

Public Document Pack

Gareth Owens LL.B Barrister/Bargyfreithiwr
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Pennaeth Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol a Democraataidd



To: Cllr Ian Roberts (Chairman)

CS/NG

Councillors: Marion Bateman, Amanda Bragg,
Adele Davies-Cooke, Ian Dunbar, Ron Hampson,
Stella Jones, Colin Legg, Phil Lightfoot,
Dave Mackie, Nancy Matthews, Ann Minshull,
Paul Shotton, Nigel Steele-Mortimer and
David Williams

24 January 2014

Maureen Potter 01352 702322
maureen.potter@flintshire.gov.uk

**David Hytch, Rita Price, Rebecca Stark,
Reverend John Thelwell and
Stephanie Williams**

Dear Sir / Madam

A meeting of the **LIFELONG LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**
will be held in the **DELYN COMMITTEE ROOM, COUNTY HALL, MOLD CH7 6NA**
on **THURSDAY, 30TH JANUARY, 2014** at **2.00 PM** to consider the following items.

**Members are requested to bring to the meeting the budget information pack
which was sent out on 16 January 2014**

Yours faithfully

Democracy & Governance Manager

AGENDA

- 1 **APOLOGIES**
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (INCLUDING WHIPPING
DECLARATIONS)**

County Hall, Mold. CH7 6NA
Tel. 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4
www.flintshire.gov.uk
Neuadd y Sir, Yr Wyddgrug. CH7 6NR
Ffôn 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4
www.siryfflint.gov.uk

The Council welcomes correspondence in Welsh or English
Mae'r Cyngor yn croesawau gohebiaeth yn y Cymraeg neu'r Saesneg

3 **MINUTES** (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting.

4 **LIFELONG LEARNING BUDGET CONSULTATION FOR 2014/15** (Pages 9 - 10)

Report of Member Engagement Manager

5 **SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA REVIEW** (Pages 11 - 38)

Report of Director of Lifelong Learning

6 **LIFELONG LEARNING FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME** (Pages 39 - 46)

Report of Member Engagement Manager -

LIFELONG LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE **19 DECEMBER 2013**

Minutes of the meeting of the Lifelong Learning Overview & Scrutiny Committee of Flintshire County Council, held at County Hall, Mold on Thursday, 19 December 2013.

PRESENT: Councillor Ian Roberts (Chairman)

Councillors: Marion Bateman, Amanda Bragg, Adele Davies-Cooke, Ian Dunbar, Ron Hampson, Stella Jones, Phil Lightfoot, Dave Mackie, Nancy Matthews, Paul Shotton, Nigel Steele-Mortimer and David Williams

CO-OPTED MEMBERS: David Hytch and Rebecca Stark

APOLOGY: Stephanie Williams.

CONTRIBUTORS:

Cabinet Member for Waste Strategy, Public Protection and Leisure, Cabinet Member for Education, Director of Lifelong Learning, Head of Culture and Leisure, Secondary Schools Advisor, and the Arts Culture and Events Manager

IN ATTENDANCE:

Housing and Learning Overview and Scrutiny Facilitator and Committee Officer

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (including Whipping Declarations)

The Chairman advised Members of the need to declare a personal interest in school related items on the agenda if they were school or college governors. All Members present except Councillors Amanda Bragg, Chris Bithell and Phil Lightfoot (who were not school governors) declared an interest as school governors.

Mr. David Hytch and Mrs Rebecca Stark also declared an interest in agenda item 5, the Flintshire Music Service Review.

57. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 November 2013 were submitted.

Mid Year Service Performance Report

Councillor Ian Dunbar referred to his comments concerning the work undertaken in partnership with Fields in Trust to secure a protection in perpetuity of recreation grounds nominated as designated Queen Elizabeth 11 Fields. He commented on a presentation which had been held at Wepre Park and expressed his disappointment that the two Ward Members had not

been invited to the event. The Cabinet Member for Waste Strategy, Public Protection and Leisure, explained that he was seeking clarification on how invitations to the event had been determined.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be received, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

58. COMMUNITY EVENTS STRATEGY 2014-2017

The Arts Culture and Events Manager introduced a report to seek endorsement of the Community Events Strategy 2014-2017. She provided background information and outlined the Strategy's four objectives which were detailed in the report. She advised that the Strategy would be supported by an annual business plan.

Councillor Paul Shotton welcomed the Strategy and commented on the opportunities to showcase the historical and industrial heritage of Flintshire.

Councillor Nancy Matthews suggested that communication with Town & Community Councils could be improved and that they should be given access to the Council's own event calendar to avoid clashes of events in future. The Arts Culture and Events Manager advised that it was intended to create a network of events organised across the County and that she would see if communication between the Council and Town and Community Councils could be strengthened within the Strategy.

Councillor Ian Dunbar commented on the many events which were organised within Flintshire by Town and Community Councils, and community and voluntary groups, and asked what support the Authority could provide to such bodies. The Arts Culture and Events Manager advised that a draft Event's Organiser's Pack was being produced for external partners and for use within the Authority and would be available in the New Year. The Pack contained contact details and guidance in relation to the facilities and equipment which was available and could be shared across the County to provide assistance for arranging such events. She gave assurance that the Authority's Arts, Culture and Events services would be working closely with Town and Community Councils in the future concerning the County's events strategy.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee endorsed the Community Events Strategy and its four objectives as a blueprint for the delivery and support of community events during the next three years.

59. FLINTSHIRE MUSIC SERVICE REVIEW

The Secondary Schools Officer introduced a report to update the Committee on progress in developing the Flintshire Music School operating model approved by Cabinet in 2013. He provided background information and advised that all schools had identified their service needs for 2013-14, although five primary schools had chosen not to participate in the service. Participating schools had increased their "order" for hours of tuition and had chosen from the wider range of opportunities offered. In addition there had also been some requests for Music Service staff to conduct school ensembles and choirs.

During discussion the Secondary Schools Officer responded to the questions and concerns expressed by members concerning the remit of the Music Service, in-service training for teachers, and the implications for schools if insufficient pupils committed to places. Councillor Dave Mackie asked if an update report on the Service could be submitted to the Committee at the end of the academic year which included the number of pupils who had requested tuition but had given up after a short period of time.

Councillor Ian Dunbar commented on the difficulties encountered by schools around the non-payment of fees for tuition and the additional administrative burden imposed on schools as a result. The Secondary Schools Officer acknowledged the issue and explained that schools had to balance their budgets and to this end should request payment in advance. He advised that the remissions process supported families with learners receiving Free School Meals.

Councillor Stella Jones sought clarification on the role and appointment of a part time Business Manager. The Director of Lifelong Learning advised that the post was being kept under review in light of the current financial restraints.

Mrs Rebecca Stark commented on the provision of tuition and asked how the number of hours that children received were monitored. The Secondary Schools Officer advised that each lesson was recorded and information fed back into the Music Service. The Secondary Schools Officer also responded to the further concerns raised by Mrs. Stark around the legal validity of the forms of agreement which should be personalised by schools and then sent to parents, and on the deferment of the Summer music exams until November 2013.

Mrs. Stark asked if consideration could be given to providing "taster sessions" to pupils who wanted to learn a musical instrument to help them to decide if they wanted to receive lessons. She suggested that this facility may also assist with the problem of non payment of fees as some parents may be reluctant to pay for music lessons in advance unless their child made a commitment.

Councillor Amanda Bragg referred to provision for “gifted” pupils and also asked if any financial support was made available for parents if they were unable to pay the annual tuition fees. The Secondary Schools Officer reiterated the support process provided to families with learners who received Free School Meals.

RESOLVED

- (a) That the progress made on implementation of the revised operating model for the School Music Service be noted;
- (b) That the Committee receive an update report, to include information on the number of pupils who had requested tuition but had given up after a short period of time, at the end of the academic year; and
- (c) That the Committee request that the Schools Music Service consider providing “taster sessions” to pupils.

60. HEALTH AND SAFETY IN SCHOOLS

The Head of Culture and Leisure introduced a report to provide the Committee with a summary on accidents and incidents in schools during the academic year September 2012 to August 2013 and a summary of actions taken by the Council to support schools in achieving healthy and safe learning environments.

The Head of Culture and Leisure provided background information and reported that the total number of accident/incident report forms received for the above academic year had reduced. He also referred to the number of accidents to pupils, accidents to employees, and accidents reported to the Health and Safety Executive under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations (RIDDOR).

Councillor Paul Shotton referred to the programme for re-inspection/asbestos surveys in schools and asked if the two year programme which had commenced would be continued in the future. Councillor Shotton also referred to the cleaning of schools and asked if there was consistency in the standard of cleaning across all schools. In his response to the questions the Director of Lifelong Learning outlined the very detailed regime in place concerning inspection of asbestos in schools. Regarding the comments on cleaning standards he agreed to provide the Committee with a summary of School Cleaning Schedules.

Councillor Nigel Steele- Mortimer asked if more funding could be made available to protect school staff from incidents or threats of verbal and physical abuse. Mr. David Hytch also raised concerns about the protection of staff from assault and commented on the measures taken in other public services to protect employees, citing hospitals as an example. The Director of Lifelong Learning assured members that the Authority intervened strongly

wherever it could and had seen an upturn in incidents where it had been able to intervene which included online abuse through the use of social media.

Councillor Ian Dunbar raised concerns about the procedure for reporting health and safety matters in schools and cited the example of an incident concerning a ramp to a portacabin which had been reported a number of times. The Head of Culture and Leisure responded and said he would circulate a copy of the frequency of inspection and reporting procedures to the Committee following the meeting.

RESOLVED

- (a) That the report and initiatives taken to improve health and safety in schools be noted; and
- (b) That the monitoring and evaluation role of the Corporate Health and Safety Steering Group be recognised.

61. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLAYScheme TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Housing and Learning Overview and Scrutiny Facilitator introduced a report on the recommendations of the Playscheme Task and Finish Group to provide sustainable play provision from April 2014 with reference to the summer play scheme programme.

The Facilitator provided background information and advised that the Playscheme Task and Finish Group had met in November 2013 to consider feedback from users of the 2013 Summer Playscheme. The Group had agreed that the playschemes provided invaluable facilities for children during the summer holidays and were important for families who could not afford to take their children on holiday. The Group had also emphasised the importance of the scheme in developing children's play, co-ordination and social skills.

RESOLVED

That the Committee recommend to Cabinet that:-

- Subject to confirmation of Families First funding, the Head of Culture and Leisure write to all Town and Community Councils advising them that the number of Playschemes available to them during the summer of 2014 and beyond be limited to a maximum of two each and that summer Playscheme provision be reduced from five weeks to three weeks at locations to be agreed through local consultation.
- Town and Community Councils who are keen to increase the complement of Playscheme sites in their area above the 2 offered are given the opportunity to increase the provision through match funding.
- A pressure bid of up to £12,000 be allocated to support match funding for Town and Community Councils.

- If confirmation was received that there would be a reduction in Families First funding; the Playscheme Task & Finish Group should meet again to consider how best to provide sustainable play provision from April 2014 with reference to the summer play scheme programme.

62. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE LEISURE FINANCE TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Housing and Learning Overview and Scrutiny Facilitator introduced a report on the Terms of Reference of the Leisure Finance Task and Finish Group. She provided background information and advised that the Leisure Finance Task and Finish Group had met in November 2013 and a copy of the Terms of Reference, as agreed by the Group, was appended to the report for consideration.

RESOLVED:

That the Terms of Reference of the Leisure Finance Task & Finish Group as shown at Appendix 1 of the report be supported.

63. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

The Housing and Learning Overview and Scrutiny Facilitator introduced the Forward Work Programme of the Committee.

The Facilitator informed members that the venue for the meeting of the Committee scheduled for 30 January, 2014 had been changed to County Hall, Mold, instead of Ysgol Maes Garmon as previously arranged. It had also been agreed that the meeting would commence at 1.30pm and that the items on Pupil Attainment, Annual School Modernisation, and School Performance be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee scheduled to be held on 6 March 2014.

Members reviewed the current programme and agreed that the following items be considered at the next meeting:

- Budget 2014/2015
- School Funding Formula Review

Following the suggestions made by Members it was agreed that the meeting of the Committee scheduled for 6 March 2014 be held at Ysgol Maes Garmon and that the Elfed High School and John Summers High School be contacted as possible venues for holding future meetings of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the above the Forward Work Programme be agreed.

64. ATTENDANCE BY MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There was one member of the press and no members of the public in attendance.

(The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and ended at 3.40pm)

.....

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: **LIFELONG LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

DATE: **THURSDAY 30TH JANUARY, 2014**

REPORT BY: **MEMBER ENGAGEMENT MANAGER**

SUBJECT: **BUDGET CONSULTATION FOR 2014/15**

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To set out the consultation arrangements with Overview & Scrutiny for 2014/15.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 The practice for holding budget consultation meetings with Overview & Scrutiny has developed and been refined over the last few years. In recognition of the challenge for 2014/15, members agreed to a change to the original process and timetable for consideration of the budget proposals. This year we shall be holding six meetings, as follows:-

Tuesday 21 January – AM	Housing (HRA)
Tuesday 28 January – AM	Joint Housing and Social & Health Care (Community Services budget – non HRA)
Tuesday 28 January – AM	Environment
Tuesday 28 January – AM	Corporate Resources (Corporate Services and Central budgets)
Thursday 30 January – PM ordinary meeting)	Lifelong Learning (budget item during the
Monday 3 February – AM	Corporate Resources (Capital Programme and revenue feedback review meeting)

The Capital Programme and revenue feedback review meeting is open for all Members to attend, as has been our previous practice.

2.02 In addition to the meetings listed above, Members have attended Budget Introduction Workshops which were held on 16 and 18 December, 2013.

2.03 A Budget Overview Workshop for all Members has also been arranged and will be held on Monday 27 January, 2014 at 2.00 p.m.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

3.01 A presentation to each of the meetings will be made by the relevant Director and/or Heads of Service together with the Chief Executive and Head of Finance. The Leader and the appropriate Cabinet Members have been invited to attend each meeting.

3.02 The budget papers for each meeting are the report to Cabinet on 21st January, and a copy has been sent to each Member. You are asked to bring your copy of that report to each of the budget meetings which you attend.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.01 The Committee is advised to note the arrangements for budget consultation for 2014/15 and make comments and observations on the budget proposals to the Cabinet.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.01 None as a result of this report.

6.00 ANTI POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 None as a result of this report.

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 None as a result of this report.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 None as a result of this report.

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 None as a result of this report.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 Publication of this report constitutes consultation.

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Publication of this report constitutes consultation.

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 None.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None.

Contact Officer: Robert Robins
Telephone: 01352 702320
Email: robert.robins@flintshire.gov.uk

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: LIFELONG LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: THURSDAY, 30 JANUARY 2014

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR OF LIFELONG LEARNING

SUBJECT: SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA REVIEW

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To update Scrutiny Members on the outcome of the consultation regarding the Flintshire Schools' Funding Formula review and to outline the final steps towards implementation of the new formula by April 2014.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 The current school funding formula which is used to delegate funding to Flintshire schools was inherited from the former Clwyd County Council with its roots dating back to the introduction of Local Management of Schools in 1988. Therefore much of the information used is based on the position of Flintshire schools at that time. Although the formula has been incrementally updated there are many factors and elements within the current formula that lack a clear educational or operational rationale.

2.02 Many changes have taken place within schools since the formula was developed. The Welsh Government has introduced new initiatives and whilst distribution methods have been bolted on to historical arrangements, there has been no fundamental review by the Authority of the overall methodology for funding schools until recently.

It has long been acknowledged by schools, officers and members that a review of the formula was long overdue.

2.03 A long and detailed process has been undertaken in Flintshire to review both the Primary and Secondary formulae. A key role has been played by project groups. These groups were established to drive the development of a new set of principles which would underpin the allocation of resources to schools. The groups comprised officer, headteacher and governor representation. In addition to this there has been ongoing consultation and discussion with stakeholders through the Schools Budget Forum and Heads Federation Groups.

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.01 Consultation documents were issued for primary and secondary schools which set out the proposed key principles and cost drivers which had been considered and developed by the project groups. Schools and other stakeholders were encouraged to complete a questionnaire which formed part of the consultation document.

We received 35 responses to the primary consultation from 27 schools. A summary of the responses is shown at Appendix 1.

We received 11 responses to the secondary consultation from 10 schools. A summary of the responses is shown at Appendix 2.

The majority of responses to both the Primary and Secondary consultations were supportive of the proposals.

- 3.02 In addition to the formal consultation a significant amount of informal consultation has taken place through attendance at consortium meetings, 1:1 meetings with Headteachers, and attendance at governor and union meetings. Both the informal and formal consultation have been an invaluable element of the final design of the funding models.

- 3.03 Some key funding policy issues were discussed through the primary consultation. Firstly, respondents were generally in favour of restricting headteacher teaching commitment to 0.5 even in the smallest school and reducing headteacher teaching commitment in bigger schools from 240 pupils to 210. Secondly, some respondents raised concern that Planning, Preparation and Assessment time would be costed at HLTA rates in the funding model. Some schools have provided cover through Higher Level Teaching Assistants and specialist coaching arrangements whilst others have provided cover through teachers since the National Workload Agreement in 2003. In each case, there is no clear view on where funding could be withdrawn to reallocate to these areas.

- 3.04 Whilst we acknowledge the responses to these consultation points at this time there are insufficient funds available to provide additional funding to schools on this basis. However, the formula review has provided an opportunity to highlight and debate these issues and we would propose that they should be taken forward as a policy debate in the future as funding becomes available for additional investment.

- 3.05 Secondary schools formula impacts issued before Christmas and a number of meetings have been held with the Secondary Heads Federation to consider the outcome. Table 1 below shows the total impact of the new formula based on 2013/14 funding values and the effect in year 1 after the 75% transitional dampening for each school.

The maximum negative impact in year 1 is 0.6%.

Table 1: Secondary Impacts Due To New Formula

School	Change £	Change %	Year 1 Impact	Year 1 % Impact
Elfed High, Buckley	1,861	0.1%	465	0.0%
Connah's Quay High	-4,268	-0.1%	-1,067	0.0%
John Summers High	542	0.0%	136	0.0%
Flint High	26,296	1.0%	6,574	0.3%
St Richard Gwyn	28,791	0.9%	7,198	0.2%
Hawarden High	-20,941	-0.6%	-5,235	-0.1%
Holywell High	-16,923	-0.8%	-4,231	-0.2%
Castell Alun	14,693	0.4%	3,673	0.1%
Mold Alun	-115,677	-2.5%	-28,919	-0.6%
Maes Garmon	14,260	0.7%	3,565	0.2%
Argoed	49,281	2.0%	12,320	0.5%
St David's High	22,087	1.1%	5,522	0.3%

Based on 13/14 values

3.06 Primary schools formula impacts are due to be issued on Monday 27 January 2014. There will be an opportunity to consult further with the primary sector at the Heads Federation on the 29 January 2014.

3.07 The Schools Budget Forum considered the outcome of the consultation process on the 23 January 2014 and it has been agreed that a further meeting will be held in February prior to the Cabinet meeting on the 18 February to give further consideration to the primary formula.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.01 To note the outcome of the formal and informal consultation process.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.01 The revision to the formula is modelled within existing resources and so has no impact on the Council budget. Individually schools may see an increase or decrease in their budgets in comparison to the current formula. Transition arrangements will be implemented over a three year period to allow schools with reduced levels of funding to make the necessary adjustments.

6.00 ANTI POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 None.

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 None.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.02 The aim of the formula is to ensure that all schools received a 'fair' share of the funding available.

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 The redistribution of resources may result in redundancies in schools.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 Schools Budget Forum 23/1/14
Primary Heads Federation 29/1/14
Lifelong Learning Scrutiny 30/1/14

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Secondary Consultation Document issued 2/10/13
Primary Consultation Document issued 21/10/13
Lifelong Learning Scrutiny 10/10/13
Flintshire Governors Assoc. 18/11/13
Members Workshop 5/12/13
Secondary Heads Federation 18/12/13 & 15/1/14

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 Appendix 1 – Primary Consultation Responses
Appendix 2 - Secondary Consultation Responses

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None.

Contact Officer: Lucy Morris
Telephone: 01352 704016
Email: Lucy.morris@flintshire.gov.uk

Flintshire County Council
Schools Funding Formula Review
Primary Consultation Response Analysis

This document sets out the responses to the consultation document that was issued by Flintshire County Council on the proposals for the primary schools funding formula. A summary of the key comments is also included.

There were 35 questionnaires returned.

Consultation Point 1			
Transitional arrangements should be applied to reduce the impact of any changes in funding to schools in accordance with the table set out in 1.13 of the report.			
Agree	25 (71%)	Disagree	10
Comments			
<p>This facility would give schools the time to restructure if needed.</p> <p>If stability is maintained in our school, all well and good. We need further explanation regarding this. It depends if you are a 'winner' or a 'loser', without figures it is difficult to give an honest comment. Transitional arrangements must be set out clearly if all parties are to understand the implications</p> <p>A table showing the potential monetary value of the percentage affect, would have helped to guide response</p> <p>It is important to be fair but schools should be told as soon as possible of the impact of the changes.</p> <p>Question as to ability to handle Single Status and Formula change at same time.</p> <p>Transition should be 2 year max to encourage schools to make difficult decisions.</p>			
Consultation Point 2			
The two date pupil count will be retained for Primary schools.			
Agree	33 (94%)	Disagree	2
Comments			
<p>A two count system is essential.</p> <p>Two date count would mean that the monetary support needed for an increase in pupil numbers would be timely.</p> <p>Could date be altered, to allow for late admissions during October - seems to be a common trend over past years.</p> <p>Single Count allows for quicker budgeting, and trends may allow for identification of growth.</p>			

Consultation Point 3

It is proposed that all primary pupils are recognised in the funding formula at their full-time equivalent value.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If the school is able to maintain current staffing levels, then I would agree. We are working at the bare minimum at the moment. But would welcome this proposal, but also would welcome clarification regarding reception weightings.

Several comments querying the gap between Year 6 and Year 7 (KS2 vs KS3) funding. (188, 203)

This should also include the part time pupils because they need all the facilities including staff in order to operate effectively.

Would urge that the new formula takes account of the need for higher ratios of staff and increased number of 'consumables' used in the FP.

Providing this means that Reception is counted as 1

Consultation Point 4

The Primary School formula should include an element for leadership and management. This will comprise a lump sum for the baseline costs which are not linked to the size of a school. In addition there will be an amount per full time equivalent pupil recognising that the cost of leadership and management increases with the size of the school.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If it allows us to have the current members of staff stabilised on current leadership spine and funding matches this to allow us to operate on current levels - difficult to be fully in agreement without having the figures

Consultation Point 5

The formula should recognise that headteachers require management time. In larger schools with non-teaching headteachers there is a requirement for additional non-teaching management time.

The scale of protected management time is subject to variation dependent on the size of school.

Agree	32 (94%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Most definitely

Small school should be encouraged to federate to enable an increase in management time for their own school. Large schools dealing with high pupil levels have increased workload.

Option 1

The maximum amount of time that a headteacher should be presumed to be teaching should be 0.7 for a school of up to 30 pupils, reducing to zero at 240 pupils.

Agree	4 (13%)	Disagree	262
-------	---------	----------	-----

Comment

Not at all possible: Paid as 0.7 HT but actually they are 1.0HT and 0.7 CT.
A teaching load of 0.7 would make it very difficult to carry out HT functions.
There are four aspects to consider – curriculum management; building management and Health & Safety attached, staff management and home contact. Although curriculum management imposes similar pressures on everybody – large buildings require more attention H&S, maintenance etc and a large team of staff puts pressure on leaders (as managing people is the most challenging aspect).
On minimum HT commitment: An alternative of 0.7 up to 30 pupils, going down to zero at 200 pupils, (but at the same time appreciate that this may reduce the amount of funding available to distribute under other elements).
Don't want to funds coming from elsewhere. I have a .5 teaching commitment with 142 pupils on roll. This is not really going to reduce my commitment, unless I have an influx of 80 pupils. What about schools in the middle? Will any concessions be given? The wording implies a sliding scale and we would like to have the figures confirmed.

Option 2

The maximum amount of time that a headteacher should be presumed to be teaching should 0.5 for a school of 30 pupils reducing to zero at 210 pupils.

Agree	27 (77%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

The HT of a small school has the same admin as that of a large school and often without full time clerical support.
Also supported: Maximum teaching time for a Headteacher should not exceed 0.5 and preferably should be a lower maximum.

Consultation Point 6

Split Site and federated schools to receive additional non-teaching allowances for the leadership team.

Agree	27 (77%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Fully agree. But will the quality of leadership within school be effected?
Only if this had an overall cost saving effect on the budget.
Distance between sites should be taken into account.
There are huge challenges to leading a school in two buildings. These can be largely addressed by full time admin and reception support in each building and leadership non-

contact time when head is off site.
 Travel time between sites may be factored in but otherwise should not attract additional funding.
 The HT should not teach and also any leadership/ management team should receive non-teaching allowance to assist HT.
 Essential for the success of amalgamated schools.

Consultation Point 7

Teacher funding should be allocated to Primary schools based on the number of classes required to accommodate their pupil numbers.

Agree	22 (69%)	Disagree	10
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

Proposal seems cumbersome, not transparent and not facilitating longer term forecasting. Schools will be penalised for having classes with less than 30 pupils if they have appropriate school places. A hybrid solution would be a fairer alternative.
 This needs more discussion as it may force schools to have combinations of year groups which would be difficult to manage due to a large physical space.
 Unfair - this would result in some schools getting significantly more per pupil than others. Although we agree with this proposal we would like to see the MCSW updated as well as recalculated on a regular basis
 Cannot agree on a formula for calculating teacher staffing costs without the figures. I am only concerned with being able to keep current staffing levels and hopefully have a little flexibility to increase in the future.
 Classroom assistant support should be enhanced where there are more than two mixed age classes e.g. 3/4/5/6.
 This would be much fairer to schools that have small dimension classrooms and so have had their admissions numbers cut. No class should be for more than 2 age groups, but the old formula causes small schools to put Years 3, 4, 5 and 6 together or all the 4 year groups of Foundation Phase.
 There should be a recognised formula for this instead of a case by case basis.
 The governors and head disagree with this proposal. A unanimous decision that all money should be distributed on pupil numbers only. Not on class or class sizes.
 As long as the data used is accurate and up to date - there are anomalies.

Consultation Point 8

Cross phase classes will be assumed in the funding model in accordance with current practice and funding availability.

Agree	21 (64%)	Disagree	12
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

As long as the data used is accurate and up to date - there are anomalies.
 Equal Opportunities / Equality and Diversity – All schools should avoid cross-phase classes.
 Difficult due to the different curriculum in FP and KS2.
 All schools should avoid cross-phase classes.
 We would prefer the Review to state clearly that while such arrangements are necessary in

some situations they should not be the norm.
 Should only be used as a last resort and only if the same applies to ALL schools both Welsh and English medium.
 This should not be JUST for Welsh medium - NO school should have cross-phase.

Consultation Point 9

Welsh Medium schools to be funded to avoid the necessity of cross-phase classes.

Agree	17 (50%)	Disagree	17
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

As per Equal Opportunities / Equality and Diversity – All schools should avoid cross-phase classes, not just Welsh Medium schools.
 There should be equality across all schools.
 Equality is required
 Most welcome proposal as it recognises that Welsh medium schools have to operate differently from other schools.
 Welsh medium should be given extra funding in order to ensure that these pupils have to be of an equal standard in both Welsh and English by the time they leave the primary school - i.e. their English on par with English medium schools although Welsh is not on par in English schools.
 Teaching English within a cross-phase class poses problems.

Consultation Point 10

Teacher Funding will be at M6, with an adjustment if average teacher costs are higher, but not penalising a school where the average cost is lower.

Agree	29 (85%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This principle should go a long way to avoid the current discrimination on grounds of age/experience. i.e. appointing a NQT rather than an experienced teacher on cost grounds. Similarly, teachers should not be denied access to the UPS on cost grounds.
 For the long term, this proposal does not encourage movement of teaching staff, however in the short term avoids possible redundancies.
 Agreed if schools not penalised for having experienced staff.
 Some comments urged funding for the staff they have, and that Leadership posts counted as UPS 3 in determining average.
 All schools should be given the funding to pay the actual staff in the school.
 Need confirmation that current leadership, UPS & TLR costs will also be honoured.

Consultation Point 11

It is proposed that the Foundation Phase grant is incorporated into the formula funding and allocated on the required ratios and grades of staff required to meet the Foundation Phase regulations.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If not agreed to, this could affect the effective implementation of the Foundation Phase. We agree on the basis that the funding that is currently allocated to FP should be the minimum amount added to the current budget to maintain the allocations and provision. As long as we can maintain our current Foundation Phase staffing levels. We do not want to go into a situation where we have to make redundancies. This has always been recognised under the present system. The different grades needed in FP needed to be more transparent.

Would prefer it to remain as a separate grant until such time as the funding is absorbed into Flintshire's annual financial Welsh Government settlement.

Concern that funding would not be maintained at current levels.

Consultation Point 12

Funding for PPA cover is based on the number of classes deemed necessary and is based on HLTA rates.

Agree	14 (42%)	Disagree	19
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

PPA cover has always been a high priority and when possible all classes have been taught by qualified teachers.

As PPA is statutory the funding should be statutory.

Teacher to cover teacher

We feel it should be based on teacher rates in KS2 with the additional funding not being diverted from another element within the budget

Teacher rate at KS2 and HLTA in Foundation Phase.

Not based on the number of classes deemed necessary but on NOR. Better to base on number of teachers than number of classes. However no problem with proposal to being funded on H.L.T.A pay rate basis.

In reality classroom assistants cannot maintain behaviour and standards in many KS2 classes – therefore we have to place a TEACHER in the class. Is it possible to have funding for 2-3 teachers initially for schools with over 100 children in the KS2, and then fund HLTA afterwards.

Consultation Point 13

Key Stage 2 Classroom support to be based on a per pupil (KS2) allocation.

Agree	31 (94%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We welcome this, especially in our school where we are unable to employ a permanent teaching assistant in KS2 - We would also welcome the ratio of pupil per teaching assistant in KS2.

Broadly welcomed on a per pupil basis.

This should be on a per class basis as every class needs classroom support.

If it is just per pupil then - disagree. If it reflects the wide spread of age groups within a KS2 class then -agree. Yrs 3, 4, 5 & 6 together regardless of number of pupils needs 2 TAs to help provide effective differentiated activities.

Consultation Point 14

The formula recognises the need for schools to be able to provide an administrative point of contact at all times.

Agree	34 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Minimum requirement – H&S considerations.

Health & Safety Issues

This should enable ALL schools no matter what size to have a full time secretary / admin support on a full time basis. This is especially true in smaller sized schools (like ours) where the Head is teaching at times when no secretarial support is available. When secretary is part time the HT also has to carry out admin tasks. Is this a good use of their time? Is it academically viable?

This would be a major factor in reducing disruption to teaching / learning. It should not mean the HT in small schools having to provide that point of contact - all schools should have full time admin especially if HT release is less in schools under 50.

Seen as an important principle and also addresses Health & Safety Issues.

Dependent on the size of school. Federated schools could have one call point.

This should enable ALL schools no matter what size to have a full time secretary / admin support on a full time basis. This is especially true in smaller sized schools where the Head is teaching at times when no secretarial support is available. When secretary is part time the HT also has to carry out admin tasks.

Will larger schools have commensurate increases to their admin budget as smaller schools as the workload increases exponentially?!

Consultation Point 15

Funding for administration (including meals) and mid-day supervision be merged. The funding to be allocated to Primary schools through a lump sum allocation and a per pupil amount.

Agree	28 (85%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Much of the work involved in organising the provision of mid-day meals and their supervision could be provided by the agency that supplies the meals.

If we are able to maintain current staffing levels - difficult to agree or disagree without figures. Could ratio for mid-day supervision be clarified and not reduced? Sufficient supervision must be provided no matter the size of school to meet H&S regulations and protect the breaktime of staff.

As long as funding is allocated on the basis of full time admin point of contact; plus other administrative costs as well as mid-day supervision. Sufficient supervision must be provided no matter the size of school to meet H&S regulations and protect the break-times of staff. Governors don't agree with an unknown lump sum percentage.

The evidence provided to support this proposal is insufficient and there appears to be no recognition of the importance of ensuring that the staff ratios for supervision at lunch times are adequate.

Consultation Point 16

A deprivation indicator is established comprising the following factors:

- FSM
- WIMD data - absolute ranking of schools
- WIMD data – ranking based on pupils on roll

Each factor would have equal weighting.

Agree	25 (76%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This is an improved mechanism for identification of pupils in accordance with Equality and Diversity policies and H&S.

Categories needed financial explanation with figures. Rationale for WIMD needs clarification Why? This creates less transparency.

Consultation Point 17

Deprivation funding is allocated to **all** Primary schools using the deprivation indicator. [Consultation point 18 offers an alternative allocation].

Agree	29 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

In accordance with point 16 above.

Would funding be allocated per pupil or by post code of the school?

Some comments point out that the proposal is complex for relatively small amounts of funding.

Support for both FSM and WIMD (alone) distribution.

An allocation on the basis of FSM eligibility / entitlement is all that is required as this would then tie in with how the Welsh Government allocates their Pupil Deprivation Grant.

FSM should have 50% weighting, WIMD data (absolute ranking) 25% and WIMD data (pupils on roll) 25%.

Using FSM as the only basis for allocating expenditure is misleading.

Preference for funding to be allocated to all schools in proportion to deprivation indicator (whichever is used).

The PDG would support those schools in areas of deprivation.

Some schools already benefit from PDG, while all schools have a degree of deprivation.

Consultation Point 18

Deprivation funding is targeted to Primary schools with the highest level of deprivation as identified by the deprivation indicator. [Consultation point 17 offers an alternative allocation].

Agree	4 (13%)	Disagree	28
-------	---------	----------	----

Comment

The most deprived schools should get the most funding

It should be targeted at where it will have the most impact.

The funding is aimed at schools operating in areas with high incidences of deprivation 'Leafy suburb' schools have many streams of funding not available in deprived areas - professional sponsorships through local businesses / industry / parental links, contributions from PTA raising significant amounts of money etc.

Consultation Point 19

There will be a single formula for the premises allocation.

Agree	28 (93%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We agree to this under the assumption that this is just for day to day maintenance and utilities, not fabric of the building.

Considerable concern expressed that without seeing the impact on budgets it would be difficult to understand the implications.

As long as it takes into account the needs of the building - eg we have to have lights on all year round due to the lack of natural daylight in the building.

The simplicity is persuasive.

As long as lump sum and top up is going to cover expenditure on repairs and maintenance, grounds, caretaking, cleaning and utilities with some to spare. Need to be aware of age of premises and condition.

The age and adaptability of any premises should be considered at all times - new buildings do not need the maintenance that older buildings need, and should be more energy efficient.

Will the energy efficiency rating of the building be factored in, and the location?

Please allow for schools which have to buy costly LPG for their mobile classrooms.

School building will always remain the same size regardless of pupil numbers!

Consultation Point 20

The formula for the premises allocation will be a combination of a lump sum amount, a per pupil allocation and an allocation based on area.

Agree	24 (83%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We feel this is an inappropriate question as part of a consultation process.

Definition of 'area' needed

As long as it is able to cover all our costs as it currently stands - again difficult to agree or disagree without figures. Clarification needed on allocation based on area

The caretakers have been given contracts agreed on floor space historically, this will need to be covered especially in light of single status.

Consultation Point 21

There will be an enhancement to the utilities allocation for Primary schools providing meals to other schools, and for those not having access to mains heating fuel.

Agree	30 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This needs to be considered on an individual basis as schools have very differing circumstances even under these headings as a school may provide only ten meals to another school, whereas some schools may provide 100, these are very different amounts of costing to take into account.

Case for case consideration needed

With the escalating costs of energy, the proposed arrangement is far more equitable than the current position.

We suggest that the allocation is based on actual costs.

Consultation Point 22

There will be a single formula allocation for supplies and services.

Agree	31 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Simplification broadly welcomed.

Consultation Point 23

The formula for the allocation of Supplies and Services to Primary schools will comprise a lump sum and a per pupil allocation.

Agree	29 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Difficult to agree or disagree without figures.
Some concern expressed that without seeing the impact on budgets it would be difficult to understand the implications.
As long as lump sum covers at least minimum requirements.
Single allocation better as if pupil numbers reduce then there will still be the same amount of services needed for those pupils that are left. Will this be based on size?

Consultation Point 24

KS2 pupils will attract a premium per pupil in recognition of additional curriculum requirements.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Very welcome
For amalgamations of Junior and Infant departments, there should be a buffering of base funding whilst the new funding formula is introduced. These would be special circumstances and applied in the event of schools which may lose a significant amount of funding from the new funding formula.
An additional allocation of administration and Leadership has already been given so no further additional amount would be required.
KS2 consistently underfunded in comparison to FP.
Although we agree we are mindful of the costs of the FP where staff ratios are high and more 'consumables' required.

Consultation Point 25

Welsh Medium schools will receive a premium for supplies and services.

Agree	21 (75%)	Disagree	7
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We recognise the additional costs incurred for providing Welsh medium resources through translation etc., however we feel that additional funding should be provided from WG for this so as not to penalise other schools within the county by a reduction in their budgets as a result.

Again the fact that Welsh medium schools are bilingual and that the pupils learn both Welsh and English to the same degree, additional resources are need for such schools.

Children who receive free school meals, LAC or EAL children should also be taken into account as expensive extra resources are also required for them.

English medium schools do have to purchase supplies and resources for Welsh as a second language curriculum need. EAL children also need support and resources in their own languages.

What additional costs do they have?

Translation and Welsh books are expensive.

We deliver 2 curriculums and 2 literacy and numeracy framework! Also all our documentation is bi-lingual prospectus, policies etc and therefore admin costs are higher.

Need to consider doubled costs for Welsh medium requirements – combine this with the lump sum and allocation per pupil.

Agree in relation to teaching and learning resources only.

Why? Can this be clarified?

Consultation Point 26

There will be a formula allocation for Additional Needs to include a lump sum for the ANCO.

Agree	34 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Governors don't agree with an unknown lump sum percentage. This should be given based on need.

Consideration must be given to schools in deprived areas as they have significantly higher incidences of pupils with SEN. This will be particularly important as school support becomes allocated to schools. This is a future time-bomb for SEN Tribunals.

Agree to an extent but it seems as if statemented children will be losing out. However, funding is needed for each ALNCo.

It is very much to be deplored that some schools do not recognise the ALNCo in salary terms. The more children on the ALN register, the more paperwork associated with this and the more contact with external agencies – so more ALNCo TIME is required (Time = Costs).

Consultation Point 27

The remaining funds to be allocated by the weighted numbers of :

- Pupils on the Special Needs Register at stages : School Action, School Action Plus, and Statemented
- Pupils on the EAL register at each stage of language acquisition
- Pupils who are in care (LAC).

Agree	28 (88%)	Disagree	4
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Including School Action would possibly create an increase in fund allocation unless there were independent criteria allocated.
Should consider pupils from the Gypsy and Traveller communities which tend to be transient. Traveller pupils should also have a weighting equal to EAL.
As School Action is not moderated, using School Action Plus, Statemented, LAC and EAL would be better measures.
Funding should be available when required and assessment undertaken quicker.
Will there be adjustment during the school year (our school has just had to take 3 SEN pupils which have a huge impact).
Weighting should be higher for SAP then less for statemented as they already have support in place. SAP are regulated numbers as they must have outside agency involvement.
Currently significantly underfunded. Many children with specific learning difficulties are not supported appropriately due to lack of funding.
There needs to be additional funding.
Don't statemented pupils receive funding from elsewhere?
Funding should be available when required and assessment undertaken quicker

Consultation Point 28

There will be a formula allocation for Split site / Federated schools, based on the lump sum elements within the overall formula.

Agree	25 (81%)	Disagree	6
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Although we agree we recognise that this is complicated and will require more in depth study in the future.

Consultation Point 29

Additional travel costs associated with a split site or federated schools will be recognised by an allowance based on the separation of the premises.

Agree

27 (84%)

Disagree

5

Comment

The potential additional costs (which are not directly associated with teaching and learning) of operating federated or split site schools needs to be fully considered when determining such arrangements in future.

This would need to be dependent on the spread of schools, ones that have sites close together would not need additional funding.

At the County mileage rate

Other Comments

Important that review facilitates forecasting for years 2 and 3.

Recognition that each school contributes to the available resources within the County, and that could be encouraged by a limit on the number of children that can attend larger schools, and the promotion of smaller settings as a sound alternative for pupils who can fare better in smaller classes with more individualised attention.

Introduction – Paragraph 1.6 says that the funding formula is a mechanism for distributing funds to schools and by so doing provides a single total budget. It goes on to say that it is not intended to fund or set budgets for individual categories of expenditure within schools. However, under the proposals a number of the Elements in paragraph 2.1 in my opinion would appear to contradict these statements as they appear to allude to specific areas of expenditure. Whilst I can appreciate the need for greater transparency in letting schools see how the new formula is to be calculated we also need to strike a balance so as not to take away from schools their autonomy in deciding how they wish to spend this budget.

Approach – Paragraph 1.10 talks of consultation on the principles and not of the impact of the new proposals on individual school budgets. If more time was available, bearing in mind that these Consultation Documents were over 3 weeks late in coming out, I could perhaps accept this concept but unfortunately we have not been afforded this luxury and we now find ourselves in a position where we, as schools, could be agreeing to a new formula which could seriously affect our funding and our ability therefore to achieve the 4 main objectives outlined in the Introduction. I acknowledge that to mitigate this effect you propose to introduce Transitional Arrangements over a 3 year period.

In conclusion, whilst I commend the vast amount of work that has been undertaken in getting the Formula Review to the stage where it is currently at I firmly believe that there is still an awful lot of work to be done over the next few months if a new Formula is to be agreed and implemented by April, 1st 2014. The decision by Flintshire to consult only on principles and not on the impact on individual schools will only add to this workload and in my opinion was not the right decision.

From the information provided within the Consultation Document and also from information gleaned from the few Working Group meetings that I attended I am still not 100% convinced that this proposed new Formula is going to help Flintshire achieve its desired aims as stated in Paragraph 1.7 of the Introduction i.e. transparency, simplification and greater predictability of resources for future years. I fear that the proposed formula is still too complicated and will not meet the needs of schools who wish to understand fully how their budgets are calculated and also will not provide schools with the means to predict any changes to their budgets in future years which may arise from changed circumstances within the school e.g. a major change in pupil numbers.

A further point I would like to make is with regard to the Authority's Section 52 Budget Statement. The Welsh Government Regulations state that at least 70% of all Primary & Secondary funding must be on the basis of pupil numbers. Is Flintshire confident therefore that with the introduction of this proposed new Formula it will be able to achieve this limit?

Comments on Welsh Medium

Again, I hope consideration is given to the views of people who UNDERSTAND the requirements of Welsh medium education and the system that exists in our Welsh medium schools – often people who are connected to non-Welsh medium schools don't really understand the requirements of being COMPLETELY BILINGUAL on all levels. It is vital that Flintshire LA show that it DOES fully understand the NEEDS of Welsh Medium Schools.

It is not only funding for quality first language WELSH materials that is needed, but also second language Welsh materials across ALL aspects of the curriculum –the 'subjects/learning areas' and the Welfare and Emotional Development (PSE) aspects; then in to Language and Speech work – copies/books and exercises are needed in Welsh and English – and all aspects of the Additional Learning Needs area also require equal materials in both languages. In terms of the school's every day resources – double the paper etc is required for policies / letters / parent contact leaflets/ Governors' reports and termly Staff to parents reports. The TIME used by school staff – especially the Head to complete the whole task is endless (often having to do translation work to the early hours of the morning to fulfil the statutory requirements only). Time (Head and UDA) means money – in order to seek quality daily translation/typing/admin support in the office to improve 'work demands' on school leaders.

Duplicating all policies and school letters is double the cost – paper and time – this has never been recognised by Flintshire – and this consultation is a real opportunity to change the way of thinking (which corresponds with and understands the Welsh Medium Education Strategy).

As Welsh medium schools are bilingual schools and therefore, all documentation at all levels are produced bilingually, which means that this takes double the time, double the paper to produce them, double the number of copies e.g. for parents.

Curriculum resources are required in both Welsh and English as the pupils in Welsh medium schools are completely bilingual by the time that they leave the school, and one of their predominant skills is to be able to gain knowledge in one language and transfer it to the other.

Therefore, these additional factors need to be identified and acknowledged when the budget review is considered – especially so in this day and age when there is so much emphasise on a bilingual Wales.

January 2014

**Flintshire County Council
Schools Funding Formula Review
Secondary Schools Consultation Response Analysis**

This document sets out the responses to the consultation document that was issued by Flintshire County Council on the proposals for the secondary schools funding formula. A summary of the key comments is also included.

Consultation Point 1			
Transitional arrangements should be applied to reduce the impact of any changes in funding to schools in accordance with the table set out in 1.13 of the report.			
Agree	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>Need to show that any gain would be phased in as well.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements as a requirement of this process, suggests that most schools will have a reduction in budget</p> <p>Given the fact that the maximum variation in schools' budgets will be 1% these are less important. However, we agree with the principle that a dampening arrangement should apply but only for a 1 year period.</p> <p>We agree with this because any changes to school budgets have the potential to destabilise a schools' staffing arrangements and curriculum offer.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements should be applied to reduce the impact of any changes in funding to schools in accordance with the table set out in 1.13 of the report</p> <p>For 2014/15 there should be protection to address the Sept/April/Aug funding arrangements. There should be no job losses as a result of the formula review.</p>			
Consultation Point 2			
A single pupil count will be adopted for secondary schools.			
Agree	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>How will the change from 11 - 18 to 11 - 16 be managed in those schools with statutory notice?</p> <p>This is logical as there is limited variation in secondary school populations between September and January.</p> <p>The collection of this data in September will assist budget planning.</p> <p>This is better than the adjustment model that existed in the past. Nevertheless secondary school numbers are not always stable and some thought needs to be given to how sudden and significant reductions in roll can impact a school's delivery of the curriculum and its staffing levels.</p> <p>Sensible minimises workload</p>			

Consultation Point 3			
The current AWPU values of 1.31 for KS3 and 1.72 for KS4 will be retained.			
Agree	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>Would have preferred using STPCD KS3/KS4 ratio, as this has external value Given the limited information provided for 2014-15 within the consultation document Governors would value further evidence of the accuracy of these ratios when considering budgets for future years. This makes sense as it links to the values that used in the STPCD There is no rational for them to be changed</p>			
Consultation Point 4			
The Secondary School formula should include an element for leadership and management			
Agree	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>Good to see that consideration is given to the point that leadership / management are equally required in small schools as well as larger ones! Given the fact that, irrespective of their size, all schools require a headteacher and leadership structure, the inclusion of this element is supported This is more desirable and it should include leadership at all levels within the school's staffing structure so middle as well as senior leaders. Does there need to be a leadership and management element for support staff as well? Leadership and management costs should be identified so that schools can benchmark themselves on their spending for this element</p>			
Consultation Point 5			
Secondary Schools should receive a lump sum and an amount per AWPU for leadership and management.			
Agree	10	Disagree	1
Comments			
<p>There should be some incentive here to structure properly to manage cost. Should be AWPU only. Would mean schools would need to rationalise their management structures to be more efficient/cost effective. There are schools that are overstaffed in terms of management where as others have made necessary changes. The principle is cautiously supported. Funding must include a small base element to recognise the needs of small schools, although this should be modest to encourage federalisation. However, the funding should largely be based upon pupil numbers to recognise the more complex leadership structure which is required to manage a large</p>			

school efficiently.
 t makes absolute sense to have a lump sum element as a school has to have a HT and a DHT or AHT to act as HT in the HT's absence
 It seems sensible to recognise the need for all schools to have a leadership and management structure, whilst also taking account of the size of the school.

Consultation Point 6

Teacher funding should be allocated to secondary schools on an AWPU basis.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This methodology for the allocation is logical to maintain pupil teacher ratios at their current level
 Teaching costs should be directly linked to pupil numbers

Consultation Point 7

There should be a top slice of teacher funding in the secondary sector of 1.5% which is reallocated to schools by reference to the largest school to reflect that a lower PTR is achievable in smaller schools at KS4.

Agree	7	Disagree	4
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

Request for an explanation as to how this is calculated
 If funding is on AWPU, no necessary slicing should be required. That would favour smaller schools, and disadvantage larger schools, also it would de incentivise larger school, support small school and not encouraging them to move to a position of attracting better pupil numbers
 This disadvantages larger schools. I do not agree with a 'top slice', certainly not of this magnitude.
 Yes if School is small and fully subscribed, No if school is small and under-subscribed
 Governors do not agree that top slicing is the correct mechanism to fund smaller schools
 If this comes from the quantum should the smaller schools' allocations be deducted before the top slice is made
 I would need to see data and calculations to establish if the 1.5% figure is appropriate
 Whilst this is agreed in principle, the size of the top slice should not adversely impact upon the opportunities for pupils in all schools to be taught in broadly similar class sizes irrespective of the size of the school.
 Define largest schools and smaller schools as it is not clear how this will impact.

Consultation Point 8

The Welsh Medium school should continue to receive funding based on one additional teacher for each of years 7 to 9 to facilitate teaching of children where Welsh is not their first language.

Agree	8	Disagree	3
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

The level of funding in Welsh medium schools is already significantly higher than English medium so this should be sufficient to meet this requirement.

Are the AWPU values of 1.31 for KS3 and 1.72 for KS4 the same for Welsh medium schools? If you do the slicing as above, this also benefits the smaller Welsh medium schools. What about other schools where resources are provided for pupils whose first language is not English or Welsh

Immersion course provision at YMG is separate to Welsh Med. Provision and must be staffed and timetabled differently. Clarification is required for the following points: 1. Pay Scale for additional teacher; immersion course teaching is very specialist discipline and requires an experienced practitioner. 2: WESP; In the light of Outcome 1 stating 'the target is to achieve an increase in size by 100%' is anticipated that the numbers on the immersion course will rise. The maximum class size is 15 according to the Welsh Language Board. If pupil numbers increase beyond this figure in a particular academic then funding for an additional teacher will be required.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there should be an element of enhancement to support the 'immersion' groups within the Welsh medium school, consideration should be given to the scale of this enhancement

Consultation Point 9

Funding currently allocated as workload is amalgamated with support staff funding.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Would still like to see this line as remaining separate
 The clarity of the budget will be supported by this funding being incorporated into support staff funding
 We agree. This makes absolute sense given that the funding is used for support staff to ensure that the workforce reform arrangements are in place
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 10

The funding identified for support staff is allocated to secondary schools through a lump sum allocation and an AWPU amount.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This principle is cautiously supported. Funding must include a small base element to recognise the needs of small schools, although this should be modest to encourage federalisation.
 This needs to happen as well and this is clearly explained in the rationale in the introduction to the formula review
 Agree in principle, but in every secondary school pupil numbers should generate the necessary funding and so any lump sum allocation should be kept small.
 We are in broad agreement although English medium schools are facing the challenge of increasing numbers pupils joining the school as EAL pupils and some provision needs to be made for these.
 Single status will have implications, even after the 2 year protection. This will need reviewing.

Consultation Point 11

The Welsh Medium school will receive an amount in respect of translation costs.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Other high schools should therefore be able to access this service free of charge for translation issues
 This allocation is endorsed. It is presumed that this allocation will be based on a per capita basis.
 In order to promote clarity and consistency, and to assist schools in checking budget allocations, it is proposed that the same methodology is used for the allocation of the deprivation funding as is used for the allocation of the Pupil Deprivation Grant - based on FSM numbers only,
 This can be costed accurately using Single Status for a translator and the staff member that provides specialist ICT/Admin support to produce translated documents
 A balanced indicator would be appropriate

Consultation Point 12

A deprivation indicator is established comprising the following factors:

- FSM
- WIMD data - absolute ranking of schools
- WIMD date – ranking based on pupils on roll

Each factor would have equal weighting.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

We broadly agree with this as using the three factors provides a better overview of deprivation.
 A long overdue element. Strongly agree.

Consultation Point 13

Deprivation funding is allocated to all secondary schools using the deprivation indicator.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

All schools contain a proportion of pupils from deprived backgrounds; consequently, all schools should receive a share of this limited amount of money.
 Strongly agree that funding should be available to all schools to target at the appropriate pupils

Consultation Point 14

Deprivation funding is targeted to secondary schools with the highest level of deprivation as identified by the deprivation indicator.

Agree	4	Disagree	7
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

This would not provide an equitable distribution of funding to schools to support young people from deprived circumstances.
 We disagree strongly with this option. The adoption of this option would divert funding from schools whose populations are slightly more advantaged overall
 Deprivation must be targeted in ALL secondary schools if it is a factor
 Strongly disagree - all schools will have individual pupils from deprived backgrounds and therefore all schools should receive an appropriate share of the funding.
 The objectives in 1.8 focus on narrowing the attainment gap. In schools where there is greater deprivation reducing the gap is more of a challenge. If the proportion of deprived children in school is greater than there needs to be adequate resource to support these children and their families.

Consultation Point 15

There will be a single formula for allocating funding to secondary schools under the heading of premises.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This opportunity to simplify this element of the budget is welcomed.
 This makes sense, however this will need to be examined more closely when modernisation is complete as in Holywell the primary and secondary schools will share some facilities
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 16

The formula for the premises allocation will be a combination of a lump sum amount, a per pupil allocation and an allocation based on area.

Agree	7	Disagree	4
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

All secondary schools should have an energy rating (DEC) as proposed by EU directive; this should be used to drive utility bills costs on a sliding scale relating to outcome of the assessment. The effect of a low energy rating outcome is not consistent or equitable for the school and is only in the control of the authority. Area and pupil numbers take no account of this factor.
 The condition of a building based on suitability survey should be taken into account as well as energy efficient ratings. This will be more complicated but would incentivise LA to tackle unsuitable buildings more quickly.

Whilst we support the principle of funding based on a lump sum allocation, and an element based upon the number of pupils, care has to be exercised in relation to area. Noting the current circumstances in some schools, where areas have been 'mothballed' as a result of demographics, the element of the allocation related to area should specifically relate to the area currently used for mainstream education
 Should 'full' schools subsidise those that have spare capacity/area? Per pupil allocations much fairer in my view
 A balanced approach to the formula seems fairest

The area of a school should not be included in the formula

Consultation Point 17

There will be an enhancement to the premises allocation for secondary schools providing meals to other schools.

Agree	8	Disagree	3
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

This should be a separate contract between the two schools
 The cost of this service should be met but why is additional 'premises allocation' needed?
 Yes - this is needed to reflect additional costs
 It is proposed that there should be an adjustment to the SLA costs for catering for schools which provide a service to other schools.

Consultation Point 18

There will be a single allocation for supplies and services.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This opportunity to simplify this element of the budget is welcomed
 This makes sense
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 19

The supplies and services allocation to secondary schools will consist of a lump sum plus an AWPU allocation.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Whilst this is supported, it is proposed that the lump sum allocation for this element is modest, with the majority of the funding being allocated on an AWPU basis.
 This makes sense
 A balanced approach is fairest

Consultation Point 20

Examination costs will be on a fixed cost per Year KS4 pupil.

Agree	11	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Can consideration be also given to raising the allocation threshold in view of externally driven rising costs which are beyond the control of schools?
 Whilst this is supported, it is suggested that due regard is given to schools' historical entry policies, as some schools enter pupils for more examinations.
 The fixed cost will need to take into account the varying costs for a range of qualifications and the varying costs of awarding bodies
 Agreed, and they would hopefully be set at a more realistic level that doesn't require subsidy from other budget headings
 KS4 examination costs at YMG are higher. Pupils sit full course GCSE Welsh Lang. and Welsh Lit. are in addition to the average cost of a Flintshire KS4 pupil
 Cost of exams at KS3 - implications of this invigilation and administration costs.

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: **LIFELONG LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

DATE: **THURSDAY, 30TH JANUARY, 2014**

REPORT BY: **HOUSING AND LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY FACILITATOR**

SUBJECT: **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

1.00 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.01 To consider the Forward Work Programme of the Lifelong Learning Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

2.00 BACKGROUND

2.01 Items feed into a Committee's Forward Work Programme from a number of sources. Members can suggest topics for review by Overview & Scrutiny Committees, members of the public can suggest topics, items can be referred by the Cabinet for consultation purposes, or by County Council or Directors. Other possible items are identified from the Cabinet Work Programme and the Strategic Assessment of Risks & Challenges.

2.02 In identifying topics for future consideration, it is useful for a 'test of significance' to be applied. This can be achieved by asking a range of questions as follows:

1. Will the review contribute to the Council's priorities and/or objectives?
2. Are there issues of weak or poor performance?
3. How, where and why were the issues identified?
4. Do local communities think the issues are important and is there any evidence of this? Is there evidence of public dissatisfaction?
5. Is there new Government guidance or legislation?
6. Have inspections been carried out?
7. Is this area already the subject of an ongoing review?

3.00 CONSIDERATIONS

3.01 Overview & Scrutiny presents a unique opportunity for Members to determine the Forward Work Programme of the Committees of which they are Members. By reviewing and prioritising the Forward Work Programme Members are able to ensure it is Member-led and includes the right issues. A copy of the Forward Work Programme is attached at Appendix 1 for Members' consideration which has been updated following the last meeting.

4.00 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.01 That the Committee considers the draft Forward Work Programme attached as Appendix 1 and approve/amend as necessary.

5.00 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.01 None as a result of this report.

6.00 ANTI POVERTY IMPACT

6.01 None as a result of this report.

7.00 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.01 None as a result of this report.

8.00 EQUALITIES IMPACT

8.01 None as a result of this report.

9.00 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

9.01 None as a result of this report.

10.00 CONSULTATION REQUIRED

10.01 N/A

11.00 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

11.01 Publication of this report constitutes consultation.

12.00 APPENDICES

12.01 Appendix 1 – Forward Work Programme

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None.

Contact Officer: Ceri Owen
Telephone: 01352 702305
Email: ceri.owen@flintshire.gov.uk

CURRENT FWP

Date of meeting	Subject	Purpose of Report	Scrutiny Focus	Responsible / Contact Officer	Submission Deadline
6 March 2014 Meeting to be held at Ysgol Maes Garmon	Incidents of arson, vandalism and burglaries in Flintshire schools	Annual update report to review progress	Monitoring Report	Director of LLL	26 February 2014
	Facilities Review	To provide Members with a quarterly update on the implementation of various service improvement initiatives.	Service Delivery	Director of LLL	
	Pupil Attainment	To provide Members with a summary of pupil attainment across primary and secondary school phases for the school year	Monitoring Report	Director of LLL	
	Annual School Modernisation Report	Annual update report to review progress	Monitoring Report	Director of LLL	
	School Performance Report – including attendance and exclusions	To provide Members with details of overall School Performance and Inspection outcomes	Monitoring Report	Director of LLL	
10 April 2014	Quarterly Performance Reporting	To consider Q3 performance outturns for improvement targets	Performance Monitoring	Director of LLL	2 April 2014

	Regional School Effectiveness and Improvement Service (GwE)	To provide Members with details of the performance of GwE in its first year	Performance Monitoring	Director of LLL	
15 May 2014	Lifelong Learning Directorate Plan 2014/15	To provide Members with an overview of the Directorate Plan 2014/15 as part of the Council's Governance Framework	Service Planning	Director of LLL	7 May 2014
	Development and Resource Service Plan	To consider the Development and Resource Service Plan	Service Planning	Director of LLL	
	School Improvement Strategy	To consider the School Improvement Strategy	Service Planning	Director of LLL	
	Culture & Leisure Plan	To consider the Culture & Leisure Plan	Service Planning	Director of LLL	
	Apprenticeships, Training & Development Opportunities	To update Members on progress in relation to creation of Apprenticeship and Training Opportunities	Performance Monitoring	Director of LLL	
19 June 2014	Quarterly Performance Reporting	To consider Q4/Year End performance outturns for improvement targets	Performance Monitoring	Director of LLL	11 June 2014

24 July 2014					
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Items to be scheduled

- Update report on the timescales of the bespoke websites for all Leisure Facilities
- Update on the growth of sports development activities for 0 – 7 year olds – October 2014 (to allow for the scheme to be running for a school year)
- Update report on the Flintshire Music Service Review (to include information on the number of pupils who had requested tuition but had given up after a short period of time) – September, 2014

Joint meeting with Social & Health Care Overview & Scrutiny Committee – March, 2014

- Corporate Parenting
- Children & Young People Plan
- Educational Attainment of Looked After Children
- Safeguarding
- Services for the blind / partially sighted in Flintshire

REGULAR ITEMS

Month	Item	Purpose of Report	Responsible / Contact Officer
February	Pupil Attainment	To provide Members with a summary of pupil attainment across primary and secondary school	Director of Lifelong Learning
February / March	Incidents of arson, vandalism and burglaries in Flintshire schools	Annual update report to review progress	Director of Lifelong Learning
March	Children & Young People Plan	Monitoring Report	Director of Lifelong Learning
March	Educational Attainment of Looked After Children	To receive the annual educational attainment report (joint meeting with Social & Health Care)	Director of Lifelong Learning
November 2010 onwards	School Balances	To provide the Committee with details of the closing balances held by Flintshire schools at the end of the financial year	Director of Lifelong Learning
November	School Exclusions	Annual monitoring report to ensure effective mechanisms remain in place for exclusions, together with appropriate levels of intervention and support	Director of Lifelong Learning
December	Health & Safety in Schools	To receive a summary report on accidents and incidents in schools during the academic year and the actions taken to support schools in achieving healthy and safe environments.	Director of Lifelong Learning
Quarterly	Performance Monitoring	To enable Members to fulfil their scrutiny role in relation to performance monitoring	Director of Lifelong Learning

Month	Item	Purpose of Report	Responsible / Contact Officer
	School Meal Service	To receive an update on the key project milestones of changes to the School Meal Service	Director of Lifelong Learning

This page is intentionally left blank