Support Level	Level	Staff Ratio	Hours	Supplementary top-up £
TA Supplement 1	S1	TA2	5.0	2,163
TA Supplement 2	S2	TA2	10.0	4,325
TA Supplement 3	S3	TA2	15.0	6,488
TA Supplement 4	S4	1 fte TA2	30.0	12,975
TA Supplement 5	S5	2 fte TA2/TA3	60.0	29,133

Schools Forum 14th December 2015

Update on the new school improvement arrangements and implementation of the annual commissioning plan

Issue

Since 2010 the local authority role in school improvement has been changing and has seen local authorities moving away from being providers of school improvement towards commissioning and quality assuring sector led school improvement.

Nationally the development of teaching school alliances and system leader roles such as National Leaders of Education, Local Leaders of Education and Specialist Leaders of Education have been the key elements in creating the capacity to support the self improving school system. In York we currently have three accredited national teaching schools, two teaching school alliances (Ebor and Pathfinder), 4 National Leaders of Education, 9 Local Leaders of Education and 32 Specialist Leaders of Education. Since 2013 we have also been developing school to school support through the geographical cluster model. This provides the infrastructure to support the transformation of the delivery of school improvement in York. This has seen the move away from the local authority as the provider of school improvement through a large retained team of advisers and consultants to a quality assurance role, providing challenge and holding schools to account for their own improvement.

In October 2014, the Council's Cabinet approved the business case for the transformation of the school improvement arrangements in York. This resulted in the restructuring of the local authority's retained school improvement team from a provider team to a smaller quality assurance team which would work with headteachers, system leaders and the two teaching school alliances and the clusters to develop sustainable and high quality school-led school improvement arrangements.

These new arrangements were implemented on 1st September 2015. The local authority school improvement team now consists of four senior school improvement professionals whose roles are focused on the

commissioning and quality assurance of school improvement activity in the city. They are supported in their work by two school improvement support assistants. The focus of the LA school improvement team's work is to ensure that the impact of the new school led activity is clearly evidenced and schools are being held effectively to account for their own improvement.

In April 2015 Schools Forum agreed to the use of funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to be used as a commissioning fund to develop the new model of sector-led school improvement. This is being 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. The new arrangements are part of an annual commissioning cycle (see Annex 1) which is focused on ensuring that commissioned work addresses the priorities for improvement identified by the local authority's school improvement team through its annual cycle of self evaluation and risk assessment.

At the time of writing the new arrangements have been in place for 14 weeks. The arrangements are underpinned by commissioning contracts which have been developed with the LA procurement and legal teams. An important feature of these new arrangements has been the agreement to commission work from the city's two teaching school alliances. A unique aspect of these arrangements is also the fact that the two teaching school alliances have agreed to assume distinct roles rather than competing with each other, which is the case in many other areas of the country.

Since 1st September 2015 the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance has recruited and deployed school to school support teams to work with all grade 3 and grade 4 schools. Support plans have been written and the impact of work is being reported through school improvement panel meetings. Early successes have been characterised by:

- Good relationships being established between the support teams and headteachers of supported schools;
- The introduction of focused coaching programmes to build the capacity of senior leaders to effectively lead improvements in teaching and learning;
- The sharing of good practice to support developments in teaching and learning;
- Effective peer support and challenge for headteachers;

- Support for school self-evaluation through providing an external view of the quality of teaching and learning.

There is much work to do to further develop and embed the model of school to school support however important first steps have been taken and the on-going dialogue between the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance (ETSA) team and the Local Authority is proving valuable in refining and developing the school to school support arrangements. An important step in the implementation of the new arrangements has been the development of the LA and ETSA joint protocol document (see Annex 2).

The Pathfinder Teaching Schools Alliance (PTSA) has been commissioned to lead the CPD offer for the city. Since September 1st 2015 PTSA has received 1559 bookings for its primary CPD offer and 51 bookings for its secondary programme. Analysis of feedback from participant evaluations shows high levels of satisfaction with the CPD offer. Strong partnership working between the LA and PTSA is ensuring that the CPD offer meets the priorities identified in the commissioning plan. As with ETSA this first term of implementation has highlighted areas for further development in embedding and developing the new arrangements. For Pathfinder the key areas of learning have related to the resolving some of the logistical issues that have arisen as they have been implementing the CPD offer. These issues have included:

- Resolving issues with car parking on a busy school site
- Implementing an automated booking system
- Providing access to toilets whilst not compromising safeguarding procedures

All of these issues have now been resolved.

In reviewing the progress of the implementation of the new arrangements it is important to reflect on how much has been achieved in a relatively short period of time. The LA and teaching schools alliances have worked together quickly to implement the new arrangements from the start of the new academic year meaning that there has been no time lost in moving from the LA led school improvement arrangements to the commissioning of the school-led system. The first 14 weeks have also helped to identify the areas where further development is needed and are also pointing the way towards ways in which the work of the teaching schools alliances is becoming ever more aligned with school to school support and delivery bespoke CPD being crucial to supporting the improvement of schools

that are not yet securely good or better and to develop the capacity to create and sustain outstanding education in the city.

An important next step in further developing and refining the new arrangements is to support the cultural shift in understanding the respective roles of the LA and schools in the new education landscape. This will be supported by on-going communication throughout 2015-16 with key stakeholders e.g. the headteacher forums and governing bodies.

The process of developing the 2016-17 commissioning plan has been discussed with the School Improvement Commissioning Group (SICG) and the plan will begin to be drafted in January 2016.

Attachments

Annex 1 – The Commissioning Plan 2015-16

Annex 2 – The LA and Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance joint protocol

Action required

This paper is to provide Schools Forum with information about the progress of the implementation of the new school improvement arrangements.

Contact:

Name: Maxine Squire

Job title: Assistant Director, Education and Skills

01904 553007

maxine.squire@york.gov.uk

#

York Learning Partnership

School Improvement Commissioning Plan

Academic Year 2015/16

York Learning Partnership

School Improvement Commissioning Plan 2015/16

The local authority will work with the headteacher members of the School Improvement Commissioning Group (SICG) and the chair of the York Learning Partnership to produce an annual commissioning plan drawn from a needs-based analysis to identify the school improvement priorities in the city. The commissioning plan will be presented to the School Improvement Commissioning Group and the members of the Schools Forum. The SICG agree the commissioning plan and recommend the funding agreement to the Schools Forum who will agree to the use of the Direct Schools Grant (DSG) to support the school improvement activities outlined in the commissioning plan.

Commissioning principles

- 1) The York Learning Partnership (YLP) is committed to providing **all** children and young people in York with a great education through ensuring that every school in the city is good or better.
- 2) Members of the YLP School Improvement Commissioning Group (SICG) take corporate responsibility for the use of the commissioning fund, which is de-delegated by the School's Forum from the DSG, to benefit **all** children and young people in the city so that outcomes improve, gaps are closed and barriers to the improvement of individual schools are removed.
- 3) All schools in the city will benefit from the use of funding to commission an annual programme of continuing professional development (CPD) from the Pathfinder Teaching School Alliance. The annual programme of CPD will be developed in consultation with all schools and specific CPD will be commissioned to address the city's improvement priorities.
- 4) The use of school-to-school support funding will be prioritised to commission the Ebor Teaching School Alliance. This will include the deployment of school to school support teams to provide bespoke support to schools that are not yet good or are at risk of losing their existing good status so that they to move to good within two years or are securely good at their next inspection.
- 5) The use of funding will be prioritised to ensure that gaps in performance between disadvantaged pupils (including those eligible for the pupil premium, looked after children and those with special educational needs and/or disabilities) and their peers are closed.
- 6) The impact of all commissioned interventions will be reported to the School's Forum and the executive board of the York Learning Partnership.

The role of the Teaching School Alliances

York currently has two teaching school alliances (TSAs), Ebor and Pathfinder. The teaching schools have a national, regional and local reach which provides York with the capacity to draw on York-based school improvement professionals and to benefit from the external links which the teaching schools are able to exploit. This allows York to benefit from internal strengths whilst remaining outward facing.

Ebor and Pathfinder have access to the National College of Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) system leaders who can be used to develop CPD and school to school support at whole school, subject and individual teacher levels.

The two teaching schools will be commissioned annually to deliver against priorities outlined in the commissioning plan. Ebor TSA will be commissioned to lead the coordination and delivery of school-to-school support, and Pathfinder TSA will be commissioned to coordinate, plan and deliver needs-led CPD packages.

School-to-school support covers a broad spectrum of activity from individual coaching of teachers to improve classroom practice to whole school intervention in a failing school.

York Learning Partnership

Funding to support clusters

The six geographical clusters in the city have been allocated funding from the School Improvement Commissioning Fund (£125,000). This funding has been allocated to build the capacity to drive sector led school improvement in localities. The focus of collaborative work in clusters is determined by the improvement priorities identified in each cluster improvement plan, but could include:

- 1) Improving the quality of teaching
- 2) Effective use of the pupil premium to close gaps between disadvantaged pupils and their peers
- 3) Developing middle and/or senior leadership
- 4) Improving behaviour and attendance.
- 5) Supporting effective transitions
- 6) Developing collaborative approaches to improve the emotional and mental health of children
- 7) Collaborative work to support the move from good to outstanding
- 8) Developing forums to share best practice through joint training days and cluster network meetings
- 9) Strengthening governance

Each cluster completes an annual cluster improvement plan which outlines the focus of the cluster work, how the cluster funding will be used and how the impact of cluster work will be monitored and evaluated. Cluster chairs are accountable to the YLP for the use of cluster funding to deliver the outcomes outlined in the cluster improvement plan.

Funding to support category 3 and 4 schools

The partnership believes that **all** children and young people in York should be able to attend schools that are at least good. This will allow them to realise their ambitions and live their dreams. As a partnership of educators we will work together to support all schools to be good or better.

Schools that are yet good or are at risk of losing their current good judgements will be prioritised for support commissioned by the School Improvement Commissioning Group (SICG).

Improvement Priorities 2015/16

The following improvement priorities have been produced using national and local data sets including Ofsted reports, information provided by York Challenge Partners and the LA's risk assessment process.

Priority 1: Ensuring all schools are good or better

Six schools are currently judged by Ofsted to require improvement and one secondary school is in special measures. Since September 2015 these schools have been prioritised for support. Of the six primary schools currently judged to require improvement three are making strong progress and are on track to move to good at their next inspection. All have engaged well with the Ebor school to school support teams. A support plan has been written for each school and these plans outline the intended outcomes of the commissioned support. Commissioned interventions are managed through the Ebor Teaching School Alliance and depend on the needs and circumstances of individual schools but can include:

York Learning Partnership

- 1) Support from a partner headteacher (including York Leaders of Education (YLEs), National Leaders of Education (NLEs) and Local Leaders of Education (LLEs) and heads from neighbouring LAs)
- 2) Support to improve the quality of governance
- 3) Additional leadership or teaching capacity
- 4) Support from a Specialist Leader of Education (SLE) to improve a subject or aspect of the school's teaching and learning

It is important to recognise that the purpose of school to school support is to build the capacity of the supported school to drive forward its own improvement at a faster pace through targeted peer interventions designed to share good practice and provide additional capacity to support school self evaluation. School to school support should not be viewed as a supply agency and cannot be used to address teacher shortages. The deployment of commissioned interventions from the Ebor support teams will be time limited, with clearly mapped exit strategies being identified as part of the support plan to ensure that the impact of the support is to build the supported schools capacity to demonstrate that it can sustain its own improvement. The impact of commissioned interventions will be monitored and evaluated by the SICG and reported to the YLP executive board and the Schools Forum. Commissioned interventions will be included as part of the support plans and LA statements of action for grade 3 and grade 4 schools. The progress of grade 3 and 4 schools will be monitored through half termly LA school improvement panel meetings, reports from the Ebor teams and the LA quality assurance reports. If schools fail to make progress then the LA will use its statutory powers of intervention to issue warning notices and will put in place interim executive boards (IEBs) in cases where governance is causing concern.

Priority 2: Support for 'At Risk' schools

Through the process of annual risk assessment the local authority uses the following criteria to review the progress that schools are making and to identify whether schools currently graded as good would be at risk of losing that status at their next inspection. These schools are prioritised for commissioned support.

Risk assessment criteria:

- Attainment and progress is below floor standards
- Value added is significantly below national for the core subjects and/or identified pupil groups
- There are wide gaps in performance between identified pupil groups e.g. gender, pupil premium, SEN etc and their peers
- There are wide gaps in performance between English and mathematics
- The quality of teaching is inconsistent across phases and/or subjects
- There are wide variations in performance between phases
- There are concerns about the quality of leadership (headteacher, senior and/or middle leaders)
- There have been significant changes in the context of the school since the previous inspection
- There are concerns about the quality of governance
- The school is not using its resources well to improve the quality of education and improve the well being of its pupils
- There are concerns about the behaviour, safety and attendance of pupils
- The school is failing to discharge its statutory duties effectively

York Learning Partnership

- The school is failing to promote the social, moral, cultural and spiritual development of its pupils

Schools identified at risk will be identified for support by the School Improvement Commissioning Group. Support could include:

- Leadership support from an NLE, LLE, SLE or YLE
- Support for governance from an NLG or YLG. This could include an external review of governance conducted by an NLG
- Targeted CPD
- Use of SLEs to support improvements at subject level
- A Pupil Premium Review

The impact of commissioned support will be monitored by the SICG and reported to the YLP Executive Board, the School Improvement Monitoring Group and the Schools Forum.

Priority 3: Schools due for re-inspection during 2015/16

Under the current inspection framework there are **13** schools due for re-inspection during 2015/16. The LA will continue to commission professional development briefings for heads, senior leaders and governors to support preparations for Ofsted.

Priority 4: Improving pupils progress across all key stages, particularly in English and mathematics

York has historically performed well against national attainment indicators however the progress pupils make has been less strong. Progress is now the key performance indicator for schools across all key stages and a key priority for all schools in York is to ensure that all pupils make good and better progress from their starting points and that this progress is sustained across all key stages

Priority 5: Closing the gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers

York performs consistently well against key national performance indicators at the end of key stages. However, this high performance against key attainment indicators has hidden the underperformance of disadvantaged pupils in the city. Whilst there have been improvements performance across key stages remains inconsistent with gaps closing in some key stages and widening in others due often to cohort factors rather than the impact of interventions. In 2014 the gap narrowed in both Early Years and Key Stage 2 however the gap remains static in Key Stage 1 and has widened in Key Stage 4.

The small size of the disadvantaged cohort in York (approximately 300 children per year group) means that they are very thinly spread across the city. As a result, their outcomes can vary significantly by school and cluster. On the whole, schools with the largest numbers of disadvantaged pupils have the narrowest gaps; however, this can be caused by the headline figure for their peers being at or just above the national average. The gaps tend to be wider in schools where the cohort size is small and headline performance is significantly above the national average.

Sharing best practice and focusing on the cohort at city- and cluster-level will be important to sustainably closing the gap. The data shows that the gaps are widest in literacy, particularly in writing, across all key stages. This impacts on the progress of disadvantaged pupils and makes it more difficult for them to access the curriculum and engage fully with learning.

Requiring Improvement schools that receive a grade 3 for the quality of leadership are being instructed to commission Pupil Premium reviews. Currently these reviews have to be conducted by accredited NLEs or LLEs. In York we have two LLEs who are accredited Pupil Premium reviewers.

York Learning Partnership

As part of the commissioning plan for 2015/16 it would be useful to commission Pupil Premium reviews for 'At Risk' schools with wide gaps which are likely to be re-inspected during 2015/16. Priority

6: Improving the outcomes of looked after children

Improving the life chances of children in care is a key priority for the city. The virtual school for looked after children plays an important role in monitoring the progress of looked after children and works in partnership with all schools in the city to ensure that the quality of education targets in PEPs is high and that schools are taking appropriate steps to support children in care and secure strong outcomes for them so that all are able to achieve their potential and live full and successful lives in line with their peers.

Priority 7: Improving the quality of teaching, learning and assessment

School self evaluation and external quality assurance by Ofsted and York Challenge Partners and advisers shows that there are variations in the quality of teaching across key stages, subjects and schools. Ensuring that the quality of teaching is consistently good or better in all phases and subjects will mean that all children in York achieve the best possible outcomes and are able to attend schools that are good or better. Even in good and better schools there are aspects of teaching in phases and subjects that require improvement and in order to support their continuous improvement it is important to provide all teachers with access to high quality continuing professional development (CPD).

In order to secure a city wide CPD offer Pathfinder Teaching School Alliance have completed an extensive consultation exercise which is being used to develop a comprehensive, needs led programme of CPD. This programme will focus on using the skills of existing good and outstanding teachers and school leaders to develop and sustain professional learning networks.

City-wide priorities for continuing professional development include:

- Securing excellent learning and progress in the early years
- A focus on developing the quality of teaching and leadership in English, mathematics and science
- Improving writing across all key stages but particularly in KS1 and KS2
- Developing understanding of changes to assessment and the curriculum across all key stages with a particular emphasis on assessing without levels and progress 8
- Supporting high quality PSHE across all phases
- Support for KS4 subjects which performed below the national average for GCSE in the subject in 2014. These subjects were: English Language (just in line), Art and Design, IT and PE.

Priority 8: Succession Planning and improving the quality of leadership

Developing and growing teachers and leaders are crucially important to maintaining good and better schools in York. A key priority is to ensure that York has systems in place to support teachers throughout their careers and to spot and grow talent. The two teaching school alliances, Ebor and Pathfinder will work in partnership with the Local Authority, the NCTL and the city's universities to develop career and leadership pathways which will ensure that York is able to attract and retain the brightest and the best to the city's schools.

To do this York needs to continue to have in place:

- Strong ITT through Schools Direct and SCITTs
- Comprehensive and high quality induction, support, training and quality assurance procedures for NQTs
- Specific support and training for RQTs

York Learning Partnership

- Middle leader development
- Senior leader development
- Headteacher induction
- Support and development for serving headteachers

Priority 9: Developing the 14-19 strategic plan so that all children develop the skills they need to become successful adults

All children in York should be supported to develop the skills they need to make secure transitions in to the next stage of their education and in to further training and employment. York's outcomes at the end of KS4 and KS5 remain significantly above national averages, however, for a small cohort of young people in the city the KS4 curriculum does not allow them to make good progress and they have difficulty sustaining their engagement with further education and employment beyond the age of 17.

Changes to secondary school accountabilities and challenging changes to the funding of post 16 education is prompting the need to develop a city wide strategy to 14-19 education which ensures that cost-effective and sustainable progression pathways are developed to meet the needs of all learners and to support the needs of the local economy.

Developing the employability skills of young people is a key priority for the city and continuing to develop employer engagement with schools and colleges to improve advice and guidance is an important area to focus on in the development of the York Learning Partnership 14-19 Strategic Plan. Another important strand within the plan is to develop progression pathways for young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities to ensure that their needs can be met through a strong local offer which supports their learning, health and care needs through to the age of 25.

Priority 10: Ensuring that York uses resources effectively to promote and sustain inclusive education

During 2015-16 the LA is working with schools and other partners to review the current use of resources to support children with special educational needs and/or disabilities. The inclusion review is examining the effectiveness of the current map of provision in the city to identify and share what is working well and to identify gaps in current provision which will inform the review of the use of resources from the high needs block to best meet needs.

Funding requirements

In 2014/15, the following amounts of DSG were de-delegated to the local authority to support school improvement:

- School Improvement Commissioning Fund: £125k
- Schools Causing Concern Fund: £200k
- Support for School Improvement: £641k

This gave a total de-delegation of **£966k**

The £641K was used to support salaries in the Local Authority's school improvement team. During 2014-15 the new model of school improvement was developed in consultation with schools and other stakeholders. In October 2014, the Council's Cabinet approved the transformation business case for school improvement which proposed the radical restructuring of the local authority's retained school improvement team from a provider team to a smaller quality assurance team which would work with headteachers, system leaders and the two teaching school alliances and the clusters to develop sustainable and high quality school-led school improvement arrangements. This has resulted in a

York Learning Partnership

reduction in the size of the LA school improvement team from **13.2** full time equivalents in 2014-15 to **6 full time equivalents** in 2015-16.

York Learning Partnership

Funding for 2015/16

Improvement priority	Funding required
<p>Priorities 1 and 2: Support for RI schools and 'At Risk Schools'</p> <p>Priority 6: Succession planning and improving the quality of leadership</p>	<p>£360,900 – This is being used to commission the Ebor Teaching School Alliance (ETSA) to provide YLEs, NLEs, LLEs and SLEs as required for the school to school support plans written for each RI/'At Risk' school. Each support plan will be written following due diligence exercise conducted in partnership between the LA and the ETSA.</p> <p>This funding is being used to ensure that capacity is in place to source and deploy system leaders. The deployment plans outline the accountabilities and outcomes expected from each deployment.</p> <p>The ETSA will co-ordinate bids to the NCTL School to School Support Fund to support the deployment of system leaders (individual bids of up to 20K can be made). Successful bids will reduce the demands for DSG funding.</p>
Funding to support clusters	<p>£125,000 – currently the School Improvement Commissioning Fund is used to support school improvement in clusters. It is proposed that this should continue to be used to support cluster work with each cluster using a proportion of its funding to focus on work to improve the quality of teaching and close the gap in attainment and progress between disadvantaged pupils and their peers.</p>
Priority 3: Schools due for re-inspection	£2,000 – to commission professional briefings from external consultants
<p>Priorities 4 and 5: Closing the Gap and Improving the quality of teaching.</p> <p>Priority 6: Succession planning and improving the quality of leadership</p>	<p>£226,680 – to commission a city-wide CPD programme from the Pathfinder Teaching School Alliance (PTSA). In order to deliver the programme PTSA need to be supported to recruit posts in their structure.</p> <p>The programme of CPD is developed through a process of annual consultation with all members of the York Learning Partnership.</p> <p>An annual programme of quality assurance drop-ins will be conducted by the LA to ensure that the programme is delivering best value.</p>
<p>Priorities 1 and 2: Support for RI schools and 'At Risk Schools'</p> <p>Priority 3: Schools due for re-inspection</p>	<p>£200,000 – The local authority School Causing Concern Fund. This will be retained by the LA to commission emergency interventions as outlined in the Schools Causing Concern statutory guidance. The use of the fund will be audited annually and the audit report will be received by the Schools Forum and the YLP Executive Board. Any unused funding will be returned to the DSG at the end of the financial year.</p>

Total: £914,580



**SCHOOL TO SCHOOL SUPPORT PROTOCOL
FOR WORK WITH REQUIRING IMPROVEMENT SCHOOLS AND
SCHOOLS CAUSING CONCERN**

BETWEEN

**CITY OF YORK SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SERVICE
AND
EBOR TEACHING SCHOOLS ALLIANCE**

Agreed: September 2015

Amended: November 2015

To be reviewed: March 2016

Introduction

This protocol has been agreed between the Assistant Director, Education and Skills, Heads of Primary and Secondary School Improvement and the Director of the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance (ETSA).

This protocol document has been drawn up to support headteachers (including, National Leaders of Education, Local Leaders of Education and York Leaders of Education), and Specialist Leaders of Education who have been commissioned to work with requiring improvement schools and schools causing concern during 2015-16.

1. Professional Conduct

The Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance School to School support teams will seek at all times to work in a professional manner, with a clear focus on improving outcomes for children so that supported schools are able to move from requiring improvement as judged by Ofsted towards good at their next inspection. Support will be brokered and delivered in a spirit of mutual respect and will be designed to build capacity in the supported schools so that they can move rapidly to good through receiving high quality peer challenge and support.

Confidentiality will be fully observed by all parties.

2. Communication

Both the members of the Local Authority School Improvement Service and the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance School to School Support Teams are fully committed to maintaining effective channels of communication at all levels during the periods of deployments with individual schools.

This includes:

- drawing up the commissioning plan by the Local Authority and deployment plan by ETSA for the supported school;
- face to face meetings and email etc;

- follow up email outlining actions and capturing evidence of progress and impact Producing written reports using the S2S Impact Report (Appendix 1) which should be submitted at the end of each half term in autumn, the end of the spring term and at the end of each half term in summer (5 in total). These S2S Impact Reports should be emailed from the headteacher's email address (not a personal email address) to the appropriate LA Head of School Improvement contact (Stephanie Windsor for primary/John Thompson for secondary) with the headteacher of the supported school and Jo Pearson (Ebor TSA) copied in. In addition a half termly verbal report at the School Improvement Panel meetings may be requested.

3. Role and Responsibilities of the Ebor School to School Support Team

The ETSA team leader will be responsible for overseeing the work of the school to school support team once the S2S Action Plan (Appendix 2) has been put in place. The S2S Action Plan will be developed in partnership with the supported headteacher and chair of governors as a result of the due diligence process. The results of this process will be shared with the LA school improvement service.

The members of the school to school support team allocated to undertake support work (e.g. coaching, mentoring and modelling) will be overseen by the ETSA team leader, who will liaise with the headteacher of the supported school or their representative regarding the direction and impact of the team's work streams.

Should any difficulties arise the team leader will be expected to raise these in the first instance with the headteacher of the school they are working with. If the difficulties cannot be resolved then the Ebor team leader should make the Director of the ETSA and the relevant LA Head of School Improvement aware of this. It will be the responsibility of the LA to intervene if the Ebor team leader has concerns that they are facing barriers or resistance from the headteacher of the supported school.

The role of the ETSA school to school support team is to add capacity to the leadership teams' of the schools they are working with to improve outcomes for children by:

- ensuring that the school's development planning is well focused and that the planned actions are the right ones to move the school to good;
- provide expert coaching and mentoring to leaders at all levels;
- providing support to develop the quality of teaching so that it is consistently good by modelling good practice to develop the quality of teaching and learning;
- supporting monitoring and evaluation so that leaders and governors have a clear understanding of the progress of the school;
- sharing good practice to add capacity on the school's journey to good;
- ETSA school to school support team members will employ observation, demonstration, coaching, modelling and support techniques to:
 - 1 Improve the quality of leadership
 - 2 Improve the quality of teaching
 - 3 Improve the quality of behaviour and attendance

So that there is an improvement in pupil progress

This will involve work in and out of the classroom and may involve working with more than one middle leader and/or teacher at a time.

The team member and LA heads of school improvement will meet with the members of the ETSA school to school support teams and the headteacher of the supported school at the beginning of each half term (or more frequently if circumstances require it) to clarify key priorities and workstreams, as identified in the commissioning plan.

The ETSA will ensure that the S2S Action Plan outlining the focus and intended outcomes/impact of the school to school support is drafted. The S2S Action Plan will also outline the details of the success criteria for each team's deployment. This S2S Action Plan will be shared with the LA heads of school improvement.

4. Recording and reporting

Following each visit to the supported school the ETSA team leader/member will **briefly** summarise the key points of the visit and email it to the headteacher of supported school via the headteacher's email address (no personal email addresses should be used) and copy in the appropriate LA Head of School Improvement

contact (Stephanie Windsor for primary/John Thompson for secondary) and also the Teaching School Co-ordinator (Jo Pearson). This brief summary will include:

- key points of work covered;
- any observations about impact etc;
- next steps.

Detailed Impact Reports (as referred to in Section 2) will be produced by the team leader/member which will be in line with the agreed ETSA format. These reports / email correspondence should be written in a suitable professional fashion, referencing the current Ofsted evaluation criteria / schedule as appropriate.

All information written about individual teachers will be shared with the teacher by the headteacher of the supported school or their representative either verbally or as a copy of the email. How the information will be shared will be agreed by the ETSA team leader/member, and supported headteacher as part of the support plan for the school.

The ETSA team leader/member will be invited to attend the half termly school improvement panel meetings chaired by the Assistant Director, Education and Skills. It will be the role of the ETSA team leader/member to provide a verbal update on the progress and impact of the school to school support work at these meetings.

5. The role and responsibilities of the Local Authority School Improvement Service

The members of the LA school improvement service will be responsible for commissioning and quality assuring school to school support contracts with the Ebor Teaching Schools Alliance. The LA heads of school improvement will complete a regular risk assessment of schools to proactively identify schools that would benefit from school to school support. In 2015-16 existing requiring improvement schools will be the first priority. Those schools at risk of moving from good to requiring improvement will be identified and information will be shared with the Director of the ETSA to inform the deployment of the ETSA school to school support team.

The members of the LA school improvement team will attend the planning meeting to set up each school to school contract and will be responsible for writing the commissioning plan for each piece of commissioned school to school support. Copies of this plan will be sent to the Assistant Director, Education and Skills, the Director of the ETSA, the headteacher and chair of governors of the supported school.

The LA school improvement team will be responsible for external quality assurance of the work of the school to school support teams, ensuring that the work is well focused, can demonstrate impact and is value for money.

The LA heads of school improvement will keep in regular contact with the ETSA team leaders and will be responsible for writing a half termly report for the Assistant Director, Education and Skills, summarising the progress and impact of the work of the school to school support team. These reports will form part of the evidence to be presented to HMI during inspections and monitoring visits. The Assistant Director will write a termly report for elected members, the York Learning Partnership Board and Schools Forum on the impact of the school to school support work.

6. Working with external partners

Should an Ofsted inspection take place during the period of the support plan then the following arrangements, as detailed below, would be followed:

- The LA head of school improvement will contact the ETSA team leader/member to share the date of the Ofsted visit and check on their availability to attend a meeting with HMI;
- The LA head of school improvement or school improvement adviser and if available the ETSA team leader/member will meet with the HMI to provide information about the focus and impact of the school to school support work;
- If the ETSA team leader/member is unavailable to meet with HMI they will provide a verbal update on the progress of the school to school support work plus any relevant documentation to the LA school improvement representative to allow them to share this with HMI either face to face or via a telephone conversation.



Appendix 1: Progress and Impact Report for [insert name of school here]

York leader of education details	
Name	
School	
Date this action plan was agreed between ETSA and City of York Local Authority	
Supported school details	
Supported school name	
Name of head teacher	
Key areas of focus	

The behaviour and safety of pupils

- Attitudes to learning and conduct in lessons/around school
- Attitudes to learning in subject areas/age groups
- Safeguarding
- Teachers' management of behaviour in lessons

Key focus	Impact measures	Progress and evidence of impact

The quality of teaching and learning

- Quality of teaching in subject areas
- Quality of teaching in year groups/phase
- Teacher expectations and pedagogical strategies
- Effectiveness of planning
- Assessment and pupil tracking

Key focus	Impact measures	Progress and evidence of impact

Achievement and progress

- The achievement and progress of pupils
- Progress across year groups
- Progress in subject areas
- Acquisition of knowledge and understanding
- Attainment and progress of vulnerable groups (disadvantaged, SEN, disabled, most able)

Key focus	Impact measures	Progress and evidence of impact

The quality of leadership and management

- Expectations, vision and direction for the school
- Self-evaluation processes and procedures
- School improvement planning, monitoring and evaluation
- Capacity of the leadership to achieve and sustain improvements independently
- Governance – challenge and support
- Relationship with parents

Key focus	Impact measures	Progress and evidence of impact

Exit recommendations	
Support is ready to be withdrawn by (<i>insert date</i>)	
It is recommended that contact takes place every week/month/half term/term (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	
Support to continue until the next impact report at the same level of input in order to maintain the current progress	
Support to be withdrawn due to lack of progress against the impact measures	
Signature of Ebor TSA team leader	
Signature of Ebor TSA Director of S2S	

EBOR

TEACHING SCHOOLS ALLIANCE



Appendix 2: Action Plan for [insert name of school here]

York leader of education details	
Name	
School	
Date this action plan was agreed between ETSA and City of York Local Authority	
Supported school details	
Supported school name	
Name of head teacher	
Key areas of focus	

The behaviour and safety of pupils

- Attitudes to learning and conduct in lessons/around school
- Attitudes to learning in subject areas/age groups
- Safeguarding
- Teachers' management of behaviour in lessons

Key focus	Activity planned	By whom	Funding required	Impact measures

The quality of teaching and learning

- Quality of teaching in subject areas
- Quality of teaching in year groups/phase
- Teacher expectations and pedagogical strategies
- Effectiveness of planning
- Assessment and pupil tracking

Key focus	Activity planned	By whom	Funding required	Impact measures

Achievement and progress

- The achievement and progress of pupils
- Progress across year groups
- Progress in subject areas
- Acquisition of knowledge and understanding
- Attainment and progress of vulnerable groups (disadvantaged, SEN, disabled, most able)

Key focus	Activity planned	By whom	Funding required	Impact measures

The quality of leadership and management

- Expectations, vision and direction for the school
- Self-evaluation processes and procedures
- School improvement planning, monitoring and evaluation
- Capacity of the leadership to achieve and sustain improvements independently
- Governance – challenge and support
- Relationship with parents

Key focus	Activity planned	By whom	Funding required	Impact measures