

# **Schools Forum**

**10 October 2011  
4.00pm**

Sapphire Room, the Emerald Suite,  
North London Business Park

Agenda, Papers and  
Minutes of the last meeting

## CONTENTS

<b>AGENDA .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (14 July) .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. MATTERS ARISING .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Item 5.1 Update on actions from previous meeting .....	10
<b>7. ITEMS FOR DECISION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Item 7.1 Schools Budget 2011/12 – distribution of additional funding.....	11
<b>8. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Item 8.1 Barnet funding formula consultation.....	13
Item 8.2 Children's Service budget proposals for 2012/13 – informal consultation .....	15
<b>9. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>16</b>
Item 9.1 DfE funding consultation .....	16
Item 9.2 Schools Financial Value Standard .....	22
Item 9.3 Funding of Redundancies in Schools.....	24
Item 9.4 Capital.....	32

## AGENDA

### Meeting to start at 4pm with no training session

1. Apologies for absence
2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair
3. Declarations of interest
4. Minutes of previous meeting: 14 July 2011
5. Matters arising
6. Actions from previous meeting
7. Items for Decision
  - 7.1. *Schools Budget 2011/12 – distribution of additional funding - CB*
8. Items for Consultation
  - 8.1. *Barnet funding formula consultation – CB*
  - 8.2. *Children's Service budget proposals for 2012/13 – informal consultation - VW*
9. Items for Information
  - 9.1. *DfE funding consultation*
  - 9.2. *Schools Financial Value Standard – NA*
  - 9.3. *Funding of Redundancies in Schools – DS*
  - 9.4. *Capital*
10. Any Other Business

## SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS

Sector	Position	Name	School	Member Until
Nursery Schools (1)	Headteacher	Jane Chew	St Margaret's	07 Dec 2013
Primary Schools (11)	Community – Headteacher 1	Jeanette Adak	Monkfrith	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Headteacher 2	Helen Schmitz	Cromer Road	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Headteacher 3	Susan Convery	Whitings Hill Primary School	30 Sep 2014
	Community – Headteacher 4	Sally Lajalati		30 Sep 2014
	Community – Governor 1	Liz Pearson	Holly Park & Livingstone	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Governor 2	Kim Garrod	Church Hill	07 Dec 2013
	Community – Governor 3	Catrin Dillon	Martin Primary	07 Dec 2013
	VA – Headteacher 1	Clare Neuberger	Menorah Foundation	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Headteacher 2	Dee Oelman	St Mary's & St John's	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Headteacher 3	Tim Bowden	Holy Trinity	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Governor	Anthony Vourou	St John's N11	30 Sep 2013
Secondary Schools (8)	Foundation / VA Governor	Janet McIntyre	Christ Church CE	30 Sep 2014
	VA – Headteacher 2	Seamus McKenna	Finchley Catholic	31 Nov 2013
	VA – Governor	Patricia French	St Mary's High	07 Dec 2013
	Community/ Foundation / Trust – Headteacher	<i>Vacant</i>		31 Nov 2013
Special Schools	Foundation / Trust – Governor	Andrew Macalpine	Hendon	01 Feb 2014
	Governor	Gilbert Knight (Chair)	Oakleigh	30 Sep 2013
	Headteacher	Jenny Gridley	Oakleigh	30 Sep 2013
Academies	Academy / Principal	Michael Whitworth	Wren Academy	30 Nov 2013
	Academy / Principal	Angela Trigg	London Academy	30 Sep 2013
	Academy / Principal	Kate Webster	Queen Elizabeth Girls	30 Sep 2013
	Academy / Principal	Paul Ferrie	The Totteridge Academy	30 Sep 2013
	Academy / Principal	Geoffrey Thompson	Mill Hill High	30 Sep 2013
Stake-holders	14-19 Partnership	Keith Murdoch	Woodhouse	30 Sep 2013
	Private Early Years	Sarah Vipond	Middlesex Uni	30 Sep 2013
	Unions	<i>Vacant</i>		
	Stakeholder	Shelley Dannell		
Non Voting Observers	Cabinet Member for Children	Cllr Andrew Harper	Deputy Leader	
	Director of Children's Service	Robert Mc-Culloch Graham	Children's Service	
	Consultant to Schools Forum	Geoff Boyd	Consultant	
Barnet Officers	Deputy Chief Executive	Andrew Travers	Finance Directorate	
	Assistant Director	Val White	Children's Service	
	Assistant Director, Schools and Learning	Mick Quigley	Children's Service	
	Principal Education Psychologist	Brian Davis	Children's Service	
	School Funding Manager	Carol Beckman	Finance Directorate	
	Schools Finance Services Manager	Nick Adams	Finance Directorate	
	Head of Finance	Kerry-Anne Smith	Finance Directorate	
	Clerk and minutes	Mark Callaghan	Finance Directorate	

## 4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (14 July)

### Meeting of the Schools Forum

**Thursday 14 July 2011**

***(4.00 pm, Conference Room 1, NLBP)***

#### **Attended**

- Members:
- Jeanette Adak (Head, Monkfrith)
  - Jane Chew (St Margaret's Nursery)
  - Shelley Dannell (Headteacher, Pavilion Pupil Referral Unit)
  - Catrin Dillon (Governor, Martin Primary)
  - Paul Ferrie (Head, Ravenscroft)
  - Patricia French (Governor, St Mary's High)
  - Kim Garrood (Governor, Church Hill Primary School)
  - Jenny Gridley (Head, Oakleigh)
  - Gilbert Knight (Governor, Oakleigh)
  - Andrew Macalpine (Governor, Hendon School)
  - Clare Neuberger (Head, Menorah Foundation)
  - Dee Oelman (Head, St Mary's & St John's)
  - Elizabeth Pearson (Governor, Livingstone)
  - Helen Schmitz (Head, Cromer Road)
- LA Officers:
- Nick Adams (Schools Finance Services Manager)
  - Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager)
  - John Hooton (Assistant Director, Strategic Finance)
  - Robert McCulloch-Graham (Director of Children's Service)
  - Mick Quigley (Assistant Director Schools and Learning)
  - Kerry-Anne Smith (Joint Head of Finance Children's & Adults)
  - Val White (Assistant Director, PPP)
- Consultant:
- Geoff Boyd (Independent Consultant)
- Clerk:
- Mark Callaghan (School Resources and Support Officer)

#### **Not Present**

- Members:
- Tim Bowden (Head, Holy Trinity)
  - Jayne Franklin (Head, Childs Hill)
  - Seamus McKenna (Head, Finchley Catholic)
  - Keith Murdoch (Principal, Woodhouse College)
  - Geoffrey Thompson (Head, Mill Hill High)
  - Angela Trigg (Principal, London Academy)
  - Anthony Vourou (Governor, St John's N11)
  - Kate Webster (Head, QE Girls)
  - Michael Whitworth (Principal, Wren Academy)
  - Sarah Vipond (Early Years Working Group)
- LA Officers:
- Brian Davis (Principle Educational Psychologist)
  - Andrew Travers (Deputy Chief Executive)
- Other:
- Cllr Andrew Harper (Cabinet Member for Education, Children & Families)

<b>1. Welcome and apologies for absence</b>	
<p>In light of the passing of Alan Homes two weeks ago, GK opened the meeting by praising the contribution Alan has made during his time on the Forum. He has been an active and knowledgeable member who has made a great contribution to the education and welfare of children and staff in the borough of Barnet, and on a national level within the union movement. The Forum held a few moments silence to pay respect to Alan and reflect on his contribution to the service.</p> <p>GK advised that Linda Parker, former Head of Finance, has now left Barnet. Linda has been involved in the work of the Forum for a number of years and has been a great help during this period. VW introduced Kerry-Anne Smith to the Forum who will be Linda's replacement.</p> <p><b>Action: MC to draft a letter of thanks to Linda Parker for her contribution on the Schools Forum.</b></p>	
<b>2. Declarations of interest</b>	
None declared.	
<b>3. Minutes of previous meeting: 14<sup>th</sup> June 2011</b>	
<p>The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that in all future minutes Patricia French will be recorded as Patricia Ann French (PAF) to distinguish her from Paul Ferrie (PF).</p>	
<b>4. Matters arising</b>	
No issues raised.	
<b>5. 1 Actions from previous meeting</b>	
JH advised that the issue relating to the Allied Irish Bank will be covered in agenda item 6.3.	
<b>6 ITEMS FOR DECISION</b>	
<b>6.1 Schools Budget 2011/12</b>	<b>Val White</b>
<p>VW presented the 2011/12 Schools Budget for approval, incorporating the use of the underspend from 2010/11 agreed at the last meeting of the Forum on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2011.</p> <p>VW distributed an addendum to the budget presented in the papers following changes to the Schools Budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pupil numbers. The final pupil numbers which were expected at the end of June were received on 13<sup>th</sup> July. The local authority was confident that there would be an additional 50 pupils than previously projected from the early years census and the PLASC. It is proposed that funding for the extra 50 pupils is added to the Individual Schools Budget.</li> <li>In addition to the 50 extra pupils from the PLASC and early years census, the final figures from the DfE also included an additional 259 pupils from the 3 year old top-up which the local authority was not expecting to receive. VW explained the mechanism behind the top-up, as detailed in the circulated addendum. VW proposed that options are presented at the September meeting of the Forum for the use of the funding for the additional 259 pupils. The local authority would have wished to present these at the July meeting but were unable to do so as the final figures were received from the DfE so late.</li> <li>Reallocation of statements for Academy conversions. VW advised that the local authority has been made aware of an accounting change by the DfE. When schools convert to academies the local authority retains responsibility for paying statement top-ups. Previously this expenditure was included in the ISB line of Section 251, but it has now been moved to line 1.2.1 in the centrally retained part of the budget. This further changes the balance between the centrally retained element and the ISB.</li> </ul> <p>As requested at the June Forum meeting a breakdown of contingences has been included.</p> <p>The Schools Budget shown is the same as that presented at the June meeting apart from the above 2 changes.</p> <p>PF asked whether moving the statement top-ups for academies will further change the CEL? VW confirmed that this will be the case.</p> <p>GK requested a formal vote to approve the Schools Budget for 2011/12 presented in Table 2 of the papers and to approve the breach of the Central Expenditure Limit.</p> <p>All members of the Forum voted unanimously in favour of the proposals.</p>	

<b>6.2 Revised Schools Forum Terms of Reference</b>	<b>Carol Beckman</b>
<p>CB noted that it was agreed at the May Forum meeting to reconsider the Terms of Reference (TOR) in line with the expectations of Forum members, the local authority and a changing school community in Barnet. A working group was formed to look at the TOR and the paper presented formalises what was discussed at the working group. The amended TOR now explicitly explains what is expected of members, including the level of knowledge required to ensure they understand the content of Forum papers. The local authority will provide the necessary training. CB stated that in line with this, it will be useful if members provide feedback if papers presented are not understood.</p> <p>VW stated that as there is a changing school community with the conversion of schools to academies, the amended TOR proposes that membership is agreed once per year rather than having in-year adjustments.</p> <p>CB stated that the local authority would like to agree the TOR at the July meeting to enable new members to come into the Forum in September for the beginning of the academic year. This may mean that some members may have to resign and be re-elected.</p> <p>PF asked how free schools will be represented in the membership structure of the Forum? VW stated that it is likely that Barnet will have a free school and it will have to be considered how they are represented and whether this should be by an academy member.</p> <p>The group discussed the structure of training sessions for members. It was agreed that half-day training sessions will be scheduled for early mornings, with the first to take place in the autumn. RMG noted that there will be announcements about changes in the funding formula in autumn so it would be useful to arrange an additional training session early next academic year.</p> <p>GK asked the Forum to vote on the proposal to approve the amended TOR.</p> <p>All members of the Forum voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b>  <b>MC to arrange Schools Forum training sessions for members in autumn 2011 and early 2012.</b>  <b>LBB to address Free School representation in TOR</b></p>	
<b>6.3 Scheme For Financing Schools – changes</b>	<b>Nick Adams</b>
<p>NA stated that a lengthy paper was presented at the last meeting outlining changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools. The Forum agreed all changes with the exception of the list of approved bankers. NA presented an addendum to the paper circulated outlining proposed changes to Section 3.6 of the Scheme 'Restrictions on Accounts.'</p> <p>JH explained that that the discussion centred on concerns with Irish Banks, particularly the Allied Irish Bank, and whether or not they are covered for compensation by the Irish government and the Financial Services Compensation Scheme (FSCS). This has now been investigated and JH confirmed that the Allied Irish Bank is covered by the Irish government but not the FSCS. Bank accounts for maintained schools are part of the council's liability, and as such it is important that the treasury management policy is adhered to. The advice is that schools should change banks to those on the approved list, but JH noted that there are long-standing relationships in place between schools and banks which make this inconvenient. The issue raising concern is with deposit balances, so the proposal to the Forum was that schools may continue to bank with the Allied Irish Bank on the condition that surplus balances are regularly transferred to an account in an approved bank to minimise the risk to the council.</p> <p>RMG asked JH to explain why there is a risk, and whether the risk is transferred to other schools in the borough which do not bank with the Allied Irish bank? JH explained that the risk is only for maintained schools as independent schools and academies have completely separate arrangements. NA clarified that money delegated to maintained schools from the DSG effectively belongs to the local authority until it is spent.</p> <p>JH stated that the local authority will work with schools which bank with the Allied Irish Bank to help them make any necessary arrangements.</p>	

NA noted that St Michael's is the only school which made a comment and it would be useful to arrange a meeting to clarify the issues outlined in their letter.

GK asked the Forum to vote on the proposed changes to the Scheme.

All members of the Forum supported the proposal.

## **7 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

### **7.1 Contracts Affecting Schools**

**Val White**

VW presented a paper outlining existing school contracts, noting that Ola Yerokun should be contacted if schools have any issues with contract information.

**Action: MC to email a link to the relevant page on the council website where this information is held.**

### **7.2 Pupil Premium**

**Carol Beckman**

CB presented a paper outlining the funding methodology for the pupil premium for looked after children. This differs from the pupil premium paid for service children and free school meals which is allocated based on pupil numbers in the January census. To be eligible for the pupil premium for looked after children, the child has to have been continuously in the care of the local authority for 6 months.

CB corrected an error in the paper distributed confirming that it will be the SEN team not the Head of the Virtual School who will manage the pupil premium for eligible Barnet children in Independent Special Schools.

There is uncertainty regarding cross charging between authorities for Barnet looked after children attending schools outside Barnet as authorities differ on whether the council should be paid directly or payments should be made to individual schools. The proposal is that Barnet pays schools and academies directly in 2011/12. Schools with looked after children from outside of Barnet should request the funding from the relevant local authority.

GB noted that schools should be aware that they have to claim money if it is not forthcoming.

GB asked whether schools are aware which authorities they have to claim from? CB stated that this is not necessarily the case as the DfE do not use the PLASC information because they feel it is not reliable.

PF asked who a school should contact if they have a child in Haringey? CB advised that they should contact Haringey council. GB stated that they should be notified automatically by Haringey council, but in reality this may not necessarily happen.

JC asked whether the rule that the child has to have been in continuous care for 6 months applies nationally? CB confirmed that this is the case for the whole of England.

GK asked whether this information has been cascaded to all schools? CB confirmed that an article has appeared in the School Circular informing schools of this.

### **7.3 Schools Compliance Review**

**Val White**

VW presented a paper to the group summarising the council's current review of external expenditure. The purpose of the review is to ensure that all correct procedures have been followed for external contracts. There will be an article in the School Circular in September advising governors of the things they may want to check in schools to ensure they are compliant with contract standing orders.

PF asked whether schools will have to look at contracts retrospectively for compliance? VW advised that it is about proportionate risk, and individual schools should make judgements about which issues can be easily rectified and which require a programme of action. PF asked how this will affect academies? VW advised that as an academy, the school is an independent organisation, but they should be aware there are issues specific to academies such as VAT. NA noted that there will likely be similar compliance issues in the financial arrangement the academy has with the YPLA. GB added that contract compliance is not a new issue and has been in the regulations since Local Management of Schools (LMS) first started. It should already be taking place in every school.



<b>8 Any Other Business</b>	
No issues raised.	
The meeting closed at 16:52.	

**Dates for future meetings**

10 October 2011      4.00pm

7 December 2011    4.00pm

1 February 2012     4.00pm

## 5. MATTERS ARISING

### Item 5.1 Update on actions from previous meeting

**MC to draft a letter of thanks to Linda Parker for her contribution on the Schools Forum.**

**MC to arrange Schools Forum training sessions for members in autumn 2011 and early 2012.  
LBB to address Free School representation in TOR**

**MC to arrange Schools Forum training sessions for members in autumn 2011 and early 2012.  
LBB to address Free School representation in TOR**

**Action: MC to email a link to the relevant page on the council website where this information is held.**

## 7. ITEMS FOR DECISION

### Item 7.1 Schools Budget 2011/12 – distribution of additional funding

**Author** Carol Beckman

**Position** School Funding Manager

#### Distribution of Additional DSG available in 2011/12

As indicated at the last meeting, the final Dedicated Schools Grant for 2011/12 is approximately £1.6m higher than originally estimated due to the addition of a '3 year old top-up' which we and other LAs believed had ceased. The top-up increased the DSG pupil numbers by 259 which is the difference between 90% of the 3 year old population and the number of 3 year olds recorded in schools and settings.

Had the additional money been available at the beginning of the year it would have formed part of the overall schools budget and distributed across the different sectors of expenditure, although the extra money is not enough to reverse the breach of the CEL.

There are various alternatives for amending the Schools Budget for 2011/12 to bring it back into balance:

- A. Place the money in contingency so that it can be used if there is exceptional pressure, but carried forward to 2012/13 if not required.
- B. Add some to the Individual Schools Budget and some to centrally retained budgets where there is need.
- C. Add all the money to the ISB for distribution to all schools.

If Alternatives B or C are preferred, the method of distribution to schools should follow the school funding formula, but it is not proposed to completely rework the formula as this would be time consuming and complicated. However, to be equitable the money must be spread fairly across all sectors including maintained schools, academies which converted this year or last and nursery age children in maintained or private settings.

The money could be distributed in one of 4 ways:

1. An amount per pupil (i.e. an addition to the AWPU). This would work out to about £35 per pupil aged 5-15, £175 per special school place and £21 per nursery pupil. This benefits all schools equally.
2. Funding linked to deprivation: IDACI or Free School Meals. This would direct more money towards those schools with pupils in danger of under achievement due to their family circumstances.
3. A lump sum per school. The rates would be about £11,000 per primary, £22,000 per secondary or special school and £22 per child in nursery schools and settings. This is the simplest approach but benefits smaller schools proportionately more than larger schools.
4. Increase the rate per hour or per child in nursery schools and settings as it is this sector which generated the extra money. However the schools budget has been distributed evenly across all sectors without regard to how much money was generated by different sectors, and it follows that we should do the same with any extra money. Moreover, the evidence suggests that the nursery schools are not in need of more extra support than other schools because the four nursery schools already benefit from the minimum funding guarantee to a total value of £160,000 and the combined balances of the 4 nursery schools was £540,000 at 31/3/11 with no school carrying forward less than £122,000.

The extra funding would be set against any Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) the school is already receiving. The 9 schools currently on the MFG this year (4 nursery schools, 2 primaries and 3 secondaries/academies) would probably receive nothing from this pot of money. The additional funding will also raise the baseline minimum funding level for 2012/13. For all of these options, the amount allocated to each sector is about the same, i.e.

Primaries: 60%  
 Secondaries (including academy conversions since Sep 2010): 30%  
 Specials 5%  
 Nurseries & PVIs 5%

Some indicative comparisons of the first 3 options:

SCHOOL	AWPU		IDACI	Lump Sum
	Pupils	Amount	Amount	Amount
The Compton Academy	896	31,360	34,285	22,200
Moss Hall Nursery School	100	2,100	3,522	2,289
Barnfield Primary School	443	15,505	32,253	11,100
Church Hill School	208	7,280	4,361	11,100
Frith Manor Primary School	623	21,805	21,252	11,100
Garden Suburb Junior School	352	12,320	7,383	11,100
Goldbeaters Primary School	406	14,210	33,205	11,100
The Orion Primary School	401	14,035	38,040	11,100
Pardes House Primary School	160	5,600	2,804	11,100
Trent CofE Primary School	204	7,140	4,399	11,100
Rosh Pinah Primary School	442	15,470	10,183	11,100
Mathilda Marks-Kennedy Jewish Prim	195	6,825	4,585	11,100
The Ravenscroft School & Technolog	701	24,535	27,689	22,200
The Henrietta Barnett Academy	465	16,275	9,995	22,200
Hendon School	1,013	35,455	44,780	22,200
Finchley Catholic High School	841	29,435	20,839	22,200
JCOSS	343	12,005	2,307	22,200
Oak Lodge School	165	28,875	6,707	22,200
Oakleigh School	65	11,375	2,000	22,200

#### Action Required:

The Schools Forum is asked to give its views on which of the three alternative distribution methods (A, B or C) should be used for the extra money. If B or C are preferred, which Option (1,2,3 or 4) should be applied to allocate additional funding to schools?

## 8. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION

### Item 8.1 Barnet funding formula consultation

<b>Author</b>	<b>Carol Beckman</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>School Funding Manager</b>

#### **Consultation with Schools and Academies on the Barnet Schools Funding Formula for April 2012 to March 2013**

##### **Background**

The school funding formula will continue for at least one more year before the government introduces a more prescriptive national funding scheme. We wish to use this period to rationalise the existing formula (which has become more complex due to the mainstreaming of former standards funds) and prepare schools for a much simpler formula in the future.

We intend to run a consultation with all schools from October 12th to November 9th. It will propose a number of simplifications which will affect academies as well as schools because Barnet academies are funded according to the Barnet funding formula. At the time of issuing Schools Forum papers, the proposed consultation document was not ready for distribution, but members will receive a copy in advance of the meeting.

##### **Former Standard Funds**

Most of the former standards funds were designed to target particular need, and the formulae for distribution of money to individual schools was either prescribed by the government or devised by the local authority in consultation with the Schools Forum. Although the individual grants have ended, the money has been mainstreamed into the Dedicated Schools Grant and in 2011-12 we have continued to apply the same allocation formulae so schools can see that they are still receiving a similar amount of money. We now want to absorb these into the elements of the main budget shares of each school so allocations are easier to understand, calculate and predict.

Schools will still be expected to target money towards identified need, but schools now have more flexibility in the use of their budget. Before the end of this financial year we will be restating the 2011-12 'standards funds' as funding factors rather than grants, but the money allocated to each school will remain the same this year.

Typically, each former standards fund was calculated as a combination of factors including:

- A lump sum for some or all schools
- An amount per pupil (like the AWPU)
- An amount per child eligible for free school meals
- An amount for other criteria such as EAL, ethnicity, low achievement, ASTs or EIC

Some were an amalgamation of historic grants for which the criteria may no longer be clear.

For 2012/13 some of these factors can be easily moved into the main funding formula (e.g. the AWPU or basic entitlement), while others could be absorbed into the additional educational need (AEN) formula which is already designed to target deprivation, underachievement and SEN. Inevitably some former grants will generate new factors – for instance ethnic minority achievement. A number of measures of low prior attainment or in-school achievement have been used for different grants. We aim to produce a straightforward formula for 2012/13 which will deliver very similar funding to all schools with transitional arrangements where necessary.

## **Main Funding Formula**

Only small changes are proposed:

- In the light of government proposals we will make clearer the separation between funding for early years (i.e. nursery age), children of statutory school age (Reception to Year 11) and 6<sup>th</sup> forms as funding for these will come in different blocks in future years.
- Add the rate for secondary Learning Support Units (LSUs) into the secondary AWP
- Add the funding for offsite playing fields to the secondary basic entitlement

The special school and resourced provision place rate formulae will be reviewed separately and at the same time a formula for delegated funding for Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) proposed – PRUs are currently within the centrally retained DSG budget.

Whilst the AEN formula is probably unnecessarily complex, we feel that there is insufficient time before the new financial year to carry out a full review.

## **Action Required**

The Schools Forum is asked to approve the consultation for distribution to schools.

## Item 8.2 Children's Service budget proposals for 2012/13 – informal consultation

**Author** Val White

**Position** Assistant Director, Children's Service

As previously discussed at the Forum, due to the reduction in government funding for local authorities, Barnet Council has to make savings of £53.4m between 2011/12 and 2013/14. All service areas need to make budget reductions. Last year the Children's Service reduced budgets by £6.4m. This included a reduction in school improvement support (this became a traded service); reshaping youth services; reducing the number of full children's centres; and reducing the behavioural support team. We also made staffing changes that reduced budgets with a minimal impact on services.

The input from the public and our partners shaped the way we changed services. Following widespread consultation, we retained 13 full service children's centres; and we targeted the remaining activities budget to ensure that vulnerable young people have access to youth provision.

For 2012/13 the Children's Service needs to find further savings of £1.044m. The proposed savings for 2011/12 to 2013/14 were set out in the council's [medium term financial strategy](#).

We are currently developing these and are trying to minimise the impact on services wherever possible. However, some proposals will impact on services and we are keen to hear your views at this early stage. The broad areas that we are proposing savings in for 2012/13 will be presented at the meeting.

## 9. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

### Item 9.1 DfE funding consultation

**Author** Carol Beckman

**Position** School Funding Manager

#### Consultation on school funding reform: proposals for a fairer system

The Government considers that the current system for funding schools is difficult to understand and results in similar schools in different areas receiving different levels of funding.

This consultation is proposing a new system for providing funding to LAs which is clear and transparent, and which also provides a local funding formula that enables schools and academies to be funded on a comparable basis.

This item for information summarises Barnet Council's proposed response to the DfE consultation on reforms to school funding, and is mindful of the vision that every school in Barnet is a good school for every child. Barnet Schools Forum may wish to submit its own response to this consultation or endorse the LA submission.

The full consultation document can be viewed using the following URL:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/index.cfm?action=consultationDetails&consultationId=1765&external=no&menu=1>

The consultation closes on Tuesday 11 October 2011.

### CHAPTER 1: THE NATIONAL FUNDING SYSTEM

#### Overview of current DSG calculation

- The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is currently calculated using the formula:  
Full time equivalent (FTE) pupil numbers \* a Guaranteed Unit of Funding (GUF)  
(Barnet 2011/12 = 44,746 pupils \* £5,641.85 GUF)
- The amount received provides funding for schools, early years provision, high needs pupils (including SEN and Alternative Provision) and certain local authority central services.
- There is currently no distinction between the funding for each of these areas at a local or national level

#### Future DSG calculation proposals – 4 blocks

Future DSG allocation			
Schools block	Early Years block	High Needs block	Central services block
Delegated budget for schools for Reception to Year 11, including low level SEN	Free entitlement to early education for 3 and 4 year olds and associated services	High Needs SEN including those in mainstream schools and Academies, and all special schools  Alternative Provision (e.g. PRUs)  SEN support services	LA responsibilities for all maintained schools and Academies – e.g. Schools Forums



### **Basis of formula for calculating LA schools block (Question 1)**

*1: Would you prefer the formula to be based on*

- a) a notional budget for every school; or*
- b) the pupils in each local authority area?*

Response: Option b). This will provide greater flexibility and ensure that Barnet is able to respond to the needs of local children.

### **CHAPTER 2: SCHOOLS BLOCK – SYSTEM**

The local schools formula is proposed to be limited to an amount per pupil, additional education need, national non-domestic rates , exception site factors and a school lump sum>

### **Local flexibility (Questions 2 to 5)**

*2. Do you agree that these are the right formula factors to retain at a local level?*

*3. What other factors, if any, should be able to be used at local level or could any of these factors be removed?*

*4. Do you think that setting a range of allowable primary / secondary ratios around the national average is the right approach to ensure that there is consistency across the country?*

Response: We acknowledge that the current system does not allow clear comparisons between funding levels and factors between authorities, and we welcome the intention to provide fair and transparent funding in future. Barnet would suggest an expanded list of permitted factors to ensure recognition of local need, particularly additional educational needs elements such as high mobility, and EAL. Temporary or permanent increases in classes/ pupil numbers should also be permissible. Establishing an allowable range of national funding ratios would also assist Schools Forum members in the decision making process, but should be set at levels commensurate with current ratios.

*5. Do you think we should implement option (i)(Local authorities calculate academy budgets for the Education Funding Agency (EFA) or (ii) (the EFA calculates academy budgets using data collected from the LA) when calculating budgets for Academies?*

Response: Option i). LA calculation of Academy budgets will reduce bureaucracy and unnecessary replication.

### **Ensuring accountability and fairness (Question 6 and 7)**

*6. Do you think the Schools Forum having more decision making powers would help to achieve greater representation and stronger accountability at a local level?*

*7. Do you think we should implement option (i)(The EFA checks compliance of local formulae to the required criteria), (ii) (the EFA would act as a review body and respond to concerns from schools), both or neither?*

Response: If Schools Forum powers are increased their decisions might conflict with local community priorities. This suggests that membership might need to be widened and increased. At present the LA appoints members and sets the agenda, we would like to know how this might be managed in the future. Section 251 submissions should already provide sufficient scrutiny and will avoid any additional bureaucratic burden on either LAs or the EFA.

### **Arrangements for free schools (Question 8)**

*8. If we introduce the new system in this spending review, do you think that Free Schools should (i) remain on the Free School methodology for 2013-14 and 2014-15 or (ii) move straight away to the overall funding system?*

Response: Option ii). 2013/14 implementation for Free Schools would ensure fairness and transparency for all

schools.

## **CHAPTER 3: THE SCHOOLS BLOCK – FORMULA CONTENT**

### **Factors in fair funding formula at a national level (Question 9)**

The Schools Block would be calculated using a formula covering an amount per pupil, deprivation, protection for small schools and an area cost adjustment (ACA).

*9. Are these the right factors to include in a fair funding formula at a national level?*

Response : Although these factors are appropriate, Barnet does not believe that these proposals for calculation of LA funding blocks will increase fairness and transparency, or create a simpler mechanism for calculating LA level funding.

### **Deprivation Funding (Question 10)**

*10. Do you agree that we should use Ever FSM to allocate deprivation funding in the national formula? Should this be Ever 3 or Ever 6?*

Response: Any deprivation funding should accurately capture local need, and Barnet holds the view that FSM can be under-reported in some parts of the community. Clear and transparent data must be used to determine this factor, and Ever 3 or Ever 6 seems to introduce greater complexity. We would also be concerned that the consistency of school generated historical pupil data is not great enough to produce reliable measures.

### **Small School Protection (Questions 11 to 14)**

*11. If we have a school-level formula, do you agree that £95,000 is an appropriate amount for a primary school lump sum?*

*12. Do you agree that the lump sum should be limited to schools with Year 6 as the highest year-group?*

Response: Barnet's preferred option is for a local authority-level formula

*13. If we have a local authority-level formula, should we use a primary school lump sum or the sparsity measure?*

*14. If we have a sparsity measure, do you think we should narrow the sparsity threshold as described above?*

Response: Barnet would prefer a sparsity measure which is narrow to ensure those authorities with most need benefit.

### **Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) (Question 15)**

*15. Which option should we use to calculate the Area Cost Adjustment: the current GLM approach or the combined approach?*

Response : An ACA should be applied to all funding blocks within any LA level formula, but whatever approach is used, it must be clear and transparent.

### **English as an Additional Language and Underperforming Ethnic Groups (Questions 16 to 17)**

*16. Do you agree that we should use an EAL factor in the national formula?*

*17. Do you agree that this should cover the first few years only? How many years would be appropriate?*

Response : EAL should be permitted, but clear and transparent data must be used to determine this factor. This will ensure that Barnet can children of all ages to achieve their full potential.

### **Transitional Arrangements (Question 18)**

*18. Do you think we should:*

- (a) Continue with a maximum decrease of -1.5% per pupil each year and accept that this will mean very slow progress towards full system reform; or*
- (b) Continue with a -1.5% per pupil floor in 2013-14 but lower it thereafter so that we can make faster*

*progress?*

Response: Transitional arrangements should be in place for as long as is needed to ensure the ability of Barnet schools to deliver high standards of education to local children is not adversely affected.

## **CHAPTER 4: CENTRAL SERVICES AND DEFINING RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Retention of services centrally (Question 19)**

*19. Do you agree that some services could be retained centrally if there is local agreement by maintained schools?*

Response: Local agreement should be reached to ensure best value and most effective use of resources and encourage economies of scale.

### **Split of functions between the blocks (Question 20) (See chart above)**

*20. Do you agree that the split of functions between the blocks is correct? If not, what changes should be made?*

Response: The split seems logical but the current S251 returns should not be used as the basis for any academy recoupment calculations as the lines may not provide sufficient detail.

## **CHAPTER 5: FUTURE ARRANGMENTS FOR THE LOCAL AUTHORITY CENTRAL SPEND EQUIVALENT GRANT (LACSEG)**

### **Questions 21 and 22:**

*21. Do you think the funding for local authority LACSEG should be moved to a national formula basis rather than using individual LA section 251 returns?*

*22. Do you think the distribution mechanism should be changed to one that more accurately reflects the actual pattern of where Academies are located?*

Response: Barnet supports the London Councils response to the LACSEG consultation.

## **CHAPTER 6: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE REQUIRING HIGH LEVELS OF SUPPORT**

### **Principles and Context (Question 23)**

*23. Is this the right set of principles for funding children and young people with high needs?(see page 29)*

Response: It is Barnet's vision to ensure every school is a good school for every child, and that all high needs pupils should have access to high quality provision to attain their full potential.

### **A Base Level of Funding for High Needs SEN (Questions 24 and 25)**

*24. Would it be appropriate to provide a base level of funding per pupil or place to all specialist SEN and LD/D settings, with individualised top up above that?*

*25. Is £10,000 an appropriate level for this funding?*

Response: Sufficient funding must be provided to enable high needs pupils to fulfil their potential and to ensure clear and transparent funding for all learners.

### **Post 16 SEN funding (Questions 26 to 28)**

*26. Is the idea of a base rate of funding helpful in the post-16 context?*

*27. Should local authorities be directly responsible for funding high level costs over £10,000 for young people in post-16 provision in line with their commissioning responsibilities?*

*28. Do the proposed funding arrangements create risks to any parts of the post-16 sector?*

Response: Barnet would wish to fund all high needs pupils in a clear and transparent manner, and sufficient funding should be available for all 0-25 high needs learners

#### **Funding by Places or Pupil Numbers (Questions 29 to 30)**

29. *Should institutions providing for high needs children and young people be funded on the basis of places or pupil numbers?*

30. *Are any of options (a)-(d) desirable?*

Response: Sufficient funding must be provided to enable high needs pupils to fulfil their potential and to enable LAs to plan services and meet the specific needs of all learners.

#### **Funding Special and Alternative Provision Academies and Free Schools (Questions 31 and 32)**

31. *For the longer term, should we fund Special and AP Academies and Free Schools:*

(a) *with all funding coming direct from the commissioner?*

(b) *with all funding coming through the EFA and recouped from the commissioner?*

(c) *through a combination of basic funding from the EFA and top-up funding for individual pupils direct from the commissioner?*

32. *If we go for the combination funding approach, should we pass all funding through the EFA for a limited period while the school is establishing itself before moving to this approach?*

Response: In response to Q5, Barnet wishes to calculate funding for Academies; this should also apply to Special and AP academies and free schools to allow consistency, fairness and transparency.

#### **Constructing the High Needs Block for Local Authorities (Questions 33 and 37) (See pages 38-39)**

33. *Given there is no absolute method of determining which pupils have high needs, and given local variation in policy and recording, is this approach to determining proxy variables acceptable?*

34. *Do you agree that deprivation is linked more to AP rather than the wider SEN needs?*

35. *Do you agree that in the short term we should base allocations to local authorities for the high needs block largely on historic spend?*

36. *Do you agree that post-16 funding should also become part of the local authority's high needs block over time, but that there might be a particular need for transitional arrangements?*

37. *What data should ideally underpin the funding allocations both initially and for a potential high needs block arrangement?*

Response: Calculation of the High Needs Block for LAs must ensure sufficient funding is provided to enable high needs pupils to fulfil their potential and to enable LAs to plan services and meet the specific needs of all learners.

#### **Issues Specific to Alternative Provision (Question 38 and 39)**

38. *Should AP continue to be treated alongside high needs SEN for funding purposes?*

39. *What differences between them need to be taken into account?*

Response: AP is subject to more variable costs, and therefore differs from high needs SEN but as discussed previously, high needs funding must be sufficient to ensure all high needs pupils fulfil their potential.

### **CHAPTER 7: EARLY YEARS**

#### **Simplifying Funding for Free Early Education (Questions 40 and 41)**

40. *Do you agree we should aim for a simpler EYSFF? If so, how?*

41. *How could we refine the EYSFF so that it better supports disadvantaged children?*

Response: It is unclear how simplification or improved targeting could be achieved as funding factors in local formulae recognise deprivation and flexibility, which were key objectives of the EYSFF. However termly funding to a large number of small and large settings has created additional bureaucracy.

### **Bringing more Consistency to Free Early Education Funding (Questions 42 and 43)**

*42. Do you agree we should allocate funding to local authorities on the basis of a formula?*

*43. Do you agree a formula should be introduced based largely on the same factors as the schools formula?*

Response: An Early Years Block formula must ensure sufficient funding to provide high quality Early Years education for all children in Barnet and elsewhere.

### **Bringing Greater Transparency to Free Early Education Funding (Question 44)**

*44. We would be grateful for views on whether anything else can be done to improve transparency.*

Response: Clear and transparent data must be used to determine Early Years funding allocations.

## **CHAPTER 8: PUPIL PREMIUM**

### **Deciding between an Ever 3 or an Ever 6 Measure (Question 45)**

*45. What is your preferred option for determining eligibility for the Pupil Premium from 2012-13? Should it be based on the Ever 3 or Ever 6 measure?*

Response: Any deprivation funding should accurately capture local need, and Barnet holds the view that FSM can be under-reported. Clear and transparent data must be used to determine this factor, and Ever 3 or Ever 6 seems to introduce greater complexity. We would also be concerned that the consistency of school generated historical pupil data is not great enough to produce reliable measures.

### **Calculating the Pupil Premium (Question 46)**

*46. What is your preferred approach for calculating the Pupil Premium?*

Response: Pupil Premium funding should ensure that deprived pupils have equal opportunities wherever they receive their education and should reflect local costs. Clear and transparent data must be used to determine this factor, to ensure that Barnet can support every child to achieve their full potential. The arrangements for paying the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children to schools in other boroughs needs to be simplified.

## **CHAPTER 9: TIMING FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

**Question 47: Do you think we should implement the proposed reforms in 2013-14 or during the next spending period?**

Response: Further consultation may be necessary once the 2012/13 shadow settlement has been provided, and LAs have been able to assess and identify issues associated with such significant changes.

## **FURTHER COMMENTS**

**Question 48: Have you any further comments?**

## Item 9.2 Schools Financial Value Standard

**Author** Nick Adams

**Position** Schools Finance Services Manager

### Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS)

#### Introduction

The DfE has now published the results of the consultation on this new Standard and this paper informs the Forum of the main features of the new Standard.

#### What is the SFVS?

Schools manage many billions of pounds of public money each year. Effective financial management ensures this money is spent wisely and properly, and allows schools to optimise their resources to provide high-quality teaching and learning and so raise standards and attainment for all their pupils. The SFVS replaces the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS) and has been designed in conjunction with schools to assist them in managing their finances and to give assurance that they have secure financial management in place.

#### Who is the SFVS for?

The standard is a requirement for local authority maintained schools. Governing bodies have formal responsibility for the financial management of their schools, and so the standard is primarily aimed at governors.

#### What do schools need to do?

- The standard consists of 23 questions which governing bodies should formally discuss annually with the headteacher and senior staff. The questions are in four sections:
  - The Governing Body and School Staff:
  - Setting the Budget
  - Value for Money
  - Protecting Public Money
- The questions which form the standard are in sections A to D. Each question requires an answer of Yes, In Part, or No.
  - If the answer is Yes, the comments column can be used to indicate the main evidence on which the governing body based its answer.
  - If the answer is No or In Part, the column should contain a very brief summary of the position and proposed remedial action.
- In Section E, governors should summarise remedial actions and the timetable for reporting back. Governors should ensure that each action has a specified deadline and an agreed owner.
- The governing body may delegate the consideration of the questions to a finance or other relevant committee, but a detailed report should be provided to the full governing body and the chair of governors must sign the completed form.
- The school must send a copy of the signed standard to their local authority's finance department. There is no prescription of the level of evidence that the governing body should require. The important thing is that governors are confident about their responses.

#### What is the role of local authorities (LAs)?

Unlike FMSiS, the SFVS will not be externally assessed. LAs should use schools' SFVS returns to inform their programme of financial assessment and audit. LA and other auditors will have access to the standard, and when they conduct an audit can check whether the self-assessment is in line with their own judgement. Auditors should make the governing body and the LA aware of any major discrepancies in judgements.

#### Timetable – key dates

- For all maintained schools, the first run through is required by 31 March 2013; and an annual review

thereafter.

- However Barnet schools are encouraged to undertake the exercise during 2011/12.

#### **Further information**

The DfE website includes support notes for each question, which governing bodies can use if they wish. The notes provide clarification of the questions, examples of good practice and information on further support to assist schools in addressing specific issues.

Briefing sessions will be held for governors, headteachers and school finance staff during the autumn term 2011.

#### **Action required**

The Forum is asked to note this report

### Item 9.3 Funding of Redundancies in Schools

**Author** Deborah Shaw

**Position** Schools Business Partner

#### **Funding of redundancy (severance) costs and associated costs for school based redundancies**

Within Barnet the costs of redundancy in schools, including pension and salary protection, have often been borne by the authority. However, legally the authority is required to pay only severance pay associated with a dismissal for redundancy. A policy covering the circumstances and the procedures by which the local authority will, in future, fund severance pay associated with a dismissal for redundancy is set out in Appendix A.

The policy has been formulated following legal advice and research by Barnet's HR service with practice in neighbouring local authorities.

The policy sets out that, in future, only the costs of redundancy payments will be met by the authority. Further, agreement to fund redundancies will be subject to compliance of the proposed procedure by schools stipulated in attached document. From 1<sup>st</sup> November 2011 therefore, schools will be responsible for funding pension costs (both final and ongoing).

The authority is prepared to continue to co-ordinate the funding of the costs of salary protection, funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant

It is proposed that the changes will come into effect from 1 November 2011 and that no retrospective costs will be charged to schools.

It would be helpful if you could forward any comments or questions you may have to Mark Callaghan (mark.callaghan@barnet.gov.uk) regarding the proposed changes prior to the Schools Forum in order that we can consider them in advance.



## **Appendix A**

### **Guidance and Procedure for Redundancy Handling for all School Staff in Maintained Schools**

#### **1. Introduction**

This procedure applies to Local Authority Maintained Schools and does not apply to Academies, Independent, Free Schools or any other Schools which are directly funded from the DfE/central government.

#### **2. Avoiding redundancies**

Forecasting and managing change is integral to successful medium and long term planning. Headteachers and Governing Bodies will, as part of the workforce planning process, manage resources to avoid or minimise the effect of any foreseen staff surpluses to alleviate the risk of compulsory redundancy.

The following strategies may be considered to as part of forward planning and resource management;

- restricting the recruitment of permanent staff (in certain circumstances - not as a matter of routine)
- managing vacancies by deleting vacant posts or holding vacancies for redeployment; ( following consultation on change of staffing structure)
- reducing the use of temporary staff without infringing employment rights;
- reduction in hours - where agreed with the employee or allowed for in the contract of employment;
- filling vacancies from among existing employees;
- job share;
- training or re-training where applicable;
- Release of staff before the contractual resignation date.

However, where circumstances are such that a redundancy situation is unavoidable in a school, the governors will ensure that the employees concerned will be treated in a fair and equitable way and the impact on staff minimised.

#### **3. Definition of redundancy**

An employee will have been dismissed by reason of redundancy if the dismissal is attributable wholly or mainly to the fact that:

- (a) The employer has ceased, or intends to cease:
  - (i) to carry on the business for the purposes of which the employee was employed: or
  - (ii) to carry on the business in the place where the employee was so employed; or
- (b) The requirements of the business for employees:
  - (i) to carry out work of a particular kind; or
  - (ii) to carry out work of a particular kind in the place where the employee was employed;

have ceased or diminished, or are expected to cease or diminish (s 139 (1) and (2) Employment Rights Act 1996 formerly s 81 (2) EP(C) A 1978).

Governors should be aware that the cessation of a temporary or fixed term contract constitutes a dismissal and redundancy will apply where employees have continuous local government service of 2 years or more.

#### **4. Funding Redundancy Costs**

##### **4.a. Legal Obligations**

Under Section 37 (5) of the Education Act 2002 the Council is required to fund the costs of redundancy payments and will do so in the following circumstances:

- where a budget deficit would otherwise arise, without any action to reduce staffing, or where a budget deficit has been approved by the Council; or
- where the Council has implemented closure as a result of statutory reorganisation
- where it has been provided with all necessary budget/actual financial information and a business case well in advance to allow it to assess the above situations in advance of any action being taken and has confirmed in writing its agreement to this.

In addition there is a need to follow guidance as set out in the Scheme for Financing Schools - paragraph 11.13. Further details are given in Annex B to the Scheme.

#### **4.b. Conditions**

In all such circumstances, the Governing Body must have acted reasonably to avoid the redundancy. Governing Bodies must comply with the following procedure and make any redundancies in accordance with the process set out in the Council's Managing Organisation Change Policy and Procedure or a policy/procedure which has been adopted by the School (for example Diocese policy) and which complies with legislation and any required terms of the Green or Burgundy Book as applicable. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the council's Managing Organisational Change policy and/or own procedure.

The Council will **not** meet costs of redundancy severance payments, where in accordance with the Education Act 2002, the Council has 'good reason' not to do so. Examples include:

- where a school is not anticipating a budget deficit; and/or
- where it considers that the Governing Body has acted unreasonably, contrary to council policy or advice provided by the Council

Where it has been determined that the Governing Body has acted unreasonably or the redundancy severance payments are not as a result of a school heading for a budget deficit, the Council charge the school's budget. Costs will include those arising, but not limited to, any redundancy payments, settlements of claims or any awards made by an Employment Tribunal arising out of or associating with the termination of employment and any legal costs incurred in defending or settling claims.

The Council will refuse to fund redundancy costs if the overall cost is in excess of that offered by the Council to other employees as outlined in annex A of the Councils Managing Organisation Change Policy & Procedure and any other limits which may be applied by the Council. Currently total compensation including any additional pension costs is limited to no more than 18\* months of an individual's salary.

\* under review

Costs arising from early retirements must be met from the school's delegated budget except where the Council exceptionally agrees with the Governing Body in writing to meet the costs centrally.

Notice payments whether worked or paid in lieu are the responsibility of the School and will not be paid by the Council.

A Governing Body may decide to follow a redundancy process without the approval of the council but in these circumstances the School would be liable for all costs associated with the redundancy

#### **5. Early Notification to LA**

All Schools must notify and discuss any proposals to restructure and reduce staffing levels with Mick Quigley, Assistant Director, Schools and Learning at the earliest opportunity and in advance of embarking on consultation with staff or trade unions. This requirement also applies in cases where staffing reductions are deemed necessary due to the cessation of external or grant funding.

## 6. Making the Business Case

Following initial discussion with Mick Quigley and his agreement in principle, the request for the Council to meet redundancy costs must be submitted in writing (and using Appendix 1 attached to this document) to the Director of Children's Services (or via the Schools Business Partner for schools buying onto the HR traded services) supported by a Business Case which must include the following:

- Why the redundancy is necessary
- The case should include:
  - structure charts pre and post change,
  - details of those affected
  - detailed costs of both structures and evidence that savings will be achieved
  - a 3 year financial plan without staff redundancies and a 3 year financial plan with redundancies
  - explanation for the reason for the change and the risks of non-implementation
  - if services are to be outsourced why it is considered that TUPE does not apply to staff allocated to those services
  - Final or draft Role Profiles with indicative grades
  - An indication of the actions taken to avoid compulsory redundancy i.e. freezing vacancies; use of fixed term contracts to meet specific needs.
- The date on which the need for work/post ceases and the date(s) of the proposed redundancy if different.
- The gross and net annual impact on the Schools budget and the proposed cost of Redundancies
- The cost of any pay protection which will result from the restructure
- Details of proposed timescales for consultation including details of proposed selection criteria
- Why redeployment of individual(s), within the School or more widely, is not an option
- What, if any, agency, fixed term or other temporary workers are employed in the school and why these cannot be ceased as an alternative to redundancy
- Impact on affected employees (e.g. the rest of a department etc)
- Where the redundancy relates to a diminished need to carry out work, it will also be necessary to show a clear rationale for the proposals e.g.: reference to school development plan, Ofsted action plan, examination results etc

In addition the front page of Appendix 1 (attached to this documents) must be completed either by the Chair of Governors and submitted with the Business case.

## 7. Process for Approval

Business Cases must receive written approval from the council before any promises or notices of redundancy are made. The proposed redundancy (ies) must be approved by the council in order for payment to be made centrally.

Schools which buy the Councils Traded HR service are able to seek support and review of their case prior to submission. In some cases the Learning Network Inspector may also be able to offer support and advice and should also have been advised at an early stage of proposals.

Schools which buy into HR traded services will seek support and assistance at an early stage (and before consultation commences) to ensure that the people aspects of any change are being adequately considered and there are no obvious flaws to the proposal.

The Director of Children's Services or his/her nominee will assess submitted business cases and will seek, as appropriate, HR and financial concurrence before agreeing any redundancies (using the form at Appendix 1), a copy of which will be returned to the School. The Director or his/her nominee may decide to seek further information from the School or other sources about the technicalities of a case (where cases are based on falling school rolls for example).

The council will only approve requests for funding where they are satisfied that

- a genuine redundancy exists,
- savings are achievable
- all avenues for avoiding the redundancy have been considered
- Procedure has been followed

Rejected cases will be provided with the reason for rejection and may be resubmitted (subject to the timescales below) if circumstances change.

### **8. School Closure, amalgamation and cessation of grant funding**

Where redundancies arise as a result of school closure, amalgamation or the cessation of external or grant funding (including SEN funding) severance, retirement and salary protection costs will generally be met from central funds. Schools will be required to comply with Paragraph 5 Early Notification to the LA requirements. Following that initial notification and discussion and depending on the scale of reductions agreement may be given to proceed using a modified version of this procedure.

### **9. Timescales**

Delay can be costly. In accordance with National Conditions of Service Teachers can only be dismissed on the grounds of redundancy in accordance with their contract at three dates in the year (i.e. the end of each term 31 August, 31 December and 30 April).

There is a statutory entitlement for all employees to receive notice of termination and the employee will be eligible to one weeks notice for each year of service up to a maximum of twelve weeks.

Business Cases should therefore normally be submitted to the Council in accordance with the following timescales:

- By no later than spring half term where a reduction is required by 31st August
- By no later than 31st May where a reduction is required by 31st December
- By no later than 31st October where a reduction is required by 30th April

Business cases for support staff may be submitted no less than 6 weeks before the anticipated date of redundancy notice issue.

### **10. Summary**

Schools are expected to observe and adhere with this procedure. Under the terms of the Education Act 2002 the Council is permitted to withhold funding if there has been a school has acted unreasonably or outside council policy.

## Appendix 1

### Approval for Funding Redundancy

School.....  
Reason for Redundancy.....  
Proposed date of redundancy dismissal(s) .....  
Effective date of change(s) .....  
Number at Risk of redundancy  
Teachers: .....  
Support staff: .....  
Proposed/actual Number of Redundancies.....  
Estimated/actual cost of redundancies £.....  
Proposed Savings £.....

#### Summary Budget (with planned redundancy savings)

The school's actual/predicted pupil number on roll in  
January was / is

2010	2011	2012	2013

Financial summary Statement/forecast Revenue balance b/fwd) from previous year	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013
Total revenue funding (including grants)			
Other income			
Total revenue resources			
Less Total revenue expenditure			
Surplus OR Deficit			

Please consider the attached business case for redundancy costs to be paid for by the London Borough of Barnet (Council). I confirm that the business case for redundancy is robust, cost effective, will achieve savings and all alternative models/ways of working/changes have been considered and the conclusion reached is that redundancy is the only available option.

I understand that the Council will only approve a request for funding where they are satisfied that a genuine redundancy exists and that all avenues for avoiding the redundancy have been exhausted. I understand that the Council can withhold or require repayment of any funding made where the School have failed to comply with this guidance and/or a legally compliant procedure and that any promises, offers of redundancy compensation etc made without authority or in excess of the Councils own scheme will be the responsibility of the School.

**Signed** .....(Chair of Governors or person with delegated powers)  
**Name and Title**.....  
**Contact Number** ..... **Date** .....

#### Finance Concurrence

The proposals are likely to result in the proposed saving and therefore the cost of redundancies can be supported,\*

Or

The proposal is not supported because\*

It is unlikely that the proposed saving will be achieved based on the proposal\*

The school has not provided evidence of a likely budget deficit\*

Or

The proposal can be supported if the following risks are resolved:

**Signed** .....

**Name/Title**..... **Date** .....

**HR concurrence**

The proposed redundancies appear to be genuine, there are no significant HR risks and therefore the proposal to dismiss on the grounds of redundancy is supported \*

Or

The proposal can be supported if the following risks are resolved:

Or

The proposal is not supported because\*

The redundancies are not genuine\*

The school has not exhausted other options\*

Other (please state)\*

**Signed** ..... **Name & Title** .....

**Date** .....

**Director Authorisation**

Redundancy notices as identified above are authorised for issue. The cost of such redundancy will be as no more than £.....\*

Or

as follows\*

Or

Redundancy costs and dismissal on the grounds of redundancy can not be supported because

**Signed**.....**Director Children's Services**

**Date** .....

\*delete as appropriate

## Item 9.4 Capital

**Author** Val White

**Position** Assistant Director, Children's Service

In July, the Government announced a number of capital-related developments including two funding streams. These are outlined below together with the implications for Barnet.

1. The provision of £500 million to help local authorities provide extra school places. This additional allocation is likely to be targeted at areas with most significant pupil pressure but no detail has yet been announced. It is thought this the money is likely to be distributed as additional 'basic needs' grant. In 2011/12 Barnet received £9m 'basic needs' capital grant to provide additional school places. This grant, together with other sources of funding is now enabling the permanent expansions of Broadfields and the Orion school to progress, to add to the permanent expansion of Colindale School, recently completed. The council's Cabinet committee is considering the next phase on investment in primary provision at its meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November together with the emerging strategy for secondary phase.
2. A new school building programme to address the condition of school premises through complete or partial rebuilding. The programme is being run by Partnerships for Schools (PfS) and it is anticipated that approximately 100 to 300 schools across the country could be covered, with 20% of the programme being delivered each year. The programme is likely to include a mix of primary schools, secondary schools, special schools, sixth form colleges and alternative provision. It should be noted that the programme is focusing on 'condition' rather than 'suitability' of premises. More information on the programme can be found here - <https://sharepoint.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/PSBP/SitePages/Home.aspx> Barnet is considering the implications of the proposed privately financed scheme, both for individual schools and for the council. There is limited funding available nationally and it is likely that any Barnet submission would be for a small number of schools in the worst condition. The submission will be based on information gained from the latest round of school condition surveys. Whilst addressing poor condition is the priority, the Government has indicated that a small amount of funding may be available to address demand for places, and so we will be looking to see whether there is also potential to expand schools that are in poor condition. The timeline for submission is very tight. A meeting has been held with interested schools and information on the final submission will be available at the meeting.