



Notice of meeting of

Decision Session - Executive Member for Children & Young People's Services

To: Councillor Runciman (Executive Member)

Date: Tuesday, 16 March 2010

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: The Guildhall, York

AGENDA

Notice to Members - Calling In:

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item on this agenda, notice must be given to Democracy Support Group by:

10:00 am on Monday 15 March 2010, if an item is called in *before* a decision is taken, *or*

4:00 pm on Thursday 18 March 2010, if an item is called in *after* a decision has been taken.

Items called in will be considered by the Scrutiny Management Committee.

Any written representations in respect of the items on the agenda should be submitted to Democratic Services by **5.00pm on Friday 12 March 2010**

1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

- 2. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)
To approve and sign the minutes of the Decision Session of the Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services held on 25 January 2010.

- 3. Public Participation**
At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak at the meeting can do so. The deadline for registering is **Friday 12 March 2010 at 5.00 pm.**

Members of the public may register to speak on:-

- An item on the agenda
- An issue within the Executive Member's remit
- An item that has been published on the Information Log since the last session.

- 4. Early Years Single Funding Formula - (Pages 7 - 34) Consultation Responses**

This report considers the responses received from schools and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) providers to the consultation document approved by the Executive Member in September 2009. The report also provides an update on the recent announcement by the DCSF to delay the statutory deadline for implementation of the new formula to April 2011.

- 5. Appointment of Local Authority (LA) School Governors** (Pages 35 - 42)

This report provides information about the current position with regard to vacancies for LA seats on governing bodies, lists current nominations for these vacancies, as detailed in Annex 1 of the report, and requests the appointment, or re-appointment of the listed nominees.

- 6. Schools Capital Programme Update 2010/11** (Pages 43 - 54)

The purpose of this report is to inform the Executive Member of recent progress on major schemes within the Children and Young People's capital programme and to seek approval of schemes proposed for 2010/11 and of revisions to the programme.

7. **"Me Too" Activity Subsidy** (Pages 55 - 66)
This report provides an update on the progress of the "Me Too" Activity Subsidy pilot and sets out plans for a city-wide roll out.
8. **Parent Support Advisers: The City of York Experience** (Pages 67 - 74)
This report provides an update on the Parent Support Adviser programme being delivered as a pilot with three small clusters of schools in York.
9. **Urgent Business**
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Information Log

No items have been published on the Information Log since the last decision session.

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jayne Carr

Contact Details:

Telephone – (01904) 552030

Email – jayne.carr@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোঅবী সর্ববরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Executive to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (40 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Decision Session) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

| | |
|---------|--|
| MEETING | DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES |
| DATE | 25 JANUARY 2010 |
| PRESENT | COUNCILLOR RUNCIMAN (EXECUTIVE MEMBER) |

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Executive Member was invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests she might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

20. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services Decision Session held on 12 January 2010 be approved and signed as a correct record.

21. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/OTHER SPEAKERS

Ben Drake spoke on behalf of Unison and Aspect regarding the proposed cuts to the arts consultants posts. He raised the following issues of concern:

- There had been a lack of consultation, and the timescale for making representation had been totally inadequate. There had been no informal consultation to identify other options for saving money.
- The proposal stated that three consultant posts would be redundant and yet staff would be appointed to undertake project work. This was not lawful and legal advice was being sought on this matter.
- The service was greatly valued, as evidenced by the number of representations that had been received in the short timescale since the proposal was put forward. The service also contributed to a number of statutory requirements and directorate priorities. It had not been identified how this work would be delivered and paid for.

Unison and Aspect requested that the proposal be referred back to the Directorate in order that the process of proper informed consultation could take place with staff and to identify alternative savings.

The Executive Member was presented with additional written representation that had been received by Unison.

Tina Wright, drama teacher, expressed concern at the proposal to cut the arts consultants posts. She expressed concern that the arts were to be the only teachers to be deprived of an invaluable source of support. The proposal would affect parents, teachers and, above all, the children whose lives were enriched by this provision. She quoted from a teacher at Applefields School and from the Head of Drama at Manor School who paid

tribute to the work that the arts consultants carried out. The Executive Member's attention was also drawn to the role that the arts consultants played in respect of the Arts Award and of the many events and cultural opportunities that they arranged for young people. Reference was also made to Sir Michael Bichard's comments in his address to the North of England Education Conference regarding the need for education to help children to develop their own creativity. The Executive Member was asked to consider the implications of the proposed decision and the impact that it would have on the creativity of many young people.

Liz Wilson, Chief Executive of York Theatre Royal, spoke against the proposal to cut the arts consultants posts. She paid tribute to the benefits that they brought to the city as a whole and the cross-curricular work that they carried out. Their posts enabled the city to have cost effective access to expertise as they had a depth of knowledge and practitioner skills. They were also in touch with developments in the arts both nationally and internationally. They were a key factor in the high number of schools in the city that had achieved the Artsmark Award. The council was requested to reconsider the proposal in view of the disproportionate effect that it would have on the community.

The Executive Member thanked the speakers for their contribution. Thanks were also expressed to those who had submitted written representation in respect of the proposals or who had attended the meeting.

22. REVENUE BUDGET ESTIMATES 2010/11

The Executive Member received a report as part of the consultation on the 2010/11 budget process. The report presented the budget proposals for Children and Young People's Services and included:

- The revenue budget for 2009/10 (Annex 1 of the report) to show the original budgets
- The base budget for 2010/11 including the 2009/10 budget rolled forward and adjusted
- The cost of pay and price increases, increments and settlement of pay and grading appeals for the portfolio
- Budget service pressure costs and savings proposals for the portfolio area (Annexes 2 and 3 of the report)
- Fees and charges proposals (Annex 4 of the report)
- Residential Homes, Foster Carers, Sharing Care, Adoption and Residence Order Weekly Allowances (Annex 5 of the report)

Full details of the budget would be considered by the Executive on 16 February 2010 and then Budget Council on 25 February 2010. The report sought the comments of the Executive Member on the proposals put forward.

The Executive Member stated that the budget for 2010/11 was being considered at a time of worldwide recession and of great financial stringency for both national and local government. The focus had to be on the council's core functions, the statutory services, front line delivery and

working to maintain excellent services. Following the Baby P case there had been an increase nationally in the number of children coming into care and this had financial implications in terms of the costs of care and court costs. There were particular pressures on the directorate in respect of children's social care costs and it was proposed to make significant investment in this area. These children had no voice in the public arena and it was the council's duty to care for them.

The Director gave an update on the directorate's financial position and areas on which there were significant financial pressures. He stated that it was acknowledged that the work that the arts consultants carried out was of a high quality but the issue was one of prioritisation.

Officers went through the key issues in the report.

The Executive Member stated that she had a longstanding commitment to the arts but that the council had a responsibility to the children in its care. The representation that had been received would be forwarded to the Executive. The Director would be asked to look at other options for funding the arts consultants posts and to write to schools to advise them that the services of the arts consultants could be purchased directly by schools.

- RESOLVED: (i) That it be confirmed that the proposals were in line with the council's priorities.
- (ii) That the report be referred to the Executive for consideration.
- (iii) That the written and verbal representations made to the Executive Member be taken into consideration when the Executive consider the final budget proposals.
- (iv) That a letter be sent by the Director to all schools to outline the budget constraints and to point out that the services of the Arts Consultants could be purchased directly by the schools¹.
- (v) That the Director be requested to investigate alternative options for funding the Arts Consultants posts¹.

REASON: As part of the consultation on the Children & Young People's Services budget for 2010/11.

Action Required

1. Director to send letter to schools and explore funding options PD

Councillor C Runciman, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 4.40 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank



Executive Member for Children & Young People's Services**16 March 2010**

Report of the Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA – CONSULTATION RESPONSES**Summary**

- 1 This report considers the responses received from schools and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) providers to the consultation document approved by the Executive Member in September 2009. The report also now reflects on the recent announcement by the DCSF to delay the statutory deadline for implementation of the new formula to April 2011.

Background

- 2 The Executive Member will be aware that the DCSF has tasked all Local Authorities with reviewing their funding for the free entitlement to 15 hours per week early years education for all 3 & 4 year olds, to achieve the following:
 - Develop a single local formula for funding to ensure consistency and fairness in the method of funding for all providers. This does not necessarily mean that providers will all be funded at the same level, but that the same factors will be taken into consideration when deciding on the level of funding.
 - Change early years' pupil count arrangements to ensure consistency across maintained and PVI settings. This will mean that providers will be funded according to the actual amount of provision taken up and not full time equivalent places.
- 3 The DCSF are concerned that there is too much place-led funding in the maintained sector and too little stability in PVI funding. The new arrangements must achieve the right balance between getting value for money, investing in the sustainability of provision and enabling longer term planning and improvement.
- 4 In York the Schools Forum agreed that all of the detailed work on developing the new formula would be carried out by the Early Years Reference Group (EYRG). The group comprises a balance of representatives from across the PVI and maintained sectors and is independently chaired.
- 5 The total funding available to support the delivery of the new formula (at 2009/10 budget levels) is estimated a £5.06m. This figure is based on the new free entitlement of 15 hours per week and is made up of the following existing budgets:

Table 1: Total Funding Available for the New Formula (2009/10 Budgets)

| | £m |
|--|--------------|
| PVI Base Budget | 2.475 |
| Pathfinder 15 Hour Extension Budget | 0.874 |
| Individual Schools Budget:(Maintained) | |
| Nursery Class Place Led Funding | 1.370 |
| SEN Formula Funding | 0.013 |
| Deprivation Formula Funding | 0.035 |
| Premises Formula Funding | 0.173 |
| Lump Sum (St Paul's Only) | 0.078 |
| Other Formula Funding | 0.042 |
| Total Available Funding | 5.060 |

Consultation Proposals

- 6 The Executive Member, through her membership of the Schools Forum, has already received a number of updates over the past 18 months, particularly around the work done on the cost analysis survey and the theoretical cost modelling exercise that has been used in developing the basic funding entitlement. A report summarising the final pieces of work done by the EYRG, and setting out the group's proposals for consultation (subsequently endorsed by the full Schools Forum) was considered, and approved, by the Executive Member in September 2009. A full copy of the consultation document is included at Annex 1.

Consultation Responses

- 7 In response to the consultation document 34 replies were received, a response rate of 29%. Of these, 14 were from maintained schools (a 70% response from the sector) and 18 from PVI providers (a 19% response from the sector), 2 responses were anonymous. A full analysis of the responses is shown at Annex 2.
- 8 The Executive Member will be pleased to note that there was overwhelming support for all of the proposals within the consultation document. In relation to Proposal 4b (where maintained schools were asked to consider their preferred option for making the adjustments to reflect actual take up), there was a small majority in favour of option 1. It is therefore proposed to have the adjustment to actual hours taken up made during the year in the final monthly payment of each term (i.e. similar to the timing of the PVI adjustment).
- 9 As well as responding to the specific consultation questions, providers also made a number of additional comments or raised issues for clarification. It is proposed to respond to these by issuing a question and answer sheet to all providers.
- 10 The Executive Member should also note that the EYRG and Schools Forum have both met to review the results of the consultation, and have confirmed their endorsement of the proposals. However, members of the group would like to remind the Executive Member that their endorsement of the proposals is made on the basis that this is the best that can be achieved within the existing level of resources available. The theoretical cost modelling work, previously presented to the forum, suggested that additional funding of between 10% and 15% (30p to 50p per hour) would be required to meet all essential and desirable requirements.
- 11 The EYRG are also concerned that the current early years funding is being enhanced through the time limited DCSF Pathfinder grant to help providers move to delivering

increased flexibility. This equates to an additional 26p per hour in 2009/10, with the allocation for 2010/11 still being finalised. Due to the uncertainty as to the amount of funding York will receive from the DCSF from 2011/12 (once the Pathfinder funding ceases), the group are very concerned that the biggest effect on providers is going to be experienced when this short term funding ceases or reduces. This will clearly be something the Schools Forum and Executive Member will want to consider as part of their deliberations on the overall Schools Budget for the next three-year funding cycle commencing in April 2011.

DCSF Implementation Delay

- 12 After the consultation exercise had been completed, and following extensive lobbying from both maintained and PVI sector providers across the country, the DCSF wrote to all Local Authorities in December 2009 announcing a delay to the statutory implementation of the new formula. The statutory deadline for implementation is now April 2011, with authorities who feel they are ready and able to implement in April 2010 being given the option to join an early implementation pathfinder group.

Options

Option 1

- 13 Reject the proposed formula and ask the EYRG, supported by officers, to develop alternative proposals in time for the delayed implementation date of April 2011.

Option 2

- 14 Implement the proposed formula as planned in April 2010. This would entail the authority applying to the DCSF to become a pathfinder.

Option 3

- 15 Agree the proposed formula, but delay implementation until April 2011.

Analysis

Option 1

- 16 The view of officers is that the proposed formula is the best that could be achieved within the constraints of the legislation and guidance laid down by the DCSF, and without a significant increase in the overall budget available. This view has been strongly supported through the consultation exercise by providers across all sectors. Option 1 is not recommended by officers.

Option 2

- 17 Option 2 has some merits as all parties feel that the proposed formula is the best solution available for York. An April 2010 implementation would allow an early start to be made on the road to merging the maintained and PVI base funding rates at the same level.
- 18 However, officers are concerned that the additional workload required from being a pathfinder authority may be difficult to resource as there will be no additional DCSF funding available. In addition the authority is already supporting two other early years pathfinders.

- 19 There are also some risks now associated with an April 2010 implementation. Although we are confident that the changed systems and processes proposed around the new formula are robust and workable, there has not been sufficient time to test them thoroughly. In addition, given there will be a general election prior to the revised April 2011 implementation date, it is possible that further policy changes may be made at a national level. In a worst case scenario we could implement the new formula in April 2010 but then be required to roll back to the original position for April 2011. Option 2 is not recommended by officers.

Option 3

- 20 Option 3 allows the work of the EYRG to be formally endorsed as the best solution for York. In addition it allows time for some reflection on the proposals that have been developed in other authorities. Any risk of investing time and resources in implementing changes that are then negated by further revision of national policy is removed. Option 3 is recommended by officers and has also been unanimously endorsed as the most favourable option by the EYRG.

Financial Implications

- 21 The move to the proposed single formula is cost neutral for the council, as it would be delivered within the total of the existing budgets available to PVI and maintained provision for 3 & 4 year olds.

Equalities Implications

- 22 The proposed formula includes allocating a proportion of the overall funding available via a deprivation factor for the first time.

Other Implications

- 23 There are no HR, ITT, Crime and Disorder or legal implications arising from this report

Recommendations

- 24 The Executive Member is recommended to:
- agree that the proposals set out in the consultation document at Annex 1 (including option 1 under proposal 4b) be approved.
 - approve option 3, and agree to a delay in implementing the new formula until April 2011.
 - ask officers to report to her any further changes in national policy or guidance prior to April 2011.

Reason: To ensure that the new single formula for funding the free entitlement for 3 & 4 year old nursery provision is set and ready to be in place by the revised statutory deadline of April 2011.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------|------------------|
| Contact Details Authors: | Chief Officers Responsible for the Report: | | | |
| Richard Hartle Head of Finance 01904 554225 richard.hartle@york.gov.uk | Pete Dwyer Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services | | | |
| Nicola Sawyer Early Years Policy & Planning Manager 01904 554348 nicola.sawyer@york.gov.uk | Report Approved | √ | Date | 24 February 2010 |
| For further information please contact the authors of the report | | | | |

Annex 1 – Consultation Document
Annex 2 – Consultation Responses

Background Papers

Early Years Reference Group reports and minutes April 2008 to January 2010, including cost analysis survey and theoretical cost models.
Various DCSF guidance notes and updates

This page is intentionally left blank

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA (EYSFF)

September 2009

Early Years and Children's Centres Service / Finance Team
Learning, Culture and Children's Services
City of York Council

INDEX

- 3 Background
- 4 Timescales
- 5 Development work
- 7 Current funding and counting process
- 9 Proposed Funding Arrangements – Counting, payment and adjustments
- 11 Proposed Funding Arrangements – Funding model

Appendices:

Annex 1 - Membership of the Equitable Funding Reform group

Annex 2 - Consultation response form

BACKGROUND

Why Review?

The Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) have required all Local Authorities (LAs) to review their funding for the free entitlement to early years provision for 3 and 4 year olds across all sectors.

Inconsistencies currently exist in the funding of the free entitlement between the Maintained Sector (Nursery Schools and nursery classes in Primary schools) and the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector. The aim of this reform is to improve fairness and transparency in the way funding is allocated to providers who deliver the free entitlement and thereby support its extension to 15 hours, alongside flexible delivery.

The key requirements are:

- To develop an Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) to ensure consistency and fairness in the method of funding for all providers. This does not necessarily mean that all providers will be funded at the same level but that the same factors will be taken into consideration when deciding on the level of funding.
- To change early years' pupil count arrangements to ensure consistency across Maintained and PVI settings. This will mean that providers will be funded according to the amount of provision children take up and not full time equivalent places.

How We Are Undertaking The Review?

Work in developing the new Single Funding Formula has been undertaken by the Early Years Reference Group (EYRG). The group is independently chaired and comprises representatives from across the Private, Voluntary, Independent and Maintained sectors in York, alongside Local Authority officers from both the Early Years and Finance service teams. The work has been undertaken in line with government guidance.

The Schools Forum (*a statutory body containing representatives from maintained nursery, primary and secondary schools, PVI providers and the LA*) is the 'guardian' of the local Schools Budget (*the total sum of money available to fund schools and other providers*) and its distribution among schools and other bodies. The Early Years Reference Group have been working alongside the Schools Forum to ensure that all sectors and stakeholders have been involved in the development of a fair and equitable Single Funding Formula.

TIMESCALES

The DCSF have stated that the new funding formula must be implemented by April 2010 therefore the following timescales have been drawn up:

- Sep / Nov 2009** The consultation period will take place over a 10 week period from:
14th September 2009 to 16th November 2009.
- Nov / Dec 2009** Consultation responses analysed and a recommendation report prepared for the Schools Forum. Consultation responses shared with all stakeholders.
- December 2009** Report detailing proposed new EYSFF and processes taken to the Schools Forum.
- January 2010** Report detailing proposed new EYSFF and processes taken to Executive Member for Children & Young People's Services for approval.
- March 2010** Indicative funding allocations for 2010/11 issued to all providers.
- April 2010** New EYSFF and processes implemented.
- Autumn 2010** Interim review of new arrangements.
- Summer 2011** Full review following first full year of implementation.

CONSULTATION EVENT DATES

- Wed 7th October: 10am - 12pm** Burton Stone Community Centre
Evelyn Crescent
York
- Tues 13th October: 1pm - 3pm** Conference Room
The House
Hob Moor Community Centre
York
- Wed 21st October: 6.30pm - 8.30pm** Eccles Building Training Room
Burnholme Community College
Bad Bargain Lane
York

DEVELOPMENT WORK

Cost Analysis Surveys

As required by the government, the first stage of the development process was to undertake an analysis of providers in all sectors to determine the costs involved in delivering the Free Early Years Provision and how these costs varied depending on the characteristics of the setting, including occupancy levels.

A questionnaire was sent to all providers in the Private, Voluntary, Independent and Maintained sectors during 2007/08 to help us gain an in-depth understanding of these costs. The main items of information requested were sector type, ownership structure, costs incurred in the most recent accounting year and breakdown of hours taken up by children during the year.

Information received through the 43 questionnaires (out of 110 providers in the PVI sector) was analysed to see how costs compared with the funding provided as well as to see if there were significant variations in costs among the different sectors. The information received was based on the accounting year 2006/07 when the funding rate was £3.17 per hour. The average cost as reported by respondents in the survey was £2.48 per hour with a range of £1.27 to £3.99.

In the maintained sector the average hourly cost derived from the survey and calculated on a comparable basis was £4.43 (range £2.18 to £7.09). This compared to an average funding rate of £3.46 (range £2.17 to £5.57) for the same period.

The EYRG spent some time reviewing, analysing and questioning the results of the cost surveys but found it very difficult to come to any specific conclusions from the data. There was a huge range of costs identified, with no consistent patterns emerging of similar cost levels across provider types, geographical areas, size of provider or take-up levels. In light of this, the EYRG agreed to develop (in line with DCSF guidance) a series of theoretical cost models that would be constructed on a consistent basis across all types of provision.

Theoretical Cost Modelling Exercise

A sub-group of the EYRG, consisting of representatives from all sectors, was created to develop the models. The sub-group was supported by officers from the council.

The theoretical cost modelling used an approach that combined the following:

- cost information that is already available including salaries, premises costs, etc
- information on things that were expected to change, for example, changes to holiday entitlements
- aspirational costs, including graduate leaders for group settings, costs for work that is currently performed by volunteers, etc
- an amount of surplus or profit

In the end, the work on the theoretical cost modelling was inconclusive. It was not possible to gain unanimous agreement on the cost drivers and elements for each provider type, particularly in respect of aspirational costs. There was significant variation between

settings in the same sector as well as between different sectors in terms of what would be appropriate as theoretical costs. As a result, the EYRG felt unable to recommend using the outcome of the theoretical cost modelling as a robust basis for developing the new formula.

Further work will be undertaken on developing the cost models and the results of this work may be used when reviewing the Single Funding Formula in the future. An agreed set of cost models will also be extremely helpful in future discussions with the DCSF about the on-going level of funding required in York to fully support the free entitlement. The initial results of the theoretical cost modelling is set out below for information:

| Setting Type | Occupancy | £ per child per hour |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 70-place Private Day Nursery | 90% | 3.37 |
| 70-place Private Day Nursery | 70% | 3.65 |
| 30-place Private Day Nursery | 97% | 3.50 |
| 30-place Private Day Nursery | 70% | 4.30 |
| 26-place Pre-school Playgroup | 70% | 2.83 |
| 16-place Pre-school Playgroup | 60% | 5.49 |
| Childminder | 83% | 1.96 |
| 39-place school nursery | 83% | 5.21 |

Summary

Following the cost analysis and theoretical cost modelling work described above, the EYRG spent some time considering three possible approaches for establishing a basic hourly funding rate in the new formula:

- a) A single base rate covering all sectors
- b) Two separate base rates for the PVI and Maintained sectors
- c) A number (up to 6) of differential base rates depending on the type of provision

No single consensus of opinion emerged with respect to the options. PVI representatives generally expressed a preference for a single rate, whereas the representatives from the maintained sector were concerned about the turbulent effect such a proposal would have on their funding. Ultimately a compromise proposal was agreed by the group as its recommendation and that was for a single base rate covering all sectors, with the condition that this be introduced on a phased basis over a number of years.

There was unanimous support for this proposal within the EYRG as it set out a clear principle for a single rate but recognised the immediate difficulties some maintained settings would experience if it were to be introduced fully in 2010/11.

CURRENT FUNDING AND COUNTING ARRANGEMENTS

Private, Voluntary & Independent Sector Settings

Counting

Providers are currently funded on a termly basis, on the number of hours attended by each child. Payments are made twice a term with 85% of the estimated figure being paid at the beginning of a term. The balance is paid after half term, based on actual hours on the Census Date with adjustments made for admissions and leavers. Providers are funded to the nearest half a term.

Funding

In 2009/10, the funding is based on an hourly rate of £3.39. This has been enhanced on a temporary basis by a supplement of £0.26 per hour (giving a total of £3.65 per hour) as part of the Pathfinder project to assist providers in moving towards delivering a flexible free entitlement that meets parents' needs. It should be noted that this additional supplement is outside the scope of the new formula and, whilst it is expected to continue in 2010/11, the funding allocations have yet to be decided. The supplement is expected to cease at 31 March 2011.

All PVI settings receive the same rate per hour per pupil for the hours that they attend up to a maximum of 15 hours per week for up to 38 weeks across the year. (Some settings only deliver the free entitlement across 33 weeks of the year and hence funding is reduced pro-rata).

Notification Of Budget

PVI settings are not currently provided with an annual funding estimate and therefore have to do their own calculations and make their own assumptions to establish what their funding will be from one term to another.

Maintained Settings

Counting

The pupil numbers are derived from termly counts based on the Schools Census. Each part time child is counted as 0.5 full time equivalent (i.e. half-time). For example, no account is taken if a child only attends 3 mornings a week. No adjustment is made for a child joining or leaving a school after the Census date.

Funding

From the count data the Local Authority agrees a maximum nursery size with each individual school that it is prepared to fund. The agreed nursery sizes are always in multiples of 13 part time places (reflecting the statutory child to adult ratio). A set amount is then allocated to each school based on the agreed nursery size (e.g. a 26 place nursery is funded at £39,234 for the 2009/10 financial year). Schools also receive other formula allocations for premises, additional educational needs and some elements of Special

Educational Needs. This leads to a range of funding per part time place purchased in 2009/10 from £1,808 to £3,245 at individual schools, with an average of £2,396.

Notification of Budget

Schools are notified before the start of the financial year of their funding and no adjustment is made during the year as a result of any changes in child numbers.

PROPOSED FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS - COUNTING, PAYMENTS AND ADJUSTMENTS

What Are We Required To Do?

The local Early Years Single Funding Formula must be developed in line with the 'Core Principles' as set out in the DCSF document 'Implementing the Early Years Single Funding Formula - Practice Guidance' (www.dcsf.gov.uk/everychildmatters/earlyyears), including:

- Early years' pupil count arrangements will be undertaken on a termly basis and will ensure consistency across Maintained and PVI settings. This will mean that providers will be funded according to the amount of provision children take up and not full time equivalent places.
- The formula must ensure consistency and fairness in the method of funding for all providers and should:
 - ⇒ Be based on a detailed understanding of providers' costs in all sectors.
 - ⇒ Include a base rate – this can be one single rate or multiple rates for different types of provider according to variations in unavoidable costs.
 - ⇒ Include a deprivation factor.
- Consideration should be given as to whether to include other supplements as a means of incentivising improvements in the quality and flexibility of provision and driving local policy objectives.
- Indicative funding budgets are to be provided to all settings prior to the start of each financial year.
- Budgets must be adjusted in the financial year to ensure funding reflects participation adequately.
- Payments to providers must take account of the cash flow needs of providers and recognise that PVI and Maintained providers will have different needs.
- An assessment of the impact of the new EYSFF on all settings must be undertaken and included in the consultation process and where changes are significant, transitional arrangements must be put in place to support the setting.

Proposal 1 – Annual Indicative Budget for all Settings

All Early Years providers will be notified of their annual budget for the forthcoming financial year before the 1st April each year. It is proposed that the estimated number of hours to be used for indicative budgets will be based on the previous 3 terms actual data for each setting, with the opportunity for settings to propose amendments to the estimates to reflect specific circumstances prior to the start of the financial year.

Following discussions by the EYRG it was felt that the current payment arrangements operating in both the PVI and Maintained sectors were working well and should not be fundamentally altered. The following proposals therefore suggest a continuation of the existing counting and payment arrangements.

Proposal 2 – Pupil Counting Arrangements

- a) *It is proposed that termly counting arrangements be used for all providers, using the Schools Census dates i.e. the third Thursday in January, third Thursday in May and the first Thursday in October, as is currently the case.*
- b) *We further propose to fund on a half term basis for all settings (as is currently the case with PVI settings) to reflect movement of children between settings.*

Proposal 3 – Payment Arrangements

It is proposed to maintain the existing payment methods, which are different for the PVI and Maintained sector:

- *For PVI settings – payments to continue to be made twice a term, with 85% of the estimated figure for that term being paid during the first week of each term and the balance being paid in the second half of the term, following the Census date and based on actual hours taken up.*
- *For Maintained settings – payments to continue to be made on a monthly basis along with other formula funding via the Schools Remit System, with 1/12 of the indicative budget being transferred each month.*

Proposal 4 – Adjustment To Actual Number Of Hours

It is proposed that

- a) *For PVI settings the adjustment for the difference between the estimated number of hours used to calculate the initial funding allocation and the actual hours taken up during the financial year continues to be made 3 times a year following the headcount (Census date) for each of the 3 terms, as per the current arrangements.*
- b) *For Maintained settings, we would welcome advice from schools as to which of the following options is preferred:*
 - i) *have the adjustment to actual hours taken up made during the year in the final monthly payment of each term (i.e. similar to the timing of the PVI adjustment)*

OR

 - ii) *roll up the adjustments into one annual figure (whether this is positive or negative) and carry it forward to be included on the annual funding statement for the following financial year.*

PROPOSED FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS - FUNDING MODEL

As previously described, the recommendation of the EYRG is for a single base rate for all sectors to be established. Due to the level of turbulence that this would cause to maintained settings it is proposed to phase this in over a period of time. Following lengthy deliberation, the EYRG agreed that it would be desirable (at least initially) for the majority of the available funding to be allocated to settings via a base rate with only a small amount used for additional supplements.

Proposal 5 – Basic Funding Rate

- a) *It is proposed to allocate 95% of the total available funding towards a basic hourly entitlement for all settings. The remaining 5% of funding would be available to fund supplements for Deprivation, Special Educational Needs (SEN) and Transition Arrangements that are covered later in the consultation document.*
- b) *It is proposed to ultimately have one hourly rate covering all sectors but initially there would be two basic hourly rates: one for PVI settings and one for Maintained settings. These two rates will be brought into alignment over a period of time between 2 and 4 years depending on the overall level of resources available. Indicative rates are set out below based on assumptions of a 2% or 3% annual increase in the overall level of resources available.*
- c) *In addition, it is proposed that a lump sum arrangement will continue to apply to St Paul's Nursery School. This recognises the unique nature of St Paul's as the only stand-alone maintained nursery in the city and the significant level of additional fixed costs incurred that would be absorbed across the full age range in any other maintained school. The initial level of this lump sum will be set having taken account of the expected take up across all maintained nursery classes but is likely to be in the region of £130,000.*

Table 1 - Indicative Basic Funding Rates

| Sector | Scenario 1 Based on a 2% annual increase in overall resources | | | | Scenario 2 Based on a 3% annual increase in overall resources | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Maintained | | PVI | | Maintained | | PVI | |
| Proportion of Full Rate | 100% £/hour | 95% £/hour | 100% £/hour | 95% £/hour | 100% £/hour | 95% £/hour | 100% £/hour | 95% £/hour |
| 2009/10 Current Average | 3.54 | 3.36 | 3.39 | 3.22 | 3.54 | 3.36 | 3.39 | 3.22 |
| 2010/11 Projected Rate | | 3.41 | | 3.32 | | 3.41 | | 3.33 |
| 2011/12 Projected Rate | | 3.46 | | 3.40 | | 3.46 | | 3.42 |
| 2012/13 Projected Rate | | 3.52 | | 3.49 | | 3.52 | | 3.52 |
| 2013/14 Projected Rate | | 3.57 | | 3.57 | | 3.62 | | 3.62 |

It is important to note that the rates detailed in Table 1 cover the core funding provided for delivering the free entitlement. The enhanced funding that all settings are receiving in 2009/10 to help them move to delivering increased flexibility through the Pathfinder project (supported by a separate DCSF grant) is excluded.

SUPPLEMENTS

As previously described, the EYRG felt that only a small sum should be top sliced from the overall resources available to support additions (or supplements) to the basic hourly rate.

Proposal 6 – Supplements

It is proposed to use a maximum of 5% (about £254k) of the total available funding allocation to support the additional elements of the funding formula (i.e. Deprivation, SEN and Transitional Arrangements)

DEPRIVATION

All LAs are required to allocate a proportion of the funding available for the new formula to support the relative levels of deprivation experienced within each setting. The EYRG felt that this would be best achieved by including a supplement to the hourly rate based on some form of deprivation index.

After considering several options, the EYRG are recommending using the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI). IDACI is a subset of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) and shows the percentage of children in each Super Output Area (a small grouping of postcodes) that live in families that are income deprived (i.e. in receipt of Income Support, Income Based Jobseekers Allowance, Working Families Tax Credit or Disabled Persons Tax Credit below a given threshold).

Proposal 7 – Deprivation

- a) *It is proposed that approximately half of the 5% of funding not allocated to the basic hourly rate is distributed based on the IDACI ratings.*
- b) *It is proposed that the deprivation supplement will be linked to the child, based on their postcode and calculated on a termly basis on the actual figures for the number of children attracting the supplement in each setting.*
- c) *It is proposed that each hour of provision for a child whose postcode lies within one of the 30% most deprived areas of the country (as defined by the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index) be allocated a supplement of £0.40 in 2010/11*

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN)

Beyond specific funding for statemented children, there is currently no separate budget available to support other exceptional special needs demands that may fall on individual early years settings. The EYRG would like to retain some funding to support non-statemented SEN that would be allocated on overall individual provider needs as opposed to being allocated on a child-by-child basis.

Proposal 8 – Special Educational Needs

- a) *It is proposed that a budget of £50,000 be retained from the 5% 'top slice' for supplements to the basic funding rate, to be made available to support Special Educational Needs within all settings.*
- b) *It is proposed that the SEN sub group of the EYRG develop the detailed criteria to be used for accessing this support fund, with its allocation to be determined on the overall SEN needs of the setting rather than the specific needs of individual children.*

TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

After considering the impact of the proposed new funding formula on settings across all sectors, it is expected that moving to a formula based on a basic hourly rate plus supplements will generally cause more funding turbulence for Maintained settings than for PVI settings. This is primarily because of the move for the maintained sector from funding places offered, to funding actual hours taken up. In light of this the Schools Forum has already set aside separate funding within the Individual Schools Budget (ISB) to manage this transition for Maintained settings. This means that only the additional costs of transitional arrangements for PVI settings will need to be funded from within the 5% top slice of the overall budget allocation.

Proposal 9 – Transitional Arrangements

It is proposed that for each year of the transitional period (i.e. 2010/11 onwards) the minimum funding any setting will receive will be the appropriate funding rate under the old funding system for their sector for 2009/10 applied to the current year's pupil numbers or hours.

(This means that no setting should see a year on year cash reduction in funding on a per pupil or per hour basis)

It is estimated that the additional costs of this proposal (over and above the funding already set aside in the ISB for maintained settings) would be a maximum of £50,000 in 2010/11. This would be the third and final use of the 5% top slice.

QUALITY

The EYRG are not proposing to include an element in the new funding formula that directly supports and incentivises the quality of early years provision. There is an expectation that the basic funding rate will include a commitment to providing a level of quality. A city wide commitment to continuous quality improvement will be achieved through existing mechanisms and funding streams (i.e. Steps to Quality, provider contracts and the Graduate leader Fund (GLF) funding). However, this will be reviewed at regular intervals in line with DCSF budget allocations and future funding streams

Proposal 10 – Quality

It is proposed to not include an element which directly incentivises quality within the new funding formula but instead support this through existing mechanisms and funding streams.

SUSTAINABILITY

Within the current pathfinder grant allocation there already exists a budget to help support individual settings where sustainability is at risk. The EYRG felt that as this grant would be available until at least March 2011 it should continue to be used for this purpose. There was therefore no immediate need to divert additional resources away from the basic hourly rate in 2010/11, but the position would be reviewed on an annual basis.

Proposal 11 – Sustainability

It is proposed that a contingency fund be retained, from the additional Pathfinder Grant funding that York currently receives, to be used to support sustainability issues faced by settings.

FLEXIBILITY

As with Sustainability, York is currently in the fortunate position of being able to access Pathfinder grant funding up until March 2011 to recognise and support the work that settings are doing in moving to offering more flexible provision which meets the needs of families within their locality. The EYRG felt that flexibility was generally a short-term transitional issue and that using the pathfinder funding was a sensible approach, rather than building flexibility into the new formula. The position will be reviewed once the level of any continuing funding for flexibility from the DCSF from April 2011 is known.

Proposal 12 – Flexibility

It is proposed that funding for flexibility remains outside of the new formula and continues to be allocated from the pathfinder grant in 2010/11

There is a clear need to continue to review the operation of the new formula in 2010/11 and beyond. This is particularly relevant to York as significant funding is currently being received through the Pathfinder Project Grant and it is uncertain as to how much of this funding will continue to be available in 2011/12 and beyond.

Proposal 13 – On Going Review

- a) *It is proposed that there will be an interim review of the new arrangements in Autumn 2010.*
- b) *It is proposed that there will be a full review in Summer 2011 following the first full year of operation.*

Contacts:

Nicola Sawyer

Policy and Planning Manager
Early Years and Children's Centre Service
Tel: 01904 554348
Email: Nicola.sawyer@york.gov.uk

Richard Hartle

Head of Finance
Learning, Culture and Children's Services
Tel: 01904 554225
Email: Richard.hartle@york.gov.uk

Sabbir Ahmed

Business Support Manager
Early Years and Children's Centre Service
Tel: 01904 554609
Email: Sabbir.ahmed@york.gov.uk

Annex 1

Equitable Funding Reform Group Membership

| Name | Setting / Organisation |
|-----------------------|--|
| Alison Hanson | Fulford Playgroup / PSLA |
| Amanda Nicholson | Haxby Playgroup |
| Angela Roberts | CYC |
| Ann Spetch | CYC |
| Barbara Birdsall | CYC |
| Barbara Mands | CYC |
| Carol Weston | Knavesmire Primary |
| Caroline Lee | Sunshine Day Nursery |
| Charly Marilyn | York Steiner School |
| Connie Abel | Pre-School Learning Alliance |
| David McCormick | CYC |
| David McMillan | CYC |
| Debbie Adair | CYC |
| Diane Bell | NCMA |
| Elen Etheridge | NCMA |
| Fiona Wheeler | Stockton Lane Playgroup |
| Gail Stormont | Huntington Pre-School |
| Jan Anderson | Little Acorns Day Nursery |
| Jennifer Hogarth | CYC |
| Jo Suggitt-Richardson | CYC |
| Jonathan Hodge | Woodthorpe Primary School |
| Julie West | NCMA |
| Karen Lacey | CYC |
| Karen Wood | YCVS |
| Kelly Atkinson | Little Acorns Day Nursery |
| Ken McArthur | York NDNA Network / Polly Anna's Nursery |
| Maggie Antoun | St Paul's Nursery |
| Maurice Dobie | York Steiner School |
| Mike Barugh | CYC |
| Niall McVicar | CYC |
| Nicola Sawyer | CYC |
| Peggy Sleight | Group Chair |
| Pia Mari Powell | St Wilfrid's Nursery |
| Richard Hartle | CYC |
| Rosemary Flanagan | CYC |
| Sabbir Ahmed | CYC |
| Shenah Forster | Cherry Tree Nursery |
| Stephanie Windsor | CYC / EDS |
| Susan Pratt | Kaleidoscope Day Nursery |
| Tracey Brookes | Tiddlywinks Day Nursery |
| Wendy Wood | The Wendy House |

CITY OF YORK COUNCIL

CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY –SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

34 responses received: 14 Maintained, 18 PVI, 2 unknown

PROPOSAL 1: ANNUAL INDICATIVE BUDGET.

Do you agree with the proposal for the estimated number of hours to be based on the previous 3 terms actual data, with the opportunity for settings to amend the estimates prior to the start of the financial year?

Agree - 33 (97%)

Disagree - 1 (3%)

Comments:

- System must take account of significant changes and adjustments made to reflect these e.g. Increase or decrease in registered number at setting.
- Indicative budget should be given as early as possible to help providers when setting their budgets

PROPOSAL 2: PUPIL COUNTING ARRANGEMENTS.

a) Do you support termly counting arrangements being used for all settings?

Agree - 33 (97%)

Disagree - 1 (3%)

b) Do you support the proposal to fund on a half term basis for all settings?

Agree - 32 (94%)

Disagree – 0 (0%)

Unanswered – 2 (6%)

Comments:

- Would be good to have a system in place to be able to receive funding after the headcount, to encourage parents to start their children later in the term and not have to pay full fees.
- Do not want any additional forms to complete.

PROPOSAL 3: PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS.

Do you support the proposal to maintain the existing, but different, payment methods for the PVI and Maintained sectors?

Agree - 31 (91%)

Disagree – 3 (9%)

Comments:

- Subject to biannual/annual review
- Appropriate to use different methods for the different settings.
- With initial 85% payment reaching providers within the first week of term

PROPOSAL 4: ADJUSTMENTS TO ACTUAL NUMBER OF HOURS.

- a) **Do you support the proposal to make the adjustment to PVI settings to reflect actual take up 3 times a year, i.e. in each of the 3 terms?**

Agree – 30 (88%)

Disagree – 0

Unanswered - 4 (12%)

- b) **Please indicate which is the preferred option for making adjustments to Maintained settings, to reflect actual take up:**

- 1) **Adjustments made during the year in the final monthly payment of each term** 6 (43%) No preference 3 (21%)
 2) **The termly adjustments rolled up into one annual figure (whether this is positive or negative) and carried forward into the Annual Resource Allocation Statement for the following financial year.** 5 (36%)

Comments:

- Large adjustments could result in difficulty in planning staffing or issuing contracts
- The last adjustment in March will be critical to the balancing/ setting of school budgets, must have before closedown and finalising the new start budget.

PROPOSAL 5: BASIC FUNDING RATE.

Do you agree with the following proposals for the basic funding rate?

- a) **To allocate 95% of the total funding towards a basic hourly rate with 5% used to fund supplements for deprivation, SEN and transition arrangements?**

Agree – 30 (88%)

Disagree – 1 (3%)

Unanswered – 3 (9%)

- b) **To agree the principle of having one basic hourly rate covering both the PVI and Maintained sectors but move to this position over a period of time?**

Agree – 21 (62%)

Disagree – 8 (23%)

Unanswered – 5 (15%)

- c) **A lump sum arrangement to continue to apply for St Paul’s Nursery school to recognise the unique nature of the only stand-alone maintained nursery?**

Agree – 22 (64%)

Disagree – 6 (18%)

Unanswered – 6 (18%)

Comments:

- The move towards an equitable system is partial and significant differences remain; terms and conditions are different across providers, if we have equitable funding we should have an equitable system. High quality, expertly staffed, stable provision for young children in a community could be compromised with a partial approach; a quality measure in the formula could address this imbalance.
- EYFS makes a distinction between the levels of staffing for different types of provision so the funding should reflect this.
- The maintained sector is bound by teacher’s pay and conditions and the CYC payment structure and the formula does not reflect this.
- If moving towards equitable funding there needs to be equitable expectations of staffing structures and quality and procedures in place to monitor quality in both maintained and PVI sector.
- Maintaining existing quality of staffing with reduced/ inequitable funding formula may lead to lowering of standards in KS1 and KS2, if main school budget is used to subsidise this. In some instances KS1 and KS2 are already subsidising Nursery Units.

Comments continued:

- It is difficult to work inclusively and in partnership when a setting may have a significant financial advantage, therefore able to offer 'a unique service' & meet a wide range of needs.
- Funding for nursery schools should not come from 'Early Years pot'. If seen as a setting which offers something different e.g. diagnostic nursery provision or SEN support, it should be funded differently, however, not just 'unique nature'. Settings are losing children to the nursery school, as they cannot attract the funding to meet their needs.

PROPOSAL 6: SUPPLEMENTS.

Do you agree with the proposal to use a maximum of 5% of the total available funding allocation to support the additional elements of the funding formula - deprivation, SEN and transitional arrangements?

Agree - 29 (85%)

Disagree - 1 (3%)

Unanswered - 4 (12%)

Comments:

- Would be better if they were 'extras', not top sliced off everyone's very small hourly rate.

PROPOSAL 7: DEPRIVATION.

Do you support the proposals that the distribution of the deprivation supplement should be:

a) based on the IDACI ratings?

Agree – 29 (85%)

Disagree - 3 (9%)

Unanswered – 2 (6%)

b) linked to the child, based on their postcode?

Agree - 28 (82%)

Disagree - 3 (9%)

Unanswered – 3 (9%)

c) allocated to all children whose postcode lies within the 30% most deprived areas of the country at a rate of £0.40 per hour?

Agree – 20 (59%)

Disagree – 5 (15%)

Unanswered – 9 (26%)

Comments:

- Some concern regarding how data used i.e. should be based on attendance of child across whole term not just on a census day.
- Consider it inappropriate that 'private' schools should be able to get this funding when children using these settings are not from 'deprived' backgrounds.
- Deprivation should not be a postcode lottery; consideration should be given to children from outside of limited postcodes.
- Based on postcode is not ideal, although perhaps the easiest to administer and hopefully the least costly.
- A broader measure of 30% to vulnerable groups e.g. travellers, single parent families, unemployed families, LAC and children with SEN would be fairer or based on benefits.

PROPOSAL 8: SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN)

Do you agree with the following proposals to support Special Educational Needs within all settings:

a) to retain a budget of £50,000 for SEN?

Agree – 31 (91%)

Disagree – 0

Unanswered – 3 (9%)

b) an SEN sub group to develop the criteria for accessing this support fund?

Agree – 28 (82%)

Disagree – 2 (6%)

Unanswered – 4 (12%)

Comments:

- Include ethnic minority children - growing number in York.
- Need much more info regarding the allocation of the funding –bidding process / clear criteria.
- Must include a quality assurance element to ensure funding has measurable impact.
- Should be used to fund all eligible children in all settings - schools should also have access to this money.
- Money must be released quickly.
- Need to work alongside existing on SEN arrangements.
- Sub group needs to have good representation from all parties - not just SEN department. They should review regularly, evaluate effectiveness, advise on future budget retention and deployment and help publicise to all sectors and make recommendations to Schools Forum.
- Need clarity on bidding process
- Historically additional funding has only been awarded if a pre-school child had a statement of special need. Early intervention and support should be at the heart of all we do.
- Should have criteria for individual severe SEN needs.

PROPOSAL 9: TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?

Agree – 33 (97%)

Disagree – 0

Unanswered – 1 (3%)

Comments:

- Transitional arrangements very important.

PROPOSAL 10: QUALITY.

Do you support the proposal not to include an element which directly incentivises quality within the new formula?

Agree – 29 (85%)

Disagree – 5 (15%)

Comments:

- Quality must be taken into account to improve overall quality
- Difficult element to moderate when maintained nurseries are Ofsted inspected differently to PVI/ private settings
- Keep under review. Should be national agreement on qualifications which covers maintained and PVI as the funding formula assumes there will be 'quality' in all settings.

11: SUSTAINABILITY.

Do you agree with the proposal to support sustainability issues via a contingency fund of £50,000 from the additional pathfinder grant?

Agree - 32 (94%)

Disagree – 1 (3%)

Unanswered – 1 (3%)

Comments:

- Needs to be more transparent.
- Clear, objective criteria need to be determined needs to be short - term allocation and responsive to immediate need, decisions scrutinised and quality assured.
- Need to monitor how this is allocated and how it is used.
- Used to address short term and in the main exceptional circumstances.
- What happens when the pathfinder grant ceases?

PROPOSAL 12: FLEXIBILITY.

Do you agree with the proposal to support flexibility from the Pathfinder grant and not via the new funding formula?

Agree - 32 (94%)

Disagree – 1 (3%)

Unanswered – 1 (3%)

Comments:

- Needs to be reviewed at a later date, especially when Pathfinder grant ceases.
- Vulnerable families captured under the pathfinder remain vulnerable and new ones arrive the problem does not go away.

PROPOSAL 13: ON GOING REVIEW.

Do you agree with the following review timescales:

a) Interim review in Autumn 2010?

Agree - 31 (91%)

Disagree - 0

Unanswered – 3 (9%)

b) Full review in Summer 2011?

Agree – 32 (94%)

Disagree – 0

Unanswered – 2 (6%)

Comments:

- Will changes (if any) be implemented straight away or will they be kept on hold till following April 2011 / 2012?
- Details on outcomes / actions from review need to be made available.

Additional Comments:

Comments:

- The costs of providing the service must at sometimes be taken into account to make for long-term sustainability for providers.
- Found form difficult to understand
- Remaining flexible will result in a substantial loss of funding leading to redundancies, less qualified staff or reduced spending on KS1/KS2 leading to loss of quality in these areas.
- Concerns surrounding any changes to admissions either locally or nationally - i.e. the impact on maintained nurseries. If all pupils start full time school in the year in which they are five funding/ staffing issues will be exacerbated as we can only admit pupils to a maintained nursery in the term following their third birthday NOTE this is not a plea to start them earlier.
- Further concerns regarding flexibility as York's current and proposed model relies heavily in funding through the Pathfinder grant. Should there be any difference to funding when this grant ceases there would be an additional impact.
- All criteria must be based on information from funding forms NOT single day census.
- Some additional costs, which will affect all settings, are increase in NI contributions from April 2011 and the obligation on employers who are not already doing so to contribute to pension schemes for their employees WEF 2012.
- Currently able to provide high quality early learning and care for families in our local community. The stability and quality of our provision supports community cohesion and provides a base for other support services to focus their work with local families. Because of our fixed costs and the quality of provision, the new formula brings into question our ability to maintain our current provision and offer flexibility to families with young children.
- These changes will compromise - parental choice, flexibility to meet needs of individual children, quality of provision across maintained settings through the need to reduce staff costs, reallocate from school budgets with a knock on effect
- Serious concerns about whether parents will understand the differences in terms of quality vs. ease and marketing.



Meeting of the Decision Session – Executive Member for Children and Young People

16 March 2010

Report of the Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

Local Authority (LA) School Governors

Summary

1. This report provides information about the current position with regard to vacancies for LA seats on governing bodies, lists current nominations for those vacancies, as detailed in Annex 1, and requests the appointment, or re-appointment, of the listed nominees

Background

2. National benchmarking data on governor vacancies indicates a national average of 12% for LA governor vacancies. York has four (2%) LA vacancies at the time of writing this report.
3. Some vacancies will be generated by those existing governors not wishing to stand for a further term of office. The following table summarises the current position of LA vacancies and appointments in City of York schools.

| | |
|---|--------|
| Total number of LA seats in City of York schools | 170 |
| Number of LA seats currently filled (or held) | 158 |
| Number of new LA appointments addressed by this paper | 5 |
| Number of LA reappointments addressed by this paper | 3 |
| Number of LA appointments in progress | 0 |
| Number of LA vacancies remaining after this paper (excluding those where a nominee has been identified or where it has been agreed to hold vacancies) | 4 (2%) |
| Number of applicants placed in community vacancies since the last report. | 0 |

| Political affiliation of LA governors | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Party | Number of governors | Percentage of all LA governors |
| Labour | 20 | 12.7% |
| Lib Dem | 15 | 9.5% |
| Conservative | 2 | 1.3% |
| Green | 1 | 0.6% |
| Independent | 3 | 1.9% |
| Others | 117 | 74% |

Identification of vacancies

4. The overall picture of governor vacancies is informed by a detailed database, which includes records of all schools, the structure of their governing bodies, individuals who serve as governors and terms of office.
5. From the database can be determined such information as current vacancies and terms of office which are due to expire. In this way the Governance Service can clearly identify in advance the actions which are required and act accordingly.

Reviewing Vacancies

6. The vacancy position is under constant review. When potential new governors are identified the candidate is interviewed to discuss their interest and suitability. The Chair of Governors and headteacher are also asked to meet with the candidate and show him or her around the school prior to nomination for appointment. This allows the school to assess the potential candidate in terms of a good match for the needs of the governing body and current governors.
7. Where a term of office is due to expire, the individuals are contacted to ask whether they would like their name to be put forward again for reappointment. Chairs and headteachers are contacted to invite any relevant supporting information. Where a reappointment is appropriate, this is included on the nomination paper for consideration by the Executive Member.
8. All Local Authority governors are required to apply for an enhanced disclosure from the Criminal Records Bureau.
9. It should be noted that, as well as filling LA vacancies, the Governance Service also assists schools who are having difficulties filling community governor vacancies.

Political Balance

10. In York the LA governor seats are filled on merit, rather than by strict consideration of political balance. Just under a third of LA governors are, in practice, linked to one of the political parties. Amongst this number there is a balance which very broadly reflects the political balance within the authority. As and when a situation arises in which any party has significantly more seats than their political representation would indicate to be appropriate, steps may be taken to redress the balance over a period of time, whilst always considering the need to identify the best possible governor for a school, rather than taking account of individuals' political affiliation.

Consultation

11. Consultation on the nominations for appointment has been undertaken in accordance with the agreed procedure for the appointment of LA governors.

Options

12. The Executive Member has the options of appointing/re-appointing or not appointing to fill vacant seat as proposed at Annex 1.

Analysis

13. If the Executive Member chooses not to appoint to fill vacant seats this will have a detrimental impact on the work of governing bodies and their ability to meet statutory requirements. However equally importantly is the need for confidence that the proposals in Annex 1 will deliver volunteers who are committed to developing their skills in order to make a strong contribution to the work of the school.

Corporate Priorities

14. Good effective school governance does play a significant role in enhancing individual institutions and contributing as a result to the Learning City corporate priority which describes how

“We want to make sure that local people have access to world class education and training facilities and provision”

Implications

15. There are no implications relating to equalities, crime and disorder, ITT, property, financial, legal or HR issues arising from this report.

Risk Management

16. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report. Good active governance arrangements do contribute to effective school management arrangements and, as a result, reduce risks to the organisation.

Recommendations

17. That the Executive Member appoints or re-appoints, LA Governors to fill vacant places as proposed in Annex 1.

Reason: to ensure that local authority places on school governing bodies continue to be effectively filled

Contact Details

Author:

Sue Pagliaro
Governance Service
LCCS
Tel No. 4258

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Pete Dwyer
Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

Report Approved Date 11 February 2010

Pete Dwyer
Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

Report Approved Date

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

None

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers

None

Annexes

Annex 1 details the current position of LA governor vacancies and lists those governors who are being nominated for appointment or re-appointment.

LA GOVERNOR NOMINATIONS AND VACANCIES: SPRING TERM : MARCH 2010

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

| Name of School | Bishopthorpe Infant | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 3 | Total number of governors | | | 14 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr D G Livesley | Lib Dem | 05/04/2006 | 04/04/2010 | Yes | N/A |
| Mrs M H Kalus | None | 08/09/2009 | 07/09/2013 | N/A | N/A |
| Mrs S Sutton | None | 05/04/2006 | 04/04/2010 | No | N/A |
| Nomination (s) for reappointment | | | | | |
| Mr David Livesley confirmed that he would like to stand for a further term of office, effective from the end date of his current term. | | | | | |

| Name of School | Carr Junior School | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 3 | Total number of governors | | | 17 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr A Hewitt | None | 04/09/2008 | 03/09/2012 | N/A | |
| Mrs C Cox | None | 10/06/2008 | 09/06/2012 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 02/03/2009 |
| Nomination for 1 vacancy: | | | | | |
| Mrs Margaret Overall: 'I believe that education should give every child the best possible start in life. I have always had a keen interest in education and as a mother and a grandmother I have seen how talented teachers can make a difference and inspire children to enjoy learning. I would like to bring my skills and experience to the role of school governor to help and support the school maximize opportunities for children. I have a wide range of experience working in senior roles for a social housing provider. I feel that that experience, which includes staff and operational management, strategic planning and project management, would be equally relevant in an educational setting. In addition I would bring my experience of life both inside and outside the workplace.' | | | | | |
| Affiliation: none Appointment: with immediate effect | | | | | |

| Name of School | Copmanthorpe Primary School | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 4 | Total number of governors | | | 18 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr A Brown | None | 04/12/2008 | 03/12/2012 | N/A | |
| Cllr D Horton | Labour | 01/09/2008 | 31/08/2012 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 19/11/09 |
| Vacancy | | | | | 01/07/09 |

Nomination (s) for 2 vacancies

Mr Tony Myers : *Reasons why he would like to become a governor* 'To contribute to and be able to influence the enthusiasm, enjoyment and appetite for lifelong learning (in its broadest sense) in children locally.
I've worked as a senior director in further education for over nine years, and prior to that was a senior director in a professional body for nine years, and wish to utilise my acquired skills and experience to benefit children within schools. I've thus got lots of experience of working with governors, and know that their role is to be a critical friend leading on strategy, and not to become over-involved in day-to-day management (for which schools employ professional staff, including heads).
I've been a parent governor for three years and been Chair of Governors since September 2009 – becoming a LA governor would ensure continuity at Copmanthorpe Primary School, and might open the door to becoming a governor elsewhere in the future.'

Affiliation: none Appointment: with immediate effect

Mr Glyn Simpson : 'My children are grown up and have good lives ahead of them and one of the reasons for this is the quality of the schooling they received at Primary, Secondary and in Further Education. Having been through the experience I believe that I know some of the issues that are involved in providing that quality,

however I am sure that there is a lot more to the overall picture and it would be my chance to learn something and more importantly to put something back into society to hopefully assist other young people coming through the system.'

Affiliation: N/A

Appointment: with immediate effect

| Name of School | | Dunnington CE Primary School | | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 2 | Total number of governors | | | 15 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Prof PN Smith | None | 01/09/2009 | 31/08/2013 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 31/08/09 |
| Nomination for 1 vacancy: None | | | | | |

| Name of School | | Federation of Our Lady's & English Martyrs' RC Primary School | | | |
|--|-------------|---|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 2 | Total number of governors | | | 20 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Ms T Matilainen | None | 01/09/2006 | 31/08/2010 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 30/04/2009 |
| Nomination for 1 vacancy: None | | | | | |

| Name of School | | Huntington Primary School | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 4 | Total number of governors | | | 18 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr S Botham | None | 01/01/2010 | 31/12/2013 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 01/01/2010 |
| Vacancy | | | | | 05/02/2010 |
| Vacancy | | | | | 23/02/2009 |
| Nomination (s) for 3 vacancies: None | | | | | |

| Name of School | | Knavesmire Primary School | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 4 | Total number of governors | | | 18 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Cllr A Fraser | Labour | 01/09/2006 | 31/08/2010 | N/A | |
| Mrs A Cox | None | 13/06/2009 | 12/06/2013 | N/A | |
| Mr T Elwell | None | 04/12/2008 | 03/12/2012 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 05/01/2009 |

Nomination (s) for 1 vacancy

David O'Brien : 'My strategic leadership position within North Yorkshire Children's Services and the North Yorkshire Children's Trust means I have extensive professional knowledge and experience of services for children and families.

I am very familiar with the delivery of the Every Child Matters outcomes, and am familiar with Ofsted's arrangements for inspections of schools and other settings. I have knowledge and experience of the development and delivery of integrated services for children and families through extended schools and in children's centres. I have previously served as a governor in a primary school in north London. Childhood is a period of astonishing growth and development and, because it is a dynamic and vulnerable stage of life, it combines great hope with great risk. Childhood is important in its own right, and as a community we must do all we can to support our young people to make the most of it. I wish to use my knowledge and experience to make a positive contribution to a school, its pupils, and its wider community in the South Bank area where I reside. I wish to work with others to help children to enjoy and achieve, to be healthy, and to stay safe both in and out of school, and in so doing to lay the foundations of their economic well-being as they move through childhood and prepare for adult life.

Affiliation: none

Appointment: with immediate effect

| Name of School | Park Grove | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 3 | Total number of governors | | | 14 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mrs J Maris | None | 01/01/2010 | 31/12/2013 | N/A | N/A |
| Cllr J Looker | Labour | 01/09/2006 | 31/08/2010 | N/A | N/A |
| Vacant | | | | | 15/09/2009 |
| Nomination (s) for 1 vacancy None | | | | | |

| Name of School | St Barnabas' CE School | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 2 | Total number of governors | | | 15 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Cllr R Cregan | Labour | 01/09/2009 | 31/08/2013 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 28/01/2010 |
| Nomination (s) for 1 vacancy None | | | | | |

| Name of School | St Paul's CE School | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 2 | Total number of governors | | | 14 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Cllr D Merrett | Labour | 06/12/2007 | 05/12/2011 | N/A | |
| Vacancy | | | | | 08/05/2009 |
| Nomination for 1 vacancy Miss Helen Overend: 'I would like to increase my involvement in the community and although I do not yet have children of my own, I see education and schooling as a fundamental part of that community. Both my parents are teachers so I appreciate, possibly more than most, the difficulties but also the rewards that education can bring. I feel that I have a lot to offer having been a Police Officer prior to moving into the financial sector. I am able to work as part of a team and build up a rapport with people from all walks of life. I have worked with neighbourhood watch schemes when in this role and so am familiar with public speaking and also the need for excellent mediation skills! I am currently a Senior Relationship Manager for HSBC (having re-trained and qualified in the financial sector) and am therefore fully equipped to assist with any financial issues which may arise. On the whole, I would like the opportunity to 'give back' to the community but also further my own personal development.' | | | | | |
| Affiliation: N/A | | Appointment: with immediate effect | | | |

| Name of School | Wiggington | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 3 | Total number of governors | | | 16 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr G Colbeck | None | 01/08/2008 | 31/07/2012 | N/A | |
| Mr R Lister | None | 21/03/2006 | 20/03/2010 | Yes | |
| Mr J Clark | Lib Dem | 01/09/2009 | 31/08/2013 | N/A | |
| Nomination (s) for reappointment Mr Robert Lister confirmed that he would like to stand for a further term of office, effective from the end date of his current term. | | | | | |

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

| Name of School | All Saints RC School | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Number of LA Governors | 2 | Total number of governors | | | 20 |
| Current appointees | Affiliation | From | To | Restanding | Vacancy since |
| Mr G Lishman | None | 01/01/2009 | 31/12/2012 | N/A | N/A |
| Mr P Cannings | None | 09/04/2006 | 08/04/2010 | Yes | N/A |
| Nomination for reappointment | | | | | |
| Mr Peter Cannings confirmed that he would like to stand for a further term of office, effective from the end date of his current term. | | | | | |



**Decision Session - Executive Member for Children
and Young People's Services**

16th March 2010

Report of the Director of Learning Culture and Children's Services

SCHOOLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE – 2010/11

Summary

- 1 This purpose of this report is to:
 - inform the Executive Member of recent progress on major schemes within the Children and Young People's Capital Programme.
 - inform the Executive Member of schemes proposed for 2010/11 and of revisions to the programme.

Background

- 2 The current approved Children's Services Capital programme shows gross capital expenditure of £26.7m in 2010/11. This is detailed in Annex A.

Consultation

- 3 All of the schemes considered in this report have been, or will be, subject to extensive consultation with governing bodies, key partner agencies, local councillors and residents in the locality of the individual schemes during development.

Analysis

- 4 Progress reports on each of the schemes are contained in the following paragraphs:

Targeted Capital Fund (14-19, SEN and Disabilities Provision)

- 5 In October 2007 the DCSF announced a total of £608m of funding to be allocated to local authorities that were not part of the Buildings Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. This funding was provided to local authorities to support the provision of facilities for 14-19 diplomas, and also to support the improvement of facilities for pupils with Special Educational Needs and disabilities. City of York Council was allocated a total of £8m split over the years 2009/10 (£2m) and 2010/11 (£6m). In addition, the authority successfully bid for £515K capital funding towards provision of two diplomas approved under the DCSF Gateway mechanism for delivery from September 2008.
- 6 The allocation of funds supporting diploma provision has been made following consultation with the 14-19 Strategic Partnership that includes headteachers and college principals. Annex B details the funding that supports the various diplomas in secondary schools and colleges that now totals £3.8m. This includes a sum of £500K to support the introduction of the new diploma in construction. Expressions

of interest have been invited from schools and colleges and will be considered by the 14-19 Strategic Partnership.

7 Further allocations from the Targeted Capital Fund were made for the provision of Learning Support Units at York High School (£500k), and Manor School (£329k). These schemes, completed as part of the recent building programmes, are now complete. Contributions from the fund will also be made to support the funding of special needs provision within the new primary schools that are due to be built in 2010/11, subject to planning approval.

8 Further schemes are now being developed in consultation with individual schools. £750K has been earmarked at this stage for the development of a Learning Support Unit and other facilities at Canon Lee School. This project will support the adaptation of Clifton without Junior School, to enable Canon Lee School to use the accommodation, once the junior school moves to the new Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary School site in October 2011. The scheme is expected to include facilities for Youth Service provision and other community services. Further reports will provide more detail when feasibility studies have been completed.

9 A scheme is also being developed to improve the accommodation and facilities for students at Applefields Special School. Demand for places at the school remains stronger than predicted and the school continues to be oversubscribed. The current accommodation does not fully meet the changing needs of the students and staff and the scheme will seek to provide more flexible accommodation. The school is also working with the LA to develop some satellite provision at another secondary school in order to provide greater opportunity and choice for students and families. Expressions of interest in a pilot scheme have been sought from schools across the city. Further reports to the Executive Member will provide more detail when feasibility studies are completed and budgets confirmed.

10 The LA is also working with the Governing Body of Clifton Green School on a scheme to increase space for teaching and learning at the school, which has seen increased pupil numbers in recent years. The infill of an unused area of courtyard in the school will provide additional accommodation from September 2011. The development of this space will allow the school to maintain its class sizes and successful nurture groups.

Modernisation Funding

11 The LA organises a programme of modernisation works to address high priority building issues in schools based on condition surveys. During 2010/11 the LA will undertake some essential works to improve or replace some of the roofing at Copmanthorpe Primary School and Carr Infant School. A small number of other schemes will also be developed following analysis of condition surveys and fire risk assessments that have been undertaken. The LA will also work with Huntington School and Fulford School to develop options for the renewal of both schools' heating systems. Both schools have lost school days this winter due to boiler and heating failures. The systems are increasingly uneconomic to run, unreliable, and expensive to maintain. Feasibility studies have been commissioned and these will consider the options available and inform investment decisions. Further discussions regarding the contribution to be met from schools delegated capital funding, and phasing of these schemes, will be held with the governing bodies of both schools and progress will be reported to the Executive Member.

Building Schools for the Future – Joseph Rowntree

- 12 The new Joseph Rowntree school has opened this month. The new school has won a prestigious design award and students and staff have celebrated the move into their fabulous new building. The building has been delivered on schedule, and within budget, through the joint efforts of the project team that includes staff and governors of the school, local authority officers, and the construction partner Carillion PLC. The school has strong links with the local community and various open events are planned this month. The old school, at the front of the new building, will be demolished over the next few months to be replaced by landscaping and a new entrance to the new school, ready for the autumn term.

Children's Centre Programme

- 13 The development of the ninth Children's Centre at Knavesmire Primary School is now well advanced and work is due to be completed in April.

Primary Capital Programme

- 14 The Primary Capital Programme is a programme of strategic investment for the primary sector with the target of rebuilding or improving at least half of all primary schools in the country by 2022. A total of £1.9bn was made available nationally over the three year period 2008/11.
- 15 City of York Council was provisionally allocated a total of £8.378m, split over the years 2009/10 (£3m) and 2010/11 (£5.378m). In order to access this funding, the authority was required to submit a local Primary Strategy for Change document containing proposals to the DCSF. This was approved by the DCSF, subject to minor modifications, late in 2008.
- 16 A report to the Executive Member on 10 June 2008 outlined the proposed initial priorities for investment: a new school building to replace those used by the federation of Rawcliffe Infant and Clifton Junior Schools, and a scheme that supports the Diocese with the merger of Our Lady's VA RC and English Martyr's VA RC Primary Schools. The funding includes DCSF grant, devolved capital contributions from the schools and prudential borrowing to be agreed with the Schools Forum. The total budget also includes £1M Modernisation Funding expected to be available in 2011/12 that is subject to further announcement from DCSF.

Clifton with Rawcliffe Primary

- 17 The planning application for the new school has been submitted at the beginning of February, and it is anticipated that the application will be considered at the end of April. Construction work is expected to start on site in June 2010, subject to planning permission and contract signing. The new school is expected to be completed in late 2011, with the infants moving in first followed by the juniors.

Our Lady's and English Martyrs Primary School

- 18 This voluntary aided scheme is being developed with the Roman Catholic Diocese of Middlesbrough that is contributing £1M to the scheme. A planning application is due to be submitted by the Diocese in mid March, with a decision by mid June. It is expected that work will commence on site at the end of July, subject to planning permission and sign off of the construction contract.

Corporate Priorities

- 19 The schemes covered in this report contribute to key elements of the Council's corporate strategy, in particular through the ambition of a Learning City that seeks to provide access to high quality education and training facilities and provision.

Financial Implications

- 20 The amendments to the capital programme required from the scheme updates above are detailed in Annex A.

Other Implications

- **Human Resources:** not applicable
- **Equalities:** not applicable
- **Legal:** not applicable
- **Crime and Disorder:** not applicable
- **Information Technology:** not applicable
- **Property:** not applicable

Risk management

- 22 There is always a degree of risk associated with operating a capital programme as schemes are developed and implemented. The key to minimising this risk is the effective operation of monitoring and control processes. This report is part of that process, where updated figures and corrective actions are proposed.

Recommendations

- 23 The Executive Member is recommended to:
- Agree the schemes to be developed from within the available resources of the approved capital programme
 - Agree the revised schemes and funding of the capital programme as detailed in Annex A, and to recommend to the Executive for approval as part of the next corporate capital programme monitoring report
- to enable the effective management and monitoring of the capital programme.

Contact Details

Authors:

Kevin Hall
Assistant Director
Learning, Culture and Children's Services
Tel No. 01904 554202

Maggie Tansley
Head of Planning and Resources
Learning, Culture and Children's Services
Tel No. 01904 554214

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Pete Dwyer
Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

**Report
Approved**



Date 01/03/2010

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial:
Mike Barugh
Principal Accountant
01904 554573

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annex

Annex A - Capital Programme 2010/11
Annex B – Allocation of Targeted Capital Fund 2008/11

This page is intentionally left blank

| SCHEME | 2009/10 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2009/10 Revised Capital Programme (£000's) | 2010/11 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2010/11 Capital Programme (£000's) | 2011/12 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2011/12 Capital Programme (£000's) | Total Revised Gross Capital Programme (£000's) |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| NDS - DEVOLVED CAPITAL | 2,275 | | | 2,275 | 2,150 | -175 | | 1,975 | 1,503 | | | 1,503 | 5,753 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 2,275 | | | 2,275 | 2,150 | -175 | | 1,975 | 1,503 | | | 1,503 | 5,753 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HUNTINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS (TCF) | 100 | | | 100 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 100 |
| - DCSF SEED Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Targeted Capital Fund | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Insurance Income | 31 | | | 31 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 31 |
| - Section 106 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - School Contribution | 23 | | | 23 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 23 |
| - cost to the city | 46 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| CHILDREN'S CENTRES PHASE 2 | 361 | | | 361 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 361 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF ICC grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Sure Start Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DoH Safeguard Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 361 | 0 | 0 | 361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 361 |
| CHILDREN'S CENTRES PHASE 3 | 479 | | | 479 | 879 | | | 879 | 0 | | | 0 | 1,358 |
| - DCSF Sure Start Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF ICC Grant | 479 | | | 479 | 879 | | | 879 | 0 | | | 0 | 1,358 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Revenue Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NDS - MODERNISATION | 1,692 | | | 1,692 | 2,818 | -2,000 | | 818 | 1,136 | -1,022 | | 114 | 2,624 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 1,692 | | | 1,692 | 2,693 | -2,000 | | 693 | 1,136 | -1,022 | | 114 | 2,499 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Revenue Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - School Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Section 106 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 125 | | | 125 | 0 | | | 0 | 125 |
| - DCSF SEED Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Sure Start Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - External Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - LSC Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SCHOOLS ACCESS INITIATIVE | 460 | | | 460 | 388 | -100 | | 288 | 173 | | | 173 | 921 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 460 | | | 460 | 388 | -100 | | 288 | 173 | | | 173 | 921 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - LSC Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| THE SKILLS CENTRE | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Targeted Capital Fund | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SURE START QUALITY AND ACCESS | 1,482 | | | 1,482 | 1,059 | | | 1,059 | 0 | | | 0 | 2,541 |
| - DCSF Sure Start Capital Grant | 958 | | | 958 | 1,059 | | | 1,059 | 0 | | | 0 | 2,017 |
| - DCSF ICC Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 524 | | | 524 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 524 |
| - Revenue Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EXTENDED SCHOOLS | 265 | | | 265 | 137 | | | 137 | 0 | | | 0 | 402 |
| - DCSF Extended Schools Capital Grant | 265 | | | 265 | 137 | | | 137 | 0 | | | 0 | 402 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Revenue Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CHILDREN'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009/10 -2011/12

| SCHEME | 2009/10 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2009/10 Revised Capital Programme (£000's) | 2010/11 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2010/11 Capital Programme (£000's) | 2011/12 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2011/12 Capital Programme (£000's) | Total Revised Gross Capital Programme (£000's) |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME | 910 | | | 910 | 7,378 | 2,875 | | 10,253 | 0 | 2,522 | | 2,522 | 13,685 |
| - DCSF Primary Capital Programme Grant | 910 | | | 910 | 7,378 | | | 7,378 | 0 | | | | 8,288 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | | 2,000 | 0 | 1,022 | | 1,022 | 3,022 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 100 | | 100 | 0 | | | | 100 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 175 | | 175 | 0 | | | | 175 |
| - DCSF TCF 14-19 , SEN and Access Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 600 | | 600 | 0 | | | | 600 |
| - Prudential Borrowing | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TARGETED CAPITAL FUND 14-19 DIPLOMAS | 1,589 | | | 1,589 | 5,500 | -600 | | 4,900 | 0 | | | 0 | 6,489 |
| - DCSF TCF 14-19 , SEN and Access Capital Grant | 1,589 | | | 1,589 | 5,500 | -600 | | 4,900 | 0 | | | 0 | 6,489 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HARNESSING TECHNOLOGY | 835 | | | 835 | 528 | | | 528 | 317 | | | 317 | 1,680 |
| - DCSF Harnessing Technology Capital Grant | 835 | | | 835 | 528 | | | 528 | 317 | | | 317 | 1,680 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YORK HIGH SCHOOL | 189 | | | 189 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 189 |
| - DCSF Targeted Capital Fund | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF TCF 14-19 , SEN and Access Capital Grant | 189 | | | 189 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 189 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Prudential Borrowing | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - Revenue Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MANOR SCHOOL | 35 | | | 35 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 35 |
| - Government Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| FULFORD SCHOOL SCIENCE LABS AND CLASSROOMS | 481 | | | 481 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 481 |
| - Prudential Borrowing | 481 | | | 266 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 266 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - School Contribution | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 |
| JOSEPH ROWNTREE ONE SCHOOL PATHFINDER | 17,881 | | | 17,881 | 2,274 | | | 2,274 | 0 | | | 0 | 20,155 |
| - DCSF One School Pathfinder Grant | 7,091 | | | 7,091 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 7,091 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 392 | | | 392 | 230 | | | 230 | 0 | | | 0 | 622 |
| - DCSF Carbon Free Schools Fund | 0 | | | 0 | 676 | | | 676 | 0 | | | 0 | 676 |
| - DCSF Project Faraday Grant | 500 | | | 500 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 500 |
| - DCSF TCF 14-19 , SEN and Access Capital Grant | 935 | | | 935 | 500 | | | 500 | 0 | | | 0 | 1,435 |
| - Section 106 | 0 | | | 0 | 168 | | | 168 | 0 | | | 0 | 168 |
| - cost to the city | 8,963 | 0 | 0 | 8,963 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,663 |
| DERWENT MUGA | 57 | | | 57 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 57 |
| - External Grant | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| - cost to the city | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| SPECIALIST SCHOOL STATUS | 25 | | | 25 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 25 |
| - DCSF Specialist School Grant | 25 | | | 25 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 25 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOME ACCESS FOR TARGETED GROUPS | 120 | | | 120 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 120 |
| - External Grant | 120 | | | 120 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 120 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YOUTH CAPITAL FUND | 70 | | | 70 | 70 | | | 70 | 0 | | | 0 | 140 |
| - Government Grant | 70 | | | 70 | 70 | | | 70 | 0 | | | 0 | 140 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AIMING HIGH FOR DISABLED CHILDREN | 72 | | | 72 | 168 | | | 168 | 0 | | | 0 | 240 |
| - DCSF Short Breaks Grant | 72 | | | 72 | 168 | | | 168 | 0 | | | 0 | 240 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CITY-WIDE DIPLOMA EXEMPLAR FACILITY AT MANOR SCHOOL | 1,000 | | | 1,000 | 2,500 | | | 2,500 | 0 | | | 0 | 3,500 |
| - DCSF Diploma Grant | 1,000 | | | 1,000 | 2,500 | | | 2,500 | 0 | | | 0 | 3,500 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| APPLEFILEDS CO-LOCATION PROJECT | 50 | | | 50 | 877 | | | 877 | 0 | | | 0 | 927 |
| - DCSF Co-Location Grant | 50 | | | 50 | 877 | | | 877 | 0 | | | 0 | 927 |
| - cost to the city | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FUNDING FROM EXTERNAL SOURCES | 20,966 | 0 | 0 | 20,751 | 26,026 | 0 | 0 | 26,026 | 3,129 | 1,500 | 0 | 4,629 | 51,406 |
| NET COST TO CITY | 9,462 | 0 | 0 | 9,677 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,377 |

CHILDREN'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009/10 -2011/12

| SCHEME | 2009/10 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2009/10 Revised Capital Programme (£000's) | 2010/11 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2010/11 Capital Programme (£000's) | 2011/12 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2011/12 Capital Programme (£000's) | Total Revised Gross Capital Programme (£000's) |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| TOTAL GROSS EXPENDITURE | 30,428 | 0 | 0 | 30,428 | 26,726 | 0 | 0 | 26,726 | 3,129 | 1,500 | 0 | 4,629 | 61,783 |

| SCHEME | 2009/10 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2009/10 Revised Capital Programme (£000's) | 2010/11 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2010/11 Capital Programme (£000's) | 2011/12 Approved Capital Programme (£000's) | Adjustments (£000's) | Slippage (£000's) | 2011/12 Capital Programme (£000's) | Total Revised Gross Capital Programme (£000's) |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| Funding Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - DCSF Carbon Free Schools Fund | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 676 |
| - DCSF Devolved Capital Grant | 2,667 | 0 | 0 | 2,667 | 2,505 | 0 | 0 | 2,505 | 1,503 | 0 | 0 | 1,503 | 6,675 |
| - DCSF Extended Schools Capital Grant | 265 | 0 | 0 | 265 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 |
| - DCSF Harnessing Technology Capital Grant | 835 | 0 | 0 | 835 | 528 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 317 | 0 | 0 | 317 | 1,680 |
| - DCSF ICC Grant | 479 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 879 | 0 | 0 | 879 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,358 |
| - DCSF One School Pathfinder Grant | 7,091 | 0 | 0 | 7,091 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,091 |
| - DCSF Primary Capital Programme Grant | 910 | 0 | 0 | 910 | 7,378 | 0 | 0 | 7,378 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,288 |
| - DCSF Project Faraday Grant | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 500 |
| - DCSF Sure Start Capital Grant | 958 | 0 | 0 | 958 | 1,059 | 0 | 0 | 1,059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,017 |
| - DCSF Targeted Capital Fund | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - DCSF TCF 14-19 , SEN and Access Capital Grant | 2,713 | 0 | 0 | 2,713 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,713 |
| - DCSF Specialist School Grant | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| - DCSF Diploma Grant | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 |
| - DCSF Short Breaks Grant | 72 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| - DCSF Co-Location Grant | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 877 | 0 | 0 | 877 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 927 |
| - NDS Modernisation | 2,216 | 0 | 0 | 2,216 | 2,693 | 0 | 0 | 2,693 | 1,136 | 0 | 0 | 1,136 | 6,045 |
| - Schools Access Initiative | 460 | 0 | 0 | 460 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 388 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 173 | 1,021 |
| - Section 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 |
| - School Contribution | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| - External Grant | 120 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| - Government Grant | 70 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| - Insurance Income | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| - Prudential Borrowing | 481 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 1,500 | 1,766 |
| - cost to the city | 9,462 | 0 | 0 | 9,677 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,377 |
| Total Funding Available | 30,428 | 0 | 0 | 30,428 | 26,726 | 0 | 0 | 26,726 | 3,129 | 1,500 | 0 | 4,629 | 61,783 |

**TCF 14-19, SEN and Access
Capital Funding 2008-11**

| School | Diplomas | | | | | | | | | SEN and Access | Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Gateway 1 | | Gateway 2 | | | Gateway 3 | | | Sub-total Diplomas | | |
| | Society Health and Development | Engineering | Hair and Beauty | Hospitaliy and Catering | Manufac turing | Retail Business | Creative and Media | Construc tion | | | |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Canon Lee | | | | | | | 150 | | 150 | 750 | 900 |
| Huntington | | | | 15 | 15 | | | | 30 | | 30 |
| Burnholme | | | | 110 | | | | | 110 | | 110 |
| Archbishop Holgates | | 137 | | | | 20 | 330 | | 487 | | 487 |
| Joseph Rowntree | | | 750 | | | | | | 750 | | 750 |
| Manor | | | | 120 | | | 550 | | 670 | 329 | 999 |
| York High | | 438 | | | | | | | 438 | 500 | 938 |
| Applefields and SEN provision | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Skills Bus | 240 | | | | | | | | 240 | | 240 |
| York College | | | | | | | 170 | | 170 | | 170 |
| Satellite Sites (6) | | | | | | | 300 | | 300 | | 300 |
| Bids invited from schools | | | | | | | | 500 | 500 | | 500 |
| Clifton Green | | | | | | | | | 0 | 150 | 150 |
| Primary Capital Programme | | | | | | | | | 0 | 600 | 600 |
| Contingency | | | | | | | | | | | 341 |
| Total | 240 | 575 | 750 | 245 | 15 | 20 | 1,500 | 500 | 3,845 | 4,329 | 8,515 |

This page is intentionally left blank



16 March 2010

Executive Member for Children & Young People's Services

Report of the Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

'Me Too' Activity Subsidy – Report on Progress

Summary

1. This report seeks to update the Executive Member on the progress of the 'Me Too' Activity Subsidy pilot and sets out plans for a city-wide roll out. "Me Too" is the local branding of the funds known nationally (and previously reported to the Executive Member) as "Extended Schools Disadvantage Subsidy Funding".

Background

2. A new stream of government funding is now available to pass on directly to schools; its purpose is to support the 'Narrowing the Gap' and 'Improved Well-being' agendas. It is part of the government's commitment to Extended Services, and complements the core offer objective of schools providing access to a comprehensive range of exciting, high quality out of school activities. The subsidy helps to ensure that these activities are accessible to all. It focuses particularly on those children and young people who are disadvantaged by economic circumstances, defined initially as those that are eligible for Free School Meals and those in care. The subsidy – which we have branded locally as 'Me Too' - provides disadvantaged children and young people with the opportunity to take part in around 2 hours of Extended Activities per week during term time, and 30 hours over the school holidays, free of charge or at a greatly reduced rate.
3. Research shows that high quality out of school activities can help improve well being and raise standards of achievement, as well as narrowing the gap in attainment. Positive relationships with low income families can be created, strengthening their engagement with schools and the wider Extended Services core offer.
4. The expected benefits for those involved are: increased self-esteem, confidence and independence; increased aspirations; taking responsibility for themselves; development of social and life skills; and

the possibility of finding inspiration in discovering a talent they might otherwise have never known they had.

5. A pilot cluster of schools in the Acomb area (Westfield, Hob Moor, Woodthorpe and York High) has been working in partnership since last summer to deliver 'Me Too' and to prepare for the sharing of learning with other schools for city wide roll out.
6. The amount of funding agreed for York in Year 1 (09/10) was £82k. This increases significantly in Year 2 (2010/11) to £446k and is to be used by all schools, working on a cluster basis, for the same purpose.

Progress of the 'Me Too' Pilot

7. The pilot cluster has taken full advantage of the 'Schools Out' Programme and has made links to other offers for children including the cultural offer, the Five Hour Sports Offer, Find Your Talent, Youth Offer, short breaks, libraries, Aiming High for Disabled Children and Parenting. As a result, a broad range of activities has been made available using this funding: for example, cooking, residential visits, climbing, football, breakdancing, drumming, rollerblading, drum sessions, music lessons, swimming, and school trips. York High has also offered taster sessions to older primary school children, and has invited families of all children within the cluster to their family learning days.
8. Take-up has increased slowly over the last few months but it varies from school to school. In the initial stages, time was spent in setting up processes and consulting with the target group, which is important to secure the engagement of children and young people, sustain their interest and to do this in a sensitive and discrete way. Although final figures will not be available until after the end of the financial year, it is already clear that (in common with many other authorities) we will only have spent a proportion of the funds available to us in the pilot year (perhaps around 30%). We have ascertained that unspent funds can be rolled over to 2010-11. Despite the limited take-up to date, Annex 1 contains many examples of where the use of this funding has already had a significant impact.
9. Partly because of the lower-than-expected take-up, we agreed that the pilot cluster would explore other indicators of economic disadvantage as possible ways of including other children and young people who would benefit from accessing 'Me Too'. In addition to eligibility for Free School Meals and Looked After children, the target group has now been expanded to also include children and young people who are:
 - Young Carers;
 - Living in Temporary Accommodation;
 - Children in Need – receiving statutory services;
 - and those who have an active Common Assessment (ie. judged to be vulnerable to poor longer term outcomes).

10. Pupils who meet at least one of these local criteria will be referred to as the 'target group' for 'Me Too' funding. In exceptional circumstances Headteachers have also had the discretion to allocate funding where they are aware of other economic circumstances within a family that would make paying for activities difficult.
11. The pilot cluster has reported that although it is a challenge to engage particular children and sustain their involvement, overall there is increased engagement between the families of the target group and the school. They have also found that monitoring and evaluating pupils' participation in activities has played an important role in maximising the benefits of the subsidy. In order to contribute to measuring and evaluating impact, schools will be expected to keep data on the eligible group, their take up of activities, costs, and feedback on the impact on the pupil from a range of perspectives. The work of the pilot cluster will save others schools from having to reinvent the wheel in this respect; however, it is worth registering that schools have some concerns about the administrative burden that the subsidy represents, given that we are not allowed to top-slice any element of it for support costs.

Plans for City-Wide Roll Out

12. The Training and Development Agency (TDA) has been supporting the local authority in delivering 'Me Too' and preparing for city-wide roll out. They are confident that York is delivering as expected and that effective planning has been put in place for the full roll-out.
13. The Extended Services Unit has kept Headteachers up-to-date about 'Me Too' and is preparing a more detailed package of support for schools, to maximise the opportunities for using the funding as quickly as possible, and to minimise the administrative burden referred to above. The Unit is also briefing activity providers, agencies, support officers and school staff. Other plans include:
 - Working with activity providers across the city to ensure full engagement with 'Me Too' and to maintain discreet ways of accessing activities by the eligible group so as to avoid stigma. Agencies/providers are also being provided with guidance on giving early notice of children and young people with complex needs who will attend activities, to ensure the provider is adequately prepared to meet their needs within the setting.
 - Briefing professionals and agencies such as Family Intervention Workers, Education Social workers, Connexion workers, etc, who are able to influence and engage the target group, and other networks involved with these to support the promotion and implementation of 'Me Too'.

- Advice and guidance to school staff on administering 'Me Too' at a detailed operational level. All documentation and guidance will be made available on the YorOK Website.
 - Preparation of marketing materials such as fact sheets and posters – an example briefing note is attached.
 - Preparation of templates for schools to monitor take-up and impact on the eligible group.
 - Highlighting to Headteachers the forward planning that has to be done by their individual schools in terms of incorporating 'Me Too' into School Improvement Plans, Self Evaluations Forms, and the need to work in collaboration to achieve roll-out in the most effective and efficient way.
14. It is intended that delivery of activities is achieved through clusters based on School Sports Partnerships as these are well embedded across the city and mean that sporting activities, which form the largest part of Me Too, are offered in the most effective and efficient means possible.

Consultation

15. A key guiding principle of 'Me Too' is that schools must consult with pupils to ascertain activities that the target group and the school population in general would like to have available. Such consultation should then identify any unmet needs and barriers to participation, with a view to commissioning new services where this is appropriate. As part of delivering Extended Services and Every Child Matters, schools should already be carrying out on-going consultation and evaluation, and therefore the work for 'Me Too' will build on feedback already available to them.

Options

16. As this report is for information, no options are appropriate.

Analysis

17. Analysis is included within the main body of the report

Corporate Priorities

18. This work will contribute to the corporate objectives around Learning City, Healthy City, Inclusive City and City of Culture, through its focus on equality of access and improved outcomes, for all of our citizens.

Implications

19. (a) **Financial** – There are no implications for existing budgets. Additional grant funding of £446k in 2010/11 will be available through the Standards Fund from the DCSF and will be devolved to schools, including Danesgate; this money must be used for provision of activities, removing barriers to access, and commissioning of new activities.
- (b) **Human Resources (HR)** – There are no direct implications on posts at this time, as the grant funding is specifically for provision/commissioning of new activities and cannot be top sliced for any other purpose such as additional posts, administration, etc. The city-wide roll out will run using existing budgets within the Extended Services Unit and the schools concerned.

There are no other implications.

Risk Management

20. The risks associated with 'Me Too' are acceptable. The Extended Services Unit is supporting schools in the implementation of 'Me Too', with additional input from the Training and Development Agency for schools (TDA), and practical support and guidance from the pathfinder authorities who have already fully rolled out this subsidy. There is clearly a risk that not all of the available fund will be taken up; this is, however, a national issue. At this stage it would be reasonable to assume that there will be no further funds available beyond April 2011.

Recommendations

21. The Executive Member is asked to note the contents of this report, the plans for rolling out the "Me Too" subsidy across the whole city and that delivery will be achieved through clusters based on Schools Sports Partnerships.

Reason: To ensure that York is well placed to take advantage of the Extended Services Disadvantage Subsidy funding.

Contact Details

| | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------|
| Author: | Chief Officer Responsible for the report: | | |
| Barbara Mands Acting Head of Extended Services LCCS 01904 554637 | Paul Murphy Assistant Director (Partnerships and Early Intervention), LCCS | | |
| Sarah Carrick Policy Manager, Extended Services LCCS 01904 554441 | Report Approved | √ | Date |
| | 25 February 2010 | | |
| Specialist Implications Officer : Richard Hartle, Head of Finance, 01904 554225 | | | |
| Wards Affected: <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i> | | | All √ |
| For further information please contact the author of the report | | | |

Background Papers:

Information Item to Decision Session – Executive member for Learning,
Culture and Children's Services 8th September 2009

Annex: Annex 1. 'Me Too' Briefing Note

‘ME TOO’ – ACTIVITY SUBSIDY IN YORK

What is the purpose of this leaflet?

- To ensure that school staff and governors understand the purpose of the subsidy and the opportunity that it represents
- To generate a case for allocating school resources (time) to making the most of the opportunity
- To set out the responsibilities of the school, and the support the school can expect to receive from the local authority.

What is the aim of the ‘Me Too’ subsidy?

The subsidy is part of the Government’s commitment to extended services in and around schools. As part of this every school should offer a comprehensive range of exciting, high-quality out-of-hours activities to its pupils, with the aim of:

- Raising self esteem, confidence and aspirations
- Improve wellbeing, responsibility, social and life skills
- Provide inspiration and an opportunity to discover a talent
- Help to build positive relationships with families
- Strengthen engagement

In York the subsidy is called ‘Me Too’ and will provide funding to help schools ensure that these out-of-hours activities are accessible to those pupils who would not be able to afford them, complementing extended services activities and outcomes that schools are *already* delivering.

In addition to Extended Services ‘Me Too’ links to other initiatives that contribute to the Every Child Matters outcomes and the vision for 21st Century Schools including: the ‘Narrowing the Gap’ agenda, increased focus on early intervention, multi-agency working, personalised education and development. Locally these goals are articulated through the Children and Young People’s Plan and the targets within.

What are the eligibility criteria?

The level of ‘Me Too’ funding is not sufficient to make a significant and sustained impact on all pupils. This means that only pupils who are **economically disadvantaged** should be eligible for the subsidy. In York the eligibility criteria for ‘Me Too’ covers young people who are:

- Eligible for Free School Meals
- Looked After
- Young Carers
- Living in Temporary accommodation
- Children in Need – receiving statutory services
- Have an active CAF

Pupils who meet at least one of these local criteria will be referred to as the ‘target group’ for ‘Me Too’ funding. Plus in exceptional circumstances Head’s

have discretion to allocate funding where they are aware of other economic circumstances within a family that would make paying for activities difficult.

Guiding principles for using the subsidy

The six guiding principles below are aimed at helping schools be clear about what they should and should not spend the subsidy funding on. These guiding principles are supported by a detailed set of frequently asked questions available at www.tda.gov.uk/subsidy

- GP1: Access:** The funding should enable the target group to access activities from which they would otherwise be excluded due to their inability to pay.
- GP2: Additionality:** The funding should be used to make existing activities more accessible to the target group, and/or to commission new activities that better meet their needs.
- GP3: Involvement:** The target group and their parents/carers should be fully involved in choosing, designing and continuously improving a range of activities that are attractive and relevant. This should help to establish genuine control of the funding identified for them, in the same way as children and young people whose participation is not excluded by inability to pay.
- GP4: Open to all:** Any new activities created and delivered as part of the subsidy work should be available to all and should be financially sustainable, including charging for activities where appropriate.
- GP5: Creativity and personalisation:** For many of the target group there are barriers to participation other than purely financial: especially in these cases, school and other staff should be creative in developing personalised approaches that support individuals.
- GP6: Sustainability and ongoing participation:** The funding arrangements for activities should be sustainable over time and be attractive to the target group to secure their ongoing participation.

Who needs to be informed?

To ensure full engagement schools should disseminate the information to all staff within school. Other agencies and organisations will also be briefed to ensure a partnership approach to engaging families in 'Me Too', especially those who are most reluctant to engage.

- all Primary and Secondary Heads
- all teaching and support staff
- Governors
- school admin teams, bursars, schools business managers (they will be crucial to the success of 'Me Too' within each school)
- School Extended Service leads
- Children's Trust and YorOK brokers
- FIP, YOT, EWO, behaviour support, connexions workers and those able to influence families, and other networks involved with children and families across the city

What do schools need to do?

To enable schools to offer activities with 'Me Too' funding at the earliest opportunity, some forward planning will be required:

- Plans for 'Me Too' should be incorporated into SIP for 2010/11
- Open the debate on allocating school resources to support the roll out of the subsidy at a school/cluster level –identifying a key person within school to coordinate the subsidy.
- Identify the cohort that meet the eligibility criteria
- Think about ways of engaging/raising awareness of these young people and their families
- Look into options for consulting and finding out what the eligible cohort would like to do
- Look to promote existing activities, providers and partners to secure 'quick to wins'
- Look more widely to securing provision for activities identified through consultation.
- Make sure the right staff are aware of the support materials for administration, monitoring and evaluation of the subsidy.

What support will schools receive?

Extended Services , the pilot schools and other partners such as the Play Team, Arts and Cultural Services have been working together to work through the delivery of 'Me Too'. This learning will be shared with schools to support city wide roll out of 'Me Too'.

- Support to identify and engage activity providers through other council services such as the play team, arts and cultural services, libraries, school sports partnerships.
- Sample letters, posters etc will be provided as well as templates for monitoring of take up by the eligible group and the associated expenditure.
- Use of an existing cluster model to provide, baseline activities, support, help with consultation and feedback for SEF.
- Support from Extended Services Team and access to TDA resources.
- Support from other services working with families and young people to support the engagement of the hardest to reach families.

Funding

The funding is for **schools** to spend **directly** on helping economically disadvantaged pupils to participate in extended services out-of-hours activities. These activities should be driven by demand from the target group and will not necessarily be on school site or provided by schools themselves. To meet local demand, schools may need to signpost to or commission activities from third-party providers, including the voluntary and community sector.

The overall funding for the project is £446K. This will be devolved to individual schools termly based on the schools deprivation indices. Funding must be used for provision or access to activities of the young persons choosing, this could include direct payment for an activity, help with transport or equipment.

It must not be used to make activities free for all - those that can afford to pay should be encouraged to do so. It cannot be used to support the administration and payment of activities or for conducting consultation.

Links to the SEF

The school improvement plan can demonstrate clearly the way you intend to utilise the additional 'Me Too' funding to target resources and activities to specific groups or individual pupils, including the most economically disadvantaged.

Demonstrating the rationale and the impact of targeting pupils with regard to learning and support will be important judgments to highlight in your SEF. The effectiveness of how schools manage available resources, to meet the needs of pupils and achieve high quality outcomes, is also important evidence to be outlined in the SEF. The subsidy will play an important role in enabling these outcomes.

Working successfully to meet the aims of the 'Me Too' subsidy will provide this evidence for the SEF, guidance and templates on this will be shared by Extended Services and its partners.

Monitoring and Impact Evaluation

As a result of taking part in activities pupils are more likely to increase their attendance and engagement with the school, and thereby improve their academic attainment. Pathfinder schools reported increased engagement between the families of the target group and the school.

Pathfinders found that monitoring and evaluating pupils' participation in activities has played an important role in maximising the benefits of the subsidy. For example, where schools agree personalised learning goals with individual pupils in the target group, they have used the subsidy to fund extended services activities to support these goals.

In order to contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of the project locally schools will be expected to keep data on the eligible group; their take up of activities, costs and feedback on the impact on the young person from being involved from a range of perspectives.

This information will be further shared to enable all schools to share good practice and success stories.

The following page includes some examples of impact from pilot authorities and also highlights the potential benefits of the partnership approach to engaging families in 'Me Too'.

For more information contact Sarah Carrick, Extended Services Policy Manager. 01904 554441. or email sarah.carrick@york.gov.uk

Examples of Impact – City of York

Package of interventions following a Common Assessment Framework transform the child's and family's situation:

- **Who:** Four-year-old child, with single parent, two siblings (aged two and seven).
- **Situation:** Getting to school late, distracted in class, aggressive behaviour at home, mum has difficulties controlling children at home, child at risk of exclusion from school.
- **How the subsidy funding helped:** Child entered Common Assessment Framework (CAF) process with multi-agency team involvement. As a result of the CAF, the school worked alongside social care and health to deliver a package of interventions. As part of this package, the school used the subsidy funding to provide access to a breakfast club, after-school clubs, and taster activities.

Impact on the child/family: The four-year-old is no longer at risk of exclusion, and has expressed gratitude to the headteacher for the opportunities offered. In addition, the family's situation has seen a significant improvement.

Package of interventions dramatically improve school attendance:

- **Who:** Year 10 pupil, with single parent.
- **Situation:** Poor attendance and performance at school, mum is a substance abuser, late with rent payments, mother and son moved into sister's house (where drugs play a role), below threshold for action by housing or social services.
- **How the subsidy funding helped:** Student social worker and the school put together a programme to support the child. School used the subsidy funding to pay for the pupil to attend a fitness centre (particularly swimming which he greatly enjoys).

Impact on the child: School attendance has improved dramatically, developed strong relationship with the student social worker with whom he now speaks regularly.

Activities improve whole family relationships:

- **Who:** Parents, son and daughter.
- **Situation:** Father has not worked for some time due to ill health. Son was coming home from school with very high energy levels and so creating problems in the (small) house as he had no creative outlet for his energy. Son was having problems with attendance and performance at school.

- ***How the subsidy funding helped:*** The subsidy funded a school expedition which the whole family attended: this was the first time for three years that the family had had an outing together and was very successful. Following the positive experience of the expedition, the son started to participate in a number of after-school activities paid for by the subsidy.

Impact on the child/family: The mother reports that the initial family outing itself made a significant positive impact on relationships within the family. The son is now very keen to go to school as he looks forward to the after-school activities, and when he returns home afterwards.

Swimming lessons improve relationship between school and family, increase attendance:

- ***Who:*** Year 9 girl.
- ***Situation:*** Poor attendance. Was unwilling to attend school on a particular Friday citing that she did not have a swimming costume for the planned trip to the local swimming pool (the trip cost £6.50). The school attendance officer was working closely with the family, and when speaking with her mother discovered that, in fact, the reason the child would not attend was that she knew her parents could not afford the £6.50 cost.
- ***How the subsidy funding helped:*** The attendance officer offered to use the subsidy funding to pay for the trip to the swimming pool. On hearing the offer her mother broke down in tears and gladly accepted.

Impact on the child: Attendance increased and as a result behaviour is improving. Significant improvement in relationship between the family and the attendance officer.



16 March 2010

Executive Member for Children & Young People's Services

Report of the Director of Learning, Culture and Children's Services

Parent Support Advisers: The City of York Experience

Summary

1. This report updates the Executive Member on the Parent Support Adviser programme being delivered as a pilot with three small clusters of schools in York.

Background

2. One of the five principles underpinning the Children's Plan states that the government does not bring up children – parents do. The government is wanting to do more to support children and families, and parenting is one of the key components of the core offer for Extended Services. The DCSF has funded a national roll out of parental support by committing resources distributed as part of the Extended Services programme. The funding is specifically to support the appointment of Parent Support Advisers (PSAs).
3. The role of the PSA is to remove barriers to learning, enabling access to the full range of learning opportunities, as well as increasing schools' capacities to provide access to Extended Services. In particular, PSAs support parenting, and swift and easy access to targeted and specialist services.
4. In York, three PSAs have been employed and they work at Levels 1 and 2 of the "Tiers of Intervention" to increase parental engagement in their child's learning and help overcome barriers to engagement. As part of this they respond early to indications that children and families could benefit from additional help, providing them with personalised support to access targeted and specialist services. Individual work with families is clearly focused on early intervention/prevention, where needs are below the threshold that triggers the involvement of other specialist services/agencies.

5. The PSAs are each working with a small cluster of schools where data shows the greatest need for this type of support, particularly on attendance/absence. The cluster schools are:

Cluster 1: Burton Green, Haxby Road, Yearsley Grove, and Clifton Green primary schools, with support for transitions to Huntington and Canon Lee secondary Schools.

Cluster 2: Derwent, Tang Hall, Osbaldwick, and Badger Hill primaries, with support for transitions to Burnholme.

Cluster 3: Hob Moor, Westfield, and Woodthorpe primaries, Hob Moor Oaks Special School, with support for transitions to York High.

Progress

6. Our PSAs have had an intense period of induction to their role. They have been fully briefed on the range of services that families can access, and they have been proactive in networking with other agencies and services to ensure that knowledge and relationships are in place to support integrated working. This has been supported by role-specific training developed by the Training and Development Agency (TDA) and delivered in partnership with North Yorkshire.
7. The PSAs have generally been enthusiastically welcomed by schools, who have themselves provided inductions to school staff, ethos, policies and procedures. This has enabled the PSAs to work in a way that is complementary to each school.
8. During the first half term the team have worked on a number of cases with existing school staff to encourage the use of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) as a tool to work with families to identify needs for support. Increasing the use and understanding of the CAF process is a target theme for the PSAs, and early signs are positive that PSAs are in a position to work with families and schools to broker this. Each PSA will have a theme for their cluster such as the “brokering of CAF”, “transitions support”, and “promoting attendance on parenting programmes”. They will also develop a themed area of work such as working with BME families, fathers, or the extended family.

Early Impact

9. Feedback so far suggests that PSAs have been involved with a range of interventions including 1:1 support for families, general advice, support, and signposting to services. A number of interventions have resulted in CAFs being completed or reviewed, and in a couple of cases Team Around the Child meetings being convened, with positive outcomes for the families involved. As increasing awareness and use of the CAF in schools is an objective of the post, early indications suggest that the PSAs could make positive progress in this area.
10. There has been some really positive feedback from teachers, parents and the Children’s Trust on the impact of their interventions. Some of

these interventions have been quite complex in their nature; as relationships build between the family and the PSA, more information is uncovered and disclosed. In these instances the PSA has worked closely with other services and agencies as well as the Children's Trust to ensure the families are supported, and information is shared appropriately.

11. The PSAs' work is being carefully measured to assess the difference being made to outcomes for children and young people. Sample case studies are attached at Annex A to highlight the breadth of support that can be offered by the PSAs.

Consultation

12. There is regular consultation with the cluster schools to ensure that the role of the PSA is tailored to meet the needs of the particular cluster group.

Options

13. As this report is for information, no options are appropriate.

Analysis

14. Early analysis of the project is contained as part of the body of the report.

Corporate Priorities

15. This work will contribute to the corporate objectives around Learning City, Inclusive City and Healthy city, through its focus on improved outcomes for children and their families.

Implications

16. (a) **Financial** –Extended Services is funded by a mixture of budget from the Area Based Grant and the Standards Fund Grant allocated for Extended Schools Sustainability. In 2010/11 this provides a total budget of £341,930. The 3 posts of Parent Support Advisor have been included in the costings for this budget. The table below shows the amounts for 2010/11 and the maximum cost.

| | | | 2010/11 TOTAL INC ON COSTS | MAXIMUM TOTAL INC ON COSTS |
|------------------------|---------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | £ | £ |
| PARENT SUPPORT ADVISOR | GRADE07 | 3FTE | 86,197 | 90,055 |

(b) **Human Resources (HR)** – There are no implications arising from this report.

There are no other implications.

Risk Management

17. The risks associated with the PSA programme are acceptable – the cluster schools are committed to the pilot programme and aware of the parameters of the PSAs' work. The Extended Services Unit line manages the PSAs, and they receive clinical supervision from the Parenting arm of the Children's Trust. Ongoing support and additional input also comes from the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), as well as support and guidance from Pathfinder Authorities.

Recommendations

18. The Executive Member is asked to note the contents of this report.

Reason: So that York schools and families can benefit from the PSA role.

Contact Details

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------|
| Author: | Chief Officer Responsible for the report: | | |
| Barbara Mands Acting Head of Extended Services LCCS 01904 554637 | Paul Murphy Assistant Director (Partnerships and Early Intervention), LCCS | | |
| Sarah Carrick Policy Manager, Extended Services LCCS 01904 554441 | Report Approved | √ | Date |
| | 25 February 2010 | | |
| Specialist Implications Officer : Richard Hartle, Head of Finance, 01904 554225 | | | |
| Wards Affected: <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i> | | | All √ |
| For further information please contact the author of the report | | | |

Background Papers: There are no background papers

Annexes

Annex A: PSAs' Case Studies

EXAMPLES OF IMPACT – PARENT SUPPORT ADVISERS (PSAs)

Finding temporary accommodation and providing support for a parent escaping domestic violence:

- **Who:** Mother and child seeking temporary accommodation after escaping domestic violence situation at home.
- **Situation:** Parent came into school in distress after fleeing from domestic violence, and school introduced her to the PSA. The PSA provided a safe environment in which the mother was able to share information about the crisis she was experiencing.
- **How the PSA helped:** PSA accompanied the mother on an appointment to Housing Services. Having the PSA present at the interview gave the mother confidence and helped keep her calm throughout the duration of the application process. The PSA was also able to advocate and support the parent's application by giving evidence from the school. As a result the application was successful and the parent and child are now living safely in temporary accommodation.
- **Impact on the parent/family:** To continue engagement with the parent, the PSA contacted a support worker already involved in the home situation to join up and provide holistic support for the family. The mother felt listened to and supported by the PSA, saying "if you hadn't have come, this wouldn't have happened."

Assessing and drawing up new strategies to deal with a child's behaviour at home:

- **Who:** A referral was made to the PSA by the school on behalf of the parent, who had asked for support in dealing with their child's behaviour at home.
- **Situation:** The parent wanted to talk to someone and share their worries about their child's behaviour, without being judged or feel like they were being looked down on.
- **How the PSA helped:** PSA liaised with the parent and the school regarding the parent's concerns about their child, and strategies were drawn up to deal with the child's behaviours displayed at home. The PSA encouraged the parent to see a GP, who made a referral to a paediatrician. The PSA also liaised with the school's SENCO (Special Educational Needs Coordinator), who suggested that the child see an Educational Psychologist.
- **Impact on the parent/family:** The parent felt that their concerns were being addressed and that progress was being made. The parent also now has someone they know they can offload their

anxieties to, in a confidential environment. Parents have new strategies to deal with their child's behaviour at home, and further referrals and assessments have been planned.

Completing a CAF for a child displaying challenging and abusive behaviour:

- **Who:** A mother called in to see the PSA after receiving a letter offering a drop-in session.
- **Situation:** The mother smelled of alcohol, and explained the family situation as having a history of domestic violence with a subsequent marriage split. She discussed concerns surrounding the challenging and abusive behaviour of her child at home.
- **How the PSA helped:** PSA challenged the alcohol consumption, provided behaviour management strategies to deal with the child, and signposted to a parenting programme. The PSA shared concerns with a Child Protection Officer, and information was shared around previous Social Services involvement. It was decided by the PSA and Head teacher to undertake a Common Assessment Framework (CAF).
- **Impact on the parent/family:** The mother is in contact with the PSA as the CAF is being completed, which shows progress as the parent was previously disengaged with school staff.

Implementing strategies and completing a CAF for a child displaying aggressive behaviour at home:

- **Who:** A Year 2 pupil, whose behaviour was deteriorating at home.
- **Situation:** The boy was hitting his younger siblings and mother, and became increasingly anxious and angry. He was also scared to go to bed so would try and stay awake, hitting his mother while she slept. As a result the boy was tired at school, lacked concentration, his schoolwork suffered, and he struggled to form and maintain friendships.
- **How the PSA helped:** PSA completed a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and referred the pupil to other agencies for assessment. The mother had bought her son a punching bag 'to get rid of his aggression', taking her cue from parenting programmes such as 'Super Nanny'. The PSA explained to the mother that it may benefit her son if she used alternative, calming strategies such as praise, good behaviour reinforcement, and taking time out to calm down, instead of strategies that focused on his aggression. The mother agreed not to have lots of toys out at once, and to instigate 'special time' with her son just before

bedtime, where the boy could calm down and spend quality time with his mother.

- **Impact on the parent/family:** It is early days, but the mother says she already sees a slight improvement at night; her son looks forward to 'special time' and is not as tired at school. The PSA is looking into parenting programmes for the mother to attend once all assessments are completed, and the mother would like to access the local Children's Centre and support within the community. The mother was very grateful to get support for her and her son from the PSA, as she felt she '*had hit rock bottom*'.

Using different behaviour management techniques for a child displaying challenging and emotional behaviours at home:

- **Who:** A School Nurse made a referral to the PSA regarding a family with two children, aged 13 months and 5 years.
- **Situation:** The mother suffered from severe Post Natal Depression following the birth of her first child, which then improved and she went on to have her second child. She is currently taking anti-depressants and has a Community Psychiatric Nurse assigned to her. The mother has recently returned to work four full days a week, and the father works full-time during school terms only. Both parents are concerned about their 5 year-old daughter's challenging behaviour at home, but the mother and father use polarised behaviour management techniques.
- **How the PSA helped:** The mother identified the child's dislike of wearing socks as having a major negative impact on the family; the arguments and delay in the mornings caused the mother much stress and guilt as she did not like taking the child to school following a disagreement. Both parents felt that the child used inappropriate emotional responses to get her own way. The PSA provided details of a website selling seamless socks, in order to eradicate the issue and knock-on effects of guilt. Other websites and information were also signposted. Different behaviour management techniques were discussed with the parents, who agreed to try using 'language of choice' which empowered the child, using a 'Time Out' technique, and the possibility of using reward schemes.
- **Impact on the parent/family:** As a result of meeting with the PSA and the subsequent support that was provided, the mother felt sufficiently skilled and empowered to take this issue forward without any further intervention.

This page is intentionally left blank