

**SOUTHEND ON SEA EDUCATION BOARD**  
**Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

I confirm that a meeting of the Board will be held on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016 from 08:15 to 10.15 at **Tickfield**.

George Crowe  
Clerk to the Board

Agenda		Lead	Time
1	Apologies, substitutions & introductions	GC	10
2	Membership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of current members</li> <li>Appointments</li> <li>Vacancies</li> </ul>	GC	10
3	Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair	GC	5
4 (a)	Minutes of Schools Forum and Education Board on 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2016	Chair	5
4 (b)	Matters arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for Nurture Bases</li> </ul>	IA/MS	5 5
4 (c)	Summary action sheet	MS	5
	Schools Forum matters		
5	a) 2016/17 and 2017/18 DSG/School Budgets	IA	20
	b) Specialist Places and consultation on High Needs Top-Up – to follow	IMc	15
	Education Board matters		
6	Report back from School Performance Sub Group	BM	10
7	Initial Feedback from Auditors on Education Board	BM	5
8	a) Standing items for noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEND area inspection progress</li> <li>OFSTED CIF action plan</li> <li>Local Authority School Improvement Inspection</li> <li>Area-based review of Post-16 and Further Education provision</li> </ul>	IMc SL BM BM	5 5 5 5
9	Confirmation of agreed dates for 2016/17 academic year Rescheduled March meeting (to 14 <sup>th</sup> ?)		5
10	Items for next meeting		
	Meeting close		



**SOUTHEND-ON-SEA SCHOOLS FORUM/EDUCATION BOARD****Minutes of the meeting held on  
Wednesday, 12 October 2016 at 8.15am  
The Tickfield Centre.****Present:**

Tim Barrett  
 Lisa Clark  
 Jerry Glazier  
 Paul Hayman  
 Neil Houchen  
 Mark House  
 Jim Johnson  
 Lionel Pryor  
 Stuart Reynolds  
 Margaret Rimmer  
 Maurice Sweeting  
 Vicky Wright

**Category:**

Primary Head  
 Primary Head  
 Trade Unions  
 Academy Head  
 Academy Head  
 Primary Governor  
 Primary Head  
 Primary Governor  
 Secondary Head  
 Special Head  
 Primary Governor  
 Early Years providers

**School:**

Temple Sutton Primary  
 Hamstel Infant  
  
 Westcliff High for Girls  
 Eastwood Academy  
 Bournes Green Infant  
 Edwards Hall Primary  
 Fairways Primary  
 Futures Community College  
 Kingsdown  
 Hinguar Primary

**Observers:**

Daniel Wills

**In attendance:**

Simon Leftley	Director for People
Ian Ambrose	Corporate Services Directorate
Paul Grout	Corporate Services Directorate
Elaine Hammans (EH)	People Directorate
Christine Hickey	Corporate Services Directorate
Ian McFee (IM)	People Directorate
Brin Martin (BM)	People Directorate
Mike Singleton (MS)	People Directorate
George Crowe	Independent Clerk

**The Clerk in the chair****Action****1. Apologies for absence, substitutions and introductions**

Apologies for absence were received from Robin Bevan (Southend High for Boys), David Parker (Shoeburyness High), Joseph Parsad (St Thomas More High) and Jane Youdale (Early Years providers).

Brin Martin reported that Tim Coulson, the Regional Schools Commissioner, had been invited to attend the meeting particularly for the Education Board items. He had, however, been unable to attend and had tendered his apologies for absence.

Daniel Wills from PricewaterhouseCoopers was welcomed to the meeting and Brin Martin explained that he would be auditing the Schools Forum/Education Board's practices. Paul Grout was also introduced and it was noted that he would be taking over the presentation of financial reports in place of Andrew Ward who had now left the authority.

**2. Membership**

It was noted that the nominations to fill the vacancies for a maintained primary school governor and an academy head and had been advertised and that Lionel Pryor and Margaret Rimmer respectively had been returned.

The up-to-date list of members had been circulated with the papers for this meeting together with a paper produced by Mike Singleton that set out the new membership proportions following the conversion of a number of schools to academies since the Forum's last meeting. The Forum was advised that its Constitution provides that, "once pupil numbers in primary or special academies warrants representation then separate primary academy, special academy and secondary academy representation would be sought proportionate to pupil numbers" and that it would be difficult to argue that this situation had not now arisen.

The paper advised the Forum that:

- the number of maintained primary representatives had reduced from 6 to 5;
- the number of primary academy representatives was now 3;
- the number of secondary academy representatives was 5;
- the Schools Forums Regulations 2012, as amended, also require representation from academy special and alternative provision schools and that a representative from each of St Christopher Special School and the Southend YMCA Community School would be sought;
- there was still a vacancy for a representative from Seabrook College and from the 14/19 education sector;
- the mainstream school membership would increase to 14 and the overall membership to 22;
- the quorum (40% of the membership of the Forum) would increase to 9;
- as mentioned at the last meeting, the term of office of Paul Hayman would shortly be expiring;
- the vacancies referred to above could be filled in time for the next Forum meeting if there is no necessity for a ballot(s) to take place.

The Forum was advised that the 3 members representing schools that had recently converted to academies had been invited to attend the meeting. Due to the large vacancies meant that the number of members otherwise able to attend was low and there had been the possibility of the meeting not being quorate.

**Resolved:**

1. That the current membership situation be noted.
2. That the interim membership arrangements outlined above be agreed and that the 3 members referred to above should continue to serve for this meeting only.
3. That the Forum agrees that now was the time for the academy representation to be proportionate between the primary and secondary sectors.
4. That nominations be sought to fill the vacancies outlined above.

**3. Chair and Vice-Chair arrangements**

The Forum was reminded that the Constitution provides for the chair and vice-chair to be appointed for 2 years at the first meeting of the school year in even years. It was suggested that, due to the high number of vacancies, the election of chair and vice-chair be deferred until the next meeting and that an interim chair be elected for this meeting.

**Resolved:** That Maurice Sweeting be elected Chair for this meeting only.

**Maurice Sweeting in the chair**

#### 4. Establishment of the Education Board

The following draft documents had previously been circulated. They were presented by Brin Martin:

- Matters for Confirmation for the Establishment of the Education Board;
- Terms of Reference;
- Education Board Protocols;
- Operational Details;
- Annual Plan.

During the presentation of the documents Brin Martin agreed that a representative of the unions would be included on the School Performance Sub-Group. He advised that there had been a shadow sub-group (SSPSG) and that it was the intention that the substantivel group should start work as soon as possible. He would, therefore, be seeking nominations at the end of this meeting.

The following nominations were subsequently received:

- Tim Barrett;
- Lisa Clark;
- Jerry Glazier (to represent the unions);
- Jim Johnson.

**BM**

**Resolved:** That the Education Board be established with immediate effect

#### 5. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2016 were received.

**Resolved:** That the minutes be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chair.

#### 6. Matters arising from the minutes

##### (a) National Funding Formula (minute 13, 16 March 2016 refers)

It was noted that the second stage of the consultation was still awaited and the latest information was that the introduction of the National funding Formula had been deferred and would not be implemented until 2018/19.

Paul Hayman mentioned that Robin Bevan had attended a briefing at which it was mentioned that the LA has the ability to apply for the disapplication of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and questioned why this had not been considered. It was agreed that a report should be submitted to the next meeting of the Forum on whether this application was possible and, if so, the implications. Jerry Glazier mentioned that the trade unions had done some work on the f40 (the Campaign for Fairer Funding in Education) proposal and said that there would be an average 10% reduction in funding in Southend.

**IA/PG**

##### (b) Homes for new teachers in Southend schools (minute 4(a) refers)

Simon Leftley and Brin Martin informed the Forum that no-one had taken advantage of the scheme, probably partly due to the poor publicity relating to the Queensway flats. Jerry Glazier commented that this was disappointing because there is a shortage of teachers and a need for housing to be provided. He suggested that the Education Board should review the teacher recruitment and retention strategy. It was

agreed that this would be an appropriate item for consideration at a future meeting of the Board.

**BM**

(c) Nurture bases (minute 10 refers)

It was noted that the information about the amounts of funding which had been provided for the nurture bases at various schools was still being worked on and would be provided at a future meeting. **IA/PG**

(d) Feedback on Service Level Agreements with Seabrook College (minute 11 refers)

The Forum was advised that the Department for Education (DfE) was raising issues relating to the land sale and transfer to the Parallel Learning Trust and the College was still working out of more than 2 sites. It was still proposed that the College would be based at the Wentworth Avenue site. In answer to questions, Simon Leftley advised that meetings with the DfE representatives go well but, subsequently, further information was requested. Such information is quickly provided and he assured the Forum that the delays were not the fault of Southend Borough Council.

## **7. Summary action sheet**

The Forum received the Summary Action Sheet. It included an item that had been added arising from the last meeting and Mike Singleton informed members of progress in the implementation of the Forum's decisions.

## **8. Monitoring report on 2016/17 Direct Schools Grant (DSG) Budget**

Ian Ambrose presented the report produced by Andrew Ward that updated the Forum on the 2016/17 financial year DSG Budget, also known as the Schools Budget. Appendix 1 to the report provided the DSG Budget, forecast and variance for 2016/17 as at the start of the autumn term.

The Schools Block contained £112m budgeted for mainstream schools in Southend. It was noted that there was little overall variance, but the forecast outturn column showed the amount allocated directly to maintained primary and secondary schools and the amount recouped for academies by the DfE. The Block was £96k underspent due to the recoupment figure being adjusted to reflect lower National Non-Domestic Rate charges as academies qualify for 80% charitable relief. Adjustments had also been made to the additional growth funding allocated to academies which operate on a separate financial year.

The current forecast for the Early Years Block was as per the budget for 2 year-old provision but this early forecast would change once the autumn term census data was available. Private, Volunteer and Independent and school and academy nursery funding provision for 3 and 4 year-olds was currently forecast as per the budget and the indications were that the overall numbers of children in these provisions would not differ significantly. Central expenditure was also forecast to be on line with the budget. Pupil Premium (PPG) was forecast to be £108k, an underspend against the original budget set by the DfE but this was offset by a corresponding variance on income. The total forecast underspend on the Block was £58k.

There were two variances on place funding allocations in the High Needs Block. The first related to the recoupment at the YMCA Free School which the DfE had now notified would only take place for 30 places rather than 32, creating an underspend of £20k. The other variance on place funding was for 21 additional places that the Education Funding Agency (EFA) was recouping as it had recorded 75 post-16 places at Lancaster School rather than the 54 on which the budget was based, despite there being only 33 Southend

pupils at the School in the summer term. Having explained that the issue originated from Essex County Council's completion of commissioned places in 2014/15, the EFA had suggested that, as the £210k would be granted to the School as place funding and that top-ups be reduced by a corresponding £210k. Other than this, the projections for top-ups in special provision were likely to change as the year proceeded. Kingsdown and St. Christopher schools had exceeded their place numbers and had received step funding of £20k for each of 3 additional teaching groups resulting in a £20k overspend against the £40k budget. The current forecast for independent school providers was underspent at £1,127k. In 2016/17 the High Incidence Low Cost SEN formula allocated £47k against the £100k budget. There was a £20k underspend forecast for the outreach service provided from Fairways School. In total, this early forecast indicated a possible underspend of £250k in the High Needs Block but forecasts could increase as demand increased.

In the Centrally Retained Block, growth allocations paid to primary schools totalled £598k, an underspend against the set budget of £690. The central cost of licenses for schools was on line with the budget at £121k. All other budgets within Block were forecast to be on-line.

The Schools Block income was as the EFA notification in July. The DSG to be received by the LA and the academy recoupment figure would change throughout the year as more conversions took place. There was a small variance relating to the allowance for NQTs. Early Years income for 2 year-olds was currently estimated at £1.8m and for 3 and 4 year-olds would be based on participation and was currently estimated as budgeted at £7,048k. High Needs funding was on-line once adjusted for recoupment but PPG was projected to be £58k less than the budget. There would be an income shortfall due to over-accrual for Early Years income. The final adjustment for the 2015/16 increase in the early years pupil numbers was £192k rather than the £321k due to over-estimated participation numbers for the January 2016 census. Planned balances brought forward would be used to balance the budget. These would support early years provision where providers were funded at a higher rate than current income and to support the MFG in the Schools Funding Formula.

The overall Position indicated an underspend of £346k against the budgeted £140.9m.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

## **9. 2017/18 (DSG) Budget**

Ian Ambrose presented a report which outlined the 2017/18 funding arrangements. It was noted that the Early Years Funding Formula consultation concluded in September and a final response from the DfE was awaited. The proposals indicated an increase in funding rates for Southend which should shift the Early Years Block to a more sustainable position and ease pressure on the DSG caused by a higher provider rate for 2 year-olds than it received in funding.

As mentioned in minute 6(a) above, the Government had announced that its response to the National Funding Formula consultation would now apply to funding for 2018/19 and beyond and not to 2017/18. The funding arrangements for 2017/18 would be broadly similar to those for 2016/17. Final allocations for the Schools and High Needs blocks would follow in December on the basis of pupil numbers recorded in the October census. No significant changes to the High Needs Block were planned at this stage for 2017/18.

The Forum noted that the retained duties element of the Education Service Grant (ESG) (£15 per pupil) would be transferred into the Schools Block for 2017/18. The report outlined the transitional arrangements and advised that the DfE would say more about transitional protection for LAs' ESG general funding rate later in the year. Regulations would be amended to allow some of the Schools Block funding to cover the

statutory duties that LAs carry out for maintained schools which were previously funded through the ESG and would be considered at the next meeting of the Forum.

The post-16 funding factor would be removed but with protection through the MFG but Southend does not allocate any funding under this factor.

The DfE had decided to update the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) banding methodology to return the IDACI bands return to a roughly similar size (in terms of the proportion of pupils in each band) as in 2015/16. This may result in some tweaking in Formula rates being necessary once the pupil data is released.

It was not possible to model these changes any further as no new data was yet available but this would be done for the next meeting. The report to the last Forum meeting (minute 9, 8 June 2016 refers) and the associated model were attached as appendices to the report.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted.

## **11. Early Years National Funding Formula**

Elaine Hammans presented her report that highlighted likely changes to Early Years free entitlement funding from April 2017. It reminded members that the Government was committed to extending the free entitlement to childcare from 15 to 30 hours a week for working parents and to increasing the average hourly rate paid to providers for delivering the extended and current entitlements. Southend would be required to implement a strong and sustainable early years funding system that would be fair, transparent and maximise funding to providers.

The proposed Early Years National Funding Formula featured three funding factors that would determine the funding per child that each LA would receive:

- A universal base rate of funding for each child;
- An additional needs factor, reflecting the extra costs of supporting children with additional needs to achieve good early learning and development outcomes; and
- An area cost adjustment, reflecting the different costs of providing childcare in different areas of the country.

The Early Years Funding Consultation had closed and the final response from the DfE was awaited but planning had started based on the proposals within the consultation. The funding rate for 3 and 4 year-olds in Southend was projected to be £4.40, an increase from the current £4.12 which was proving to be insufficient. However, this would only be a real increase if the £500k Early Years central expenditure on training, etc. continued to be funded from the main DSG funding block. This arrangement had supported the quality of Early Years provision, with the majority of providers being good or outstanding. This was believed to have improved the school readiness of KS1 pupils. The £4.40 rate would mean that funding rates to the PVI sector could be maintained and increased.

All providers would have to be put onto a single basic rate as a DfE requirement and would mean increasing the rates for the PVI sector and reducing the rates for school nurseries by 2019/20. A cut of 2.75% per year to do this had been modelled. Supplements could be added to the value of a maximum 10% of the funding rate but, in practice, only a deprivation supplement could be used in Southend. At 10% this would be £0.44 per hour, a 2p reduction on the current deprivation funding rate.



Modelling suggested that funding for 15 hours a week for 38 weeks for 2,850 children at £4.40 an hour would provide £7,147k of funding. If a basic rate of £4.18 was employed (a significant increase for some providers) then for 2,850 children this would cost £6,790k. Assuming 34% of these children qualify for deprivation at £0.44 this would cost £243k. School nurseries were currently funded at £4.55. To limit the reduction to 2.75%, transitional protection of £0.24 an hour would be granted in 2017/18. This would cost £115k. This model would provide a break even position. In 2018/19 the transitional protection for schools would halve to £0.12 per hour and disappear in 2019/20. The money saved could be added to the basic rate, increasing it by around £0.02 an hour.

For 2 year-olds funding was projected to increase from £4.89 per hour to £5.24 per hour. 2 year-old provision at was currently funded at £5.10 per hour with the shortfall coming from the underspend on the indicative amount allocated for 2 year-old places. The current arrangement was unsustainable in the medium term. It was proposed to pass on £5.20 of 2 year-old funding. Assuming 527 2 year-olds, the £0.04 per hour held back would result in £12k for discretionary 2 year-old spending.

The numbers for 2, 3 and 4 year-olds used in the modelling were consistent with the current DSG projections for 2016/17. These were based on January 2016 census data. It was believed that the numbers accessing provision were likely to increase in which case the proposal above would not increase costs to the DSG, as marginal cost would be slightly less than marginal income.

Members were asked to note that Early Years PPG was not included in any of the above figures and would be additional income for providers to spend on qualifying children.

During the presentation of the report members provided the following comments:

- nursery nurses had been excluded from the implementation of single status and school nurseries would not be viable using the figures outlined above. Contracts of employment were for 30 hours and did not cover the time required for setting up, etc. In addition, the children have to be fed and beds, etc., have to be provided;
- the funding levels do not recognise the ratio of children to adults required;
- parents are being required to work full-time;
- it was not mandatory for there to be provision for 30 hours. It is up to each business to tell the LA what provision they would be making;
- the earlier children were admitted to nurseries the better it is for their development, their families and their subsequent education;
- the benefits of early years education is well recognised but not being funded properly by the Government.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted and that the Forum would recommend funding rates for 2017/18 and 2018/19 once funding from the DfE had been confirmed.

## 11. Summary Performance for Southend Schools, summer 2016

Brin Martin presented his report that updated the Board on the performance of Southend schools overall at the end of the academic year 2015/16.

The report advised that, following significant changes to the examinations, base-lining and high level measures from DfE, schools had been faced with calibrating their performance against an unknown and a new set of measures that was not yet validated. All Southend schools and the LA remained accountable for the performance of pupils within their care.

The new accountability measures for KS2 and KS4 were set out in the report and the KS2 and KS4 results were summarised.

The following performance outcomes were noted:

(a) Southend performance at KS2:

- 55% of Southend pupils reached the expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths - above the national average of 53%;
- 20 out of 34 schools were nominally “below the floor” of 65% combined on attainment. No schools were below the nominal floor for progress. Therefore, no schools were below the floor target;
- Southend was ranked 42nd out of the 149 authorities with published results and was in the second quartile nationally. Last year, it was in the third quartile in the main accountability measure (% achieving level 4 or above);
- 60% of girls reached the expected standard in the combined measure compared to 51% of boys;
- 7% of Southend pupils reached the higher standard in all of Reading, Writing and Maths. This was above the national average of 5% and put Southend in the second quartile nationally (ranked 24th);
- in the individual subjects Southend’s results were as follows:
  - 66% reached the expected standard in Reading, compared to 66% nationally (second quartile);
  - 78% reached the expected standard in Writing teacher assessments, compared to 74% nationally (first quartile);
  - 70% reached the expected standard in Maths, compared to 70% nationally (third quartile);
  - 73% reached the expected standard in Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling, compared to 72% nationally (second quartile);
- Compared to national, regional and selected neighbours, Southend performed well in all measures against attainment at the end of the key stage, with the following % reaching the expected standard:
  - national 53%
  - east 52%
  - Southend 55%; Essex 55%; Thurrock 51%;
- calculations based upon the progress measures indicate that Southend is above the measure (0) at 0.5 in Writing but below in Reading (-0.3) and Maths (- 0.2).

(b) Southend performance at KS4:

- overall performance for Southend schools was 69.5% achieving A\*- C in English and Maths, compared to approximately 66% nationally;
- no trend data was possible due to the change in calibration.

(c) Southend performance at Early Years:

- the LA results were above national measure for the % achieving a good level of development, with 71.2 achieving compared to 69.3 nationally;
- this continued a three-year upward trend of 61.6; 68.5 and 71.2%.

(d) Southend performance at KS1:

- outcomes at KS1 were above the national figures for all three measures –
  - Reading 76.5 (74)
  - Writing 68.7 (65.5)
  - Maths 74 (72.6).

The report added that, following the work of the SSPSG, a list of schools that may be subject to imminent inspection had been produced. These schools would be invited to a *Readiness for Inspection* programme of activity in order to assist them in their preparation for inspection.

Simon Leftley added that the gap between achievement of children who attract PPG and those who do not was still too wide. It would now be necessary to focus in on individual schools to identify what could be done to decrease the gap. Jerry Glazier referred to the significant level of deprivation in Southend and for the need for more work to be carried out to support requests for additional funding.

In response to a question as to whether the impact of grammar schools could be identified, Simon Leftley pointed out that in the primary sector, where there was no selection, results were above the national average.

A question was raised about whether the above outcomes related to pupils in Southend schools or to pupils resident in Southend and it was mentioned that results had previously been broken down to show the performance of the both groups of pupils. Brin Martin said that the SPSG would be asked to break down the high-level data and said that, together with the Regional Schools Commissioner, he would be looking at commissioning intervention measures. A second piece of work for the sub-group would be to address the Ofsted inspection risk list referred to above and the third would be to review the school improvement strategy. He added that, currently 89% of Southend children attend good or outstanding Southend schools.

**Resolved:** That the SPSG be asked to carry out the work referred to above.

## **12. Southend Borough Council Education Policy**

A paper entitled *Our Ambitions for Your Child's Education in Southend - Education Offer for Your Child from Southend Borough Council* was tabled and presented by Brin Martin who described it as an ambitious document. He advised that the policy document would be subject to consultation through the Southend Learning Network (SLN) and urged members to encourage parent groups to respond to the consultation.

The following comments were made on the document:

- that "better start"(pages 3 and 5) means something different to how it was used in the document;
- paragraph 3 should read "up to 25";
- should read "pre-birth".

## **13. Standard items**

### **(a) SEND area inspection progress**

Ian McFee reported that a number of area inspections had taken place and 7 reports had been published. A working group had been set up to look at the challenges. A self-evaluation which included using Care Quality Commission criteria had been carried out and a mock inspection held. The report would shortly be published on the SLN.

In answer to questions about places available at special schools for children that need them, the Board was advised that some schools were over capacity and efforts were being made to ensure that only the children in the most need would be allocated places by having a waiting list. Some places were available in some schools, but at present, there is not capacity in all of them. Those for which there was the most demand the places would be allocated to the children most in need. There were no children that had special schools included on their Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) that are not in a special school.

In response to questions about how many children meet the criteria for attendance at special schools but were not in one and how many children were on the waiting list for September 2017, Ian McFee said there

is not a criteria for attendance at special school, and some parents opt for their children to be educated in mainstream schools and every effort was made to ensure that provision at the schools was appropriate. He thought that the number above the quota that are not fully funded was 17 and undertook to provide the figures in a report to the next meeting. **IM**

A further question was asked about the average length of time for getting EHCPs and the target and Ian McFee advised that the target was 20 weeks and the average length of time was above that. The Board was ensured that the causes of the delays were not the fault of the LA and the main reason was outlined. Ian McFee undertook to include information in his report referred to above and, following a further question, agreed to include the numbers of EHCPs that had not been issued after 26 weeks. **IM**

(b) Ofsted Common Inspection Framework (CIF) Action Plan

Simon Leftley reported that the Ofsted inspection had taken place over a 4-week period by 10 inspectors. The aim was for a good rating overall but the result was 2 good and 3 judgements of requires improvement (RI). The overall rating was RI which was disappointing. The main issue related to consistency of provision.

A 50-page action plan was to be submitted to the Department for Education on Friday of the week of this meeting. An Improvement Board had been set up led by the Chief Executive with the aim of obtaining good or outstanding at the next inspection.

(c) Local Authority School Improvement inspection

Brin Martin referred to a question at a recent Local Safeguarding Children Board meeting and said that there was no requirement for schools to produce an action plan on a single inspection.

Members were advised that, following the Ofsted inspection in April/May, the matter was still live and inspection would take place of the Education Board and School Improvement Group. The Education Board would be kept informed on progress.

(d) Area-based review of Post-16 and Further Education provision

Members were advised that this would be an additional standard item for Education Board agendas.

The review would not include the Adult Education College and was optional for 6th form provision schools. The first meeting of the Review Board would be taking place in November.

## **14. Items for next meeting**

The following items were identified:

- Election of Chair and Vice-Chair;
- Possibility of disapplication of the MFG and the implications (minute 6(a) above refers);
- Funding of nurture bases (minute 11, 8 June 2016 refers);
- Special Educational Needs (minute 13 above refers);
- 2017/18 draft DSG budget;
- Banded funding for EHCP support in mainstream schools and other information re EHCPs (minute 13(a) above refers).

## **15. Dates of future meetings**

Members were reminded that it had been agreed that meetings would be held on the following Wednesdays at 8.15am at the Tickfield Centre:

- 7 December 2016;
- 18 January 2017;
- 15 March 2017;
- 7 June 2017.

The meeting ended at 10.15am.

**Southend on Sea Education Board 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016**  
**Item 4 (b) Matters Arising**  
**Funding for Nurture Bases**

**2014/15**

In 2014/15 provision was split into 3 areas – Eastern, Western, and Central. Each had a budget of £161,000, so total budget of £483,000.

- The Eastern area spent £77,000 on staff and other team costs employed directly by Southend Borough Council, and £84,000 granted to Thorpedene for hosting the nurture base.
- The Western area spent 77,000 on staff and other team costs employed directly by Southend Borough Council, and £61,000 granted to Eastwood school for hosting the nurture base. The under spend was subsumed into the overall DSG carry forward.
- The central area used a formula to allocate funding to £161,000 across the schools in the area. The breakdown was;

Barons Court Infant School And Nursery	£13,169
Milton Hall Primary School	£17,787
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School And Nursery	£13,169
St Helens Catholic Primary School	£13,169
St Marys Church Of England Primary School Prittlewell	£16,761
Temple Sutton Primary School	£21,319
Bournemouth Park Primary School	£17,184
Hamstel Infant School And Nursery	£15,901
Hamstel Junior School	£16,987
Porters Grange Primary School And Nursery	£15,554

**2015/16**

For the Summer Term arrangements continued as before. With salaries and other costs for the Eastern and Western bases being paid centrally:

- The Eastern Area spent £41K on staffing and other costs centrally through SBC for the summer term, and paid £30K to Thorpedene for hosting the base. The remaining £90K went towards the costs of the Behaviour Outreach Service SLA with Seabrook which began in September 2015.
- The Western Area spent £31K on staffing etc centrally for the summer term. £22K was paid to Eastwood for hosting the base

Central schools who needed to retain some of the nurture pump priming resources for one more transition year received funds to give time to plan for 2016/17.

Some of the central schools received funding but not all in 2015/16:

Barons Court Infant School And Nursery	£13,169
Milton Hall Primary School	£17,787
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School And Nursery	£13,169
St Helens Catholic Primary School	£13,169
St Marys Church Of England Primary School Prittlewell	£16,761

**SOUTHEND-ON-SEA SCHOOLS FORUM****SUMMARY ACTION SHEET**

(The completion of missing items has been reported to the Forum)

Number	Meeting date	Minute no.	Action	Person responsible	Date action to be completed	Completion noted by Forum
266	19/03/14	7	Arrangements for nursery education funding for targeted 2-year olds to be reviewed by the Forum annually.	Elaine Hammans	18/03/15 and onwards	12/10/16
286	18/03/15	7	Review of the Single Funding Formula to ensure that payment is fair and supports the sustainability of Early Years settings for 2016/17, including funding in the maintained sector and that any additional funding be backdated.	Paul Grout/ Early Years	ongoing	12/10/16
293	14/10/15	3	The seeking of nominations to fill the vacancy for an academy representative be deferred for the time being and issue to be kept under review.	George Crowe	ongoing	12/10/16
307	13/01/16	4(c)	Strategic review of retention and recruitment of teachers required.	SOPHA/SOSHA/ Jerry Glazier/	Ongoing (for Ed. Board)	
309	16/03/16	4	Form of words for job advertisements re homes for new teachers to be provided to schools in the near future.	Simon Leftley	31/03/16	12/10/16
310	16/03/16	9	Commissioned budgets for High Needs SLAs to be reported on throughout the year if arrangements with providers alter.	Ian McFee/ Paul Grout	ongoing	
313	16/03/16	13	Information to be provided on the impact of the National Funding Formula (to be introduced for 2018/19?) and whether they can continue to be funded through combined budgets.	Paul Grout	ongoing	
314	08/06/16	10	Information to be provided on the amounts of nurture base funding schools had received.	Paul Grout	12/10/16 07/12/16	
315	08/06/16	11	Feedback on issues raised relating to Seabrook College to be provided to the next meeting	Brin Martin	12/10/16 07/12/16	
316	12/10/16	10	Forum to recommend funding rates for Early Years for 2017/18 and 2018/19 once funding from the DfE has been confirmed.	Elaine Hammans/ Paul Grout	18/01/16	
317	12/10/16	11	SPSG asked to (a) break down the high-level pupil look at commissioning intervention measures, (b) address the Ofsted inspection risk and (c) review the school improvement strategy.	SPSG/ Brin Martin	18/01/16	

318	12/10/16	13(a)	Report to next meeting on (a) how many children meet the criteria for attendance at special schools but were not in one and (b) how many are on the waiting list for September 2017 and (c) the numbers of EHCPs that had not been issued after 26 weeks.	Ian McFee	12/10/16	
-----	----------	-------	---	-----------	----------	--



**Southend-on-Sea Education Board**  
**on**

**7<sup>th</sup> Dec 2016**

Report prepared by: Ian Ambrose, Group Manager  
 Financial Management

**Report Title: School Budgets 2016/17 and 2017/18**

**Agenda Item: Item 5 (a)**

**1 Purpose of Report**

To update the Schools Forum on the anticipated outturn for the 2016/17 schools budget, to present a draft 2017/18 schools budget and outline some expected future financial pressures

**2 Recommendations**

Schools Forum members are asked to

**In relation to 2016/17**

- 2.1 Note the anticipated outturn for the 2016/17 schools budget, and the anticipated carry forward to 2017/18;

**In relation to 2017/18**

- 2.2 Note the indicative draft schools budget for 2017/18, based on maintaining the current schools funding formula;
- 2.3 [Maintained Schools Only] Agree the de-delegation of funding back to the Local Authority for the continuance of the following services;
- Behavioural Support
  - Licences and Subscriptions
  - Staff costs (trade union duties)
- 2.4 Agree on the continuation of the centrally retained services;
- 2.5 Agree on the continuation of the funding of the growth fund to support schools that are required to provide extra places to meet basic need within the authority;
- 2.6 Agree that the ESG retained rate funding is centrally held to continue to fund the costs of the local authority's role in supporting the provision of excellent education for all children of compulsory school age;

- 2.7 Approve in principle minor adjustments to the basic entitlement allocations once the funding formula data is available in December; and
- 2.8 Note the various future financial pressures anticipated to affect the schools budget.

### **3 Background**

- 3.1 This report sets out the anticipated outturn for the 2016/17 schools budget, which is the starting point for setting the 2017/18 draft budget. It also presents a draft Schools Budget for 2017/18, ahead of a budget being recommended by forum at the next meeting and set by the council in January 2016. At the time of writing the block funding allocations have not been confirmed, nor have any announcements from the Autumn Statement been factored in.

### **4 2016/17 Schools Budget**

- 4.1 Appendix 1 provides the DSG Budget, forecast and variance for 2016/17. It represents the latest forecast position as we near the end of the Autumn Term.
- 4.2 The budget is given as per the Section 251 return submitted to the DfE. This is a gross budget which includes allocations which are recouped by the DfE in order to pass funding onto Academies. The recoupment figures are reported in separate columns. This report seeks to explain the variances.

#### **Schools Block**

- 4.3 The Schools block contains the £112M budgeted for mainstream schools in Southend including Academies. As this was set by the funding formula in early 2016, there is little overall variance, but the forecast outturn column shows the amount allocated directly to maintained primary and secondary schools and the amount recouped for Academies by the DfE.
- 4.4 The variance for the block has risen to £263,800 underspent. This is due to the recoupment figure being adjusted to reflect lower NNDR charges as Academies qualify for 80% charitable relief, and for adjustments to the additional growth funding allocated to academies which operate on a separate financial year.

#### **Early Years Block**

- 4.5 The total forecast underspend on the Early Years Block remains unchanged at £58,000 as reported in October.

#### **High Needs Block**

- 4.6 The opportunity has been taken to undertake a fundamental review of the expenditure within the high needs block, which has thrown up some significant pressures within this block, which will carry through to outturn.

4.7 The forecast presented in October was based on the metrics for the summer term. Whilst place numbers have remained relatively unchanged since then, with the exception of St Christopher's where place numbers have increased, the value of top-ups has increased significantly. Notably this has been majorly caused by schools rebanding pupils into higher bands.

4.8 From the October Forum position, the following movements has taken place

	<b>Amount</b>
Increase relating to Bandings in special schools and special units	£193,000
Top-ups for statemented pupils	£223,000
Top-ups for out of borough placements	£47,000
Top-ups for independent schools	£129,000
Hospital Education	£45,000
Outreach Services	£26,000
SEN Support Services	£10,000

4.9 Overall therefore this latest forecast indicates a probable overspend of £422,000 in the High Needs Block, but forecasts could easily continue to change in the Spring Terms.

### **Centrally Retained**

4.10 The total forecast underspend for centrally retained remains has fallen to £65,700.

### **Income**

4.11 There is no change from the anticipated income reported in October, barring adjustments for recoupment.

### **Overall Position for 2016/17 Budget**

4.12 The bottom line indicates an overspend of £218,000 against the budgeted £140.9M. This overspend will need to be met from DSG balances brought forward from 2015/16, which will still leave some £571,000 in reserves to flow forward to support the 2017/18 schools budget. However as this remains an early estimate of the overspend, it has not been used in the draft 2017/18 schools budget at this stage. It will be incorporated into the proposed budget brought before Schools Forum in January.

## **5 Draft 2017/18 Schools Budget**

5.1 Appendix 2 sets out the draft 2017/18 schools budget. The draft budget is presented for illustration purposes to enable early planning by schools, but will be subject to change once the DfE data release is provided to the Council late December.

## Schools Block

- 5.2 As set out at the October meeting of Schools Forum, there are no changes to the underlying funding formula previously agreed.
- 5.3 The formula has been remodelled on provisional October 2016 census numbers. Please note that the pupil data still has to be updated and we have seen significant shifts in school data in previous years, e.g. changes to Free School Meal pupil numbers. The formula uses the latest adjusted baseline funding issued by the DfE in July, which allows for the transfer in of resources from the department's post-16 budget to the high needs block baseline. This is a transfer of place funding for high needs places in further education (FE) colleges and post-16 charitable and commercial providers. It also allows for the transfer of the total funding that the local authority received in 2016/17 through ESG retained duties to the schools block baseline.
- 5.4 The total modelled in the funding formula is £114,687,231. This includes MFG allocations of £498,904. The detail of this funding formula is included in Appendix 2.
- 5.5 The final funding formula will be presented in January once actual funding for each block has been issued and final pupil numbers are known. Further tweaks to funding rates may therefore be necessary once the pupil data is available in order to balance the income received and total amount to be released through the formula.
- 5.6 **Minimum Funding Guarantee** - A request was made at the October Schools Forum for consideration of the potential to request for a disapplication of MFG. Having reviewed the current guidance for schools funding arrangements 2017/18, a request for disapplication may be considered where there has been "significant change in a school's circumstances or pupil numbers" that would lead to inappropriate levels of protection. The guidance gives examples of previously approved disapplication requests, namely
- schools which previously qualified for a split site, PFI or exceptional factor, but are no longer eligible (or vice versa)
  - where the normal operation of the MFG would produce perverse results for very small schools with falling or rising rolls
  - secondary schools which are admitting primary age pupils who would otherwise be over-protected at the secondary age-weighted pupil unit of funding
  - where over-protection would otherwise occur, for example where additional funding has been distributed in the previous year and the authority can demonstrate that the funding is genuinely one-off
- 5.7 None of these or similar circumstances exist in the Southend Schools community, so it is concluded that there is not any reasonable basis on which to request MFG disapplication for 2017/18. The amount of MFG is diminishing in any event, with the potential 2017/18 figure being £498,904, which lessens the impact any disapplication would have.

### Early Years Block

- 5.8 The Early Years Block will be set on the same basis as outlined in the October Forum report, being around 530 2 year olds and 2,850 3 to 4 year olds accessing provision. The income budget will also reflect this. Assuming the outcome of the Early Years Consultation is in line with the DfE proposals, the funding rates indicated in the October report will be implemented as agreed by Forum. This will include the transitional protection for school nurseries as Early Years moves to a single funding rate across all settings.
- 5.9 No other changes have been made to the Early Years Block. We await announcements on the Early Years Funding Block, including the outcome of the Early Years consultation.

### High Needs Block

- 5.10 The High Needs budget is shown as per the previous year, with commissioning budgets for SLAs unchanged, save for the rebasing of income and expenditure for the transfer in of resources from the DfE's post-16 budget to the high needs block baseline. There is currently a consultation being undertaken on a revised methodology for the distribution of the High Needs Block to ensure it remains sustainable into the future. The revised methodology will be in place from 1 April 2017.

### Centrally Retained Funding

- 5.11 A number of services are covered by funding that is held centrally subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increases in expenditure from 2016/17. Approval is required by Schools Forum each year to confirm the amounts.
- 5.12 The table below provides a breakdown of the services funded by centrally retained funding, and indicates the voting rights on each line.

	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Voting Right</b>
<b>De-delegated budgets</b>	£86,145	Maintained Schools Only
<i>Being:</i>		
<i>Behaviour Support</i>	£75,000	
<i>Licences</i>	£1,245	
<i>Staff Costs (TU)</i>	£9,900	
<b>CLA/MPA Licences</b>	£121,000	For information only
<b>Combined Budgets</b>	£941,288	Whole Forum
<b>Growth Fund</b>	£690,000	Whole Forum
<b>Schools Admissions</b>	£236,300	Whole Forum
<b>Servicing of Schools Forum</b>	£18,700	Whole Forum

- 5.13 For 2017/18 the recommendation is to agree to retain the same level of funding as at 2016/17 levels. The amount held for CLA/MPA Licences may need to change once advice as to the cost in 2017/18 is received.

- 5.14 The Forum is asked to agree, as in previous years, that this portion of the DSG can be held centrally for the services to continue.

### **Education Service Grant**

- 5.15 As previously referred to at October Forum, it should be noted that for 2017/18 there are new arrangements for Schools Forum to approve the retention of funding for the duties previously funded by the Education Services Grant retained duties rate.
- 5.16 This is purely a technical change to the way in which the Local Authority receives the funding for the ESG retained duties; it is not additional funding for schools.
- 5.17 There are currently two elements to the ESG – the general rate and the retained rate. Both elements of the grant are paid to the LA and used to fund education services and statutory duties carried out for schools.
- 5.18 **ESG General rate** - The Government announced in the 2015 Spending Review that the general rate element of the ESG will cease with effect from September 2017. This is in advance of changes to the legislation that removes the functions that are funded from the grant to support maintained schools e.g. school improvement. The EFA “recognise that Local Authorities will need to use other sources of funding to pay for education once the general funding rate has been removed”. This funding gap falls as a pressure on the Council in 2017/18.
- 5.19 **ESG Retained duties rate** - The retained duties rate funding is used to fund the local authority’s role in supporting the provision of excellent education for all children of compulsory school age to ensure that every child has a school place and ensuring fair access through admissions and transport arrangements; ensuring the needs of vulnerable pupils are met; and to act as a champion for all parents and families and in shaping school provision in the area.
- 5.20 The funding consultation proposed that the retained duties element of the ESG will be transferred from local authorities’ base budget to a new DSG block i.e. the central schools block, from which these costs will continue to be met.
- 5.21 Even though the funding consultation has been delayed, the changes to the ESG are going ahead with effect from 2017/18. Therefore although there is no DSG fourth block in 2017/18, the £427,260 funding for the retained element of the ESG has been transferred to DSG to fund the duties previously funded by the ESG retained rate as outlined above.
- 5.22 Schools Forum is therefore asked to approve that the ESG retained duties funding is centrally held to fund the continuation of these services.

### **Income**

- 5.23 Schools Block income is estimated at £117,149,000. This is based on 25,485 pupils at a rate of £4,598.78 per pupil. This is an increase of £2.765M compared to 2016/17.

- 5.24 2 year old funding is estimated at £1,574,000. This is based on 527 2 year olds at a rate of £5.24 per hour.
- 5.25 3 to 4 year old funding is estimated at £7,147,800. This is based on 2,850 placements at £4.40 per hour. A small amount of Early Years pupil premium remains assumed.
- 5.26 High Needs Block income is estimated at £17,429,000, being the rebased income for 2016/17.

### Overall Position

- 5.27 The overall position set out for 2017/18 is an in-year deficit of £476,468. This will be drawn down from the DSG reserves. The reserves will effectively be covering the cost of the MFG.

## 6 Future Pressures

- 6.1 As ever, the funding blocks for schools and early years settings remain subject to the outcomes of reviews. At the time of writing we are waiting on confirmation of the national funding formula proposals for both. Future planning therefore remains problematic. Nevertheless Forum should hold in mind some of the coming pressures on DSG. These include:

Schools Block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of the MFG for Funding Formula Changes</li> <li>• Cost pressures on schools, particularly staffing costs, including national living wage, pensions and apprenticeship levy (see below)</li> <li>• Growth allocations once the demographic bulge reaches KS3</li> <li>• Impact of national funding reforms</li> </ul>
Early Years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National living wage</li> <li>• Cost of expanding provision to 30 hours per week</li> <li>• Impact of EY national funding reforms, including standardisation of basic rate across providers</li> </ul>
High Needs Block	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost pressures on schools, particularly staffing costs, including national living wage, pensions and apprenticeship levy (see below)</li> <li>• Increased demand for places</li> <li>• Increased demand and cost of post 16 places</li> </ul>

- 6.2 **Apprenticeship Levy** – Forum Members will be aware that the Government's Apprenticeship Levy is being introduced from 1 April 2017. Employers with a pay bill over £3M will be required to pay a levy of 0.5% and there will also be an additional top up of 10% from Government. The levy contribution an organisation makes will then be available but is restricted to apprenticeship training costs only and only for apprentices within the organisation.
- 6.3 Under the Government's rules, organisations are joined together as "connected employers". This will mean that for community schools they will be joined together with the local authority for calculating the £3M threshold, and therefore all community schools will be subject to the 0.5% levy as an additional cost on their pay bill.
- 6.4 For Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools, as in Academies, the governing body is considered to be the employer, rather than the Local Authority. Therefore each VA/Foundation school's liability for the levy will be based on its own pay bill.
- 6.5 For Academies, where they are part of a Multi-Academy Trust, it is likely that they will be deemed to be part of a "connected employers" group, and therefore potentially liable to pay the levy. Academies will need to take advice from their respective MAT.

## 7 Conclusion

- 7.1 This report has set out the likely outturn for 2016/17, and based on early pupil numbers, potential budgets for 2017/18. Based on Forum decisions relating to the requested central budgets for 2017/18, the schools budget for 2017/18 will be recommended to the January Forum.

## 8 Appendices

Appendix 1 – DSG Budget 2016/17 – Forecast Outturn

Appendix 2 – DSG Budget 2017/18 – Provisional Schools Funding



## Appendix 1 – 2016/17 DSG ‘Schools Budget’

Block	S251 Line	Summary Line	2016/17 Budget	Recoupment	Total Budget	Forecast	Forecast Recoupment	Total Forecast	Variance
Schools Block	1.0.1	Primary Schools	51,598,002	6,325,168	57,923,170	39,246,508	18,412,863	57,659,371	(263,799)
		Secondary Schools	3,371,882	51,262,399	54,634,281	3,371,882	51,262,400	54,634,282	1
Schools Block Total			54,969,884	57,587,567	112,557,451	42,618,390	69,675,263	112,293,653	(263,798)
	1.0.1	2 year old provision	1,970,333		1,970,333	1,970,333		1,970,333	0
		3 and 4 y/o provision	4,836,650		4,836,650	4,836,650		4,836,650	0
		School/Academy Nurseries	2,200,000		2,200,000	2,200,000		2,200,000	0
		Early Years Pupil Premium	167,000		167,000	108,759		108,759	(58,241)
	1.3.1	Central Expenditure on Children under 5	500,000		500,000	500,000		500,000	0
Early Years Total			9,673,983	0	9,673,983	9,615,742	0	9,615,742	(58,241)
High Needs	1.0.1	Place Funding - PRU - Seabrook College	810,000		810,000	810,000		810,000	0
		Place Funding - St Christopher's Special Academy (Pre 16)	0	2,000,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	0
		Place Funding - St Nicholas Special School	920,000		920,000	920,000		920,000	0
		Place Funding - Seabrook College Special School Provision	440,000		440,000	440,000		440,000	0
		Place Funding - Kingsdown Special School	1,050,000		1,050,000	1,050,000		1,050,000	0
		Place Funding - Lancaster Special School (Pre 16)	230,000		230,000	230,000		230,000	0
		Place Funding - St Christopher's Special Academy (Post 16)	50,000	70,000	120,000	50,000	70,000	120,000	0
		Place Funding - Lancaster Special School (Post 16)		540,000	540,000		750,000	750,000	210,000
		Place Funding - Chase Academy Special Base		120,000	120,000		120,000	120,000	0
		Place Funding - Shoeburyness Academy Special Base		180,000	180,000		180,000	180,000	0
		Place Funding - Temple Sutton Special Base	50,000		50,000	50,000		50,000	0
		Place Funding - Fairways Special Base	150,000		150,000	150,000		150,000	0
		Place Funding - Hamstel Infants Special Base	30,000		30,000	12,500	17,500	30,000	0
		NMSS recoupment			0			0	0
		YMCA - Free School Recoupment		320,000	320,000		300,000	300,000	(20,000)
	1.2.1 / 1.2.2	Top Up Funding - PRU - Seabrook College	387,600		387,600	387,600		387,600	0
		Top Up Funding - St Christopher's Special Academy (Pre 16)	1,294,448		1,294,448	1,521,778		1,521,778	227,330
		Top Up Funding - St Nicholas Special School	405,180		405,180	538,172		538,172	132,992
		Top Up Funding - Seabrook College Special School Provision	465,615		465,615	285,008		285,008	(180,607)
		Top Up Funding - Kingsdown Special School	863,690		863,690	1,031,148		1,031,148	167,458
		Top Up Funding - Lancaster Special School (Pre 16)	197,444		197,444	106,237		106,237	(91,207)
		Top Up Funding - St Christopher's Special Academy (Post 16)	102,796		102,796	80,624		80,624	(22,172)
		Top Up Funding - Lancaster Special School (Post 16)	468,379		468,379	99,765		99,765	(368,614)
		Top Up Funding - Chase Academy Special Base	27,815		27,815	45,905		45,905	18,090
		Top Up Funding - Shoeburyness Academy Special Base	74,174		74,174	79,235		79,235	5,061
		Top Up Funding - Temple Sutton Special Base	30,906		30,906	34,542		34,542	3,636
		Top Up Funding - Fairways Special Base	23,180		23,180	19,392		19,392	(3,788)
		Top Up Funding - Hamstel Infants Special Base	18,544		18,544	21,816		21,816	3,272
		Top Up Funding- Flexible Top ups for additional numbers	40,000		40,000	46,666		46,666	6,666
	1.2.1 / 1.2.2	ECHP Top ups - Early years	40,000		40,000	54,000		54,000	14,000
		ECHP Top ups - Primary phase	1,038,000		1,038,000	1,306,944		1,306,944	268,944
		ECHP Top ups - Secondary phase	600,000		600,000	540,000		540,000	(60,000)
		Out of Borough Top ups	370,000		370,000	417,000		417,000	47,000
		Post 16 Top ups	560,000		560,000	560,000		560,000	0
		Other Top ups	0		0			0	0
	1.2.3	Top up funding - independent providers	1,200,000		1,200,000	1,256,169		1,256,169	56,169

Block	S251 Line	Summary Line	2016/17 Budget	Recoupment	Total Budget	Forecast	Forecast Recoupment	Total Forecast	Variance
	1.2.4	HN targeted LCHI funding	100,000		100,000	46,955		46,955	(53,045)
	1.2.5	Education out of School	153,100		153,100	153,100		153,100	0
	1.2.6	Hospital Education provision	32,000		32,000	76,649		76,649	44,649
	1.2.5	SEN Team - Assessments and Placements	422,479		422,479	422,479		422,479	1
	1.2.5	SEN Support Services - Visually Impaired Outreach Service at K	90,000		90,000	96,000		96,000	6,000
		SEN Support Services - Outreach Service at St Christopher's	50,000		50,000	80,000		80,000	30,000
		SEN Support Services - Outreach Service at Fairways	50,000		50,000	20,000		20,000	(30,000)
		SEN Support Services - Other	12,000		12,000	24,000		24,000	12,000
	1.2.7	Preventative Pathways SLA with Seabrook	192,000		192,000	192,000		192,000	0
		Elective Home Education Costs	8,000		8,000	6,000		6,000	(2,000)
	1.2.8	Nurture Base Provision	483,000		483,000	483,000		483,000	0
		Summer Term - Nurture Base costs	0		0			0	0
		Summer term -Thorpedene Nurture Base	0		0			0	0
		Summer term - Eastwood Nurture Base	0		0			0	0
		Cash allocation to schools	0		0			0	0
		Behaviour Support SLA with Seabrook	0		0			0	0
<b>High Needs Total</b>			<b>13,530,349</b>	<b>3,230,000</b>	<b>16,760,349</b>	<b>13,744,684</b>	<b>3,437,500</b>	<b>17,182,184</b>	<b>421,835</b>
<b>Centrally Retained</b>	1.1.2	De-delegated - Behaviour Support	75,000		75,000	75,000		75,000	0
	1.1.7	De-delegated - Licenses Subscriptions	1,245		1,245	1,245		1,245	0
	1.1.8	De-delegated - Staff costs	9,900		9,900	9,900		9,900	0
	1.4.1	Contribution to combined budgets	941,288		941,288	967,521		967,521	26,233
	1.4.10	Growth Fund	690,000		690,000	598,070		598,070	(91,930)
	1.4.12	CLA/MPA License	121,000		121,000	121,000		121,000	0
	1.4.2	School Admissions	236,300		236,300	236,300		236,300	0
	1.4.3	Servicing of School Forums	18,700		18,700	18,700		18,700	0
<b>Centrally Retained Total</b>			<b>2,093,433</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,093,433</b>	<b>2,027,736</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,027,736</b>	<b>(65,697)</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>80,267,649</b>	<b>60,817,567</b>	<b>141,085,216</b>	<b>68,006,552</b>	<b>73,112,763</b>	<b>141,119,315</b>	<b>34,099</b>
		DSG - Schools Block	(56,796,433)	(57,587,567)	(114,384,000)	(44,708,737)	(69,675,263)	(114,384,000)	0
		DSG - Early Years Block (2 year olds)	(1,811,745)		(1,811,745)	(1,811,745)		(1,811,745)	0
		DSG - Early Years Block	(7,048,458)		(7,048,458)	(7,048,458)		(7,048,458)	0
		DSG - High Needs Funding Block	(13,639,000)	(3,230,000)	(16,869,000)	(13,435,258)	(3,437,500)	(16,872,758)	(3,758)
		DSG - Early Years Pupil Premium	(167,000)		(167,000)	(108,759)		(108,759)	58,241
		DSG - Early Years Block 15/16 Accrual shortfall				129,000		129,000	129,000
<b>Funded From</b>		DSG Brought Forward - Early Years	(237,000)		(237,000)	(237,000)		(237,000)	0
		DSG Brought Forward - to balance	(568,013)		(568,013)	(568,013)		(568,013)	0
								0	0
<b>Funded From Total</b>			<b>(80,267,649)</b>	<b>(60,817,567)</b>	<b>(141,085,216)</b>	<b>(67,788,970)</b>	<b>(73,112,763)</b>	<b>(140,901,733)</b>	<b>183,483</b>
			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>217,582</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>217,582</b>	<b>217,582</b>

DSG B/FWD  
Used Above  
Forecast Overspend  
C/Fwd to 2017/18

1,593,856	1,593,856		1,593,856	
(805,013)	(805,013)		(805,013)	
0	(217,582)		(217,582)	
788,843	571,261		571,261	

**Appendix 2 - Illustrative Baseline Modelling 2017/18**  
**IMPORTANT - The modelling carried out does not provide forecast income figures for schools and academies for 2017/18. It is presented to provide a baseline that helps illustrate the likely financial challenges that Schools Forum will have to manage in the medium term.**

School Name	NOR	Basic Entitlement	Deprivation - FSM	Deprivation - IDACI	LAC	EAL	Mobility	Prior Attainment	Total - Pupil Led	Lump Sum	Rates	Split Site / Exceptional Factor	Total - School Led	GRAND TOTAL	Per Pupil	MFG / (CAPPING)	FINAL FUNDING	Per Pupil	Estimated Pupil Premium	Per Pupil including PP	School Name
PRIMARY SCHOOLS																					
Barons Court Primary School	232	695,235	33,403	33,869	0	5,342	0	22,045	789,894	150,000	27,832	0	177,832	967,726	4,171	0	967,726	4,171	89,971	4,559	Barons Court Primary School
Blenheim Primary School	609	1,824,991	77,160	97,693	3,389	7,039	0	91,295	2,101,568	150,000	51,958	0	201,958	2,303,526	3,782	0	2,303,526	3,782	264,792	4,217	Blenheim Primary School
Bournemouth Park Primary School	519	1,555,288	216,534	187,908	1,287	20,607	4,804	136,096	2,122,524	150,000	26,838	0	176,838	2,299,362	4,430	0	2,299,362	4,430	347,846	5,101	Bournemouth Park Primary School
Bournes Green Infant School	183	548,396	7,644	7,601	603	10,738	0	13,356	588,338	150,000	10,437	0	160,437	748,775	4,092	0	748,775	4,092	4,831	4,118	Bournes Green Infant School
Bournes Green Junior	265	794,126	5,068	12,597	0	4,260	0	9,834	825,885	150,000	18,513	0	168,513	994,398	3,752	0	994,398	3,752	13,939	3,805	Bournes Green Junior
Chalkwell Hall Infants	325	973,928	11,765	27,425	310	6,593	0	31,014	1,051,035	150,000	11,804	0	161,804	1,212,839	3,732	0	1,212,839	3,732	54,054	3,898	Chalkwell Hall Infants
Chalkwell Hall Junior School	430	1,288,582	27,306	35,272	0	2,332	0	33,416	1,386,906	150,000	15,780	0	165,780	1,552,686	3,611	0	1,552,686	3,611	94,248	3,830	Chalkwell Hall Junior School
Darlinghurst School Academy Trust	689	2,064,727	176,207	91,877	694	17,320	0	79,156	2,429,980	150,000	45,857	0	195,857	2,625,837	3,811	0	2,625,837	3,811	297,528	4,243	Darlinghurst School Academy Trust
Earls Hall Primary School	631	1,890,919	54,741	47,163	0	18,286	0	74,332	2,085,441	150,000	31,311	0	181,311	2,266,752	3,592	0	2,266,752	3,592	121,176	3,784	Earls Hall Primary School
Eastwood Primary School	385	1,153,730	130,272	59,573	786	5,816	17,426	63,452	1,431,055	150,000	4,920	0	154,920	1,585,975	4,119	149,615	1,735,590	4,508	218,962	5,077	Eastwood Primary School
Edwards Hall Primary School	386	1,156,727	31,512	7,748	613	751	0	36,729	1,234,079	150,000	21,992	0	171,992	1,406,071	3,643	0	1,406,071	3,643	87,067	3,868	Edwards Hall Primary School
Fairways Primary School	427	1,279,592	30,266	35,530	594	1,666	0	47,359	1,395,008	150,000	25,411	0	175,411	1,570,419	3,678	0	1,570,419	3,678	86,328	3,880	Fairways Primary School
Friars Primary and Nursery School	452	1,354,509	163,624	121,719	365	4,682	61	75,249	1,720,209	150,000	31,808	0	181,808	1,902,017	4,208	22,965	1,924,982	4,259	275,933	4,869	Friars Primary and Nursery School
Hamstel Infant School & Nursery	454	1,360,503	110,962	129,147	324	12,894	0	48,995	1,662,824	150,000	43,239	0	193,239	1,856,063	4,088	6,294	1,862,357	4,102	226,723	4,601	Hamstel Infant School & Nursery
Hamstel Junior School	508	1,522,324	122,533	144,040	0	7,244	0	107,104	1,903,245	150,000	36,530	0	186,530	2,089,775	4,114	0	2,089,775	4,114	286,598	4,678	Hamstel Junior School
Heycroft Primary School	416	1,246,628	22,751	3,571	0	2,317	0	38,172	1,313,439	150,000	31,808	0	181,808	1,495,247	3,594	0	1,495,247	3,594	49,421	3,713	Heycroft Primary School
Hinguar Community Primary School	204	611,327	25,094	31,390	300	658	0	24,667	693,437	150,000	59,640	0	209,640	903,077	4,427	8,421	911,498	4,468	76,138	4,841	Hinguar Community Primary School
Leigh Primary School	628	1,881,929	55,571	6,075	0	4,954	0	40,194	1,988,723	150,000	30,317	0	180,317	2,169,040	3,454	0	2,169,040	3,454	140,580	3,678	Leigh Primary School
Milton Hall Primary School	609	1,824,991	218,774	155,593	330	45,569	21,791	150,506	2,417,555	150,000	10,835	0	160,835	2,578,390	4,234	170,974	2,749,364	4,515	440,154	5,237	Milton Hall Primary School
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School	420	1,258,615	1,264	27,169	0	3,655	0	34,996	1,325,698	150,000	5,944	0	155,944	1,481,642	3,528	0	1,481,642	3,528	27,852	3,594	Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School
Porters Grange Primary School & Nursery	396	1,186,694	171,543	172,427	594	26,005	12,126	113,845	1,683,234	150,000	33,299	0	183,299	1,866,533	4,713	13,637	1,880,170	4,748	329,327	5,580	Porters Grange Primary School & Nursery
Prince Avenue Academy	390	1,168,714	108,091	84,125	641	12,871	10,511	52,152	1,437,104	150,000	8,449	0	158,449	1,595,553	4,091	0	1,595,553	4,091	246,431	4,723	Prince Avenue Academy
Richmond Avenue Primary and Nursery School	389	1,165,717	119,012	81,144	636	3,097	0	61,056	1,430,662	150,000	21,247	0	171,247	1,601,909	4,118	15,282	1,617,191	4,157	176,774	4,612	Richmond Avenue Primary and Nursery School
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	260	779,142	34,676	81,471	0	9,331	0	36,453	941,073	150,000	2,659	0	152,659	1,093,732	4,207	0	1,093,732	4,207	79,200	4,511	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School
St. George's Primary School	209	626,311	10,088	26,044	297	989	0	23,137	686,866	150,000	3,578	0	153,578	840,444	4,021	0	840,444	4,021	16,711	4,101	St. George's Primary School
St. Helen's Catholic Primary School	262	785,136	18,286	57,188	0	21,200	0	40,464	922,273	150,000	2,957	0	152,957	1,075,230	4,104	0	1,075,230	4,104	50,054	4,295	St. Helen's Catholic Primary School
St Mary's C of E School	551	1,651,183	88,976	142,908	1,762	21,702	0	64,355	1,970,885	150,000	5,020	116,500	271,520	2,242,405	4,070	0	2,242,405	4,070	180,523	4,397	St Mary's C of E School
Temple Sutton Primary	773	2,316,450	237,010	226,902	588	8,236	0	138,130	2,927,316	150,000	54,173	0	204,173	3,131,489	4,051	0	3,131,489	4,051	388,238	4,553	Temple Sutton Primary
The Westborough School	563	1,687,143	155,402	102,200	590	32,683	11,922	101,613	2,091,552	150,000	6,362	0	156,362	2,247,914	3,993	0	2,247,914	3,993	279,602	4,489	The Westborough School
Thorpe Greenways Infant School	450	1,348,516	101,421	97,359	0	7,601	0	46,369	1,601,267	150,000	0	0	150,000	1,751,267	3,892	0	1,751,267	3,892	143,801	4,211	Thorpe Greenways Infant School
Thorpe Greenways Junior School	474	1,420,437	120,867	87,533	594	2,262	0	54,267	1,685,960	150,000	50,197	0	200,197	1,886,157	3,979	0	1,886,157	3,979	246,074	4,498	Thorpe Greenways Junior School
Thorpedene Primary School	541	1,621,216	245,344	160,926	1,745	7,747	10,115	95,582	2,142,675	150,000	6,759	0	156,759	2,299,434	4,250	60,473	2,359,907	4,362	396,211	5,094	Thorpedene Primary School
Westleigh Infant School	360	1,078,813	8,869	1,470	0	6,390	0	29,674	1,125,216	150,000	16,650	0	166,650	1,291,866	3,589	0	1,291,866	3,589	28,512	3,668	Westleigh Infant School
Westleigh Junior School	514	1,540,305	16,471	4,627	301	1,420	0	27,258	1,590,381	150,000	22,489	0	172,489	1,762,870	3,430	0	1,762,870	3,430	47,309	3,522	Westleigh Junior School
SECONDARY SCHOOLS																					
Belfairs Academy	1,161	4,794,691	266,015	304,154	3,388	5,531	0	315,417	5,689,196	160,000	67,095	0	227,095	5,916,291	5,096	0	5,916,291	5,096	234,704	5,298	Belfairs Academy
Cecil Jones College	919	3,775,547	566,861	608,931	1,146	31,712	0	382,761	5,366,957	160,000	37,424	0	197,424	5,564,381	6,055	6,320	5,570,701	6,062	375,608	6,470	Cecil Jones College
Chase High School	934	3,864,538	419,804	477,492	2,347	32,208	8,574	391,978	5,196,942	160,000	50,694	0	210,694	5,407,636	5,790	24,610	5,432,246	5,816	446,930	6,295	Chase High School
Futures Community College	475	1,999,158	335,324	300,306	2,069	14,380	0	263,397	2,914,635	160,000	14,612	0	174,612	3,089,247	6,504	20,313	3,109,560	6,546	306,306	7,191	Futures Community College
Shoeburyness High School	1,423	5,868,553	526,774	725,223	5,493	6,424	0	470,483	7,602,951	160,000	44,482	0	204,482	7,807,433	5,487	0	7,807,433	5,487	499,552	5,838	Shoeburyness High School
Southend High School for Girls	808	3,317,514	62,781	259,757	327	10,670	0	0	3,651,049	160,000	25,347	0	185,347	3,836,396	4,748	0	3,836,396	4,748	43,141	4,801	Southend High School for Girls
Southend High School for Boys	834	3,413,894	35,771	248,702	0	2,842	0	0	3,701,210	160,000	32,057	0	192,057	3,893,267	4,668	0	3,893,267	4,668	52,687	4,731	Southend High School for Boys
St Bernard's High School	725	2,995,433	83,206	290,204	1,502	12,705	0	118,463	3,501,513	160,000	18,488	0	178,488	3,680,001	5,076	0	3,680,001	5,076	95,033	5,207	St Bernard's High School
St. Thomas More High School	744	3,069,301	112,431	306,789	600	8,179	0	154,858	3,652,158	160,000	28,533	0	188,533	3,840,691	5,162	0	3,840,691	5,162	119,371	5,323	St. Thomas More High School
The Eastwood Academy	880	3,609,255	228,386	332,845	319	4,716	0	204,893	4,380,415	160,000	23,856	0	183,856	4,564,271	5,187	0	4,564,271	5,187	205,663	5,420	The Eastwood Academy
Westcliff High School for Boys	823	3,376,176	43,461	255,429	0	42,715	0	0	3,717,780	160,000	22,961	0	182,961	3,900,741	4,740	0	3,900,741	4,740	44,543	4,794	Westcliff High School for Boys
Westcliff High School for Girls	855	3,498,643	38,381	247,088	0	10,437	0	0	3,794,550	160,000	37,002	0	197,002	3,991,552	4,668	0	3,991,552	4,668	46,170	4,722	Westcliff High School for Girls
Total by Factor	25,485	88,245,547	5,677,702	6,946,204	34,534	526,776	97,330	4,344,572	105,872,663	7,020,000	1,179,164	116,500	8,315,664	114,188,327		498,904	114,687,231		8,282,619		
Percentage by Factor		77.3%	5.0%	6.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	3.8%	92.7%	6.1%	1.0%	0.1%	7.3%	100.0%		0.4%					

Appendix 2 - Comparison to 2016-17									
IMPORTANT - The modelling carried out does not provide forecast income figures for schools and academies for 2017/18. It is presented to provide a baseline that helps illustrate the likely financial challenges that Schools Forum will have to manage in the medium term.									
	2016/17 Formula Funding			2017/18 Formula Funding			Change		
School Name	NOR	Funding £	£ per Pupil	NOR	Funding £	£ per pupil	NOR	Funding £	£ per pupil
Barons Court Primary School	220	920,536	4,184	232	967,726	4,171	12	47,190	(13)
Blenheim Primary School	600	2,295,744	3,826	609	2,303,526	3,782	9	7,782	(44)
Bournemouth Park Primary School	495	2,224,900	4,495	519	2,299,362	4,430	24	74,462	(64)
Bournes Green Infant School	182	743,964	4,088	183	748,775	4,092	1	4,811	4
Bournes Green Junior	265	992,111	3,744	265	994,398	3,752	0	2,287	9
Chalkwell Hall Infants	315	1,177,785	3,739	325	1,212,839	3,732	10	35,054	(7)
Chalkwell Hall Junior School	419	1,513,582	3,612	430	1,552,686	3,611	11	39,104	(1)
Darlinghurst School Academy Trust	652	2,489,024	3,818	689	2,625,837	3,811	37	136,813	(6)
Earls Hall Primary School	628	2,354,059	3,749	631	2,266,752	3,592	3	(87,307)	(156)
Eastwood Primary School	338	1,559,552	4,614	385	1,735,590	4,508	47	176,038	(106)
Edwards Hall Primary School	388	1,408,482	3,630	386	1,406,071	3,643	(2)	(2,411)	13
Fairways Primary School	414	1,521,608	3,675	427	1,570,419	3,678	13	48,811	2
Friars Primary and Nursery School	399	1,743,766	4,370	452	1,924,982	4,259	53	181,216	(112)
Hamstel Infant School & Nursery	448	1,867,855	4,169	454	1,862,357	4,102	6	(5,498)	(67)
Hamstel Junior School	478	1,973,649	4,129	508	2,089,775	4,114	30	116,126	(15)
Heycroft Primary School	417	1,493,513	3,582	416	1,495,247	3,594	(1)	1,734	13
Hinguar Community Primary School	206	928,702	4,508	204	911,498	4,468	(2)	(17,204)	(40)
Leigh Primary School	630	2,273,952	3,609	628	2,169,040	3,454	(2)	(104,912)	(156)
Milton Hall Primary School	592	2,702,394	4,565	609	2,749,364	4,515	17	46,970	(50)
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School	421	1,478,953	3,513	420	1,481,642	3,528	(1)	2,689	15
Porters Grange Primary School & Nursery	392	1,875,297	4,784	396	1,880,170	4,748	4	4,873	(36)
Prince Avenue Academy	386	1,588,259	4,115	390	1,595,553	4,091	4	7,294	(23)
Richmond Avenue Primary and Nursery School	381	1,608,854	4,223	389	1,617,191	4,157	8	8,337	(65)
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	229	980,546	4,282	260	1,093,732	4,207	31	113,186	(75)
St. George's Primary School	210	840,759	4,004	209	840,444	4,021	(1)	(315)	18
St. Helen's Catholic Primary School	236	982,948	4,165	262	1,075,230	4,104	26	92,282	(61)
St Mary's C of E School	510	2,090,551	4,099	551	2,242,405	4,070	41	151,854	(29)
Temple Sutton Primary	777	3,136,946	4,037	773	3,131,489	4,051	(4)	(5,457)	14
The Westborough School	564	2,254,619	3,998	563	2,247,914	3,993	(1)	(6,705)	(5)
Thorpe Greenways Infant School	418	1,633,921	3,909	450	1,751,267	3,892	32	117,346	(17)
Thorpe Greenways Junior School	477	1,892,507	3,968	474	1,886,157	3,979	(3)	(6,350)	12
Thorpedene Primary School	544	2,397,539	4,407	541	2,359,907	4,362	(3)	(37,632)	(45)
Westleigh Infant School	360	1,288,738	3,580	360	1,291,866	3,589	0	3,128	9
Westleigh Junior School	514	1,758,416	3,421	514	1,762,870	3,430	0	4,454	9
Belfairs Academy	1,146	5,769,145	5,034	1,161	5,916,291	5,096	15	147,146	62
Cecil Jones College	923	5,675,961	6,149	919	5,570,701	6,062	(4)	(105,259)	(88)
Chase High School	938	5,602,173	5,972	934	5,432,246	5,816	(4)	(169,927)	(156)
Futures Community College	511	3,394,383	6,643	475	3,109,560	6,546	(36)	(284,823)	(96)
Shoeburyness High School	1,394	7,571,868	5,432	1,423	7,807,433	5,487	29	235,565	55
Southend High School for Girls	758	3,574,537	4,716	808	3,836,396	4,748	50	261,859	32
Southend High School for Boys	801	3,705,759	4,626	834	3,893,267	4,668	33	187,508	42
St Bernard's High School	727	3,653,796	5,026	725	3,680,001	5,076	(2)	26,205	50
St. Thomas More High School	747	3,817,681	5,111	744	3,840,691	5,162	(3)	23,010	52
The Eastwood Academy	851	4,402,616	5,173	880	4,564,271	5,187	29	161,655	13
Westcliff High School for Boys	790	3,717,832	4,706	823	3,900,741	4,740	33	182,909	34
Westcliff High School for Girls	820	3,795,537	4,629	855	3,991,552	4,668	35	196,015	40
	24,911	112,675,317		25,485	114,687,231		574	2,011,915	

**Southend-on-Sea Education Board****on****7<sup>th</sup> December 2016****Report prepared by: Brin Martin, Director of Learning**


---

**Report Title: Draft note of the initial meeting of the School Performance Sub Group**
**Agenda Item: Item 6**


---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 This report is intended to update members of Education Board with the progress made and activity of the School Performance Sub Group (SPSG) of the Education Board. The SPSG has met and been formally minuted. These minutes will form a confidential "part two" minute of Education Board, and not be available as a public document. The reason for this is that detailed and confidential discussion that is not in the public domain takes place.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the contents of the report.  
 2.2 To approve the decision to restrict the distribution of the minutes to full members of Education Board.  
 2.3 To approve the proposed actions.

**3. Background/Context**

- 3.1 Following the establishment of the Education Board and its initial meeting the first formal meeting of the School Performance Sub Group (SPSG) took place on 28.11.16. The group was elected in accordance with the mandate given by Education Board.

**4. Summary of meeting****4.1 Operation of the group**

- 4.1.1 As mentioned above, it would not be appropriate for the full notes of meeting to be made available in the Education Board minutes. However these notes will be distributed to full members of Education Board, and in future meetings, a summary of the sub group activity, evaluation and impact will be made available in the full minutes.
- 4.1.2 It was agreed that a Headteacher should serve as chair. Mr Neil Houchen from Eastbrook Academy was duly elected, and Mr Jim Johnson from Edwards Hall as vice chair.
- 4.1.3 The remit was discussed and agreed as being good enough pending the full review of the Education Board early next year. It was further agreed that the group would ensure that decisions and actions from the sub group should be evaluated against this remit.
- 4.1.4 A further meeting date was identified, and then on a half termly basis.
- 4.1.5 The Director of Learning reiterated that in essence the SPSG were discharging several of the functions that previously were undertaken solely by the Local Authority and its officers. Whilst this new relationship

was far more in keeping with the current model of school to school and sector led improvement, he stressed that ultimately, the accountability for the operation, effectiveness and impact of the group on school performance resides with him through the Local Authority. This may require executive action on the part of the LA in particular circumstances.

## **4.2 School performance**

- 4.2.1** A full and detailed discussion of all primary schools then took place. This was based upon the current risk register, valid intelligence, and notes from meetings with the Regional Schools Commissioner. As a result each school was categorised based upon the judgement of the SPWG using the OSTED categories. It will be important that this information is first shared with individual schools prior to further action.
- 4.2.2** As a result of the scrutiny, a plan of intervention in proportion to need was discussed and agreed. In line with the partnership principles that underpin the establishment of the Board, these action relate to both maintained and academy schools, although further dialogue between the RSC and the Director of Learning will take place regarding each school prior to action.
- 4.2.3** The actions ranged from supporting existing improvements within schools: seeking assurance, in the case of an academy, that the academy/trust has sufficient capacity to make required improvements; offering additional support through to a diagnostic visit by a school performance officer and supporting the school through direct intervention.
- 4.2.4** The meeting further discussed and differentiated the role of a school performance officer, allocated by the group, to monitor and challenge the school, and that of development support brokered by the group through SETSA in the first instance.

## **4.3 School Performance Strategy**

- 4.3.1** The Direct or Learning shared a very early draft of a school performance strategy that will be required to replace the existing school improvement strategy, improving learning together phase two. This will reflect the new operating procedures under the Education Board and Sub Group.
- 4.3.2** Members of the sub group were asked to feed back to the DoL prior to the redrafting and representation at the next meeting. The new strategy would then come to Board for sign off.

## **4.4 School Performance Officers (SPO)**

- 4.4.1** SETSA has previously invited Headteachers the opportunity to be "trained" in the role of SPO. The original date has now been put back until the New Year.
- 4.4.2** However, the group felt strongly that the planned activity that was identified under 4.2.2 should go ahead as soon as possible in order that schools can maximise the support offered.

# **5. Implications of the report**

## **5.1 Financial implications**

- 5.1.1 Money has already been set aside by the Local Authority to commission both monitoring, challenge and development support over current and subsequent two financial years.
- 5.1.2 In addition, through their mandate, SETSA is able to access intervention funding for targeted schools.
- 5.1.3 Lastly, under the potential emerging strategy, matched funding in certain circumstances would be expected from the school.

## **5.2 Risk associated with the report**

- 5.2.1 The operation of the Board and Sub Group are new and innovative. The group felt it essential that they robustly evaluated their impact on a frequent basis.

## **6. Background Papers**

- 6.1 None

**Southend-on-Sea Education Board**  
**on**  
**7<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

Report prepared by: Brin Martin, Director of Learning

---

**Report Title: Draft notes from the "Audit" of Education Board 28.11.16**

**Agenda Item: Item 7**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1** Following the establishment of the Education Board and associated sub groups, SBC internal audit team were asked to "pre-audit" Board processes, documentation and workings rather than wait a year. At the initial; meeting, Daniel Wills from PWC attended, observed board, reviewed documentation and spoke to members. He verbally fed back in late November on his findings and view, and will formally report back through management letter within 10 working days. This report will be made available to Board members as soon as it is published.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1** To note the findings of the audit.
- 2.2** To ensure, following the publication of the management letter, that the recommendations are built into the formal review of the first year of implementation (March 2017).
- 2.3** That the recommendations, subject to Board approval are implemented in full.

**3. Background/Context**

- 3.1** The initial audit of the establishment of the Board took place in October, and consisted of scrutiny of available documentation, interviews with the Director of Learning; the chair and vice chair and an officer responsible for the previous schools forum.
- 3.2** Subsequent conversation and clarifications around the operating of the Board and sub groups took place.
- 3.3** In addition, the feedback took place immediately after the first meeting of the School Performance Working Group. This served to again triangulate processes and intentions of that sub group.

**4. Summary of findings**

- 4.1** Overall, the auditor spoke positively of the Board concept, and recognised how far the Borough has moved to adopt such a policy. It identified that the Board concept was innovative, and a positive opportunity to manage the emerging education landscape in the borough. The following feedback will serve to strengthen both the operation of, and the subscription to the Board in its function of improving outcomes for young people. Several of the points raised are already in hand, others serve as a useful



reminder of actions planned but not yet implemented. In the order of the verbal feedback the points raised were:

- 4.1.1 The Audit identified the need to strengthen the draft Terms of Reference by incorporating elements from some of the other documentation supplied. It was also noted that an organisational chart would aid this visually.
- 4.1.2 There was a need to define the roles of the chair, vice chair and clerk, and for the sub groups.
- 4.1.3** The auditor recognised the benefit of subsuming the role of other subgroups through existing meeting patterns, ie the Vulnerable Learners Sub Group would be formed through the SEND strategic Board.
- 4.1.4 Formal minutes of meetings including subgroups should be made available. Where confidential matters were discussed in Board or Sub Group these should be reported under part two minutes
- 4.1.5 The Auditor recommended that Board identify salient KPIs across the full spectrum of its remit that would be shared, tracked and updated on a meeting by meeting basis. In this way, any potential items that may require clarification could be addressed at the meeting rather than retrospectively.
- 4.1.6 The Auditor recognised that a chair's briefing would prove invaluable prior to Board.
- 4.1.7 Action is still required to identify and enrol observers from the Board, including University, Business and Health representatives.
- 4.1.8 The identified need for a dedicated public website should be progressed.
- 4.1.9 Previous arrangements for induction should continue.
- 4.1.10 The Auditor asked what would be done in the result of a tied vote. It was agreed that normal practice of chair's casting vote would take place for all matters other than those requiring Executive Councillor decisions.
- 4.1.11 Documentation has not made clear the definition of quorate.
- 4.1.12 Discussion took place with regard to the monitoring of educational spend other than school funding. It was agreed that proper evaluation of impact would take place for Board sponsored activity.

## **5. Implications of the report**

### **5.1 Financial implications**

- 5.1.1 To implement the recommendations and strengthen the operation of the Board would require some additional officer time. This will be subsumed into the normal operating of officers.

### **5.2 Risk associated with the report**

- 5.2.1 Given the importance of the Board success, it is recommended to minimise risk that the points are implemented in full.

## **6. Background Papers**

- 6.1 Following the formal publication of the management letter, this would be made available to all board and sub group members.