

Dear Colleague

LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM

I would like to invite you to a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum to be held on **Thursday 4 December 2014 at 2.00 pm** at **Beaumanor Hall** with the room being available from 1.30 pm.

Please see below for the agenda for the meeting.

Yours sincerely

Bryn Emerson

AGENDA

	Paper
1. Apologies and Substitutions	
2. Minutes and Matters Arising	2
3. Universal Free School Meals Capital Funding	3
4. Implementation of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM)	4
5. Behaviour Partnership Update	5
6. 2014/15 Schools Budget Outturn	6
7. AOB	
8. Next Meetings:	
Monday 23 February 2015	
Thursday 18 June 2015	
Monday 21 September 2015	

All the above from 2.00 – 4.00pm at Beaumanor Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire Schools' Forum
Notes of the meeting held on Thursday 18 September 2014,
2.00pm at Beaumanor Hall

Present

Alex Green	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Suzanne Uprichard Richard Spurr Michael Murphy	Secondary Academy Governors
David Lloyd Karen Allen	Primary Maintained Headteachers
Jean Lewis	Primary Academy Governor
David Thomas Tony Gelsthorpe	Primary Maintained Governors
Ian Sharpe	CE Representative
Heather Stretton	Trade Union Representative
Suzanne Uprichard	PRU Representative
Chris Davies	RC Representative

In attendance:

Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources Department
 Lesley Hagger, Director, Children and Family Services
 Gill Weston, Assistant Director, Education, Learning and Skills
 Chris Bristow, Interim Head of Strategy, Vulnerable Groups
 Chris Connearn, Interim Head of Strategy, Education Quality and Vulnerable Groups

1.	<p>Election of Chair and Vice Chair</p> <p>Tim Moralee was elected Chair of the Schools' Forum for the coming academic year.</p> <p>Tony Gelsthorpe was elected Vice Chair of the Schools' Forum for the ensuing year.</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were received from Tim Moralee, Ivan Ould, Nigel Leigh, Alison Deacon, Louisa Hallam, Bill Nash, Sonia Singleton, Brian Myatt, Heather Sewell, Sue Horn and Jason Brooks.</p>	
3.	<p>Membership Update</p> <p>Jenny Lawrence reported that she had undertaken an annual review of pupil numbers in school phases to identify whether any changes to Schools' Forum membership for 2014/15 were needed. Jenny confirmed that no changes were required to the 2014/15 membership.</p>	

4.	<p>Minutes</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 16 June 2014 and 5 September 2014 were agreed as accurate and true records.</p> <p>Matters Arising from 16 June 2014 – Lesley Hagger reported that the meeting with Peter Lauener from the EFA held at the end of July, regarding the use of basic need capital allocations had been very successful and will help deliver the priorities identified in the school place planning strategy (which is currently out to consultation).</p> <p>Matters Arising from 5 September 2014 – Tony Gelsthorpe thanked Jenny Lawrence for responding to his question about the cost of funding protection for age range changes.</p>	
5.	<p>Oakfield Update</p> <p>Chris Connearn introduced her paper and outlined that Oakfield was primary provision for children at risk of exclusion.</p> <p>At the last Ofsted inspection Oakfield had been judged a good provision on every count.</p> <p>Karen Allen, on behalf of primary headteachers, expressed her thanks to those working at Oakfield for the hard work and commitment to ensuring that the school no longer required special measures and developing behaviour support for primary schools. Karen highlighted that there are still children who require support even though they were not able to access the expertise at Oakfield.</p> <p>David Lloyd acknowledged that this was a challenging and difficult job.</p> <p>Chris Connearn said that the Primary Behaviour Forum purpose is around building capacity in schools, and providing school to school support in the system through schools working together.</p> <p>Lesley Hagger said it was important to ensure this was pulled into Supporting Leicestershire Families work so that the whole family is supported.</p> <p>Jean Lewis asked if there was any suggestion support might translate to training opportunities to mainstream schools.</p> <p>Chris Connearn responded that idea was being developed using expertise from around the County and Oakfield.</p> <p>Suzanne Uprichard – behaviour forums will be a means of starting that pushing out of support, if issues caught early they don't develop and families then feel supported.</p> <p>David Thomas – request to provide additional support January to March – post April 2015 will require full cost from school. Which schools are the Local Authority planning recovery from and what are the chances of getting it?</p>	

	<p>Chris Connearn responded that the Local Authority was looking at developing that model in the consultation and to share the learning. Models will be drawn up, but still at an early stage.</p> <p>Karen Allen – if child presenting these quite extreme behaviours in school the headteacher’s priority for the sake of other children, other families and their reputation. Extra support in classroom often which is very expensive, but not necessarily the answer. Chance for schools to explore effective/efficient ways. If £6.25 per child was delegated in to budget, schools would be prepared to pay.</p> <p>Suzanne Uprichard – this model will address issues early on, for a young person up to 11, if we can overcome their behaviour problems and support the family, this will lead to more productive and useful secondary education, therefore money worth investing.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Chris Connearn for her work.</p> <p>Schools’ Forum agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuation of the funding arrangement from DSG be carried forward for 2014-15. 2. DSG reserves be used to fund an additional teacher and administrative support from September 2014 to April 2015 	
6.	<p>2013/14 School Balances</p> <p>Jenny Lawrence explained that the annual report comes to Schools’ Forum detailing school balances maintained schools were holding on 31 March 2014 and the 2013/14 financial year.</p> <p>Jenny referred to the table in paragraph 13, numbers of schools holding balances in excess of 5% are increasing as are balances themselves. The Local Authority was looking to try to match performance data to school balances.</p> <p>Follow up work with schools to find out why schools with high balances are holding those balances will be completed.</p> <p>Suzanne Uprichard asked why the Local Authority are proposing to give 7% to primaries who seem to be holding this surplus, when conversations with schools holding those large reserves, they don’t have plans to spend them, no reason to drop in NOR, will they still get the whole amount?</p> <p>Jenny responded that local authorities are not allowed to take school balances into account within the school funding formula. The Local Authority started looking at school funding before school balances were reported by schools, and looked for evidence base and the relative funding position for Leicestershire schools.</p> <p>Richard Spurr asked if there was an analysis of why schools have high balances?</p>	

	<p>Jenny responded that these are the conversations to have with schools. Data was not in until the end of June and takes a while to analyse. This is a piece of work that needs to happen.</p> <p>Lesley Hagger said it was really important to undertake that analysis and look at schools with balances and their performance to gain a good knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Ian Sharpe reported that those schools that have not got plans, not being analytical.</p> <p>Karen Allen referred to balance control mechanism and asked whether the claw back was ever used?</p> <p>Jenny responded yes.</p> <p>Karen Allen - looking particularly at primary budgets relatively small amounts of money. A child with a particular behavioural difficulty, suddenly having to recruit staff can be the difference between 8% and 10% and can de-stabilise the whole school. 2% can make a huge difference/impact to smaller schools.</p> <p>Jean Lewis – have to look at the large balances and must not mix up large balances with the budget for next year. Need to look at year on year allowance for the children.</p> <p>Suzanne Uprichard – schools given money to teach and provide learning for their children increasingly being asked to justify why schools receive money are not good or outstanding. How many of these schools are not graded one or two?</p> <p>Jenny responded that was one of the performance measures the Local Authority would be looking at, attainment gap and OfSTED judgement.</p> <p>Heather Stretton – there should be a level playing field – EFA not publishing the same information for academies and hoped that would be rectified by the EFA.</p> <p>Schools’ Forum discussed and noted the position of the 2013/14 school balances for Local Authority maintained schools.</p>	
7.	<p>Personal Budgets</p> <p>Chris Bristow introduced his paper. The final approved Code of Practice was issued in July which reiterates the Local Authority’s responsibility to roll out Personal Budgets.</p> <p>The position in terms of education is that the Local Authority offer no Personal Budget as of today, but need to establish a mechanism how the LA can best do that and extend Personal Budget offer to families to get the best possible outcome for our children and young people with SEN and disability.</p>	

	<p>The purpose of the report is to ask Schools' Forum to nominate a member to be part of a working group of headteachers to bring proposals how this could work in reality in Leicestershire.</p> <p>Richard Spurr – Personal Budget money could include Social Care, Education and Health. How do we ensure that a particular individual may decide to spend money depending on their needs?</p> <p>Chris responded that money has to achieve those health outcomes identified by health or other professionals.</p> <p>Karen Allen raised a question on SEND Reform, as she understands from SENCO and PRU School Heads from 1 September schools had to publish their Local Offer in terms of SEN. Understands the Local Authority is yet to publish their Offer and advice SENCOs given was not to produce theirs until have Local Authority Offer to link it to. Has it been published, if not when will it be published?</p> <p>Chris reported that the Local Authority Local Offer was published on 1 September 2014 and was available on the website: www.leics.gov.uk/local_offer. School Offer and template was provided during the summer term for schools to complete and needs to be completed and on school websites by October half term.</p> <p>David Lloyd said the amount of training expected with these huge changes with no extra money was not acceptable.</p> <p>Jean Lewis – NHS continuing care funding and Personal Budgets – what are the limitations on each of these? What about the swap over on Health?</p> <p>Chris stated the current position is Health have to consider Personal Budget if a child has severe or complex care needs, (approx. 20 young people across Leicestershire, Rutland and City). Personal Budget will need to extend from 1 April 2015 and 1 April 2016 for young people with long term complex health conditions. 0-25 agenda needs to consider how those options are offered as a Personal Budget.</p> <p>Heather Stretton asked will children with SEN still be statemented? Chris responded no, EHC plan.</p> <p>Heather asked regarding High Needs Block – will this be used? Chris responded yes, for commissioning places in specialist provision and top up funding.</p> <p>It was agreed that Jean Lewis from Schools' Forum would join the working group of headteachers.</p>	
8.	<p>2015/16 School Funding</p> <p>Jenny Lawrence talked through the key points of her report and explained it had only been possible to table the report and outcome of the consultation late as the consultation closed on 17 September. The</p>	

timeline had been extremely challenging to develop these proposals.

The proposal had been to Schools' Forum twice and the Task and Finish Group 3 times who unanimously supported the principles and the proposals - that all education providers should benefit from additional money but the Local Authority recognise that it is impossible to find a solution that meets every schools individual needs, the proposals provide the best solution for Leicestershire as a whole and will leave schools in a better place to respond to the introduction of a national funding formula.

Jenny stated that this is not a formula review but a basis to distribute the additional funding.

Jenny thanked the Task and Finish Group for their time over the summer to work on formulating proposals.

Jenny said the Local Authority had done as much as possible to alert all schools and academies to the importance of the consultation, but had only received 13 responses. 7 primary (unanimous in favour) and 6 secondary (mixed responses). The Local Authority have proposed no changes to funding age range changes.

It was important to note not all schools can get additional £240 per pupil largely due to the way the minimum funding guarantee works. There are 23 schools who will not see a cash increase. However, they would have seen a 1.5% increase. No school will lose money as a result of these proposals.

It remains the Local Authority's view that the proposals are measured and principled. Schools will benefit from lower levels minimum funding guarantee from the formula.

Anecdotally secondary schools are telling the Local Authority that the proposals are not fair but the consultation outcome does not make this point – the LA feel that there is an alternative proposal which retains principles that Schools' Forum may wish to consider which is to retain 7% AWPU primary school, retain 100% uplift at prior attainment (primary and secondary), retain funding increase early years providers and could provide secondaries with an AWPU increase of 2.75%.

If that option were supported the Local Authority would need to adjust primary and secondary AWPU 2014 data and this would also increase the number of schools remaining on minimum funding guarantee from 23 to 26 schools.

The Chair asked Schools' Forum members whether they would like to adjourn for 30 minutes to allow time for consideration of the issues raised. The Forum decided to continue with the meeting and not adjourn.

David Thomas referred to page 14 alternative proposal and asked whether this was a political proposal?

Jenny responded no, the secondary position was reported by a limited group of secondary schools, the Local Authority are in consultation so took that informal feedback into account when the option was explored around an alternative that kept with those fundamental principles agreed in June.

Richard Spurr said this was an excellent piece of work. The feedback he had received from secondary representatives had been negative, they fully understand the minimum funding guarantee, but the main issue had been around disproportionate increase directed more to primary than secondary.

Jenny responded that the analysis shows basic entitlement funding into all schools for primary is 1.6% lower than in similar authorities, KS3 is 0.5% greater and KS4 1.22% greater.

Karen Allen responded to Richard's questions. This is addressing a long term discrepancy primary have been coping with for a long time.

Jenny said the Local Authority can only take into account the views it receives and had not just provided the formal consultation feedback but also included the email responses received for completeness.

David Thomas, as a member of the Task and Finish Group, expressed his disappointment in the number of consultation responses. The alternative is a fundamental change from the consultation proposal.

Alex Green reported 6th form funding over the last 4 years had been cut significantly beyond any other area, which has a significant impact on secondary. There is a Primary bias, understands why, but important to remember, at every stage secondary colleagues have promoted the primary additional funding, 6th form funding KS5 has never been mentioned. Really would plead to consider latitude if flexibility in system to go for 2.75% centrally retained budgets – should come back to that – look at Schools Block in its totality, how and why it is split.

Jenny responded that DSG given to the Local Authority was for 0-15 year olds, there is no DSG funding for KS5. Jenny clarified 2.75% was not considered by the Working Group. Schools' Forum approves the budgets that are centrally retained in the Schools Block.

Jean Lewis asked for clarification – whether these proposals were for the one year?

Jenny responded no, that they were recurrent and would carry forward 2016/17 and onwards.

Richard Spurr – key points about perception – principle is sound we should be realigning. We should use extra money to readdress the balance. As secondary academy representative must consider 2.75%.

Heather Stretton – understands minimum funding guarantee to

	<p>safeguard schools. Eventually there will be a price per pupil. Proposal of 2.75% only floated last couple of days does not give much time to consider, and there needs to be more time.</p> <p>Jenny responded there was no time, a report was to go to Cabinet on 13 October and papers needed to be issued a week in advance. Minimum funding guarantee has been in place around 11 years introduced designed to ensure the Local Authority did not take more money than they should from the Schools Block, latterly used for ensuring school funding did not fall significantly year on year.</p> <p>Karen Allen asked for it to be confirmed - if were to go for the new proposal of 2.75% - the only disadvantage would be an additional 3 schools retained on minimum funding guarantee?</p> <p>Jenny responded yes, and it would also increase rates going into nursery education and SEN. SEN can be funded from contingency already held. Early Years allocation would increase from £730K to £920K, secondary schools were not supportive of funding going to early years providers.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 - Schools' Forum considered the consultation.</p> <p>That the proposals should be amended – 5 voted in favour.</p> <p>That the proposals should remain – 5 voted in favour, (6 in favour with the final casting vote from the Chairman).</p> <p>The Chairman, considering the work of the Task and Finish Group, therefore agreed not to change the proposal.</p> <p>Recommendation 5 - was agreed.</p> <p>Jenny clarified that the final decision rests with Cabinet on 13 October.</p> <p>David Thomas – AWPU alignment – could that be negative?</p> <p>Jenny responded yes, one example is the rates backdated over a number of years, if call on that increases all AWPU will need to be factored down. Not possible to say whether it could go up or down.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Jenny for doing a tremendous job, given the extremely tight timescale.</p>	
9.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>Karen Allen raised concern about the capital programme for universal infant meals.</p> <p>Karen reported on the cost of work which had to be undertaken to kitchens which in some cases were not fit for purpose. Karen asked whether the Local Authority had to meet any of the costs, or whether it was to be met centrally?</p>	

	<p>Lesley Hagger suggested that the Director of Corporate Resources be asked to bring a report to a future meeting of Schools' Forum.</p> <p>Ian Sharpe reported on the impact on schools, staff time and budgets for teaching and learning.</p> <p>Jenny Lawrence asked colleagues to let her have any particular case studies that schools can submit to show the impact on their budget.</p> <p>Lesley Hagger said that consideration needed to be given to the Government pledge not to create additional burden.</p>	
10.	<p>Date of Next Meetings</p> <p>Schools' Forum agreed the following dates for future meetings:</p> <p>Thursday 4 December 2014 Monday 23 February 2015 Thursday 18 June 2015 Monday 21 September 2015</p> <p>All the above from 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS' FORUM

Universal Free School Meals Capital Funding

4th December 2014

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	X
PVI Settings		Primary	X
Special Schools / Academies	X	Secondary	
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	X

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	X
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	
		Maintained Special School Members	X
		Academy Members	X
		All Schools Forum	

This report provides an update on the allocation of the Universal Free School Meals Capital funding and the current position on the implementation of the initiative.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum notes the allocation to date of the school meals capital funding.

Introduction

To support the introduction of the Universal Infant Free School Meals the Government announced that £150 million capital funding would be available to improve kitchen and dining facilities. Leicestershire has received £886,000 for all maintained schools.

Background

The new legislation required all state funded schools to provide free school meals to infant children from September 2014. School Food currently supplies meals to 218 schools in the County on a daily basis. The service produces in excess of 19,000 meals per day. The introduction of the new free meals has resulted in the service providing 30,686 meals, which is 12,454 additional meals a day. The uptake of universal free school meals is running at 79%.

Criteria for Funding Allocation

The service carried out an initial assessment at all schools that have their service provided by School Food, to assess the impact the additional meals would have at individual school level. As a result of this assessment schools were prioritised taking into account other schools that they also produce meals for.

The main objective of the grant was for as many schools as possible to be in a position to cook meals on site. The allocation of the funding for Leicestershire took into account the schools that could convert their existing kitchen area into a space able to produce meals on site without the need to extend the building. This has maximised the allocation of the funding. Consideration was also given to the pressure on existing production kitchens that transport to more than one school and the need to reduce the volume of meals produced at one site.

The assessment took into account the cooking and service equipment in existing kitchens required to enable the production of the additional meals. (Breakdown of allocation below).

It was clear that there was insufficient funding to convert all schools without a production kitchen and in many circumstances there was not enough space to extend the school. Fortunately many schools were already in a good position to meet the challenge going forward.

The equipment allocation also took into account the schools that provide their own catering, discussions took place with individual schools and agreement was based on an assessment of additional meals.

Kitchen Refurbishments and Equipment Allocation

While Leicestershire kitchens are in a reasonable position to provide the additional meals the capital funding has enabled the conversion of six dining centres into full production kitchens to date. The remaining two will be completed in the new year. The conversions have enabled the schools to be in a position to produce meals on site. This has released pressure on the kitchens that currently produce their meals.

The success of the conversions has been dependant on increasing the electrical supply, detailed electrical surveys have been carried out and unfortunately Oxley Primary had to be put on hold due to the excessive cost of upgrading the electric meter. A bid has now been submitted for Oxley Primary for the next round of Government capital for UIFSM. Announcements regarding the allocation of funding will be made by 20th January 2015.

The conversions are;

- Hugglescote Primary - complete - final costs - £47,234.48
- Castle Donington St Edwards - complete - final costs - £63,534.08
- Thurnby St Lukes - planned for completion before the end of March 2015 - budget costs - £53,277.32
- Ashby Woodcote - complete - final costs - £32,735.56
- Melton Sherard - complete - final costs - £62,985.66
- Broughton Astley Hallbrook - complete - final costs - £30,6076.92
- Witherley Primary - complete - final costs - £27,577.92
- Moira Primary - planned for completion before the end of March 2015 - budget costs - £45,769.06

It was always the intention to complete the conversions to production kitchens on a rolling programme if all of the schemes had been planned for the summer holidays it could have left schools in difficulty and unable to serve food at all should the conversions not have been complete.

A contribution of £50,000 has also been included for the provision of equipment for a full production kitchen at Melton Brownlow as a part of the rebuild of their kitchen/dining room. While Brownlow has recently converted to an Academy the criteria allows for schools to still receive funding. An element of the cost for the new build has been provided by the LA capital funding, this had originally been agreed to provide a servery area utilising the school gym for dining. The remainder needed for the build has come from a successful bid from the academies maintenance fund enabling the school to have a full rebuild of the kitchen/dining room. The existing Brownlow kitchen and dining room is an old Horsa building which is at the end of its life.

Melton area has very few production kitchens and this scheme has allowed for the production of meals to become more sustainable moving forward. For example Swallowdale Primary currently provides for a total of six schools, one of which is Brownlow. With the additional universal free meals Swallowdale would not have the capacity to produce for all of the schools. The new build for Brownlow will be complete before the end of March 2015. Four of the six schools meals have been split and transferred to other schools in the area to reduce the pressure leaving only Brownlow being produced at Swallowdale.

The equipment assessment highlighted the need for additional cooking equipment that takes minimal space but allows for faster cooking of food. The most effective way of speeding up production has been to install one or more combination ovens (combi's) that are able to bake and steam food at high speeds. Combi ovens also require an electric supply and water connections. The combi ovens have been installed on a rolling programme which started during the summer holiday. It is expected that the programme will be complete before Christmas.

A number of schools also required further hot holding counters and fridge and freezer space. The attached spreadsheet details the schools full requirements. To date all additional equipment has been delivered to kitchens.

Allocation of Remaining Funding

- Production/service equipment - £330,511
- Building/drainage works for combi ovens - £39,068.60
- Electrical/plumbing/installations for combi ovens - £103,348.30
- Melton Brownlow contribution - £50,000

Resource Implications

The capital programme is scheduled to be fully completed by the end of the year and has been based upon the capital allocation given to the local authority by the Department of Education.

Contract and Procurement Implications

All of the equipment has been purchased through the recommended framework agreements ie ESPO or the Government Buying Solutions. All building works etc has been carried out through the Properties framework agreements and their list of approved contractors.

Equal Opportunity Issues

There are no equality issues arising directly from this report.

Background Papers

- *Children and Families DMT 14th May 2014 – Universal Infant Free School Meals Capital Funding*
- *Children and Families DMT 19th November 2014 – Universal Infant Free School Meals Capital Funding Update*

Officers to Contact

Wendy Philp
School Food and catering Services Manager
wendy.philp@leics.gov.uk
0116 3055770



SCHOOLS' FORUM

Implementation of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM)

16 June 2014

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools		Pre School	
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	X
PVI Settings		Primary	X
Special Schools / Academies	X	Secondary	
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	X

1. This report presents the comments and experiences of schools on implementation of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM)

Recommendations

2. That Schools Forum notes the contents of this report

Introduction

3. Schools Forum raised a number of concerns regarding the implementation of UIFSM at its meeting in February 2014 and subsequently wrote to the Secretary of State with those concerns, namely the cost of implementation and the expected disruption of the school day.

4. Following further concerns raised at Schools Forum in September the local authority has invited all schools and academies to submit their experiences of implementation, 6 schools submitted information which is shown in Appendix 1.
5. At a regional finance officer meeting in October the Education Funding Agency (EFA) suggested that there would not be a national post implementation review but also were not able to provide any assurance about the future funding for the initiative. They also stated that they would be interested in any information collated by the local authority.

Background

6. The information submitted by schools identifies some disruption of the school day that is being supported by additional staffing. The case studies submitted show a varied approach to implementation but they have not been able to quantify the additional costs falling to the school where the grant is insufficient.
7. Where responses raised concerns regarding implementation issues relating to the School Food Support Service, the issues were passed to that service for investigation and rectification.
8. It should be noted that the feedback collected was completed early in the autumn term, it is not possible therefore to identify whether the reported issues were one off implementation issues and now rectified. Nor is it possible to identify whether the issues have arisen as a result of choices made by schools regarding implementation.
9. It can be seen by the responses that there is relatively few references to the impact on children.

Resource Implications

10. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the introduction of UIFSM is having an adverse impact on school resources, nor that the additional staffing referred to with the studies is being funded from the school budget because the grant is insufficient.

Equal Opportunity Issues

11. Non arising directly from this report

Background Papers

None

Officers to Contact

Jenny Lawrence
 Finance Business Partner, Children and Family Services
 Tel: 0116 3056401
 Email: jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk

SCHOOL 1

- No money, help, support for one on my schools – just additional pressure on the one dining assistant in place
- Children are now complaining about the quality of foo and that its cold – more dinners, more wait = food getting cold by the end of the queue
- Children are being hurried
- More mess to clean up;
 - Costs to get the floor deep cleaned every half term
 - Plus extra time needed each day to clear it up
- Lots of time to manage the operational aspects at each school. Teaching staff are having to help – extra pressure on my teachers to help them – which is a breach of teachers T & C
- Lots of time listening to stresses, anxiety, moans, complaints from dining / midday staff, children, parents and teachers. I'm fed up with it!
- Children are also complaining that the crockery & cutlery are getting greasy or dirty – clearly the kitchen staff are so stretched for time they don't have time to clean them properly
- I've had to pay staff to attend meetings re operational management; stickers to offset the unhappy children; additional costs to clean the floor

SCHOOL 2

We do not currently have the facility to prepare and cook our own meals on site, therefore the are prepared and cooked at XXXXXXXXXX.

Impact on the school day

SFS have employed an additional member of staff to cope with the additional meals. The meals a meant to arrive at 11.45 which allows a 15 minute window to unpack probe and be ready to serve to our reception children at 12.00pm. Unfortunately the impact of the additional meals required at both xxxxxx and xxxxxx the meals do not arrive until 12.00pm on a good day. I understand that xxxx were promised a new oven to help with the extra meals but this has yet to materialise.

The impact of numbers of infants registered for free school meals

We wrote to all of our parents advising them of the difference between FSM and UIFSM and to the best of our knowledge we have ensured that all our reception parents who are eligible have registered for FSM. Our concern is if parents with children in KS1 only, would think to register if their circumstances were to change.

Capital Works

We would dearly love to have our own cooking facility. We are currently working with Wendy Philp at SFS as we have now identified that we have enough space. Unfortunately the main issue is whether we have enough power coming into the school to cope with the additional equipment required. We have equipment installed at the moment to monitor this.

Funding

We have not been advised yet if the school will have to contribute towards the work and we have not been advised of any grants. Could you please send me some information of where we could apply for additional funding as I fear that there may be further cost implications if power does turn out to be an issue.

SCHOOL 3

Impact on the school day.

We have had to reorganise the school day in respect of Infant children only and the younger children do have to start their meals at 11:45 rather than 12:00 as was previously.

Also the hall is out of action for necessary PE provision as we only have one hall we cannot use other areas. We can sometimes use outside but if the weather is wet we obviously can't.

Impact of USFM on registrations of FSM for Pupil Premium

We have had to be very proactive in advertising that FSM still need to be registered for and have actually had 3 new FSM children out of the 30 intake. This has worked this year due to our knowledge of family connections and by amending our admissions forms with more probing questions.

Additional Costs

We have employed 3 members of our lunchtime staff for an extra 15 minutes per day so that we can start serving earlier. This means it has cost us 45 mins x £7.35 (hourly rate) per day therefore £1047 per annum plus on costs from main school budget.

Problems with SFS

We have had numerous problems with SFS provision, too numerous to mention here. Some of those were teething problems with staffing and with quantity of food but some are still on going. If anyone in Ed finance knows how long we are tied into SFS Contract I would be grateful for this information as we will be looking at different provision at some point in the future. I cannot find a copy of our contract anywhere.

Numbers

Our uptake of UFSM out of a potential of 92 pupils is between 62 and 84 pupils so between ranging from 67% and 91%.

SCHOOL 4

In terms of impact on our school day, introduction of the UFSM has had a temporary impact, in that we brought forward the start of our lunch break by 15 minutes specifically for the new reception children to go into dinners early. This was put in place for the first 6 weeks of term only, so it gave them time to get used to having to queue, take a tray, eat their food etc. Gradually we have been cutting down this time so that after half term all children will queue for lunch from the normal time of 12 o'clock. Hopefully the reception children will be well practised by then!

The other impact is on the midday supervisory staff - they seem to have felt the impact more because they have more children to get through the hall in the same amount of time, which results in more staff needed for scraping plates, supervising etc. We are in the process of recruiting at least one more midday supervisor to ease the load and to make sure that we have enough staff in other areas of the school to supervise children while others are having lunch. So this is a financial impact on our revenue budget that we had not anticipated.

In terms of pupil premium, we have really emphasised in our new parents meetings, the importance of registering for FSM, even if their child is in infants and getting a free meal anyway. Its difficult to explain to people the difference between a free meal and a free meal! We have also encouraged our office staff to proactively push registration to parents when they have an idea that they may be eligible. This is my main area of concern, however, because it will be an ongoing thing for future years intake at reception. But we are doing the best we can to ensure our FSM numbers don't drop too much as a result of the introduction of UFSM.

We received ACMF funding for improvements to the kitchen for the implementation of UFSM. This involved installing a new servery to cope with the additional meals required, and we have also had to have building work undertaken as a result to remove the old servery, had new equipment such as oven, and electrical work. The work is not going to cost as much as was originally bid for, and so we are going to have to return some of this capital funding to the EFA once the work is complete. All the work, bar the new oven, was completed on time in readiness for the new term.

We are not sure at this stage, whether the amount of UFSM grant received will be enough to cover the actual costs. On the census day in October, we had 79% take up, and so we will be pushing for at least this number in the January census too. Typically on a normal day we have approximately 68% take up. Unless we have a big increase in the daily numbers of children taking up a free meal, this should be enough to cover our costs. An issue here though is that schools are unlikely to encourage children to take up the free meal after January census day because they don't want to be faced with additional costs that they will not receive funding for in that particular academic year. This goes against the principal of providing a free meal to all infant children, but schools will want to protect their budgets.

I think the way the allocation is decided (based on the average of 2 censuses) is an issue, because I've heard that some schools are basically ordering a meal for every infant child on census days whether they eat it or not, so they effectively get 100% take up on the days that matter i.e. census days, whereas others have adopted the approach that they will push parents to get their child to have a free meal on those days, so they get as many children having a meal as possible, but you're then not guaranteed 100% take up. Some might say this is playing the game, however, other people I've spoken to have said there are some moral implications about ordering more food than you actually need and then wasting it because its not really required. I'm not sure how this issue could be addressed, unless we could claim funding for actual numbers somehow, or submit numbers termly for meals taken or something, but its definitely an area that needs some more thought I think.

SCHOOL 5

Background Information:

Xxxxxxx School has a large school kitchen that has been well maintained and meals have always been cooked on the premises. Prior to the introduction of UIFSM pupils in year 1 and year 2 who had packed lunches ate them in the classrooms.

N.O.R. 284 (Autumn Term Census 2014)

For many years School Food Support were contracted to provide the meals. We successfully operated a cash cafeteria system which offered a fixed choice menu. Since August 2013 xxxxxxxx Academy have had the contract to provide the meals. xxxxxxxxxx (Business Manager at xxxxxxxx) negotiated and organised the funding for the new equipment so she will be able to provide further details if required.

Prior to UIFSM the staff catered for between 80 and 120 meals a day. Friday was always the most popular day as it is the only day chips are served and is also Year 2 swimming day.

Over the last 5 years the number of pupils entitled to Free School Meals has varied between 10 % and 18 %.

Autumn Term Census 2014 recorded 12% entitlement for FSM.

Preparation for the introduction of UIFSM:

New equipment in the kitchen that was installed by xxxxxxxx Academy during the summer term and summer closure 2014 included:

- New fridge and freezers
- New Combi oven and the adaptations to the kitchen for this to be fitted
- New working areas (stainless steel working surfaces)
- New heated trolley
- Additional flight trays
- Additional serving dishes and small bowls

From school funds we have purchased:

- Extra tables so more children can be seated
- New tray storage and waste bin trolley
- Larger storage containers for cutlery and beakers after use
- Additional small dishes so puddings can be served in bowls

Both Xxxxxxxx Academy and Xxxxxxxx Infant School have had additional staffing costs. WIS have employed 2 additional members of the Lunchtime Team for 1.5 hours each a day. We have also increased the working hours of 3 members of lunchtime staff to 1.5 hours rather than 1 hour each day that they worked previously.

Preparation for UIFSM

As a large school we were very aware that UIFSM would have a huge impact on the organisation of our lunch hours. We only have one hall and the hall was already in great demand for P.E. sessions and all the other activities we need to fit in there.

During the first part of the Summer Term 2014 we held a week of timed trials where all the children came into the hall to eat. Packed Lunch pupils came up to the counter as if choosing a meal so that we could time all aspects of the organisation.

The week of trails confirmed to us that we needed to change the time of our lunch break. We now have:

11.30 – 12.30 Reception Pupils

11.50 – 12.50 Year 1 and Year 2 Pupils

This has resulted in the hall being out of use between 11.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. every day for setting up, lunchtime and packing away. This is an increase of .5 compared to before the introduction of UIFSM.

Three representatives from the school attended a UIFSM Roadshow in Nottingham during the summer term. On advice from schools involved in the Pilot Schemes it was agreed by governors that the reception pupils entering school in the autumn 2014 would not be given a choice of bringing a packed lunch. The choice was a UIFSM or going home for lunch. There was a 100% take up for UIFSM.

There were concerns expressed by some parents/carers of Year 1 and 2 pupils and Governors held individual meetings with some families. Parents/carers who were still unhappy about the situation were invited to apply to Governors for their child to be made an exception and to bring a packed lunch.

At the beginning of the Autumn Term 2014 we had 7 pupils bringing a packed lunch. Families were given a copy of the guidance for providing a healthy packed lunch and we requested that only plain containers were used rather than novelty lunchboxes as these are often the attraction to the child rather than the food inside!
By half term the number of children bringing a packed lunch had reduced to 4 Year 1 pupils.

One of the issues parents/carers had difficulty understanding was why the children could not continue to have a choice of a UIFSM or packed lunch on a daily basis as they had before when we ran the cash cafeteria system. There are two main reasons for this:

Organisation – we cannot staff for preparing 280 meals one day and only 100 the next. It simply would not work and we would not have routines and systems in place which is crucial when dealing with large numbers of young children

Improvement – we were aware as staff and governors that many of our pupils were not eating a healthy packed lunch and in many cases are eating a very limited diet at home. We saw the introduction of UIFSM as the ideal opportunity to try and make a difference to the health and well-being of all the pupils. The long term aim is that this will impact on standards of educational achievement and also the long term health of the pupils we work with.

However we are also aware that we need to work with families and change attitudes to eating, the importance of sitting at a table, using a knife and fork and eating a meal as a family.

Xxxxxxxx School has a 20 place MLD Unit and a number of these children have ASD and limited communication. We also have a number of mainstream pupils with SEN and we were well aware that prior to the introduction of UIFSM a number of the children were eating a very limited diet. In order to encourage pupils with specific needs and a limited use of cutlery we have extended our lunchtime nurture provision. Experienced and skilled staff run three Luncheon Clubs:

- 1 for Reception Pupils
- 2 for Year 1 and 2 Pupils. These are mixed groups of mainstream pupils and pupils from the MLD Unit.

The children eat in a smaller room and are currently offered 'Family Service' rather than queuing for meals. Staff working with these children have discussed diets with parents/carers and a Food Diary has been introduced that will help parents/carers to know the new foods the children have tried at school.

These groups are proving to be very successful. The children have charts to record new foods they have tried and the feedback from parents/carers has been very positive. By having regular contact with parents/carers we have been able to explain that we all need to try new food more than once in order to acquire a taste for it.

The ultimate aim during the year is to gradually introduce pupils back into the hall and able to eat with their peers. It is already apparent that this individualised approach is working and it obviously requires a high level of additional staff.

Positive Impact of UIFSM at Xxxxxxxx School:

- Pupils eating a wider range of food at school and some parents/carers have reported that this is now also happening at home
- Many pupils eating a more nutritional, balanced meal than they were when they were bringing a packed lunch
- Staff able to help more pupils with the correct use of cutlery and table manners
- No money to deal with! We were constantly having to change money for parents/carers in the morning and looking for lost money and purses.

- New times of the lunch breaks has had an unexpected bonus in that all the three year groups are never out on the playground at the same time. This has reduced the number of lunch time incidents/accidents as the pupils have more space to play in.

Challenges of UIFSM at XXXXXXXX School:

- The loss of the use of the hall for an additional .5 each day
- Requirement of additional staffing and the increase of hours of lunchtime staff already employed
- The time it has taken for governors and staff to talk to parents/carers explaining and reassuring them about the system
- Time it has taken to organise the system and the staffing. An example being that during the first half of the Autumn Term 2014 the Headteacher was in the dinner hall for an hour each day. If she was off site for any reason the Deputy Headteacher took on this role. This high level of involvement was required in order that adaptations could be introduced as required which has ensured the smooth running of the system

Impact on Pupil Premium:

Staff and Governors were very aware of the need to ensure that the numbers of pupils eligible for FSM leading to the Pupil Premium Grant did not drop.

Representatives from WIS who attended the Road show in Nottingham sought information and guidance from Pilot Schools and we have found the following strategies to have been successful in maintaining and possibly increasing the number of pupils eligible for FSM (Pupil Premium Grant):

- Newsletters and information meetings – at every opportunity we shared information with parents/carers about the need to still apply for FSM
- Introduced a form that we adapted from examples used by Pilot Schools. This gave us information that we could then use to check that all families eligible for FSM applied and were therefore entitled to the PPG
- Using the above form we contacted parents/carers individually to point out that from the information they had given us we felt it was worth checking eligibility. We were able to explain the benefits both to them as a family and us a school and as a result the numbers increased during the first few weeks of term
- School Uniform Vouchers – Governors agreed to extend the benefits by providing School Uniform Vouchers to all families who applied and were entitled to FSM. This is in addition to the financial support we previously offered for trips, clubs and funding for school holiday activities. The amount of money parents/carers could save by making a phone call checking eligibility was well advertised and seems to have been a successful strategy

At this stage we feel that all those families with eligibility for FSM have applied and are registered.

Future Considerations:

- Menu – as previously pointed out the children are young and many of them are not adventurous in their choice of food. We started with a 3 week menu but at half term this was reduced to a 2 week menu to enable us to ensure that we are offering balanced, nutritious choices that Xxxxxxxx children will eat and enjoy
- We have found that it is essential that we work closely with the Catering Staff to ensure that the menu suits the tastes of the pupils. We have now embarked on the Food For Life Programme and are working towards the Bronze Award during the academic year 2014/2015
- There is still work to be carried out on the financial implications of the introduction of UIFSM to WIS. However the positive impact has already impressed staff and governors
- A member of the teaching staff is now using the introduction of UIFSM as her Research Project in order to complete her Master's Degree Programme which will give us additional information about the introduction of UIFSM
- We need to continue to highlight the need for parents/carers to apply for FSM in order that we maintain the level of Pupil Premium Grant we as a school are entitled to

Staff and Governors feel we have embraced this opportunity to make genuine improvements for the pupils and families at Xxxxxxxx School. An area that does concern us is that Professional Organisations have encouraged schools to increase the numbers of pupils having dinner on the days when numbers are recorded for the Census.

We would like to point out to Schools Forum members that we do not consider this to be a good use of public money and is very unfair on schools like xxxxxxx who have given a great deal of time and consideration to introducing a system that is successful and will hopefully achieve what the original aim of the project was i.e.: 'To provide a tasty and nutritious school lunch to all pupils in R, Year 1 and Year 2'. We are able to provide paperwork to show that parents/carers have opted for, signed and agreed to pupils having a UIFSM but we feel that the system was introduced in a great hurry which has led to a lot of confusion and a lack of continuity in how the system is being run.

SCHOOL 6

Below is a list of expenses incurred from the implementation of the Universal Free School Meals initiative:

- Hall extension. School paid a further £31,000 (final bill to be received) in addition to the grant from School Food Support (£17,000)
- Extended lunchtimes to be able to get all children served.
- Employment of an extra midday supervisor for 1.5 hours a day due to the extended lunch time.
- Kitchen serving staff allocated an extra hour a day each (2 staff members)
- Purchase of extra cutlery, bowls, plates etc
- Possible impact of numbers of infants registered for free school meals and therefore pupil premium is 24.

The Headteacher would very much appreciate any further funding towards the costs incurred if further grants become available.

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS' FORUM

Behaviour Partnerships

4 December 2014

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	
PVI Settings		Primary	
Special Schools / Academies	X	Secondary	X
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	X

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	X
		Maintained Special School Members	X
		Academy Members	X
		All Schools Forum	

1. This report presents an update on the performance of Leicestershire's five secondary behaviour partnerships from September 2013.

Recommendations

2. That Schools' Forum notes the performance of the five secondary behaviour partnerships.

Introduction

3. The report provides an update of the finances and progress of the five secondary behaviour partnerships. The Partnerships are in the second year of a three year funding agreement with the Local Authority ending on 31 July 2016.

4. The relationship between the Behaviour Partnerships and Leicestershire County Council is based on:
 - i.* a commissioning agreement enshrined in a memorandum of understanding agreed by the Chair of each Partnership on behalf of and with the support of secondary schools. This commits the partnerships to provide education for all secondary aged students living in the county area who, as a result of challenging behaviour, cannot sustain a place in school.
 - ii.* a partnership of the LA and its services with the behaviour partnerships and the schools to secure best practice across and between agencies in order to improve effectiveness of support for our most vulnerable young people and their families.

Background

5. The five Secondary Behaviour Partnerships, based on the SEN areas of the county, emerged from the Local Area Placement and Support Panels. Since September 2013 the Partnerships have taken on full responsibility for the education of Key Stage Four pupils who, by dint of challenging behaviour, cannot be educated in school (and in the past might well have been dual registered with the Pupil Referral Unit or Permanently Excluded). Since April 2014 the Partnerships have taken on full responsibility for Key Stage Three pupils with similar needs with the Pupil Referral Unit no longer providing for secondary aged pupils nor receiving funding.
6. The Partnerships have been fully responsible for the planning and delivery of education for the 2013-2014 Year 11 cohort only for the last year of their education. In Year 10 (2012-2013) programmes were run by the Local Authority Commissioning and Personalised Programmes (C& PP) team, although the Partnerships were actively involved in planning decisions.
7. The element of higher needs funding for these learners was devolved in stages:
 - i.* 2012-2013 Key Stage Four alternative provision and transport costs (the students were supervised and supported by the Commissioning and Personalised Programmes Staff employed by the LA until August 2013)
 - ii.* From September 2013 partnership staffing costs.
 - iii.* From April 2014 most of the budget for Key Stage Three pupils provision and staffing were transferred from the Pupil Referral Unit to the Partnerships. (Some salary costs for KS3 staff remained with the PRU until the end of August 2014)
 - iv.* From September 2014 the process of devolution was complete.
8. The school year 2014-2015 will be the first where Behaviour Partnerships have complete responsibility for all secondary pupils in this category and have full devolution of the funding. Levels of funding that the Partnerships could expect were not finalised until April 2014.

Resource Implications and Finance

9. The budgets for the five partnerships are based upon a formula that uses pupil numbers and deprivation data. The formula is based upon historic numbers but will change in 2015/16 to reflect the data collected in the October pupil census, this will mean that the formula budgets for schools and the partnerships will use the same data. Using the census data means that as the deprivation data previously used is no longer available Ever 6 free school meals data will be used.
10. Early discussions have been held with the partnership chairs on the impact of this change, any significant variance in budget as a result of the change may need to be moderated in some manner. This work will be completed alongside the schools budget process following the release of the October 2013 dataset by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) which is expected in early December.
11. Table One: 2013-2014 School Year Income and Expenditure
(Source: Partnership returns)

Partnership Area	Income			Expenditure				
	Income from LA	Income from Schools	Total	Staffing	Admin and other	Transport	Provision	Total
Hinckley and Bosworth	281,208	89,430	370,638	124,191	12,520	56,166	200,102	392,979
Melton & South Charnwood	186,277	22,000	208,277	57,200	3,850	43,198	53,295	157,543
North Charnwood	234,632	95,778	330,410	93,643	16,206	54,409	143,730	307,988
North West	211,720	3,800	215,520	0	59,588	45,286	18,885	123,760
South Leicestershire	464,051	58,189	522,240	203,711	86,415	66,778	280,761	637,665
Totals	1,377,888	269,197	1,647,085	478,745	17,8579	265,837	696,773	1,619,935
Table 1 Total of Programme Managed pupils			86	Total expenditure divided by Programme Managed pupil number			18836	

Points arising from Table 1:

Overall expenditure

- 12.
- The calculation of the cost per pupil for programme management is indicative only. In reality partnership expenditure is used across a wider group of pupils. All the Partnerships:
 - invest considerable time and effort in supporting pupils in school or in part time provision;
 - work with school staff in order to share good practice and collectively strengthen in school provision for pupils with challenging behaviour;
 - increasingly act as key workers with other agencies in shaping wider support for vulnerable young people and their families;
 - carry out the functions that arise from the Fair Access Protocol.

13. All Partnerships benefit from the contribution from school based staff, including senior staff attending regular meetings and SENCO's and Behaviour Teams sharing information and expertise. This is an additional resource.

Variations between the Partnerships

14. This is the first year in which data has been systematically collected from the Partnerships. There are significant differences in the way partnerships share the burden of cost for alternative provision between schools and the partnership budget. (For example NW Leicestershire had a number of students who were part time programme managed in 2013-2014. These students were not counted as "partnership cases" and most of their costs were met from school budgets estimated at £140000. This was a collective response to an overspend of the Partnership budget in the previous year.)
15. There are noticeable differences in staffing costs for the five BPs. This is a reflection of the varying pace of development amongst the partnerships. For example South Leicestershire made an early commitment to employing a staff team and developing a learning centre, confident in the support of schools that worked together in "Learning South Leicestershire". North West Leicestershire had within its upper schools a well developed infrastructure for supporting alternative provision. It has only recently agreed to appoint a co-ordinator and is currently considering the appointment of other posts. Whilst each partnership continues to develop autonomously, practices across the partnerships are converging and differences in staffing costs will diminish.
16. This varying pace is also a reflection of the way decisions about devolution of funding have emerged. Final arrangements were clarified in the months before April 2014. This had an impact in the areas where partnerships between schools was less developed with a resulting lower confidence in making financial commitments that carried some risk to schools.
17. The success of all the partnerships in the last eighteen months has overcome any local reticence in supporting partnerships developments. (For example NW Leicestershire has now appointed a Co-ordinator, Melton and South Charnwood are expanding their team to include provision for GCSE English and Maths.)
18. Whilst there appears to be reasonable stability in the numbers of pupils requiring programme management across Leicestershire, numbers in each partnership vary from year to year.
19. The current variation in payments by schools to Partnerships is set to diminish as all Partnerships ensure that they reclaim from schools the AWPU for Programme Managed pupils. The practice of a per capita payment of around £5 per pupil will be standard across all five partnerships in 2014-2015.

Balances held by Partnerships

20. Table 1 shows a wide range of in year balances ranging from a significant overspend in South Leicestershire and a similar underspend in North West Leicestershire. These balances are held and managed within the accounts of the Chair of Partnerships' schools. Variations in pupil numbers and in the apportionment of costs between individual schools and partnerships are significant factors in accounting for the range. Overall there is a tendency for Partnerships to sustain a positive balance for the following reasons.
21. Because partnership budgets sit within the budgets of the Chair's school, Governors have pressed Chairs to be cautious in ensuring that schools do not end up carrying a Partnership deficit.
22. Partnerships need to be able to guarantee that they can provide for pupils who cannot be in school at the standard required to meet their needs, whatever the demand. For some pupils meeting their needs can be very expensive. The need to ensure that Partnerships can meet need encourages caution in managing the flow of money. Nevertheless the figures show that only two of the five partnerships spent significantly less than their allocation in the last school year.
23. The schools within the Partnerships have aimed to ensure that the Partnership budget will be able to meet any wind up costs should this arrangement end when the funding agreement ends in April 2016.

Pressures on Finances

24. The concern in all schools that all students should make progress has increased the numbers being identified as requiring additional support and has put more pressure on those individuals. We expect to see levels of referral to the Partnerships remain at the current level or grow despite the clear success in the work of the Partnerships.
25. Recent Ofsted theme inspections, and amendments to the Inspection Framework have increased focus on this area of work. This is part of a drive to raise expectations as to what can and should be achieved for this group of vulnerable young people. Ofsted expects that:
 - provision should include a strong focus on ensuring that all these students continue to make progress with literacy and numeracy towards national expectations
 - needs assessment should be thorough
 - programmes should be designed to meet the assessed need in a way that secures progress, successful transition to the next stage at 16 and improved life chances

and in order to ensure that this is happening

- students are offered full time provision and attend well
- those responsible for the student ensure that provision is effective and safe

26. This is raising the standards for provision and for outcomes that the Partnerships work to.
- The need for better assessment of individuals at the same time that some LA services are being reduced may requires new expenditure by the Partnerships on specialist services such as Educational Psychologists.
27. The Partnerships have or are developing their structures on the basis of financial plans that work with in the current framework. There is an expectation that they will manage to operate successfully within the current financial framework.

Performance

28. This table shows the number of pupils supported by the five partnerships

Table 2: Pupils supported by Partnerships School Year 2013-2014

Partnership	Number of pupils at KS4 who are Programme Managed	Number of pupils at KS4 who have Advice and Guidance	Number of pupils at KS3 who are Programme Managed	Number of pupils at KS3 who have Advice and Guidance
Hinckley and Bosworth	19	1	4	0
Melton and South Charnwood	7	4	0	11
North Charnwood (Loughborough Inclusion Partnership)	23	40	7	64
North West	5	6	0	11
South Leicestershire	20	24	1	34
TOTALS	74	75	12	120
Total KS3&4 PM	86	Total KS3&4 A&G	195	

Key points

- 74 were programme managed at key stage 4 in 2013/14 and 12 at Key Stage 3
 - 195 were supported in some way by the partnership in dialogue with the school. If support is provided earlier it may prevent programme management
29. The most significant success of this partnership working to date has been the large reduction in the numbers of Permanent Exclusions in Leicestershire (see Table 2). The downward trend emerged as schools recognised that solutions for seemingly intractable behaviour issues in schools could be found by working in partnership first with C&PPS and then with the successor partnership staff. This decline in permanent exclusions:
- has removed the stigma of the label "Permanent Exclusion" from often vulnerable and damaged young people;
 - has reduced the climate of crisis that often inhibited good decision making in schools about challenging youngsters;

- has enabled schools and Partnership staff to build or sustain previous constructive relationships with families much more effectively;
- but has not ended the issue of the difficulties that some young people experience in maintaining their places in school.

30. Table 3: Permanent Exclusions

Year	KS3	KS4 & Special	Total
09-10	5	23	28
10-11	6	17	23
11-12	6	6	12
12-13	4	12	16
13-14	3	6	9
14-15	2	2	4

Key points:

- By 13-14 the practice has been embedded across all Leicestershire schools that Permanent Exclusion will be used only in the most exceptional circumstances;
 - All pupils are now single registered at a school when Programme Managed with the school remaining accountable for the pupil's education;
 - In 2013-2014 7 of the 9 excluded were pupils with City of Leicester addresses. 2 of the 4 in 14-15 are City address pupils;
 - Schools may exclude pupils for a fixed term whilst consulting in a Partnership about Programme Management. All Partnerships aim to respond as quickly as possible in taking decisions and in setting up Programmes for pupils in order to minimise the time out of school.
31. The Partnerships inherited a well developed market place of Alternative Education Providers from the Local Authority Commissioning and Personalised Programmes Service and a process for checking on Safeguarding etc. operated by Leicestershire Education Business Company (LEBC). There are close working relationships between some Providers and Partnerships, especially where provision has developed as a result of direct commissioning by schools and/ or Partnerships.
32. Many students on Programme Management present significant challenges to Partnership Staff as staff work to re-engage them in education. Table 3 includes all students in the county who have been supported by the BPs, whether or not they have fully engaged in the programmes that they were offered. There is a wide range of ability and levels of engagement within the cohort of Programme Managed students. As a result comparisons across partnerships can give only limited insight.
33. The table below shows that:
- on average, Year 11 programme managed students achieved three qualifications;
 - just over half achieved one or more passes at GCSE;
 - Five pupils achieved Grade C+ at GCSE in English and/ or maths;
 - there were only 5 students who ended the year without qualifications.

34. Table 4: Year 11 Outcomes

TOTAL S	Student numbers (number achieving 1 or more GCSE)	Eng GCSE at C+	Ma GCSE at C+	Eng GCSE below C	Maths GCSE Below C	Other GCSE C+	Other GCSE below C	Other quals (number of students gaining no quals)	Points	Credit
Hinckley and Bosworth										
TOTAL	9(5)	3	3	2	1	0	3	40 (1)	638	158
Melton and South Charnwood										
TOTAL	6(2)	0	0	1	1	0	1	26 (1)	204.5	186
North Charnwood (Loughborough Inclusion Partnership)										
TOTAL	14(5)	0	0	1	5	0	0	26 (2)	533	405
North West										
	2(1)	0	1	2	1	0	0	3 (0)	224	0
South Leicestershire										
TOTAL	12(9)	1	1	5	7	0	7	27 (1)	1115	123
Leicestershire Totals										
BP TOTAL	43(22)	5	4	9	14	0	11	119 (5)	2714	872
Mean point score per student									63	

35. Table Five indicates the destinations of Year 11 students. Partnership Co-ordinators have agreed to carry out a follow up survey in the Spring Term in order to report on the numbers of students who continue to engage with their next step provision. The Table shows that:

- there are currently only four students who are NEET or where their destination is unknown;
- the Partnerships are successful in securing next step provision for a large majority of these pupils;
- the majority of pupils move onto FE courses.

36. Table 5 Destinations Key and summary

		HB	MSC	LIP	NW	SL	All
FE	Further Education in an FE College, school or similar	6	3	7	2	10	28
VS	Voluntary Sector provider ie Princes Trust, Twenty Twenty, YEP	2	1	2	0	0	5
AP	Apprenticeship	0	1	2	0	1	4
E	Employment	0	1	0	0	0	1
YC	Youth Custody	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Unknown – NEET	1	0	2	0	1	4

37. All the partnerships have built or are building capacity to provide teaching of maths and English at KS3 and up to GCSE.. Hinckley and Bosworth Partnership now offer a similar provision for GCSE for their own pupils and for suitable pupils from other partnerships. We expect to see an improving set of outcomes for the current year 11 with all Partnerships moving to equal or outdo the performance of the best in 2013-2014. All are committed to maximising the opportunity for KS4 pupils to achieve GCSE based outcomes.

38. This is work in progress. Partnerships collectively are working to:

- improve the range of GCSE provision available;
- increase the number of Programme managed students who can access at least some GCSEs;
- ensure that English and Maths remain a priority;
- strengthen the processes by which schools and partnerships quality assure provision.

Structure

39. Partnerships are developing their own structure for a professional team to support pupils in school and out in alternative provision and to provide some of the alternative provision directly. The pace of development has responded to local need and to the step by step devolution of funding and has varied between Partnerships because:

- Some Partnerships have been able to mobilise existing good practice;(for example South Leicestershire utilised the existing Learning South Leicestershire partnership infrastructure);
- Some Partnerships had stronger traditions of collaboration between schools in their locality;
- Needs and the responses to them have been defined locally.

Table 6 sets out the infrastructure in more detail

40. Table 6: Partnership Structure

Partnership Area	Number of schools	Chair	Funding level		Current Staffing arrangements
			13-14 financial year	14-15 financial year	
Hinckley and Bosworth	13	Mr R. Coles, Groby College	208467	380615	Co-ordinator TLR1(c) 2 x .6 fte teachers (UPS) 1 HLTA 1 Support Officer Grade 10. 1 Admin Support Officer Grade 7
Melton and South Charnwood	8	Mr T. Pinnock Wreake Valley Academy	186277	340100	Co-ordinator Grade 10 Assistant Co-ordinator Grade 7 to be appointed HLTA x 1 to be appointed
North Charnwood	10	Mr M. Sutton, Charnwood College	192584	351616	Co-ordinator Grade 12 2x HLTA Grade 8 1 Support Officer Grade 8 2 x Teachers a.2fte each 1 x Admin .7fte Grade 7
North West	7	Mrs J. Patrick, Castle Rock HS	156954	286563	(Autumn 2014 appointments) Co-ordinator UPS 1 .6fte. 1 x Admin .7fte Grade 7

South Leicestershire	16	Mr B Myatt, Countesthorpe College	344014	628093	Co-ordinator TLR1b Teachers x 2 UPS Inclusion Mentors x 3 Grade 10
----------------------	----	---	--------	--------	---

41. Each Partnership has appointed a Co-ordinator and has developed its own approach to its operation. However the Partnership Co-ordinators meet together regularly to share developing approaches, supported by the LA Partnership Consultant who is the link to the Chairs' Meetings. They are currently working together to:

- create and implement a Quality Assurance Framework for Partnership work;(which is attached);
- agree on a common process for the collection of essential data about the performance and outcomes of Partnership work;
- identify and facilitate training for Partnership staff.

42. There has been good progress in individual Partnerships in expanding their capacity to meet the needs of the young people referred with an increased emphasis on achieving good academic outcomes as well as promoting engagement. The work of the Chairs of Partnership supported by the consultant, Adrian Stephenson, has become more focussed and outcome orientated. The Chairs decision to enable the Behaviour Partnership Co-ordinators to meet and work together has created an additional node for the development of the Partnerships.

Progress

43. The Chairs of Partnership have continued to meet each month and to attend the termly Partnership Executive Meeting at County Hall. Co-ordination of the business of these two meeting cycles has enabled the team of Chairs to develop and agree a Development Plan for the coming year. The scope of this plan is in itself an indication of the progress of the Behaviour Partnerships in collectively analysing their current state of development and in defining, co-ordinating and prioritising the issues they need to tackle next.

Development Plan

44. The Development Plan attached includes a commentary of the progress to date against each issue.

Accountability

45. The Behaviour Partnerships are increasingly playing a role in supporting schools in preventative work. They are beginning to assist in creating solutions that keep learners in school for at least some of their time. This means that the accountability data will be more complex and needs to include more than outcomes for Year 11 students. We are at an early stage in exploring this.

46. Far more in depth information is required on the learner; an issue the Behaviour Partnership Chairs now fully appreciate and understand e.g. 25 hours per week in education, quality assurance visits, outcomes at Key Stage 3 and 4 and destination at 16.
47. The Partnership Co-ordinators are currently developing a standardised register which will record a wide range of information about referred students. This will facilitate deeper analysis

Quality Assurance

48. Chairs and the Behaviour Partnership Co-ordinators are clear about the importance of ensuring effective Quality Assurance and have agreed to develop a Quality Assurance framework which is attached. Co-ordinators are working together with support from the Consultant. There is a shared view that the outcome from this work needs to be challenging and rigorous. The Chairs now fully accept that Headteachers must visit Alternative Provision and provide a judgement for learners on roll at their school. The December Executive Group meeting will have a report from the chairs on the autumn term activity.
49. Chairs have a clear understanding of the importance of ensuring that Alternative Provision is effective (and its priority for Ofsted). Ofsted judgements on Quality Assurance of Alternative Provision are made currently *at school and college level*. Behaviour Partnerships need to work to support schools in maintaining their commitment to students on roll even when they are fully programme managed by partnerships in order that schools understand and carry through their responsibilities in this aspect of quality assurance.

SEN

50. A mutual suspicion that BPs and SENA were more concerned with protecting their resources than meeting the needs of learners has rapidly dissipated as a result of contact between the two. Good progress in clarifying referral routes and thresholds has been made. There is a growing potential for creative dialogue between SENA and BPs in shaping effective provision for individuals using the knowledge and expertise of both that has the potential to save money and achieve better outcomes.

Multiagency Working

51. Less progress has been made in exploring how to promote co-ordinated multi agency working. Thinking about how to plan a route forward is a priority for the new school year. However, the development of the use by Behaviour Partnerships of MASH is in hand. There will be meetings on how the Behaviour Partnerships can assist and work with Supporting Leicestershire Families and the Early Help team. The Supporting Leicestershire Families team are invited to the November chairs meeting

Transition at 16+

52. Good progress has been made in clarifying where responsibility lies for Careers Education Information Advice & Guidance (CEIAG).
53. This has opened a discussion within the Behaviour Partnerships about how to strengthen the processes of transition at the end of managed programmes. Our most vulnerable learners currently move from a situation where they have sympathetic skilled and individualised support (backed up by access to considerable additional financial resources) to one where they are on their own. There is no data to provide insights into the long term outcomes for this group although some Partnerships, for example, South Leicestershire, are exploring ways of tracking learners for many years after leaving key stage 4..

Border Issues

54. A start has been made in moving to a more learner focussed approach for the group of vulnerable youngsters who straddle the city county border. The challenge will be engaging with some of the Headteachers of schools and colleges affected by this issue. After meeting the City council, we have agreed to explore the data and work through the process and outcome of a city learner at a county school and a county learner at a city school. We are working through a process with Leicester city Council and have asked Bill Morris to attend the Chairs meeting in early January 2015.

Behaviour Partnership Stability

55. There is evidence that Behaviour Partnerships are an accepted part of the landscape of school organisation in Leicestershire. Vigilance in maintaining a critical mass of involved schools is essential. Many chairs maintain that Behaviour partnerships are the local partnerships across the secondary school sector and act as the conduit for other secondary school priorities.

Challenges in the management of Behaviour Partnerships

- 56.
- How do we ensure that schools play their part in a QA of provision without leaving the LA or BPs exposed to criticism where schools do not fully meet this responsibility?
 - How do we secure much more responsive and co-ordinated multi agency working?
 - How do we develop structures to support these vulnerable learners into post 16?
 - How do we ensure that vulnerable learners have their needs identified as soon as possible and secure seamless support for them as they move from KS2 to KS3?
 - How do we ensure Behaviour Partnerships find appropriate learner solutions for complex cases?

We are working with the behaviour partnerships to explore the answers to these questions

Equal Opportunity Issues

None

Background Papers

None

Officers to Contact

Francis Lawlor
16-19/25 Service Manager
Tel: 0116 305 5460
Email: francis.lawlor@leics.gov.uk

Adrian Stephenson
Behaviour Partnership Consultant

Support Activity (Advice and Guidance) - Supporting Pupils who have been referred to Partnerships

195 pupils were referred to Partnerships for Advice and Guidance and were ongoing cases at the end of 2013-14. These pupils are considered to be the equivalent of those who were in previous years supported by the Locality Support Service. The thresholds for referral and the response to referral differs from Partnership to Partnership. Table Six illustrates the way that Partnership working has facilitated collaborative and creative developments to support this group of vulnerable pupils.

Table Seven Partnership support to schools

Activity	Detail
Using assessment tools for pupils with challenging behaviour	<i>Close links between Partnerships and Oakfield have supported the use of tools that facilitate better assessment of need, matching provision, measuring progress and provide evidence where additional external support is required</i>
Hosting arrangements	<i>Schools support each other by hosting students who on fixed term exclusions. This is not only for "six day provision" but also is used to avoid any time out of school.</i>
Practitioners Networks	<i>Key Behaviour Staff meet together to share strategies.</i>
Supporting engagement projects	<i>Some Partnerships provide "reengagement projects" particularly for Year 8 & 9 students - short courses with some time out of school but a limited effect on curriculum continuity eg Forest Schools courses, Music workshops etc.</i>
Funding Grants to schools	<i>Some Partnerships provide limited finance to schools for additional support in the classroom.</i>
Holiday activities	<i>Vulnerable students are engaged in weekly activities in school holidays to keep them in touch - often co-ordinated with the Youth Service</i>
Interagency linking	<i>All five Partnership Co-ordinators are emerging as key figures in linking schools with external agencies.</i>
Dialogue with SENA	<i>New referral pathways are being developed</i>
Managed Moves	<i>All Partnerships use Managed Moves between schools as one strategy to meet the needs of KS3 pupils, using a common protocol</i>
Joint Training for school staff	<i>Partnerships provide training activities</i>

Quality Assurance Framework for Leicestershire Behaviour Partnerships

Introduction

This document was commissioned by the Chairs of Partnership and written by the Co-ordinators: Elise Rogers, Helen Masoum, Anne Tookey, Steve Meadwell and Adrian Stephenson

The Five Leicestershire Behaviour Partnerships aspire to be outstanding in the work they do with the young people in their care.

Behaviour Partnerships are composed of groups of schools located together in each of the five designated SEN areas of Leicestershire. Each partnership has a partnership team who are responsible for the organisation of the programmes delivered to referred pupils and the organisation of processes that bring schools together. The QA Framework focuses on the partnership as a whole, not just the partnership team. This is to reflect that the partnerships are a coming together of schools who **collectively and individually continue to share responsibility for all their pupils** even when they can no longer be educated in school.

Goals

In order to be judged as Outstanding under this framework Behaviour Partnerships need to be able to demonstrate that they are ensuring that:

- a majority of pupils referred to them are quickly re-engaged in learning;
- this majority make demonstrable progress in their learning at rates that ensure that they are "closing the gap" and moving towards attainment levels that are in line with their ability;
- achieve the expected outcomes in maths and English;
- and sustain their commitment to the next step provision that they move to at the end of their time with the Partnerships.

The Grade descriptors developed in this document are in line with these goals. These describe the standards Partnerships need to achieve and aligned to the Ofsted Grades 1-4 (Outstanding, Good, Requiring Improvement and Inadequate)

The basis of our Grade Descriptors

Pupils are referred to the Partnerships for

- advice and guidance from other schools within the Partnership and from Partnership staff;
- support from the Partnership such as short term programmes, managed moves, hosting etc.;
- part or full time programme management.

Invariably all these pupils have exhibited behaviour that is disruptive of the good order of the school they attend and that damages their own learning and learning of others. School staff may have an incomplete understanding of the pupil's needs because they are so complex. Alternatively the needs are such that the school cannot meet them from within their own resources. Partnership involvement invariably begins at a low point for the pupil, his or her family and the school. The starting point for Partnerships is often characterised by:

- damaged relationships between pupil, family and schools
- partial or full disengagement of the pupil from learning

- damaged self esteem
- an incomplete and/or changing understanding of the pupil's difficulties and needs

This defines the role of the Partnerships in five strands:

1. securing good **attendance** as a first step to reengagement;
2. ensuring that processes for **referral, assessment and provision planning** enable Partnerships to address individual pupils' needs and align provision to them;
3. ensuring that the **provision is high quality**;

in order to secure

4. **Outcomes for students** that are in line with the goals

which requires

5. effective **leadership and management** of the partnerships

Scope of the QA Framework

The framework focuses on the five strands.

Strand 1. Attendance

Grade descriptors – Attendance of pupils

Note: These descriptors should not be used as a checklist. They must be applied adopting a 'best fit' approach that relies on the professional judgement of the inspection team.

Outstanding (1)

- Students attendance is 95%+ or where individual students attendance has been an issue their attendance is improving and is in line with their challenging improvement targets.
- A large majority of students are improving attendance and meeting their personal improvement targets, which are challenging, and many are achieving attendance at 95% or above.
- The large majority of students understand the importance of good attendance and demonstrate that they aspire to and have ownership of their personal attendance targets.
- All schools in the Behaviour Partnership rigorously record the attendance of these students and work proactively with the Partnership to support the attendance targets
- Providers show a commitment to attaining the highest possible standards of attendance and can show evidence of the actions they take to implement this commitment and this is reflected in the progress of the students
- Partnership staff, Providers and schools and colleges work together when necessary to swiftly address any issues related to attendance

Good (2)

- Data shows that students' attendance is on an improving trend form the baseline prior to referral
- Aspirational, challenging, achievable attendance targets have been set with individual

students, who see them as meaningful and important

- Attendance records are managed effectively to ensure that schools meet stringent accountability standards
- Partnership attendance recording systems ensures that Providers are vigilant about the attendance and safety of students and comply with Partnership requirements fully.
- Robust systems are in place to follow up any slippage in attendance

Requires improvement (3)

- Attendance procedures and policies require improvement because a significant minority of students are showing no improvement in attendance despite the injection of Partnership resources

Inadequate (4)

Attendance is likely to be judged inadequate if **any** of the following apply.

- The recording of attendance by the Partnership is not reliable
- The Partnership is not using the data to track the progress of students and modify provision in order to improve attendance or the evaluation lacks rigour and is inaccurate in its conclusions
- Information received by the Partnership from Providers is insufficient to ensure accurate attendance recording
- Information provided by the Partnership to the schools is insufficient for the schools to provide evidence of their accountability for attendance of these students

Strand 2: Referral, Assessment and Provision Planning

to be added

Strand 3: Quality of Provision

Grade descriptors – overall effectiveness: the quality of provision

Note: These descriptors should not be used as a checklist. They must be applied adopting a 'best fit' approach that relies on the professional judgement of the inspection team.

Outstanding (1)

- The Behaviour Partnership consistently commissions provision for students which offers a rich, relevant, broad and balanced curriculum that contributes to outstanding learning and achievement, significant growth in pupils' knowledge, and excellent attitudes to learning.
- Academic tracking is rigorous and timely and clearly demonstrates that achievement may be good and rapidly improving.
- Rigorous systems are in place to quality assure safeguarding and health and safety at provision.
- Personal Learning Plans are always shared with providers to ensure pupils have the best opportunities to meet their PLP targets.
- Pupils and particular groups of pupils have excellent educational experiences at their provision and these ensure that they are very well equipped for the next stage of their education, training or employment.
- Provision commissioned by the Behaviour Partnership demonstrates that English and maths

are embedded across the curriculum thus ensuring pupils have high levels of literacy and mathematical knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to their age.¹

- Provision is consistently and regularly monitored, including lesson observations and work scrutiny in order to ensure that students are supported and challenge in order to achieve at the best possible levels, according to individual needs.
- The commission of provision by the Behaviour Partnership demonstrates thoughtful and wide-ranging promotion of pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and their physical well-being enables them to thrive in a supportive, highly cohesive learning community suited to their needs.

Good (2)

- The Behaviour Partnership regularly commission provision for students which offers a relevant, balanced curriculum which therefore contributes to good learning and achievement, growth in pupils' knowledge, and good attitudes to learning.
- Academic tracking is good and timely, demonstrating that achievement is improving and may be good.
- Providers are informed of Personal Learning Plans.
- Health and Safety is quality assured by the Behaviour Partnership.
- Pupils and particular groups of pupils have highly positive educational experiences at their provision that ensure that they are well prepared for the next stage in their education, training or employment.
- Provision commissioned by the Behaviour Partnership ensures that pupils who have fallen behind are being helped to make substantial and sustained progress in their English and maths skills.
- Provision is monitored so that most pupils, including the most able, disabled pupils and those with special educational needs, are able to meet their potential.
- The commission of provision by the Behaviour Partnership ensures that promotion of pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, and their physical well-being is in place.

Requires improvement (3)

- The commissioning of provision requires improvement because one or more of the **four key** judgements requires improvement (grade 3) and/or there are weaknesses in the overall provision for pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.

Inadequate (4)

The quality of provision is likely to be inadequate if inspectors judge **any** of the following to be inadequate:

- the achievement of pupils is much lower than expected
- pupils' progress in literacy is not meeting their needs
- the quality of monitoring of provision (including academic tracking) is insufficient to ensure that pupils are attending suitable provision
- the health and safety of pupils is not prioritised as the Behaviour Partnership does not have systems in place to quality assure this aspect of provision.
- there are serious weaknesses in the overall promotion of pupils' spiritual, moral, social and
- cultural development or their physical well-being, so that pupils are intolerant of others and/or reject any of the core values fundamental to life in modern Britain.

¹ Pupils whose cognitive ability is such that their literacy skills are likely to be limited make excellent progress appropriate to their age and capabilities.

Strand 4 Outcomes for Pupils

Grade Descriptors – Outcomes for Students

Note: These descriptors should not be used as a checklist. They must be applied adopting a ‘best fit’ approach that relies on the professional judgement of the inspection team.

Outstanding (1)

- A majority of students achieve maths and English GCSE qualifications at the end of year 11 broadly in line with their ability
- maths and English is a Core part of each students programme and all students have made measurable progress by the end of their programme.
- Students obtain a wide range of appropriate qualifications and experiences from the provisions they attend.
- Detailed tracking and evidence of progression through regular review demonstrates that students have
 - made progress
 - have improved their rate of progress
 - and have, as a result attained outcomes that are broadly in line with their ability.
- Students enter appropriate Post 16 provision that is aligned to their needs, abilities and aspirations and is secure. No student is NEET at the end of their time with the Partnership. The Partnership can demonstrate that a large majority of students have sustained their post sixteen placements well into Year 12.
- Partnership, Schools, Parents, Provisions and other agencies have worked together and have secured improvements in the life chances for the student.
- Where progress has faltered the Partnership can demonstrate that it has actively pursued alternative routes and provisions to secure the best possible outcome.

Good (2)

- All students have continued with maths and English programmes until the end of KS4 and a large majority of students achieve level 2 qualifications in maths and English
- All students obtain one or more additional appropriate qualifications from the provision they attend. The partnership can demonstrate that the range and level of qualifications achieved by each student is broadly in line with the student's ability and current capacity.
- Regular reviews assisted in steering the student's outcomes and provide reliable feedback on progress being made. Progress is being sustained by a large majority of students.
- Students receive timely support in planning their next steps post 16. A large majority of students secure appropriate post 16 provision.
- The Partnership has worked effectively with schools, parents, providers and other agencies in order to improve the life chances of the student.
- The Partnership has actively managed the programme for the student in order to secure

progress. Progress can be demonstrated.

Requires improvement (3)

- Outcome Procedures and policies require improvement because a significant minority of students don't fulfil their potential and achieve the appropriate grades and qualifications they should.

Inadequate (4)

The quality of outcomes are likely to be inadequate if inspectors judge **any** of the following to be inadequate:

- Outcome for students are inconsistent.
- Outcome Planning for students is poor.
- Students do not receive appropriate maths and English provision.
- Students gain few or no qualifications from their programmes and no other measures of success can be demonstrated.
- Too many students are making little or no progress.

Strand 5 Leadership and Management

Grade Descriptors – Leadership and Management

Note: These descriptors should not be used as a checklist. They must be applied adopting a 'best fit' approach that relies on the professional judgement of the inspection team.

OUTSTANDING (1)

- Facilitate the development of a shared vision and values in pursuit of excellence, setting direction and building trust across the Partnership.
- Strive to ensure the highest levels of achievement and personal development for all students over a sustained period of time to ensure they reach their full potential.
- Effectively monitor and evaluate systems for checking student progress.
- Effectively monitor and evaluate the quality of teaching to ensure levels remain high.
- Effectively monitor and evaluate the evidence of achievement and progress for all students in English and Maths and ensure that the rigorous assessment of student progress leads to the identification of, and planning for, individual learning needs.
- Effectively monitor and evaluate the curriculum for Programme Managed students to ensure that it
 - effectively engages students in their learning
 - maximises their opportunities to achieve academically
 - is as broad and balanced as it can be given the need to promote engagement
 - effectively promotes the spiritual and physical well being and the moral social, cultural development of students.
- Lead the staff in challenging negative behaviour and using highly effective strategies to

secure on-going improvement in student's behaviour and attitude to learning.

- Provide effective support and guidance to Partnership schools to help develop effective behaviour strategies and feedback from schools confirms the support has made a positive impact.
- Ensure the availability and understanding of excellent policies and protocols underpinning practice for all relevant parties.
- Ensure the Partnership is adept at identifying any student at risk of harm and engages with partners to respond appropriately.
- Enable, monitor and review the effective sharing of information between all relevant parties, parents and carers at formal and informal levels.
- Facilitate the continuous personal and professional development of staff within a spirit of continuous participation.
- Ensure that there are effective links and communication, and transition arrangements with post 16 providers ensuring students are well supported in the next phase of their life-long learning.
- Through highly rigorous systems ensure financial stability for the Partnership and effective deployment of staff and resources to the benefit of identified students.
- Ensure the continuous review and evaluation of the effectiveness of policy and practice across Partnerships.

GOOD (2)

- Facilitate the development of a shared vision and values in pursuit of clear direction and good team work across the Partnership.
- Ensure good and/or improving education, achievement and personal development over a sustained period of time for identified students.
- Monitor and evaluate practice to ensure that there are good and/or improving levels of teaching that secure achievement and progress for all students in English and Maths.
- Ensure the accurate assessment of student progress leading to the identification of, and planning for, individual learning needs.
- Monitor and evaluate the curriculum in order to secure
 - the engagement of students in their learning
 - good progress in English and maths
 - appropriate opportunities for achievement across a range of subjects and courses
 - access to learning opportunities that will promote the spiritual and physical well being and the moral social, cultural development of students.
- Ensure that staff challenge negative behaviour with consistency and that this results in evidence to show that there is on-going improvement in student's behaviour and attitude to learning.
- Ensure that the Partnership has established good links with schools to support improving the behaviour of identified students.
- Ensure the availability and understanding of well thought out policies and protocols

underpinning practice for all relevant parties.

- Ensure that staff are well trained in identifying students at risk of harm and respond appropriately and that the Partnership's arrangements for safeguarding meet statutory requirements.
- Enable the sharing of information between all relevant parties, parents and carers at formal and informal levels.
- Facilitate the cycle of effective performance management and professional development which show further development and are closely matched to the needs of the staff and Partnership.
- Ensure that there are effective links to aid transition arrangements with post 16 providers.
- Through effective systems ensure financial stability for the Partnership and the deployment of staff and resources are to the benefit of identified students and the needs of the Partnership schools.
- Ensure the continuous review and evaluation of the effectiveness of policy and practice across Partnerships.

Requires Improvement (3)

Leadership and/or management require improvement because they are not good but are demonstrating the capacity to secure improvement.

Inadequate (4)

- There is no evidence of a capacity for future improvements and a lack of vision. There is little evidence of a supportive, positive relationship within the Partnership amongst staff and/or between schools.
- Improvements that have been made are unlikely to be sustainable, too slow or reliant on external support.
- Evaluations of the Partnership performance, including student progress, staff performance and financial systems lack rigour and accuracy resulting in an unrealistic view of outcomes or provision.
- Leadership fails to ensure the teaching is good for all students and the organisation of the curriculum and lessons results in some students achieving less well than they should.
- The curriculum fails to meet the needs of students and their achievement, and their physical well-being and enjoyment of learning are significantly impaired.
- Students are making inadequate progress, have insufficient access to maths and English learning and achieve outcomes that are well below their capacity.
- There is insufficient evidence to prove that the behaviour of students is good and/or improving and there is a lack of consistency in the approach to the management of

challenging behaviour within the Partnership. There is little evidence of a good working relationship between the Partnership and its schools to help support students with difficulties in their behaviour.

- The Partnerships arrangements for working with other agencies and parents and carers are weak and parents express little confidence in the service.
- The Partnership fails to identify students at risk of harm and/or statutory guidance is not adhered to.
- There is no evidence of links with post 16 provisions to help support students with transition.
- Evidence of little or no review and evaluation of the effectiveness of policy and practice across Partnerships.

LEICESTERSHIRE BEHAVIOUR PARTNERSHIPS DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NOVEMBER 2014 update (Schools Forum)

Priority	Aim	Progress and Milestones by March 2015 for Transformation Board November 2014
<p>Accountability</p> <p>1. To submit data to the LA officers and members, Chairs and Headteachers that enables them to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judge the effectiveness of the provision in achieving outcomes for children • Identify trends, emerging needs and new good practice, • Facilitate value for money judgements <p>2. To use the insights provided by the data to develop a shared understanding and a common descriptive language amongst all stakeholders of the purpose and benefits of the BPs and a shared vision for their future development.</p>	<p><i>Robust data collection system in place</i></p> <p><i>Data is received by the LA on time</i></p> <p><i>Data is gathered and presented in a consistent manner aligned to the accountability requirements</i></p> <p><i>Data gives key information on numbers involved, attendance and participation rates, outcomes at the end of Key Stages and destinations.</i></p> <p><i>Data is published to schools</i></p> <p><i>Stakeholders can describe the purpose, benefits and vision for the future of the BPs</i></p>	<p><i>Progress:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved flow of data from BPs as shown by summary data July 2014 • Cross checking of Exclusion data with SAPS and City on going • Growing understanding amongst Co-ordinators of BPs of the accountability requirements • Collation of outcome data for Year 11 leavers from BPs <p><i>Milestones</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen a common approach across the BPs as to the type of information to be held • Develop a format for presentation of the information we currently have for the Scrutiny Committee • Explore with MIS and the BP chairs how BP data might be more easily pooled and shared between BPs and with the LA
<p>Quality Assurance</p> <p>1. To create a framework for reviewing the work of individual BPs against a set of agreed standards and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To use the framework to carry out at reviews of each partnership • To create a process for QA of the reviews. <p>2. To further develop processes by which school and colleges and BPs robustly evaluate Alternative Provision</p>	<p><i>Chairs and Partnership staff will share a consensus view as to the key features that make a BP "good" or "outstanding"</i></p> <p><i>A minimum of three reviews will be completed and the findings will be shared with Chairs and the LA</i></p> <p><i>Chairs will have established a process to validate the reviews</i></p> <p><i>Schools and Colleges with students in AP will have clear audit trails that demonstrate how they have achieved confidence in the quality of the APs they are using</i></p>	<p><i>Progress</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs have agreed to a shared approach across the BPs • Co-ordinators have drafted a framework which is attached • Ofsted Expectations of the level of review of APs shared across BPs • Some BPs have begun to plan for additional AP monitoring • All BPs moving to compliance on rules about use of unregistered provision <p><i>Milestones</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-ordinators to continue to work on framework • Trial runs to use framework • BPs to develop clear strategies for M and E of AP where gaps have been identified
<p>Transition at 16+</p> <p>To further develop good practice related to the transition of PM students out of BP care at the end of Year 11, including ensuring effective CEIAG.</p>	<p><i>Young people will show resilience in the path they enter at the end of Year 11 and will not become NEET in the future.</i></p>	<p><i>Progress</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick review of current practice • Decision that BP resources must support CEIAG <p><i>Milestones</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs to consider what BP responsibilities post 16 should be

LEICESTERSHIRE BEHAVIOUR PARTNERSHIPS DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NOVEMBER 2014 update (Schools Forum)

<p>SENCOP To ensure that SENA and BP processes for accessing additional funding and support for our vulnerable students enable us to secure their entitlement and meet the needs of all including our most complex students</p>	<p>Each child referred to the Partnership will have a well designed programme of support in place that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • builds on the knowledge held and shared between agencies about the child and his or her family • as been put together with appropriate and timely involvement of all services and agencies that the child needs • is aligned to his or her educational needs • addresses any related social or health issues • has an effective process for review embedded in it including agreed outcome targets • draws down funding as appropriate to the provision and need 	<p>Progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working group to redefine processes for BPs to seek SENA resources is underway - agreed goals include ensuring that SEN needs are correctly assessed for children referred to BPs and that BPs will work with SENA to shape cost effective provision for individuals • Plans to develop working relationships between SENA case work officers and BP co-ordinators in hand <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review the outcomes of the working group • To ensure operational relationships are effective • To contribute to the review of threshold criteria • To contribute to development of documentation related to the local offer
<p>Multi agency working 1. To establish effective processes between BPs and other agencies so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • care and support needs can be assessed and met rapidly • our provision can be co-ordinated and or aligned with provision from other agencies • case leadership is clear <p>2. To enable the use of "Mash" by Partnership Co-ordinators</p>		<p>Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution of BP Co-ordinators and Chairs to LA research into PME • First steps in enabling BP Co-ordinators to access MASH • Fact finding about issues for individual partnerships in communicating with other agencies <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision needed as to how BPs will link in with ongoing PME work by the LA • Gaining approval for access to MASH • Ensuring logistical arrangements for BP co-ordinators to access MASH are robust and efficient • Developing our thinking about how we can strengthen and streamline links with Early help and Social Care
<p>Border Issues To establish protocols with neighbouring authorities that will ensure that the interests of young people always come first and that jurisdictions do not become barriers.</p>	<p>The needs of these vulnerable students are met without hindrance from jurisdictional disputes</p>	<p>Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with City BP and planned further contact • Exchange of information about County students with City Addresses who have been permanently excluded <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs of BP to consider how best to secure child centred outcomes for cross border children • LA to consider strategy for tackling issues with other jurisdictions
<p>BP Stability To ensure smooth transition of Transition Team work to BPs To continue to work together to promote the ethos of Partnership working across Leicestershire</p>	<p>Arrangements for winding up Transition Team and dispersing resources will be complete All schools will continue to participate in Partnership arrangements Permanent Exclusions will be minimal The numbers of students who are fully programme managed outside of schools will decline</p>	<p>Progress :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter from Director to all schools and colleges • KS3 resources dispersed • New appointments to Partnership teams in readiness for 14-15 <p>Milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing support to BP Co-ordinators particularly in helping them develop their preventative roles • Continuing support between LA and BPs in ensuring that we work actively with reluctant schools
<p>Working with the Primary Sector To promote positively with Primary colleagues the ethos that underpins the secondary BPs. To establish effective processes for the transition of vulnerable children from primary to secondary that promote continuity of provision</p>	<p>Vulnerable children entering secondary schools will have appropriate additional provision in place where this is needed.</p>	<p>Progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs responded to consultant input on Primary developments • Ongoing links between BP and Oakfield via Consultant • Oakfield linking with individual BP Co-ordinators as required <p>Milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs ready to respond to any proposals emerging from LA and Primaries about future arrangements



SCHOOLS FORUM

2014-15 SCHOOLS BUDGET

4 DECEMBER 2014

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	x	Pre School	x
Academies	x	Foundation Stage	x
PVI Settings	x	Primary	x
Special Schools / Academies	x	Secondary	x
Local Authority	x	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	x	Maintained Primary School Members	
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	x

1. This report presents an update on the performance of the 2014/15 Schools Budget

Recommendation

2. That Schools Forum note the report.

2014-15 Schools Budget Outturn

3. The projected 2014/15 Outturn position, based on Period 6 financial data, for the Children and Family Services is summarised in the following table. This table presents both the Local Authority and Schools Budget for completeness but the report presents detail only for the Schools Budget funding blocks.

4. Overall the Schools Budget is forecast to underspend by £1.238m (Schools Block - £49.1, Early Years -£445.1, High Needs -£743.9) which is summarised in the following table. Under the grant conditions for the Dedicated Schools Grant any under or over spend on the budget carries forward to following years Schools Budget;

	2014/15 Budget	Total (Under) / Over Spend		Variance Schools Block	Variance Early Years Block	Variance High Needs Block	Variance LA Block
	£,000	£,000	%	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
Directorate	1,499	-26.3	-1.7%	-0.5	-1.1	-4.0	-20.7
Safeguarding	2,915	64.8	-2.2%	0	0	0	64.8
Social Care Assessment & Response	31,964	1,668.6	5.2%	0	0	0	1,668.6
Targeted Early Help	11,936	-401.6	-3.4%	0	0	0	-401.6
Education Sufficiency	684	-120.3	-17.6%	-47.6	0	-6.4	-66.2
CFS Other	-75,569	-799.4	-1.0%	0	0		-799.4
0 – 19 Learning	26,590	-453.0	-1.7%	-1.0	-443.9	0	-8.1
Education of Vulnerable Groups	7,272	-332.3	-4.6%	0	0	-118.6	-213.7
SEN / Commissioning & Procurement	48,793	-699.4	-1.4%	0	0	-614.8	-84.7
Committees, Finance, HR	4,762	-93.3	-1.9%	0	0	0	-93.3
Total	60,847	-1,192	-1.9%	-49.1	-445.1	-743.9	45.7

5. The major variances within the School Budget are detailed below;

Service Area	Variance		
	£,000	%	
Early Years Block			
Nursery Education Funding	255	1.3	The initial autumn term headcount indicates more 3 and 4 year olds accessed nursery places than anticipated, a second census point in January 2015 will revise the Early Years Block which may generate additional funding to offset the additional cost
Nursery Education for Disadvantaged 2 year	-650	-21.4	Demand is lower than anticipated for two year old funding, the service

olds			is continuing to raise awareness of the offer and increase take up
High Needs Block			
Alternative Provision	(162)	(100)	This budget was established to support alternative provision as part of the transitional arrangements for Oakfield and has not been required
Special Educational Needs	(615)	(1.3)	Contingency was held in this budget as 2014/15 is the first full financial year of the new funding arrangements for post 16 high needs providers, additionally September 2014 saw the first increase to the participation age, this contingency can be released. For 2015/16 the contingency will fund an increase in rates for special schools and schools with special needs units.

Dedicated Schools Grant Reserve

6. An updated position on the DSG reserve was incorporated into the 2013/14 Schools Budget Outturn report presented to Schools Forum on 16 June. The current position is detailed in the following table;

	£,000
Balance as at April 1 2014	9,595
Allocated to 2014/15 Budget	-1,250
Provision for academy deficits	-2,500
Provision for Age Range Change funding protection	-2,700
Provision for demographic growth	-1,000
Oakfield Action Plan	-72
KS3 Transition Team	-197
Academy Rate Adjustments	-500
Primary Behaviour Support	-31
Period 6 Underspend	1,238
Unallocated Reserve	2,583

7. There are a number of strategic issues that need to be considered in the allocation of the DSG reserve both in the short term to support the 2015/16 schools budget or to set aside for particular purposes. No proposals are made in this report to allocate the reserve which will be considered in the wider context of the 2015/16 budget setting

exercise. It should be noted that the underspend is generated by High Needs and Early Years funding but is largely being used to support schools.

Those issues include;

a) Pupil Number Growth

It is anticipated that Leicestershire will open a new school to serve Braunstone Town and Leicester Forest East in September 2016. Where new schools are required as a result of the basic need for school places, local authorities are required to provide funding for start-up and for diseconomies of scale. Further new schools are anticipated as new housing is delivered through the Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE's). £1m is notionally set aside within the DSG reserve to meet the first phase of costs but further work to assess the funding requirement over the medium term needs to be completed prior to Schools Forum being asked to approve the criteria for the allocation of funding. No additional DSG is made available to meet the additional costs and the local authority, in consultation with Schools Forum, needs to consider a sustainable method of revenue funding.

b) Early Years Block Funding

For 2014/15 local authorities are funded on the number of disadvantaged two year olds eligible for nursery education funding, for 2015/16 this will change to the number of two year olds participating in the offer. It is anticipated that this change will reduce the Early Years Block DSG by £2.6m, as the higher amount of funding is currently allocated the reduction in funding will create financial pressure that will need to be considered in setting the 2015/16 budget.

c) Continued Financial implications arising from Academy Conversion

Financial pressure will continue to be felt from sponsored academy conversions, it is anticipated that the cost of deficit for schools currently undertaking sponsored conversions will be met from the current reserve. It will be prudent however to make further provision.

d) Age Range Changes

Currently the funding set aside within the DSG reserve is sufficient to fund the estimated cost of £1.9m for age range changes in 2015/16 however it is expected that further changes will occur in 2016/17 and will require additional funding

e) High Needs funding for pupils without SEN

The establishment of the High Needs funding system established commonality in funding arrangements for a range of providers and will provide a platform for personal budgets arising from Education, Health and Care plans. There is inconsistency within the financial regulations that govern the use of DSG and the operational guidance which refer to the need to fund pupils with additional needs. Two areas have been identified where there may be a need to provide funding from the High Needs Block.

The first relates to educational needs of children in care which often are not funded unless a statement is issued, there may be clear educational benefits and enhanced placement stability, from providing additional financial support.

Secondly there is a growing bank of evidence that family support workers are providing successful early interventions with vulnerable families, this work is happening in schools, the strengthening families service, through children's centre programmes and through Supporting Leicestershire Families. There may be longer term benefits from aligning this work and supporting from the High Needs Block, this is being successfully delivered in this way in other local authorities.

Conclusions

8. An underspend on SEN remains the result of prudent budget provision given the significant changes made to the High Needs funding system in 2013/14, this level of underspend is not expected to incur in 2015/16 as that contingency has been allocated to increase the payment rates to special schools and school with SEN units. The budget will however remain volatile given its very nature.
9. The use of the DSG reserve will be considered within the 2015/16 budget setting exercise, it will be important to use the reserve in a considered manner given that the funding is not recurrent.

Resource Implications

10. All resource implications are contained within the body of the report.

Equal Opportunity Issues

11. There are no equality issues arising directly from this report.

Background Papers

Schools Forum 16 June 2014 – 2013/14 Schools Budget Outturn
Schools Forum 13 February 2014 - 2014/15 Schools Budget

Officer to Contact

Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, CYPS
jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk
0116 305 6401

This page is intentionally left blank