

DATE & TIME OF MEETING:	Thursday 28 January 2016 @ 2pm
VENUE:	The Grand Meeting Room County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD
Please confirm attendance by e-mail to deborah.wilbor@northyorks.gov.uk or telephone 01609 532727.	

Important information for those attending:

Declaration of Interests

Members of the Education Partnership who have an interest in an agenda item beyond the generality of the group they represent are required to declare the existence and nature of that interest to the Chair prior to the start of the meeting. *Further information can be found in paragraph 13 of the constitution of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership.*

Voting

Voting on proposals in relation to the school and early years funding formulae may only be undertaken by (i) those listed as “Schools’ Members” on the Membership page of this agenda and (ii) the Early Years representative.

Where a phase-related de-delegation proposal requires a vote, only schools’ members representing schools within that phase may vote.

All members are entitled to vote on proposals other than those relating to the funding formulae.

Observers cannot vote on any proposal brought before the Education Partnership.

Voting requirements will be clearly identified in the agenda item.

Information only reports

Reports marked for information only will not, under normal circumstances, be presented to the Education Partnership. Any comments or questions arising from the report should be directed to the Clerk who will either (i) seek a response from the author or (ii) request their attendance in order to respond directly to the members of the Education Partnership.

General Public

Meetings of the Education Partnership are public meetings

The Chair will request that any members of the public leave the meeting for items marked as confidential and which involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local government Act 1972.

Further information can be found in paragraph 11 of the constitution of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership

DATE & TIME OF MEETING:	Thursday, 28 January 2016 @ 2pm
VENUE:	The Grand Meeting Room County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD
Please confirm attendance by e-mail to deborah.wilbor@northyorks.gov.uk telephone 01609 532727.	

Agenda

Part 1: Procedural

Item	Title	Lead
1.1	Welcome and apologies	Chair
1.2	Membership update	Chair
1.3	Minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising	Chair
1.4	Notification of other urgent business	Chair

Part 2: School Organisation

Item	Title	Lead
2.1	Draft School Organisation Strategy	Carolyn Bird

Part 3: School Funding

Item	Title	Lead
3.1	Funding Update and the impact of the Spending Review	P Dwyer/A Hodge
3.2	School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block	A Hodge/H Coulthard
3.3	School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block	H Coulthard
3.4	School Budgets 2016-17: The High Needs Block	A Hodge
3.5	Review of Balances Control Scheme	H Coulthard
3.6	Traded Services update	Anton Hodge / Ian Yapp

Part 4: School Improvement

Item	Title	Lead
4.1	Improvement Partnerships Reports (i) Early Years (ii) Primary (iii) Secondary (iv) Special	Jill Hodges

Part 5: Future Agendas

Dates of future meetings	Title
9 March 2016	School Contributions to Capital Schemes – Final Proposal DfE Consultation on Policy and Funding
26 May 2016	Pupil Growth Fund Update
15 September 2016	
20 October 2016	

Membership

Schools Members (29)			
Headteachers (16)			
Primary	Tammy Cooper	Ruswarp CoE VC Primary School	Jan 2020
Primary	Ian Clennan	Selby Community Primary School	Dec 2017
Primary	Rachel Wells	West Heslerton CE Primary School	Dec 2017
Primary	Ian Yapp	Riverside Community Primary School	Jan 2018
Primary	David Barber	Hambleton CoE Primary School	Aug 2019
Primary	Vacancy		
Primary	Vacancy		
Primary	Vacancy		
Secondary (Chair)	Carl Sugden	King James's School	Nov 2016
Secondary	Michele Costello	Settle College	Sep 2017
Secondary	Mark McCandless	Ryedale School	May 2018
Secondary (IP Chair)	Rob Pritchard	St John Fisher Catholic High School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Sue Whelan	Eskdale School	Aug 2019
Secondary	Vacancy		
Special	Hanne Barton	The Dales Special School	Nov 2016
Nursery	Jane Pepper	Childhaven Nursery	Aug 2019
School Governors (8)			
Primary	Vacancy		
Primary	Ken Blackwood	Appleton Wiske Primary School	Oct 2019
Primary	Helen Flynn	Hookstone Chase Primary School	May 2017
Primary	Jim Martin	Newby and Scalby Primary School	Nov 2017
Primary	Geoff Archer	Applegarth Primary School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Denise Powley	Lady Lumley's School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Gerry Price	Bedale High School	Apr 2019
Secondary	Rosemary Rees	Settle College	Nov 2016
Academy Representatives (4)			
Secondary	Andrew Cummings	South Craven Academy	Sep 2016
Secondary	John Barker	Skipton Girls' High School	Dec 2017

Special	Annette Fearn	The Woodlands Special School	Aug 2019
PRS	tbc	The Grove Academy	Aug 2019

Pupil Referral Service Representative (1)

PRS	Les Bell	Selby PRS	Oct 2018
-----	----------	-----------	----------

Non-Schools Members (6)

Early Years	Gill Hunton	Osmotherley Pre-School	Aug 2019
RC Diocese	Vacancy		
CoE Diocese	Vacancy		
Unison	Stella Smethurst		Dec 2016
Teachers Unions	Chris Head		Dec 2019
16-19 Providers	Debra Forsythe-Conroy	Harrogate College	Aug 2018

Observers (4)

County Councillor	Arthur Barker	Lead Member for schools, 16-19 year old education and early years provision
County Councillor	Janet Sanderson	Lead Member for children's services, special needs, youth justice, youth service and adult education
EFA Observer	Keith Howkins	Education Funding Agency
	Stephen Payne	Teachers' Association

Vacancy Update:

Primary headteachers – 3

Secondary headteachers – 1

Primary School Governors - 1

Non-schools vacancies - 2



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	Minutes of the Education Partnership – 15 October 2015
Type of report: Delete as required	For information only
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	The minutes of the previous meeting of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership are presented for approval.
Budget / Risk implications:	N/A
Recommendations:	The minutes are approved as an accurate record.
Voting requirements:	N/A
Appendices: To be attached	N/A
Report originator and contact details:	Jayne Laver – former Clerk to the NYEP Tel: 01609 534416 E-mail: jayne.laver@northyorks.gov.uk
Presenting officer: If not the originator	N/A

PRESENT:

Chair:	Carl Sugden
Primary Headteachers:	Ian Clennan, Rachel Wells & Ian Yapp
Secondary Headteachers:	Mark McCandless, Rob Pritchard & Sue Whelan
Nursery headteacher:	Jane Pepper
Special Headteacher:	Hanne Barton
Pupil Referral Service:	Les Bell
Academies:	Andrew Cummings
Governors:	Primary: Geoff Archer, Ken Blackwood, Helen Flynn & Jim Martin Secondary: Rosemary Rees
Early Years Providers:	Gill Hunton
Trade Unions:	Emma Hoddinott
Observers:	County Councillor Arthur Barker Chris Head
In Attendance:	Carolyn Bird, Helen Coulthard, Pete Dwyer, Anton Hodge, Jayne Laver, Jane le Sage & Wendy Ripley
Apologies:	David Barber, Michele Costello, John Barker, Annette Fearn, Denise Powley, Gerry Price, Josie Guinness & County Councillor Janet Sanderson

660: WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted.

661: MEMBERSHIP OF THE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

David Gill's membership has come to an end and Ken Blackwood's current term is due to end before the next meeting of the Partnership. Efforts are underway to recruit to these two positions.

The closing date for nominations to fill the three primary headteacher and one secondary headteacher vacancies is Friday 16th October 2015.

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015

The Chair highlighted the difficulties being experienced in recruiting headteachers to the Partnership and asked for support from current members to fill the vacancies.

The Diocesan and Trade Union vacancies have still to be resolved.

The Grove Academy has still to nominate their representative and engage with the Partnership. Communications are being sent to the academy.

662: MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED – the minutes were approved as an accurate record.

663: MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

664: NOTIFICATION OF OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no notifications of other urgent business for consideration.

665: NYEP MEETING DATES 2016

The dates of meetings for the 2016 calendar year were proposed with the option to start meetings up to an hour earlier. It was felt that an earlier start would restrict participation as those headteachers with teaching commitments and those who had to travel some distance would find it particularly difficult to manage it.

All meetings will take place in the Grand Meeting Room at County Hall, Northallerton.

RESOLVED – that the following dates were endorsed for meetings of the Partnership in 2016 and that the start time would remain as 2pm:

- **Thursday 28 January**
- **Wednesday 9 March**
- **Thursday 26 May**
- **Thursday 15 September**
- **Thursday 20 October**

666: REPORTS OF THE IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIPS**(i) EARLY YEARS IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP**

Report author: Jane Pepper (Chair)

Helen Flynn noted that of all the data included in the report, the most telling was the statistical neighbour ranking where North Yorkshire sat in the bottom half. In response, Mrs Pepper advised that the aim is to

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015

improve both outcomes and rankings as these issues begin to be addressed. The large number of small settings makes community development so important. The focus is very much on identifying the areas where the gap is the greatest and what the common issues are. The Chair questioned how, given the sheer range of providers, those hard to reach settings were identified and approached. The distribution structure is key as is increasing the number of leads and practitioners in targeted areas to develop relationships and a shared responsibility at community level to focus on what can make a difference to the outcomes of young children. Gill Hunton, a lead practitioner, added that community hub meetings have commenced and have been relatively well attended although it is hoped that word of mouth will result in increased attendance and participation.

Jim Martin highlighted that for large primary schools, a large number of feeder providers can result in a significant differentiation in standards. Ken Blackwood questioned what advice and support in relation to improving outcomes was available to the following phases when children transition. Collaboration and engagement at a local level is the pragmatic approach with link governors for early years getting involved in establishing links with the PVI sector.

Rachel Wells added that care had to be taken as data could affect inclusion.

(ii) **PRIMARY IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP**

Report author: Wendy Ripley (Chair)

Rosemary Rees asked how the good work being undertaken was being disseminated to the wider school community. The IP Chair has written to all headteachers to introduce herself and information will be disseminated through the school improvement networks and regular bulletins.

In response to a question from Rachel Wells, Jill Hodges advised that further work was needed to ensure that internal NYCC services were joined up and working alongside the improvement partnerships so reducing any duplication or conflict.

Jill Hodges acknowledged that the methods of communication needed reviewing to ensure that all schools were and felt involved.

(iii) **SECONDARY IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP**

Report author: Rob Pritchard (Chair)

In terms of the School Direct partnerships across the region, the Chair asked whether it was known who and where they were and to what extent the Improvement Partnership was working with them. Jill Hodges advised that an exercise was required to map across and beyond the County Council the location and nature of these partnerships so that a cohesive landscape for school improvement can be identified and tapped into.

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015

Emma Hoddinott queried the role of support staff in contributing to the priorities for the IP identified in the report. Rob Pritchard acknowledged that it was becoming apparent that support for the whole school community was required in order to effectively address these priorities.

(iv) **SPECIAL SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP**

Report presented by Hanne Barton who advised that although the Special School headteachers had been meeting regularly for many years, the focus of these meetings had not been on school improvement. The IP was now addressing this. She advised the Partnership that the way in which data was used in other phases did not translate as well to the Special phase. The IP has identified specific support needs particularly around preparing evidence for Ofsted and the further developing of links to support, advise and share best practice with other mainstream settings phases where children with high needs are being educated. National support on measuring the progress of special school children was being progressed.

Ken Blackwood highlighted the clear correlation between school funding and pupil outcomes.

RESOLVED – that the Partnership noted the contents of the reports and requested that future reports include details of the membership of each improvement partnership as well as addressing how allocated funding was being utilised.

667: REPORT FROM THE TASK AND FINISH GROUP

Report prepared by: Anton Hodge (Assistant Director – Strategic Resources)

Purpose of report: to feedback to the Partnership on the meeting of the task and finish group with The Key as part of a procurement discovery session.

Concerns were raised by the Partnership with regard to (i) the focus on The Key as the only option available and (ii) the use of Reserves to fund the cost.

Members of the task and finish group, Geoff Archer and Ian Yapp acknowledged that it appeared to be a viable product and welcomed a channelled source of material but felt that it looked as if it would be a “bolt-on” to existing communication and information channels. The feeling was that discovery sessions were needed with other potential providers to see what was available on the market.

Anton Hodge clarified that the recommendation to the Partnership was to undertake a formal procurement exercise which would enable other providers to bid.

Rosemary Rees whose school subscribes to The Key said that whilst it was a good resource, it was expensive. She felt that a coordinated communication approach was needed.

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015

Ian Yapp questioned whether there was a precedent for using Reserves for such procurements and the Chair suggested that it was going against the direction of travel when the Partnership is making different decisions about delegation and de-delegation.

Les Bell, acknowledging that 20% of schools in the county are subscribing to The Key suggested that an understanding as to why they were purchasing it was required and whether cost was an issue for the other 80% of schools.

Emma Hoddinott questioned the nature of the advice available on The Key due to concerns that it would conflict with local advice. In response to both Ms Hoddinott and Jim Martin, Pete Dwyer clarified that such a procurement exercise would add value and enhance rather than replace existing resources by providing schools with access to the best advice available nationally.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION –

Due to the concerns raised, the recommendation was made that officers should undertake further work on this proposal, that no decision on the funding of any procurement would be made at this stage and reference to The Key would be removed.

RESOLVED -

The Partnership endorsed the revised recommendation.

668: SCHOOL ORGANISATION UPDATE

Report prepared by: Suzanne Firth (Strategic Planning Manager)

Report presented by: Carolyn Bird (Assistant Director – Prevention and Commissioning)

Purpose of report: to provide the latest position statement with regard to school organisation.

Carolyn Bird advised that a school organisation strategy was planned for publication in the future.

Ken Blackwood questioned the opportunities for realigning catchment areas in order to address capacity issues. Ms Bird advised that careful assessment was needed to ensure that any change in catchment area did not severely impact parental choice. She added that there was no guarantee that such a change would result in the provision of the required places.

In response to Chris Head, Jill Hodges confirmed that data was available on the levels of school improvement as a result of federating and confederating. However, Carolyn Bird advised that such reorganisations did not always guarantee school improvement.

RESOLVED –

That the Partnership noted the contents of the report.

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015**669: SCHOOL FUNDING 2016-17**

Report prepared by: Helen Coulthard (Head of Finance - Schools and Projects)

Purpose of report: to propose changes to the split site factor and the pre-opening costs funding for a new primary school.

In response to Ken Blackwood, it was clarified that the proposal related to two sites.

RESOLVED –

The partnership endorsed the following recommendations:

- i. To agree the revision of the split site factor for 2016-17 to incorporate an element for schools operating on more than two sites;
- ii. To agree that for 2016-17 the EYFSP results for September 2013, 2014 and 2015 be weighted and that the amount per pupil for children not achieving a good level of development be kept at £509; and
- iii. To agree that the amount allocated for pre-opening costs for a new primary school be increased to £60k for 2016-17.

670: SCHOOL BALANCES 2014-15

Report prepared by: Helen Coulthard (Head of Finance - Schools and Projects) and Nick Reast (Accounting Technician – Integrated Finance)

Purpose of report: to summarise the position relating to school balances as at 31 March 2015 and to seek the Partnerships views in relation to proposals regarding three schools which have exceeded the Balances Control limit.

School 1: In response to Hanne Barton's question, Helen Coulthard advised that 2015-16 would be the first year in which the school had projected an in-year deficit during the four year period in which the balances had been monitored. In response to Rachel Wells, Mrs Coulthard advised that it was not known whether a change in school leadership had led to a concerted effort to reduce the excessive balance in 2015-16.

In response to Chris Head, Helen Coulthard advised that schools had access to a loan scheme for capital works and a Falling Rolls Contingency to reduce the need to make costly redundancies when pupil projections showed that the pupil roll was expected to increase in the near future. She added that the loan scheme had few investors and that DSG Reserves were sufficient to cover the needs of the scheme.

RESOLVED –

That the Partnership endorsed the recommendations to:

- i. Remove £1.2k of School 1's revenue balance having taken into account the projected in-year deficit position for 2015-16 to leave them with a projected revenue balance of 15% at 31 March 2016.
- ii. Not remove any balance from School 2 at this stage in recognition of the school's attempts to use the surplus balance to secure removal

Minutes of the NYEP meeting held on 15 October 2015

from special measures but to advise the school that any revenue balance over 15% at 31 March 2016 may be subject to claw back.

- iii. Not remove any balance from School 3 at this stage in recognition of the school's plans to make a revenue contribution to capital but to seek assurance that the planned purchase has taken place and the associated revenue contribution transferred.

680: OTHER BUSINESS

Pete Dwyer informed the Partnership that this meeting constituted the last for the current Clerk following the restructure of the Finance function across the County Council. Mr Dwyer thanked the Clerk for the support provided to the Schools Forum and the North Yorkshire Education Partnership since taking over in September 2008.

Alternative support will be in place for the January 2016 meeting.

681: DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Thursday 28 January

Wednesday 9 March

Thursday 26 May

Thursday 15 September

Thursday 20 October

Jayne Laver

16 October 2015



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	Draft Schools Strategy
Type of report: Delete as required	For information and comment
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	This paper lays out the strategic position of the local authority regarding the planning of school places.
Budget / Risk implications:	
Recommendations:	The views of North Yorkshire Education Partnership would be welcomed
Voting requirements:	
Appendices: To be attached	Draft Schools Strategy
Report originator and contact details:	Carolyn Bird Assistant Director: Strategy and Commissioning Ext 2147
Presenting officer: If not the originator	



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To seek the views of the Partnership on the draft Schools Strategy.

2 BACKGROUND

The draft strategy lays out the position of the local authority in relation to its key statutory duty for the provision of high quality school places. In doing that it articulates the complex school planning environment in which we operate.

Headteachers and governors have asked for a clear statement of the authority's position regarding how we plan provision, view the status of schools and how we support schools in looking at the future.

The Draft Strategy will be considered by the Executive Member for Schools and subject to his agreement will be publicised more generally with schools and governing bodies.

3. RECOMMENDATION

The views of the North Yorkshire Education Partnership would be welcomed on the Draft Schools Strategy.

Pete Dwyer: Corporate Director for Children and Young People's Services

Report author: Carolyn Bird: Assistant Director Strategy and Commissioning
19 January 2016

DRAFT SCHOOLS STRATEGY

The quality of education available to children and young people in North Yorkshire is of paramount importance. Access to education is a right of every child; the provision of sufficient high quality school places is a statutory duty on local authorities, and the quality of the education provided by those schools is a joint responsibility of school leaders, governors and the local authority.

OUR PRINCIPLES

- We aim to have all pupils attending a good or outstanding school or setting, with high quality outcomes for all children, no matter what their circumstances
- We believe strongly in the importance of strong school leadership and governance in creating strong and sustainable schools
- We have an expectation that all schools will be working in demonstrably effective partnerships with other schools
- We recognise the importance of schools to community life, particularly in rural areas, but also acknowledge that it is not always right to retain schools where they cannot sustainably deliver a high quality of education
- We acknowledge that the viability of schools should relate not only to their financial situation but also to how they may offer both the required breadth of curriculum and the social experiences children need
- We believe that removing transitions between different organisations can benefit learners through continuity and familiarity
- We understand the importance of being able to recruit and retain the best teachers and leaders and will promote and support strategies to support schools in this
- We respect diversity of provision and parental choice whilst acknowledging that geography and economics may make provision of that impractical
- We welcome and support new models of delivery which lead to improved outcomes
- We are committed to the local authority and local schools bringing together their collective energy and resource to maintain educational coherence across our communities, together with diocesan authorities as appropriate

Our strategic view:

We actively support the development of local federations, single or cross-phase, which over time and at a pace which is right for those local circumstances, could evolve into other structural forms such as local multi-academy trusts.

We are clear that in some areas of growth, the development of new academies may be the way forward, rather than the expansion of existing schools. We will be sensitive to local views when making those decisions.

We are aware that the challenges facing some schools – at all phases – are too great to be addressed alone. We will if necessary take structural decisions for the greater good of quality education across an area. We would hope to do this wherever possible in partnership with the local school communities.

The local and national context

There is now greater variety in the manner and organisation of education in England than in any time since the 1944 Education Act.

Schools are able to select from a range of options about their future: conversely schools may be directed into a variety of arrangements by the Secretary of State.

As a local authority which has for decades championed significant delegation of resource and responsibilities to schools, North Yorkshire has no ideological position on the status of schools. What we do hold strongly is a view that schools should be in arrangements that offer the greatest possibility of securing high quality education for children, and that those arrangements should be appropriate and make sense for local communities.

There are already high standards of education across the county, which is something we celebrate, and we are encouraged by the rapid development of sector-led improvement, which is consolidating more widely through the work of the School Improvement Partnerships which came about after the work undertaken by the North Yorkshire Schools' Commission.

In "Young and Yorkshire" the plan for all children and young people in North Yorkshire, we collectively signed up to an aspiration that all children should be in good or outstanding schools. That was a challenging ambition, but we believe it is within our reach – if we work together across the education community. The **Schools' Commission** made it clear that we expect all schools to be working in partnership, and we are seeing that shared leadership, joint practice development and collaborative work is making a real and positive difference to outcomes.

We celebrate and welcome schools' leadership of their destiny. We do so within a view that in an area such as North Yorkshire, with all its challenges of geography and demography, individual school aspirations are best taken forward in local partnership. We are challenged in North Yorkshire by both the need for additional school places in and around our market and larger towns, and by the diminishing need for school places in many rural areas. Each scenario presents challenges for schools and for the county council. Each is best addressed in partnership with others and with a clear view as to the needs of the local population. We value the input of diocesan authorities across our area, the support they give to faith schools, their involvement in school improvement and in community leadership.

We want to see coherent local partnerships formed which provide local leadership and local accountability and quality education for local communities.

In our discussions with the Regional Schools' Commissioner we do not see capacity within existing Academy Trusts to be able to take on significant additional numbers of schools. The Chancellor has made a commitment to helping schools to become academies by 2020. Whether this is just secondary schools, or all schools, is open to debate, the capacity nationally is not as yet there even for secondaries. The additional financial resources originally available to converting academies is not at previous levels, and academies are facing the same funding constraints as other schools. The imposition of a national funding formula will no doubt further erode any lingering financial advantage.

So our view is that we would wish to see schools considering the future carefully and examining possibilities based on a clear understanding of the local position, shared with the local authority.

QUALITY IN SCHOOLS

The influences on the delivery of high quality education are many and various:

- Quality of leadership and governance
- Quality of teaching
- Funding of schools
- Quality of the built environment
- Quality of the taught curriculum
- The health and emotional well-being of the children and young people
- Quality and accessibility of support services

SCHOOL PLACES IN NORTH YORKSHIRE

North Yorkshire faces an unprecedented situation with a growing primary school population largely concentrated in towns, combined with some rural parts of the County where numbers are still declining. In the coming years the growth in pupil numbers will feed into the secondary sector which is currently facing in many places its lowest pupil rolls for a decade. Post 16 numbers will continue to decline for the next couple of years.

This volatile demographic position means that at the same time as implementing a programme of school expansions and opening new school sites it is necessary to address the challenges faced by a significant number of very small schools, both primary and secondary.

The current school funding arrangements are likely to be challenging for all schools in coming years and there will need to be a proactive approach to creating sustainable structures in areas where schools are struggling with combinations of low numbers, challenging finances, difficulties recruiting and retaining staff and governors and declining educational standards.

CREATING ADDITIONAL PLACES

One of the key strategic issues which will continue to affect school organisation in North Yorkshire over the next few years will be the growth in demand for primary school places as a result of population growth, housing development and major army re-basing plans. We will only be able to continue to meet our statutory duty to provide sufficient places if we continue to invest in expanding schools or building new ones.

We are currently delivering a £58 million capital investment programme which will provide up to 1700 additional places by September 2017. This includes the development of two new school sites and some major expansions, as well as some smaller scale school expansions. One, at Staynor Hall in Selby, will be the first wholly new sponsored academy to be built in North Yorkshire but others are likely to follow in Northallerton, Thirsk, Harrogate, Catterick and Norton.

There are a further 21 potential projects identified where initial options and feasibility assessments are being undertaken. This includes a number of further new school sites arising from major housing and some large scale expansions. A further allocation of just over £1 million has been made to North Yorkshire for 2017/18. Priority needs greatly exceed this and the County Council will consider how it can resource the level of demand by putting in funding directly from its own reserves.

There are 18 key areas of growth anticipated in North Yorkshire by 2018. The position is being monitored closely as it is very sensitive to the speed with which particular housing developments advance. The level of planning applications for new housing has reached an unprecedented level compared with recent years. Multiple negotiations are in progress to secure developer contributions through s106 or Community Infrastructure Levy funding.

In time this growth will feed through into secondary school places. At present the only two areas showing potential shortfalls of secondary school places are Knaresborough and Boroughbridge, both of which attract students from neighbouring catchment areas in significant numbers. The position will continue to be monitored and where additional secondary places are required discussions will be initiated with schools and academies about expansion.

The position in Harrogate will be affected by the rebuilding of Harrogate High School on a significantly smaller footprint with a reduced capacity.

The ability of Academies to admit above their admission number and to expand their size and/or age range will impact on the number of places available as will any government approved provision such as UTCs, studio schools or free schools.

THE CHALLENGES FACING SMALL SCHOOLS

North Yorkshire has a relatively high number of small schools compared with other local authorities. This has long been a challenge affecting the organisation of education in this area. Whilst many of them provide a good or outstanding education, this is as inconsistent as it is in other groupings of schools, and the vulnerabilities associated with them are without doubt greater than in larger schools. This was recognised in a peer review of school improvement services carried out in 2015.

There are a number of very small primary schools (with fewer than 50 pupils) with declining rolls which continue to be monitored in terms of viability. In the past few years there have been a number of closures of small primary schools. The County Council has a long history of supporting small schools and will continue to do so where schools are of high quality and where they are necessary to ensure the availability of accessible school places. However, sometimes a school closure is unavoidable and may represent the most appropriate solution to declining numbers and budgets impacting on educational quality.

The challenges facing small schools are a combination of low pupil rolls, financial viability, difficulties recruiting headteachers and variable educational standards. These factors interact with each other. It is often the schools experiencing a combination of these challenges which are the most vulnerable.

This is not only a challenge for small primary schools but also for smaller secondary schools. Funding arrangements are creating a particular challenge for small sixth forms.

Not all very small school schools have faced immediate financial difficulties. A number have been protected from a deficit position as a result of the minimum funding guarantee and/or the operation of the sparsity factor. Others have been relying on revenue balances carried forward acting as a buffer. However some of these balances are now reaching the point of exhaustion and these schools will face deficits in the coming years.

The current assessment from schools themselves is that by March 2017, 87 schools will be in a deficit budget situation. This number may increase further due to continuing pressures on funding.

These schools will need, with the support of the local authority, to seek solutions to their financial vulnerability. Governors will need to consider carefully how they can balance the books through

reducing costs. In some cases the local authority and/or governors may conclude that a school should close. In other cases it could be that creating larger more sustainable structures which can benefit from economies of scale could be an appropriate solution.

Whilst many small schools are offering a good quality of education even in the face of low numbers and challenged finances, solutions for small schools need to take account not just of the quality of what is on offer now, but also whether that is likely to continue to be the case in the future.

The concern is always that as numbers reduce alongside budgets the school's ability to deliver a broad educational and social experience for children diminishes. Schools with poor Ofsted judgements or below average outcomes may rapidly become unpopular with parents, creating a downward spiral of falling rolls, reducing budgets and a struggle to retain good leaders and to make improvements. This spiral can operate in the reverse direction when standards are seen to improve.

SUPPORTING COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Experience with the first wave of collaborations between schools is indicating that informal collaborations which retain individual governing bodies at each school are unlikely to sustain small schools on a long term basis. They create a significant challenge for shared Headteachers who remain accountable to multiple governing bodies.

It is our view that "hard" federations or other structural solutions are a more secure and sustainable structure for small schools.

Whilst school to school support and partnership is essentially for schools themselves, the local authority is proactive in promoting this and in making available advice and guidance, including support through partnership conferences, dissemination of good practice and toolkits to help governors and school leaders explore these options. Where potential arrangements are particularly complex and/or sensitive, Local Authority officers help to broker these discussions and to advise on collaboration and federation processes.

The Strategic Planning section within CYPS is the first point of contact on all school organisation issues co-ordinating support from other teams such as Education and Skills, HR, Governor Support and Finance.

REMOVING TRANSITIONS

There has been a longstanding recognition that transitions between educational establishments can result in dips in educational attainment. As a result schools which do not offer the full primary or secondary age range have been vulnerable in terms of their outcomes and Ofsted judgements.

North Yorkshire actively encourages amalgamations which remove unnecessary transitions and over recent years has carried out a number of these, predominantly in response to school standards issues but also to alleviate concerns over finances, pupil numbers and leadership.

There are 15 remaining infant and junior schools in the county where amalgamation may be an appropriate response over time as the position develops in these schools.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

A review of services for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, including enhanced mainstream provisions as well as special schools and pupil referral services will over time lead to structural change. This is work in progress and proposals will emerge in due course.

Pupil numbers in special schools are starting to grow which may have an impact on accommodation. No funding is available from government to address shortfalls in special school accommodation so this would have to be locally resourced.

EARLY YEARS

Children aged 2-4 have an entitlement to varying hours of high quality childcare and early years education. In an area such as North Yorkshire provision of early years places on an economic basis can be challenging. It is important to consider the early years provision in an area when wider issues of school organisation are being considered, including the provision of new schools. It is important to get the balance right between school involvement and providing the right environment for very young children. North Yorkshire Children and Young People's Service has responsibilities for early years which extend across the maintained, private, voluntary and independent sectors and should always be consulted when early years provision is being considered.

FURTHER INFORMATION AND ADVICE

North Yorkshire: Guide to models of school organisation/collaboration. Detailed information on alternative models of working has been published and is available on the North Yorkshire CYPS website at www.northyorks.gov.uk ##### This includes a toolkit for governing bodies to use to frame their thinking.

It also includes references to good practice elsewhere, nationally and internationally.

The Strategic Planning team within the Strategy and Commissioning Unit provide further advice and support when governing bodies have committed to developing new ways of working. Contact: ####

DfE Guidance on academies may be found at: www.gov.uk #####

January 2016



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review
Type of report: Delete as required	For information and discussion
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	<p>This paper sets out information regarding two important announcements made by the Chancellor late last year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Autumn Statement (25 November) • the Local Government Financial Settlement (17 December) <p>Both contained important information regarding schools and LA funding and also future policy issues.</p> <p>The paper also picks up the Director's reference in his end of term message to schools regarding the future of schools and academy trusts.</p> <p>It is intended to compliment the paper on School Strategy and should be read alongside that.</p>
Budget / Risk implications:	
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposals.
Voting requirements:	N/A
Appendices: To be attached	None
Report originator and contact details:	<p>Anton Hodge, Assistant Director – Strategic Resources anton.hodge@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 532118</p>
Presenting officer: If not the originator	

Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review**1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 This paper sets out information regarding two important announcements made by the Chancellor late last year. These were
- the Autumn Statement – 25 November
 - the Local Government Financial Settlement – 17 December
- 1.2 Both contained important information regarding schools and LA funding and also future policy issues.
- 1.3 The paper also picks up the Director's reference in his end of term message to schools regarding recent policy announcements and their possible local implications. It is intended to compliment the paper on School Strategy and should be read alongside that.

2 DSG Funding

- 2.1 The Government's announcements at the end of last year confirmed that there would be no increase to the DSG funding units for 2016-17. This means that the additional £9.8m allocated in the 2015-16 Schools Block will continue as part of mainstreamed funding.
- 2.2 There will also be consultation early in 2016 on a new way of funding Local Authorities and schools. A National Funding Formula will, if adopted, redistribute funding levels around the country for the entire DSG (including High Needs and Early Years), although it is unclear what impact this will have on the formulae used to calculate individual school budgets. There will be transitional arrangements but further details are not yet available.
- 2.3 The Chancellor also announced that
- "The government will help schools to make savings on procurement, including by exploiting economies of scale. In 2016 the government will publish a set of specific actions to support school leaders target over £1 billion a year in procurement savings by the end of the parliament through benchmarking, guidance and improved framework contracts."*

We await details with interest.

3. Childcare

- 3.1 The Autumn Statement confirmed that free childcare for **working families** of 3- and 4- year-olds would be doubled from 15 to 30 hours per week from September 2017. Although the current 15 hours per week will remain for all 3- and 4-year-olds, the additional service will be available to families where both parents are working (or the sole parent is working in a lone parent family) and each parent earns a weekly minimum equivalent to 16 hours at minimum/living wage, and less than £100k per year.
- 3.2 The new rates announced included an assumption of a national average of £4.88 per hour for 3- and 4-year-olds and £5.39 per hour for 2 year olds.
- 3.3 The existing arrangements for 2-year-olds will continue.

Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review

4. Capital

4.1 A recognition of demographic pressures was shown in the announcement that £23bn would be provided over the course of this parliament for 600,000 additional school places. However this money will also cover the opening of 500 new free schools as well as essential maintenance and is approximately £1bn less than that spent during the previous parliament.

4.2 As a comparison, the funding levels for previous years are shown below:

	£bn
2009-10	7.4
2010-11	7.0
2011-12	5.0
2012-13	4.3
2013-14	3.6
2014-15	5.0
2015-16	4.6
2016-17	5.2
2017-18	4.6
2018-19	4.4
2019-20	4.4

5. Education Services Grant (ESG)

5.1 In the Autumn Statement, the chancellor announced savings of around £600 million from the Education Services Grant (ESG), including phasing out the additional funding schools (academies) receive. This equates to around 75% of the total grant at a national level. This was linked to the statement that the government would reduce the local authority role in running schools and remove a number of statutory duties. The government will consult on policy and funding proposals early this year. Most commentators suggest that this is code for saying that there will be a White Paper, possibly with Green edges followed by a significant Education Bill in the next session of Parliament in late 2016.

5.2 The Statement was not clear how an increase in academy conversion numbers would lead to savings. The ESG is paid at a flat rate to both academies and LAs to cover the costs of services such as school improvement, redundancies, education welfare and asset management. When a school converts, the funding simply transfers to the academy. However in the December settlement, the Chancellor confirmed that the rate paid to both LAs and academies would reduce by approximately 12% in 2016-17 with further cuts to come.

5.3 Mr Osborne said the government wanted to complete the “academy revolution” and “help every secondary school become an academy”, adding that he wanted local authorities running schools to be “a thing of the past”. The language of “all schools” and “all secondary schools” is used inconsistently. The question of how – whether by compulsion or not is also interesting - the Chancellor’s speech says we will “help every secondary school become an Academy”. It does not say we will “require”.

Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review

- 5.4 In response Roy Perry, chairman of the Local Government Association's children and young people's board, said the announcement that all schools will be helped towards academy status "dismisses the fact that over 80 per cent of council maintained schools are currently rated as 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted.
- 5.5 We have recently and relevantly also seen the publication of the 2015 Annual Report of Sir Michael Wilshaw in Ofsted who noted:
- "Of the 3,300 secondary schools in England, 2,000 are now academies, outside local authority control and formally accountable to the Department for Education. Sponsored academies no longer account for the largest proportion of schools with academy status; over the last five years almost 1,400 secondary schools, many of whom were previously good or outstanding schools, converted to academy status under the Academies Act 2010. Overall, the best performing sponsor-led academies are those that have been open for five years or more. 53% of secondary sponsor-led academies, many of whom were previously failing schools, are now good or outstanding, 3% higher than last year. Secondary converter academies are continuing to perform well and are increasingly working with weaker schools in their local areas through becoming sponsors or through informal arrangements. However 99 converter academies in 2014-15 declined from good or outstanding to less than good."*
- 5.6 The HMCI concludes that the continued promotion of the academy policy can create the conditions for dramatic improvements but '*structural reform can only do so much...we must ensure that schools have the capacity to use their freedoms effectively*'.
- 5.7 In the Director's message to Headteachers and Chairs of Governors in December 2015 he said:
- "I am very concerned that the Chancellor's announcements, without a clear timeline, may create an added sense of urgency and possibly undue haste in the deliberations of individual schools. The desire to control one's own destiny is understandable and admirable but all, at the same time, are keen to ensure we retain an important focus on place/locality and avoid unhealthy unplanned fragmentation. We know from our discussions with the Regional Schools Commissioner that there is not the capacity in existing academy trusts to cope with significant expansion. Let us collectively reflect on the Green Paper expected in the New Year. We will certainly be keen to work with schools, and through the Education Partnership, to develop and champion coherent structural options/solutions. It cannot make sense to see towns where secondary schools are part of different Academy Trusts, with head offices distant from the local area, when a joined up quality alternative could have been created. I would welcome your initial thoughts and I am keen to open this discussion at Secondary SIN and Primary Leadership Network meetings and through the Education Partnership in the Spring Term."*
- 5.8 Our understanding is that the consultation is planned to be launched in February 2016. It is expected to present a wide range of possibilities for the continuing role of LAs in education and possible timescales for any changes. Most options describe a continued role around admissions, place planning, SEND and safeguarding. Any role around school improvement directly is less clear. The role of Schools Forums is also expected to be included. The outcomes of the consultation are anticipated in the summer of 2016 and implementation commencing April 2017.

Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review

5.9 The consultation will also include national funding proposals for all blocks of the DSG. This will probably lead to a formula approach for funding High Needs – rather than the current method which is based on historic local decisions.

6.0 Impact on the County Council’s Budget

6.1 Although the NYEP has no formal responsibilities in this respect, the following sections are included to inform schools about the impact of the settlement on the Council’s Budget, which continues to fund many services used by, or which impact on, schools. This is the budget which pays for such services as:

- Education Psychology and the assessment process for SEN
- Home to School Transport
- School Improvement
- Education Welfare
- Youth services
- Safeguarding
- Children’s Social Care
- Redundancy costs in schools
- Family Support
- Youth Justice
- Children’s Centres

6.2 The Local Government Financial Settlement was much tougher than had been expected following the Chancellor’s statement made only a few weeks earlier. Expectation had been raised not just by the summary of overall figures but also the ability of some Councils to raise Council Tax by an extra 2% to cover adult social care costs. However in reality overall funding (including this extra 2%) has been redistributed to inner London and metropolitan districts, as shown below.

Type of Authority	Revenue Support Grant		
	16-17 Flat LA Change	16-17 Consultation Value	16-17 Redistributional Effect
	£m	£m	£m
English Upper-tier	6,484.717	6,448.155	-36.562
SCT Members	2,173.541	1,986.384	-187.157
Shire Counties	1,805.519	1,644.860	-160.659
Unitaries	1,524.780	1,503.117	-21.663
Metropolitan Districts	1,832.421	1,925.013	92.592
Inner London (inc City)	633.098	686.538	53.439
Outer London	688.899	688.626	-0.272

	RSG Flat Reduction	2016/17 Value	Redistribution Loss	2% Social Care Precept	Net Effect
North Yorkshire	44,231	37,370	(6,861)	4,836	(2,025)
Westminster	52,184	57,851	+5,667	922	+6,589

RSG Flat Reduction is the amount we would have expected under the normal share of cuts

Funding Update and the Impact of the Spending Review

- 6.3 North Yorkshire has received the 5th worst settlement of all the shire counties and longer term this means that the County will face the total elimination of government grant by 2019-20.
- 6.4 Before this news, the Council's MTFs (2020) programme had expected cuts of £75.4m for the period 2015-19. Although final figures have not yet been received, this is expected to be higher and could be as high as £82.5m, with a revised profile meaning that more needs to be found in the first two years of the period.
- 6.5 For comparative purposes, the Council's gross budget (excluding schools) in 2015-16 is £479.4 (£364.5m net after grants). The £82.5m would be in addition to the £91.1m reduction already made in 2011-15.
- 6.6 The Council's 2020 Programme is an ambitious one which seeks to fundamentally re-align the Council and make it fit for purpose beyond 2020. It is therefore much more than a simple savings programme – it contains major changes in how the Council will operate.
- 6.7 The scale of budget cuts required – and achieved to date, whilst maintaining service levels, has been a significant challenge. The objective has been to protect front-line services as much as possible, thus enabling a restructured Children and Young People's Service to operate effectively across its universal, preventative, targeted and acute service responsibilities, in line with legislation. Our programme has shifted the focus from direct delivery of universal provision to one which is targeted on those in the greatest levels of need whilst retaining our recognition of the importance of early intervention.
- 6.8 We have given priority to key statutory responsibilities to those children and young people who are at risk of harm and or in need of care and protection. The proposals do not see any reduction in social work capacity or its management.
- 6.9 Clearly the challenges will continue and CYPS will play its part in the work the Council now needs to undertake to identify how we will meet the gap which remains, while ensuring that the plans already agreed for the next few years remain on track.

7.0 Recommendations

- 7.1 NYEP members are asked to note the contents of this report and in particular to express their initial views on paragraph 5.7 and to hear of any feedback received by the Director to date. NYEP is also asked to consider what the next steps described in this paragraph may consist of.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	<p>This paper sets out the planned expenditure on the Schools Block Budget in 2016-17. The largest part of this budget is delegated funding to schools and there are a number of options which the Partnership is asked to consider to enable final decisions to be taken. Some of these were discussed at the meeting on October 2015, but a recommendation is also sought on an issue which has arisen since then concerning the funding through IDACI.</p> <p>The paper also suggests the use of one-off reserves to fund additional pupil numbers which will arise in-year and will not be funded by the DfE in 2016-17.</p> <p>A list of de-delegated and centrally-managed budgets is also set out for agreement. There is no change to these from 2015-16.</p>
Budget / Risk implications:	Impact on individual schools due to data changes, particularly the impact of the revised IDACI data set.
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership agrees the recommendations as set out in section 5
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	
Report originator and contact details:	Anton Hodge, Assistant Director – Strategic Resources anton.hodge@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 532118
Presenting officer: If not the originator	Anton Hodge and Helen Coulthard

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This paper sets out the planned expenditure on the Schools Block Budget in 2016-17. The largest part of this budget is delegated funding to schools and there are a number of options which the Partnership is asked to consider to enable final decisions to be taken. Some of these were discussed at the meeting on October 2015, but a recommendation is also sought on an issue which has arisen since then concerning the funding through IDACI.
- 1.2 The paper also suggests the use of one-off reserves to fund additional pupil numbers which will arise in-year and will not be funded by the DfE in 2016-17.
- 1.3 A list of de-delegated and centrally-managed budgets is also set out for agreement. There is no change to these from 2015-16.

2 DSG Allocations 2016-17

- 2.1 In 2013-14 the DSG was split into three blocks under revised arrangements for schools funding. These 3 blocks, which are indicative only and not ring-fenced, are:
- Schools
 - High Needs
 - Early Years
- 2.2 The amount currently allocated for 2016-17 is in line with expectations. Overall there has been an increase in the baseline figure of £2m to £395.2m. This is largely to do with increased pupil numbers in the primary sector. There has been no increase to the 2015-16 funding rate per pupil and therefore schools and other DSG-funded budgets remain under pressure.
- 2.3 The DfE has also allocated some additional funding across the country to assist with growing pressures in the High Needs budget. There has also been a deduction for place funding in Non Maintained Special Schools which will no longer be included in the DSG Baseline.
- 2.4 In summary therefore, the change in DSG (before adjustments for Early Years, Academies and other direct funding of High Needs Places by the Education Funding Agency) shows:

	£000
2015-16	393,249
Pupil Numbers increase	1,569
Net High Needs changes	<u>428</u>
2015-16	<u><u>395,246</u></u>

- 2.5 The final allocation is dependent on final early years numbers and academy recouplement and therefore the total DSG will change throughout the financial year.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

2.6 The initial allocation of the funding to each of the three blocks is as below:

NYCC Split	Schools	High Needs	Early Years	Total
2015-16 baseline	324,229	45,462	23,558	393,250
Increase in pupil numbers	1,572			1,572
NQTs	-3			-3
High Needs Adjustments		428		428
2016-17	<u>325,798</u>	<u>45,890</u>	<u>23,558</u>	<u>395,246</u>
Early Years projected numbers			467	467
High Needs Recoupment		-2,514		-2,514
Final DSG Expected	<u>325,798</u>	<u>43,376</u>	<u>24,025</u>	<u>393,199</u>

3.0 Proposed Changes for 2016-17

3.1 The following changes are proposed

Prior Attainment

3.2 At its meeting in October, the Education Partnership agreed that for 2016-17 we continue to weight the results from the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) and keep the amount per pupil 'not achieving a good level of development' at £509. The EYFSP will be replaced by a new early years baseline from summer 2016 and this will necessitate a further review of this factor for 2017-18.

Exceptions (subject to approval from the Secretary of State)

3.3 School budgets are calculated using October census pupil numbers. However due to significant changes expected in the course of the next financial year, it is proposed that the following schools, are funded on estimated pupil numbers for 2016-17:

- Staynor Hall Community Primary Academy – this is a new school due to open September 2016 and therefore cannot be funded on lagged pupil numbers. An agreement has been reached with Ebor Academy Trust to base 2016-17 funding on 120 children with funding adjusted the following year to represent the actual number of children on roll as at October 2016. The DfE has approved this exception and it is estimated it will cost £322k.
- Dishforth Airfield Primary School – as a result of the army re-basing this school is projected to expand from 38 pupils to 139 pupils in September 2016. An expansion of this size cannot be adequately funded via the Pupil Growth Contingency. It is proposed to base 2016/17 funding on 97 pupils ((39 * 5/12) + (139 * 7/12)). The DfE has approved this exception and it is estimated it will cost £190k.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- 3.4 The DSG is calculated based on the October census and no additional funding would be allocated to North Yorkshire to pay for these exceptions. Therefore to ensure that these exceptions have no detrimental effect on other school budgets, it is proposed that the additional cost is allocated from reserves.

Sparsity Funding

- 3.5 Analysis of the October 2015 pupil data set, has identified one additional school that meets our previously agreed local sparsity criteria. The criteria for Secondary schools is a sparsity distance of greater than 3 miles by crow (DfE criteria) or 3 miles by road (North Yorkshire local criteria). St Francis Xavier school's sparsity distance is 2.2 miles by crow and 3.2 miles by road therefore whilst they do not meet the DfE threshold they meet our local threshold. The DfE has approved this exception and it will cost £100k.

Split Site Funding

- 3.6 The Education Partnership agreed at the last meeting to revise the split site factor for 2016-17 to incorporate an element for schools operating on more than two sites, for each site in excess of two, 50% of the full split site lump sum will be allocated.

IDACI

- 3.7 This is an area which has caused considerable concern at a national level. IDACI stands for "Income Deprivation Affection Children Index" and is a measure of deprivation which is allowed to be used in allocating resources to schools. At the end of last year, central government released a new IDACI data set which shows considerable changes at local level compared with the previous one.
- 3.8 Several LAs and schools have raised concerns over the revised data and the fact it significantly reduces the number of pupils attracting IDACI funding – however the DfE states the data is correct.
- 3.9 Modelling has taken place to ascertain the impact on schools in North Yorkshire and this has shown that were we to continue using the same unit values as previously, because there is now deemed to be "less" deprivation overall, the amount allocated would reduce by £1.2m from £12.4m to £11.3m. The funding thus freed-up would remain in the overall budget available for schools, but would have to be allocated through a factor such as AWPU and this will have an impact on some schools.
- 3.10 The table below shows a summary of this change. This funding is of course subject to the Minimum Funding Guarantee (and cap) and therefore many schools would see any change limited. However there are a number of schools which are already on the cap and therefore would see any expected increase reduced in time.
- 3.11 A second option would be to retain the total amount allocated through IDACI at the same overall level i.e £12.4m. This could be done by raising each unit value allocated. Modelling based on this scenario does reduce the highest losses, but conversely increases the largest gains. This would still show turbulence as per Table 2
- 3.12 Neither of these options addresses the issue highlighted a couple of years ago where we agreed to set the values of different IDACI bands in order to minimise the overall turbulence in school funding as part of our "Least Worse" formula option. This

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

approach created some anomalies which has resulted in funding values attached to IDACI bands that do not necessarily correlate to the level of deprivation.

- 3.13 The Partnership is therefore asked to recommend a way forward for 2016-17 based on the limited options we have, and with the knowledge that our own review of the bandings, and indeed any nationally-imposed changes, may mean further changes in later years

Table 1: Impact of allocating £1.2m through AWPU

	Impact of revised IDACI		Impact of revised IDACI (including re-allocation of £1.2m via AWPU)	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Highest Loss	-£87.8k	-£153.1k	-£76.4k	-£137.2k
Highest Gain	£62.0k	£62.1k	£63.9k	£75.0k
Summary of changes				
loss greater than £50k	4	7	4	5
loss between £30k - £50k	6	3	6	3
loss between £10k - £30k	19	7	13	2
loss less than £10k	90	9	56	3
no change	107	0	0	0
gain less than £10k	71	11	215	13
gain between £10k - £30k	11	1	13	11
gain between £30k - £50k	4	2	4	1
gain greater than £50k	1	3	2	5

Table 2: Impact of increasing the value of each IDACI band so the same amount of money is distributed via IDACI

	Impact of revised IDACI		16/17 Funding with Revised Bands - all increased by 10.75%	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Highest Loss	-£87.8k	-£153.1k	-£61.5k	-£130.2k
Highest Gain	£62.0k	£62.1k	£76.4k	£96.8k
Summary of changes				
loss greater than £50k	4	7	2	4
loss between £30k - £50k	6	3	8	4
loss between £10k - £30k	19	7	12	4
loss less than £10k	90	9	84	7
no change	107	0	99	0
gain less than £10k	71	11	84	12
gain between £10k - £30k	11	1	12	6
gain between £30k - £50k	4	2	7	2
gain greater than £50k	1	3	5	4

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

Pupil Growth Contingency

- 3.14 The Education Partnership agreed at the September meeting, that the amount allocated for pre-opening costs for a new primary school is increased to £60k for 2016/17. It was also agreed to reduce the funding allocation for primary class expansion to £25k per additional class and to introduce a new set of criteria for growth in Secondary schools.

Falling rolls Contingency

- 3.15 The Education Partnership agreed at the September meeting, to revise the criteria for falling rolls in secondary schools and for both primary and secondary schools take into account revenue balances that exceed 15%.

4.0 Impact of Proposals

- 4.1 At the time of writing, work is underway to allocate budgets to schools and other service areas. We are expecting budgets to be able to be sent to schools in the week before half term.
- 4.2 We hope, by the time of the meeting, to be able to report on the impact on the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and the “cap” for schools.
- 4.3 Overall pupil numbers have, after several years of continuous reduction, begun to increase as the higher numbers of younger children begin to make their way through the system. The financial impact of this over the last four years is shown below (figures in £000s):

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Pri	3,557	1,041	1,119	1,833
Sec	-3,188	-3,141	-1,709	-261
Total	369	-2,099	-590	1,572

- 4.4 A full summary of the Schools Block in 2016-17, including a list of de-delegated and centrally-managed budgets is shown below. There are no proposed changes to these, in accordance with the work carried out in the summer and autumn of 2014. All of these budgets will be considered as part of a full review for 2017-18.

ISB (delegated budgets)	318,184	97.7%
Schools in Financial Difficulty	693	
Unreasonable School Expenditure	90	
Behaviour Support Services	202	
Ethnic Minority	925	
Free School Meals Eligibility	21	
Trade Union Costs	85	
	<u>2,016</u>	0.6%

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

Central Budgets

Commissioning of Services	57	
Strategic Support	11	
Outdoor Learning	389	
CYPFT Schools Block	29	
Preventative Services	1,720	
Property Service	332	
School Admissions	790	
Schools Forum	100	
Asbestos Removal	261	
Broadband, etc	770	
IMPULSE System	90	
Copyright Licences	466	
Falling rolls	301	
Pupil growth	201	
Other Overheads	84	
	<u>5,602</u>	1.7%
	<u><u>325,798</u></u>	

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 The Schools Forum is asked to note the contents of this report and:

- i. to agree to continue to weight the results from the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) and keep the amount per pupil 'not achieving a good level of development' at £509 (paragraph 3.2)
- ii. to agree the exceptions at 3.3 relating to Dishforth Airfield and Staynor Hall
- iii. to agree that these exceptions are funded from reserves (3.4)
- iv. to agree that sparsity funding is allocated to St Francis Xavier as per our previously-agreed local criteria (3.5)
- v. to agree that split site funding is allocated to schools operating on more than two sites as per paragraph 3.6
- vi. to recommend which of the two options proposed in sections 3.7 – 3.13 for IDACI is used
- vii. to agree the funding for pre-opening costs as at paragraph 3.14
- viii. to agree to the revised criteria for the falling rolls contingency (3.15)
- ix. to agree the Schools Budget as presented in the summary in section 4.4

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	This paper sets out a proposal to consult on changes to the funding formula used to determine the hourly rates paid to early years providers for the free early education entitlement for 3&4 year old
Budget / Risk implications:	See section 4
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposal set out in section 5
Voting requirements:	
Appendices: To be attached	Funding rates for 3&4 year olds – options for consultation
Report originator and contact details:	Helen Coulthard – Head of Finance for Schools and Projects helen.coulthard@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 532012
Presenting officer: If not the originator	

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This paper sets out a proposal to consult on changes to the funding formula used to determine the hourly rates paid to early years providers for the free early education entitlement for 3&4 year old.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In Autumn 2015, the DfE announced the hourly rates of early years funding for the 30 hour entitlement. These rates represent a significant increase to current rates, however the Local Government Financial Settlement in December 2015 confirmed that no additional funding will be available for the 2016/17 financial year. Therefore the current assumption is that the increases announced by the DfE will start to be phased in from April 2017, however we have no information at this stage to confirm this.
- 2.2 PVI providers' costs are projected to increase substantially wef April 2016 as a result of the living wage and pension auto-enrolment. Pressure is mounting locally and nationally from providers who fear they will not be able to meet these increased costs and will go out of business
- 2.3 The announcement by the DfE and the subsequent delay in releasing the additional funding has several consequences:
- The Government plans to increase the free entitlement for eligible 3&4 year olds from 15 hours to 30 hours wef April 2017. This will require an increase in available nursery places, some of which will be provided by maintained schools but for others we will rely on existing or new PVI provision. There is a risk that some existing providers will not be able to survive financially until April 2017. Currently 70% of 3 and 4 year olds across North Yorkshire access their early education places in the PVI sector.
 - The Government's announcement of increased early years funding has raised expectations amongst providers that cannot be met. Not only because of the delay in releasing the additional funding but because the rates quoted by the Government are an average across the country and include both pupil premium and other costs which are not met by providers.

3 REVIEW OF THE EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA

- 3.1 The Early Years Improvement Partnership was consulted as to whether the funding formula for 3&4 year olds should be reviewed. It strongly supported a review for the reasons stated in paragraph 2.3 and felt this should take place regardless of whether there was any additional funding or not.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block

- 3.2 It was recognised that the DfE's plans to review early years funding arrangements during 2016 may change the parameters once again, but it was felt that we could not afford to wait for the outcomes of this review.
- 3.3 It was agreed with the EYIP that the scope of the funding formula review would cover the differential hourly rates paid to different types of providers for the 3&4 year old free entitlement. Out of scope would be the deprivation factor which was reviewed quite recently and the lump sum paid to Nursery Schools. It was also agreed that we wouldn't consider introducing additional supplements.
- 3.4 Research was carried out to review recent government findings, what other comparative local authorities' funding rates are, and to review information gathered locally from Private Voluntary and Independent (PVI) settings and Childminders.
- 3.5 Information was gathered from the recent DfE research into the Cost of Childcare report. This review concluded that different types of provider have different cost bases but that there were even greater cost variations between providers of the same type.
- 3.6 Benchmarking information was gathered from NYCC's ten statistical neighbours. There are a range of approaches from these local authorities in terms of rates paid to providers. In three local authorities, one rate was paid to all providers. The remaining local authorities did recognise a differential in rates, particularly between PVI, Nursery School, and Nursery Classes. Two local authorities paid a different rate to childminders.
- 3.7 Additionally information was gathered for the annual North Yorkshire Sufficiency Report. As part of this report, hourly rates charged by PVI providers and child minders in North Yorkshire were gathered. The average hourly charged by PVI providers was £3.91 and the average charge by childminders was £3.96
- 3.8 Four options for the calculation of 3&4 year old funding rates were originally considered. These options were narrowed down to the following three by the EYIP:
- Option 1 – keep the basis for the funding rates the same
- Option 2 – one single funding rate for all providers
- Option 3 – Amend funding rates to reflect revised differential costs incurred by different providers
- 3.9 The financial modelling of the three options assumes the Minimum Funding Guarantee will be applied to those providers who will see a reduction in funding. The modelling also assumes growth in early years funding from the DfE of 5% over the next 4 years, however, the actual growth in funding will be dependent upon the DfE's review of early years funding during 2016.

3.10 Option 1 – Keep the basis for the funding rates the same

There are currently different rates paid to different providers based on calculations made a number of years ago to reflect the differing cost bases of different types of provider. These have been increased by inflation year on year and it is felt that recent pressures on the private and voluntary settings are not reflected in these rates. (see para 2.2)

Current rates payable as at 2015/16

2015-16	3 & 4 Year Old Hourly Rate 15/16	Costs per provider type as percentage of total costs
	£	%
PVI - Full Day Care	3.77	37.0
PVI - Sessional Care	3.62	22.1
PVI - Childminders	5.56	4.0
PVI - Independent Schools	4.16	3.9
Maintained – Nursery Class	4.16	28.3
Maintained - Nursery Schools	5.67	3.8
Academies	4.16	0.9

3.11 Option 2 – One single rate for all providers

Based on the funding available, is it estimated that a single rate for all providers would equate to £3.95 for all providers, which would increase to £4.09 if we assume 5% growth in funding from the DfE.

Taking into account the Minimum Funding Guarantee, those providers who currently have higher rates will have their rates reduced by 1.5% reduction pa. In particular,

- By 2017/18 Maintained Nursery Classes, Academies and Independent Schools would be at £4.09
- By 2018/19 assuming the projected increase in funding from the DfE is received, PVI Full Day Care and Sessional providers would also be at £4.09
- The hourly funding rate for Maintained Nursery Schools and Childminders would gradually reduce by 1.5% per annum, taking in excess of 15 years before it reached the proposed single rate.

3.12 Option 3 – Amend funding rates to reflect the differential costs incurred by providers

This option is based on the differential costs incurred by providers. There is no conclusive evidence nationally or locally around the actual costs incurred by different providers. From the government research it is clear that different types of provider

School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block

have different cost bases, however, there were greater variations between providers of the same type than across providers.

Therefore in order to calculate these rates, we have concentrated on the known differences between providers rather than the actual costs:-

- A school setting will employ a teacher in accordance with teachers' pay and conditions, and a teaching assistant on local government pay and conditions. It is estimated that this will result in increased staffing costs of 17% compared with the PVI's.
- A PVI provider will need to pay staff in accordance with the living wage from April 2016
- Similar levels of occupancy for all providers has been assumed. Ratios of children to staff are calculated according to the statutory limits.
- Childminders oncosts are estimated to be lower than a PVI setting as they are likely to use their own premises.

Appendix 1 provides details of the hourly rates for each provider for each option, assuming overall funding levels stay the same and the impact of a 5% increase in DfE funding.

3.13 The table below is a benefit/risk assessment of each of the three options.

	Risks	Benefits
Option One Keep the basis for the funding rate the same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a number of PVI providers may not be financially viable • PVI provision will close and the LA will struggle to meet its' sufficiency responsibilities • the PVI sector will lose confidence in the LA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoids change in light of the DfE's pending review of early years funding
Option Two Move to a single rate for all providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant drop in funding for childminders and nursery schools albeit phased in over a number of years – how will this impact on their financial viability? • doesn't recognise any differences within the sector re current cost drivers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • simple and transparent • a level playing field for all providers • helps to remove the ceiling on pay for staff in the PVI sector

School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block

<p>Option Three Move to revised, simplified differential rates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant drop in funding for childminders and nursery schools albeit phased in over a number of years – how will this impact on their financial viability? • doesn't help to remove the ceiling on pay for staff in the PVI sector as it is based on existing pay levels which are constrained by existing funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognises the impact of the living wage and auto enrolment of pensions on PVI providers • recognises differences within the sector re current cost drivers
---	--	--

- 3.14 One of the main risks identified with options 2 and 3 is the impact on childminders and maintained nursery schools. Under both of these options they will see a significant reduction in their funding albeit it will be gradual at a rate of -1.5% per annum.
- 3.15 The early years sufficiency audit conducted during 2015, showed that the average charge by a childminder in North Yorkshire, for hours additional to the free funded entitlement was £3.96 which is significantly below the amount per hour currently paid to childminders for 3&4 year old funding, which is £5.56. However, it is acknowledged that whilst the evidence suggests that it is reasonable to reduce childminders funding this will be a controversial decision.
- 3.16 The position for maintained nursery schools is more complicated. As well as the hourly rate, nursery schools receive a lump sum in recognition of their high operating costs. Whilst it is feasible that nursery schools could withstand a reduction of -1.5% for the first couple of years, it is unlikely that they could be financially viable in the long term without an increase to their lump sum. It is felt further work needs to be done on the financial position of nursery schools to evaluate the additional cost and the associated benefits of providing early years provision in a nursery school. This shouldn't prevent the consultation going ahead on the proposed options as the MFG will provide the necessary short term protection for the three maintained nursery schools.
- 3.17 It is proposed that a consultation is undertaken with all early years providers on the three options presented in this report and that the outcome of this consultation is reported back to the Education Partnership on 9th March 2016.

4. 2016/17 FUNDING SHORTFALL - OPTIONS

- 4.1 The consultation proposed in Section 3 addresses concerns about the basis of the current early years funding formula but it does not address fully the issues described in Section 2. The combined impact of no increase to the Early Years DSG Block for 2016/17 and the cost of the MFG for those providers who will lose as a result of any change to the funding formula, means that there would be limited gains in 2016/17 for those providers due to benefit under options 2 and 3. If the overall amount of

School Budgets 2016-17: The Early Years Block

available for 3&4 year old funding stays the same, full day care and sessional providers would only receive an increase of 1% in 2016/17 under options 2 and 3. An increase at this level will not do much to help the financial viability of those types of providers – the National Day Nurseries Association research indicates an estimated average increase of 10% to wage bills and we know of a number of PVI providers who are anticipating that they would need to increase fees to parents by 5-10% from April 2017 to cover their costs and. This will potentially have a significant impact on families and their ability to access affordable childcare.

- 4.2 The Education Partnership therefore may wish to consider using one off funding from DSG Early Years reserves to help mitigate against some of the potential risks identified in this report. Reserves could be used to provide additional funding for 2016/17 to bridge the gap to the expected increase in DfE funding for early years in April 2017.
- 4.3 It is proposed that at the next meeting of the Education Partnership when the results of the consultation will be known, information is presented on options for using Early Years DSG reserves in 2016/17 to support the funding of the free early education entitlement for 2,3 and 4 year olds.

5 RECCOMENDATION

- 5.1 The Education Partnership is asked to note the contents of this report and to agree to a consultation with all early years providers on the three options for determining hourly funding rates for the free early education entitlement for 3&4 year olds, as set out in Section 3.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

Appendix 1 - Funding Rates for 3&4 Year olds - options for consultation

	Option One		Option Two 5%		Option Three 5%	
	Current Funding Level £	5% Growth in DfE Funding £	Current Funding Level £	Growth in DfE Funding £	Current Funding Level £	Growth in DfE Funding £
PVI - Full Day Care	3.77	3.96	3.95	4.09	3.82	4.01
PVI - Sessional Care	3.62	3.80	3.95	4.09	3.82	4.01
PVI - Childminders	5.56	5.84	3.95	4.09	4.15	4.36
PVI - Independent Schools	4.16	4.37	3.95	4.09	4.07	4.27
Maintained - Nursery Schools	5.67	5.95	3.95	4.09	4.07	4.27
Maintained - Nursery Classes	4.16	4.37	3.95	4.09	4.07	4.27
PVI - Academies	4.16	4.37	3.95	4.09	4.07	4.27



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	School Budgets 2016-17: The High Needs Block
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	This report deals with the commissioning elements High Needs Block of the DSG and sets out the services funded from that. Final recommendations are sought regarding these, and their cost implications, to enable work to be completed on allocations to schools and other providers.
Budget / Risk implications:	Funding pressures are set out in this report as are recommendations on how to deal with these
Recommendations:	That the North Yorkshire Education Partnership endorses the proposals.
Voting requirements:	Schools only
Appendices: To be attached	Appendix 1 – Summary of High Needs Commissioning Funding
Report originator and contact details:	Anton Hodge, Assistant Director – Strategic Resources anton.hodge@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 532118
Presenting officer: If not the originator	

1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 This report deals with the commissioning elements High Needs Block of the DSG and sets out the services funded from that. Final recommendations are sought regarding these, and their cost implications, to enable work to be completed on allocations to schools and other providers.

2 High Needs Block Commissioning Budgets

- 2.1 This overall High Needs Block budget available is, as set out elsewhere in this agenda, £43.376m.
- 2.2 To enable final decisions to be taken regarding this budget, this paper deals specifically with the commissioning budgets in the High Needs Block, i.e. the funding which is allocated to schools, the Pupil Referral Service (PRS) and other providers to support children and young people with High Needs.
- 2.3 The recommendations in this paper are largely based on discussions which took place during October and November at meetings of the Formula Review Group. Invitations to attend these meetings were extended to all headteachers of special schools and PRS.
- 2.4 This report also takes into account announcements and decisions made by the DfE in December of last year.
- 2.5 Appendix 1 provides a reminder of how this element of the Schools Budget works in practice. This report will set out each of the main issues which the Partnership is invited to consider

3.0 Element 3 Funding through the Resource Allocation System (RAS), also known as the Can-Do

- 3.1 Modelling work undertaken prior to the introduction of the RAS in 2015-16 suggested that there would be a shift in resources of £866k from primary and secondary to special schools. It was agreed that there would be transitional arrangements during 2015-16 in order to give some time for moderation to test the robustness of the system. This resulted in no school losing out while there was capping of gains at some schools, where changes in individual packages were limited to an increase of 25%.
- 3.2 Overall this meant an increase to the funding of £468k, of which £412k was for special schools, £51k for primary and £5k for secondary.
- 3.3 At the meeting of the Formula Review Group on 5 November 2015, it was noted that a full moderation of the allocations had not at that time been undertaken while other concerns were raised about particular aspects of the methodology being used.
- 3.4 The meeting concluded that the RAS is more child- and young person-centred and transparent and is the right framework for allocation of resources across the whole age range of 0-25, but there is a need to review intelligence behind some of the questions and weightings.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- 3.5 It was therefore agreed that a more fundamental review take place of the system rather than a simple moderation of the outputs. This would include school representatives and would look at the following issues:
- The process of completing each assessment can be time especially if it involves parents/carers. In addition, there was some discomfort in schools engaging parents/carers in the process of completing the assessment presentation of the questions to parents as it might be seen to emphasise the gap between their child and others, particularly for those with very complex needs.
 - Whilst recognising that the CAN-Do is evidence-based, in terms of how the included items have been identified, the system generates a monetary total for questions as the form is completed and this monetary value is not based on a recognised system for resource allocation. This requires further validation. There could, be an element of bias during completion, related to the monetary value being displayed and calculated throughout the process.
 - Successful support might lead to a change in funding from one year to the next which may then lead to withdrawal of such support.
 - There were technical issues around schools having to re-do the ones completed last year
 - Concerns were raised about the overall level of top-up generated for some pupils, and particularly those children and young people with complex social, emotional and mental health.
 - Some schools with relatively small numbers of high needs students may not be as familiar with the process as others, nor undertake it regularly so there was an ongoing training
- 3.6 It was also noted by the Group that the Government had recently published the ISOS report into High Needs Funding which looked particularly at:
- the way funding for young people with SEN is spent
 - the reason for differences between spending patterns in different local authorities
 - the options for changing the ways in which high needs funding is distributed in future
- 3.7 With respect to the last of these, it came as no surprise that the report concluded that historic spend does not match very closely to current levels of need and therefore there is a strong argument in favour of moving to a formula based allocation in the future. It has now been confirmed that options for this will be included in the wider consultation on school policy and funding expected in the coming weeks.
- 3.8 In terms of funding schools and other institutions, ISOS suggested that local authorities should work with their schools to agree a “core entitlement” that all schools in a local area will provide for children and young people with SEN as a matter of course. This should reduce the funding inequities between schools which are highly inclusive and those which do not have a strong culture of inclusion. It was also suggested that the DfE considers use of the 0-15 disability living allowance (DLA) claimant measure as an additional factor in school funding to better reflect the needs of children and young people with SEN.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

3.9 In conclusion, given the review of the RAS outlined above to address some of the concerns about the system and the potential changes arising from the national consultation, the Group supported the proposal to continue with the transitional arrangements in 2016-17.

3.10 Although work has not yet been finalised, figures to date suggest that the total budget for Mainstream schools, allocated through the RAS, will be sufficient for 2016-17, including the continuation of Transitional Funding on the same basis as 2015-16. There is however a net increase required in special schools of around £300k, after adjustments for capping and changes to residential places. Current indications also show an additional £175k pressure for children and young people in special schools in other Local Authorities.

4.0 Special Schools

4.1 There are no major changes proposed for the funding of special schools for 2016-17 with one exception, relating to the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee.

4.2 The DfE guidance for special schools' MFG, states that when calculating protection, LAs should ensure that they are comparing like with like and adjustments can be made for changes in the nature of the provision. For example if previous top up rates included an element for a service that is no longer provided by the school, the value of that element can be discounted when calculating the MFG protected level. The original MFG per pupil calculation included the residential element for two schools which no longer provide that provision, so this element has been taken out and has therefore resulted in a reduced MFG rate per pupil for Woodlands and Forest Moor.

4.3 This will of course have an impact on the schools affected, and discussions will take place to ascertain the extent of this and, if necessary, how the LA can support the schools to adapt to this. These discussions will take place in the coming weeks once the true position is known

5.0 Pupil Referral Service

5.1 There are no major changes proposed for the funding of the Pupil Referral Service.

5.2 The number of places allocated is based on a formula agreed in 2013 and this may result in changes at individual establishments. Overall however the total amount of places commissioned will be 88, as in previous years.

5.3 In 2015-16 there have been pressures in the contingency and top-up funding of £300k, but these are expected to be contained within the overall budget available for 2016-17.

6.0 Contingencies

6.1 The High Needs Block currently retains a number of contingencies and these were also discussed at the Formula Review Group in November.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

Exceptional Support – Element 2

- 6.2 This contingency was originally approved by the Schools Forum in October 2013 and was £1.2m for 2014-15. In 2015-16 it reduced to £1m.
- 6.3 It provides additional Element 2 funding to schools that have a disproportionate number of children with either a Statement of Special Educational Needs or an Education Health or Care Plan (EHCP).
- 6.4 There is no need for schools to apply for the additional funding as it is calculated automatically on a monthly basis using the following details: -
- The amount of Element 2 funding the school currently receives;
 - The actual number of pupils attending the school at the end of the given month with either a Statement or an EHCP including children from other local authorities;
- 6.5 The number of pupils that a school should be able to meet the first £6,000 of additional and different support for =

The Notional SEN Budget for the school x 60%

£6,000

- 6.6 As an example, for a school that currently has 10 pupils attracting top up funding and a notional SEN budget of £80,000 through the Element 2 formula:

Notional SEN Budget for School = £80,000

Pupils to be funded = £80,000 x 60% / £6,000 = 8

(60% of the Element 2 budget is used to allow schools greater freedom over the use of 40% of the funding to provide support for lower levels of need.)

The LA would provide SEN exceptional funding at £5,000 per FTE where the number of pupils with Statements or EHCP was greater than the notional numbers that could be supported out of the 60% of the Element 2 funding.

In this example the school would receive an additional £10,000 per year whilst these circumstances remained the same.

- 6.7 Based upon information up to 31st December 2015, £783k of the £1m budget has been allocated. 110 schools have received financial support from the contingency (approximately 31% of the total number of schools). The largest allocation to a secondary school is £78,851, and the largest allocation to a primary school is £25,190.
- 6.8 Following discussions at the Funding Review Group, the Partnership is asked to recommend that this contingency continues.

Additional Element 3 Top-Up Pending Statutory Assessment

- 6.9 A contingency of £200k was agreed to provide additional Element 3 Top-up funding for children undergoing a statutory assessment. This was to be allocated via an application process considered by the SEN Panel

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- 6.10 £19,094 for two pupils has been allocated to date. This budget has been included as part of the overall E3 top up funding for mainstream schools.
- 6.11 Following discussions at the Funding Review Group, the Partnership is asked to recommend that this contingency continues.

Alternative Provision

- 6.12 For 2015-16 a contingency was also agreed for Alternative Provision that would
- provide additional top-up funding for statutory places that have exceeded the number of commissioned places, and
 - provide additional place-led funding.
- 6.13 Any adjustment is not made until the end of the financial year. There are some months that Alternative Provision would be below their statutory places and some months when they would be exceeded and therefore the financial adjustment will reflect the overall position for the year.
- 6.14 This is funded from the contingency that already existed for Alternative Provision which is approximately £174k.
- 6.15 Any in-year adjustments to top-up funding are met from within the current budget. However in some cases further financial pressures result from additional place-led funding where the number of North Yorkshire children and young people have exceeded the North Yorkshire commissioned places.
- 6.16 Based upon information up to 31st December 2015, this budget is overspent with £187k having been allocated.

Specialist Provision

- 6.17 For 2015-16 a contingency of £300k was also agreed for Specialist Provision that would provide additional Element 2 funding where the number of North Yorkshire pupils has exceeded the commissioned places. The additional funding would be based on a pro-rata calculation and only paid at the end of the financial year where applicable as exceptional funding.
- 6.18 Any adjustment is not made until the end of the financial year.
- 6.19 This is another budget which is under serious financial pressure with current estimates of £564k to be allocated to special schools and other Post-16 providers.

7.0 Independent and Non-Maintained Special Schools (NMSS)

- 7.1 Place funding in NMSS will continue to be funded directly by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). To bring NMSS in line with place funding in General FE institutions, and Post-16 Independent Specialist Providers (ISPs), place funding in NMSS will not be included in the high needs block baseline for the 2016 to 2017 financial year. As a result the 2016 to 2017 DSG allocations table does not include these places in the high needs baseline, nor are these places included in the high needs deductions table.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- 7.2 The LA remains responsible for funding Element 3 both pre and post 16 in these institutions, with a budget of just over £3.6m
- 7.3 Based on information up to 31st December 2015, £3.9m is required in 2016/17, an increase of £284k. Trend information confirms that the number of residential placements made is decreasing; however there has been an increase in day placements.
- 8.0 Other Post 16 (Post School)**
- 8.1 There are several types of institutions for post-16 High Needs learners, including general FE colleges, sixth form colleges, mainstream schools and academies (including free schools), non-maintained special schools (NMSS), special post-16 institutions (ISPs), and commercial and charitable providers (CCPs).
- 8.2 Prior to the implementation of the Children and Families Act 2014, there was more 'protection' for children with a Statement of SEN compared with post-16 learners pursuing further education, who may have had a Learning Difficulty Assessment (LDA). Following the implementation of the Act a number of these settings have taken on significant new legal duties, including the duty to cooperate with the local authority on arrangements for children and young people with SEND (with a reciprocal duty on the local authority) and to admit a young person if, following consultation with the institution, the institution is named in an Education Health and Care (EHC) plan. These institutions must have regard to the Code of Practice which covers the 0-25 age range and includes guidance relating to disabled children and young people with SEN.
- 8.3 In 2014-15, there were 175 post-16 learners in education, outside of school. In 2015-16 the numbers have increased by 18% to 207 young people and it is projected to increase by a further 21% in 2016-17 to 251. The raising of the participation age to 18 has been a contributory factor to increasing numbers of young people accessing FE.
- 8.4 The numbers of 19-25 year olds accessing provision has remained relatively stable over the last two years, (81 and 84 respectively) but there has been a change in the type of settings requested by the various age groups.
- 8.5 For example, in 2014-15 there were two under-18-year-olds attending ISPs, whereas in 2015-16 there are currently 6 placements at a cost of circa £540k. Also, for the first time, there are now two under-18-year-olds accessing Personalised Learning Programmes, who may otherwise have requested residential provision outside of the local authority area. Providing local education opportunities is to be encouraged in order to ensure young people remain within their local communities wherever possible.
- 8.6 The combination of the significantly changed legislation brought in by the Children and Families Act, increases in the number of learners continuing in post-16 education outside of school, and the request and subsequent approval of placements in special post-16 institutions, has increased expenditure on post 16 on high needs placements from £2.1m in 2014-15 to £2.5m in 2015-16. Based on current projections this is set to further increase to circa £3.0m in 2016-17.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

8.7 This compares with a budget allocated to NYCC of approximately £2.5m.

9.0 Overall Impact

- 9.1 Although figures are still being finalised, and discussions with institutions ongoing, our current estimate is that these pressures, net of any redistributed MFG, add up to approximately £1.3m after the redistribution of funds previously allocated through the MFG.
- 9.2 This pressure can be offset partially by the £733k transitional budget allocated through Prior Attainment in 2015-16. Members of the Partnership will recall that this was one-year funding following our direction to end the allocation of £2.7m of High Needs funding in previous years (and also previously agreed by DfE), as the amount to be delegated to schools through the new national formula was considerably less than had been delegated in North Yorkshire. This funding will remain in the High Needs Block.
- 9.3 The remaining pressure can therefore be met within the High Needs Block allocation but work needs to continue to address the increasing pressures in this area, particularly around spending on Post-16, for which we have received no additional funding. It is suggested that this is pursued in collaboration with the various providers who are also experiencing financial pressures.
- 9.4 The remaining work to finalise High Needs budgets will continue and any remaining issues can be discussed at the next meeting of the Funding Review Group (5th February). Any items requiring agreement with the Partnership can be picked up at the meeting on 9th March.

10.0 Recommendations

- 10.1 The Partnership is asked to note the contents of this report, in particular the discussions which have already taken place in the Funding Review Group and the recommendations falling out from those. In particular the Partnership is asked:
- to agree to continue with the transitional arrangements in 2016-17 with respect to the RAS allocations (section 3)
 - to note the changes regarding the calculation of Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) in special schools, and also the LA's intention to support any school adversely affected by this (section 4)
 - to note that no major changes are proposed for the allocation of funding for the Pupil Referral Service (section 5)
 - to agree to the continuation of the contingencies (section 6)
 - to note the pressures arising from the Independent and Non-Maintained Schools sectors (section 7)
 - to note the pressures arising from post-school provision (section 8)
 - to note the overall budget pressures caused and agree the proposed way of addressing this (including the confirmation of the end of transitional funding allocated via Prior Attainment, which frees up £733k of funds within the High Needs Block) (section 9)

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- to support the Local Authority in working with all providers to lobby central government regarding the allocation of High Needs funding
- to note the work being undertaken within the Inclusion Service to reduce financial pressures where possible
- to note that the remaining work to finalise High Needs budgets will continue and any remaining issues can be discussed at the next meeting of the Funding Review Group (5th February). Any items requiring agreement with the Partnership can be picked up at the meeting on 9th March.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF HIGH NEEDS COMMISSIONING FUNDING

CURRENT POSITION

- 1 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) allocates funding to local authorities for High Needs as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This “High Needs Block” is not based on any national assessment of resources required; it simply reflects historic decisions made by schools and councils in the past two decades, although additional funding has been made to councils recently to assist with financial pressures. The High Needs Block is not separately ring-fenced within a local authority’s DSG. This means that local authorities can decide to spend more or less of the funding than they have been “allocated.”
- 2 Local authorities decide how much to set aside in their high needs budget, for the place and top-up funding to institutions (except place funding to FE institutions, commercial and charitable providers (CCPs) and specialist Post-16 institutions (SPIs). Some of the place funding is included in local authorities’ initial DSG allocation and then deducted by the EFA so that it can pay the funding direct, for example to academies.
- 3 There may be instances where aspects of high needs provision are not allocated through place funding. For instance, specialist support for pupils with sensory impairments, or tuition for pupils not able to attend school for medical or other reasons. Local authorities may fund this provision from their high needs budget as a separate arrangement. Where such services are delivered by, or commissioned from, schools or other institutions, the authority may devolve funding from its high needs budget to that institution through a service level agreement.
- 4 Pupils and students who receive support from local authorities’ high needs budgets include:
 - children aged 0 to 5 with SEN whom the local authority decides to support from its high needs budget. Some of these children may have EHC plans
 - pupils aged 5 to 18 (inclusive of students who turn 19 on or after 31st August in the academic year in which they study) with high levels of SEN in schools and academies, further education (FE) institutions, specialist post-16 institutions (SPIs) or other settings who receive top-up funding from the high needs budget. Most, but not all, of these pupils will have either statements of SEN or EHC plans
 - those aged 19 to 25 in FE institutions and SPIs who have a EHC plan and require additional support costing over £6,000 (if aged 19 to 25 without an ECH plan, local authorities must not use their DSG to fund these students)
 - school-age pupils placed in alternative provision by local authorities or schools.

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

- 5 High Needs Funding system has two main components:
- **core funding** - included within mainstream schools' and academies budgets, derived from their local funding formula. Other institutions receive place funding (sometimes known as elements 1 and 2 for post-16).
 - **top-up funding** (sometimes known as element 3).

High needs places

- 6 Place funding is allocated to an institution and includes the funding pupils and students attract for their core education and basic programmes and to provide a contribution to the additional costs associated with a support package. Most high needs places are typically funded at £10,000 per year in pre-16 settings, although this amount varies dependent on institution type. The following table sets out the responsibilities for funding high needs provision in different types of provider for both pre and post 16 students:

Pre-16		Post-16		
Type of provision	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)
Mainstream schools Mainstream academies	Funding to meet first £6,000 of additional need delegated within school budget and academy grant derived from local formula (in addition to the age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU) funding).	LA can provide additional funds where it would be unreasonable to expect school to fund from within notional SEN budget. Agreed per-pupil top up paid by commissioning LA	Element 1 (based on 16-19 National Funding Formula (NFF)) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on allocated place number	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA
HN Units in mainstream schools HN units in mainstream academies	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA	Element 1 (NFF) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on agreed place number	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA
Maintained special schools Special academies Non maintained special schools	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA	£10,000 per place based on agreed place number	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning LA

School Budgets 2016-17: The Schools Block

Pre-16		Post-16		
Type of provision	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)	Core funding	Top up funding (real time)
Independent Schools	N/A	Agreed per-pupil funding paid by commissioning LA	N/A	Agreed per-pupil funding paid by commissioning LA
Maintained pupil referral units (PRUs) AP Academies	£10,000 per place based on agreed places	Agreed per-pupil top-up paid by commissioning school or LA	N/A	N/A
Further education and sixth form colleges, Post 16 Independent Specialist Providers and CCPs	N/A	N/A	Element 1 (NFF) plus Element 2 (£6,000) based on places commissioned by LAs	Agreed per-student top-up paid by commissioning LA

High Needs Top-up funding

- 7 Top-up funding, sometimes known as element 3, is the funding required over and above the place funding to enable a pupil or student with high needs to participate in education and learning. This is paid by the local authority in which the pupil or student is resident or belongs (in the case of looked after children), from their high needs budget, in line with their place commissioning.
- 8 Top-up funding rates should mainly reflect the additional support costs relating to individual pupils and students, in excess of core funding, that the institution receives. Top-up funding can also reflect costs that relate to the facilities needed to support a pupil's or student's education and training needs (either for individuals or on offer to all), and can take into account expected place occupancy levels and other factors.
- 9 Top-up Funding in North Yorkshire is now allocated through the Can-Do Resource Allocation System (RAS) as agreed and finalised by the Schools Forum in November 2014 and March 2015. Transitional arrangements were confirmed for the current financial year which resulted in the capping of gains at some schools and the minimising of losses at others. This was agreed in order to give some time for moderation to test the robustness of the system.



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	School Balances Control Scheme
Type of report: Delete as required	For decision
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	To consider the future of the School Balances Control Scheme
Budget / Risk implications:	N/A
Recommendations:	See section 4
Voting requirements:	Schools and non-schools
Appendices: To be attached	N/A
Report originator and contact details:	Helen Coulthard – Head of Finance (Schools and Projects) 01609 532102
Presenting officer: If not the originator	N/A

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To review and consider the future of the School Balances Control Scheme.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Local Authority currently has a School Balances Control Scheme (revenue balances only) which allows maintained schools to retain surplus balances in excess of 15% of their annual funding allocations for three consecutive years. Where a school retains a balance in excess of 15% for a fourth consecutive year a report is presented to the Education Partnership for a decision whether claw back of excess balances is appropriate or not.
- 2.2 It was felt to be an appropriate time to review the scheme to test if it is still relevant particularly taking into consideration the increasing number of schools converting to become Academies who have no balance restrictions enforced upon them.
- 2.3 Information was collected from our regional local authorities and statistical neighbours to help understand their approach to school balances and clarification sought from the DfE re their recommended balance thresholds for schools.

3.0 REGIONAL AND STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS APPROACH TO SCHOOL BALANCES

- 3.1 Feedback was received from 9 local authorities of which 6 operate with no balance restrictions in place. The remaining 3 local authorities do enforce control of school balances within limits that vary between 5% and 15%.
- 3.2 Of the 3 local authorities that operate a balance control scheme only 1 has enforced claw back of balances during the last two financial years (2013/14 & 2014/15) affecting 2 schools.
- 3.3 2 local authorities felt their schemes had contributed to an overall reduction in the level of school balances. The third stated a reduction in the number of individual schools holding excess balances but no reduction in the overall figure.
- 3.4 2 local authorities felt that their schemes did not encourage unplanned spending to reduce high balances however, the third was aware of instances where revenue had been spent for this purpose but could not accurately quantify the scale of this occurring.
- 3.5 All 3 local authorities felt that their schemes did not restrict schools from making longer term financial plans, whilst strongly emphasising the importance of them being able to provide sound supporting evidence as required.
- 3.6 All 3 local authorities feel that their current scheme is effective and do not plan to undertake any formal reviews in the near future.

- 3.7 The general consensus from both the local authorities that do not operate a scheme (and 1 that does) is that the administration process is time consuming and labour intensive with only low levels of claw back actually undertaken.
- 3.8 Several local authorities who no longer operate a balances control scheme have chosen to adopt a lighter touch approach with no claw back whilst still applying relevant degrees of challenge to those schools with the highest revenue balances.
- 3.9 The DfE confirmed that they no longer have recommended balance thresholds in place for schools.

4.0 **NORTH YORKSHIRE SCHEME**

- 4.1 The table below shows the levels of revenue balances held by schools in North Yorkshire during the period 2010/11 to 2014/15 and the number of schools that held balances in excess of the permitted limit at the end of each financial year.
- 4.2 With the exception of 2011/12 (where school balances reduced by £0.8m) there has been a steady increase year on year of both the total revenue balances held by schools and the number of schools exceeding the permitted balance limit at 31st March.

	Total School Revenue Balances	
2010/11	£24.0m	41 schools exceeded the 15% balance limit
2011/12	£23.2m	24 schools exceeded the 15% balance limit
2012/13	£24.9m	26 schools exceeded the 15% balance limit
2013/14	£28.9m	47 schools exceeded the 15% balance limit
2014/15	£30.7m	79 schools exceeded the 15% balance limit

- 4.3 The Education Partnership has agreed to the claw back of funds from schools on 2 occasions during this timeframe.
- 4.4 Whilst the above table highlights the fact that our scheme has not resulted in a reduction of revenue balances held by schools it is of course difficult to predict what the impact would have been of having no scheme in place.

5.0 SUMMARY

- 5.1 The research from other Local Authorities, the removal of any guidelines on school balances by the DfE and the lack of restrictions on Academies all support a proposal not to continue with a School Balances Control Scheme in North Yorkshire.
- 5.2 In addition, there is no strong evidence to suggest that the existence of a Balances Control Scheme has contributed to a reduction in the level of balances held by schools or that this is something we would necessarily want to encourage.
- 5.3 There is still a role for the Local Authority and Education Partnership to challenge schools in exceptional circumstances where the level of balances held by a particular school warrants further investigation. It is also proposed that we continue to take into account a school's revenue balance level when considering applications for additional funding from contingencies such as Pupil Growth and Falling Rolls.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Education Partnership is asked to note the contents of this report and to agree to remove the School Balances Control Scheme with effect from 31st March 2016.

PETE DWYER

Corporate Director – Children and Young People's Service



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday, 28 January 2016
Title of report:	Traded Services Update
Type of report: Delete as required	For information only
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	A synopsis of the Traded Services Panel meeting held on 24 November 2015
Budget / Risk implications:	
Recommendations:	That the Partnership notes the contents of the report
Voting requirements:	N/A
Appendices: To be attached	N/A
Report originator and contact details:	Bryony Clark – SmartSolutions Bryony.clark@northyorks.gov.uk 01609 533222
Presenting officer: If not the originator	Anton Hodge – Assistant Director, Strategic Resources / Ian Yapp – Chair of the Traded Services Panel

Traded Services Panel

Synopsis of the meeting held on 24th November 2015

The synopsis below will provide you with a summary of what was discussed at the Traded Services Panel meeting.

SmartSolutions

Lesa Brown, Commercial Director SmartSolutions, gave an update of progress in SmartSolutions over the last 4 months.

There has been a huge shift in thinking recently regarding traded services which now need to be much more commercially focussed. Services need to make greater profits which can be ploughed back into and will improve the whole service. Therefore every single cost is now being forensically reviewed with a view to maximising profits and a much harder line is being taken with services that are running at a deficit as this can't be allowed to continue.

All financial information will be on SmartSolutions Online by the start of December and digital Ratecards are being created. Service Level Agreements are also being reviewed as they have little or no governance.

Workshops have taken place to give a greater understanding of customer needs – customers require a good service which isn't price led but provides good value for money. There are some areas where this isn't always achieved but work is on-going to identify and rectify these problems.

Once all the financial information is on SmartSolutions Online Relationship Managers will be ready to go to schools and complete their buy back. Services are continually being reviewed and options for bundling together or alternatively de-clustering being considered. Training and Learning is also being looked at from the point of having all the information on one site and also finding other options such as increasing the use of E-learning.

Property Service

Jon Holden, Investments and Delivery Manager, informed the panel of developments in the Property Service.

MASS's current contract with Jacobs is due to end in March 2016 and this presented the opportunity to bring MASS back in house. From April 2016, with the exception of capital projects, estates and highways work which will be carried out by Mouchel, everything else will be carried out internally via the use of contractors. The customer will see very little change to the service apart from the introduction of a new Helpdesk. In order to lessen disruption or confusion during the change-over period the service intends to communicate with schools and keep them informed of what is happening.

Jon Holden, Head of Property Service informed the Panel of changes that are being planned within the Property Service.

The County Council's contract for technical consultancy with Jacobs expires on 31 March 2016. The County Council has, therefore, reviewed its strategy for the delivery of property services and will be implementing changes with effect from 1 April.

The most obvious change will be the maintenance services, including MASS, will be delivered directly by the County Council with effect from 1 April 2016. Although there will be very few changes to the way in which the MASS Scheme is delivered in the short term the County Council considers that this will provide an opportunity to further develop the scheme together with the wider support that is provided to schools. We will, therefore, be undertaking consultation with schools in the longer term about wider changes in the way in which property services are provided.

The County Council will be providing further information during the course of the Spring Term about new contact arrangements for MASS.

The Panel and individual schools will be aware that a programme of emergency inspections was recently undertaken in respect of external play equipment. This followed two significant failures of play equipment at school sites. In order to acknowledge that, in most instances, no further action was required to be undertaken the charges that were made to schools have been refunded.

Financial Overview

There is now a full overview of Profit and Loss for both individual traded services and also SmartSolutions. These figures have been split between core and traded and government funding has been identified. Any services running at a deficit are being thoroughly investigated to see if they need to change their working model or if they are not financially viable.

Now that income and expenditure is known there is chance to look at options such as reviewing services and staffing, reviewing training, simplifying pricing models etc.

Budget management training courses have been introduced and there are also monthly meetings with Heads of Services to keep on top of the financial situation.

It was pointed out that the Panel don't need to be concerned with finances, instead they need to have confidence that SmartSolutions are in control of the situation.

Inclusive Education Service

Inclusive Education is a new traded service which has been rolled out gently so far. The core (statutory) service will still remain and be free of charge but specialist services on top of that will be charged for. There needs to be clarification of what is statutory or not, and also schools need to know their statutory obligations. Although it has been low key there is definitely an interest from schools for buying in to this service.

Education and Skills

Since September 2015 greater priority has been given to the traded element of this service and the traded part has now been rebranded SmartSolutions (Education & Skills) with the Head of this service being seconded to SmartSolutions.

There is now a more clearly defined difference between core and traded with priorities being identifying customer needs and working closely with Relationship Managers to enhance the service. There have been issues with capacity in the past due to increased demand; however these issues are now being dealt with.

The next phase is to build a blended education docu-storage platform which will provide a single portal for a huge range of resources, and will hopefully enhance the digital experience for customers.

In 2014/15 63% of overall demand related to consultancy requests and therefore the service is building up a pool of associates to deal with this increasing business. It was pointed out that there may already be resources available in schools to fulfil this role and the Head of service confirmed that all options are being considered.

New Head Teacher's proposal

David Dixon, SmartSolutions Business Development Manager, outlined plans for a new service which would provide additional support to Head teachers and senior leadership. This project has been developed in conjunction with SmartSolutions (Education & Skills).

Every year there are a large number of newly appointed Heads (40+ in 2015/16) but there are very limited resources available for heads once the initial recruitment and induction has taken place. Currently it is a one size fits all system with many different points of contact, however the intention is to offer a seamless (core and traded) Head teacher induction process that is tailored to individual needs. There should be a far more joined-up approach with particular needs of Heads potentially being analysed at the recruitment stage. This would strengthen links, give Heads a far better chance of succeeding in their roles which in turn would enhance the whole learning experience for pupils.

This proposal is conceptual at the moment and David asked for feedback as to whether there is a need for this service and also for the involvement of the Panel to help identify needs and further develop the proposal. There was a general agreement that there is a need for this service and therefore it is worth pursuing.

SmartSolutions Online

SmartSolutions Online has been in use for 18 months now and was implemented in order to provide a "One Stop Shop" for all traded services. However the original remit has now grown which has raised questions as to whether this system is still fit for purpose. One of the frustrations is that,

because it is an off the shelf website, there are restrictions to making the developments to the system that would be beneficial to us.

Therefore it has been decided that now is the time to look for a new system that would better suit customer requirements. The current contract with Frontline Data ends in December 2016 and will not be renewed. Susie Whitaker will be in charge of scoping a new system that better fulfils requirements. This raises many questions such as should it be purpose built in house or bought in, should it incorporate CYPs info, should there be different websites for traded and none traded? All of which matters need to be carefully considered before continuing. SmartSolutions will also work very closely with Technology & Change as things change very quickly in this department. Susie asked for feedback and pointed out that no decisions would be made without due consultation. It was decided that it would be a good idea to survey schools to find out what they would like to get from the new website.

Employment Support Service

Kirstie Paterson gave an update on progress with MyView and RAS.

19 schools are currently piloting using MyView to input more information, specifically to process and authorise timesheets for additional hours, relief posts etc. 7 more schools have asked to trial this system and training has been arranged for next January.

To date 300 claims have been submitted and authorised. All claims are being double checked and so far no issues have been identified. However certain changes have been made in response to feedback from schools, for example additional guidance or reports etc. The aim is to take stock at the end of February and then potentially roll this out further. Schools have also raised other areas that they would like to be able to use MyView for inputting and therefore ESS is continuing to develop the system in order to facilitate this.

Feedback regarding the increased use of MyView has been very positive so far, and ideally the long term aim would be to use this for all inputting relating to staff including sickness.

RAS training and on-going support has now moved from HR to ESS and user groups have been set up for January 2016 in order to continue providing this function. However over the last 12 months there has been a reduction in the number of schools using RAS and therefore rolling this out any further has been put on hold pending the results of the MyView trial. In the meantime RAS access will not be taken away from any schools that are currently using it.



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Date of meeting:	Thursday 28 January 2016
Title of report:	Report of the North Yorkshire Improvement Partnership Boards
Type of report: Delete as required	For information only
Executive summary: Including reason for submission	To provide an update of the priorities, activity, early impact and funding for the Improvement Partnerships
Budget / Risk implications:	N/A
Recommendations:	For the NYEP to note and approve
Voting requirements:	N/A
Appendices: To be attached	Reports from :- Early Years Improvement Partnership Primary Improvement Partnership Secondary Improvement Partnership Special Improvement Partnership
Report originator and contact details:	Jill Hodges – Assistant Director, Education and Skills 01609 532166 Jill.hodges@northyorks.gov.uk
Presenting officer: If not the originator	Chairs of the Improvement Partnerships Early Years – Jane Pepper Primary – Wendy Ripley Secondary – Rob Pritchard Special – Jane le Sage for Diane Reynard



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

The Early Years Improvement Partnership (EYIP)

Membership

Jane Pepper (Chair), Headteacher, Childhaven Nursery School
 Barry Appleton, Penny Pott Day Nursery
 Caroline Midgley, Embsay Children's Centre
 Donna Makepeace, Ings Primary School
 Fiona Mukerjee, West Cliffe Playgroup
 Elizabeth Robson, Oatlands Infant School
 Elizabeth Walker, Burniston & Cloughton Playgroup
 Gail Brown, Brotherton & Byram Academy
 Gail Hope, Fieldside Day Nursery
 Gill Donaghy, Brayton Head Start Playgroup
 Gill Hunton, Osmotherley Playgroup
 Helen Hardie, Childminder representative
 Jayne Hopkins, Ashville Independent School
 Josy Thompson, Funcare Day Nurseries, Little Dragons, Playaway, Woodlands, Harrogate
 Linda Mortimer, Saltergate Infant & Junior School
 Sarah Moon-Gatford, Incy Wincy Day Nursery

Andrea Sedgewick – Strategy & Commissioning
 Andy Lancashire – Principal Adviser, Early Years & Primary
 Helen Coulthard - Finance
 Rachel Copping, Prevention Service/Children Centre Rep.
 Ruth Mason – Lead Adviser, Early Years

The Early Years sector is the most diverse and extensive, including schools, private businesses offering full day care, voluntary sector settings operating in shared accommodation such as church halls, and childminders working out of their own homes. The common factor is the work with our youngest and most vulnerable children and the responsibility for giving them the best possible support for learning and development during their critical early years.

The Early Years Improvement Partnership Board includes 6 Headteachers from schools, 9 representatives from the Private, Voluntary and Independent sectors, and a representative from the Prevention Service, supported by officers for the LA. The views of childminders are represented indirectly through surveys and it is hoped that their role will increase over time.



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

The Partnership Board has met three times during the autumn term and is working to develop a strategy to improve outcomes for all children at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage, and to improve the proportion of children who attend good or outstanding provision.

During the meetings over the autumn term members have reviewed the current data for Early Years outcomes across the county, and Ofsted judgements for all providers including settings and childminders, and have reviewed support plans and plans for locality “Closing the Gap” strategies. A main focus has been on developing the strategic plan for the Early Years Improvement Partnership. This plan can access £150,000 in the current academic year.

The main feature of the strategic plan is to develop the capacity for sector led peer-to-peer support alongside the role of LA Improvement advisers and consultants. This has begun with training in “Pedagogical Mediation” delivered by professors Chris Pascal and Tony Bertram from the Centre for Research in Early Childhood, which was delivered to Early Years Lead Practitioners, Lead Teachers and Early Years Specialist Leaders of Education from the Teaching School Alliances. They are now working to support the further development of networks within their communities, based on local priorities and needs. This work is being aligned with the Early Years “Closing the Gap” strategy.

The Early Years Improvement Partnership Board also retains an advisory and consultative function and will be working with LA officers to develop a response changes in funding and policy based on the Government's review of funding and the expansion of free childcare.

While the complexity of the challenge is significant, The EYIP Board has the commitment and expertise to work through the issues, and to ensure that the needs of our young children remain our priority.

Jane Pepper
Chair, Early Years Improvement Partnership



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Primary Improvement Partnership (PIP)

At the previous NYEP partnership meeting held on 15 October, Chairs were asked to report on the membership of their partnership board. The membership of the PIP Board is as follows:

Wendy Ripley (Chair)

Anne Vetch, Governor, Kettlewell Primary School

Catherine Lassey, Headteacher, Dacre Braithwaite CE Primary School

Don Parker, Headteacher, Askwith Community Primary School

Jane Douglass, Headteacher, Castleton and Glaisdale Federation

Jane Pepper, Headteacher Childhaven Nursery School & Chair of EYIP

Mary Kelly, Governor, Boroughbridge Primary School

Mike White, Headteacher, Brompton on Swale Community Primary School

Nigel Ashley, Headteacher, Meadowside Community Primary School

Rick Weights Headteacher, Monk Fryston CE Primary School

Simone Bennett, Headteacher, Christ Church CE VC Primary School

Jill Hodges (Assistant Director, Education & Skills)

Andy Lancashire, Principal Adviser, Early Years & Primary

Ruth Mason, Lead Adviser, Early Years

Helen Davey, Lead Improvement Adviser, South,

Jo Mackle, Lead Improvement Adviser, North

Joy Willis, Lead Improvement Adviser, East

Matt Blyton, Lead Improvement Adviser, West

Steven Holmes, Lead Improvement Adviser, Central

Mandy Lambert (Clerk)

Since the last NYEP meeting, two PIP meetings have taken place on: 21 October and 9 December 2015. The PIP is in the very early stages of development and meetings to date have focused on:

- establishing and building relationships
- establishing priorities and drawing up the PIP development plan for 2015 – 18
- discussing and agreeing initial allocations from the PIP budget (see following section on budget and risk implications for details)
- agreeing the North Yorkshire Strategy for school Improvement and Quality Assurance
- identifying priority actions for the remainder of the 2015 -16 academic year and scoping out project proposals and funding and other resource needs
- how to communicate the actions of the PIP more widely.

Beyond reporting that very productive relationships have been established and the initial activities undertaken both within formal meetings and additional 'scoping'



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

meetings, demonstrate deep commitment to the PIP and supporting improvement in North Yorkshire primary schools there is very little impact to report at this stage. The main outcomes of the three meetings held to date have been:

- agreement on the format and content of the PIP development plan for 2015 – 18
- agreement on the main work strands for the remainder of the current academic year; although the project plans and financial allocations for some of these work strands have yet to be agreed.

The North Yorkshire Primary Improvement Partnership development plan 2015 - 18

The PIPB has high aspirations for the children and young people of North Yorkshire. Members recognise that the priorities set must be realistic, achievable and **must** demonstrably have impact and promote improvement. We circulated our initial development plan to schools early on in the autumn term and invited comments and ideas. The feedback we received has informed the current version of the plan.

Very briefly, the main priorities in the PIP development plan for 2015 – 18 are:

1. Ensure that the proportion of pupils who attend a school that is good or outstanding is at least 95% by July 2018. We will do this by increasing the number of schools in the LA that are good and outstanding (as defined by Ofsted). We will achieve this by focusing our actions and the support and challenge we provide on those schools:
 - that the most recent Ofsted inspection has deemed to require improvement
 - that are below floor standards
 - where contextual information and local intelligence indicate a school is an 'insecure' good or outstanding school, for whatever reason(s)
 - that are small and/or in rural or coastal locations
 - support 'securely' good to become outstanding.
2. Improve outcomes for pupils and ensure that by July 2018 we are at least 5% above national benchmarks for the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 (working in partnership with the Early Years Improvement partnership to achieve this).
3. Close the attainment and progress gaps between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils in North Yorkshire and nationally.
4. Improve outcomes and the progress made by more able/most able pupils and children who have high prior attainment.
5. Ensure that our performance measures and our actions take full account of national strategies and changes and provide timely support to help our schools implement these; for example, sharing information and knowledge that will help schools to embed the accountability measures and statutory assessment arrangements being implemented in 2016.



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

6. Meet the new national standard requirements (which will be broadly equivalent to a 'good level 4' or RWM 4b+) being implemented in 2016.
7. To develop quality assurance procedures that monitor, review and report on all aspects of school-to school support being delivered within the LA irrespective of who is delivering it.

We have identified a number of important work strands for the remainder of the 2015-16 academic year. These will contribute to achievement of the PIP priorities. These include:

- **Mapping:** developing a comprehensive map of alliances, partnerships and the school-to-school support taking place across North Yorkshire; compiling a directory of sources of expertise and support that can be kept up to date easily.
- **Peer Reviews:** establishing memorandums of understanding and commonly shared terminology; developing a range of protocols and supporting documentation for peer reviews; piloting quality assurance procedures for peer reviews.
- **Getting beyond good:** a time-limited piece of research that aims to identify which actions and strategies are most effective at moving 'securely good' schools to outstanding the outcomes of which can be shared with and implemented by North Yorkshire schools.
- **Assessment:** investigate the county wide picture in terms of the implementation of new assessment systems; understand what is working well in different settings (small schools, across collaborations/federated schools, for teaching heads etc); identify how we can share knowledge and expertise and best provide support for example through a county-wide conference and/or the establishment of assessment 'networks'.

Most of the work strands will commence during the course of the spring term. However, work around peer reviews and quality assurance procedures is already progressing well. We have recently communicated our latest proposals and progress to date to schools across the county. We have invited school leaders to express an interest in participating in the research and projects we will be undertaking in the coming months as well as to share their ideas and suggestions with us.

The Partnership has access to £470k with funding so far being committed for

- £200k for each of the 6 TSAs to have £33k each for building capacity
- £40k in total planned for two alliances – CASTLE and STAR to evolve into TSAs



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

TSA's has submitted plans for their £33k and the other alliances are producing Business Cases to access their £20K. These are on the agenda to be discussed and potentially approved at the next Board meeting.

Wendy Ripley
Chair, Primary Improvement Partnership



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Secondary Improvement Partnership

The Secondary Improvement Partnership has met five times since the beginning of September. The one year development plan was quickly ratified by the IP Board, and subsequent meetings have focused on: monitoring the progress and impact of the priorities in the plan; producing protocols for school to school support; identifying sources of support for schools; considering how to overcome initial challenges, including clear communication with schools and rapid brokering of support.

Members of the Secondary Improvement Partnership Board:

Rob Pritchard, St John Fisher Catholic High School: Chair
 Helen Woodcock, Rossett School: Harrogate and District
 Honor Byford, Chair of Governors, Graham School: Governor
 Ian Robertson, Richmond School: The North
 Martyn Sibley, Tadcaster Grammar School: Selby Area
 Michele Costello, Settle College: Craven
 Phil Loftus, Norton College: Coast and Ryedale

Janet Bates, (Principal Secondary Adviser)

Key aims of the Secondary Improvement Partnership Development Plan 2015 – 2016

Ensuring all schools are good or better

We have focused the core offer of support (15k per school) to five schools that have been categorised as requires improvement at the last two inspections. The LA is also providing/ brokering support to schools already in a category of concern or whose data indicates that they would be vulnerable in an inspection. Lead Improvement Advisers are monitoring the impact of all support to ensure the resource is well targeted.

Developing leadership capacity to promote improvement

This links into the first priority and is a key strategy for the Secondary IP. Schools have been generous in supporting the partnership by deploying leadership capacity in schools across the LA, and several are supporting the initiative by building extra leadership capacity into their schools for September 2016. We have also secured an Associate Leader, employed through the Secondary IP for the next two terms, to deploy into schools which are in immediate need of extra leadership capacity. (Approx. £130k)



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Developing an intensive county wide recruitment strategy

Keeley Hawes, based in the HR team in County Hall, is working with the Secondary IP and schools to improve recruitment to North Yorkshire secondary schools. After the last SIN meeting, many schools have requested bespoke recruitment support from Keeley. Keeley and the recruitment team have also produced marketing material to encourage students to train in our schools, and for NQTs and other teachers to apply to posts in the county. In the New Year you will see adverts in the TES with links to the new North Yorkshire web site for recruitment to North Yorkshire secondary schools. Keeley will be contacting all schools soon, as you will be able to post vacancies on the website this year at no cost to the school. There are plans for this to grow so that we are proactive in persuading the best candidates to consider working in North Yorkshire. (Approx. 40k)

We are already seeing the direct impact of the recruitment work, both for individual schools and the county as a whole. We are expecting the biggest impact to be with schools that require improvement. We want to use the limited sum of money from the Secondary IP to add resource and capacity which otherwise would not be available. Since September, 18 secondary schools in the LA are directly contributing to the school to school support process and are actively engaged in supplying support, or are in receipt of support.

If you now have support capacity at any level, or want to become more involved in supporting other schools, please contact the person in your area who attends the Secondary IP Board meetings.

Rob Pritchard
Chair, Secondary Improvement Partnership



NORTH YORKSHIRE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

Special Improvement Partnership

Membership

Diane Reynard, Chair and Headteacher at John Jamieson School, Leeds
Debbie Wilson, Springhead School
Denise Sansom, Brooklands School
Hanne Barton, The Dales School
Jonathan Tearle, Mowbray School
Marc Peart, Forest Moor School
Marianne Best, Welburn Hall School
Mark Mikhelson, Brompton Hall School
Peter Hewitt, The Forest School
Sarah Edwards, Springwater School

Jane le Sage, Assistant Director

Diane Reynard has just taken up her post as Chair with her first meeting being January 14th. Therefore a full update will be circulated next time. Diane, as an Ofsted inspector, will initially be working with special schools on their improvement agenda. The Partnership has access to £23k to support its improvement plan.