

Schools Forum

5th October 2010

4pm – Briefing

4:30pm – Schools Forum

Conference Room 2
Ground Floor Building 4
North London Business Park

Agenda, Papers and
Minutes of the last meeting

Contents

Agenda.....	3
Schools Forum Members	4
Minutes of the Meeting of the Schools Forum 13th July 2010	5
Item 3 : Proposal to defer election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2010/11	9
Item 6.1 Composition of the Schools Forum.....	10
Item 6.2 Dedicated Schools Grant 2010/11	12
Item 6.3 DfE Consultations on School Funding	13
Item 6.4 Consultation with Schools Funding Formula for 2011/12.....	21
Item 7.1 Contracts Affecting Schools – for Information	21
Item 7.2 Early Years Progress Report – for Information.....	21

Agenda

Please note: the main meeting starts at 4pm – there is no pre-meeting briefing.

1. Welcome and apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of interest
3. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2010/11 – proposal to defer until December meeting
4. Minutes of previous meeting: 13th July 2010
5. Matters arising
6. Items for Consultation
 - 6.1. Revised membership of the Schools Forum
 - 6.2. DSG 2010/11
 - 6.3. DfE consultations on School Funding
 - 6.4. Review of the School Funding Formula
7. Items for Information
 - 7.1. Contracts affecting Schools
 - 7.2. Early Years progress report
8. Any Other Business

Dates for future meetings:

7 December 2010

1 February 2011

10 May 2011

12 July 2011

Schools Forum Members

Schools Forum Membership	As at 23 rd September 2010
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Mrs	Clare	Neuberger	Menorah Foundation	Head	Primary	VA
Ms	Jo	Djora	Coppetts Wood	Head	Primary	Community
Ms	Jayne	Franklin	Childs Hill School	Head	Primary	Community
Mrs	Angela	Murphy	Bishop Douglass RC	Head	Secondary	VA
Ms	Kate	Webster	Queen Elizabeth Girls School	Head	Secondary	Community
Ms	Dee	Oelman	St Mary's & St John's	Head	Primary	VA
Dr	John	Marincowitz	Queen Elizabeth's Barnet	Head	Secondary	Foundation
Ms	Jeanette	Adak	Monkfrith	Head	Primary	Community
Mrs	Helen	Schmitz	Cromer Road Primary School	Head	Primary	Community
Ms	Lisa	Clarke	Brookhill Nursery	Head	Nursery	Community
Mrs	Jenny	Gridley	Oakleigh School	Head	Special	Community
Mr	Tim	Bowden	Holy Trinity	Head	Primary	VA
Mr	Teresa	Tunnadine	The Compton	Head	Secondary	Community

GOVERNORS

Mr	Derrick	Brown	Headteacher, Ashmole	Governor	Secondary	Foundation
Ms			vacant	Governor	Primary	Community
Mr	Jonathan	Hewlings	Governor, East Barnet School	Governor	Secondary	Community
Mr			Vacant	Governor	Secondary	Community
Mr	Gilbert	Knight	Governor, Oakleigh	Governor	Special	Community
Mr	Stephen	Parkin (Vice Chair)	Governor, St Mary's CE High	Governor	Secondary	VA
Ms	Elizabeth	Pearson	Governor, Holly Park & Livingstone	Governor	Primary	Community
Mr	Anthony	Vourou	Governor, St John's N11	Governor	Primary	VA

NON-SCHOOL MEMBERS

Ms	Angela	Trigg	London Academy	Principal	Academies	
Mr	Mick	Quigley	Principal Inspector, Children's Svce	Other	Stakeholder – SIPs	
Mr	Alan	Homes	NASUWT	Other	Union	
Mr	Keith	Murdoch	Woodhouse College	Other	14-19 Partnership	
Ms	Sarah	Vipond	Middlesex University Nursery	Other	Private Early Years Providers	

OBSERVER

Cllr	Andrew	Harper	Cabinet Member for Children	Other	Elected Member	
------	--------	--------	-----------------------------	-------	----------------	--

OTHER ATTENDEES

Mr	Robert	McCulloch	Graham	Director of Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Val	White		Assistant Director, Children's Service	Officer	
Mr	Graham	Durham		Assistant Director of Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Linda	Parker		Joint Head of Finance – Children's Service	Officer	
Mr	Nick	Adams		Schools Finance Services Manager	Officer	
Ms	Carol	Beckman		School Funding Manager	Officer	
Ms	Sarrosh	Malik		School Resources & Support Officer	Officer (minutes)	
Mr	Geoff	Boyd		Consultant	Other	

Minutes of the Meeting of the Schools Forum 13th July 2010

(4.00 pm, Oak Room, Building 2 NLBP)

<u>Attended</u>	Members:	Alan Homes (NASUWT) Clare Neuberger (Head, Menorah Foundation) Dee Oelman (Head, St Mary's & St John's) Derrick Brown (Governor, Ashmole) Elizabeth Pearson (Governor, Livingstone) Gilbert Knight (Governor, Oakleigh) Jeanette Adak (Head, Monkfrith) John Marincowitz (Head, QE Boys) Jonathan Hewlings (Governor, East Barnet) Kate Webster (Head QE Girls) Keith Murdoch (Principal, Woodhouse College) Ken Huggins (Governor, The Compton) Lisa Clarke (Head, Brookhill Nursery) Mick Quigley (Principal Inspector, Children's Service) Tim Bowden (Head, Holy Trinity) Teresa Tunnadine (Head, The Compton)
	LA Officers:	Robert McCulloch-Graham (Director of Children's Service) Denise Murray (Strategic Finance Manager) Graham Durham (Assistant Director, Inclusion) Linda Parker (Strategic Finance Manager) Nick Adams (Finance Manager) Ola Yerokun (Contracts Officer) Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager) Nigel Bell (Asset Manager)
	Clerk:	Claire Gray (Deputy School Funding Manager)
	Consultant:	Geoff Boyd
<u>Not Present</u>	Members:	Angela Murphy (Head, Bishop Douglass) Angela Trigg (London Academy) Anthony Vourou (Governor, St John's N11) Hazel Godfrey (Governor, Broadfields) Helen Schmitz (Head, Cromer Road) Jayne Franklin (Head, Childs Hill) Jenny Gridley (Head, Oakleigh) Jo Djora (Head, Coppetts Wood) Sarah Vipond (Early Years Working Group) Stephen Parkin (Governor, St Mary's High)
	LA Officers:	Andrew Travers (Deputy Chief Executive) Chris Malyon (Assistant Director of Finance) Val White (Assistant Director, PPP)
	Other:	Cllr Andrew Harper (Cabinet Member for Education, Children & Families)

1. Welcome and apologies for Absence

JM welcomed Teresa Tunnadine as a new member of the Forum, in place of Gary Tucker. Apologies were received from Stephen Parkin, Helen Schmitz, Chris Malyon, Val White and Cllr Andrew Harper.

2. Declarations of interest

Declaration of interest forms were circulated to members. To ensure confidentiality these can be returned to Carol Beckman or Sarrosh Malik once completed.

3. Minutes of previous meeting: 18th May 2010

The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. Matters arising

AH asked if there had been any further information regarding continuation of the 1-2-1 Tuition grant. MQ advised that no update on the future of this grant has been received.

5. Items for Consultation

5.1 School Balances – Review of Surplus Balances Nick Adams

NA presented a summary of the 11 schools with excess balances, and commented that all had co-operated fully in providing documentation that justified the whole of the surplus, not just the excess amount. 9 schools met either the local or national requirements, with items that were deferred and assigned, contractual commitments, or specific projects. 2 schools provided documentation showing exceptional circumstances.

Members were asked to consider if these 2 schools should retain their balances.

Motion carried. Proposed: Jonathan Hewlings, Seconded: Alan Homes.

Members were also asked if there should be a review of the schools with deferred and assigned items in the autumn term to ensure that the spending plans have been implemented as proposed.

Motion carried. Proposed: Jonathan Hewlings, Seconded: Alan Homes.

5.2 Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Nigel Bell

NB explained the principles and requirements of the scheme, and clarified that carbon allowances will be fixed for the introductory phase of the scheme from 2010-13. The LA will be collecting energy consumption data from schools, and a full report showing all data will be made available. NB advised that schools will not be required to purchase carbon allowances from their school budgets under current arrangements. However, future arrangements may pass on penalties to schools should energy reductions not be achieved.

AH queried if Academies are included in LA targets, and NB confirmed that they are. JM expressed concern that schools in older buildings would be disadvantaged. NB advised that this is not the case, as it is energy reduction from initial levels that is recognised and older schools would therefore have greater scope for improvement. GK was concerned that special schools will be penalised, as higher temperatures are inevitably needed for pupil welfare at such settings. He asked if there are any grants or allowances available towards installation of items such as solar panels. NB advised that this had been examined, but that the current immature market did not provide sufficient choice or value for provision without long-term commitment by the LA. It was agreed that the scheme is very bureaucratic, but it was noted that the current levy by suppliers on bills has not reduced overall consumption in the market, so new measures are needed.

5.3 Membership & terms of reference of the Schools Forum: Geoff Boyd

In the light of recent government changes to Schools Forum requirements, GB presented an updated document incorporating these revisions into the remit and constitution of the Forum. Members were also asked for their views on reviewing the length of office for membership of the Schools Forum, and whether membership should now be for a 2 or 3 year term. It was the unanimous view that the term of office recommended to the LA should be 3 years, as this would ensure stability through the current period of significant change. It was also a recommendation by Forum that for ease of administration and re-election purposes (providing it meets current statutory requirements) the commencement of the term of office for all existing members should be considered as 13th July 2010. Members were advised to note that changes to representation on the Forum may be essential if a number of schools, especially those with members on the Schools Forum become academies. However, to ensure stability it was agreed that whatever happens in September the current constitution, representation and Chair/Vice-Chair arrangements would apply for the next meeting in October, and will be reviewed in December

5.4 Contracts affecting schools

Ola Yerokun

OY presented details of the cleaning contracts that are due to expire in April 2011, but which offer the option to extend for a further 2 year period. The LA is minded to extend the contract, but Forum members held the view that some schools were unhappy with the level of service received. It was recommended that a short survey of schools should be undertaken before the summer break to assess whether schools were satisfied with both service levels and value for money. JH suggested that negotiation of improved SLAs might be a better option for the term of the extension, rather than moving to a new supplier. OY agreed to undertake a short survey of schools, and that the Forum's comments would be considered when negotiating with suppliers.

5.5 Academies

Mick Quigley

MQ outlined the most recent guidance regarding the process for fast-track conversion to Academy status. Schools that have completed the online application form for conversion have a specified point of contact at the New Academies Division within the DfE, and all applications will be scrutinised by an operations board before being passed to the Secretary of State for a final decision. The LA has established an inter-departmental academy task group that is considering the issues and impact on all schools of additional academies. This group is currently providing support in Financial, HR and Legal matters, amongst other areas. MQ advised members to bear in mind that, once the number of schools converting to Academy status is confirmed, adjustments will be required to the current LA and Schools Budget figures.

5.6 BSF

Denise Murray, Robert McCulloch-Graham

DM reported that she is currently in the process of completing the formal financial closedown of the BSF scheme. The 6 BSF schools would not be expected to make a contribution to the abortive costs. Therefore in containing the costs within the Children's Service and DSG, an additional £200,000 would be redirected to BSF stage 1 from the 2009/10 c/fwd balance earmarked for BSF stage 2. A financial schedule and actual funding will be presented at the next meeting.

RMG stated that the LA is very aware that a significant number of schools are still in need of improvement. However, in light of the withdrawal of capital funding, future investment will need to be prioritised to meet sufficiency requirements and any such projects may have to be resourced internally.

Forum members queried whether the results of the current condition and measurement survey will be available to all schools, and this was confirmed.

GD also highlighted that with the cancellation of the Oak Lodge rebuilding programme, special schools within Barnet are now operating at maximum capacity. If placements have to be purchased elsewhere, this is likely to impact on the Schools Budget in future.

5.7 DSG 2010/11

Linda Parker

LP presented the final DSG 2010/11 figures to members, and highlighted that the overall amount of £213,274,877 (*erratum: £213,273,877 was shown in the original meeting papers*) has increased due to slightly higher than expected pupil numbers. The ISB uncommitted funding has also increased, as the pupil intake of JCoSS will be lower than previously planned and their funding has been reduced accordingly. However, LP advised that in light of additional place funding pressures, adjustments to LACSEG for academy conversions and in-year adjustments to some grants, it is planned to utilise the uncommitted and the additional resources to offset the cost pressures. Use of contingency funding to cover the cost pressures and grant reductions elsewhere will mean that the proposed adjustments required as a result of the recent measurement survey will need to be deferred until 2011/12.

Members expressed concern that the level of the unallocated contingency budget seemed high, but officers explained that the majority of this is used to cover moves and changes to statement funding and SEN contingency arrangements.

5.8 Autumn review of the School Funding Formula

Carol Beckman

CB presented a summary of the proposed areas of the funding formula that will be reviewed, modelled and consulted on during the autumn term. Some of the factors depend on the outcome of both the Comprehensive Spending Review and the second DSG review, but these will be incorporated wherever possible once this information becomes available. Analysis and modelling will be undertaken, and it is proposed that a draft consultation paper will be presented to Schools Forum in October. The consultation with schools is planned for the autumn term with the results being reported to the Schools Forum in December.

6. Items for information

6.1 Early Years Report

Carol Beckman

CB updated members on progress regarding Early Years funding, and the planned payment arrangements for the autumn term. Maintained providers will receive additional extension and flexibility funding through the autopayment system until the new funding formula is brought in from April 2011; PVI providers will receive advance (80%) payments at the beginning of each term, with adjustments calculated once the termly pupil census has been submitted and checked. From April all providers will receive funding based on the termly census, not the annual census as has applied previously.

6.2 Cashless systems in Primary Schools

Denise Murray

DM reported to members that a cashless catering pilot will be undertaken by Sunnyfields Primary school, to assess the benefits and cost impact to schools of implementation. The estimated cost of the pilot is £6,000, which will be covered from reassigned BSF funding.

7. AOB

JM thanked members for their attendance and contribution throughout the year, and offered his good wishes for the summer break. The meeting closed at 6pm.

Item 3 : Proposal to defer election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2010/11

It is normal practice to hold elections for the Schools Forum Chair and Vice-Chair at the first meeting of the new academic year. This year there are a number of vacancies which have occurred through resignation and also non-eligibility following conversion to academy status. We also have a proposal for a change in the composition of the Schools Forum later on today's agenda. It would therefore seem logical to defer the election of the Chair and Vice Chair until the next meeting when we should have sorted out membership.

Ken Huggins and Hazel Godfrey are no longer governors at their schools and therefore are no longer Schools Forum members, but we would like to register our thanks to them for their hard work over the years.

ACTION: We hope that the current Chair and Vice Chair agree to continue for one more meeting and that the Schools Forum agrees to the delay in the election.

Item 6.1 Composition of the Schools Forum

Carol Beckman

School Funding Manager

29 September 2010

Since the Schools Forum was set up in 2003 the profile of types of schools in Barnet has changed, even more so now with some taking up Academy status.

Analysis of the numbers of pupils in different types of schools suggests we should update the representation on the Schools Forum

The current make-up is as follows:

Type of Member	Number	Head Teachers	Governors
Primary Schools			
Community	6	4	2
Foundation & VA	4	3	1
Nursery	1	1	0
Secondary Schools			
Community	4	2	2
Foundation	2	1	1
VA	2	1	1
Special Schools	2	1	1
Academies	1	1	
Union	1		
School Improvement Partners	1		
Private Early Years Providers	1		
14-19 Partnership	1		
Total Members	<u>26</u>	14	8

On the assumption that we will soon have 6 secondary academies, the proposed membership would change as follows:

Headteachers:

1 more secondary academy principal

1 more secondary VA Head

1 less secondary community Head

This increases the number of Headteachers by 1 to 15

Governors:

1 new academy governor

1 new primary community governor

1 less secondary foundation governor

1 less secondary community governor

Type of Member	Number	Head Teachers	Governors
Primary Schools			
Community	7	4	3
Foundation & VA	4	3	1
Nursery	1	1	0
Secondary Schools			
Community	2	1	1
Foundation	1	1	0
VA	3	2	1
Special Schools	2	1	1
Academies	3	2	1
Union	1		
School Improvement Partners	1		
Private Early Years Providers	1		
14-19 Partnership	1		
Total Members	27	15	8

Members can be assimilated to these posts, or complete new elections held. Several existing members are or will no longer be eligible to hold their current posts as their schools become academies.

Appointments required:

Additional academy headteacher

Additional secondary VA headteacher – election now, or defer until either Kate Webster or Teresa Tunnadine stand down from a community secondary head place which would then be deleted.
Headteachers from 6 VA secondary schools eligible (2 already have Forum representatives)

Replacement foundation secondary headteacher (for John Marincowitz) – Hendon or Mill Hill High

Academy governor – from currently designated academies

Two primary community governors – elections to be held.

ACTION

The Schools Forum is asked to approve the new structure of the Schools Forum and advise which elections to vacant posts the LA should organise.

Item 6.2 Dedicated Schools Grant 2010/11

Author	Linda Parker
Position	Head of Finance, Children and Adults
Date	29th September 2010
Awaiting text on final Schools Budget and use of £170,000 for combines services.	

Item 6.3 DfE Consultations on School Funding

Author	Carol Beckman
Position	Schools Funding Manager
Date	29th September 2010

Proposed changes to School Funding 2011/12

Before the general election the government intended to introduce a new way of calculating the dedicated schools grant to local authorities. They also announced plans to mainstream many Standards Funds grants. Barnet intended to carry out a full survey of the school funding formula this autumn ready for the new multi-year funding cycle and was expecting the details of introducing a local pupil premium.

Since the election the coalition government plans have changed:

- 2011/12 will be a single year funding formula
- At least 3 grants (SDG, SSG, SSG(P)) will be mainstreamed into the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)
- The DSG will continue to be calculated on the Spend Plus methodology for one year
- A national pupil premium will be introduced from September 2011.
- The Spending Review announcement on 20th October will provide more details of the future level of spending on schools but details will not be available until at least a month later
- Two consultations have been issued. The first covers the Pupil Premium and Dedicated Schools Grant and closes on 18th October. The second is largely about detailed changes to school funding regulations and closes on 10th December. Draft responses for Barnet are included in this paper
- The Minimum Funding Guarantee for schools will continue but may be negative (e.g. if set at -2% a school would be guaranteed receive at least 98% of its per pupil funding in the previous year.). The MFG has been 2.1% for the last two years.

As 2011/12 will be a single year funding period, we are no longer under so much pressure to review the school funding formula this autumn. In view of the uncertainty of funding levels and the continuation, or otherwise, of a number of grants, Barnet feels that schools are likely to experience enough turbulence in their funding without introducing changes to the local funding formula. For this reason we intend to defer the full review until 2011.

Two particular issues have been brought to our attention during the current 3 year funding period (2008-11):

Start-up funding for new schools – completely new schools (no predecessor either maintained or private) opening in Barnet receive additional funding to the value of an additional basic entitlement (secondary: primary:) for each of the first two years. Payments start 4 terms before the planned date of opening. JCOS feels that this is inadequate and propose that it should be provided for the first three years.

Additional Educational Need - Church Hill School feels that the amount some schools receive is too little to provide sufficient support for children at School Action and Action Plus especially if there are a number of children with statements at the school. We have looked at the trends in SEN/AEN since the formula was introduced in 2003 and although the costs of statement top-ups is rising, the value of AEN has also risen, albeit more slowly, over the period. For this reason, we feel that this issue should be deferred until 2011 when we should know more about how the Pupil Premium will work in Barnet.

The Pupil Premium

The national pupil premium is to be introduced in September 2011 and will be an additional specific grant outside the Dedicated Schools Grant. Many of the details are not yet available as the consultation is still open. The local authority will have to pass on all the grant to schools without any deduction but the school can spend the money in any way it feels will be most effective in narrowing the gap between the least and most disadvantaged children. This might include additional teaching resource or advice and support for parents. In the first instance the Pupil Premium will be targeted at Reception to Year 11, but the under 5s may be included in the future. We have no information about arrangements for Post 16.

Barnet would oppose allocations to schools being based on eligibility for free school meals as we know this indicator under represents deprivation in some faith schools and at secondary schools where take up of school meals is low.

The government wishes to correct the inequality of deprivation funding per pupil in different local authorities. It will therefore set a national target level (adjusted for areas of higher cost) and provide a higher level of Pupil Premium each year until all LAs have reached the target funding level. This means that the Pupil Premium will vary in size between LAs, with the authorities currently receiving least deprivation funding attracting the highest Pupil Premium.

The consultation asks which deprivation measure should be used to distribute funding:

- Free School Meals
- “Ever Free School Meals” – i.e. children who have been eligible at any time in the last 3 or the last 6 years
- Tax Credit Indicator (not available at child level)
- Mosaic or Acorn – these are both proprietary indexes of multiple deprivation.

Barnet’s recent preference has been for IDACI (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index) which is a government measure rather than one provided by a private company which means more is known about the make-up.

The consultation also suggests Looked After Children and Service Children could be eligible for the Pupil Premium. The former poses a problem with recoupment, where a child in care is placed in a school outside their home authority. Both could be subject to doubts about the reliability of data.

Dedicated Schools Grant

Although the Spend Plus methodology will continue for another year, there are proposals to amend the number of pupils to be counted for the DSG, i.e.

- Remove the 90% guarantee for 3 year olds (Barnet has less than 90% of its 3 year olds in private or maintained early years settings and so benefits from this)
- Remove the double counting of dually registered children in PRUs (i.e. children on roll at both a PRU and a mainstream school)
- Count home educated children who have some input from the authority as 10% of a pupil.
- Allow authorities to claim if they have high numbers of children moving in and out of the borough due to relocation of military personnel
- Remove the ‘cash floor’ which protects authorities with falling rolls.

Mainstreamed Grants

Moving three of the biggest grants into the Dedicated Schools Grant will have a number of effects:

- The MFG will apply to the grants as well as the budget share
- Initially, the LA can use the same calculation to allocate the money to schools as was used when they were separate grants
- Retention of parts of the grant (e.g. EMAG) is still allowed as long as there is no breach of the Central Expenditure Limit, in which case the Schools Forum would have to give approval first.

Carbon Reduction Commitment

All schools (including academies) will be part of the authorities Carbon Reduction Commitment and will be subject to penalties or receive bonuses. Some technical changes have been made to the regulations to allow this to happen – for instance a new funding element to allow the bonus or penalty to be passed on to schools.

Early Years Single Funding Formula

EYSFF must be introduced from April 2011. Although Barnet has not been a pathfinder authority we have already started funding private providers using the new formula and maintained schools will come in line from April 2011. Our formula meets government requirements and we do not intend to propose any changes from the version currently in place. We had hoped to investigate a quality or qualifications element but there has been no pressure for this and a fair mechanism for calculating such a measure has not yet been found.

Academies

The principal is that academies and maintained schools should be funded in the same way and an academy should be no better or worse off for transferring from the maintained sector. The government plans to review the funding for academies and have set up a task group with LA representation to look at this. At present new academies receive the following

- Budget share – calculated using the same funding formula as other schools in the LA a year behind. This comes from the government, except in the year of transfer when it is recouped from the LA
- Standards Funds – paid by the government except in the year of transfer when the LA continues to pay the academy until the end of the financial year
- Statements and other individually assigned resources for pupils with SEN – continue to be paid by the LA at the same level as when the school was maintained. The first two Barnet academies (London and Wren) have been funded on the full value of statements, not for hours in excess of 10. As their funding formula now replicates the AEN formula for Barnet schools, we propose to fund statement top-ups in the same way as maintained schools from April 2011.
- LACSEG (General and SEN) – a proportion of certain parts of the retained Schools Budget. This is recouped from the LA
- VAT grant – unlike LA schools, academies have to pay VAT

Barnet's first two academies are funded slightly differently in that the LACSEG has not been recouped from us. All new academies set up from 1st September will trigger a reduction in the council's retained school budget. If the reduction cannot be absorbed it will be carried forward as an overspend into the following year.

Consultation on School Funding 2011-12: Introducing a Pupil Premium

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is: 18 October 2010

Your comments must reach us by that date.



THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Education e-consultation website (<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>).

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential. ☐

Reason for confidentiality:

Name Carol Beckman
Organisation (if applicable) London Borough of Barnet
Address: Building 4
North London Business Park
Oakleigh Road South
London N11 1NP

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either:

Juliet Yates on: telephone: 020 7340 8313 e-mail:
juliet.yates@education.gsi.gov.uk, or
Ian McVicar on: telephone: 020 7340 7980 e-mail:
ian.mcvicar@education.gsi.gov.uk

If you have a query relating to the consultation process you can contact the
Consultation Unit on telephone: 0870 000 2288 or email:
consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Please select **ONE** category which best describes you as a respondent:

<input type="checkbox"/> School	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Trade Union/Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Early Years Setting
<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

--

1 Do you agree it is right to give a higher premium to areas that currently receive less per pupil funding? [Paras 24 - 27]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

The documentation does not explain the reasoning behind the aim of having a single national rate per disadvantaged pupil (subject to ACA). Neither does it explain how each LA's deprivation funding is to be calculated e.g. is it based on historical allocations before Spend Plus? Does it include Standards Funds? If so which ones?

The process of moving from the current deprivation funding to the national Pupil Premium is expected to take several years, but if the method of calculating the DSG changes during that time, how will this affect the transition?

Having different pupil premiums in different LAs will mean that a child who goes to school in one borough will benefit from one amount while the child next door who goes to school over the border will attract different funding and consequently LAs may wish to enter into a recoupment agreement. This would be an unwelcome added layer of bureaucracy.

Will the 'Pupil Premium' be defined as the additional funding on top of existing deprivation funding per child – or the whole amount, including what is already being received?

3 Do you agree the coverage of the pupil premium should include Looked After Children? [Paras 51 - 54]

☐

Yes

☐

No

x Not Sure

Comments: This all adds to the complexity of the school funding model and as the pupil premium is not ringfenced at school level, it might be better to rely on schools to direct support to children's needs rather than try to control it through the funding mechanism.

4 What are your views on the operation of the Looked After Children element of the pupil premium? In particular, how might the funding arrangements work at local authority level for pupils educated outside of the local authority with caring responsibility? [Paras 55 - 60]

Comments: We would not welcome an expansion of the recoupment system, especially as the pupil premium will vary between LAs, but it is difficult to see how the system could be managed equitably without. Perhaps schools, which generally only have a few LAC each, could invoice the caring local authority.

5 Do you think the coverage of the pupil premium should be extended to include additional support for Service children? [Paras 61 - 66]

☐

Yes

☐

No

x Not Sure

Comments: We understand that the intention here is to provide funding for emotional support for children who may be suffering the stress of a parent away on active service, but we are not convinced that the data is accurate enough at present. The census simply asks if the child is from a service family – yes or no (personnel status 1 or 2 which defines the relationship of the service personnel to the child). This would include any child whose parents are in the armed services, not just those on active service away from home. It would exclude the children of foreign military personnel and indeed those children who have emigrated to the UK from areas of unrest and have experienced war first hand. Again this may be introducing a level of complexity which is not necessarily targeting those most in need.

6 Should the pupil count for three year olds, used to allocate DSG for 2011-12, reflect actual take up or continue to reflect a minimum of 90% participation where lower? [Paras 75 - 76]

x Actual Take-Up

☐

90% Minimum

☐

Not Sure

Comments: Now that take-up by 3 year olds is increasing, this addition is not really necessary, especially as the number used for the population of 3 year olds is questionable. However, if the Spend Plus methodology is to remain for another year, this too should be deferred until the following year.

7 Should the pupil count used to allocate DSG for 2011-12 continue to reflect dual subsidiary registrations for pupils at pupil referral units? [Paras 77 - 78]

x Yes

☐

No

☐

Not Sure

Comments: Schools often need to keep places open for children at PRUs who may only be on a short term placement. As the LA has to fund both the mainstream and the PRU place, the LA should receive double funding.

8 Do you support our proposals for additional support for schools catering for Service children? [Para 79]

☐

Yes

☐

No

x Not Sure

Comments: Service children should only be targeted once – either as a discretionary amount or the Pupil Premium. Large scale movement of service families can be extremely disruptive to schools and in Barnet we recognise this with our mobility funding factor. Discretionary allocations to local authorities reduce the transparency and simplicity of the funding formula. At any time at least one local authority will be experiencing an upheaval in the local population through immigration, new housing estates or other development as well as through the relocation of service personnel and it could be seen as inequitable to favour one group over another.

9 Do you support our proposals for home educated pupils? [Para 80]

☐

Yes

x No

☐

Not Sure

Comments: Home educated pupils should represent more than 10% of a child – 20% would be more reasonable, representing 1 day per week of some kind of support

10 Do you think that there should be a cash floor at local authority level in 2011-12? [Para 85]

x Yes

☐

No

☐

Not Sure

Comments: LAs which have falling rolls cannot downsize their school estate overnight, so the cost per pupil is higher until schools have been rationalised. LAs need the protection of the cash floor.

11 Have you any further comments?

Comments:

1. Why is the Pupil Premium not due to start until September 2011? It would be easier for schools for it to cover the financial year. Will the level of the PP announced before April 2011 so schools can budget effectively?
2. Will the level of an Academy's PP be calculated on the same rate as the LA they are in?
3. Will there be additional money for a Post 16 Pupil Premium through the YPLA?
4. Although we know the PP will be outside the Schools Budget, will other specific grants of grants to education / LAs be top sliced to pay for it?
5. When will the review of Academy funding take place and who will be consulted?

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

☐

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

xYes

☐

No

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 794304 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 18 October 2010

Send by post to: School Funding Consultation 2011-12, Funding and Technology Unit, Department for Education, Level 3, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT.

Send by e-mail to: dsg.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

Item 6.4 Consultation with Schools Funding Formula for 2011/12

Author	Carol Beckman
---------------	----------------------

Position	Schools Funding Manager
-----------------	--------------------------------

Date	29th September 2010
-------------	----------------------------

This section will explain the draft consultation with schools ie:

Newly opening schools – additional funding

Early Years Funding Formula

Mainstreaming of grants

Item 7.1 Contracts Affecting Schools – for Information

Author	Ola Yerokun
---------------	--------------------

Position	Contracts Manager
-----------------	--------------------------

Date	29th September 2010
-------------	---------------------------------------

Following the last Schools Forum, an email was forwarded to the participating schools for their response to extending the cleaning contracts. Overall there was a 26 percent response rate, of which 89 percent were satisfied with the quality and price of the contract.

A further email was sent on 21 September 2010 stating the intention to take the extension. Schools that were not willing to continue with the contract were given until 30 September 2010 to express their intention and failure to do so could incur some fees. One school has since stated their expression to be excluded from the extension.

Item 7.2 Early Years Progress Report – for Information

Author	Carol Beckman
---------------	----------------------

Position	Schools Funding Manager
-----------------	--------------------------------

Date	29th September 2010
-------------	---------------------------------------

All providers, both maintained and private are now offering 15 hours early years provision to 3 and 4 year olds.

The private providers, childminders and children's centres have moved to the new funding formula which is based on estimates of pupil numbers until the termly headcount returns are received. Private settings have been given an 80% advance on the autumn term estimated funding and this will then be corrected with a balancing payment at the end of the year.

Maintained schools are being funded via a version of the new funding formula, excluding deprivation and the basic entitlement which they are currently receiving through the main school formula. This funding will be paid through the Standards Fund autopayment system.

The DfE recently issued a report on the pathfinder authorities which implemented their Early Years Single Funding Formula in April 2010. Barnet's formula compares well with these formulae.