

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

Date:	16 October 2013	AGENDA ITEM: 05
Title:	Service Proposals	
Responsible officer:	Angela Wellings, Head of Education and Childcare Services	
Contact officer:	Angela Wellings, Head of Education and Childcare Services	Tel: 01628 683529 E-mail: Angela.wellings@rbwm.gov.uk

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 This paper presents four proposals to Schools Forum on the use of the £956k Dedicated Schools Grant surplus. This surplus has arisen from accumulated underspends brought forward from previous years.
- 1.2 **Schools Forum members are asked to comment and offer advice to the Director and Lead Member for Children's Services on the four proposals for the use of the Dedicated Schools Grant surplus, described in detail in Appendices 1-4.**

2 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT SURPLUS

- 2.1 On 16 July 2013 Schools Forum received a report on the 2012-13 Schools Block Budget outturn. This identified an accumulated non-recurring surplus of £956k (see table 1):

Table 1 Dedicated Schools Grant surplus	£000
DSG accumulated surplus at 31 March 2012	£1,025
Funding to support 2012-13 school block budget (£500k) and in-year allocations to schools and PVI ¹ (£317k)	(£817)
2012-13 underspend on central expenditure	<u>£1,248</u>
Surplus remaining at 31 Mar 2013	£1,456
Funding to support 2013-14 schools block budget	<u>(£500)</u>
DSG surplus still to be allocated	<u>£956</u>

- 2.2 In March 2013 Forum members agreed a budget that committed £500k of the £1,456k surplus remaining at 31 March 2013 to supplement the 2013-14 DSG allocation in support of central expenditure and schools' delegated budgets. At the time some members of the Forum highlighted the risk of using one-off funding to support recurring expenditure. Discontinuing this level of budget support in 2014-15 would mean having to find savings of £500k from central expenditure and delegated budgets in the 2014-15 Schools Budget² (whilst continuing to ensure funding protection for schools under the Minimum Funding Guarantee). This reduction will therefore be taken in two stages, £250k from the base

¹ The £317k was the first of two such allocations in 2012-13. The second allocation of £300k was made in March 2013, and funded from the 2012-13 DSG allocation, not from the brought forward surplus.

² The Schools Budget comprises both delegated individual schools' budgets (the ISB) and central expenditure in the Schools, Early Years and High Needs Blocks.

budget in 2014-15, and a further £250k in 2015-16. This approach reduces the overall surplus from £956k to £706k, see table 2.

- 2.3 New schools finance legislation no longer allows ‘in-year budget redeterminations’. This change rules out in-year direct allocations to schools such as those made in 2012-13. DSG surpluses brought forward from previous years can be carried forward to the next funding period and allocated to schools via the funding formula, or they can be used in-year to support central expenditure in the schools, early years or high needs blocks.

3 PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Schools Forum is asked to comment on and support the four proposals:

- Capacity building for 2 year old provision
- Support for a replacement IT network in schools
- Support for narrowing the attainment gap of children in care
- School to school support for education improvement

- 3.2 Details of the proposals are set out in appendices 1-4. The estimated cost of these proposals is summarised in table 2:

Table 2: Summary of proposals

	£000	£000
DSG surplus available for allocation (see table1)		956
Funding to support 2014-15 schools block budget		<u>(250)</u>
Remaining funding available		706
Proposal 1: Capacity building for 2 year old provision (see para 3.4)	88	
Proposal 2: Support for a replacement IT network in schools	291	
Proposal 3: Support for narrowing the attainment gap of children in care	100	
Proposal 4: School to school support for education improvement	<u>200</u>	<u>(679)</u>
Balance remaining		<u>27</u>

- 3.3 The proposals comply with the guidance on the use of DSG surpluses. The funding will be managed centrally and may include expenditure on reimbursing schools for expenses incurred on specific initiatives. The proposals also take account of the one-off nature of the funding available and avoid locking RBWM into unsustainable long-term financial commitments.
- 3.4 Appendix 1 refers to a total funding requirement of £188k for building capacity for 2 year old provision (proposal 1). It is proposed that only £88k of this will be funded from the DSG surplus, and £100k from an underspend on the 2013-14 budget for 2 year old provision resulting from the current low levels of take-up.
- 3.5 Any eventual underspends on DSG central expenditure budgets in 2013-14 will be added to the remaining £27k surplus and allocated in 2014-15 following consultation with Schools Forum.

Proposal 1:	FUNDING EXPANSION OF TWO YEAR OLD FREE ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMME		
Responsible officer:	Angela Wellings, Head of Education & Childcare		
Contact officer:	Rita Vasa, Ian Povey	Tel:	01628 796534
		E-mail	Rita.vasa@rbwm.gov.uk

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 To support the expanding 2 year old free entitlement programme to ensure every eligible two year old child living in RBWM is given the very best opportunity to develop and learn.
- 1.2 Funds will be used to build additional provider capacity in readiness for the second phase of the programme in September 2014 (when the number of eligible children increases from 20% to 40%), to give essential support to the parents/families of the eligible 2 year old children and to raise the quality of childcare in providers that offer free places for eligible 2 year olds.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Schools Forum is requested to approve £187,500 spend of DSG (£100k from the DSG Surplus and £87,500 from the underspend in the 2 year old EYSFF free entitlement budget) to be spent on :
 - £112,500 to increase staff resource (on a fixed term basis) within the Early Years Team. These staff will be dedicated to the expansion of the 2 year old free entitlement programme to comply with our statutory obligation to secure places for all RBWM eligible 2 year old children.
 - £75,000 to cover costs including promoting and marketing the entitlement to parents, expanding capacity and improving the quality of provision of providers taking eligible 2 year olds.

3 EXISTING 2 YEAR OLD BUDGET

- 3.1 At its meeting in March , Schools Forum members agreed the allocation of the 2013-14 Schools Budget for the eligible 2 year olds, see Table 1.

Table 1: CURRENT Allocation of the Increase in DSG arising for the implementation of the Free Entitlement for 2 Year olds		
Total available to fund 2 year old free entitlement		£616,380
Staffing		£80,000
Funding used to support other expenditure commitments within the DSG		£187,395
Total		£883,775

- 3.2 Agreement was also given to increase the hourly rate paid to providers and a new rate of £5.30 was introduced from the 1st April 2013.

- 3.3 The RBWM 2013-14 Revenue Allocation (to fund statutory places for up to 20% of the Borough's most disadvantaged two year old children) was based on an estimate of 203 eligible children taking up their full annual entitlement of 570 hours at an hourly rate of £5.48. This compared to the national average funding rate of £5.09. This provided headroom, within the budget, to set a higher rate but officers had concerns about the longer term sustainability of setting a higher rate because funding was moving from place funding to a participation basis in 2015/16.

It was also agreed that any underspend against the agreed budget for provision of the free entitlement for 2 year olds is ring fenced for 2 year old providers.

- 3.4 Members of Schools Forum will recall that the overall increase in funding was not fully deployed in support of Two Year Old Free Entitlement. This is because officers considered that the numbers of children taking up the new free 2 year old entitlement will be fewer than is provided for in the Borough's DSG settlement and £187,395 was allocated to support other DSG commitments.
- 3.5 The take up so far this year has been, as expected, lower than the DfE estimates (see paragraph 5 below) and this report puts forward proposals for using part of the underspend in the 2 year old free entitlement budget.
- 3.6 The use of DSG to support the provision of free early education through spend other than that passed to providers through the hourly EYSFF rate is within the LA's discretion subject to Schools Forum agreement.

4 BACKGROUND TO TWO YEAR OLD FREE ENTITLEMENT

- 4.1 Free early education became a statutory entitlement for eligible two year olds from 1st September 2013, with the LA having a duty to secure provision of up to 570 hours of free childcare per annum (max 15 hours per week). Since September 2009 RBWM has been a pilot authority offering free early education and childcare to less advantaged 2 year olds. In 2012-13 RBWM allocated a budget of £305K from its Early Intervention Grant allocation to fund childcare providers to deliver the free childcare offer³. From April 2013, funding for provision of the free entitlement for two years olds is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant, and Schools Finance Regulations have been amended to enable this.
- 4.2 From September 2013 20% (150,000) nationally of 2 year olds are expected to receive free early education (phase1). This will be extended from September 2014 to 40% (around 260,000) of 2YOs (Phase 2).
- 4.3 From September 2013 the duty to secure free early education for 2 year olds relates to
1. Looked after children
 2. Children who meet the FSM criteria i.e. families whose income is below £16,190 and are in receipt of one of a range of benefits

LAs have discretion to fund children who meet local criteria e.g. children with a special educational need or children referred by a professional e.g. a health visitor or social worker working with the family. RBWM uses these wider criteria to support as many eligible children as possible.

- 4.4 The DfE estimates that approximately 130,000 children (20% of the total in England) are eligible and funding for RBWM in 2013/14 for phase 1 is based on an estimate of 203 eligible children.

4.5 The government's strong recommendation/expectation is that this funding should be allocated to early years. However, despite this they have also been clear that funding transferred into DSG for two year olds is not ring fenced and that LAs are free to take expenditure decisions in consultation with their Schools Forum about the strategic deployment of DSG across any budget headings allowed within the Schools Finance Regulations and DSG terms and conditions of grant.

5 CURRENT POSITION

5.1 In the year to date (the summer 2013 term) we have funded free places for 110 eligible 2 year olds at a cost of £97000.

5.2 At this time we have 160 eligible 2 year old children approved for funding, 60 of which are already in place and a further 100 have been accepted (and are eligible to take up a place over the next term or two). The DfE estimates for the number of eligible 2 year olds in RBWM in phase one is 203 (400 in the second phase from September 2014).

5.3 Just over half of the 80 PVI providers in the Borough have agreed to offer places (where available) to eligible funded 2 year old children. In addition we have 3 childminders offering places to eligible 2 year olds. Between them they have up to 300 places available for eligible 2 year olds.

5.4 To be eligible providers must have an Ofsted rating of good or better at the point of place allocation.

5.5 Although we appear at this stage to have sufficient places to meet our statutory obligation to have places for all eligible 2 year olds there is still a need to increase capacity to ensure we have sufficient places in the required locations and to meet the further expansion (doubling to 40% in Phase 2 of the programme in 2014/15). The approval of the £167,812 Capital Funding budget to fund the expansion of 2 year old provision was the subject of a separate report to Cabinet in August and will be used to expand provision in the areas of greatest need.

5.6 Discussions are taking place with the nursery school federation and a number of schools with nursery classes to assess their suitability to take this younger age group. Maintained settings will have to be registered with Ofsted to take children younger than "Rising threes". This requirement is a potential barrier and there are national plans to remove this requirement in future.

5.7 We are actively promoting the 15 hour free childcare entitlement with providers, parents and partners/agencies including Social Services, Learning Difficulties & Disabilities (LDD) Team, Health Visitors, Children's Centres. But there is more that needs to be done to ensure we reach all eligible children. Posters and leaflets are being distributed around the Borough to doctors' surgeries, mother& toddler groups, libraries, shops, job centres etc. We are also sending promotional material to schools.

5.8 We have a steering group which meets termly to evaluate progress with the programme's implementation and includes representatives from Early Years, Children's Centres, Speech & Language Development, Health and Social Care.

5.9 In July a LA conference was held with a focus on how to deliver best quality childcare for 2 year olds. This was attended by 100 practitioners (including childminders) from the Borough with high profile guest speakers and workshops. The evaluations were excellent.

5.10 We provide a programme of training activities/courses/support each term available to all early years practitioners to help raise/maintain the quality of provision. This is being extended further to focus specifically on two year olds.

6 STAFF BUDGETS

- 6.1 The existing staff budget of £80,000 meets the majority of the annual cost of the current staff resource supporting the 2YO programme :
- 2YO Project Officer – 0.675 FTE (cost £25Kpa) – oversees 2YO programme, liaises with partners and other agencies, enrolls providers, processes applications (supports/aids parents through the process), checks provider funding claims.
 - 2 part time Development/Support Officers – total 0.8 FTE (cost £30Kpa) - primary role is to support the 40 providers that offer places to eligible 2 year olds to improve/maintain highest quality practice by providing advice & assistance around best practice, Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) requirements, training/development needs – also provide help with the application process by following up applications and giving help & advice to parents applying for funding.
 - Business support – 0.1FTE (4 hours per week) – issue letters to parents and process funding claims.
 - In addition we employ a Speech & Language Consultant 0.5FTE (on an annual contract with the NHS) to deliver the Every Child A Talker and Early Language Development Programme to support speech and language development for 2 year olds (cost £26Kpa). These programmes also have significant parent involvement.
- 6.2 The current level of staff resource is not sufficient to ensure all eligible 2 year olds have the opportunity to access their entitlement to high quality childcare. We must also be preparing now for the further expansion (the doubling) of the programme in 2014/15.
- 6.3 The extra £112,500 Staff Budget is sufficient to cover the cost of taking on an additional 2 FTE staff for a period of 18 months (until March 2015) based on an annual total cost of £37500 per 1 FTE ($2 \times £37500 \times 1.5 \text{ yrs} = £112500$). This additional resource will comprise a combination of new positions and existing staff increasing hours on a fixed term/temporary basis (2 existing staff have agreed to temporarily increase their hours by 5.5 hours a week (0.14 FTE, cost £6000pa $\times 1.5 = £9000$).
- 6.4 New roles and increased hours will be on a short/fixed term basis for a maximum 18 months (until March 2015).
- 6.5 The following are the primary key roles/activities which the increased staff resource will enable us to expand/undertake:-
1. The marketing/promotion of the 2 year old free entitlement to providers, other agencies and parents to encourage/stimulate/achieve increased take up.
 2. Outreach – direct (1:1/key worker) support to parents/families of eligible children, signposting wider community support services and activities. Identify and train parent champions to be active within communities
 3. Additional targeted support for the most vulnerable 2 year old children in the Borough including Children in Need (CIN) and children subject to a Child Protection Plan (CPP).
 4. Specialist Support (if/when required) - Early Years Therapeutic Support, additional Speech & Language Development/Therapy and Portage Home Learning
 5. Completion/support for providers regarding the child monitoring/progress check.
- 6.6 Additional business support will be required to process the increasing levels of applications, associated paperwork and provide telephone based specialist help/support for parents and providers.
- 6.7 Expected outcomes/benefits : –
- Improved outcomes for the most vulnerable children.
 - Close the Free School Meal(FSM) attainment gap

- Increased capacity and take up of free places
- Parent engagement and confidence in supporting their children
- Community benefits for residents

7 NEW £75,000 PROGRAMME SUPPORT BUDGET

7.1 The £75,000 will be used to support the delivery/expansion of the 2 year old programme over the next 18 months as follows :-

- Training – core & bespoke training to early years practitioners to provide and enhance their skills to meet the specific needs of 2 year old children including speech and language training, supporting 2 year olds in the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), working with vulnerable families (in association with National Day Nursery Association), communication with very young children.
- Resources for approved providers – the purchase of resources (to meet the developmental needs of 2 year olds) for providers where needed, in particular for voluntary settings that have difficulty funding the cost of quality resources themselves.
- Resources for eligible parents – we wish to provide eligible parents with a “welcome pack” when they first become eligible for funding to include a guide on parenting skills or child development, other information and an educational toy and picture books to share with their children.
- Workforce Development – bursaries for early years’ practitioners directly working with eligible 2 year olds wanting to study approved Level 3 or Level 5 early years qualifications. As research shows, a well qualified workforce is key to improving/delivering the best quality early education.
- Production and delivery of marketing & promotional materials & events – to promote the early learning and care of eligible 2 year olds to parents, providers and other agencies/advocates.
- Sufficiency survey – the commissioning of a survey by an external organisation if required. We have conducted our own internal survey but a more detailed, independent report may be required in order to be ready for the further expansion in 2014.
- Other – development of IT systems, online eligibility checking systems, online/text based services to improve the administration of the programme
- Consideration may also be required around the possible need for transport in areas where provision is not available or sufficient to meet eligible children’s needs.

7.2 Expected outcomes/benefits :-

- Additional capacity
- Improved quality of provision
- Improved knowledge/awareness
- Evidence of positive outcomes for children
- Minimised difference in attainment gap

Proposal 2: Funding a replacement network following BT product withdrawal

Responsible officer: Rocco Labellarte – Head of Technology and Change Delivery

Contact officer: John Tordoff – ICT Operations Manager

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 To enable schools to continue to access the internet and external service providers. This request is to fund a programme of migration of schools from the existing BT network to an alternative service or service provider in response to the 15th June 2012 BT notification of product withdrawal. No firm dates have been provided by BT, but based on current information we believe cessation of service will occur on or before the end of the current financial year.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Schools Forum is requested to agree that:

£291,000 of DSG underspend be allocated to a programme of investment, to begin immediately and conclude on or before 31st March 2013, to upgrade systems and circuits including the BT network replacement, but excluding construction and cable-laying costs which would need to be paid for separately by individual schools as well as excluding the uplift of circa £121,000 in annual revenue stream to cover increases in BT maintenance fees.

- 2.2 BT is unable to provide specific costs until such time as site surveys are commissioned by individual schools. Costs incurred to date to legal activity required for way leaves and so forth are also not included in the above figures and would need to be factored in if there is a need to dig on any property, including playing fields.

The option of not carrying out this work will be that at some point in the near future, and certainly by May 2015 according to BT, schools will have no network connectivity to services outside of their premises.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 RBWM provides a number of ICT services to 62 local schools and academies. The cost for 2013/14 of these services is in the region of £680,000. Schools and academies contribute an amount based on historically agreed principles. With the exception of staff support costs, which amounts to £240,448, the remainder of this cost is a pass through for licensing and maintenance costs of third party equipment, software and services.
- 3.2 In June 2012 RBWM were originally advised by BT that they intended to cease providing a network service on their current infrastructure by May 2015, this is being replaced by an upgraded 21st Century Network service. Alternative service providers may also offer similar services.

- 3.3 The technical benefits of this new service from BT are significant compared to the current provision. The majority of educational establishments are currently using a 2Mbits (slow speed) internet connection. The new service takes this speed up to 100Mbits (high speed), in line with the best home broadband speeds currently available.
- 3.4 The upgrade will require additional capital investment. In addition, line rental charges will increase. See point 4.1 below.
- 3.5 In addition to the replacement of BT circuits, a number of other hardware and software upgrades are also needed to ensure service continuity.
- 3.6 The capital investment needed to upgrade these systems and circuits including the BT work, but excluding construction and cable-laying costs, is estimated in the region of £291,000. A further estimated £121,000 on-going annual revenue stream for maintenance fees will also be needed across all schools. Other individual school costs mentioned previously will also need to be factored into considerations schools make.
- 3.7 RBWM have, on behalf of all affected schools, organised two events in September 2013 with national and local service providers in order to better establish schools service requirements and the potential service offerings from these providers. Schools representatives are attending one or more of these events to engage in discussions.

4 PROPOSAL: FURTHER DETAILS

- 4.1 **RBWM proposes that the capital investment required to upgrade the hardware, software and circuits which provide ICT services to those schools, be funded through the appropriate distribution of DSG underspend.**
- 4.2 Any additional capital funds required for construction and cable-laying work at individual institutes will need to be reserved either from the same underspend or provisioned by schools on a case by case basis. Unfortunately, any quotation requested from BT today would not highlight the construction charges for sites where fibre is not already installed. This will be identified at the time of the site surveys. Legal works for way leaves and so forth would also need to be factored in if there is a need to dig on any property, including playing fields.
- 4.3 RBWM proposes that a technical project manager be employed for the period through to May 2014 to provide dedicated service support to all schools. The benefit would be much improved response times for technical support enquiries in relation to the decommissioning of BT network services and their replacement with alternative solutions.
- 4.4 Noteworthy is the decision by RBWM to cease infrastructure and software licensing support to schools in March 2014 and only offer applications support for SIMS software. In particular the cessation of software licensing through the Council may have a financial impact on individual schools as Capita, the incumbent software provider applies a higher standard charge for their SIMS product when contracting directly with schools. Whilst not the subject of this proposal for funding, schools need to be aware of these additional revenue pressures for the coming financial year. It is currently not possible for RBWM to quantify the precise uplift in costs as this will depend upon the negotiations between schools and the provider, whether that be Capita or another solution provider.

Proposal 3: Funding additional educational support to narrow the gap in attainment of children in the care of The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead and their peers.

Responsible officer: Angela Wellings – Head of Education and Childcare

Contact officers: Jenny Lockwood Virtual School Consultant Teacher -Secondary
Anne Bunce Virtual School Consultant Teacher-Primary

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 To enhance the educational outcomes for children in care (CiC) and to narrow the achievement gap between these children and their peers . The funding would support schools to implement early identification and bespoke intervention strategies, with measureable impact on the academic progress of each individual child.
- 1.2 The Personal Education Plans (PEPs), as the statutory planning tool for Children in Care, would be the mechanism for the identification of need, the costing of intervention and the evaluation of impact. Overall monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken through the Virtual School Leadership Team and reported to the Children in Care Council, DMT, the Corporate Parenting Forum, and the Lead Member for Children's Services.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 This report seeks approval from Schools' Forum to allocate agreed funding to Children in Care, targeted through their Personal Education Plan, to drive forward the progress, and therefore improve the life chances, of Children in Care in RBWM. This report proposesto allocate £100,000 of DSG underspend to all schools with children in care in the Royal Borough to the value of £900 for each child for 2014/15. Funding would be held centrally and would be released by the Headteacher of the Virtual School on the approval of the planned priorities identified in the PEP.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As an ambitious Local Authority we aim to meet our duty to promote educational excellence for all children and young people, by providing a range of support and challenge to all our partners. We are continuously seeking ways to drive forward improvements for Children in Care in partnership with our education providers.
- 3.2 Children in Care remain one of the most vulnerable groups of young people, and their progress in education, whilst better in RBWM than in some local authorities, continues to lag behind their peers.
- 3.3 Nationally, (See Annex 1), there is significant difference between the attainment of children in local authority care and their age peers. In RBWM the small cohorts of children in care in make it difficult to analyse any trends. However there is significant underachievement of some children.
- 3.4 Within RBWM we are fortunate that many of our Children in Care attend good or outstanding education provision. Ofsted judgements demonstrate that 88% of the 64 RBWM schools are Good/ Outstanding (31st August 2013), which is higher than the national average (70% 31st Aug 2012) and statistical neighbours. In August 2013:

- 72% of all RBWM's Children in care attend secondary schools that are judged good or outstanding and
- 100% of primary RBWM Children in Care attend borough schools judged good or outstanding.
- Overall 82% attended good or outstanding RBWM schools.

3.5 KS1 and KS2 data demonstrate that RBWM is above national figures on all measures. 86% pupils in RBWM make 2+ levels of progress in writing between KS1 and 2 but this percentage varies between schools from 40% to 100%. 87% pupils in RBWM make 2+ levels progress in maths between KS1 and 2; the range varies between schools from 72% to 100%.

3.6 **Expected progress (3 levels) KS2 and KS4 - All RBWM Children in Care:** this data demonstrates the gap for Children in Care

3.7

Academic year	No. of students	English KS2-4	Maths KS2-4
2012/13	9*	3 (33%)	3(33%)

Consequently improving progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 is a priority.

Children in Care (CiC) Educational achievement 2011-2013

Number of pupils CiC	KEY Stage & measures	RBWM		National	
		CiC	All	CiC	All
	Early Years				
1*	% achieving good level of development 2011	0*	65	n/a	59
3	% achieving good level of development 2012	67	72	n/a	64
1#	% achieving good level of development 2013	100	56	n/a	52
	Key Stage 1				
1	% achieving L2+ Reading 2011	100	92	n/a	85
5	% achieving L2+ Reading 2012	100	89	67	87
3*	% achieving L2+ Reading 2013	67*	93	-	89
1	% achieving L2+ Writing 2011	100	90	n/a	81
5	% achieving L2+ Writing 2012	60	87	57	83
3*	% achieving L2+ Writing 2013	67*	90	-	85
1	% achieving L2+ Maths 2011	100	95	n/a	90
5	% achieving L2+ Maths 2012	80	93	71	91
3*	% achieving L2+ Maths 2013	67*	95	-	91
	Key Stage 2				
2	% achieving E+M L4+ 2011	0	78	43	75
1	% achieving E+M L4+ 2012	100	84	50	80
4~	% achieving R+W+M L4+ 2013	50	78	-	76
	Key Stage 4				
1	% achieving %EM 2011	0	63	14	58
4	% achieving %EM 2012	25	64	15	59
2	% achieving %EM 2013	50	69	-	-
	Key Stage 5				
1	% achieving 2+ A*-B 2011	0	37	n/a	46
0	% achieving 2+ A*-B 2012	0	40	n/a	44

2	% achieving 2+ A*-B 2013	0	-	n/a	-
---	--------------------------	---	---	-----	---

* Includes pupils at Manor Green Special school

- Data not yet available for 2013

Basis of assessment and areas of learning have changed for Early Years so 2013 not directly comparable with previous years

~ Headline measure for KS2 has changed from English and Maths to Reading, Writing and Maths so 2013 not directly comparable with previous years

All 2013 data is provisional

4 PROPOSAL: FURTHER DETAILS

- 4.1 Pupil Premium Grant is currently not available to several groups who would benefit from additional funds
- Children who have not been in continuous care for 6 months
 - Children under 5 and over 16
 - Children at the edge of care
- 4.2 Research consistently recommends early identification and intervention have the greatest impact and hence the best value for money.
- 4.3 As corporate parents we need to be as highly aspirational for our Children in Care as other RBWM parents
- 4.4 Currently the Virtual School has no school budget. This means that specialist services to support intervention are currently unavailable through the Virtual School. These services include :-
- Emotional and psychological support
 - Bereavement counselling
 - Support for Pre-school children eg speech and language, personal and social development
 - Speech and language support within school
 - Home tutoring e.g. for GCSE revision, EAL etc
 - Additional adult support in class e.g. ELSA
- Allocating funding from the DSG underspend could therefore be utilised also in accessing packages of support from these and other specialist services
- 4.5 Funding would be held centrally and be released following the identification of needs at a PEP meeting. The impact of its use will be measured against demonstrated improvements in the targeted need. Schools with Children in Care would be required to demonstrate how any funding had been utilised and the impact it had had on outcomes for the young person.
- 4.6 Reporting procedures with regard to the effectiveness of deploying this funding in this way would be through the Schools Forum, the Children in Care Council, DMT within the Local Authority and the Corporate Parenting Forum as well as the Lead Member for Children's Services
- 4.7 Additional funds would increase the breadth and depth of personalised professional development of adults working with Children in Care.

ANNEX 1

The impact of virtual schools on the educational progress of looked after children- published by OFSTED October 2012

“In the local authorities visited, virtual schools have raised the profile of educational attainment for children in care, promoted much better communication between professionals, increased the involvement of carers in children’s education, and helped to improve attendance and reduce exclusions.

However, there was little evidence that they were yet able to reduce the attainment gap between looked after children and their peers. Progress between Key Stages 3 and 4 was generally slower than during earlier key stages, and improving the percentage of those attaining five or more good GCSE passes, including English and maths, remained a challenge for most authorities.

Budget constraints have also led to a significant reduction in the capacity of virtual schools in some local authorities. Although most of the local authorities were able to protect existing resources, nearly all expressed concerns about the future.”

Proposal 4: Funding school to school support as a key element of education improvement

Responsible officer: Angela Wellings – Head of Education and Childcare

Contact officer: Simon Evry – Senior Adviser, Secondary

1 SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

1.1 To improve pupil outcomes through a programme of school to school support. Schools would be funded to release outstanding school leaders and curriculum expertise in order to support others and spread proven good practice in maximising pupil outcomes; this would complement advisory support from Borough officers. School to school support would be commissioned, quality assured and monitored by the Local Authority, and used strategically as an integral part of the Borough's Education Improvement Plan.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Schools Forum is requested to agree

- £200,000 of DSG underspend to be allocated to a three year programme of Local Authority commissioned school to school support. Funding to enable the purchase of time from outstanding leaders and areas of outstanding school practice.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 As an ambitious Local Authority we aim to meet our duty, to promote educational excellence, for all children and young people, by providing a range of support and challenge to all our partners. We are continuously on an improvement journey in partnership with our education providers.

3.2 **Ofsted Judgments:** 88% of the 64 RBWM schools are Good/ Outstanding (31st August 2013) which is higher than the national average (70% 31st Aug 2012) and statistical neighbours. The Borough's ambition is for the majority to be outstanding (currently at 25%) and for all to be at least good (currently 95% Primary and 63% secondary). During the academic year 2012/13 there were 21 school inspections under a new Ofsted framework in RBWM; 7 schools stayed at the same grade, 9 improved and 5 were downgraded. This additional funding would enable the Local Authority to commission support from outstanding schools, and elements of outstanding practice from other schools, and target it at ensuring all schools were at least good, and the majority outstanding. This would include supporting schools at an early stage where there is any risk of a decline in Ofsted grade.

3.3 **KS1 and KS2 data:** RBWM is above national figures on all measures. 86% pupils in RBWM make 2+ levels of progress in writing between KS1 and 2 but this % varies between schools from 40% to 100%. 87% pupils in RBWM make 2+ levels progress in maths KS1 -2; the range varies between schools from 72% to 100%. Achievement gaps for pupils entitled to free school meals are narrowing at KS2. School to school support would focus on further accelerating progress from KS1 to 2, particularly between Years 2 – 4, and closing the gap where pupils entitled to Free School Meals are still achieving less well.

- 3.4 KS4 data:** 69% pupils achieved 5A* -C with English and Maths (2013 unvalidated data). This is an increase on 2012 and considerably above national average. We can aim for further improvements: increasing the number of pupils making better than expected progress and ensuring that at least all pupils who enter secondary school with Level 4 English and Maths achieve A*-Cs. Currently the difference between % Level 4 En Ma on entry, and % of these pupils then achieving 5A*-C EM varies between schools from -15 to +4. There are also considerable variations in the achievement of FSM pupils at KS4. This funding would be targeted at enabling leaders from schools that are maximising pupil progress and closing achievement gaps to support others, particularly in light of significant ongoing changes to GCSE examinations.
- 3.5 Post 16 Data:** RBWM is above national averages at all key stages until KS5 where it is at or below it on some key measures. For example the average point score per A – level student: 736 England (state funded), 694 RBWM (2012). All RBWM school 6th forms have several subject areas that perform well but there is significant in school variation between subjects in most. Funding would enable outstanding 6th form strategy to be systematically shared and, making use of Borough wide ALPs data, enable the most successful A- level departments to support others. Support could also be commissioned from areas of expertise out of Borough.

4 PROPOSAL: FURTHER DETAILS

- 4.1** The section above highlights some priority areas for commissioned school to school support. This would complement support from Borough Advisers as part of a coherent school improvement strategy in partnership with Headteachers. The Borough Education Improvement Plan (currently being developed) outlines a level of core support for all schools. See Annex A. This includes all schools having an allocated school improvement adviser who would oversee and monitor any commissioned school to school support. It applies to all maintained schools, academies and free schools.
- 4.2** The Borough identifies outstanding practice through data analysis, Ofsted reports and local knowledge. We also seek support from national, local and specialist leaders of Education (NLEs, LLEs, SLEs). Teaching schools will also become a key source of outstanding practice. The latter national systems, together with regional partnerships, such as the Berkshire Leadership Hub, will enable some support to be commissioned from outside RBWM. However it is acknowledged that a wide range of existing expertise can be drawn upon from within the Borough.
- 4.3** If members of forum agree to the proposal in principal exact rates of funding will be determined. For example £500 per day for an outstanding Headteacher supporting another school.
- 4.4** When commissioning support LA advisers will ensure that is planned with agreed timescales, outcomes, monitoring and evaluation.
- 4.5** The key benefit to schools receiving support will be a coherent and planned package of support that does not depend on the school's ability to pay. Schools offering support will be able to fund any backfill required as well as benefitting from the continuous professional development that comes from supporting others.

Annex A: Core Services Provided

The table below details a core level of support and challenge from Borough advisers to all schools (all state funded statutory age provision including Academies and Free Schools). Further support can be purchased through RBWM traded services. Commissioned school to school support will complement this.

Category	RBWM Support & Challenge Provision	Days	Adviser time allocation based on:
All Schools Given a nominated lead school improvement adviser to address:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 day strategic whole school review 	96	1.5 days per sch including prep/ follow up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Ofsted inspections upon notification, meeting with lead inspector and attendance at feedback 	30	15 inspections X 2 days each
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Headteachers: five days support to Governing Body for appointment process, attendance at two day interviews, post appointment introductory meeting with lead adviser and brokerage of a Headteacher mentor programme (latter includes 3 days support from an experienced Headteacher) New Deputy Headteachers: support to Governing Body for appointment process and attendance at one day of interviews 	49	7 X 5 days Headteacher appointments 7 X 2 days Deputy Head appointments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core meetings and briefings for Middle and Senior leader groups including the provision of information regarding national and local current/ emergent educational issues and policy. Communications giving advice to leaders and key staff Signposting to good practice based on our access to local knowledge and detailed data analysis 	20	Advisers planning and delivering/ facilitating several event across the year
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly meeting of senior leadership forum 	6	Advisers attending Borough forum with Headteachers
Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential lead school for providing leadership expertise and other brokered school to school support 	20	Quality assurance of good practice, facilitating arrangements for schools to
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential lead school in areas of strength 		

			access good practice
Outstanding/ Good identified as at risk of RI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three days of tailored support package in at risk aspects of provision including a governance review 	24	8 at risk of RI good/ outstanding schools X 3 days each
Requires Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 days tailored support package to include a review of teaching, leadership and governance; and a termly visit from lead adviser to monitor progress on RI issues • HMI monitoring visits: meet HMI and attend feedback 	70 7	7 RI schools X 10 days + 1 day HMI visits
Ofsted Category	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 days tailored support package to include review of teaching and leadership • Lead adviser attends IEB meetings • HMI monitoring visits: meet HMI and attend feedback 	40 6 2	2 schools in special measures
LA Statutory assessment functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Years, Key Stage One/ Two moderation and monitoring visits for phonics screening check, Key Stage One and Two assessments and tests. 	132	DfE stipulates % schools requiring moderation and monitoring visits
Management and development of team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line management supervision • Team meetings • Attendance at training/ conferences in order to maintain up to date expertise/ information for schools 	9 12 8	3 advisers X 1.5 days each + manager time Team X 3 days each 2 days per adviser
Total adviser days for core function		531	2.37 FTE posts
FTE = 260 days – 28 days leave – 8 days BH = 224 available days.			