## Public Document Pack

# THE SCHOOLS FORUM 

Thursday, 11th July, 2013 at 5.30 pm
at St Pauls Primary, Ringwood Way, Winchmore Hill, London, N21 2RA

1. AGENDA (Pages 1-28)
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# Schools Forum <br> Meeting to be held from 17:30 on Thursday 11 July 2013 <br> Venue: St Pauls Primary, Ringwood Way, Winchmore Hill, London, N21 2RA <br> (NOTE: Sangeeta Brown, Resources Development Manager - 07956 539613) 

## Schools Members

Maintained Schools:

| Governors: | Ms N Conway (Primary), Cllr I Cranfield (Primary), Mr B Grayston (Primary), |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr T McGee (Secondary), |
| Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary) |  |, | Mrs P Alder (Primary), Ms J Cullen (Secondary), Mr B Goddard (Secondary), |
| :--- |
| Headteachers: |
|  |
|  |
| Mr G Lefley (Pupil Referral Unit), Mrs S Moore (Primary), |
| Mrs P Rutherford (Secondary), Mr P Smith (Primary), Mrs S Tripp (Special), |
|  |
| Mr R Yarwood (Primary) |,

## Non-Schools MEMBERS

Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Panel Voluntary Sector 14-19 Partnership Teachers' Committee LA Lead Professional Head of Pupil Referral Unit

## ObSERVER

Cabinet Member
Education Funding Agency

Cllr R Simbodyal
Mrs S Roberts
Mr K Hintz
Mr R Gow
Ms J Tosh
Mr J Carrick

Cllr A Orhan
Ms B Pennekett

MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ARRIVE AT 17:15 PM WHEN SANDWICHES WILL BE PROVIDED ENABLING A PROMPT START AT 17:30 PM

## AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTIONS and APOLOGIES for ABSENCE

## 2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members are invited to identify any personal or prejudicial interests relevant to items on the agenda. A definition of personal and prejudicial interests has been attached for members' information.

## Page 2

(17:45)
3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES (WHITE)
(a) Schools Forum Meeting held on 9 May 2013 (attached)
(b) Commissioning Group meeting held on 14 June 2013 (attached)
(c) Matters arising from these minutes
4. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION (PINK)
(a) School Funding Review 2013/14 (attached)
(b) School Funding Reforms: Phase 2 (2014/15) (attached)
5. ITEMS FOR DECISION (BLUE)
(a) School Trade Union Facilities funding: 2013/14 (attached)
(18:55)
6. ITEM FOR INFORMATION
(a) Additional Resource Provision (to be tabled)
7. WORKPLAN (YELLOW) (attached)
8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
9. FUTURE MEETINGS
(a) Date for next meeting 16 October 2013 - Venue to be confirmed
(b) Proposed Dates for future meetings

- 11 December 2013 - Venue to be confirmed
- 15 / 22 January 2014 - Venue to be confirmed
(c) Apologies for absence from the proposed meetings

10. CONFIDENTIALITY

To consider which items should be treated as confidential.
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## DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF
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# MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING HELD ON 9 MAY 2013 <br> AT ST PAUL'S SCHOOL 

| Schools Members |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Governors: | Mr B Grayston (Primary), Ms N Conway (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary), Mr T McGee (Secondary), Cllr I Cranfield (Primary) |
| Headteachers: | Mrs P Alder (Primary), Ms J Cullen (Secondary), Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Mr G Lefley (Pupil Referral Unit), Mrs S Moore (Primary), <br> Mrs P Rutherford (Secondary), Mr P Smith (Primary), Mrs S Tripp (Special), Mr R Yarwood (Primary) |
| Academies: | Mr M Lees, Ms R Stanley-McKenzie |

Non-Schools Members
Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Panel Early Years Provider
14-19 Partnership
Teachers' Committee
Assistant Director, Education
Head of Behaviour Support

Cllr R Simbodyal<br>Mrs S Roberts<br>Mr K Hintz<br>Mr R Gow<br>Ms J Tosh<br>Mr J Carrick

## Observers

Member (Observer): Cllr A Orhan
Assistant Director, Commissioning \& Com. Engagement:
Finance Business Partner:
Assistant Finance Business Partner: Mrs Y Medlam
Resources Development Manager: Mrs S Brown
Also Attending:
Assistant Director, Customer Services \& Information Ms Robertson
Italics denotes absence
As the position of Chair of Schools Forum was vacant, Ms Stickler opened the meeting.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS and APOLOGIES for ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Leach, Mr McGee, Mrs Rutherford, Mr Lees, Ms Stanley-McKenzie, CIIr Orhan, Cllr Simbodyal, Mrs Roberts and Mr Gow.

Noted the absences of Mrs Alder and Ms Cullen.
2. MEMBERSHIP

Reported since the last meeting Mr Woodhall, secondary governor had tendered his resignation from the Forum. Therefore, the place vacated by Mr Woodhall had also been included for nomination from the Member Governor Forum. Nominations had been sought from the Member Governor Forum; Cllr Ingrid Cranfield, Mr Brian Grayston for the primary vacancies and Mr Terry McGee for the secondary vacancy had been nominated.

Noted Mr McGee had been unable to attend this meeting of Forum due to a prior appointment.

Cllr Ingrid Cranfield and Mr Brian Grayston were welcomed to the Schools Forum.

## 3. ELECTION OF CHAIR

(a) Election of Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2013/14 Ms Stickler invited nominations for the position of Chair of the Schools' Forum.

Received a nomination for Mrs Sless from Ms Conway. Mrs Sless stated that she was honoured to be nominated but felt she could not accept as the role may conflict with her position as Chair of the Member Governor Forum. Mrs Sless put forward a nomination for Mr Grayston to be Chair;

Resolved Mr Grayston be elected Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2013/14.

Mr Grayston thanked the Forum and Ms Stickler and took over as the Chair.
(b) Election of Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2010/11

Mr Grayston stated that Mrs Sless had expressed an interest in the position of Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum.

Resolved that Mrs Sless be elected as Vice-Chair of the Schools' Forum for the municipal year 2013/14.
4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Reported some Forum members as well as the new members needed to complete the register of business interest form.

Action: Mrs Brown
5. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
(a) Schools Forum meetings held on 13 February 2013

Received and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools' Forum held on 13 February 2013.
(b) Matters arising from the Schools Forum meeting held on 13 February 2013
(i) Item 6(a(iv)): Schools Budget Shares - Recoupment

It was questioned whether there was an agreed process for recoupment of funding for pupils with high special education needs. It was stated that the process was being developed and information was being shared with schools as it was being developed.
(ii) Item 7: Enfield Traded Services to Schools: Summary Brochure

It was commented that the arrangements as outlined in the brochure were not helpful because schools were required to confirm their buyback of a service within a tight timescale yet no information was available on the cost of the service and some of the description of the services were inadequate.

Noted that the brochure was published as early as possible in January 2013, and where price information was available and could be published these had been included. It was stated that schools were not satisfied this was not sufficient and it was important for schools to have information on prices for all services and accurate information to consider whether to purchase a service from the LA or not.

Agreed to note the comments made by the Forum and seek to use these to support further improvements in the information provided for traded services.

Action: Mrs Brown
6. ITEM FOR PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Welfare Benefit Reforms - Ms Robertson attended the meeting to present this item.
Received a paper outlining the timetable for the Welfare Benefit reforms and a presentation on the changes being introduced and the impact of these for Enfield, copies of both are included in the minute book.

## Noted:

(i) the timetable provided to the Forum outlined the changes that have or will happen;
(ii) the changes in housing benefits had affected a number of groups:

- single people between $25-35$ living alone in the private rented sector. This group were now only eligible for benefits for a shared accommodation rate and unlikely to be able to afford to live in a one bedroom flat. It was estimated that they could lose up to $£ 100$ per week;
- people living in 5 bedroom accommodation. This group had had their benefit reduced to a 4 bedroom rate;
(iii) a new size criteria will apply for the social rented sector whereby families living in properties larger than they needed will be required to move into smaller properties or meet the shortfall in reduced Housing Benefit. It was uncertain if those effected by the under occupancy criteria would move. It was stated that current view was that they would stay and pay the rent required. There was concern as to how landlords of the social rented sector would react to guard against rent arrears. People with one bedroom too many will see a $14 \%$ ( $£ 25$ ) per week reduction and those with two or more bedrooms too many would see a $25 \%$ reduction in their benefits from 1 April 2013.
(iv) Enfield was one of four London authorities to be selected to implement the benefit cap changes in the first phase from 1 April 2013. This will see people's housing benefit cut if their total benefit income is over $£ 500$ a week for families (or $£ 350$ for single people). Affects over 1200 families in Enfield ( 4000 children). Officers had been working to inform and support the residents effected by the changes but unless they were able to work, many will face eviction. The national roll-out begins in July through to September 2013;
(v) The Government were assuming that private rent would reduce to an affordable level. So far, there was little evidence in London to support this assumption;
(vi) the Council tax benefit scheme had ceased and replaced by the localised Council tax support scheme. This meant all people of working age were required to pay something towards Council tax and in future would only receive up to $80.5 \%$ support for their Council tax. It was estimated 27,000 households were affected. The new scheme will continue to support pensioners.
It was questioned whether the Council could fund the full cost of the Council tax. It was stated that it had been calculated there would be a $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ shortfall in funding for Council tax support. A few authorities had been able to continue to fund Council tax benefit because of low numbers. Enfield currently had nearly 40,000 claimants, including 11,000 pensioners so was not in a position to extend the support;
(vii) the Social Fund had been abolished. Local authorities were now required to set up Emergency Support Scheme to support people in need.
The Council also has a Discretionary Housing Payments scheme which can offer temporary financial support. It was questioned for how long could residents continue to seek support from the Fund. It was stated that it was finite fund of $£ 3.2 \mathrm{~m}$. Priority would be given to preventing homelessness, safeguarding vulnerable families and people living in the community. It was commented that there were further restrictions in relation to the use of the fund which included children in need of a room were exempt but an adult in a similar position was not exempt from accessing the Fund;
(viii) Disability Living Allowance (DLA) will be replaced by Personal Independence Payments (PIP) from this summer. This year all new claimants would have to apply for a PIP and from next year until 2016 everyone receiving DLA would have to reapply and be assessed for PIP. There were currently 12,000 people accessing DLA

It was envisaged that there would be a reduction in the number of people able to access support from the PIP. In addition, in the past, once individuals were awarded DLA it could be for life whereas the PIP will be reassessed on a regular basis;
(ix) from October 2013, Universal Credit will be rolled out on a phased basis. It was a means-tested benefit for people of working age that will bring together multiple benefits into one award. It would be paid monthly in arrears directly into the claimant's bank account. This was a key change from the current system where for many in social housing, their housing benefit was paid directly to the landlord and their other benefits are paid weekly or fortnightly. Furthermore, the claims process would be carried out online. These changes had raised a number of concerns including individual's ability to access an online system and issues of money management. A further change which was likely to have an impact will link Universal Credit to the HMRC real time tax system
It was questioned how schools could support families. It was stated that if people were working less than 16 hours then they were not able to be exempt from the benefit cap. Therefore, it was important when considering offering a contract of employment to offer at least 16 hours contract and not a lower amount;
(x) the 2011 Census reported the population for Enfield had increased by 30,000 and recent figures showed Enfield had experienced net migration with 100 families on benefits moving into the area each month. This increase had impacted on the number of school places required.
The barriers to adults obtaining work include language acquisition and prior learning and skills. There was a need for schools and employers to support and develop programmes to up skill vulnerable families and their children.
It was commented that local colleges were developing programmes to support young people and consideration be given to young people accessing these programmes;
(xi) the Forum raised their concerns that the Welfare Reforms were an attack on the poorest and most vulnerable people and would have a drastic effect on those living in the east of the borough. Recent report on health highlighted that people living in the east of the borough lived 12 years less than those in the west. The reason for this was high level of special education needs, low attainment and the impact of social deprivation. A third of the pupils and young were living below the poverty line.
The evidence regarding the myth of welfare scroungers was questioned and it was commented that the data showed a minimal amount was lost due to this when compared to the loss incurred to the nation due to tax evasion. Therefore, there was no economic or financial evidence to support these changes.
(xii) the Council's approach was to actively engage with those effected and also with the wider community, to monitor the situation using wide range of indicators and publish local data on the impact. The Government had not provided any money to support homelessness as their view was there wouldn't be any but locally there was concern that this would be an impact. Therefore, the data collected would provide any evidence related to this and other issues due to the implementation of the reforms. It was important to use this evidence to seek to have some amendments to the Welfare Benefit arrangements including providing local authorities maximum flexibility to manage the local impact of these reforms. One example of flexibility would be to enable local authorities greater freedom to review aspects of council tax discounts such as the single person discount;
(xiii) other issues included no joined up approach between Government departments, for example the CAP on local authority borrowing on housing;
(xiv) the Forum supported the view that there need to be joined up approach locally between services within the Council and also between the Council and schools.

The Forum thanked Ms Robertson for attending and providing an update on the Welfare Benefit Reforms.

## Clerk's note: Ms Robertson left at this point

7. ITEM FOR INFORMATION
(a) Audit Update - Briefing Note

Received a report providing an update on the Schools Financial Value Standard, audits carried out during 2012/13 and planned for 2013/14, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

## Noted:

(i) all the Schools Financial Value Standards had been received within the statutory deadline. The quality of the submissions varied.
(ii) the report had summarised the top audit findings from the audits carried out during the last year. It was requested that it would be helpful to have information on the percentage of schools against each of the findings.
(iii) There was a view that it could be difficult to manage the asset register.

Agreed the report be circulated to schools and also the findings from audits be included in the Governors Finance Handbook.

Action: Mrs Brown
(b) Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools (2013/14)

Received the final Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools (2013/14), a copy of which is included in the minute book.

Reported the Scheme circulated included the changes discussed with the Forum at previous meetings and if accepted then would be published and circulated to all schools.

It was questioned how schools would undertake fraud awareness training. It was stated that an online fraud awareness training course was available on the Schools Portal for schools to access and if further training was required then it would be considered as part of the wider training and development programme.

The Forum accepted the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools for publication.

## 7. WORKPLAN

Received the workplan of the Schools Forum, a copy of which is included in the minute book.
Reported information was awaited on the next stage of the School Funding Reforms and if available would be presented to the next meeting of the Forum.

It was commented that the financial information sent to schools had not allowed for the teachers' pay increases. It was confirmed that the funding provided through the DSG was based on flat cash and included no increase for cost pressures such as the pay award. However, with the agreement of the Schools Forum an increase of $0.7 \%$ had been included in the schools' budget to support cost pressures such as the pay award. It was suggested that the increase had not been built into the LBE costing tool and if this was the case, schools using the costing spreadsheet were not aware of this. It was commented that this was the case because it had not been confirmed at the time the tool was issued. Furthermore, the

Forum was advised the position on this may vary where schools were using costing tools devised by external providers.

It was requested that a review of the budget for 2013/14 be included as an item for the next meeting.

Resolved the review of the budget for 2013/14 would be an item for discussion at the next meeting.

Action: Mrs Brown
8. FUTURE MEETINGS

## Noted

(a) date for the next meeting of Thursday 11 July at 5:30pm at St Paul's School;
(b) proposed dates for future meetings

- 16 October 2013 - Venue to be confirmed
- 11 December 2013 - Venue to be confirmed
- 15 / 22 January 2014 - Venue to be confirmed
(c) Induction Training for new members - proposed date Wednesday 3 July 2013
(d) Apologies for absence were received from Mr Goddard for the meeting to be held on 11 July 2013.

Action: Mrs Brown
9. CONFIDENTIALITY

Resolved none of the above be regarded as confidential.

# MINUTES OF COMMISSIONING GROUP MEETING 

14 June 2013

Membership:
Eve Stickler, Tricia Alder, Janet Cullen, Bruce Goddard, Julie Messer, Sally Moore, Pam Rutherford, Paul Smith, Sue Tripp, Richard Yarwood, Jenny Tosh, Claire Whetstone, Marie Janaway, Apu Alam, Jayne Fitzgerald, Yvonne Medlam, Sangeeta Brown

Also attending: Louise McNamara
cc Schools Forum, DMT

- Italics denote absence


## 1. Apologies for absence

Janet Cullen, Bruce Goddard, Pam Rutherford, Julie Messer, Sue Tripp, Richard Yarwood, Marie Janaway, Apu Alam, Jayne Fitzgerald and Yvonne Medlam
2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising
(a) The minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2013 were agreed.
(b) Matters arising;

Procurement: Reported Winston Yearwood, Schools Procurement Manager had attended the School Business Management Forum to introduce himself. The members of the Commissioning Group were asked whether Winston should liaise with Headteachers or School Business Manager for support in developing the SLA for Procurement. It was confirmed that Headteacher preference was that Winston should liaise with School Business Manager.

Developments in the 2,3 \& 4 Year Olds Offer in Enfield: Reported the consultation document detailing the developments was due to be published shortly.

## 3. School Funding Review - 2013/14

Received a paper providing information comparing the changes in funding delegated to schools between 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Reported following the implementation of the School Funding Reforms, the comparison was an initial attempt and comments on the format would be welcomed.
Noted:
(a) During the development of the new funding formula, illustrative models had been provided of the effect on individual schools. Since the final budgets were calculated, the actual position differed from the illustrative models because of changes in pupil nos, school context, such as numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals.
(b) It was questioned why a small primary school had a high per pupil funding. It was stated that this was probably because the effect of the lump sum being divided by a smaller number of pupils.
(c) It was questioned what were the funding arrangements for the first year for expanding schools. It was stated that expanding schools received the per pupils funding for the agreed number of pupils from the date they were due to start.
(d) There was concern that there were some secondary schools with significant loss in funding both in terms of the per pupil amount and also the total funding. It was stated that the change was due to a large reduction in the pupil numbers at these schools. It was acknowledged the loss in funding would be extremely challenging for these schools. Unfortunately, the recently published School Funding Reforms had introduced a new factor meaning that only schools were Ofsted rated as 'good' or 'outstanding' would be supported if they had falling rolls.
4. Commissioning Activity

Received a report which provided a summary of the commissioning activities being carried out by the Schools \& Children's Services department.

Reported Sharon Scott had been appointed as Interim Head of Commissioning. Sharon was in the process of reviewing the services commissioned by Schools \& Children's Services Department with a view to rationalising the services commissioned. The reasons for carrying out this activity was because of the financial challenges the Council faced; unlike the Schools Budget, in the current spending review period there had been a $26 \%$ reduction funding in Council budgets and it was projected to be similar over the next spending period. Andrew Fraser wanted there to be openness and transparency regarding the position and challenges confronting the Council.
Sharon was currently re-examining the commissioning framework with a view to developing a new framework which would meet priorities for addressing needs within the reduced resources available to the Council. Regular updates would be provided to the group.

Noted:
(a) The group welcomed the suggestion of having a greater understanding of the work being done by the third sector should be shared with all stakeholders and schools. It was stated there were over 800 organisations and it would be good communicate this information to schools.
(b) The opportunity to review how resources were allocated was welcomed. An example was given of how sometimes resources were used in a way which seems to be a duplication rather than a practical approach.
(c) It was suggested that Claire attend the Director's meeting with Headteachers to provide information and update on the work being done by the third sector.
(d) As Council funding shrinks, it is envisaged the third sector would also be facing similar challenges as many were reliant on funding from the Council.

## Claire Whetstone left at this point

## 5. School Funding Reforms: Phase 2 (2014/15)

Received a report which provided a summary of the DfE requirements for meeting the next phase of the School Funding Reforms.

Reported the arrangements were a continuation of those in place for 2013/14 with some small changes.

Noted:
(a) The changes being proposed for the formula factor included the use of 12 learning and development goals for the Foundation Stage. It was questioned what this meant as there were 32 expected levels.
Agreed this would be checked.
ACTION: Sangeeta Brown
(b) It was questioned whether the funding for looked after children also included adopted children. Agreed this would be checked.
(c) The proposal for including falling rolls was a positive inclusion but was not helpful as it was limited in its use to schools that were assessed as being good or outstanding. Enfield had a few secondary schools with falling rolls, one of which was an academy. These schools would not benefit as this factor but they had not received a good or outstanding assessment from Ofsted. The concern was that the places provided by these schools would be required in a couple of year's time. It was questioned whether the Local Authority was required to support academies. It was stated that the Local Authority had to support all schools identified to be in need.
(d) There was concern that the support provided for pupils with complex special educational needs was not sufficient to meet their needs. It was stated that the statement for these pupils did not
fully cover the cost of the support required to meet their needs. There was a premise that there would be some level of support provided from within the school's base provision. For schools with a number of pupils with complex needs, it was found that resources had to be redistributed from other areas.
(e) It was questioned whether the expansion programme included special schools. It was stated the expansion programme going forward was considering capacity within the special sector.
(f) The timetable for reviewing, developing proposals, consulting with the Commissioning Group and all schools and stakeholders by the end of September was challenging. It was acknowledged that the main changes had taken effect and it was most likely the changes for 2014/15 would not be as significant. It was suggested that:

- any proposals be presented to the group at the meeting in September 2013;
- the consultation document, incorporating any comments from the group, is then published;
- the period for responding to the consultation be limited to two weeks.

Agreed the proposals for changing the funding arrangements would be presented to the meeting on 13 September 13 and this would then be followed by a two week consultation with schools and keys stakeholders.
6. Workplan

Noted the additional items to be included on the workplan.
ACTION: Sangeeta Brown

ACTION: Sangeeta Brown

## 7. Any other business - Data Collection

It was commented that schools were required to provide similar data, but in a different format, for both the Local Authority and DfE. It was suggested to meet both the Local Authority and DfE requirement was time consuming and it was requested where similar information and data was required by the Local Authority and DfE whether this could be standardised to reduce the administrative burden for schools. It was further suggested the requirement for providing some type of data be reviewed, e.g. if a school had $96 \%$ attendance then it was questioned whether a return should be required.

Agreed to forward this comment to the Management Information team and also would be discussed at the School Business Management Forum.
8. Dates of meetings for the Commissioning Group

Dates of the subsequent meeting confirmed as:

| Date | Time | Venue | Comment |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 19 July 2013 | $8.15-10.15 \mathrm{am}$ | Highlands School | Cancelled |
| 13 Sep 2013 | $8.15-10.15 \mathrm{am}$ | St Paul's |  |
| 10 Oct 2013 | $14.00-16.00 \mathrm{pm}$ | TBC |  |
| 06 Dec 2013 | $8: 15-10: 15 \mathrm{am}$ | TBC |  |
| 10 Jan 2014 | $8: 15-10: 15 \mathrm{am}$ | TBC |  |

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/2014 REPORT NO. 5

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:
Schools Forum - 11 July 13

## REPORT OF:

Director of Schools \& Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:

|  | Item: 4a |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject: <br> School Funding Review: 2013/14) <br>  |  |

Sangeeta Brown - 02083793109
E-mail: sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a brief comparison of the changes in funding delegated to schools between 2012/13 and 2013/14.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The contents of this report are noted.

## 3 BACKGROUND \& INTRODUCTION

3.1 This report provides brief information on the changes in per pupil funding for the Schools Block between 2012/13 and 2013/14 at individual school and sector level for primary and secondary.
3.2 The information for special schools has not been included because special schools are funded on a place plus approach agreed separately as part of the arrangements for the High Needs block.
3.3 The Commissioning Group will be aware from previous reports presented that a straight comparison can not be provided between the two years because of the implementation of the Government's School Funding Reforms. As for previous reports, the budget information for 2012/13 has been adjusted to include information related to the Schools Budget and excludes items which for 2013/14 would form part of the High Needs Block.

## 4 Analysis

4.1 The analysis for this report has been derived from information included in the attached appendices.

The appendices are in three parts with information on changes in:

- per pupil funding for individual schools
- total funding and pupil premium for individual schools
- pupil numbers, numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals
4.2 The information has been analysed to assess the impact of the changes of the Government's School Funding Reforms. Please note for comparison purposes the figures include the minimum funding guarantee. The table below shows the range of changes in per pupil funding.

Change in the per pupil funding between 2012/13 and 2013/14 excluding pupil premium

| Sector |  | $2012 / 13$ <br> Per Pupil <br> Funding <br> $£$ | $2013 / 14$ <br> Per Pupil <br> Funding <br> $£$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | Lowest | 3,686 | 3,763 |
|  | Average | 4,487 | 4,505 |
|  | Highest | 6,011 | 6,319 |
| Secondary | Lowest | 4,930 | 4,930 |
|  | Average | 5,723 | 5,747 |
|  | Highest | 6,796 | 6,735 |

4.3 One of the main factors for the change in funding has been the change to the national funding formula and the removal or change of factors which were used previously; for example the formula for social deprivation had been developed to cater for small changes in pupils eligible for free school meals and at each upward change the unit rate was increased to reflect the higher percentage of pupils at the individual school. This is not now possible under the new arrangements,

The key areas where a change in total or per pupil funding has been seen include:

- the effect of funding provided for the primary expansion programme
- a change in pupil numbers
- a change in pupils eligible for free school meals
- a change in the use of the additional education needs factor
4.4 This report provides a very brief and top level analysis and further work will continue to understand the full impact of the funding formula.
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| $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{o} \\ & \\ & \underset{\gamma}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\substack{\tilde{\prime} \\ \underset{\infty}{\infty} \\ \infty \\ 0}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{0}{6}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ \dot{8} \\ \dot{6} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{t}} \\ \stackrel{y}{\mathrm{j}} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \infty \\ \stackrel{0}{n} \\ \stackrel{-}{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \hline \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\infty$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { No } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{M}{\infty}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { N } \\ \text { N } \\ \text { O } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 . \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{N} \\ \infty_{\sim}^{0} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{\dot{4}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N}}{\stackrel{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{N} \\ & \text { en } \\ & \underset{\sim}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\sigma} \end{gathered}$ | N | N y ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $\frac{\infty}{\infty}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \hline \\ & \stackrel{8}{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 0 | - | - |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathbf{\sigma}} \\ & \text { ó } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |


|  | $\stackrel{c}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \tilde{N}_{1} \\ w_{1}^{0} \\ 0 \\ n \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \infty \\ \tilde{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \\ \stackrel{8}{\infty} \\ \stackrel{-}{\infty} \end{array}$ | $\hat{\mathrm{S}}$ | $0$ | $\stackrel{O}{\therefore}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N 0 O. 0 m |  |  |  | O |  | $\left.\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ i \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{i} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~m}} \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ |  | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{m}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~m}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{N}{N} \\ \stackrel{1}{2} \\ \underset{N}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 0 \\ 0 \\ \hat{0} \\ 0 \\ \underset{N}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \mathrm{~N} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{L}{\infty} \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \\ \infty \\ \stackrel{\infty}{c} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{c} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\infty_{0}^{\infty}$ | è | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{f}}$ |  |  |  |  | - | - | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}}{\dot{6}}$ | $5$ | $\overline{\mathrm{O}}$ | $f_{0}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{N}$ |  |  |  | $\left.\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{O}{2} \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{o} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \underset{D}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \\ \stackrel{y}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{~N} \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \tilde{y} \\ \underset{0}{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ \stackrel{m}{2} \\ \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{c} \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{N}} \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\underset{\substack{\mathrm{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { Nu} \end{gathered}$ | $0$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \infty \\ \substack{0 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 0} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \underset{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{c}_{1} \\ & \hat{0} \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{8}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{y}{c} \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{m}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\mid$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{y}{c} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | N |  |  |  |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{N}_{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |
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## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/2014 REPORT NO. 6

## MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Schools Forum - 11 July 13

## REPORT OF:

Director of Schools \& Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:

|  | Item: 4b |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject: <br> School Funding Reforms: Phase 2 (2014/15) <br>  |  |

Sangeeta Brown - 02083793109
E-mail: sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a summary of the requirements outlined in the DfE publication on the School Funding Reforms: Arrangements for 2014/15.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

To note and comment on the DfE requirements detailed in paragraph 4.

## 3 BACKGROUND \& INTRODUCTION

3.1 Last year the Government set out their arrangements for introducing a national funding formula in the next spending review period. Authorities were required to develop local formulas for 2013/14 using a reduced number of factors.
3.2 As reported at a previous meeting, the DfE undertook a review of the arrangements introduced for 2013/14. On 4 June 2013, the DfE published requirements for 2014/15 based on the outcomes from the review and then on 26 June the Chancellor outlined the details of the Comprehensive Spending Review for 2015/16.

For 2014/15, the Government, apart for some minor changes, are looking to embed the arrangements put in place for this year. For 2015/16, the Government have stated they will consult further on how best to introduce a national funding formula for schools; with the aim of supporting the wider school reforms and what the Government consider is a vital step towards fixing the historic and unfair differences in funding between schools in different local authorities. They have stated the amount of funding a school receives will be based on a fair and rational assessment of the needs of its pupils, including how many pupils are disadvantaged.
3.3 This report provides information on the DfE's requirements for the schools funding arrangements for 2014/15.
4. PROPOSALS FOR 2014/15
4.1 The table below provides a summary of the arrangements published by the DfE and the current position based on the local funding formula.

| Factors | National Requirements | Current Position - Enfield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil led funding | The Government require as much funding as possible to be delegated on a per pupil basis. For 2012/13, there was no minimum requirement but for 2014/15 there is a requirement for a minimum of $80 \%$ of the funding to be delegated on a per pupil basis. The DfE definition of per pupil led factors includes the age weighted pupil unit (AWPU), deprivation, prior attainment, looked after children and English as an additional language. | Enfield already meets this threshold. |
| Per Pupil Amount - AWPU (mandatory) | For 2014/15, there is a requirement rate for: - primary rate to be at least £2k and <br> - KS3 \& KS4 to be at least £3k | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Primary - } £ 3,399 \\ & \text { KS3 }-£ 4,346 \\ & \text { KS4-£4,774 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Prior Attainment (Optional) | To support low prior attainment and provide a proxy for low cost SEN, the DfE used for: <br> Primary - Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) as a measure for prior attainment. With the introduction of a new framework for Early Years and the outcome of the review, the DfE have proposed the continued use of EYFSP with some changes for 2014/15 due to the introduction of the framework. The changes allow the inclusion of all pupils who have not achieved the expected level of development in all 12 prime areas of learning as well as maths and literacy. <br> Secondary - continue to use KS2 assessment data, but for 2014/15, the arrangements have changed to include pupils who do not achieve a level 4 in English OR Maths. For the KS2 assessments from 2013, data for English would be based on those pupils not achieving Level 4 in either reading or writing. | Primary -pupils who do not achieve 73 points in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile Secondary - pupils who do not achieve a level 4 in both English AND Maths at KS2 |
| Deprivation (mandatory) | There continues to be a requirement schools with high level of pupils from a deprived background continue to be supported and where additional funding is available that it is used as appropriate to support these schools. For 2014/15, there is no change to the arrangements already in place to support pupils from deprived background. | Unit rate using free school meals and also for the higher IDACI bands |
| Looked After Children (Optional) | The DfE have recognised that all looked after children require support and for 2014/15 have proposed funding be allocated to support all children who have been looked after for a day or more. | Based on a rate per Looked After Child |
| Pupil Mobility \& Service Children (Optional) | There is continued support for schools with high levels of pupil mobility. However, the DfE following the review that the current factor does not fund sufficiently those schools with very high levels of mobility, so for 2014/15, the DfE have introduced the application of a $10 \%$ threshold. This will mean only those schools with significantly high levels of mobility will receive this funding. | Based on a unit rate per casual admission |
| Lump Sum (Optional) | For 2014/15, the maximum lump sum allowable has been reduced from $£ 200 \mathrm{k}$ to $£ 175 \mathrm{k}$, there is now local flexibility to have different amounts between phases. Furthermore, where two schools merging will be able to keep $85 \%$ of both the lump sums following the year in which they merge. | The basic lump sum rate is set at $£ 150 \mathrm{k}$ plus $£ 12 \mathrm{k}$ as a contribution towards the cost of the first $£ 6 \mathrm{k}$ cost of supporting 2 statemented pupils |
| Schools with falling rolls (Optional) | New factor for this year. With the agreement of the Schools Forum, for 2014/15 funding from the DSG may be used to support (good) schools with falling rolls in exceptional circumstances. |  |
| Post 16 | For 2014/15, there are no changes being introduced | Unit rate based on 2012/13 |


| Factors | National Requirements | Current Position - Enfield |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| EAL <br> Split site <br> Rates <br> PFI <br> London fringe | for these factors. | Split site - unit rate <br> EAL - Unit rates for <br> their first 3 years in the <br> British education system |
| Sparsity | N/A - factor to support rural schools | N/A |
| High Needs <br> Pupils | As part of the outcome of the review, the DfE have <br> considered the possibility of introducing a formula <br> factor for high needs where schools had a <br> disproportionate population of pupils with high <br> needs but have decided not to do so for 2014/15. <br> Targeted support for these schools can be <br> considered and provided from the high needs block. <br> For 2014/15, the £6k threshold will be a mandatory <br> requirement. |  |
| Schools Forum | With changes to the arrangements for high need <br> pupils, for 2014/15, it is proposed that there should <br> be one elected representative from an institution <br> (other than from a school or an academy) providing <br> education beyond age 16 (but may also be <br> providing education for 14-16 year olds). This <br> replaces the current requirement for a <br> representative from 14 - 19 partnership. | Currently, a representative <br> is elected from 14 - 19 <br> partnership. |
|  | 而 |  |

4.2 The timetable for considering the local arrangements to address or include the above requirements is similar to last year and is shown in the table below:

| Date | Action |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 September 2013 | Commissioning Group |
| ?? September | Publish Consultation |
| ?? September | Headteachers' Conferences |
| 3 October | Pupil Census |
| 10 October | Commissioning Group |
| 16 October | Schools Forum |
| 31October | Submit provisional Schools Budget pro forma to EFA |
| 27 November | Schools census database closed |
| 6 December | Commissioning Group |
| 11 December | Schools Forum |
| 16 December | EFA confirms DSG allocation |
| 10 January 2014 | Commissioning Group |
| 15 January | Schools Forum |
| 21 January | Submit final Schools Budget pro forma to EFA |
| March 2014 | Delegate school budget share |

4.3 The arrangements in place for the local funding formula are being reviewed in line with changes published by the DfE and also in relation to known local factors. Any proposals for changes to the local formula would need to the subject of consultation and then would need to be presented to the Schools Forum for approval.
4.4 Similar to last year, meeting the above timetable continues to be challenging and was the subject of discussion with Commissioning Group, in particular the arrangements for consulting with schools and key stakeholders. The Commissioning Group advised that if the proposals and options were presented to the group at their meeting on 13 September 2013 and following comment from the group, should then be circulated to schools and key stakeholders for response. It was noted that this would mean the duration for the consultation would be two weeks because of the need to finalise the arrangements for the Schools Forum meeting on 16 October. It was confirmed that schools should be able to comment within this timeframe. Comments are invited on the proposed arrangements for consultation.
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## MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Schools Forum - 11 July 13

## REPORT OF:

Director of Schools \& Children's Services
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Sarah Fryer - 02083793372
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|  | Item: 5a |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject: |  |
| School Trade Union Facilities funding: |  |
| 2013/14 |  |
|  |  |

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report proposes changes to the Schools Trade union Facility agreement and the de-delegated funding arrangements from schools.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools Forum agrees with the proposal outlined in Section 4 and the consequence increase in de-delegation per pupil with effect from 1September 13.

## 3 BACKGROUND \& INTRODUCTION

3.1 This report provides information on the School Trade Union Facilities Funding and considers the increasing demands placed on teacher trade union representatives within the Borough as requested by the Teacher Trade Unions. In reviewing the arrangements consideration is made of the substantial increase in support staff within our schools.
3.2 The previous arrangements have not been reviewed since 2000, in which time there have been many changes, not least the growth of both teaching staff and support staff within Enfield schools and the addition of Health and Safety and Union Learning Representatives. The agreement at that time granted paid time off on the basis of number of members within the trade union in Enfield.
3.3 Together with half days for Health and Safety for the largest unions of NUT, NASUWT and Unison, half days for Union Learning Rep for NUT and NASUWT and a half day for the Teachers committee, the facilities time to date served to provide the following allocation of time:

| Trade Union | No. of Days per week paid time off |
| :---: | :---: |
| NUT | 4.5 days |
| Unison | 3 days |
| NASUWT | 2.5 days |
| ATL (vacant) | 1.5 days |
| Voice the Union | 0.5 days |
| NAHT | 0.5 days |
| GMB | 2 hours per week |
| ASCL | 0 |
| Teachers Committee | 0.5 days |

3.4 When the decision was made with regards to the funding allowance for school, there was only a main teachers pay scale and schools have always been refunded on the basis of the top of the 'main teachers scale' and therefore have not necessarily been refunded the full cost of releasing their employee for union duties since the Upper Pay Range was created.
3.5 Funding for the School Trade Union Facilities time is fully covered by maintained schools agreeing delegated monies from their budgets. Together with overheads and training, paying at M6 of the main teachers' pay range and the absence of an ATL representative, this level of Facilities release has been brought in on budget at £89,400.
3.6 The release time granted may be a reflection that the greater the number of members has a disproportionate effect on the amount of casework. This is borne out by the fact that over $90 \%$ of the Schools' Personnel casework involves members of NUT, Unison and NASUWT. Whilst NUT has been represented by a former member of teaching staff he has been available 5 days a week, which is above his allocated time, but this has proved both necessary and extremely helpful in resolving casework swiftly and appropriately to allow schools to focus on teaching and learning.
3.7 Whilst there are a number of Academies and Free Schools in Enfield, to this point they have not been contributing to the Facilities funding. However the Enfield School Trade Union reps continue to act within these schools and work with the schools and the local authority as necessary within these settings. Therefore, to ensure future local union support (which is often quicker and understands the local context) it is proposed that the Academies and Free Schools contribute to the cost of local representatives as their commitment to the facilities agreement.

## 4 Proposal

4.1 With the retirement of the current NUT representative and the long standing NASUWT representative, the teacher trade unions (and Headteachers of 'release schools') have made representation to request that
a) That a level of release of 5 days is created for Unions with over 2000 members in Enfield
b) Schools who release teachers for trade union facilities time be refunded the full cost of release
c) that the Academies and Free schools are offered Enfield School Trade Union representatives via a Service Level Agreement at a similar rate to Enfield school with a percentage additional to reflect administration and associated costs.

## 5 Effect of these proposals

5.1 The effect of these proposals would be as follows:

| Number of members | No. of Days per week paid time off |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2000+$ | 5 days |
| $1500-1999$ | 4 days |
| $1000-1499$ | 2.5 days |
| $750-999$ | 2 days |
| $500-749$ | 1.5 days |
| $250-499$ | 1 day |
| $100-249$ | 0.5 days |
| 0100 | 0 |

5.2 Consequently, including Health and Safety, Union Learning and Teachers Committee and taking in to account changes in union membership this would alter the allocation as follows:

| Trade Union | No. of Days per week paid time off |
| :---: | :---: |
| NUT (2337) | 6 days |
| Unison (1459) | 3 days |
| NASUWT (740) | 2.5 days |
| ATL (377) (vacant) | 1 day |
| Voice the Union (75) | 0 |
| NAHT (120) | 0.5 days |
| GMB (unknown) | 2 hours per week |
| ASCL (54) | 0 |
| Teachers Committee | 0.5 days |

This keeps the allocation of School Trade Union facilities time approximately similar (in total a $4 \%$ increase ( 0.5 days) but a shift in emphasis to those unions with greater numbers of staff in Enfield
5.3 It is proposed that the increase in facility time comes into effect from 1September 2013, but that the union who is losing their allowance is given a minimum of term's notice to allow their school to come to alternative arrangements for their time.
5.4 The impact on the budget of paying all staff their full release cost at the above levels will increase the budgetary requirement. It is likely the actual funding required will change on an annual basis depending on who is elected by their members to the post.
5.5 Taking the current postholders (including leaving vacant the post for ATL), it is estimated the annual budget would need to be increased by approximately $£ 30,000$. This increase would need to be met from funding provided for this provision through de-delegation and also buyback from academies and free schools.
5.6 If this change is to be implemented from September 2013, it is anticipated that most of the cost for the remainder of this year could be met from the income generated from academy and free school buyback. However, this can not be verified until confirmations have been received from the academies and free schools as to whether they are buying into this service.
5.7 Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the total income from the current total funding provided from de-delegation and buyback from academies and free schools will be sufficient to support the full cost of this change.
5.8 The Schools Forum is asked to consider and agree the proposed changes with effect from 1 September and, in principle, to an increase in the funding allocated for this provision through de-delegation and from the SLAs with academies and free schools for 2014/15.
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## REPORT OF:
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| Agenda - Part: | Item: 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject: |  |
| Schools Forum: Workplan |  |

Recommendation
To note the workplan.

| Meetings |  | Officer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May 2013 | Welfare Benefit Reforms <br> Audit Arrangements <br> Review of School Efficiencies (Information) <br> Scheme for Financing (Information) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { KR } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ |
| July 2013 | School Funding Review (2013/14) <br> School Funding Arrangements (2014/15) <br> Trade Union Facilities Funding <br> Additional Resources Provision (Information) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \text { SF } \\ & \text { JT } \end{aligned}$ |
| October 2013 | Schools Budget: 2014/15: Update <br> Responses to consultation on School Funding Arrangements (2014/15) <br> Outturn Report 2012/13 <br> Schools Balances 2012/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YM } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \text { JF } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ |
| December 2013 | Schools Budget: 2014/15: Update Local Authority Budget (2014/15) Pupil Places strategy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YM } \\ & \text { ES } \\ & \text { NB } \end{aligned}$ |
| January 2014 | Schools Budget: 2014/15: Update | YM |
| February 2014 | School Budget 2014/15: Update Scheme for Financing Schools Enfield Traded Services to Schools | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YM } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ |
| May 2014 |  |  |

Dates of Meetings

| Date | Time |  | Venue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 May 2013 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ | St Pauls |  |
| July 2013 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| 11 July 2013 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ | St Pauls |  |
| 16 October 2013 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| 11 December 2013 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| 15 January 2014 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| February 2014 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| May 2014 | $5.30 \mathrm{pm}-7.30 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |

