

Central Bedfordshire
Council
Priory House
Monks Walk
Chicksands,
Shefford SG17 5TQ



please ask for Sandra Hobbs
direct line 0300 300 5257
date 18 September 2009

NOTICE OF MEETING

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

Date & Time

Monday, 28 September 2009 at 6.00 p.m.

Please note: a light buffet will be provided from 5.30 p.m.

Venue at

**Room 14, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands,
Shefford, SG17 5TQ**

Jaki Salisbury
Interim Chief Executive

To: The Chairman and Members of the CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM:

School Members: Anne Bell, Headteacher, Willow Nursery School
Neil Bramwell, Headteacher, Stratton Upper School
Shirley-Anne Crosbie, Headteacher, Glenwood
Special School
Malcolm Griffiths, Governor, Eaton Bray Lower
School
Richard Holland, Governor, Harlington Upper School
Sue Howley, Governor, Greenleas Lower School
Sharon Ingham, Headteacher, Hadrian Lower School
Ian Mitchell, Headteacher, Etonbury Middle School
Jim Parker, Headteacher, Manshead Upper School
Ray Payne, Headteacher, Henlow Middle School
Jim Smart, Headteacher, Shelton Lower School

**Non-School
Members:**

Ian Greenley, Church of England Diocese
Representative
Bill Hamilton, Roman Catholic Diocese
Representative
Caroll Leggatt, PVI Early Years Providers
Representative
Bill McCarthy, Teacher's Union Representative
Chris Vesey, 14-19 Partnership Sector
Representative

AGENDA

No.	Item	Lead Person	Time
1.	Apologies for Absence	Chairman	18:00
2.	Minutes of 29 June 2009 and Matters Arising	Chairman	18:05
3.	Early Years Update	Bob Thompson, Early Years Consultant	18:15
4.	Revision to Scheme for Financing Schools and the Fully Funded Bank Account Scheme	Dawn Hill, Finance Manager – Schools	18:25
5.	Update Surplus Balances	Dawn Hill, Finance Manager – Schools	18:35
6.	Update from the Technical Funding Sub-Group	Dawn Hill, Finance Manager – Schools	18:45
7.	Schools Specific Contingency Budget	Dawn Hill, Finance Manager – Schools	18:55
8.	Schools Forum Budget	Dawn Hill, Finance Manager – Schools	19:00
9.	Use of Harnessing Technology Funding to Support Transition to Web Based MIS in Schools	Cathy Piotrowski, ICT/MIS, Learning & Support	19:05
10.	Position Statement on Central Bedfordshire Council Financial Management Standard in Schools Assessments & Benchmarking Data	Roger Willoughby	19:20

11. Date of Next Meeting Chairman 19:30

The date of the next meeting is scheduled for Monday 25 January 2010.

12. Close Chairman 19:35

This page is intentionally left blank

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM** held in Room 14, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ on Monday, 29 June 2009

Present:

Anne Bell	Ray Payne
Neil Bramwell	Jim Smart
Shirley-Anne Crosbie	Ian Greenley
Malcolm Griffiths	Bill Hamilton
Sue Howley	Carol Leggatt
Sharon Ingham	Bill McCarthy
Ian Mitchell	Chris Vesey
Jim Parker	

Apologies for Absence: Richard Holland

Members in Attendance: Councillors Mrs Anita Lewis, Steve Male and Mrs Christina Turner

Officers in Attendance: Stuart Freel, Edwina Grant, Kevin Green, Dawn Hill, Sandra Hobbs, Nick Murley, Patrick Shevlin, Bob Thompson and Roy Waterfield

Also in Attendance: Hazel Fariam - Linslade Lower School

L/04/1 **INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

Councillor Mrs Lewis welcomed everyone to the meeting, including Councillor Male, Executive Portfolio Holder for Culture and Skills and Councillor Mrs C Turner, Assistant to the Portfolio Holders for Children's Services and Culture and Skills.

The Forum congratulated Sue Howley on being awarded an MBE for voluntary service to education.

The Forum also congratulated Councillor Mrs Lewis for being appointed the Executive Portfolio Holder for Children's Services. She advised Members that she would be attending the School Forum meetings as an observer in her role as Executive Portfolio Holder.

L/04/2 **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED that Jim Parker be elected as Chairman of the Schools Forum for the municipal year.

L/04/3 **ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED that Ray Payne be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Schools Forum for the municipal year.

L/04/4 **MINUTES OF 2 MARCH 2009 AND MATTERS ARISING**

RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the meeting of the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum held on 2 March 2009 as a correct record and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

Members were advised that additional funding had been obtained from a different fund stream for the Samuel Whitbread pyramid. The Team Co-ordinator for Executive Services for Schools oversaw the procedure for allocating funding to make sure the system was transparent, although each pyramid had its own co-ordinator.

L/04/5 **EARLY YEARS UPDATE**

The Forum received the following update on the Early Years Initiatives:

- an impact analysis was currently being undertaken to inform a single funding formula, in respect of the counting method for the maintained sector being moved to an actual uptake of provision basis
- progress was being made on the Free Flexible Extended Entitlement (FFEE) which included offers in schools/settings being identified and firmed up by the Childcare Development Officers, promotional material being distributed, parental needs survey information being collated and the criteria being developed for 'one-off' bids to the Childcare Funding Panel
- progress on the placements for 2 year olds was being made with a project plan and a self evaluation form (SEF) in place, criteria was confirmed for parents and settings, an outreach strategy was in place, promotional material and a letter to family support providers was being worked on
- progress on the single funding formula was being made with early consultation being undertaken, the outcomes would be analysed over the summer break, development of the formula and transition arrangements would be progressed, modelling and impact analysis with full consultation would be carried out in October/November.

Members were advised that all childcare providers would be treated equally whether they were private or voluntary.

NOTED the presentation.

L/04/6

SCHOOLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME - PROGRESS REPORT

The Forum received a report that set out the initial Central Bedfordshire Capital Programme for schools, current progress and gave an indicator of future issues.

Members discussed the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme and were advised that the Shadow Executive on 17 March had agreed the draft governance arrangements and management arrangements for the preparation in planning for BSF. The next key stage in the process was the development of a statement of readiness.

Members were advised that the capital project for Dunstable College would not be funded. Dunstable College was originally shortlisted for funding to redevelop the College, but unfortunately it was not one of the 13 colleges chosen.

NOTED the progress report.

L/04/7

POSITION STATEMENT ON CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL FMSiS ASSESSMENT

The Forum received a report which updated Members of the current position with regard to schools which had passed the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS).

The four year assessment cycle undertaken by Internal Audit and Schools Finance staff commenced in 2006/07. All Bedfordshire schools were notified of the year in which they would be assessed. To date 42% of schools who were programmed to be assessed had passed the assessment. It was explained that in actual terms, 74% of schools had passed who had actually been assessed.

Members did ask that for any future reports that these results were put into context perhaps by benchmarking against other authorities and officers agreed to do so.

Schools were disappointed that there was a backlog as there was a lot of work behind the scenes that went into putting together the evidence portfolios. Officers explained that the backlog had occurred due to the schools submitting their evidence portfolio at the very end of each financial year.

Members were advised that 30 schools were scheduled to be assessed during 2009/10, as well as completion of the backlog of 2008/09 assessments, reassessment of the schools that failed and the schools that passed during 2006/07 were also due for reassessment.

Members requested that thought be given to the guidelines to make them as clear as possible to enable the schools to be confident that the correct evidence was being supplied. Officers agreed to remind the schools due for assessment of the guidance available to them before they prepare their evidence.

In an attempt to reduce any future backlog, officers were preparing a schedule for 2009/10 setting out the date when a school needs to provide its evidence to meet the Standard before the year end. This would help Officers resource the activity in a more effective way.

Officers did acknowledge that as an assessment on its own, the FMSiS was perhaps not the most effective way of adding value to the school. Work would be undertaken to propose a risk based approach to audit work in the future and Officers would ask the Forum to consider and comment upon any new approach.

NOTED the report.

L/04/8

REVISION TO SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS AND FULLY FUNDED BANK ACCOUNT SCHEME

The Forum received a report on the consultation on the revision to the Fully Funded Bank Account and Scheme for Financing Schools. Members were advised of the following five areas that headteachers and governing bodies would be consulted upon:

- to revise the due date for monthly/quarterly financial returns to the 10th of each month instead of the 20th of each month as there was insufficient time for the returns to be reviewed and challenged between the 20th of the month and the 5th/6th of the following month when the SAP period closed
- to clarify the Governing Body of Schools responsibilities in respect of the submission and approval of the School Budget Plan. It was proposed that the word 'full' be inserted before Governing Body in the paragraphs concerned
- to insert a paragraph with regard to Voluntary Aided Schools 10% contribution from Revenue for Capital purposes clarifying that revenue surpluses remain revenue until the monies have been spent
- that the schools in Licensed Deficit submit their monthly monitoring reports by the 20th of the following month, as in the current scheme no date exists for the receipt of these reports
- generally update the scheme to take account of Unitary status, job titles, address, revised appendix 'Earmarked Funds', list of schools and type.

RESOLVED to approve the proposals for consultation with Headteachers and Governing bodies on the revision of dates for Fully Funded Schools Financial Returns and amendments to the Scheme for Financing Schools.

L/04/9

14 - 19 FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

a) 14-16 Practical Learning Options – Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Devolved to Strategic Partnerships

Members were advised about the devolved funding of the DSG Practical Learning Options. Previously the Schools Forum had agreed the funding be allocated to the three 14-19 area groups, as defined by the old district boundaries. Since the original decision there had been a number of changes:

- the two consortia was Mid/North Bedfordshire and South Bedfordshire, these consortia remain in place, although the Mid/North cuts across the two new unitary authorities
- Bedfordshire had retained a joint partnership for the two new unitary authorities whereas each area in the country had set up a mandatory 14-19 Partnership which included representatives of Local Authorities, the Learning and Skills Council, Schools and Further Education colleges
- the 14-19 Partnership was the strategic lead for 14-19 provision and was a statutory sub-group of the Children's Trust.

RESOLVED that the amount of DSG assigned to Practical Learning Options be devolved to the 14-19 Strategic Partnership with reports on its usage being reported back to the Schools Forum as diplomas develop.

b) Diploma Funding – September 2009 Cohort

The Schools Forum received a report that advised Members on the process of funding the introduction of Diplomas from September 2009 in respect of the first cohort of students. It was intended that there be four lines of study in Upper schools in the North/Mid Beds Consortium from September 2009, namely Construction & the Built Environment, Creative & Media, Engineering and Hair & Beauty. It was planned that further lines of study would be introduced in September 2010 in both consortiums.

There were a total of 38 students from Upper schools in Central Bedfordshire pursuing the Diploma programme in September 2009. It was also projected that 15 students from Upper schools in Bedford Borough would follow the same Diploma programme. Members were advised that this was a very low uptake as the courses were difficult to market to 14 year olds and their parents.

To enable the programme to proceed there would need to be a form of subsidy. The 14-19 Strategic Partnership and the Upper school headteachers had considered the matter and had resolved to accept a principle of cost neutrality, whereby any schools which have Diploma students would not contribute more, per student, than the appropriate element of the age-weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) for that Key Stage of student. This equated to £1,400 based on a two day a week course and an AWPU at Years 10 and 11 of some £3,500.

Government recommendation was that as well as the Diploma Grant the DSG Practical Learning Opportunities funding be used to enable the financing of Diplomas, as well as the £1,400 contribution from participating schools be used to deliver the programme. Officers circulated the estimated income and expenditure for the financial year 2009/10, with the Diploma programme commencing in September 2009.

The Diploma programme would be for the two year course of the first cohort. It was expected that there would be a wider programme with more students in the second cohort commencing in September 2010. There would need to be a fresh look at how this second and subsequent cohort would be funded.

NOTED the decisions and recommendations of the 14-19 Strategic Partnership and the Upper School headteachers, especially the use of the element of DSG relating to Practical Learning Opportunities.

c) **Children's Trust Progress and 14-19 Commissioning Progress**

The Forum was taken through a presentation that updated them on the progress of the Children's Trust and the 14-19 Commissioning. The presentation set out the following points:

- the background to establishing the Children's Trust including commissioning, delivery and joint accountabilities plus statutory responsibility to develop a Children's Plan
- the implications of establishing a Children's Trust
- developing 16-19 Commissioning across the 14-19 agenda
- the process – Councils had a statutory duty to participate in shadowing this activity so that they can go live in April 2010.

The Children's Plan would be a significant document over the next few years and would include the priorities where funding would be focused towards. There would be a role for the Forum in considering and acknowledging the work being carried out.

The Children's Trust would feed in and out of the Local Strategic Partnership and the two bodies must work closely together to protect children.

NOTED the presentation.

L/04/10 **SURPLUS BALANCES**

The Forum was advised that the Surplus Balance Sub-Group had met twice, during June. It was agreed that the minutes from these meetings would be circulated to the members of the Schools Forum. This would give members the opportunity to review and pass comments on the process followed and detailed recommendations to enable schools to be notified by the end of term. The Sub-Group would need to reconvene to consider those schools below the previous thresholds, if members accept that these should no longer apply.

Members were advised that the Sub-Group's approach to allowable deductions to the surplus balances had been tougher than in previous years, in particular with the recommendation not to continue the additional allowance of 1% of school budget share or £10,000 (whichever the greater).

The Headteacher from Linslade Lower School requested that the surplus monies held by Vandyke Upper School for the Learning Community collaboration, on behalf of all schools in the collaboration, remain in place. Officers advised that many schools earmark funds for particular functions and these funds would remain earmarked, to the extent that they were held on behalf of the Learning Community.

RESOLVED that the minutes from the Surplus Balance Sub-Group meetings would be circulated to the members of the Schools Forum.

L/04/11 **ALLOCATION OF DEPRIVATION FUNDING**

Jim Smart raised concerns regarding the allocation of deprivation funding, although this was likely to change in the autumn. Officers advised that there were two issues:

- the funding provided to bands 4 and 5 of the Acorn Index had individual thresholds and the issue was whether these should be a combined threshold and the funding would be all or nothing once a threshold was reached; and
- whether there should be some tapering introduced.

Officers advised that this could be picked up under the Future Programme item on the agenda.

L/04/12 **SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERSHIP**

The Forum received a report that:

- reminded members of the expiry of their current term of office on 31 August 2009 and the need for the Council to seek nominations to the Forum for a new three-year term

- proposed extending members' current terms of office until 31 December 2009, to enable the required nomination and election process to take place during the autumn term.

Members were advised that the extension of the membership was possible as it was considered that this was part of the transition process to the new unitary authority.

Members were advised that as from September 2009 Northfields Technology College would become All Saints Academy. This would entitle them to a place on the Schools Forum, once the Schools Forum Regulations (2009), were enacted by Parliament.

Members were advised that consultation was being carried out on the new Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2009 and could be found at www.teachernet.gov.uk/schoolfundingframework/. Consultation responses should be sent to Schools.Forums@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk by Friday 28 August 2009.

NOTED the Councils intention:

- to seek fresh nominations for membership of the Schools Forum for a new term beginning 1 January 2010 and expiring on either 31 August 2012 or 31 December 2012
- meanwhile to extend members' current terms of office until 31 December 2009 to enable the required nomination and election process to take place during the autumn term 2009.

L/04/13

DATE OF NEXT MEETING(S) AND FORWARD PROGRAMME

Members received a report that set out an outline forward programme for the Schools Forum for the next academic year. The programme was flexible, to respond to national and local policy issues and the actual timings of preparatory work.

Members were advised that the new draft regulations proposed that there be four meetings a year instead of the current three meetings a year. It was agreed that an extra meeting would be scheduled once the new regulations came into force.

There was already an Early Years Reference Group established as a sub-group to the Schools Forum. It was proposed to establish a Technical Funding Sub-Group to look at specific areas of formula funding changes. It was proposed that Neil Bramwell, Shirley-Anne Crosbie become members of the Technical Funding Sub-Group and enquire if Jim Smart was available to sit on the Sub-Group.

Members thanked Kevin Green, Head of Business Finance as it would be his last meeting before taking a new job at Essex County Council.

RESOLVED

- (1) to establish a Technical Funding Sub-Group with Neil Bramwell, Shirley-Anne Crosbie as members
- (2) to enquire if Jim Smart was available to become a member on the Technical Funding Sub-Group
- (3) that future meetings of the schools forum be scheduled for 6.00 pm of the last Monday of each month, this being:

28 September 2009

25 January 2010

28 June 2010

L/04/14

Close

(Note: The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and concluded at 8.15 p.m.)

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Early Years Single Funding Formula
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the progress made to date on the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) and feedback from the initial consultation with settings and schools.

Contact Officer: Bob Thompson
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency
(if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To discuss and comment on the latest update of the Early Years Single Funding Formula.**

Background

1. Central Bedfordshire Council is required to implement an Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) for all schools and settings making the free early years entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds from 1st April 2010. In order to achieve this the following is being undertaken:
 - an initial consultation during the Summer Term 2009 to gain settings' views on the factors/elements which might be included in the EYSFF and the possible impact on their settings;
 - construction of a single funding pot for the EYSFF;
 - the construction of possible formulae and their impact on settings; and
 - a formal consultation on the formulae options during November.

Feedback from consultation

2. 42 schools and settings responded to the initial consultation which was undertaken during June and July, the outcomes of which are outlined in Appendix A.

The Funding Pot for the EYSFF

3. A single funding pot of nearly £7,060,618 has been identified for distribution to settings through the EYSFF. This excludes the summer term adjustment (contingency) for lower schools of approximately £300,000 and is made up from the following elements:
 - Nursery Education Funding budget for the Private, Voluntary and Independent sector (PVI) derived from the 2010-11 Section 52 Statement;
 - a notional Special Education Needs (SEN) budget for PVI settings based on 60% of Bedfordshire County Council's 2009-10 SEN budget for the PVI (not included in the above total for distribution through the EYSFF);
 - Nursery schools budget;
 - Lower schools budget for:-
 - Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) 3+
 - AWPU 3+ headcount
 - Social deprivation element for 3+ and 3+ headcount;
 - additional Summer term funding for 3+ and 3+ headcount; and
 - insurance funding for 3+ headcount.

The Formula

4. It is proposed that Central Bedfordshire consult on 4 formulae as follows:

A

Base rate £3.60 per hour x Hours uptake per child	+	Social deprivation supplement x Average hours uptake per child	+	Nursery school lump sum
--	---	---	---	------------------------------------

B

Base rate £3.30 per hour x Hours uptake of children	+	Social deprivation supplement x Average hours uptake per child	+	Other funding factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lump sum for nursery school headteachers• Lump sum for PVI administration• PVI rent & rates• NS & PVI utility costs
--	---	---	---	--

C

Base rate £3.60 per hour x Hours uptake of children	+	Social deprivation supplement x Average hours uptake per child
--	---	---

D

Base rate £3.30 per hour x Hours uptake per child	+	Social deprivation supplement x Average hours uptake per child	+	Other funding factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lump sum for PVI administration• PVI rent & rates• NS & PVI utility costs
--	---	---	---	---

Explanation of elements included in the Funding Formulae

5. All modelling has been undertaken on actual uptake of children's hours during 2009-10.
6. A fixed base rate with additional factors is used for the formulae because this model has greater transparency for what is included in the add-ons. Even though a majority of schools/settings expressed a preference for Option 3 (Differential Rate with Social Deprivation factor – see Appendix A) as the DCSF requires a Social Deprivation factor to be included when all responses to this question are considered the majority (22 – 20) is inconclusive.
7. The Social Deprivation Supplement uses the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) to identify the postcodes of children living in the 30 % most disadvantaged Local Super Output Areas (LSOAs) and schools/settings they attend in 3 bands:
 - average hours (12.5 hours) of number of children attending setting living in 0-30% most disadvantaged LSOAs – 20p
 - 31-60% LSOAs – 10p
 - 61-100% LSOAs – 0p.
8. The other funding factors where they are used in Formulae B and D are as follows:
 - lump sum for nursery school headteacher
 - lump sum for PVI administration base on £100 + 10p per hour uptake
 - PVI rent, rates and premises costs @ 10p per hour uptake
 - Nursery school and PVI – utility costs @ 10p per hour uptake.
9. Lower schools have not been included in the utility cost element because they will continue to be funded for this through their existing formula.
10. It is suggested that a quality element for Formulae B and D based on the actual employment or commitment to employ a graduate through the Graduate Leadership Fund is introduced from April 2011 after further research is undertaken to ensure accurate information collection. The £3.30 rate per hour for 2010-11 for Formulae B and D includes 10p per hour contingency to be set aside for a quality element. If either Formula B or D is adopted the hourly rate from April 2011 will be £3.20 to allow for the quality element to be implemented. It should be noted that that the redistribution of the 10p contingency for quality will result in settings in the PVI sector receiving differentiated amounts related to the employment of a graduate from April 2011.

11. The Schools Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) has been used a mechanism to support transition funding for the maximum of 3 years that the DCSF allows. No additional transition funding is recommended. The MFG provides protection at school level of a minimum increase in funding of 2.1% year on year until 2011. For the purposes of the EYSFF the 2010-11 formulae are based on 2009-10 pupil uptake of hours. The full effect of the MFG protection will be felt by schools in 2010-11 and this will be reduced by a third each year until this protection is completely removed in 2013-14. The amount released year by year from the decrease in protection will be go back into the total pot for distribution through the base rate, the social deprivation supplement and the other funding factors .
12. The PVI sector will continue to be funded as they are currently, namely, termly on children’s uptake of hours. Schools’ annual budget for the Early Years will be based on January uptake of children’s hours. However, it is proposed that schools will be counted termly and any adjustments due to fluctuation in numbers will be made in the next financial year. A contingency amount has been included in each model to allow for this.

Elements not included

13. Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) will continue to be funded by the current mechanisms as will free school meals for children in the early years.

Timetable

14. The following timetable is proposed for the successful conclusion of the EYFF.

Activity	Date	Papers required
Early Years Reference Group (EYRG)	28 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of early consultation • Early draft of formulae, indicative budgets and impact analysis
Schools Forum (SF)	28 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of early consultation • Early draft of formulae, indicative budgets and impact analysis
EYRG	29 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper outlining full consultation with formulae, indicative budgets, impact analysis and funding effects for 4 years until 2013 -14
SF	19 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ditto
Full consultation begins	2 November	
4 Cross sector consultation meetings	2 November – 23 November	

Schools finance seminar	4 November	
Full consultation ends	30 November	
EYRG	10 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft outcomes of full consultation
EYRG	w/c 4 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of full consultation • Paper to agree formula for April 2010 and recommendations for SF
SF	25 January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper to agree formula for April 2010 and recommendations from EYRG
Implementation of SFF	1 April	

Appendices:

Appendix A - Outcomes of the Consultation Document

Appendix A

CBC SFF Consultation outcomes

Consultation responses

Number of responses			
Maintained schools: 8	Private, Voluntary and independent (PVI): 34	Total: 42	
Base hourly rate - Basic Structure			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: Common rate plus social deprivation Option 2: Common rate without social deprivation Option 3: Different rate with social deprivation Option 4: Different rate without social deprivation 			
Option 1: 13	Option 2: 7	Option 3: 20	Option 4: 2
Social Deprivation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 bands using IMD for LSOAs – low, medium and high 			
Agree: 24	Disagree: 8	Unsure: 10	Nil: 0
Nursery School Headteachers			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide nursery school lump sum 			
Agree: 20	Disagree: 11	Unsure: 11	Nil: 0
PVI Administration			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leave nursery and lower school lump sums intact and establish lump sum for PVI administration 			
Agree: 29	Disagree: 9	Unsure: 4	Nil: 0
Sustainability			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish lump sum for qualifying providers with fewer than x pupils up to the equivalent of funding for x pupils where viability of provision necessary for sufficiency 			
Agree: 23	Disagree: 7	Unsure: 11	Nil: 1
Rent, rates and premises costs			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: Leave rents, rates and conditions survey allocations for schools intact and fund costs for PVI providers on uptake Option 2: Leave rents, rates and conditions survey allocation for schools intact and fund PVI providers at two set amounts – 1) those registered for up to 24 children and 2) those above 24 children 			
Option 1: 18	Option 2: 20	Unsure: 2	Nil: 2
Quality funding for PVI sector			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate funding to all PVI providers on qualification of staff using 3 bands based on pupil uptake 			
Agree: 19	Disagree: 12	Unsure: 11	Nil: 0
Qualified teachers and nursery nurses in the maintained sector			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a formula factor based on pupil uptake for qualified teachers and nursery nurses in maintained schools 			
Agree: 21	Disagree: 7	Unsure: 14	Nil: 0
Meals provision			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to fund free meals and school meals by current funding mechanisms 			
Agree: 34	Disagree: 3	Unsure: 5	Nil: 0
Special educational needs (SEN)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the current funding mechanisms for funding children with SEN in maintained and PVI sectors 			
Agree: 37	Disagree: 2	Unsure: 3	Nil: 0
Single pupil count			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All settings counted and funded termly on uptake 			

Agree: 34	Disagree: 3	Unsure: 4	Nil: 1
Transition funding			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guaranteed minimum funding level per child per hour (no setting receiving less than an average of £x per hour even if the formula suggests a lower figure) 			
Agree: 33	Disagree: 4	Unsure: 4	Nil: 1
Schools MFG			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2010-11 MFG calculation should use the same methodology of counting for both the base year and the funding year 			
Agree: 24	Disagree: 4	Unsure: 13	Nil: 1

Comments (Please note – not all comments have been included and those included are representative of those received. They are not written in any order of preference.)

Base hourly rate - Basic Structure
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for social deprivation factor, core rates provide level playing field Option 3 – need to retain current levels of funding SFF should start from same base rate As accredited childminder funding does not cover hourly rate Does a childminder have similar costs as more formal settings, shouldn't all settings provide similar care and have similar staff in place? Option 1 seems a fairer starting place Need to know what differential rates include SFF should be just that – unsure how social deprivation would be calculated.
Social Deprivation
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should follow the child but can change termly Additional funding should be based on assessment of individual needs Unsure about use of Acorn Index DCSF requires deprivation factor Providers cost survey showed it cost more to educate a child in the maintained sector, so this should be reflected in the differential base rate Agree with the use of Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) but would like to see it extended beyond Local Super Output Areas (LSOAs). Could use same process as for FFEE.
Nursery School Headteachers
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All settings have an administrative lead or a committee Lump sum would need to cover headteacher plus on-costs All settings should get a lump sum / include under level of quality? All full daycare settings require graduate leader by 2015 So long as nursery is attached to main school – don't see the need for nursery school headteacher Again one amount for all, when is a headteacher better qualified than a teacher with EYP status As this reads as a requirement there is no choice but to agree All nursery / early years provision should be funded to employ a teacher I think it id very difficult because schools get a lot of support whereas PVI settings don't get as much. However, I do agree nursery schools need a headteacher DCSF requirement for nursery schools to have a headteacher The day that nursery schools are run by an EYP would be a retrograde step.

PVI Administration
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enormous administrative load, less unpaid hours • Would make a huge difference • As nursery schools have increasing demands on administration would like to see lump sum review to adequately provide administrative support • Need to differentiate between voluntary and private / independent as latter are profit making, need to ensure not giving public money to increase profits • Agree with reservations – would the nursery and lower school lump sum remain intact or are you taking slices out of the same size pie? • Supports efficiently run provision, no other way to recoup administrative costs • Agree with PVI need for administrative and management costs but one system of payment should be analysed with the idea of one method to cover all types of provider so that the system would seem fairer • Recognises extra hours worked when children have gone home • Money needed for growth and quality of these settings, needs to go to the right organisations not to limited companies • Keep it simple, the rate is the rate, no slight of hand please.
Sustainability
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a must, would support providers in rural areas • Smaller settings should not have to close due to lack of numbers, villages need childcare • Could be unrealistic level of funding required • Definitely would support PVI settings affected by once a year intake • Need criteria before deciding • If a business / setting is viable, it is viable! • Efforts should be made and demonstrated for settings to accept advice and work to increase numbers.
Rent, rates and premises costs
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 could still affect sustainability if numbers fall • Rents and rates not according to take-up • Let free market work, only need sustainability when there are not enough places in local authority • Closed question makes assumption of payment. Should be proportional to numbers if 3 and 4 year olds • We are a business not an extension of the state • I feel we need more guidance on this.
Quality funding for PVI sector
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many staff still taking higher qualification in 2010, settings with no Early Years Professional (EYP) disadvantaged • Disagree strongly, have you tried to keep a graduate in a private nursery? • May seriously affect pre-school settings • An allowance which considers staff qualifications and part-time employment / sessions open / could include headteacher funding here • What about childminders who have level 4, 5 or 6 qualifications? • Not cost effective for smaller settings to have graduate EYP

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not measurable and will make gulf bigger between good and bad • I think bands are biased to the schools sector or large nursery chains • Any funding needs to be ring-fenced.
<p>Qualified teachers and nursery nurses in the maintained sector</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintained settings need teachers but less staff • Cost of employing qualified teachers, deputy head and teachers through the Threshold etc much higher than a nursery nurse • PVI settings required to maintain higher adult:child ratios could be included in quality funding element • Not simple • Needs to take account of teachers on the leadership spine • We agree in principle but with fluctuating birth rate and pupil uptake it is difficult to maintain.
<p>Meals provision</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality principle • PVI's don't get funding for free meals • School meals need to be looked at as the size of the portions wouldn't keep a baby alive!
<p>Special educational needs (SEN)</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is fine how it is • It is hard to obtain funding for children with SEN in PVI settings. It should be made easier to better support children before moving to maintained settings • Funding differentials need to be addressed • The current formula includes a notional figure for children with SEN. Will this be added to the SFF? • It works • Disagree – to make it easier to access funding for SEN as we do not always have the time or staff to gather the information or evidence.
<p>Single pupil count</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the fairest method • Nursery schools funded full-time for Year R children in the summer term • Nursery schools admit termly, often means spare places which are filled later in the year. Having staffing levels which respond to pupil numbers will disrupt quality and continuity.
<p>Transition funding</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more detail to make valid judgement • Assume this will apply to PVI settings as well as schools – not clear • Again this suggests various outcomes – this is not a single formula • This would be easier for administration and staffing • No brainer but like voting for your limbs to be cut off gradually rather than all at once!
<p>Schools MFG</p>
<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not qualified to comment.

Further comments

- Nursery schools under threat of being dumbed down, need funding at current levels to retain current quality, concern about deficits in funding but feel PVI settings should also receive realistic funding levels
- Not enough time to consider questionnaire (received 29/06). Document written considering primarily the maintained sector and ignores some different and specific needs of the PVI sector
- We do not have sufficient funds to support an administrator despite being very popular
- Profile of PVI settings needs to be raised / funding linked to qualifications and to assist with administration would help to recruit colleagues of the right calibre
- Distinction need to be made between voluntary and private / independent as the latter are potentially profit making
- If public money is allocated to the PVI sector it should be a requirement to meet the same financial standards as schools
- Most maintained settings have a leadership structure which is not acknowledged in consultation
- If public money is used for children in the PVI sector to improve quality we need to ensure that sufficient monitoring is undertaken to ensure standards rise and action taken if they don't
- Where is the bonus for the quality and availability of outdoor provision?
- Please stop trying to control our business. The NEF covers barely 20% of our pre-school fee income yet takes up to 90% of our curriculum time. How can that be fair?

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Revision to Scheme for Financing Schools and the Fully Funded Bank Account Scheme
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the feedback from schools following the consultation on the proposed revisions to the Scheme for Financing Schools and the Fully Funded Bank Account Scheme.
To gain the Schools Forum approval on the five proposed changes.

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency (if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. That four of the five main changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools and Fully Funded Bank Account Scheme be approved.**
- 2. That a compromise on the proposed date for the return of Fully Funded monthly/quarterly returns of the 10th of each month be agreed as the 15th of each month.**

Background

1. Proposal to formally consult on the revision to the Schemes brought to School Forum on the 29 June 2009. A letter was sent to schools and posted on School website on the 30 June 2009 (Appendix A). The consultation period - 30 June to 31 July 2009.

The main changes Proposed:-

1. Changing the date by which fully funded schools send in either their monthly or quarterly returns to 10th of the month. (Previously 20th of the month)
2. The Budget Plan should be approved by the **FULL** governing body and governors meetings should be arranged in May in order to meet this requirement.
3. Voluntary Aided (VA) Schools should only transfer the 10% contribution to capital works from their LA school budget share to their formula capital bank accounts as and when it is required in order to pay invoices for works done.
4. Any school in receipt of a licensed deficit must return a monthly monitoring report to their School Financial Adviser by 20th of the following month.
5. Revision to the Appendix 'Earmarked Funds' form to take account of the previously agreed addition of 'Consultancy Fees' earned by the Head teacher or Senior Staff of the school.

Feedback from consultation

2. Five Responses were received: One from a Fully Funded Lower, one from a VA/Fully Funded Middle School and three from Fully Funded Upper Schools.
3. There were four responses out of the 48 Fully Funded Schools to the proposal to change the due date of Fully Funded financial returns and one out of the 14 Voluntary Aided Schools response regarding the transfer of Revenue funds to Capital applicable to VA Schools.
4. In relation to the Fully Funded financial returns, two schools requested that the date stayed at the 20th, one very strongly, and two schools appreciated the time pressures for LA officers and requested a compromise of the 15th of the month.
5. In relation to the proposal of a 10% Revenue Contribution, one middle school requested that they be allowed to transfer 10% contribution at the beginning of each financial year. The DCSF direction states that 'Revenue surpluses remain revenue until they are spent', therefore the LA would not be permitted to allow this transfer to take place at the beginning of each financial year.

Appendices:

Appendix A - Letter to schools

APPENDIX A

**The Headteacher and Chair of Governors of
all Central Bedfordshire, Nursery, Lower,
Middle, Upper and Special Schools**

Your ref:

Our ref:

Date: 30th June 2009

Dear Headteacher and Chair of Governors

Central Bedfordshire Council's Scheme for Financing Schools

The Bedfordshire County Council Scheme for Financing Schools was previously adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council; however we are now proposing five main changes to the scheme, which were taken to the Schools Forum on 29th June 2009. The main changes are:-

1. Changing the date by which fully funded schools send in either their monthly or quarterly returns to 10th of the month. (Previously 20th of the month)
2. The Budget Plan should be approved by the **FULL** governing body and governors meetings should be arranged in May in order to meet this requirement.
3. Voluntary Aided (VA) Schools should only transfer the 10% contribution to capital works from their LA school budget share to their formula capital bank accounts as and when it is required in order to pay invoices for works done
4. Any school in receipt of a licensed deficit must return a monthly monitoring report to their School Financial Adviser by 20th of the following month.
5. Revision to the Appendix 'Earmarked Funds' form to take account of the previously agreed addition of 'Consultancy Fees' earned by the Head teacher or Senior Staff of the school.

Other changes made to the Scheme include the date, the change of local authority from Bedfordshire County Council to Central Bedfordshire Council, and the change of any job titles for any directors mentioned in the scheme to reflect their current positions.

A copy of the revised Scheme for Financing Schools is available to download from the schools website

<http://www.schools.bedfordshire.gov.uk/finance/Main%20Central%20Beds%20Bulletin.htm> showing these proposed changes.

Central Bedfordshire Council

Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

Telephone 0300 300 8000

Email customer.services@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

If you have any comments regarding these changes to the scheme, I would be grateful if you could send these in to me by 31st July in order for them to be taken to the next Schools Forum, where the changes will be discussed, amended as appropriate and implemented.

Yours sincerely

Dawn Hill

Finance Manager - Schools

Direct telephone 0300 300 6269

Email dawn.hill@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Surplus Balances
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the School's Surplus Balances

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency (if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To discuss and comment on the latest update from the Surplus Balance Sub Group.**
- 2. That the 27 school exceeding the surplus balance, but below the additional criteria of £10,000 or one percent of the School Budget Share be allowed to retain the surplus balance, be approved.**
- 3. That the four schools where the Sub Group accepted the information supplied in support of the Schools excess balance, be approved.**
- 4. The remaining 15 schools with 'minded to' claw back recommendation be subject to an appeals meeting and brought back to the next meeting.**

Background

1. The Scheme for Financing Schools, Section 4, details the treatment of surplus balances arising in relation to budget shares (Appendix A). Where schools have a surplus balance that exceeds the prescribed thresholds, the Governing Body are required to put in place a financial plan to reduce the surplus to below the threshold. The plan is reviewed and agreed by the Sub Group of the Schools Forum each year and monitored to ensure such surpluses are used appropriately for the benefit of the school. However, If the Sub Group is minded to believe that a school is not retaining the balance for appropriate reasons, then a process will be started to recycle the funds in excess of the threshold.

2. Members of the Surplus Balance Sub Group:

Shirley Anne Crosbie, Headteacher, Glenwood Special
 Ian Greenley, Church of England Diocese Representative
 Malcolm Griffiths, Governor, Eaton Bray Lower
 Richard Holland, Governor, Harlington Upper
 Jim Smart, Headteacher, Shelton Lower

3. The Surplus Balance Sub Group met on the 10 June and 26 June 2009 where 46 out of the 139 Central Bedfordshire Schools balances were presented as being above the agreed thresholds.

4. Further to the School Forum meeting of the 29 June, it was resolved that minutes of the meetings from the Surplus Balance Sub Group would be circulated to all members of the full School Forum, giving the opportunity to review and pass comments on the process followed and recommendations. In particular, to the recommendation, **not** to continue with the additional allowance of £10,000 or 1% of SBS, above the agreed thresholds, that had been previously applied under Bedfordshire County Council. Comments were requested back by the 7 July (Appendix B).

Update on progress

5. Responses were limited to two School Forum members, requesting the additional allowance to stand for the 2008/09 balances. A further letter was sent via the Chairman with particular emphasise to the additional allowance, requesting all forum members to respond either accepting or declining the removal. Responses were requested by the 10 July (Appendix C). Nine further responses were received agreeing the additional allowance should stand for the 2008/2009 balances.

6. Letters have been sent to all 46 schools with an excess surplus balance outlining 'minded to' recommendation, for their return in September: Each letter has been individualised stating the 'minded to' recommendation and detailing any further requirements (See table 1 below). The deadline for further information to be received from schools is the 30 September; failure to submit this information will result in the Sub Group recommending the additional surplus balance to be 'clawed back'.

Table 1

	Total no of Schools in Phase	Total No of Schools Surplus Balance each phase	No of Schools Below Criteria	No of Schools Explanation / Evidence accepted	Schools Recommend no Claw back subject to further information		Schools Recommend for Claw back	
					No	Amount	No	Amount
Nursery	4	2	0	1	1	£ 1,063	0	0
Lower	95	31	19	2	4	£46,216	6	£ 64,395
Middle	24	6	3	0	0	0	3	£151,168
Upper	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Special	6	5	3	1	0	0	1	£ 5,830
Total	139	46	27	4	5	£47,279	10	£221,393

Next Steps

7. The Sub Group is to re-convene on the 1 October to discuss any additional evidence received from the 15 Schools with 'minded to' recommendations. The Sub Groups 'minded to' recommendations will be brought back to the next full School Forum meeting,

Appendices:

- Appendix A – Extract from Scheme for Financing Schools (April 2008 – March 2011)
- Appendix B – Letter from Chairman dated 30 June 2009
- Appendix C – Letter from Chairman dated 9 July 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Extract Scheme for Financing Schools (April 2008 – March 2011)

4. THE TREATMENT OF SURPLUSES AND DEFICIT BALANCES ARISING IN RELATION TO BUDGET SHARES

4.1. The Right to Carry Forward Surplus Balances

Schools may carry forward from one financial year to the next any surplus/deficit in net expenditure relative to the school's budget share for the year plus/minus any balance brought forward from the previous year.

4.2 Reporting On The Intended Use Of Surplus Balances

Surplus balances held by schools as permitted under this scheme are subject to the following restrictions with effect from 1 April 2008:

- a. the Authority shall calculate by 31 May each year the surplus balance, if any, held by each school as at the preceding 31 March. For this purpose the balance will be the recurrent balance as defined in the Consistent Financial Reporting Framework;
- b. the Authority shall deduct from the calculated balance any amounts for which the school has a prior year commitment to pay from the surplus balance and any unspent Standards Fund grant for the previous financial year;
- c. the Authority shall then deduct from the resulting sum any amounts which the governing body of the school has declared to be assigned for specific purposes permitted by the authority, and which the authority is satisfied are properly assigned. To count as properly assigned, amounts must not be retained beyond the period stipulated for the purpose in question, without the consent of the Authority. In considering whether any sums are properly assigned the Authority may also take into account any previously declared assignment of such sums but may not take any change in planned assignments to be the sole reason for considering that a sum is not properly assigned.
- d. if the result of steps a-c is a sum greater than 5% of the current year's budget share for secondary schools, 8% for primary and special schools, or £10,000 (where that is greater than either percentage threshold), then the Authority shall deduct from the

current year's budget share an amount equal to the excess, subject to the review by the Sub Group of the Schools Forum, set out below.

Funds deriving from sources other than the Authority will be taken into account in this calculation if paid into the budget share account of the school, whether under provisions in this scheme or otherwise.

Funds held in relation to a school's exercise of powers under s.27 of the Education Act 2002 (community facilities) will not be taken into account unless added to the budget share surplus by the school as permitted by the Authority.

The total of any amounts deducted from schools' budget shares by the Authority under this provision are to be applied to the Schools Budget of the authority.

To assist the LA in carrying out its financial monitoring role, Governing bodies are required to report to the LA on the use which the school intends to make of surplus balances – after taking account of any earmarked funds, as per the annual CFR return - in cases where the total balance exceeds the threshold's set out in d. above.

Where schools have a surplus balance that exceeds the above thresholds of the School's Budget Share at the financial year end, the Governing Body are required to put in place a financial plan to reduce the surplus to below the threshold.

The plan will be reviewed and agreed by a Sub Group of the Schools Forum, each year and monitored to ensure such surpluses are used appropriately for the benefit of the school.

If the Sub Group of the Schools Forum is minded to believe that a school is not retaining the balance for appropriate reasons, then a process will be started to recycle the funds in excess of the threshold.

The calculation of the excess balance will be notified by a letter in the format of Appendix D1, Schools will also be required to complete the Declaration of Earmarked Funds and Surplus Balances(appendix D2), which must be submitted to the LA and supported by relevant evidence..

Relevant evidence must support B02 Uncommitted Revenue Balances and be in written form and may comprise of:-

- Finance Governors Minutes
- Three year plans
- Projected Pupil Numbers
- Correspondence with Contractors
- Any other relevant information

your reference
our reference
please ask for Dawn Hill
direct line 01234 – 228901
e-mail Dawn.Hill@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
web-site www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
date 30th June 2009

Clive Heaphy
Director of Corporate
Resources
Central Bedfordshire
Council
PO Box 1395
MK42 5AN

Tel: 0300 300 8000

Dear Colleagues

Surplus Balances 2008/2009

At the School Forum meeting of 29th June 2009, it was agreed that the minutes of the meetings from the Surplus Balance Sub Group would be circulated to all members of the full School Forum. This will give you all the opportunity to review and pass comments on the process followed and detailed recommendations. The Sub-group's approach to allowable deductions to the surplus balances is tougher than previous years (i.e. at Bedfordshire CC) – in particular with the recommendation not to continue the additional allowance of 1% of school budget share or £10,000 (whichever the greater).

I would be grateful if all comments could be passed back to me by 7th July (copy to Dawn Hill - Dawn.Hill@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk), in order for a letter to be sent to all schools concerned before the end of term. The Sub-group will need to reconvene to consider those schools below the previous thresholds, if members accept that these should no longer apply.

I have also given you the link to the consultation on the new Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2009 - www.teachernet.gov.uk/schoolfundingframework/. Consultation responses should be sent to Schools.Forums@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk by Friday 28th August 2009

Yours sincerely



Jim Parker
Chairman of Central Bedfordshire Council School Forum

This page is intentionally left blank

your reference
our reference
please ask for Dawn Hill
direct line 01234 – 228901
e-mail Dawn.Hill@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
web-site www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
date 9th July 2009

Clive Heaphy
Director of Corporate
Resources
Central Bedfordshire
Council
PO Box 1395
MK42 5AN

Tel: 0300 300 8000

Dear Colleagues

Surplus Balances 2008/2009

Further to my letter of the 30th June 2009 and the circulation of the Surplus Balance Sub Group minutes, I have only had responses from two forum members. The feedback so far requests that the £10,000 or 1% of SBS threshold is not removed for the balances for 2008/2009 and that all 139 Central Bedfordshire Schools should be advised before the criteria is changed. It is, therefore, proposed by the two members that this change takes place for 2009/10 balances.

Schools would have been allowed 5% for Middle and Upper Sectors, or 8% for all other phases of School Budget Share, as a surplus revenue balance, excluding Earmarked funds. The threshold of £10,000 or 1% of SBS is in addition to this and has been seen in previous years as an additional cushion. If the forum agree for the threshold to be in place a further year this would reduce the number of schools under scrutiny from 46 to 19.

I would be grateful if all forum members could respond either accepting or declining the removal of this additional threshold.

Responses are urgently required by the 10th July (Dawn.Hill@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk) to ensure all schools concerned receive notification before schools break for the Summer term. If you have any queries, Dawn can be contacted on tel 01234 228901.

Yours sincerely



Jim Parker
Chairman of Central Bedfordshire Council School Forum

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Update from the Technical Funding Sub Group
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on initial meeting of the Technical Funding Sub Group.

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency
(if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. that the progress report be received.

Background

1. It was resolved at the meeting of the 29 June 2009 that a Technical Sub Group should be formed to look at specific areas of formula funding changes. It was further proposed that this group initially reviews:
 - a review of the thresholds for deprivation funding and where this should include a tapering element;
 - a review of 'ghost funding' to establish whether this factor need a tapering element; and
 - a factor where a significant number of armed forces pupils are present and have significant mobility, outside of natural transition stages.
2. Members:

Neil Bramwell, Headteacher Stratton Upper
Shirley Anne Crosbie, Headteacher, Glenwood Special
Jim Smart, Headteacher, Shelton Lower School.

It was felt that further representation would be required to ensure all sectors are represented and therefore, Ian Mitchell (Middle Schools representative) and Ian Greenley (non-schools representative) were contacted and requested to participate.

Update

3. The first of the meetings was held on the 13 July 2009 (Minutes - Appendix A)

The three initial reviews were discussed (Deprivation, Ghost Funding and Armed Forces pupil) and resolved that during the summer break further research would take place regarding Service Personnel and benchmarking statistics, and modelling on possible options for 'Ghost Funding' and Deprivation.

The findings are to be brought back to the Technical Funding Sub group mid September with recommendation to the main School Forum at the next meeting.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Minutes of meeting 13 July 2009

TECHNICAL FUNDING SUB-GROUP OF SCHOOLS FORUM – 13th July 2009 – Notes & Further Action

Members Present

Neil Bramwell (Upper School)
Jim Smart (Lower School)

Apologies

Ian Greenley (Diocese)

Members not Present

Shirley-Anne Crosbie (Special School)
Middle School Representative (Ian Mitchell invited, no response)

Officers Present

Kevin Green
Dawn Hill
Gezim Leka

INTRODUCTION

- The Sub-Group was established the previous School Forum, to examine, report back and make recommendations to the Children's Families and Learning Directorate Management Team and the full Schools' Forum.
- Neil Bramwell and Shirley-Anne Crosbie volunteered at the SF meeting and this was agreed. It was also suggested that Jim Smart be invited to attend. Officers were concerned that 3 members was not sufficient representation, particularly if not all were available for a meeting. It was agreed through the SF Chair to invite 2 further members 1) Ian Greenley who had previously at on the Deprivation Review Sub-Group and represents cross phase and 2) a middle school representative. Ray Payne felt he could not commit to another group and Ian Mitchell was invited.
- The initial remit of the group was to look at 3 particular issues
 - Significant mobility outside of natural transition stages for children of services personnel
 - "ghost funding" tapering (current "cliff-edge" funding)
 - Deprivation – thresholds and tapering (current "cliff-edge" funding)
- The purpose of the meeting was to look at the above issues and scope work to be carried out by finance over the summer, with a further meeting early next term. An update should go to the next SF, with any recommendations to SF for 2010-11 to be made to this meeting, or January meeting at the latest. When considering the timing of any changes the Sub-group/DLT/SF would need to consider the impact on indicative budgets already issued for 2010-11, as well as any changes from 2009-10. The national review of DSG distribution to LAs would also need to be taken into account, in respect of specific factors and any central direction (e.g. re deprivation funding)

CHILDREN OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

- Representations have been made from Campton Lower School, with regards the high level of pupil mobility, outside of normal transitions. There is correspondence from the Headteacher setting out the consequences of this and dealing with service children generally. KG referred to a useful paper from CEAS (Children’s Education Advisory Bureau) of MOD – KG will try and get hold of the relevant paper. KG referred to some benchmarking carried previously at BCC.
- The Campton Lower head would be happy to address a future meeting if needed.
- The Sub-Group agreed that there should be further research over the summer and the next meeting to consider the educational case, benchmarking and any associated costing at the next meeting.

“GHOST” FUNDING

- Currently “Ghost” Funding is given for pupils aged 4 to 6, to the next multiple of 30. This can create a “cliff-edge” with say 31 pupils plus 29 “ghost places” one year, followed by 30 pupils, no “ghost places”, with a loss of some £30-£40k of funding. In theory a school should need one less teacher, in these circumstances.
- The Sub-Group had some discussion on what the appropriate transition funding might be. This was agreed to be 5/12 (approximation 40%) – being the funding April to August in the year of decrease. The school should be aware of the ghost funding impact from their January PLASC. This transitional funding would give the school until the start of the school year to make alternative staffing arrangements, if necessary.
- The Sub-Group agreed that finance should model options to:-
 - Calculate 40% transition paid from AWPU (all pupils, lower school pupils or 4-6 year old pupils)
 - Calculate 40% transition paid from the “ghost” funding “pot”. This amount is the historic amount available for this funding factor, uplifted for inflation.
 - The Sub-Group also requested that “Ghost” Funding be modelled based on a per pupil calculation, rather than dividing a specific “pot”. It was agreed that this would be based on M6 (top of scale for qualified teacher) plus on-costs divided by 30. Similar transition arrangements would be modelled, as above. (The Sub-Group was keen where possible to move from specific amounts for factors, divided by eligible pupils, to a fixed per pupil amount – with a transparent rationale such as this.)

DEPRIVATION

- There were 2 separate but linked issues re. the thresholds for deprivation, based on Acorn Factors 4 and 5:-
 - A threshold of 20% was applied to each factor. This creates anomalies e.g. schools could have thresholds close to both thresholds and not receive any funding, alternatively they could breach one threshold and be very low on the other and receive substantial funding. The Sub-Group agreed that modelling should be carried out based on a combined weighted threshold of 25% (being all of category 5 and 1/3 category 4, this is consistent with the funding weighting of 3:1).
 - The thresholds provide “cliff-edged” funding is that they are absolute (all or nothing). The Sub-Group agreed that modelling should be carried out on tapering whereby if full funding is at the 25% threshold and above 24.00% to 24.99% would be at 90% funding, 23.00 to 23.99 would be at 80% etc etc ..to 16.00% to 16.99% would be at 10% funding.
 - One issue around percentage thresholds was that this seemed to work against larger (mainly upper) schools, with a mixed intake from a variety of socio-economic areas e.g. e.g. it was felt that at least 7 of 10 uppers had sufficient numbers of children in Acorn categories 4 & 5 to receive some deprivation funding, at least via tapering (the exceptions being Cedars, Harlington and Redbourne - there was a recognisable gap that could lead to the conclusion that if any upper school was to be excluded it would be them).
 - The Sub-Group requested a model that followed the child i.e. per pupil funding for all Acorn category 4 and 5 children. It is understood that this could well provide too much turbulence to indicative figures for 2010-11, but may be something that can be moved towards over time.
 - An alternative to the above would be a model which funds 50% based on the combined weighted threshold, with tapering and 50% to follow the pupil. Again, this may need to be done over time.
- Further discussion was around rural deprivation, being particularly applicable to Central Bedfordshire and whether this was sufficiently measured by Acorn. Acorn, like many indices is constructed by a “basket” of measures (around 60). A new, well received index produced by the DCSF is the Tax Credit deprivation indicator, which is now being used by some LAs. It came out too late for the Bedfordshire deprivation review. A review of the relevant indices would be a substantial undertaking, but should possibly be timed with the national formula review outcomes for 2011-12 onwards.

NEXT MEETING

- TBA (early September).

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Schools Specific Contingency Budget
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the use of the Schools Contingency Budget.

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency (if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To discuss and comment on the position statement as at Period 4 July.**
- 2. To approve that the additional funding of the responsibility points for Head-teachers managing additional units and contributions to awards are not to be funded from Schools Contingency.**

Background

1. The Schools Specific Contingency Budget has been previously employed to fund the following:
 - Rent and Joint Use equalisation charge;
 - Rates adjustments that have arisen from re-valuations or an adjustment to original formula – equalisation charges;
 - Funding of exceptional circumstances, with up to £10,000 delegated to the Director of Children’s Services;
 - Attendance Manager post;
 - Floor Area adjustments to the initial allocation of SBS. No in year adjustments are made;

- DSG Shortfall;
- Redundancy/Safeguarding costs;
- Additional pupil numbers;
- Headteacher Re-imburement for managing additional responsibilities (2008/09);
- Hearing Impaired – Parkfields (£1,672), Toddington St George (£1,761) Language Provision – Lark Rise (£1,720); and
- Contribution to award at Vandyke Upper School £400.

2. At the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum on 2 March 2009, the following budgets were agreed as:

- £500,000 General Contingency;
- £270,000 SEN Contingency; and
- £200,840 to finance the shift of funding between the two new unitary authorities arising from the Special Schools Funding Formula review This will apply to 2009-10 and 2010-11 only, thereafter the new national formula for DSG distribution will be in place.

Total Budget agreed for 2009/10 £970,840

3. The School Contingency carry forward share from Bedfordshire County Council, as at 31 March 2009 is £671,100 which is to be split into General and SEN Contingency

General	£283,260
SEN	£387,840 (of which £218,767 earmarked for Oakbank building project)

General Contingency Spend to 31 July 2009

	BUDGET £	SPEND £	BALANCE £
Carry Forward from 2008/2009	283,260		
Budget Allocation 2009/10	500,000		
Attendance Manager Post		40,000	
Floor Area Adjustment		6,880	
Rates Adjustments		-2,990	
DSG Adjustment		4,000	
NQT Adjustment		1,594	
Teacher Threshold Adjustment		-1,187	
LACSEG		444	
Total General Contingency	783,260	48,741	734,519

- 5.
- As agreed by the School Forum, 2 March 2009, to fund through contingency a further years trial (2009/10) period for an Attendance Manager post to a total cost of £40,000 but to be self funded through the buy back arrangements for 2010/11.
 - Floor Area adjustments to the initial allocation of SBS.
 - Rates adjustments have arisen from re-valuations or an adjustment to original formula.
 - DSG shortfall of £4,000. Final settlement less than budgeted (1 pupil).
 - An adjustment to the initial allocation of funding for NQT.
 - Refund on the funding of Teacher Threshold.
 - Academy costs (LACSEG) £444. Revised estimate of DSG withheld for Northfield's Academy.

SEN Contingency Spend to 31 July 2009

	BUDGET £	SPEND £	BALANCE £
Carry Forward from 2008/2009	387,840		
Budget Allocation 2009/10	270,000		
Total SEN Contingency	657,840	NIL	657,840

- The recurrent budget of £270,000 is the balance of the former allocation to Rainbow School (now closed), where it was agreed that the funding would be retained for SEN provision.

Special Schools Spend to 31 July 2009

	BUDGET £	SPEND £	BALANCE £
Carry Forward from 2008/2009	NIL		
Budget Allocation 2009/10	200,840		
Unitary Authority Shift		200,840	
Total SEN Contingency	200,840	200,840	NIL

Appendices:

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: School Forum Budget
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the use of the Schools Forum Budget.

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency
(if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To discuss and comment on the position statement as at Period 4 July.**

Background

1. Paragraph 13 of the Constitution and Terms of Reference, agreed by the Shadow Executive sets out the following:

‘A budget of £10,000 will be available for each financial year for costs associated with the operation of the Forum e.g. venue hire, expenses and clerking costs’. The level of the budget would be reviewed annually.

It was resolved at the School Forum meeting on 2 March 2009 to set a budget for the Schools’ Forum for 2009/10 of £5,000.

Expenditure to Date

2. It was resolved at the School Forum meeting on 2 March 2009 that Central Bedfordshire becomes a member of the F40 Group, representing the lowest funded LAs and that £2,000 from the Schools Forum budget be utilised for the annual subscription.

Balance remaining £3,000.

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Use of Harnessing Technology funding to support transition to web based MIS in schools
Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children, Families and Learning
Summary: To agree use of Harnessing Technology funding to support transition to web MIS.

Contact Officer: Cathy Piotrowski, ICT/MIS, Learning & Support
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency (if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To approve the recommendation that Harnessing Technology funding is used to support schools in the transition to a web based Management Information System (MIS).**

Background

1. There is a national requirement for schools to integrate their management information systems (MIS) with the learning platform (VLE) and to provide online reporting to parents (Secondaries from 2010, Primaries from 2012). The data requirements for online reporting are prescribed to include attainment, progress, attendance, behaviour and special educational needs where appropriate.

These data integration and online reporting requirements offer an opportunity for the local authority to take an innovative and co-ordinated approach to MIS development.

The e-Learning Strategy team has consulted with schools on an MIS strategy for schools and the LA which:

- a) responds comprehensively to the challenge of these national requirements;
- b) supports the developing Transforming Learning and Teaching agenda;
- c) recognises the need for appropriate, timely data in effective monitoring, analysis, decision-making and intervention; and

- d) promotes online reporting for senior management teams in schools and for local authority staff to support the authority's key objectives of narrowing the gap and raising attainment.

This MIS strategy advocates two key objectives:

- i) establish one web-based MIS system for all schools which will, in due course integrate with the learning platform and with the local authority's Tribal central pupil database; and
- ii) achieve online reporting for parents via the learning platform, i.e that parents alongside their children access the same learning platform for information irrespective of which school the pupils attend.

- 2. There are two main management information systems in use in schools (Sims.net and Integris). Schools have traditionally paid for their MIS from their own school budgets. The main MIS holds standardised pupil and attendance data. Assessment, behaviour and SEN data are held in a variety of different software.

Contractual arrangements, individual preferences, transition and ongoing maintenance costs, and in some cases, resistance to change, have been prohibitive factors for schools in switching suppliers/systems and achieving best value for money.

Update on progress

- 3. We are now approaching the end of a year long consultation period with schools. Feedback from this consultation suggests that the Lower/Nursery phase schools are in a far more ready state of acceptance of the need to transfer to a web MIS than the Middle/Upper phases. Additionally, web MIS for the primary sector is far better developed and tested than that for the secondary environment. Upper schools will not transfer to a web MIS unless all the critical functionality is available (eg; timetabling; exams).

Schools also reported their reluctance to change without effective central support from the LA to deal with transition and training needs. Many schools are not prepared to take on the high level of risk associated with implementing a change of MIS system on their own as an individual organisation when they are reliant upon their MIS to perform a number of statutory returns each term.

Schools also acknowledged that data and access security is of paramount importance. The technical expertise required to appropriately manage the security aspects of data integration and accessibility cannot be realistically resourced by each individual school.

- 4. Currently, work is being undertaken to renew the schools broadband network. It is envisaged that this work will be completed by December 2009. This new network will give all schools a unique connection to the core allowing greater bandwidth and better resilience.

The majority of lower schools and all the nursery schools use the classic Integris software as their main MIS. It is anticipated that software development for this MIS will cease from Summer 2010.

5. The MIS Strategy objectives and intended outcomes were presented to the by the CFL Management Team meeting on 11th August 2009. The meeting approved the strategy and agreed that a portion of the Harnessing Technology Grant should be used to fund the transition costs on behalf of schools for the first year to help schools with the transition.

It was also agreed that implementation of a web MIS for the lower and nursery phases should be pursued in the first instance. A review of the web MIS software for the secondary phase will be undertaken once suitably tested software is available.

The retained element of the Harnessing Technology Grant for 2009-2010 amounts to £705K. It is envisaged that an approximate cost of implementing a web MIS for Lower and Nursery schools will be in the region of £155K. This amount falls within the savings accrued since April 2009 through negotiation with suppliers for aggregated purchasing.

Harnessing Technology Grant

6. The Harnessing Technology Grant is directed by BECTA on behalf of the DCSF and is designed to support a step change in the way technology is used to improve and develop services in response to the needs of children and young people.

The fund is explicitly for supporting purchases of ICT infrastructure and equipment or upgrades, as well as software and digital curriculum resources according to local priorities. As a reminder of the scope in which the funding can be used to achieve ICT targets, the spend criteria is reproduced below for information:

- Broadband services
- Learning Platforms, email services and personal storage areas
- Simplified sign-on for users
- Parental reporting
- Integration of learning and management systems
- High quality digital learning resources
- ICT Mark and Self-Review Framework

7. In March 2008, the Schools Forum (under the previous Bedfordshire County Council authority) approved the recommendation for the LA to retain 60% of the Harnessing Technology funding to allow for greater efficiencies from aggregated purchasing on behalf of schools for the 3 year funding cycle.

The Harnessing Technology Grant has funded the purchase of the Netmedia learning platform for all schools and the deployment of central support resources to help schools effectively implement and develop this step change in teaching and learning.

Notably, the LA has achieved national recognition for this approach.

8. The initial investment in securing a single MIS system as a single, uniform and consistent data source for all Lower schools will help to maximise benefits of future investments with regard to achieving data integration, single sign-on and parental reporting. Taking this approach will also maximise benefits for majority of schools and for the local authority in achieving economies of scale through joint working.

Using the Harnessing Technology funding for this purpose will also meet BECTA's recommendations in the following areas:

- purchasing carried out at a local authority level achieves better value;
- schools are best supported when 'buying in' to a managed service based solution which incorporates support for transition, implementation, helpdesk support and maintenance;
- schools can focus valuable school resources on teaching and learning rather than managing and supporting ICT; and
- joint ownership between the schools and the LA of the management and co-ordination of software development to achieve better efficiency and effectiveness in linking MIS to raising standards.

Next Steps

9. Once Harnessing Technology funding is secured:
- a decision is made as to the most appropriate web MIS for lower schools;
 - a Project Initiation Document which outlines the transition plans is drafted;
 - resources for central support; and
 - commence a phased implementation.

Appendices: None

Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: 28 September 2009
Subject: Position Statement on Central Bedfordshire Council FMSiS Assessments & Benchmarking Data
Report of: Audit Manager- Internal Audit
Summary: To update the Schools Forum on the current position with regards to schools that have passed the FMSiS and further actions taken since the last Schools Forum meeting.

Contact Officer: Roger Willoughby, Audit Manager – Internal Audit
Public/Exempt: Public
Wards Affected: All
Function of: Council
Reason for urgency (if appropriate)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. To discuss and comment on the position statement and agreed actions from last Schools Forum.**

Background

1. The Forum was presented with a position statement in June 2009 on the progress of the Authority in assessing schools against the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS). Since then, further assessments have been completed and actions agreed with the Forum in June 2009 have been implemented, namely an attempt to benchmark against other authorities to ascertain the relative position of the pass rate for schools in Central Bedfordshire in relation to the rest of the country, and the 'scheduling' of assessments of schools scheduled for 2009-10.

Current position

2. The summary table below indicates the current status of Central Bedfordshire Council's schools in terms of passing the FMSiS. Assessments are completed by Internal Audit and Schools Finance staff. Please note that Northfields Technology College is now an Academy and no longer subject to FMSiS compliance, hence the number of schools has been reduced from 139 to 138.

	Status at 10.9.09	As percentage of schools programmed for assessment	Status at 29.6.09 (previous update)	Comments
Pass	57	53%	46	This includes schools that have previously failed
Fail	19	18%	17	Due for reassessment in 2009-10
Assessments in progress	32	29%	46	This includes schools that have previously failed
Total assessments completed or in progress (pre- 2009-10)	108	100%	109	
Schools due for assessment in 2009-10	30		30	
Total CBC Schools	138		139	This excludes 2009-10 reassessments

3. Overall 14 assessments have been fully completed since the last update to the Schools Forum, and a further 12 are substantially complete (these are identified as 'Awaiting Review' or 'Conditional Pass' in the attached Appendix A). This means that only 21 'in progress' assessments have still to be completed, and these can now be progressed with the start of the new school term.

Current Approach to Assessments

4. In the context of the progress reported above, it is also worth mentioning that the 'two- stage' assessment approach currently utilised by Central Bedfordshire has evolved as a result of the poor quality of evidence provided by some schools and the absence of any funding for the reassessment of schools which do not meet the Standard. In essence this means that, without compromising the Standard required of schools, every attempt is made to give schools the opportunity to meet the Standard at the first attempt. Many are given opportunities to submit further evidence, clarify existing evidence and implement processes which are not already in place and this can delay the completion of the assessments by up to several weeks. In addition, the poor quality of evidence provided in some cases, and a failure to cross reference the evidence thoroughly, often leads to assessments taking longer than the 4 day budget.
5. Further FMSiS training has been arranged for schools and updated guidance on the Central Bedfordshire Council Schools Finance website has been made available. It is hoped that these mechanisms will help schools provide a better quality portfolio of evidence and facilitate the completion of the assessments within the required 4 day budget.

Schedule for 2009-10

6. The 2009-10 schedule of assessments includes a further 30 schools that have yet to be assessed. Further to discussions at the last Schools Forum in June 2009, we have attempted to schedule these assessments to try to avoid a bottleneck at the end of the financial year, when traditionally most schools

have submitted their evidence for assessment. To date we have confirmed submission dates in writing with 50 of the 57 schools due to be assessed in 2009-10 (this includes the 30 schools noted in the table above, plus 12 schools that have not submitted evidence previously and a further 7 schools that have recently been assessed and failed, and 8 Upper Schools due for reassessment). The remainder are in the process of being contacted at the start of the Autumn Term 2009 and scheduled as far as possible.

7. Of those schools with whom a submission date has been agreed, 17 have confirmed that they will not be in a position to be assessed before the end of March 2010. The other schools have agreed submission deadlines ranging from the Autumn Term half term break (end October 2009) to 31 March 2010.

Benchmarking against other Local Authorities

8. There is no recognised national forum at which local authorities discuss and compare their approach to FMSiS. However, the Assistant Director (Audit & Risk) and Audit Manager attended a Home Counties Chief Internal Auditor Group (HCCIAG) on 15 July which was dedicated to discussion of various aspects of FMSiS. Many of the 25 or so authorities that attended had provided the HCCIAG with the data from the CFO Assurance Statement at 31/3/09 including the number of schools meeting the Standard. The forum identified primarily that these authorities have adopted diverse approaches to completing the schedule of schools to be assessed, depending on:
 - the mechanisms of assurance required by the LA's Section 151 Officer
 - the number of schools under the LA's jurisdiction
 - the resources available
 - the existing schedule of financial audits of schools.
9. These variables mean that comparison of pass/ fail rates are very difficult. Some authorities reported a 'pass' rate of close to 100%, but in many cases this includes schools that are considered to have met the Standard without external assessment, and in some cases relies on self assessments combined with other assurance mechanisms. One authority reported a 'pass' rate of close to zero, and again this is likely to be due to the LA's approach rather than a wholesale failure on the part of their schools to meet the Standard.

Summary and Conclusions

- Substantial progress has been made against the current backlog since the previous update to the Schools Forum; 14 assessments have been finalised and a further 12 substantially completed.
- Training for schools has been arranged with regards to the FMSiS assessment criteria and the evidence required. This supplements previous enhancements to the guidance to schools on the CBC Schools Finance website.

- The majority of schools scheduled for assessment during 2009-10 have been notified in writing of their scheduled submission date following discussions with the Headteacher.
- A 'high level' benchmarking exercise has been completed, and the exercise has highlighted the need for Central Bedfordshire to evaluate its current approach to the assessment process in consultation with the Director of Corporate Resources and the Director of Children, Families and Learning within the framework of the factors listed above.

Appendices:

Appendix A - Schedule of Central Bedfordshire Council Schools and FMSiS Status

School	Status at 9.9.09	Notes / Comments
BROOKLANDS MIDDLE	Pass	
CEDARS UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
CHALTON LOWER	Pass	
EDWARD PEAKE MIDDLE	Pass	
GILBERT INGLEFIELD	Pass	
HAYNES LOWER	Pass	
LEIGHTON MIDDLE	Pass	
MILL VALE MIDDLE	Pass	
PRIORY MIDDLE	Pass	
SHILLINGTON LOWER	Pass	
ST LEONARDS LOWER	Pass	
STREETFIELD MIDDLE	Pass	
SWALLOWFIELD LOWER	Pass	
ALL SAINTS LOWER	Pass	
ARNOLD MIDDLE	Pass	
ARDLEY HILL LOWER	Pass	
ASHTON MIDDLE	Pass	
ASHTON ST PETERS	Pass	
BEECROFT LOWER	Pass	
BREWERS HILL	Pass	
GOTHIC MEDE LOWER	Pass	
HARLINGTON UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
HENLOW MIDDLE	Pass	
HOLYWELL MIDDLE	Pass	
KINGS HOUGHTON MIDDLE	Pass	
KINGSMOOR LOWER	Pass	
LABURNUM LOWER	Pass	
LANGFORD LOWER	Pass	
MANSHEAD UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
PARKFIELDS MIDDLE	Pass	
QUEENSBURY UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
RAMSEY MANOR LOWER	Pass	
RAYNSFORD LOWER	Pass	
REDBORNE UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
ROBERT BLOOMFIELD MIDDLE	Pass	
SAMUEL WHITBREAD UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
SANDY UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
SANDYE PLACE MIDDLE	Pass	
SOUTHCOTT LOWER	Pass	
ST GEORGE LOWER TODDINGTON	Pass	
ST MARYS LOWER STOTFOLD	Pass	
ST SWITHUNS LOWER	Pass	
STRATTON UPPER	Pass	
VANDYKE UPPER	Pass	Due for Reassessment 2009-10
WESTONING LOWER	Pass	
WILLOW NURSERY	Pass	Discretionary compliance
CRANFIELD LOWER	Pass	
POTTON LOWER	Pass	
STONDON LOWER	Pass	
THE FIRS LOWER	Pass	
WOODLAND MIDDLE	Pass	
BURGOYNE MIDDLE	Pass	
CAMPTON LOWER	Pass	
LINSLADE MIDDLE	Pass	

MOGGERHANGER LOWER	Pass	
SILSOE LOWER	Pass	
ROECROFT LOWER	Pass	Conditional Pass

Total 57

ASPLEY GUISE LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
BEAUDESERT LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
CHURCH END LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
CLIPSTONE BROOK LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
DOVERY DOWN LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
DOWNSIDE LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
FULBROOK MIDDLE	In progress (Int Audit)	Conditional Pass
GREENFIELD LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
GREENLEAS LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
HADRIAN LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
HARLINGTON LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	Conditional Pass
HEATHWOOD LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	Conditional Pass
HOCKLIFFE LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
HOUGHTON REGIS LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	Awaiting Review
ICKNIELD LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	Conditional Pass
LANCOT LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
LAWNSIDE LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
MAPLE TREE LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
MAULDEN LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
ROBERT PEEL LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
RUSSELL LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Conditional Pass
SOUTHLANDS LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
ST ANDREWS LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
STANBRIDGE LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
TEMPLEFIELD LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
TITHE FARM LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
TOTTERNHOE LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
LARK RISE LOWER	In progress (Int Audit)	
SHEFFORD LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
ST MARYS LOWER CLOPHILL	In progress (Int Audit)	Awaiting Review
HAWTHORN PARK LOWER	In progress (Bursary)	
ETONBURY MIDDLE	Not started (Int Audit)	Submitted 2009-10 not started

Total 32

DUNTON LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
EVERSHOLT LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
EVERTON LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
FAIRFIELD LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
GLENWOOD SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
GRAVENHURST LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
HILLCREST SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
HITCHMEAD SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
HUSBORNE CRAWLEY LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
JOHN DONNE LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
KENSWORTH LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
NORTHILL LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
OAK BANK SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
PULLOXHILL LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
RIDGMONT LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
SHELTON LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
SOUTHILL LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10

STUDHAM LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
SUNDON LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
SUNNYSIDE SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
SUTTON LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
WEATHERFIELD SPECIAL	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
WOBURN LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
WRESTLNGWORTH LOWER	Not yet assessed	Due 2009-10
HOUGHTON CONQUEST LOWER	Not yet assessed	Deferred to 2009-10 from 2008-09
MARY BASSETT LOWER	Not yet assessed	Deferred to 2009-10 from 2008-09
ST CHRISTOPHERS LOWER	Not yet assessed	Deferred to 2009-10 from 2008-09
ARLESEY NURSERY	Not yet assessed	Discretionary compliance- due 2009-10
THE LAWNS NURSERY	Not yet assessed	Discretionary compliance- due 2009-10
WESTFIELD NURSERY	Not yet assessed	Discretionary compliance- due 2009-10

Total 30

THOMAS JOHNSON LOWER	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
WATLING LOWER	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
HOLMEMEAD MIDDLE	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
CALDECOTE LOWER	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
PULFORD LOWER	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
ALAMEDA MIDDLE	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
MEPPERSHALL LOWER	Fail	Due 2009-10 Reassessment
EATON BRAY LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
FLITWICK LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
CADDINGTON VILLAGE	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
LEEDON LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
LINSLADE LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
SLIP END LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
ST GEORGES LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
ST MARYS LOWER DUNSTABLE	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
ST VINCENTS LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
THORNHILL LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
DERWENT LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10
THOMAS WHITEHEAD LOWER	Fail (non- submission)	Due 2009-10

Total 19

Total number of schools 138

This page is intentionally left blank