



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Kerry Nicholls
kerry.nicholls@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4602

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 29 October 2012

To: Members of the
EDUCATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. (Chairman)
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance, Nicky Dykes, Judi Ellis, Brian Humphrys, David McBride,
Alexa Michael and Neil Reddin FCCA

Church Representatives with Voting Rights
Father Owen Higgs and Joan McConnell

Parent Governor Members with Voting Rights
Dolores Bray-Ash JP, Darren Jenkins and Janet Latinwo

Non-Voting Co-opted Members
Alison Regester, (Pre-school Settings and Early Years Representative)
Hilary Richardson, (Head Teacher Representative)
Andrew Spears, (Young People's Representative)

A meeting of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be held
at Bromley Civic Centre on **TUESDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2012 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Resources

Paper copies of this agenda will not be provided at the meeting. Copies can be printed off at www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings. Any member of the public requiring a paper copy of the agenda may request one in advance of the meeting by contacting the Clerk to the Committee, giving 24 hours notice before the meeting.

Items marked for information only will not be debated unless a member of the Committee requests a discussion be held, in which case please inform the Clerk 24 hours in advance indicating the aspects of the information item you wish to discuss

A G E N D A

PART 1 (PUBLIC) AGENDA

Note for Members: Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

STANDARD ITEMS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3 MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11TH SEPTEMBER 2012 (Pages 5 - 18)

4 QUESTIONS TO THE PDS CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

To hear questions to the Committee received in writing by the Democratic Services Team by 5.00pm on Wednesday 31st October 2012 and to respond. Questions must relate to the work of the scrutiny committee.

PORTFOLIO PRESENTATIONS AND DECISIONS

5 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

To hear questions to the Portfolio Holder received in writing by the Democratic Services Team by 5.00pm on Wednesday 31st October 2012 and to respond. Questions must relate to the work of the Portfolio.

6 PORTFOLIO HOLDER PROPOSED DECISIONS

The Education Portfolio Holder to present scheduled reports for pre-decision scrutiny on matters where he is minded to make decisions.

a MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (Pages 19 - 24)

b REVISED INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT - FARNBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL (Pages 25 - 30)

c REVIEW OF PRIMARY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: OUTCOMES (Pages 31 - 42)

d TRANSFER OF THE ADULT EDUCATION SERVICE (Pages 43 - 46)

e 2013/14 FUNDING REVIEW - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS (Pages 47 - 58)

7 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER INFORMATION ITEMS

The items comprise:

- Education Portfolio Plan: Mid Year Performance Report 2012/13
- Education and Care Services Contract Reports - Education Contracts
- Minutes of the Education Budget Sub Committee held on 25th September 2012

Members and Co-opted Members have been provided with advance copies of the briefing via e-mail. The briefing is also available on the Council's Website at the following link: <http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=559&Year=2012>

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

- 8 SUPPORT FOR UNDER PERFORMING SCHOOLS** (Pages 59 - 68)
- 9 SUPPORT FOR UNDER ACHIEVING GROUPS OF CHILDREN - CLOSING THE GAP** (Pages 69 - 76)
- 10 COMPARISON OF THERAPY PROVISION IN BROMLEY SCHOOLS AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS** (Pages 77 - 92)
- 11 EDUCATION PROGRAMME 2012/13** (Pages 93 - 100)

DATES OF FUTURE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

23rd January 2013

19th March 2013

.....

This page is left intentionally blank

Agenda Item 3

EDUCATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 11 September 2012

Present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. (Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance, Will Harmer, Brian Humphrys,
David McBride, Alexa Michael and Neil Reddin FCCA

Dolores Bray-Ash JP, Father Owen Higgs, Darren Jenkins,
Joan McConnell, Janet Latinwo, Alison Register and
Andrew Spears

Also Present:

Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education
Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, Executive Support Assistant to the
Portfolio Holder for Education

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lydia Buttinger, Councillor Nicky Dykes and Councillor Judi Ellis. Councillor Will Harmer attended as substitute for Councillor Nicky Dykes. Apologies were also received from Hilary Richardson.

The Chairman noted that Councillor Lydia Buttinger and Councillor Russell Jackson had just been married and the members of the Committee sent their best wishes.

23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Declarations of Interest made at the meeting on 12th June 2012 were taken as read.

Mrs Joan McConnell, Church representative, declared that she was no longer Chairman of Governors at St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, however she remained a member of the Governing Body.

24 MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 12TH JUNE 2012 AND THE EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17TH JULY 2012 AND MATTERS ARISING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Education PDS Committee meeting held on 12th June 2012 and the Education Select Committee meeting held on 17th July 2012 be agreed.

25 QUESTIONS TO THE PDS CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions had been received.

26 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions had been received.

27 PORTFOLIO HOLDER PROPOSED DECISIONS

A) REVISED INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT - HIGHFIELD JUNIOR SCHOOL

Report ED12023

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the revised Instrument of Government for Highfield Junior School.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the revised Instrument of Government for Highfield Junior School, and that the Instrument be made by the Common Seal of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.

B) MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES

Report ED12022

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining LA Governor Appointments to eight schools and academies in the Borough.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the following LA Governor appointments, subject to CRB checks:

Burwood School	Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe (Orpington Ward)
Clare House Primary School	Mrs Janet Tibbalds (Beckenham)
	Mr Enkanah Soobadoo (Beckenham)
Churchfields Primary School	Mr David Hughes (Beckenham)
Downe Primary School	Mrs Jane Thornton (Downe)

Keston CE Primary School	Mrs Katherine Blair (Bromley)
Oak Lodge Primary School	Mrs Ann Medhurst
St Mary Cray Primary School	Mrs Helen Fiorini (Beckenham)
Worsley Bridge Junior School	Mr Stephen Powell

**C) CONSULTATION OUTCOMES: PROPOSAL TO EXPAND
CHURCHFIELDS PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Report ED12026

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the proposed expansion of Churchfields Primary School. Churchfields Primary School, a one form of entry school, had agreed to accept a 'bulge year' in 2010 (an increase of one form of entry at Reception) to meet increased demand for primary school places, and had subsequently been full at two forms of entry for the past two years with pupils drawn from close proximity to the school. Following the Local Authority's 2012 review of Bromley primary school places, it had been identified that the increase in demand for pupil places would be sustained for the foreseeable future and it was now proposed to make the expansion to two forms of entry permanent

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Agree the proposed expansion to take effect from 1st September 2013; and,**
- 2) That Officers be authorised to undertake the formal statutory processes required for the expansion.**

**D) CONSULTATION OUTCOMES: PROPOSAL TO EXPAND
RIVERSIDE SCHOOL**

Report ED12027

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the proposed expansion of Riverside School by one form of entry at the St Paul's Cray site, admitting 8 additional children with autistic spectrum disorder to Year 7 each year from September 2013. The report outlined the increased demand for specialist school places within the Borough and highlighted that the expansion of Riverside School would give more children and young people with autistic spectrum disorder the opportunity to access a high quality education at a local Bromley school.

In response to a question from a Co-opted Member around how children and young people would move between provision, the Head of Access and Admissions confirmed that the aim was for Riverside to provide a primary education offer on the Beckenham site and a secondary education offer on the St Paul's Cray site.

Work was also being undertaken on a proposal to establish a two form entry secondary education offer at The Glebe School for children and young people with autistic spectrum disorder in the higher ability range.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Agree the proposed expansion to take effect from 1st September 2013; and,**
- 2) That Officers be authorised to undertake the formal statutory processes required for the expansion.**

E) BASIC NEED PROGRAMME UPDATE REPORT 4

Report ED12034

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report setting out the proposed updated 2012-13 Basic Need Programme, which was funded by the Basic Need Capital Grant to support the provision of sufficient school places in publicly funded schools.

On 26th March 2012, the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People had agreed a list of priority schemes for addressing the estimated increase in the number of reception age pupils from September 2012. To meet this demand, 'bulge years' were planned at existing local schools to provide the required pupil places, which would be delivered through a combination of modular build and internal refurbishment. Following this decision, the Council had been awarded a second exceptional Basic Need Capital Grant allocation, which had increased Bromley's total award to date by £1,590,436 to £9,769,662.

A Co-opted Member queried whether early years provision had been displaced at Scotts Park Primary school to accommodate a 'bulge year' class. The Head of Access and Admissions confirmed that the space used was suitable for early years with access to the same outdoor areas; however no early years provision had been displaced to accommodate the additional class.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- 1) Approve the updated list of schools within the Basic Need Capital Programme 2012-13;**
- 2) Agree the procurement of schemes within the Basic Need Programme through traditional procurement, the Lewisham Modular Buildings Framework or through devolution of Basic Need Capital Grant to schools.**
- 3) Authorise the Director of Education and Care Services to submit planning applications at the appropriate time in respect of the list of schemes.**

28 QUESTIONS ON THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER BRIEFING

The Portfolio Holder Briefing comprised six reports:

- Education and Care Services Contract Activity Report
- Annual Update Report on Bromley Youth Offending Team Partnership 2011/12
- Academy Programme in Bromley: Update
- Education Policy and Legislative Changes: Update
- Minutes of the Education Budget Sub-Committee held on 31st July 2012
- Outcomes from Ofsted Thematic Inspection of Safeguarding Disabled Children

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder Briefing be noted.

29 FURTHER REVIEW OF THE BEHAVIOUR SERVICE

Report ED12036

The Committee considered a report outlining options for the future delivery of a local behaviour service following consultation undertaken with head teachers. The Bromley Behaviour Service delivered the Pupil Referral Service, respite provision, outreach behaviour support to primary and secondary schools and provision for children and young people out of school, including home and hospital provision and provision for school-age mothers.

In considering the report, a Co-opted Member noted some user dissatisfaction with elements of the Behaviour Service in responses from secondary academies, whilst primary school responses had been overwhelmingly positive. Another Co-opted Member noted that primary and secondary schools made very different uses of the Behaviour Service, with secondary schools likely to have more varied needs.

The Chairman proposed that a Member Officer Working Group be established to consider the future delivery of the Bromley Behaviour Service. This was supported by the Committee and Member nominations were received from Councillors Nicholas Bennett JP and Alexa Michael and Co-opted Members, Mr Darren Jenkins and Mrs Joan McConnell. It was also proposed to include Officers and Head Teacher representatives as part of the Membership.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Further discussions be held between Officers and Head Teachers to consider the future of the Bromley Behaviour Service; and,**
- 2) A Member Officer Working Group be established to consider the future delivery of the Bromley Behaviour Service and for membership to comprise Councillors Nicholas Bennett JP and Alexa Michael, Co-**

opted Members, Mr Darren Jenkins and Mrs Joan McConnell, Officers and Head Teacher representatives.

30 EXAMINATION OF FOUNDATION STAGE PROFILES IN EARLY YEARS SETTINGS

Report ED12038

The Committee considered a report outlining the analysis of results matched to Early Years settings over a five year period and outlining the methodology used. This report had been requested by Members following consideration of a report around standards of attainment in Bromley Schools in 2011 at the meeting of Children and Young People PDS Committee on 20th March 2012. Members had expressed an interest in understanding the performance of Early Years settings in relation to the Early Years Foundation Stage profile, which was the first informal assessment of a child's learning undertaken in the Reception year in primary school.

A Co-opted Member welcomed the report but highlighted that the figures shown did not necessarily reflect the quality of early years settings as the attainment of children would be impacted by the quality of the teaching they received in their Reception year. The figures also did not identify those early years settings who provided places for children with special educational needs or those for whom English was an additional language.

The Chairman noted that Local Authority settings had shown a steady year on year increase in performance over the last five years, but that performance had been below average in these settings since 2008. The Head of Learning confirmed that the Local Authority settings were located in areas of greatest deprivation in the Borough but that support was being given to the most vulnerable children and there had been a steady increase in performance.

RESOLVED that Members comments be noted.

31 DECLINING LITERACY IN EARLY YEARS

Report ED12024

The Committee considered a report which had been requested by Members following consideration of a report around standards of attainment in Bromley Schools in 2011 at the meeting of Children and Young People PDS Committee on 20th March 2012. This report had indicated that the London Borough of Bromley was below the National Average in the percentage of pupils scoring 6+ on the Early Years Foundation Stage profile, with attainment in Communication, Language and Literacy of particular concern.

In considering the report, Members noted that the 2012 results showed an encouraging upward trend, with an increase in the overall Local Authority percentage score of 6+ points for the Foundation Stage Profiles increasing from 57.9% in 2011 (against a National average of 59%) to 68.2% in 2012, which was

likely to be above the National average for 2012, although there were still gaps in attainment between boys and girls and those eligible for free school meals.

A Co-opted Member was concerned that the Early Years Team, which supported schools, had been reduced from 5 full time equivalent (FTE) staff to 3 FTE and noted the importance of early intervention where issues were identified. The Head of Learning confirmed that there had been a reduction in staff, but noted that there was potential for these staff to work with teaching schools in the Borough to build capacity and support the introduction of the new Early Years Framework.

Another Co-opted Member highlighted the need to ensure early years settings were being supported in understanding the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile. It was also noted that early years settings that had been rated unsatisfactory could not apply for grant funding through the new Framework for Nursery Education Funding, and that those rated 'satisfactory' would need to sign up to a programme of improvement to qualify for funding.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Reasons for improvements in the Early Years Foundation Stage results in 2012 be noted;**
- 2) Members comments on the challenge for Schools and Early Years settings as a new Early Years Foundation Stage Framework is introduced be noted; and,**
- 3) A further update be provided to the Education PDS Committee in September 2013.**

32 IDENTIFYING UNDER PERFORMING SCHOOLS AND ACTION TO IMPROVE THEM

This item was withdrawn.

33 INCREASING USE OF ONLINE APPLICATIONS

Report ED12030

The Committee considered a report outlining the use of online processes for free school meal eligibility checking and admission applications by the Local Authority and setting out targets for the increased use of these processes in the future. The London Borough of Bromley had a significantly lower proportion of applications submitted online than the highest performing Local Authorities, but proposals had been developed to increase this proportion and it was expected that 85% of all admission applications would be submitted online for 2013/14.

In considering the drive to submit online applications for free school meal eligibility checking and admission applications, a Member highlighted that paper evidence was still required for admission applications, including the child's birth certificate and council tax data. A National Initiative meant that evidence required for free

school meal eligibility checking was available online via 'The Hub', and the Chairman noted the need for a similar scheme to be introduced on a London-wide or National level for admission applications, simplifying the application process for parents and realising significant cost savings for the Local Authority.

With regard to evidence for admission applications, the Head of Access and Admissions confirmed that processes to access Council Tax data electronically were being put in place. There would also be a move to print on demand for school admissions brochures to further encourage the use of online applications, although a Co-opted Member highlighted the need to ensure promotional materials were still available for parents of children in early years settings in relation to the school admissions process to ensure they met the primary school application deadline.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) A target of 85% of all admission applications to be submitted online be set for 2013/14;**
- 2) Representations be made to London Councils to extend the use of 'The Hub' to support the availability online of evidence needed to support admission applications;**
- 3) Print-on-demand to be introduced for the Schools Admissions Brochure; and,**
- 4) A further update be provided to the Education PDS Committee in September 2013.**

34 SCHOOLS' SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY

This item was withdrawn.

35 TEACHER APPRAISAL AND CAPABILITY ARRANGEMENTS

Report ED12037

The Committee considered a report outlining revised arrangements to be introduced from 1st September 2012 to manage teacher performance and setting out the proposed changes to the Council's existing procedures and policies.

In response to a query from a Member, the Assistant Chief Executive: Human Resources confirmed that the proposed arrangements would also apply to Head Teachers.

RESOLVED that the General Purposes and Licensing Committee be recommended to:

- 1) Note Members' comments regarding the Department for Education model policy for teachers' appraisal and capability;**

- 2) Agree that the model policy be adopted by all Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and in respect of centrally based teacher staff employed by the Local Authority; and,**
- 3) Agree the minor change to the current Capability Procedure enabling the informal capability process to be dealt with as part of the appraisal process.**

**36 OUTCOMES OF THE EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE
HEARING INTO PROVISION OF SOLD SERVICES TO
SCHOOLS**

Report ED12020

The Committee considered a report outlining the outcomes of the Education Select Committee Hearing into Provision of Sold Services to Schools, which was held on 17th July 2012. The aim of the Select Committee Hearing was to explore how sold services were currently delivered across the Borough and to consider how sold services could be delivered in future to support the needs of schools across the Borough. Evidence was presented by a number of witnesses including representatives of the Local Authority, local schools, private providers of sold services and a neighbouring local authority. Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education, also represented the Local Authority's Executive.

In considering the Select Committee Hearing, the Chairman thanked all Members and Co-opted Members who attended the Education Select Committee Hearing, and requested that the Portfolio Holder for Education provide an update to the Committee around sold services.

The Portfolio Holder for Education advised the Committee that detailed reports were being developed in respect of a range of sold services, including Human Resources, Audit, Health and Safety and Occupational Health. Progress had also been made in plans to relocate services from the Education Development Centre site to another location in the Borough, with work being undertaken prior to any move to identify if services could be delivered in a different way.

In response to a question from a Co-opted Member, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that following the relocation of services from the Education Development Centre, it was proposed to recommend the site be used to support the delivery of additional primary school places for the local community.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The conclusions of the Select Committee Hearing be noted;**
- 2) The Education Portfolio Holder be recommended to support the option of contractor commissioning for sold services where appropriate; and,**

- 3) Changes to the future organisation of Select Committee Hearings be agreed.**

37 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EDUCATION BUDGET SUB COMMITTEE

Report ED12021

The Committee considered the draft Terms of Reference for the Education Budget Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED that the Terms of Reference for the Education Budget Sub-Committee be endorsed.

38 EDUCATION PROGRAMME 2012/13

Report ED12035

The Committee considered the forward rolling work programme for the year ahead, based on items scheduled for decision by the Education Portfolio Holder and items for consideration by the Education PDS Committee.

In considering the work programme for the Committee, the Chairman confirmed that the two items withdrawn from the agenda for the meeting of Education PDS Committee on 11th September 2012 would be considered at the meeting on 6th November 2012. These comprised reports on 'Identifying Under Performing Schools and Action to Improve Them' and 'Schools' Social Media Policy'.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that responsibility for adult education had now been transferred from the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio to the Education Portfolio.

The Chairman announced that an Education Seminar would take place on 15th November 2012 for all Members exploring a range of themes and issues that were key to the Education Portfolio. These themes would include Looked After Children – the role of the Virtual Head Teacher, Raising the Participation Age, SEN Strategy and School Places, and the Chairman invited all Members and Co-opted Members of the Education PDS Committee to attend.

RESOLVED that the Education Programme 2012/13 be noted.

39 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it was likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

**40 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION PDS COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 12TH JUNE 2012**

RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the Education PDS Committee meeting held on 12th June 2012 be agreed.

**41 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER PART 2 (EXEMPT)
INFORMATION ITEMS**

The Part 2 (Exempt) Portfolio Holder Briefing comprised one item:

- Part 2 (Exempt) Minutes of the Education Budget Sub-Committee held on 31st July 2012

RESOLVED that the Part 2 (Exempt) Portfolio Holder Briefing be noted.

The Meeting ended at 8.08 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Matters Arising

Minute Number/Title	Decision	Update	Action	Completion Date
20th March 2012				
95 (a) An Update on Recent Government Reform Developments Including the Academy Programme	That the outcomes of discussions on the Raising the Participation Age regulations by the 14-19 collaborative be reported to the Committee.	An update would be provided to a future meeting of the Committee.	Assistant Director ECS	TBA
12th June 2012				
8 (d) Speech and Language and Occupational Therapy Provision for Children with Statements of Educational Need Accessing Bromley Specialist Education Provisions	That a study be undertaken prior to the re-tendering of the contract to investigate the use of Occupational and Speech and Language Therapists within special schools, special units and mainstream school settings, and to compare this provision with that of Independent Schools.	A report would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee.	Assistant Director ECS	November
11 Education Forward Rolling Work Programme	That a seminar be held in November 2012 for all Members of the PDS Committee and Council to hear speakers on a range of Education themes and issues	An Education Seminar would be arranged for November 2012.	Assistant Director ECS	November
11th September 2012				
29 Further Review of the Behaviour Service	That a Member Officer Working Group be established to consider the future delivery of the Bromley Behaviour Service and for membership to comprise Councillors Nicholas Bennett JP and Alexa Michael, Co-opted Members, Mr Darren Jenkins and Mrs Joan McConnell, Officers and Head Teacher representatives.	The initial meeting of the Bromley Behaviour Services Working Group would be convened in November 2012.	Democratic Services Officer	November
33 Increasing Use of Online Applications	That representations be made to London Councils to extend the use of 'The Hub' to support the availability online of evidence needed to support admission applications.	The Head of Service would contact London Councils with this request	Assistant Director ECS	November

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12056

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Portfolio Holder

Date: For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education PDS Committee on 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES

Contact Officer: Janet Heathcote, Governor Support Officer
Tel: 020 8461 6243 E-mail: janet.heathcote@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Orpington, Cray Valley West, Bromley Common and Keston, Bickley, Penge and Cator

1. Reason for report

1.1 LA Governor appointments to schools and academies:

Burwood School

Midfield Primary School

Princes Plain Primary School

Scotts Park Primary School

St Anthony's RC Primary School

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 **Members of the Education PDS Committee are requested to note this report.**

2.2 **It is recommended that the Executive Member for Education approve the appointments subject to CRB checks.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £N/A
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional) – N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours – N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement: School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2007
 2. Call in: Call-in is applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected) - N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 Details of the LA Governor vacancies that have arisen are set out in **Appendix 1**.
- 3.2 The names of the applicants for all the LA Governor vacancies are set out in the report with biographical details. Further detailed information on applicants is held by Governor Services to support the decision made by the Portfolio Holder.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 All Council Members and Governing Bodies have been consulted.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Schools contribute to the achievement of improved outcomes for children and young people as outlined in the Borough's Sustainable Community Strategy: 'Building a Better Bromley 2010 Vision' and in the CYP Portfolio Plan for 2011/12.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Details of individuals who are barred from working with children are contained on the Independent Safeguarding Authority's (ISA) Children's Barred List to which the Local Authority has access. This list replaces the previous list 99 and POCA list.
- 6.2 Following the introduction of the Vetting and Barring Scheme in October 2009, Governors are included in the list of roles regarded as undertaking "regulated activity".
- 6.3 Although the Vetting and Barring Scheme is now on hold whilst being reviewed by the current Government, where Governors continue to meet the criteria for an enhanced CRB check disclosure this should be undertaken.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 now adds a new category of people who are disqualified from being a School Governor by Schedule 6 of the School Government Regulations 2002/03. The Act makes it a criminal offence for a person who is disqualified from working with children to apply for, offer to do, accept or do, any work in a "regulated position" and a member of the Governing Body of a school is included in the list of "regulated positions" set out in the Act.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Financial Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	N/A

DETAILS OF LA GOVERNOR VACANCIES

Burwood School – two LA Governor vacancies will be created when Mrs Jane Clark completes a four year term of office on 10 November 2012 and Mrs Dolores Ward completes a four year term of office on 12 January 2013. Therefore, these appointments will take effect from 11 November 2012 and 13 January 2013 respectively.

Names

Mrs Jane Clark
(Orpington)

Details

Mrs Clark has served on the Governing Body of Burwood School for four years. She is a very experienced governor who also serves on a local primary school governing body. Mrs Clark is the designated governor responsible for Safeguarding, and is a regular attendee of governor training. She is willing to be reappointed for a further four year term of office.

Mrs Dolores Ward
(West Wickham)

Mrs Ward has served on the Governing Body of Burwood School for four years. She is an experienced governor having served previously on a secondary school governing body. She is willing to serve for a further four year term of office.

Midfield Primary School – one LA Governor vacancy will be created when Mrs Linda Sokoloff completes a four year term of office on 9 December 2012. Therefore, this appointment will take effect from 10 December 2012.

Name

Mrs Linda Sokoloff
(Orpington)

Details

Mrs Sokoloff has served on the Governing Body of Midfield Primary School as an LA Governor for 8 Years. She is a highly valued Governor who met with Ofsted during the School's last inspection. She serves on both the Attendance Strategy Committee and the Standards and Achievement Committee. Mrs Sokoloff is willing to be reappointed for a further four year term of office.

Princes Plain Primary School – one LA Governor vacancy will be created when Reverend Roger Bristow completes a four year term of office on 9 December 2012. Therefore, this appointment will take effect from 10 December 2012.

Name

Reverend Roger Bristow
(Bromley)

Details

Reverend Bristow has served on the Governing Body of Princes Plain Primary School for over 14 years and has served as Chair of Governors from 2005. Reverend Bristow is the designated governor with responsibility for SEN, Safeguarding and LAC and regularly attends governance courses, forums and briefings. He is willing to be reappointed for a further four year term of office.

Scotts Park Primary School – two LA Governor vacancies have been created by the resignation of both Mrs Doris Gruenes and Mr Patrick Walsh.

Name

Mr Adrian Donoghue
(Bromley)

Details

Nominated by the Governing Body.
Mr Donoghue is a retired Construction Director who has had previous experience of serving as a school governor of a Bromley school. He has an expertise in buildings and finance. Mr Donoghue originally applied to LBB Governor Services as he would like to volunteer in his local area.

Ms Leah Coveney
(Bromley)

Nominated by Cllr Nicholas Bennett.
Ms Coveney is a student Social Worker and would like to become more involved in her local community. She previously worked for ten years in business where she supervised staff, managed budgets and sat on various committees. Ms Coveney is currently in her third year of a social work degree and would like the opportunity to contribute to the vision and long term future of a local primary school.

St Anthony's RC Primary School – one LA Governor vacancy will be created when Mr Jonathan Appleby completes a four year term of office on 10 November 2012. Therefore this appointment will take effect from 11 November 2012.

Name

Mr Jonathan Appleby

Details

Mr Appleby has served on the Governing Body of St Anthony's RC Primary School for 12 years. He is the Vice Chair of Governors, a member of all committees and is the Chair of the Governing Body's Site and Accommodation Committee.

Mr Appleby regularly attends school governor training and is willing to be reappointed for a further four year term of office.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12057

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Portfolio Holder

Date: For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education PDS Committee on 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: **REVISED INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT – Farnborough Primary School**

Contact Officer: Janet Heathcote, Governor Support Officer
Tel: 020 8461 6243 E-mail: janet.heathcote@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Farnborough and Crofton

1. Reason for the Report

- 1.1 Each school must have an Instrument of Government. It records the name of the school and the constitution of the Governing Body. It is the Governing Body's responsibility to prepare a draft Instrument of Government for submission to the LA, who must be content that the draft complies with all applicable statutory requirements. The following school has submitted a draft Instrument of Government for approval.

Farnborough Primary School

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **It is recommended that the Executive Member approves the revised Instrument of Government, set out in Appendix 1.**
- 2.2 **It is recommended that the Executive Member instructs that the Instrument be made by the Common Seal of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £N/A
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The Governing Body of Farnborough Primary School, agreed at a recent meeting, to request the approval from the Education Portfolio Holder to a revision of their School Instrument of Government under the new Constitution Regulations 2012.

The Governing Body wish to reduce by 2 governor positions in the following category of governor, parent and LA governor. The staff governor category be reduced by 1, and the co-opted governor positions remain unchanged. The Governing Body have agreed a total number of governors of 9, a total reduction of 5 governor positions.

The Governing Body of Farnborough Primary have had a number of governors end a four year term of office or resigned during this year, therefore there will not be any surplus governors.

- 3.2 The revised Instrument of Government for Farnborough Primary School is set out within **Appendix 1.**

Background Information

- 3.3 The Education Act 2011 made provision for new regulations regarding the constitution of school governing bodies. The School Governance (Constitution)(England) Regulations 2012 amend those of 2007 for governing bodies of maintained schools that decide to change their Instrument of Government from 1 September 2012.
- 3.4 Unlike previous changes to constitutional regulations, schools will not need to reconstitute their governing body as a result of the 2012 regulations. However, when they do so, the new regulations will apply.
- 3.5 The new regulations specify that the membership must consist of no fewer than 7 governors for maintained schools. There is no restriction on maximum number. (Previous regulations required a minimum of 9 governors).
- 3.6 Farnborough Primary is a community maintained school, the governing body must include the following:
- (a) at least two elected parent governors;
 - (b) the head teacher, unless the head teacher resigns the office of governor;
 - (c) one elected staff governor (only); and
 - (d) one local authority governor (only);
 - (e) the governing body may, in addition, appoint such number of co-opted governors (formerly community governors) as they consider necessary. In these regulations, co-opted governor means a person who is appointed as a governor by the governing body and who, in the opinion of the governing body, has the skills required to contribute to the effective leadership and governance and success of the school. The total number of co-opted governors who are also eligible to be elected as staff governors, when counted with the staff governor and the head teacher, must not exceed one third of the total membership of the governing body.

- 3.7 The new regulations also set out new criteria for the appointment of local authority governors which now means a person who:
- (a) is nominated by the local authority; and
 - (b) is appointed as a governor by the governing body having, in the opinion of the governing body, met any eligibility criteria that they have set.

Therefore, this will mean that there will be two different ways in which local authority governors will be appointed to governing bodies of LA maintained schools in Bromley.

- 3.8 Under the new 2012 Regulations, if, as a result of changes to the Governing Body composition, there are governors surplus to the new Instrument of Government, those governors would not serve out their term of office. Decisions on who will remain will be based on juniority, i.e. the governor whose period of continuous service is the shortest will be the first to cease to hold office. Where governors may have held office for an equal length of time, the selection must be decided by drawing lots.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Schools contribute to the achievement of improved outcomes for children and young people as outlined in the Borough's Sustainable Community Strategy: 'Building a Better Bromley 2010 Vision' and in the CYP Portfolio Plan for 2011/12.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The draft Instrument of Government complies with the requirements of the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Financial Implications Personnel implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	School Governor Services Statutory Guidance on the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012

Education and Care Services

Instrument of Government: Community School

1. The name of the school is **Farnborough Primary School**
2. The school is a community school.
3. The name of the governing body is “**The Governing Body of Farnborough Primary School**”.
4. The governing body shall consist of:
 - a. 3 parent governors;
 - b. 1 LA governors;
 - c. 2 staff governors;
 - d. 3 co-opted governors.
5. Total number of governors 9.
6. The term of office of all governors is 4 years.
7. This instrument of government comes into effect on **6th November 2012**.
8. This instrument made by order of **Bromley Local Education Authority** on **6th November 2012**.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12058

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Education Portfolio Holder**

Date: **For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education PDS Committee on 6 November 2012**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

TITLE: REVIEW OF PRIMARY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: OUTCOMES

Contact Officer: Mike Barnes, Head of Access and Admissions
Tel: 020 8313 4865 E-mail: mike.barnes@bromley.gov.uk
Dr Tessa Moore, Assistant Director (Education)
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: tessa.moore@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides details of the outcomes and recommendations of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Member/Officer Working Party which oversees the review and strategic planning of primary school places and related school organisation.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **It is recommended that Members of the Education PDS Committee consider and comment on the outcomes from the August 2012 review of the Primary School Development Plan.**
- 2.2 **It is recommended that the Education Portfolio Holder endorses these recommendations taking into account the views of the PDS Committee and authorises the Director Education and Care Services to undertake consultation with schools and other key agencies on the proposed temporary and permanent expansion of places and to implement the proposals where feasible as set out below:**
- 2.3 **Planning Area 1 - Wards: Crystal Palace, Penge and Cator, Clock House**
- **Malcolm Primary School to increase its intake to 2 FE for a further year.**
 - **To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity initially on a temporary basis to 2FE (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School for reception in 2013/14.**
 - **To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a permanent basis to 2 FE (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School.**

- 2.4 **Planning Area 2 - Wards: Copers Cope, Kelsey and Eden Park**
- To review, with Governors the feasibility of Clare House Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 2 FE.
 - To formally consult on extending the age range of Bromley Road Infant School to become a 1 FE Primary School and Worsley Bridge Junior School to become a 2 FE Primary School with the potential to expand to 3 FE.
- 2.5 **Planning Area 3 - Wards: Shortlands, West Wickham, Hayes and Coney Hall**
- Hawes Down Infant School to increase its intake to 3 FE for a further year.
 - To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at St Mark's C.E. School if future demand was sufficient.
- 2.6 **Planning Area 4 - Wards: Bromley Town, Plaistow and Sundridge, Bickley**
- Scotts Park Primary School to increase its intake to 3 FE for a further year.
 - To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Bickley Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- 2.7 **Planning Area 5 - Wards: Bromley Common and Keston, Petts Wood and Knoll, Farnborough and Crofton**
- Keston C.E. Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 60.
 - To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Southborough Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- 2.8 **Planning Area 6 - Wards: Chislehurst, Mottingham, Chislehurst North**
- To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Edgebury Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
 - To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Castlecombe Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
 - To continue to pursue discussions with the Governors and Diocese regarding Chislehurst C.E. School increasing its PAN by 1 FE, in light of any potential relocation.
- 2.9 **Planning Area 7 - Wards: Cray Valley West and Cray Valley East**
- Midfield Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 60.
 - To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Leasons Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- 2.10 **Planning Area 8 - Wards: Orpington, Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom**
- No current changes to school organisation or size in this planning area
- 2.11 **Planning Area 9 - Wards: Biggin Hill and Darwin**
- No current changes to school organisation or size in this planning area.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy: Primary School Development Plan
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not known at this stage
 2. Ongoing costs:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Schools' delegated budget
 4. Total current budget for this head: £219 million
 5. Source of funding: Dedicated schools' grant
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional) – N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours – N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement: The Education and Inspections Act 2006, The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended by The School Organisation and Governance (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2007).The School Organisation and Governance (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2009 .
 2. Call in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected) -
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Ward Councillors' views will be sought as part of consultation on any proposals for change to school organisation.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The strategic planning of primary school places and school organisation in the Borough is driven through the Primary School Development Plan.
- 3.2 A comprehensive review of the Primary School Development Plan (PSDP) was completed in autumn 2010 to address the significant increase in demand from primary places; outcomes from this review were reported to the Children and Young People (CYP) PDS in January 2011. A further review took place in January 2012 with outcomes reported to the CYP PDS on 21 February 2012.
- 3.3 The Education PDS agreed the membership of the reconvened Member Officer Working Party at its meeting of 12 June 2012. The Member Officer Working Party met on 9 August 2012 and reviewed updated pupil population projections which indicate a continuing demand for reception class places at current levels for the foreseeable future. The number of reception pupils in Bromley schools has risen from 3165 in January 2007 to 3706 in January 2012. The numbers are projected to remain at between 3790 and 4070 until at least 2020. The working group concluded that there was likely to be a need for additional forms of entry across the Borough and, taking account of projections for each planning area and other local circumstances, is recommending that the additional capacity required is achieved by both temporary and permanent increases in admissions at a number of schools.
- 3.4 The minutes of the Member Officer Working Party are attached as **Appendix 1**.
- 3.5 The data considered by the Working Party is available in the Members' Room and on the [Bromley website](#).

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Bromley Council has an established policy for the review and strategic planning of school places and related school organisation. The need to ensure sufficient school places and efficiency of organisation is a priority within the Council's Strategy 'Building a Better Bromley' and contributes to the strategy to achieve the status of an Excellent Council.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Should these recommendations lead to changes in pupil numbers within an individual school, this would be reflected in the school's delegated budget share funded from the Dedicated Schools' Grant. Consultation with the Schools' Forum would take place before any changes to school funding were implemented.
- 5.2 The capital implications for those schools being approached for temporary and permanent expansion of places cannot be quantified at this stage. Further reports on any capital implications will be submitted to Members as appropriate.
- 5.3 The Council has been allocated £9,769,662 in 100% capital grant for the financial years 2011-13 to meet the basic need provision in schools

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Any proposed permanent expansion of a school is subject to a formal statutory process. Proposed changes that are of a temporary nature do not constitute a school reorganisation that triggers the statutory process for consultation. However if at a later stage any temporary changes were to become permanent then the designated process would need to be complied with.

- 6.2 In considering the establishment of a new school provision, expanding existing provision or changing the nature of maintained schools the LA is required to publish Public Notices and undertake formal consultation. This consultation must include parents, teachers, professional associations, neighbouring LAs and other interested agencies. Outcomes from consultation are considered for a formal decision by the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder and the Executive of the Council.
- 6.3 In the case of a new school, or if objections are raised for other statutory proposals, the final decision is referred to the Office of the Schools' Adjudicator.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no immediate implications for staffing arising from this report. Should proposals for changes to school size and organisation be progressed, the schools identified will require support on an individual basis and this will vary due to their then staffing structure. Implications may include the salary arrangements for the Head Teacher as the Individual School Range may be affected, and an increase to the number of teaching and non teaching FTE required to facilitate the curriculum and support the infrastructure. Where additional staffing appointments are required it is recommended that such appointments be made on a temporary fixed term basis initially subject to review.
- 7.2 Any proposed changes to relocate a school would require extensive consultation with key stakeholders including staff and Trade Union Representatives and would be the subject of a separate report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	N/A
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bromley LEA Primary School Development Plan: Review 2001 – Report to Education Committee 21 May 2001. 2. Bromley 'Schools' Organisation Plan' 1999-2003. 3. Primary School Development Plan: Review Outcomes – Report to CYP PDS Committee and Portfolio Holder of 13 September and 5 December 2005. 4. Primary School Development Plan: 2006 Review Outcomes – Report to CYP PDS Committee and Portfolio Holder of 12 September 2006 and 19 September 2006. 5. Primary School Development Plan: 2006 Review Outcomes for Planning Areas 7 and 8 – Report to CYP PDS Committee and Portfolio Holder of 7 November 2006 and 14 November 2006. 6. Strategic Planning of Secondary and Primary Provision: Outcomes from Working Party - Report to CYP PDS 18 March 2008 and PH 25 March 2008. 7. Review of Primary School Development Plan: outcomes – Report to CYP PDS 14 October 2009. 8. Review of Primary School Development Plan Outcomes –Report to CYP PDS 24 January 2011. 9. Review of Primary School Development Plan Outcomes –Report to CYP PDS 21 February 2012

EDUCATION PDS PRIMARY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN WORKING PARTY

Notes of Meeting held at 7.00pm on 9th August 2012

Present

Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Chairman)
Councillor Kathy Bance
Councillor Judi Ellis
Councillor Brian Humphrys
Councillor Neil Reddin

Also present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett, Chairman of Education PDS Committee
Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education
Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, Executive Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Education
Tessa Moore, Assistant Director (Education)
Mike Barnes, Head of Access & Admissions
Robert Bollen, Education Strategic Capital Manager
Gill Slater, Planner (Planning Strategy and Heritage Team)
Max Winters, Principal Research and Statistics Officer (ECS)
Kerry Nicholls, Democratic Services Officer

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Lydia Buttinger was elected Chairman.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

3. ANALYSIS BY PLANNING AREA

Members considered projected demand for primary school places across the Borough up to 2015. The current admissions limit capacity in the Borough was 3575, and for the 2012/13 reception intake, nine schools had accepted an additional form of entry above the school's published admission number, resulting in a total of 3845 reception places. The number of reception pupils was projected to remain at between 3790 and 4070 until at least 2020.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Head of Access and Admissions confirmed that the increased demand for primary places would continue in the long term, with the need to identify both temporary and permanent solutions to increase the number of primary places available. It was also important to ensure that schools identified for potential expansion were those that were high achieving and popular with parents. New academies or free schools could be established if sufficient demand could be evidenced, although the Local Authority was no longer able to establish a new maintained school, and it was noted that Bromley had been in contact with the Harris Federation regarding the introduction of a potential free school.

There had been no other contact with other academies or schools in the independent sector at this time. However Portfolio Holder confirmed he had spoken with representatives of the Diocese of Rochester and the Archdiocese of Southwark on the issue of free schools, and it was possible that a roadshow could be delivered in the Borough to encourage free school applications.

In response to a number of questions regarding free schools from the Chairman of Education PDS Committee, the Head of Access and Admissions confirmed that there was an annual application process and that the application window to submit a bid to establish a free school for the 2014/15 academic year closed on 4th January 2013. A key part of the application was to demonstrate demand for the proposed free school from a group of parents, and a Member noted that evidence on the demand for places in particular schools or areas could be drawn from admissions data. Another issue was identifying sites for any free school to be introduced and the Portfolio Holder noted that work was being undertaken with the Property Division to identify potential sites, including land owned by the Local Authority.

Members went on to analyse the future demand for primary places by planning area.

Planning Area 1 continued to be a volatile area in pupil place planning terms. The number of 4 year olds in this area remained above that of the total admissions numbers for the schools and there was a history of migration to schools in the neighbouring Planning Area 2 and bordering Local Authorities. The area analysis currently showed a projected shortfall of approximately two forms of entry. To meet the demand for additional places, Churchfields Primary School had accepted an additional 30 reception pupils since 2010/11 as a temporary arrangement and it was proposed to expand Churchfields Primary School permanently from 1 form of entry (FE) to 2 FE. Malcolm Primary School had accepted an additional 30 reception pupils in 2011/12 and 2012/13, and Royston Primary School had accepted an additional 30 reception pupils in 2011/12 but this was not repeated for 2012/13.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential to repeat the additional form of entry at Malcolm Primary School for a further year in 2013/14. Members also agreed to investigate, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis to two forms of entry (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School for reception in 2013/14. It was also agreed to investigate, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a permanent basis to two forms of entry (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School.

Planning Area 2 currently had a very close match of places to demand and had seen an increase in projected reception numbers. The permanent expansion of Unicorn Primary School and the additional form of entry at Clare House Primary School in 2012/13, which could be repeated in 2013/14, had ensured sufficient places to meet the current increased demand. A shortfall of places was projected from 2014/15, and it was noted that there were two residential developments within this planning area, including a large development on the Dylon site. Governors of Worsley Bridge Junior and Bromley Road Infant School had separately indicated that they would like to review the future organisation of the two schools as distinct primary schools.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential for Clare House Primary School to permanently increase its PAN (Pupil Admission Number) to 2 forms of entry. Following discussion it was also agreed to formally consult on extending the age range of Bromley Road Infant School to become a 1 FE Primary School and Worsley Bridge Junior School to become a 2 FE Primary School with the potential to expand to 3 FE.

Planning Area 3 currently had a close match of places to demand, with a current shortfall of places that had been accommodated by Hawes Down Infant School admitting an additional form of entry in September 2012. There was a small projected shortfall in places for the rest of the decade.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to manage shortfall in places by negotiating extra year intakes with schools in this area and keeping under review the need for any permanent change to school organisation. It was also agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential to repeat the additional form of entry at Hawes Down Infant School for a further year in 2013/14. Members noted that St Mark's C.E. Primary School was in discussions with the Parks Service to negotiate a land-swap to free up additional land on the school site. Should this be successful, it was agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at St Mark's C.E. Primary School if future demand was sufficient.

Planning Area 4 capacity had been closely matched to need for several years and it had been necessary to negotiate an extra form of entry at Bickley Primary School for reception in 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11, before a permanent expansion of the school from 2011/12. Both Valley and Parish Primary Schools had accepted an extra form of entry in 2011/12 and 2012/13, and it had been agreed to consult on the permanent expansion of Parish Primary School from 2 FE to 3 FE. Scotts Park Primary School had admitted an additional form of entry in 2012/13 and was able to repeat this in 2013/14. The updated pupil projection data indicated there would be a continuing shortfall of places in this planning area of 2 FE. The Governors of St George's C.E. Primary School had indicated that they wished to consolidate from 1.5FE to whole forms of entry if feasible.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential to repeat the additional form of entry at Scotts Park Primary School for a further year in 2013/14. Following discussion, it was agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at Bickley Primary School for reception in 2013/14. Members considered it was not feasible to consolidate the PAN for St George's C.E. Primary School to whole forms of entry at the current time, however discussions with the school would continue.

Planning Area 5 currently had a projected shortfall of places of approximately 2 FE. Demand had increased in recent years leading to the expansion of Princes Plain Primary School by half a form of entry. Keston C.E. Primary School had admitted an additional form of entry in 2012/13 and was able to repeat this in 2013/14. There was a significant housing development on the 'Blue Circle' site which had the potential to further increase demand for places.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential for Keston C.E. Primary School to permanently increase its PAN to 60. Following discussion regarding the building currently used by Bromley Youth Music Trust, it was agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at Southborough Primary School for reception in 2013/14.

Planning Area 6 currently had a projected shortfall of places of approximately 1 FE. There was a major residential development on the site of the Ravensbourne College of Art and Design which had the potential to further increase demand for places. Members noted that Chislehurst C.E. School and the Diocese of Rochester had been in discussions with the Local Authority concerning the feasibility of relocating the school to a new site in Chislehurst.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at Edgebury Primary School for reception in 2013/14. It was also agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at Castlecombe Primary School for reception in 2013/14. Following discussion, Members agreed to review the feasibility of relocation and expansion of Chislehurst C.E. Primary School.

Planning Area 7 capacity had been reduced from 400 places to 328 from 2008/09. There was now a very close match of places to demand in this area, with a shortfall in 2012/13. This shortfall had been accommodated by Midfield Primary School admitting an additional form of entry. There was a projected shortfall of 1 FE for 2013/14.

Members discussed a range of options and agreed to investigate, with Governors, the potential for Midfield Primary School to permanently increase its PAN to 60. Following discussion, it was agreed to review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by one form of entry at Leasons Primary School for reception in 2013/14.

Planning Area 8 currently had a close match between capacity and current need. Following previous primary school reviews, Blenheim Infant and Junior Schools had merged to form Blenheim Primary School, reducing by 1 FE. Warren Road had increased from 3 to 4 FE and Holy Innocents Catholic Primary reduced from 2 to 1 FE. Following a decision by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator in March 2007, Hillside had a PAN of 54. It might be necessary to consider temporary expansions of other schools in this Planning Area if future demand was sufficient.

Members agreed that there should be no current change to school organisation or size in this planning area.

Planning Area 9 continued to have some surplus capacity following the amalgamation of Biggin Hill Infant and Junior Schools with effect from January 2008, and Oaklands Infant and Junior Schools in April 2009, although it was noted that future demand might be impacted by the projected development of the former RAF site. Members noted that Cudham C.E. Primary School had reduced its PAN to 15 from 2012/13.

Members agreed that there should be no current change to school organisation or size in this planning area.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Members summarised the Working Party's initial recommendations, the feasibility of which would be considered in partnership with school representatives.

- Planning Area 1 Malcolm Primary School to increase its intake to 2 FE for a further year. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis to 2FE (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School for reception in 2013/14. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a permanent basis to 2 FE (from 1.5 FE) at St John's C.E. Primary School.
- Planning Area 2 To review, with Governors the feasibility of Clare House Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 2 FE. To formally consult on extending the age range of Bromley Road Infant School to become a 1 FE Primary School and Worsley Bridge Junior School to become a 2 FE Primary School with the potential to expand to 3 FE.
- Planning Area 3 Hawes Down Infant School to increase its intake to 3 FE for a further year. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at St Mark's C.E. School if future demand was sufficient.
- Planning Area 4 Scotts Park Primary School to increase its intake to 3 FE for a further year. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Bickley Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- Planning Area 5 Keston C.E. Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 60. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Southborough Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- Planning Area 6 To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Edgebury Primary School for reception in 2013/14. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Castlecombe Primary School for reception in 2013/14. To continue to pursue discussions with the Governors and Diocese regarding Chislehurst C.E. School increasing its PAN by 1 FE, in light of any potential relocation.
- Planning Area 7 Midfield Primary School to permanently increase its intake to 60. To review, with Governors, the feasibility of increasing capacity on a temporary basis by 1 FE at Leeson's Primary School for reception in 2013/14.
- Planning Area 8 No additional places required.
- Planning Area 9 No additional places required.

RESOLVED that an interim report on the Primary School Development Plan be provided to Education PDS Committee on 6th November 2012.

5. OVERVIEW OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PROJECTIONS

Members considered projected demand for secondary school places across the Borough up to 2022. The current admissions limit was 3555, however pupil numbers were expected to increase significantly from 2017/18, and there was a need to liaise with secondary academy schools across the Borough to identify where extra capacity could be made available.

The Portfolio Holder noted that he had already been in discussions with the Archdiocese of Southwark and with Bishop Justus C.E. School with regard to the need for extra capacity, and that the Archdiocese of Southwark had identified the potential need for a Catholic secondary school in the Borough. There was also potential to approach Harris Beckenham, which was previously an 8FE but had reduced to 6FE. It was important that any expansion of capacity be cost effective to mitigate against the impact of any future reduction in pupil numbers.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Portfolio Holder noted that the Archdiocese of Southwark was close to completion on the former All Saints Catholic School site and that this would realise certain funds for catholic schools across the Borough. This might include the re-build of Holy Innocent's Catholic Primary School. The Archdiocese of Southwark was also considering a move to academy trust status for their schools.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

No further meeting dates were arranged.

The meeting ended at 8.34pm

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12063

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Portfolio Holder

Date: For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education PDS Committee on 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: **TRANSFER OF THE ADULT EDUCATION SERVICE**

Contact Officer: Dr Tessa Moore, Assistant Director (Education)
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: tessa.moore@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report outlines recent changes to the strategic management of the Bromley Adult Education College and briefs Members on future plans for school workforce development and staff training at the College.
- 1.2 The report also includes an update on the transfer of the course delivery function from the Education Development Centre (EDC) to the College and briefs Members on plans for rationalisation and relocation of staff from the EDC to other sites.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 That Members of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee consider and comment on the contents of this report.
- 2.2 That the Education Portfolio Holder agrees in principle to recommend future use of the EDC site for educational purposes.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Further Details
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People: Further Details
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Various including Adult Education, School Improvement and Education Commissioning and Business services
 4. Total current budget for this head: £1,959k
 5. Source of funding: Core funding, DSG, other grants, income from sales and sold services
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 Context

- 3.1.1 The Bromley Adult Education College (BAEC) is part of Bromley Council. The function of the College is to fulfil the Council's statutory duty to ensure reasonable provision for adult education in the Borough.
- 3.1.2 BAEC has three main designated centres: Widmore site; Kentwood site; and Poverest site. This multi-site arrangement responds to the needs of local communities for 'easy to access' adult learning.
- 3.1.3 Additionally, the College has a range of other community venues and partners, including Job Centre Plus, Cabrini House, Mottingham Community Learning Shop, The Elders of Orpington Chinese Community and various primary schools across the borough.
- 3.1.4 BAEC registered 9,000+ students in the academic year 2011/12 (which equates to 13,500+ enrolments). The College employed over 230 tutors for over 1,200 courses offered in that same year.
- 3.1.5 The student profile at BAEC is predominantly adult, with 38% of its learners in the 40-59 age group. The College offers a wide range of non-accredited courses; accredited provision; employment training; community courses and learning delivered through partnerships. BAEC also holds the current contract for IT development training for the London Borough of Bromley staff.
- 3.1.6 Funding for Bromley Adult Education College comes from a number of sources. The Skills Funding Agency provides two streams: the Adult Skills Budget for approved accredited provision; and the Community Learning Funding for non-accredited provision. Student fees and learning contracts also contribute to the BAEC budget, along with College revenue from room rentals and developmental projects.

3.2 Changes to Service Line Management

- 3.2.1 In September 2012, strategic management responsibility for the Bromley Adult Education College transferred from the Recreation and Renewal department to the Education division within the Education and Care Services department.
- 3.2.2 There are now plans to relocate courses currently delivered at the Education Development Centre (EDC) - on the Princes Plain site - to the College (mainly on the Widmore site). This will create a joined-up service for adult education, workforce development and employee training at BAEC.
- 3.2.3 Staff located at the EDC site are currently part of a restructuring process. Following this, remaining EDC staff will be relocated either to the College at the Widmore site or to the Civic Centre.
- 3.2.4 The plan to relocate EDC staff and functions will be cost effective as it will release some funds previously used for maintaining the EDC site. A further advantage is that this plan will 'free up' the EDC site for a Council decision regarding much needed space for additional primary/secondary school expansion.

3.3 Proposed Timescales

September – October 2012	⌘	Briefing to staff (EDC & BAEC)
	⌘	Briefing to BAEC governors
September – December 2012	⌘	BAEC ‘shadowing’ of course delivery
	⌘	BAEC project management and development of business case
January – February 2013	⌘	Staff restructuring process
March 2013	⌘	Relocation of staff to BAEC or Civic Centre
	⌘	Closure ‘mothball’ of EDC site
April 2013	⌘	Course delivery fully functional at BAEC
	⌘	Small central Education Support team located at Civic Centre
	⌘	Some course delivery teams and administrative support located at BAEC

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The London Borough of Bromley’s Corporate Operating Principles define the Council as an organisation based around four core principles: Member-led; delivering Value for Money; supporting independence; and efficient and non-bureaucratic.
- 4.2 This restructure will support the Council to achieve the principles of delivering value for money by bringing together separate services into an efficient single service. It will also make the best use of the Council’s resources including its assets, finances and workforce.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Savings are expected as part of the restructuring of the service. This is currently out to consultation. By freeing up the EDC and moving functions to sites currently used by Adult Education and the corporate centre, savings will be made on premises costs. The vacated EDC building will also be freed up for potential school expansion purposes.
- 5.2 Any savings realised will form part of the financial strategy for 2013/14 onwards.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The management of the site is at the discretion of Local Authority having regard to any need for additional school expansions or alternative educational uses as the appropriate decision making body may see fit.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Key roles and responsibilities have been realigned to take account of the changes to strategic management. Following a review of the new arrangements, and as outlined in paragraph 3.3, further work will now follow on restructuring the service. These proposals will have staffing implications and some staff will be at risk of redundancy. Formal consultation, in line with the Council’s procedures for managing change, will take place with staff and their representatives once further details are available.

Non-Applicable Sections:	N/A
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

Report No.
ED12059

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Portfolio Holder

Date: For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Education PDS Committee on 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **2013/14 FUNDING REVIEW – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools Finance Team
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.2 This report provides details of the outcome of consultation with schools and recommends the final version of the funding formula to be submitted to the DfE.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Education PDS Committee is asked to consider the outcome of consultation and the Assistant Director's recommendation that version 12 should be used for the 2013/14 Funding Formula.**
- 2.2 **The Education PDS Committee is asked to note the Schools Forum's decisions with regard to de-delegation for maintained primary schools based on the outcome of the consultation.**
- 2.3 **The Education Portfolio Holder is asked to consider this proposal and to agree the proposed model.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable: n/a
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable: n/a
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Not Applicable
 4. Total current budget for this head: N/A
 5. Source of funding: N/A
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: Guidance- School Funding Reform Arrangements 2013/14
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 During 2012 the DfE has published a number of documents outlining their plans for School Funding Reform. This is the first step towards the introduction of a new national funding formula during the next spending review period which will ensure that similar pupils will attract similar levels of funding no matter where they go to school in the country. In preparation for this the DfE aims to simplify the local funding arrangements for 2013-14 and to introduce a new approach to high needs funding that will help to improve transparency, quality and choice for young people and their families.
- 3.2 The proposed timeframe for this is as follows:
- During the summer a revised funding formula needs to be produced by the local authority working with its Schools' Forum, Schools and Academies.
 - By the end of October 2012 every local authority to submit its revised formula, set out on a prescribed pro-forma, to the Education Funding Agency with all the key parameters of the revised formula fixed, but with the possibility of later amendments to the values if the results of the October pupil count warrant it.
 - By the 18 January 2013 to submit a final proforma taking account of any changes driven by the data coming out of the October pupil census.
 - In parallel there will be significant work to be done on the high needs reform.
- 3.3 The first impact of these changes is that the Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG) will be divided into three separate blocks; the Early Years Block, the Schools Block and the High Needs Block. The amount of funding allocated to each of these blocks will be based on the local authority's Section 251 Budget statement for 2012/13. Funding for the three blocks will be separately identified, but will not be ring fenced allowing local authorities to move funding between blocks, with the agreement of the Schools' Forum, to meet any additional funding pressures in each area.
- 3.4 Within the Schools' Block, local authorities will be required to revise their funding formula to include only a limited number of factors as prescribed by the DfE. It is anticipated that moving to the new formula will inevitably cause some turbulence to a number of schools, with some schools being very big winners or losers. However, this will be mitigated during 2013/14 and 2014/15 by the Minimum Funding Guarantee which will effectively prevent any school from losing by more than -1.5% per pupil.
- 3.5 Several budget items which can currently be retained centrally will have to be delegated through the formula from 2013/14. This will include items such as allocation of contingencies, staff supply costs (e.g. for maternity, trade union duties and jury services) and behaviour support services.
- 3.6 Once the costs of these services have been delegated to schools, maintained schools within each relevant phase will be able to decide if they would prefer for these services to be retained centrally. The decision regarding this would be made by the Schools' Forum representatives for each relevant sector and will then apply to all the schools in that sector.
- 3.7 Within the High Needs' Block Authorities will need to determine the number of places in maintained special schools, in special units in maintained mainstream schools and to rework the budgets to be based on £10,000 base funding per place, plus top up funding which will relate to individual pupils needs rather than conventional formula funding.

- 3.8 There are no major changes proposed with regard to the Early Years' Block and most authorities Early Years' Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) has only been in place for a couple of years. However, with regard to the Early Funding within the DSG, whereas previously authorities have received funding for 90% of early years' pupils regardless of actual numbers, this will reduce to either 85% or actual take up, whichever is the highest.
- 3.9 There will be some changes to the Schools' Forum Regulations to look at the size and constitution of Forums to ensure that they are able to carry out their role in an effective and transparent way.
- 3.10 Bromley has already made some progress in addressing all of these issues. With regard to the review of funding, early consultation was carried out with all schools at the end of the summer term which included briefing sessions for Finance Officers, Head Teachers and Governors. The early formal consultation process has enabled officers to make some judgements with regard to the new funding formula and to carry out modelling on this basis.
- 3.11 Following on from the Schools' Forum Meeting on 18 October 2012, the LA released four funding models to all schools as part of the consultation on the proposed funding formula for 2013/14. The four models were based on the following principles:

Version 6

73 Points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum £150,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on current funding blocks

Version 8

73 Points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum £150,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on fixed amount for all pupils

Version 10

73 Points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum £180,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on current funding blocks

Version 12

73 Points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum £180,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on fixed amount for all pupils

Details of the four models are attached at **Appendix 1**.

- 3.12 Schools were also consulted on de-delegation for maintained primary schools to allow Schools' Forum members to make a final decision on these areas.
- 3.13 The LA received 38 consultation responses, being 33 from Primary Schools, 1 from a Special School and 4 from Secondary Schools. However, included within the Primary responses were 6 individual responses from 1 school and 3 from another school. In order to ensure that the results were considered on a fair and equitable basis, only two responses have been included from each school. Whilst there was a slightly higher number of responses from 1fe schools, there was a fair representation of responses from all sizes of schools. Within the responses, a number of schools did not answer particular questions, or ticked both boxes for some questions, or ticked a particular version that did not correlate to their earlier answers.

- 3.14 Details of the consultation responses can be seen at **Appendix 2**. With regard to the funding formula, based on these responses, the Assistant Director for Education is recommending version 12 on the basis that a larger number of schools opted for £180,000 as the lump sum and fixed amounts for the values for deprivation, attainment and EAL. Whilst this would appear to go against the model opted for by most schools, it is clear from the consultation responses that the options selected did not necessarily agree to the model selected. The LA believes that £180,000 is an appropriate lump sum and also feels that having fixed amounts for these factors will make it easier to calculate the notional SEN for each school and Academy.
- 3.15 Using their notional SEN budget, mainstream schools and Academies will be expected to:
- (a) meet the needs of pupils with low-cost, high-incidence SEN; and
 - (b) contribute, up to a certain level set by the local authority, towards the costs of provision for pupils with high needs (including those with high-cost, low-incidence SEN).
- 3.16 With regard to the de-delegation, the relevant members of the Schools' Forum were asked to vote on behalf of the maintained primary schools. With regard to the two areas where schools appeared to not be in favour of de-delegation, the Schools' Forum were reminded that as part of the initial consultation, this funding had been included in the current models and that the Ethnic Minority funding had been delegated to schools 100 % through the EAL factor. The Behaviour Service funding had been allocated 10% AWPU, 45% deprivation and 45% attainment. It was recommended that schools be reminded of this and advised that they would not see a separate allocation as part of the funding formula.
- 3.17 For areas where de-delegation is agreed, the LA must be able to clearly demonstrate how the funding will be de-delegated eg £10 per FSM pupil for free school meal eligibility.
- 3.18 Attached at **Appendix 3** is a copy of the draft proforma to be completed and returned to the DfE by 31 October. The actual proforma provided by the LA has to be completed online and will be populated with the appropriate data once the funding model has been agreed. It is proposed that this will be submitted in line with the DfE's timescale but should be clearly identified as being subject to final approval of the Portfolio Holder.
- 3.19 At their meeting on the 18 October, the Schools' Forum endorsed the LA's recommendation for model version 12 to be adopted as the new funding formula. Maintained primary school representatives also agreed that funding for contingencies, free school meal eligibility and staff costs supply cover should be de-delegated back to the LA, but that funding for support for Ethnic Minority pupils and for the Behaviour Support Service would not be de-delegated.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no direct financial implications for Bromley. Dedicated Schools' Grant funding is ring fenced and can only be used for specific educational purposes. Funding of Schools and centrally retained services will have to be contained within the overall funding allocation, as per previous years. Any over or underspends will be carried forward into the following year.
- 4.2 Although there are major changes in the way in which schools are funded, schools have been offered protection by the minimum funding guarantee. This means that irrespective of any turbulence in the formula, they will be protected and will receive per pupil funding of not less than minus 1.5%.
- 4.3 The new formula arrangements will be in place for a two year period. After this time the government is proposing a national formula. Details as to how this new funding mechanism will work have not yet been received.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Local Authority is required to have due regard to any guidance and directive on funding received from central government and implement any changes to its funding structure as directed.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy Implications and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Do we need the reference to the new funding formula here?

APPENDIX 1

School	Current School Budget Share	New Individual Schools Budget	Difference	% Diff	New Individual Schools Budget	Difference	% Diff	New Individual Schools Budget	Difference	% Diff	New Individual Schools Budget	Difference	% Diff
		Version 6			Version 8			Version 10			Version 12		
	£	£	£		£	£		£	£		£	£	
Alexandra Infant School	£695,820	£717,791	£21,971	3.16%	£730,785	£34,965	5.02%	£732,234	£36,414	5.23%	£745,228	£49,407	7.10%
Alexandra Junior School	£826,503	£927,202	£100,699	12.18%	£936,691	£110,188	13.33%	£937,496	£110,993	13.43%	£946,985	£120,481	14.58%
Balgowan Primary School	£1,938,046	£1,837,078	£100,968	-5.21%	£1,772,162	-£165,884	-8.56%	£1,811,763	-£126,283	-6.52%	£1,746,846	£191,200	-9.87%
Bickley Primary	£1,087,637	£1,143,639	£56,002	5.15%	£1,137,715	£50,078	4.60%	£1,144,857	£57,221	5.26%	£1,138,933	£51,297	4.72%
Biggin Hill Primary	£1,317,411	£1,300,108	£17,303	-1.31%	£1,264,049	-£53,362	-4.05%	£1,294,585	-£22,826	-1.73%	£1,258,526	£58,885	-4.47%
Blenheim Primary School	£843,930	£797,308	£46,622	-5.52%	£826,997	-£16,933	-2.01%	£811,751	-£32,179	-3.81%	£841,440	£2,490	-0.30%
Bromley Road Infant School	£901,260	£977,528	£76,268	8.46%	£1,019,754	£118,494	13.15%	£987,131	£85,870	9.53%	£1,029,356	£128,096	14.21%
Burnt Ash Primary School	£1,661,578	£1,753,674	£92,097	5.54%	£1,824,477	£162,899	9.80%	£1,747,633	£86,055	5.18%	£1,818,435	£156,858	9.44%
Castlecombe Primary School	£916,034	£877,093	£38,941	-4.25%	£897,519	-£18,516	-2.02%	£889,202	-£26,832	-2.93%	£909,627	£6,407	-0.70%
Chelsfield Primary School	£436,788	£423,824	£12,964	-2.97%	£418,587	-£18,201	-4.17%	£445,786	£8,998	2.06%	£440,549	£3,761	0.86%
Chislehurst (CoFE) Primary	£714,575	£720,558	£5,983	0.84%	£693,541	-£21,034	-2.94%	£731,889	£17,314	2.42%	£704,872	£9,703	-1.36%
Churchfields Primary School	£1,013,991	£1,038,475	£24,485	2.41%	£1,046,280	£32,289	3.18%	£1,044,793	£30,803	3.04%	£1,052,598	£38,607	3.81%
Clare House Primary School	£743,781	£730,959	£12,823	-1.72%	£717,303	-£26,478	-3.56%	£742,636	-£1,146	-0.15%	£728,980	£14,801	-1.99%
Crofton Infant School	£1,802,291	£1,622,330	£179,961	-9.99%	£1,588,057	-£214,234	-11.89%	£1,605,830	-£196,461	-10.90%	£1,571,558	£230,733	-12.80%
Crofton Junior School	£2,129,999	£1,999,349	£130,650	-6.13%	£1,918,098	-£211,901	-9.95%	£1,968,502	-£161,497	-7.58%	£1,887,251	£242,748	-11.40%
Cudham CE Primary School	£425,056	£395,535	£29,522	-6.95%	£389,630	-£35,426	-8.33%	£418,188	-£6,868	-1.62%	£412,284	£12,773	-3.00%
Darrick Wood Infant School	£901,589	£971,138	£69,549	7.71%	£972,933	£71,344	7.91%	£977,542	£75,953	8.42%	£979,337	£77,749	8.62%
Darrick Wood Junior School	£1,185,882	£1,179,957	£5,925	-0.50%	£1,149,167	-£36,715	-3.10%	£1,177,891	-£7,991	-0.67%	£1,147,101	£38,780	-3.27%
Dorset Road Infant School	£379,613	£365,791	£13,822	-3.64%	£365,412	-£14,201	-3.74%	£390,000	£10,387	2.74%	£389,621	£10,008	2.64%
Downe Primary School	£384,373	£386,962	£2,589	0.67%	£381,371	-£3,002	-0.78%	£410,480	£26,107	6.79%	£404,888	£20,516	5.34%
Edgebury Primary School	£807,195	£793,422	£13,773	-1.71%	£780,853	-£26,342	-3.26%	£804,062	-£3,133	-0.39%	£791,492	£15,703	-1.95%
Farnborough Primary	£763,594	£758,084	£5,510	-0.72%	£743,158	-£20,436	-2.68%	£769,760	£6,167	0.81%	£754,835	£8,759	-1.15%
Gray's Farm Primary School	£1,481,317	£1,662,645	£181,328	12.24%	£1,727,238	£245,921	16.60%	£1,657,900	£176,583	11.92%	£1,722,493	£241,176	16.28%
Green Street Green Primary	£1,371,524	£1,428,219	£56,695	4.13%	£1,406,856	£35,332	2.58%	£1,420,795	£49,271	3.59%	£1,399,431	£27,907	2.03%
Hawes Down Infant School	£657,282	£696,358	£39,075	5.94%	£679,998	£22,716	3.46%	£710,109	£52,826	8.04%	£693,749	£36,467	5.55%
Hawes Down Junior School	£803,139	£839,931	£36,792	4.58%	£817,291	£14,151	1.76%	£848,410	£45,270	5.64%	£825,769	£22,630	2.82%
Hayes Primary School	£1,988,221	£1,862,942	£125,279	-6.30%	£1,799,642	-£188,579	-9.48%	£1,837,626	-£150,595	-7.57%	£1,774,326	£213,894	-10.76%

Highfield Infants' School	£836,796	£828,562	£8,234	-0.98%	£803,804	£32,992	-3.94%	£835,485	£1,311	-0.16%	£810,727	£26,069	-3.12%
Highfield Junior School	£1,142,744	£1,171,963	£29,218	2.56%	£1,128,685	£14,059	-1.23%	£1,168,946	£26,202	2.29%	£1,125,669	£17,076	-1.49%
Hillside Primary School	£1,299,872	£1,441,748	£141,877	10.91%	£1,488,740	£188,868	14.53%	£1,442,276	£142,404	10.96%	£1,489,267	£189,395	14.57%
Holy Innocents Catholic Primar	£750,158	£758,047	£7,888	1.05%	£745,401	£4,757	-0.63%	£769,551	£19,392	2.59%	£756,905	£6,747	0.90%
James Dixon Primary School	£1,347,448	£1,317,283	£30,166	-2.24%	£1,402,373	£54,925	4.08%	£1,321,094	£26,354	-1.96%	£1,406,185	£58,737	4.36%
Keston C.E. Primary School	£737,277	£718,939	£18,338	-2.49%	£697,294	£39,983	-5.42%	£730,789	£6,489	-0.88%	£709,144	£28,134	-3.82%
Leesons Primary School	£1,006,178	£919,407	£86,771	-8.62%	£946,439	£59,738	-5.94%	£932,034	£74,144	-7.37%	£959,067	£47,111	-4.68%
Malcolm Primary School	£1,066,832	£1,058,421	£8,411	-0.79%	£1,112,761	£45,929	4.31%	£1,068,196	£1,364	0.13%	£1,122,536	£55,705	5.22%
Manor Oak Primary School	£886,874	£863,788	£23,087	-2.60%	£899,598	£12,724	1.43%	£877,971	£8,904	-1.00%	£913,781	£26,907	3.03%
Marian Vian Primary School	£1,983,020	£1,937,718	£45,301	-2.28%	£1,906,793	£76,227	-3.84%	£1,914,995	£68,024	-3.43%	£1,884,070	£98,950	-4.99%
Mead Road Infant School	£404,032	£390,076	£13,956	-3.45%	£387,614	£16,419	-4.06%	£413,075	£9,043	2.24%	£410,613	£6,581	1.63%
Midfield Primary School	£1,004,682	£949,804	£54,878	-5.46%	£985,816	£18,866	-1.88%	£962,345	£42,337	-4.21%	£998,357	£6,325	-0.63%
Mottingham Primary School	£1,207,443	£1,311,274	£103,830	8.60%	£1,382,310	£174,866	14.48%	£1,316,641	£109,197	9.04%	£1,387,677	£180,234	14.93%
Oak Lodge Primary	£2,088,055	£1,961,356	£126,699	-6.07%	£1,900,329	£187,726	-8.99%	£1,934,139	£153,916	-7.37%	£1,873,112	£214,943	-10.29%
Oaklands Primary School	£1,444,721	£1,403,755	£40,966	-2.84%	£1,390,399	£54,322	-3.76%	£1,398,405	£46,316	-3.21%	£1,385,049	£59,672	-4.13%
Parish C.E. Primary School	£1,565,500	£1,412,715	£152,785	-9.76%	£1,386,573	£178,926	-11.43%	£1,403,303	£162,197	-10.36%	£1,377,161	£188,339	-12.03%
Perry Hall Primary School	£1,397,308	£1,394,896	£2,412	-0.17%	£1,381,374	£15,933	-1.14%	£1,388,768	£8,540	-0.61%	£1,375,246	£22,061	-1.58%
Pickhurst Infants' School	£1,158,923	£1,107,620	£51,302	-4.43%	£1,079,672	£79,251	-6.84%	£1,106,851	£52,072	-4.49%	£1,078,903	£80,020	-6.90%
Pickhurst Junior School	£1,415,447	£1,542,571	£127,124	8.98%	£1,524,263	£108,816	7.69%	£1,533,332	£117,885	8.33%	£1,515,023	£99,576	7.03%
Poverest Primary School	£868,286	£803,499	£64,787	-7.46%	£812,470	£55,816	-6.43%	£816,904	£51,382	-5.92%	£825,875	£42,411	-4.88%
Pratts Bottom Primary School	£382,404	£359,195	£23,209	-6.07%	£356,443	£25,962	-6.79%	£383,491	£1,087	0.28%	£380,738	£1,666	-0.44%
Princes Plain Primary School	£1,721,389	£1,855,010	£133,621	7.76%	£1,970,491	£249,102	14.47%	£1,850,092	£128,703	7.48%	£1,965,573	£244,184	14.19%
Raglan Primary School	£1,380,469	£1,358,544	£21,926	-1.59%	£1,327,805	£52,664	-3.81%	£1,351,292	£29,177	-2.11%	£1,320,553	£59,916	-4.34%
Red Hill Primary School	£2,247,880	£2,255,052	£7,172	0.32%	£2,284,077	£36,197	1.61%	£2,230,255	£17,625	-0.78%	£2,259,280	£11,400	0.51%
Royston Primary School	£1,716,533	£1,784,774	£68,241	3.98%	£1,893,170	£176,637	10.29%	£1,779,338	£62,804	3.66%	£1,887,734	£171,200	9.97%
Scotts Park Primary School	£1,315,505	£1,312,405	£3,100	-0.24%	£1,296,589	£18,916	-1.44%	£1,307,746	£7,759	-0.59%	£1,291,930	£23,575	-1.79%
Southborough Primary School	£1,545,016	£1,554,547	£9,531	0.62%	£1,580,264	£35,248	2.28%	£1,549,197	£4,181	0.27%	£1,574,914	£29,898	1.94%
St George's CE Primary	£1,043,313	£998,058	£45,255	-4.34%	£1,000,445	£42,868	-4.11%	£1,004,290	£39,023	-3.74%	£1,006,677	£36,636	-3.51%
James' RC Primary School	£681,539	£766,182	£84,644	12.42%	£746,439	£64,900	9.52%	£777,686	£96,148	14.11%	£757,943	£76,404	11.21%
St John's CE Primary School	£1,140,753	£1,021,540	£119,213	10.45%	£1,011,160	£129,593	-11.36%	£1,025,698	£115,055	-10.09%	£1,015,318	£125,435	-11.00%
St Joseph's R.C.Primary School	£709,025	£690,955	£18,070	-2.55%	£667,721	£41,304	-5.83%	£703,064	£5,961	-0.84%	£679,830	£29,195	-4.12%
St Mark's C.E. Primary School	£1,347,260	£1,401,633	£54,373	4.04%	£1,393,605	£46,345	3.44%	£1,394,900	£47,640	3.54%	£1,386,872	£39,612	2.94%
St Mary's Catholic Primary	£1,345,298	£1,254,678	£90,619	-6.74%	£1,197,504	£147,794	-10.99%	£1,247,254	£98,044	-7.29%	£1,190,080	£155,218	-11.54%
St Paul's Cray CE Primary	£952,022	£913,755	£38,266	-4.02%	£953,303	£1,282	0.13%	£926,901	£25,120	-2.64%	£966,449	£14,428	1.52%
St Peter & St Paul Catholic Primary	£793,669	£908,214	£114,545	14.43%	£925,373	£131,703	16.59%	£919,372	£125,703	15.84%	£936,531	£142,861	18.00%
St Philomena's Catholic Primary	£736,158	£730,886	£5,272	-0.72%	£714,618	£21,540	-2.93%	£742,650	£6,491	0.88%	£726,382	£9,777	-1.33%
St Vincent's Catholic Primary	£740,654	£843,021	£102,367	13.82%	£850,118	£109,464	14.78%	£853,661	£113,007	15.26%	£860,758	£120,103	16.22%
St. Mary Cray Primary School	£672,061	£695,560	£23,498	3.50%	£719,944	£47,882	7.12%	£713,373	£41,312	6.15%	£737,757	£65,696	9.78%
St.Anthony's R.C Primary	£783,135	£902,386	£119,251	15.23%	£958,749	£175,614	22.42%	£916,137	£133,002	16.98%	£972,500	£189,365	24.18%

The Highway Primary School	£751,332	£795,295	£43,963	5.85%	£792,326	£40,994	5.46%	£807,404	£56,072	7.46%	£804,435	£53,103	7.07%
The Pioneer Academy	£1,238,383	£1,255,075	£16,692	1.35%	£1,257,790	£19,407	1.57%	£1,254,565	£16,182	1.31%	£1,257,280	£18,897	1.53%
Tubbenden Primary School	£1,873,670	£1,943,142	£69,472	3.71%	£1,915,205	£41,536	2.22%	£1,920,332	£46,662	2.49%	£1,892,396	£18,726	1.00%
Unicorn Primary School	£1,002,829	£919,184	£83,645	-8.34%	£899,933	£-102,896	-10.26%	£924,724	£-78,105	-7.79%	£905,473	£97,356	-9.71%
Valley Primary School	£1,488,509	£1,577,835	£89,325	6.00%	£1,619,824	£131,315	8.82%	£1,569,114	£80,605	5.42%	£1,611,103	£122,594	8.24%
Warren Road Primary School	£2,540,981	£2,456,850	£84,131	-3.31%	£2,390,076	£-150,905	-5.94%	£2,414,075	£-126,906	-4.99%	£2,347,302	£193,680	-7.62%
Wickham Common Primary School	£1,372,501	£1,261,160	£111,340	-8.11%	£1,209,616	£-162,885	-11.87%	£1,255,205	£-117,296	-8.55%	£1,203,661	£168,840	-12.30%
Worsley Bridge Junior School	£728,480	£725,160	£3,319	-0.46%	£740,578	£12,098	1.66%	£741,159	£12,679	1.74%	£756,576	£28,096	3.86%
Beaverwood School for Girls	£5,093,581	£5,364,060	£270,479	5.31%	£5,396,160	£302,580	5.94%	£5,379,901	£286,320	5.62%	£5,412,168	£318,587	6.25%
Bishop Justus Church of England School	£4,229,363	£4,277,645	£48,282	1.14%	£4,279,050	£49,687	1.17%	£4,296,653	£67,290	1.59%	£4,298,018	£68,655	1.62%
Bullers Wood School	£5,136,452	£4,963,050	£-173,402	-3.38%	£4,998,490	£-137,963	-2.69%	£4,979,608	£156,844	-3.05%	£5,015,087	£121,365	-2.36%
Charles Darwin	£4,995,274	£5,354,424	£359,151	7.19%	£5,317,760	£322,486	6.46%	£5,370,846	£375,573	7.52%	£5,334,172	£338,899	6.78%
Coopers Technology College	£5,112,603	£5,598,267	£485,664	9.50%	£5,580,250	£467,646	9.15%	£5,614,208	£501,605	9.81%	£5,596,503	£483,899	9.46%
Darrick Wood School	£5,910,023	£5,847,842	£-62,180	-1.05%	£5,866,267	£-43,755	-0.74%	£5,861,669	£48,353	-0.82%	£5,880,174	£29,849	-0.51%
Harris Academy Beckenham	£3,507,721	£3,587,673	£79,952	2.28%	£3,519,125	£11,404	0.33%	£3,610,665	£102,944	2.93%	£3,541,361	£33,640	0.96%
Harris Academy Bromley	£4,560,679	£4,757,479	£196,799	4.32%	£4,725,644	£164,965	3.62%	£4,775,992	£215,313	4.72%	£4,744,649	£183,970	4.03%
Hayes School	£5,405,241	£5,393,885	£-11,356	-0.21%	£5,397,801	£-7,440	-0.14%	£5,409,093	£3,852	0.07%	£5,413,034	£7,793	0.14%
Kemnal Technology College	£4,659,561	£4,872,248	£212,687	4.56%	£4,838,143	£178,582	3.83%	£4,890,514	£230,953	4.96%	£4,856,141	£196,580	4.22%
Langley Park School for Boys	£4,854,609	£4,666,849	£-187,759	-3.87%	£4,685,357	£-169,252	-3.49%	£4,683,798	£170,811	-3.52%	£4,702,335	£152,274	-3.14%
Langley Park School for Girls	£5,646,892	£5,180,642	£-466,249	-8.26%	£5,228,214	£-418,678	-7.41%	£5,196,003	£450,889	-7.98%	£5,243,545	£403,346	-7.14%
Newstead Wood School	£3,109,273	£2,893,292	£-215,981	-6.95%	£2,930,059	£-179,214	-5.76%	£2,914,953	£194,321	-6.25%	£2,951,742	£157,531	-5.07%
Ravens Wood School	£5,038,616	£4,968,194	£-70,423	-1.40%	£4,998,681	£-39,935	-0.79%	£4,984,481	£54,135	-1.07%	£5,015,033	£23,584	-0.47%
St Olaves Grammar School	£2,798,620	£2,572,429	£-226,192	-8.08%	£2,602,473	£-196,147	-7.01%	£2,595,136	£203,485	-7.27%	£2,625,188	£173,432	-6.20%
The Priory School	£5,421,236	£5,306,505	£-114,732	-2.12%	£5,234,678	£-186,558	-3.44%	£5,324,730	£96,506	-1.78%	£5,252,503	£168,733	-3.11%
The Ravensbourne School	£5,491,040	£5,462,702	£-28,338	-0.52%	£5,469,032	£-22,008	-0.40%	£5,478,937	£12,103	-0.22%	£5,485,531	£5,509	-0.10%

ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Primary	28 responses
Special	1 response
Secondary	4 responses

Funding Formula

Q1 Do you support the Schools Forum proposal to use 73 points at EYSFF as an indicator for attainment for Primary Schools?

Yes	27
No	2

Q2 Which lump sum level do you think is most appropriate?

£150,000	11
£180,000	21

Q3 What values should be used for attainment, deprivation and EAL?

Same fixed level for Primary and Secondary Schools	16
Different levels based on pots of funding	14

Q4 Which overall funding model do you support?

Version 6	7
Version 8	6
Version 10	10
Version 12	8

De- delegation

1. Contingencies

Yes	17
No	3

2. Free School Meal Eligibility

Yes	20
No	2

3. Staff Costs- Supply Cover

Yes	21
No	1

4. Support for Ethnic Minority Pupils

Yes	6
No	16

5. Behaviour Support Service

Yes	4
No	18

LA Name

Bromley

Pupil Led Factors

Sample – the final pro forma may differ

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Reception Uplift				n/a		n/a	n/a
	Primary (including reception)	£2,149		23655		£50,844,923		72%
	Key Stage 3	£4,009		10253		£41,102,991	£119,372,626	
	Key Stage 4	£4,009		6841		£27,424,712		
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)	Number of eligible primary pupils	Number of eligible secondary pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: FSM6	£1,500	£1,500	4,700	3,576	£12,414,331		
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25	£0	£0	1,213	786	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3	£0	£0	820	683	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.3- 0.4	£0	£0	2,418	1,625	£0	£12,414,331	8%
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5	£0	£0	2,386	1,843	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.5-0.6	£0	£0	1,448	946	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.6-1	£0	£0	32	37	£0		
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: LAC_X_Mar11	£0		132			£0	0.00%
4) Low cost, high incidence SEN	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: LowAtt_%_PRI_73	£2,500		4050		£10,125,656		
	Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English and Maths)	£2,500		1469		£3,672,769	£13,798,425	8.36%
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: EAL_3_PRI	£1,000		1,537		£1,536,775		
	Secondary pupils- Indicator: EAL_3_SEC	£1,000		153		£152,700	£1,689,475	1.0%
6) Mobility	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£0		1,737		£0		
	Secondary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£0		445		£0	£0	0.0%

Other Factors

7) Lump Sum	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Lump Sum	£180,000	per school	91			£16,380,000	9.93%
8) Split Sites	Description						Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Split Sites						£0	0.00%
9) Rates	Description						Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Rates						£1,929,250	1.17%
10) PFI funding	Description						Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	PFI						£0	0.00%
11) Sixth Form	Description						Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Existing Sixth Form Commitments						£0	0.00%
12) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)	Description					Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Excep Circs 1					£0		
	Excep Circs 2					£0	£0	0.00%
	Excep Circs 3					£0		
13) Minimum Funding Guarantee	Description	MFG Floor		Ceiling	Scale Factor		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	MFG is set at -1.5%, gains may be capped above a specified ceiling and / or scaled	-2%		2%	100%		£-582,658	0%

TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£) :

£165,013,728

RETAINED FOR GROWTH

£976,362

PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO :

1 : 1.44

London fringe pay bands (only applicable to Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent and West Sussex)	Description	Uplift amount (%)	Unit	Number of schools		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Preset uplift on pupil lead factors and the lump sum	check please	per pupil	0			0	£0

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12060

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **SUPPORT FOR UNDERPERFORMING SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Sue Mordecai, Head of Learning
Tel: 020 8461 6236 E-mail: sue.mordecai@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 To update Members on the current school improvement strategy to support underperforming schools in Bromley and the future challenges in the light of the evolving education agenda.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **That Members of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee consider and comment on the current school improvement strategy and how this accords with the local agenda for the future.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

Bromley LA Strategy to Support Underperforming Schools

3.1 Introduction

The Local Authority Strategy to support underperforming schools is set within the context of:

- the Education Act of November 2011;
- updated DFE Guidance for Local Authorities September 2012;
- the evolving education agenda, including academy conversion /sponsorship and the growth of teaching schools;
- a commitment to enabling schools to become more autonomous in leading their own improvement and to facilitate the ability of schools to support and challenge each other;
- the growth of external partnerships within Bromley and beyond;
- the re-organisation of the School Improvement Team within Bromley LA;
- ongoing budget cuts and local prioritisation of services.

3.2 The Statutory Responsibilities of the Council for Underperforming Schools

Schools are self managing and autonomous institutions, responsible for their own performance and improvement. The Local Authority's role is one of advocacy for children and young people and it continues to hold a democratic accountability for securing best outcomes for children and young people.

The Secretary of State requires a Local Authority to intervene in LA maintained schools, community and voluntary aided, where there are serious concerns which need tackling. In relation to underperformance these concerns are based on schools which are consistently below floor targets or where there is a serious drop in performance. This duty does not apply to academies or independent schools.

Should a school not make the necessary improvements within a given timescale, the Local Authority may use its appropriate statutory powers of intervention which include:

- requiring the Governing Body to work with another school, federation or other named partner for the purpose of school improvement;
- the appointment of additional governors to provide additional expertise;
- applying to the Secretary of State to replace the Governing Body with an Interim Executive Board to provide challenge to the leadership of the school to provide rapid progress;
- suspension of delegated authority for the governing body to manage a school's budget;
- issuing a warning notice to the Governing Body where a school shows reluctance to address concerns;
- seeking academy sponsorship.

The LA has a statutory responsibility to take action when a school goes into an Ofsted category of concern. If a maintained school goes into an Ofsted category of 'Serious Weaknesses' or 'Special Measures' the Local Authority is required to write a 'Statement of Action' and submit that plan to Ofsted for approval as to whether or not the plan is 'fit for purpose'. There is an expectation by the DfE that where a school has been judged by Ofsted to require 'Special Measures', conversion to an academy with a strong sponsor will be the normal route to secure improvement.

There are currently 3 primary schools in category, however, one of these is a converter academy and it is not yet clear from the DfE what mechanisms will be put in to secure improvement. The two LA maintained schools in Special Measures will become sponsored academies by September 2013. Nevertheless the Local Authority is responsible for the Statement of Action to improve the outcomes for pupils until each school becomes an academy.

3.3 The Secretary of State has the power to:

- direct the LA to issue a notice of warning;
- appoint additional governors;
- require the governing body to be constituted as an Interim Executive Board;
- direct the closure of a school;
- make an academy order.

3.4 The Identification of Underperforming Schools

The key warning signs:

The LA has an established system for early identification of those schools that are underperforming through:

- the use of multiple data sources to monitor school performance and progress;
- regular monitoring and reviewing of the performance of schools;
- termly meetings for those schools deemed 'Satisfactory' by Ofsted;
- 'local knowledge' from LA Officers;
- regular meetings with the Directors of Education of the Archdiocese of Southwark (RC) and Diocese of Rochester (C of E);
- Ofsted reports.

The Characteristics of an Underperforming School

- the school is failing to address significant underperformance;
- the school is lacking the leadership capacity to improve;
- issues with governance;
- schools that are below floor target in the three national indicators at KS2 and KS4;
- risks to pupils' safety and well-being;
- significant budget problems in maintained schools, without a secure recovery plan;
- Ofsted category (see **Appendix 1**).

The National Data Indicators

Primary schools are identified as being below floor target and therefore underperforming in the three national indicators of:

- below 60% KS2 L4+ in English and mathematics (combined)
- below the national median at KS2 for two levels of progress in English (87% in 2011)
- below the national median at KS2 for two levels of progress in mathematics (86% in 2011).

There are currently no schools in this category in Bromley. Schools that were previously in this category have either improved significantly or have become sponsored academies.

The DfE had a particular concern in 2008 with the number of primary schools in Bromley (12) which were underperforming according to their criteria. Therefore, the LA School Improvement Team in Learning and Achievement has had this as a key focus. Although there are currently no schools which match the criteria of the DfE to be designated as underperforming, the Local Authority does identify schools that may be at risk of underperforming in order to put in place a programme of intervention strategies to prevent a further decline in standards. Four schools are currently identified as requiring support (see Appendix 2 and 3).

3.5 Strategies to Improve Underperforming Schools

The Head of Learning plays a key role in co-ordinating Local Authority and brokered support, monitoring delivery, gathering and presenting progress reports. Schools that are deemed as underperforming currently receive advice and support according to need. This includes some or all of the following:

- Meeting with the head teacher and if necessary the Chair of Governors to clarify issues and recommend necessary actions.
- Preparing a flexible, tailored and costed action plan to address these issues.
- Provision of differentiated levels of support.
- Supporting and strengthening school leadership with support from a head teacher from an outstanding school or a head teacher who has national accreditation, eg National Leader of Education (NLE).
- Monitoring and regular review.
- Working in collaboration with other schools or partners.
- There are monthly meetings of the Local Authority Priority Schools Group to monitor those schools causing concern. The membership of this group includes the Head of Access and Admissions, the Head of Special Educational Needs, Head of Research and Statistics, the Human Resources Manager, Head of Schools Finance and these meetings are chaired by the Head of Learning.

Schools which have shown significant improvement:

A number of schools in Bromley have shown significant improvement and developed from an underperforming school to one that is at least Good and which is sustainable. The characteristics that these schools have in common are:

- determined and resolute leadership from the head teacher
- improving teaching and learning is the key priority
- accepting nothing less than good behaviour from pupils
- rigorous monitoring and evaluation by senior leaders
- use of target setting, assessment and tracking to raise achievement
- effective performance management and professional development of teachers
- effective development of middle leaders
- a curriculum which is 'fit for purpose'
- effective governance which holds school leaders to account
- greater parental engagement.

3.6 The future strategy for school improvement is set within the context of:

- the evolving education agenda, including academy conversion
- the growth of external partnerships within Bromley and beyond
- teaching schools
- the re-organisation within Bromley LA and the move towards commissioning services
- the ability of schools to support each other successfully
- clarity from the DfE regarding the role of the Local Authority in tackling schools that are underperforming and support for vulnerable pupils.

The challenges afforded by a more autonomous education system are many, the opportunities and potential for innovation and informed sharing of effective practice are significant. The main challenge is how to ensure that a school-to-school support model is coherent and comprehensive; that schools that are underperforming have a wide range of high quality support to draw upon and that those schools receive informed advice, support and challenge that is crucial in securing improvement.

Appendix 1 : Ofsted outcomes for Bromley schools in September 2012

Appendix 2 : School profile of schools that have recently been identified as underperforming

Appendix 3 : Staff profile of schools that have recently been identified as Underperforming

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Bromley School Improvement Plan

OFSTED OUTCOMES FOR SCHOOLS IN BROMLEY – SEPTEMBER 2012

School	Outcome	Date
PRIMARY SCHOOLS		
Alexandra Infants	Outstanding	May 2011
Darrick Wood Infants	Outstanding	Nov 2009
Edgebury Primary	Outstanding	Jan 2009
Green St Green Primary	Outstanding	May 2009
Highfield Infant	Outstanding	Jan 2008
Highfield Junior	Outstanding	Jan 2009
Keston C of E Primary	Outstanding	Jun 2009
Mead Road Infants	Outstanding	Mar 2009
Parish Primary	Outstanding	Nov 2011
Perry Hall Primary	Outstanding	Nov 2011
Pickhurst Infant	Outstanding	Nov 2007
Pickhurst Junior	Outstanding	Jul 2011
St James RC Primary	Outstanding	Sept 2007
St Vincent's RC Primary	Outstanding	Apr 2007
Valley Primary	Outstanding	Dec 2008
Warren Road Primary	Outstanding	Mar 2008
Balgowan Primary	Good	Jan 2008
Bickley Primary	Good	May 2009
Castlecombe Primary	Good	May 2009
Chelsfield Primary	Good	Nov 2007
Chislehurst Primary	Good	Mar 2009
Clare House Primary	Good	May 2012
Crofton Infants	Good	Oct 2010
Crofton Junior	Good	Nov 2008
Cudham Primary	Good	Nov 2009
Darrick Wood Junior	Good	Oct 2012
Dorset Road Infant	Good	Mar 2011
Downe Primary	Good	Jan 2007
Farnborough Primary	Good	Jul 2008
Hawes Down Infant	Good	Feb 2009
Hawes Down Junior	Good	Jul 2008
Hayes Primary	Good	Jul 2008
Leesons Primary	Good	Feb 2012
Marian Vian Primary	Good	Jun 2012
Midfield Primary	Good	Nov 2010
Mottingham Primary	Good	May 2011
Oaklands Primary	Good	Dec 2010
Pratts Bottom Primary	Good	Feb 2011
Princes Plain Primary	Good	Nov 2011
Raglan Primary	Good	Jun 2010
Red Hill Primary	Good	Oct 2011
Scotts Park Primary	Good	May 2009
Southborough Primary	Good	Jul 2011
St Joseph's RC Primary	Good	Oct 2010
St Mark's C of E Primary	Good	May 2011
St Mary's RC Primary	Good	Sept 2008
St Philomena's RC Primary	Good	May 2010
Stewart Fleming Primary	Good	Jun 2011
The Highway Primary	Good	Nov 2009
Unicorn Primary	Good	Sept 2009

School	Outcome	Date
Wickham Common Primary	Good	Oct 2008
Alexandra Junior	Satisfactory	Mar 2010
Blenheim Primary	Satisfactory	Nov 2010
Bromley Road Infant	Satisfactory	Nov 2010
Burnt Ash Primary	Satisfactory	Jan 2012
Churchfields Primary	Satisfactory	Oct 2011
Hillside Primary	Satisfactory	Jul 2012
James Dixon Primary	Satisfactory	Mar 2011
Malcolm Primary	Satisfactory	Sept 2009
Manor Oak Primary	Satisfactory	Mar 2011
Oak Lodge Primary	Satisfactory	Nov 2011
Poverest Primary	Satisfactory	Sept 2009
St Anthony's RC Primary	Satisfactory	Sept 2010
St George's C of E Primary	Satisfactory	Feb 2010
St John's C of E Primary	Satisfactory	Jul 2011
St Mary Cray Primary	Satisfactory	Jul 2011
St Paul's Cray C of E Primary	Satisfactory	Feb 2012
St Peter and St Paul RC Primary	Satisfactory	Nov 2011
Tubbenden Primary	Satisfactory	Jan 2011
Worsley Bridge Junior	Satisfactory	Oct 2010
Biggin Hill Primary	Notice to Improve	May 2012
Gray's Farm Primary	Special Measures	Jul 2012
Royston Primary	Special Measures	Mar 2012
SECONDARY SCHOOLS		
Bullers Wood	Outstanding	Jun 2011
Darrick Wood	Outstanding	Apr 2009
Hayes	Outstanding	Mar 2011
Kemnal Technology College	Outstanding	Feb 2009
Langley Park Boys	Outstanding	Oct 2006
Newstead Wood	Outstanding	May 2010
Ravens Wood	Outstanding	Nov 2007
St Olave's	Outstanding	Nov 2006
Beaverwood	Good	Oct 2007
Bishop Justus	Good	May 2012
Charles Darwin	Good	Sept 2008
Coopers	Good	Dec 2009
Langley Park Girls	Good	Feb 2009
The Priory	Good	Jan 2012
The Ravensbourne	Good	Jan 2010
Harris Beckenham	Satisfactory	Dec 2010
Harris Bromley	Satisfactory	Nov 2011
SPECIAL SCHOOLS		
Glebe	Outstanding	May 2010
Marjorie McClure	Good	May 2011
Riverside	Good	Sept 2011
Burwood	Satisfactory	May 2011

Schools which are shaded are academies.

Sue Mordecai Sept 2012

**SCHOOL PROFILE OF SCHOOLS THAT HAVE RECENTLY
BEEN IDENTIFIED AT RISK OF UNDERPERFORMING**

School	FSM	MEG	SA+/St	SDF	Size
School A	45.3%	34.3%	20.2%	0.78*	1 FE
School B	25.5%	25.7%	8.8%	0.19	2 FE
School C	39.4%	27.1%	7.0%	0.38*	2 FE
School D	55.0%	76.0%	11.3%	0.33	2 FE
National	26.2%	27.7%	7.9%	0.24	
Bromley LA	12.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	

FSM = Free School Meals

MEG = Minority Ethnic Group

SA+ / St = School Action Plus / Statemented

SDF = Social Deprivation Factor

* = Top Quartile

STAFF PROFILE OF SCHOOLS THAT HAVE RECENTLY BEEN IDENTIFIED AS UNDERPERFORMING

School	Total No of Staff	Teaching Staff		Support Staff		Age Range				
		Female	Male	Female	Male	17-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-60+
School A	35	13	2	19	1		8	7	11	9
School B	99	20	6	70	3		10	19	30	40
School C	68	16	1	48	3		10	6	22	30
School D	94	26	2	65	1		13	11	37	33
Totals	296	75	11	202	8	0	41	43	100	112

Agenda Item 9

Report No.
ED12061

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **SUPPORT FOR UNDERACHIEVING GROUPS OF CHILDREN – CLOSING THE GAP**

Contact Officer: Sue Mordecai, Head of Learning
Tel: 020 8461 6236 E-mail: sue.mordecai@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 To update Members on support for underachieving groups of children and where gaps have closed.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **That Members of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee consider and comment on issues raised with underperforming groups in Bromley and how this accords with the local agenda for the future.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 Introduction

- Successive governments have been exercised by improving the outcomes of vulnerable pupils which can differ significantly compared with those from more advantaged backgrounds. The groups of children who are vulnerable and therefore may underachieve are identified nationally as:
 - Gender - Boys
 - Pupils eligible for Free Schools Meals
 - Ethnicity / EAL
 - Special Educational Needs
 - Looked After Children
- There are 'sub' groups within Ethnicity and Special Educational Needs.
- The attainment gap between children from rich and poor backgrounds is detectable at an early age (22 months) and widens throughout the education system, for example children from the lowest income homes are half as likely to get 5 good GCSEs and go on to higher education.
- White working-class pupils – particularly boys – are among the lowest performers in academic achievement.
- Socio – economic gaps are much greater than ethnic group differences.
- There is extensive research in the UK analysing the link between poverty and attainment, however, there is much less quantitative and qualitative evidence available in terms of 'what works'
- Priorities for the Coalition Government to address 'Closing the gap' include:
 - providing funding to schools through the Pupil Premium to address the gap in outcomes for children living in poverty.
 - targeting resources where needs are most acute.
 - encouraging early intervention.

3.2 Trends over time – Closing the Gap in Bromley

The attainment for all indicators from KS1 to KS4 for Bromley Local Authority is higher than the National Average, however, in some indicators the gaps between identified groups are similar. Some data for KS2 and KS4 is not available until the end of December 2012.

3.3 Gender

- Foundation Stage
 - The percentage gap between the lowest achieving 20% in FSP has narrowed by 6% from 2008 to 2012. This is broadly in line with the national average.
 - The gap between boys and girls has narrowed from 14% in 2011 to 7% in 2012 with girls outperforming boys, which is in line with the national average.

- Within the EYFS profile girls outperform boys in all aspects with the biggest gap in Communications, Language and Literacy – which was 20% in 2011 but has narrowed to 15% in 2012.
- Key Stage 1
 - In the Year 1 Phonics Screening Check, introduced for the first time in 2012, girls outperformed boys by 64% to 58% a gap of 6% compared with a gap of 8% nationally.
 - At KS1 girls outperform boys in reading by 5%, compared with 6% nationally. Trends over time have been variable, ranging from a similar 5% gap in 2008 to a 7% gap in 2010. Girls outperform boys in writing by 9% compared with 10% nationally. This gap has been consistent over time both locally and nationally. In mathematics, girls outperform boys by 2% compared with 3% nationally. The gap over the last 5 years has varied between 1% and 3%.
- Key Stage 2
 - Girls continue to outperform boys but the gap is narrowing slowly in writing. There is no gap in mathematics and boys outperform girls by 9% at the higher level 5. In reading the gap is 6%, which reflects the national gap and the trends over time vary between 5% and 7%.
 - In writing the gap in 2008 was 11% compared with 7% nationally and in 2010 it was 13% compared with 15% nationally. The gap has narrowed in 2012 to 9% compared with 11% nationally. In mathematics at KS2 L4+ there is no gap and this is the same nationally. Boys outperformed girls by 2% in 2008 and girls outperformed boys by 1% in 2010.
- Key Stage 4
 - Girls outperform boys in the key indicator of 5+ A*-C including English and mathematics. In 2010 the gap was 1.5% compared with 7.5% nationally, however, for 2012 there has been a significant rise in the gap for Bromley which is now 11% compared with 9.5% nationally.

3.4 Free School Meals Eligibility

- Foundation Stage
 - There was a significant gap in the Foundation Stage indicator of achieving at least 78 points and 6+ in all PSE and CLL. The gap in 2007 was 22% compared with 21% nationally however in 2012 the Bromley gap narrowed by 8%
- Key Stage 1
 - In the Year 1 Phonics Screening Check the gap between FSM and non FSM is 21% compared with the national which is 17%.
 - At KS1 in reading the gap is 18% compared with 14% nationally. Trends over time indicate gaps of between 20% in 2010 and 15% in 2011. In writing the gap is 22% compared with 16% nationally. Trends over time vary between 25% and 20% compared with the national which is between 20% and 16%. In maths the gap is 13% compared with 11% nationally. This has varied between 9% and 15% over time compared with the national of 11% and 13%.

- Key Stage 2
 - The gap between those eligible for FSM and Non FSM achieving L4+ in English and mathematics is 22% compared with 29% in 2008 and 2009. The national varies between 23% and 20%.
- Key Stage 4
 - The gap for those achieving 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE including English and mathematics is the widest of all key stage indicators, however the gap has narrowed from 35% in 2010 to 26% in 2011. The data for 2012 is not yet available. The gap nationally over the last 5 years has remained fairly static at 27% or 28%.

3.5 Ethnicity

- Key Stage 1
 - The lowest performing group in the Year 1 Phonics Screening Check is White achieving 59% compared with 61% for all pupils and 83% achieved by Chinese pupils. This reflects the position nationally.
 - At KS1 the percentage achieving L2+ reading indicates little variation on the 88% for all pupils except for 100% of Chinese pupils who reach this standard. It is similar for writing and mathematics.
- Key Stage 2
 - At KS2, the lowest performing group is Black, achieving 72% L4+ English and mathematics compared with 70% nationally and 83% for all pupils. This is a 5% increase since 2009.
- Key Stage 4
 - At KS4 the lowest performing group is Black achieving 61% 5+ A*-C including English and mathematics compared with 55% nationally and 68% for all pupils. This is a 7% increase since 2009.

3.6 Special Educational Needs

- Pupils classified as 'School Action' tend to perform slightly below national expectations in all KS1 indicators but achieve slightly above expectations at KS2. In 2012 at KS1, 61% achieved L2+ in reading compared with 63% nationally. Trends over time indicate that this gap has varied slightly between 2% and 3%.
- In writing, 48% achieve L2+ compared with 53% nationally and in mathematics the gap is 2% with 72% achieving L2+ compared with 74% nationally.
- At KS2, there has been a steady increase in English and mathematics at L4+, with 72% achieving L4+ in English compared with 62% in 2011 and 57% nationally (2011).
- Mathematics has increased from 58% in 2010 to 63% and English and mathematics combined results have increased from 44% in 2010 to 54% in 2012 compared with 43% nationally (2011).
- At KS4, 25% on School Action achieved 5+A*-C including English and mathematics in 2010 however this increased to 40% in 2012.

- School Action Plus pupils achieve at national expectations in Y1 Phonics, but above at KS1 L2+ in reading, writing and mathematics. This indicates a steady trend of improvement in all areas, for example reading has increased 14% in 3 years, writing 16% and mathematics 9%. This compares with national increases of between 2% and 5%.
- We do not have the KS2 data for 2012, but in 2011, School Action Plus pupils did not achieve national expectations in any of the indicators, however there has been a steady trend of improvement, for example 37% achieved L4+ in English in 2010 but 52% achieved that indicator in 2012. Similarly in mathematics, 45% achieved L4+ in 2010 compared with 59% in 2012.
- At KS4, 17% on School Action Plus achieved 5+A*-C including English and mathematics in 2010, however this increased to 24% in 2012.
- Statemented pupils achieved 4% above national expectations in the Y1 Phonics Screening Check and significantly above at KS1 L2+ by 6% in reading, 8% in writing and 4% in mathematics.
- We do not have the national data for KS2 but there were significant increases compared with 2011 – 5% increase in English, 7% in mathematics and 4% in English and mathematics combined and significantly above the 2011 national average.
- At KS4, 15% of pupils with statements achieved 5+A*-C including English and mathematics in 2010, however this decreased to 13% in 2012.

3.7 National Strategies to Support Schools:

- Previous funding to support the most disadvantaged was through 'One to One' tuition for literacy and/or numeracy and several initiatives aimed at Early Years and KS1 and KS2, in particular 'Every Child a Reader (ECAR), Every Child a Writer (ECAW), Every Child a Talker (ECAT) and SEAL (Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning). The strategies and materials to support these initiatives continue to be used in many schools.
- The Pupil Premium is government funded and was introduced in April 2011. It is to support children from low-income families who are eligible for free school meals, looked after children and those from families with parents in the armed forces. From April 2012, the Pupil Premium was extended to include children who had been eligible for free school meals at any point in the last six years. The Pupil Premium is currently £619 per pupil and this will rise to £900 in the next financial year.
- Schools decide how the money is used to secure the best outcomes for those pupils eligible for the Premium, however, schools must publish on line how the funding has been spent and the impact. Ofsted will evaluate the use of Pupil Premium funding by schools to ensure that they are focusing it on disadvantaged pupils and using it effectively.

3.8 Local Strategies to Support Schools:

- School by school analysis of data by Research and Statistics to identify underperforming groups supported by further analysis by the Head of Learning.
- 'Closing the gap' is a focus for school reviews.

- For schools in a category of concern, there is school based intervention which can range from whole school training to intensive support from an LA specialist advisory teacher for small groups of pupils – for example EAL support, support for boys and writing,
- There is a dedicated specialist teacher for Family Learning, funded by a national grant, to support the most vulnerable with their learning through parental/carer engagement.
- There is a dedicated LA Looked After Children team to support a range of funded learning opportunities which include after school and holiday events.
- Advice, support and training (including accredited courses leading to Specialist qualifications) for SENCOs and Inclusion Managers.
- There is a comprehensive ‘Sold services’ offer for all schools to buy into, eg EAL support, specialist literacy, specialist numeracy, support for particular aspects of SEN eg Down’s Syndrome, behaviour support.

3.9 Impact:

- There are a number of schools which have narrowed the gap for some of the most vulnerable pupils because of carefully focused and targeted intervention. The table below indicates those schools which have the highest FSM and the highest social deprivation indicators. Some schools in challenging circumstances may appear to be doing less well than more advantaged schools in terms of attainment but the progress for English in particular, which is a key indicator, shows a different picture. In the examples below, some schools are doing exceptionally well with their attainment as well for a number of reasons eg stability compared with high mobility rates in schools.
- It is expected that the Annual Standards Report will indicate an increasing trajectory of improvement for those schools with the highest number of vulnerable pupils. The Pupil Premium should start to show an impact in the 2013 results.

School	FSM	MEG	SA+/St	SDF	Progress - English 2+ levels KS1-KS2	Attainment L4+ English
St Mary Cray	57.4%	25.6%	12.2%	0.42*	100%	60%
Mottingham	56.5%	41.9%	9.5%	0.40*	97%	86%
Manor Oak	55.3%	43.6%	14.0%	0.45*	92%	79%
Midfield	48.8%	23.5%	27.0%	0.37*	96%	89%
James Dixon	48.2%	77.9%	19.9%	0.36*	93%	93%
Leesons	48.1%	24.0%	22.4%	0.39*	89%	86%
Castlecombe	47.8%	21.9%	13.1%	0.41*	97%	100%
National	26.2%	27.7%	7.9%	0.24	89%	81%
Bromley LA	12.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	92%	88%

FSM = Free School Meals

MEG = Minority Ethnic Groups

SA+ / St = School Action Plus / Statemented

SDF = Social Deprivation Factor

* = Top Quartile

3.10 Characteristics of schools which close the gap:

- strong, visionary leadership
- rigorous monitoring and use of data
- judicious use of intervention strategies
- effective use of external support
- raising pupil aspirations
- engaging parents and raising parental aspirations
- developing social and emotional competencies
- supporting school transitions

3.11 Future support for schools:

- The future for 'in-house' support services is currently under review, but continues to be provided as a 'sold service' until further notice.
- There are a number of external providers that also offer packages of support required and requested by schools.
- The School Improvement Service also continues to support and promote the use of high quality school-to-school support through Borough school partnership arrangements.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy Implications, Financial Implications, Legal Implications, Personnel implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Bromley School Improvement Plan

Decision Maker: Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **COMPARISON OF THERAPY PROVISION IN BROMLEY SCHOOLS AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Mary Çava, Head of SEN & Disability Services
Tel: 020 8461 7633 E-mail: mary.cava@bromley.gov.uk
Hilary Rogers, Service Manager (Joint Commissioning),
Tel: 07904 395860 E-mail: hilary.rogers@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report has been requested by Members to identify the current capacity and delivery methods of speech and language therapy and occupational therapy (hereinafter referred to as 'therapies') for children and young people in Bromley (PDS May 2012 refers).
- 1.2 The report considers therapies funded by the Local Authority and Bromley Primary Care Trust (PCT) in comparison to therapies provided by schools in the Independent sector and one other out of borough maintained school.
- 1.3 Members have requested this detail prior to giving consideration to any request for the re-tendering and commissioning of therapy services in 2013.
- 1.4 Members have also requested commentary on the value of Early Intervention of therapy services.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 The Education PDS Committee is asked to:

- (i) consider the content of the report for information purposes;
- (ii) consider the re-alignment of the contracts held by the London Borough of Bromley and the PCT with Bromley Healthcare to provide a core service with the flexibility to meet identified needs as and when required;
- (iii) consider the appropriateness of an Invest to Save bid.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Draft Education and Care Services Plan for 2012/13
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People - Enjoy learning and achieve their full potential; ensuring the health and wellbeing of children and young people, and their families
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head:
 5. Source of funding: Revenue Support Grant
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): No LBB staff are employed in the delivery of therapies boroughwide.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement : Education Act 1996 ,Children Act 2002
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected)
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

Speech and Language Therapy (SaLT) and Occupational Therapy (OT) is delivered into Bromley school settings primarily through commissioned provision which is delivered by Bromley Healthcare (BHC).

Funding for the commissioning is provided by both LB Bromley, SEN, through the Dedicated Schools Grant and by Bromley Primary Care Trust (PCT).

Historically commissioning has been carried separately and funding is also separate.

There is no clarification of the respective statutory duties of local authorities and Primary Care Trusts for the funding of therapy provision within educational settings. Current discussions with the Department of Health linked to the SEND Pathfinder project indicate that the Department of Health will maintain this position and will not give national direction or guidance as to any criteria to establish a joint funding methodology and thus agreement is expected to be locally negotiated. However, there has been case law acknowledging that SaLT can be defined as an educational need as the therapy is required to access the curriculum.

3.1 SPEECH AND LANGUAGE PROVISION:

Bromley PCT has a duty to provide community health care for all Bromley residents who are registered with a Bromley GP. The PCT commissions a contract with BHC with a value of £1.2m per annum for the delivery of community therapy and nursing provision for this purpose. BHC's delivery includes provision for therapy for pupils in mainstream schools and for pre school aged children. This is typically delivered through out patient clinics. The target cohort is those in primary schools. As and when pupils are discharged they may still access 'advice clinics' in the community. However, when pupils attending Bromley's special schools are discharged they may attend advice clinics which are established by BHC on these school sites. The number of school aged pupils identified as having speech and language as a primary or secondary need identified in their Statement of Education Need in 2011/12 is 1,062 children or 2.2% of the school aged population.

3.1.1 PCT Commissioning within specialist school provision

PCT currently commissions SaLT at the following Special Schools:

- Riverside School (St Pauls Cray) All age
- Marjorie McClure School All age
- The Glebe (Key Stage 3 and Key stage 4 only)

There are currently 169 children and young people on Bromley Healthcare's caseload across these three special schools, resulting in the delivery of 8 full days of therapy per week.

PCT commissioning is carried out by way of an overarching agreement with BHC for children and adults' healthcare provision across the borough.

PCT also currently commissions SaLT at 12 Provisions for children with complex needs and/or autism. These are attached to mainstream primary schools.

There are currently 134 children and young people on BHC's caseload across these 12 Provisions, with BHC delivering 9 full days of therapy per week.

PCT also currently commissions SaLT at the following schools:-

- Darrick Wood Primary and Secondary Campus – part funded with LBB
- Green Street Green Speech & Language Provision
- Raglan Speech & Language Provision – part funded with LBB

There are currently 75 children and young people on Bromley Healthcare's caseload across these 3 settings, with BHC delivering 15½ days of therapy per week.

PCT commissions SaLT at three specialist pre school settings.

The value of the PCT contract is £1,424k.

This contract has 3½ years to run, although a contract variation can be put in place on an annual basis but this must fit into the PCT review cycle.

Appendix 1 details the level of provision which is currently funded by PCT in Bromley Schools

3.1.2 LBB Commissioning

LBB currently commissions SaLT at the following Special Schools:-

- The Glebe (Age 16 – 19 only)
- Burwood

LBB currently commissions SaLT at three Provisions attached to mainstream primary schools:-

LBB currently commissions SaLT at the following schools and settings :-

- Darrick Wood Primary and Secondary Campus – part funded with PCT Darrick Wood Pre School for Deaf Children
- Raglan Speech & Language Provision – part funded with PCT
- Hayes Secondary SPALD Provision (Speech and Language Disorder)
- Phoenix Classrooms x 2
- Assistive Technology Project based at Marjorie McClure School as an Outreach service

The value of this contract is £239,792 p.a.

LBB Inclusion Support Service has a separate contract with BHC for SaLT which specifically supports children entering Reception and Year One mainstream school classes. This provides fortnightly one to one therapy sessions for 120 pupils. The purpose of this intervention is to avoid more costly intervention at a later date.

The value of this contract is £63,614.

There are currently 148 children and young people on Bromley Healthcare's caseload for LBB commissioned contracts with BHC delivering 12½ days of therapy per week.

In June 2012, these contracts were combined and extended for one year until the end of July 2013. It is proposed to request permission to tender for the contracts on the open market in January 2013.

Appendix 2 details the level of provision which is funded by LBB in Bromley Schools.

In addition to the above, in the event of a SEN Tribunal directing that individual pupils must have specifically defined SaLT provision, LBB separately commissions the therapy by way of individual 'spot purchased' contracts. There are currently 3 contracts with BHC with a total value of £9,945 p.a., and an additional two contracts with other third party SaLT providers with a total value of £4,900

In summary, LBB currently commission SaLT to the value of £313,351 plus other third parties value £14,845 into Bromley school settings.

There are a total of 526 children and young people receiving SaLT therapy in Bromley special schools and provisions, from a total school population of 46,396, i.e. 1.13% which reflects the national average.

Every child has a Statement of Special Educational Need with a statutory requirement for SaLT therapy input.

3.2 SPECIALIST PROVISION WITH NO CURRENT THERAPY INPUT

There is no SaLT provision at the following provisions:-

Kingswood PRU

Grovelands PRU

Priory SpeLD (Specific Learning Disability)

Ravensbourne SpeLD (Specific Learning Disability)

3.3 CURRENT SERVICE DELIVERY

SaLT is currently delivered through either one to one therapy or small group therapy, with additional time spent working with school staff to ensure that they model strategies within the classroom environment.

The PCT contract allows flexibility on the part of the Provider to adjust the therapy resource allocation into specific schools dependant upon ongoing needs analysis. This is undertaken by BHC Head of Service. Assessed need may vary on a termly or annual basis. Thus, for instance, if an unmet need is recognised in a school that has insufficient support to meet the need, a resource may be moved from a better resourced school to address that need.

The LBB contract is currently less flexible in that it specifies the actual school where the therapy will be delivered. This contracting arrangement is favoured by schools as they have a definitive resource allocation which enables the school planning to be more robust.

As these methods of service delivery are so different, assessing the efficiency of different arrangements for organising and providing SaLT is complex. Commissioners need to consider how to align the 2 contracts in order to ensure a flexible, coherent and transparent delivery model which can be robustly monitored in order to maximise resources. Cohorts of children with language needs may change over time and thus there is a need for flexibility within the contracting of the service.

There is a need to clarify and disseminate the range of evidence based and effective delivery methods for therapy services to ensure targeted support is delivered in the most cost effective manner. This may include group work, team teaching/therapy work as well as the more traditional 1:1 therapy which is more widely known.

The monitoring must consider both academic attainment and also the broader skills of social communication, interactive and life skills that allow for independent living. This evaluation should involve service users.

3.4 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY PROVISION:

3.4.1 PCT Commissioning

PCT currently commissions OT at the following special schools:

- Riverside School (St Paul's Cray)
- Marjorie McClure School

There are 87 children and young people on Bromley Healthcare's caseload across these two special schools, delivering 3½ full days of therapy per day, plus additional technician support as required.

PCT commissions the OT at two pre school settings. PCT commissioning is carried out by way of an overarching agreement with BHC for children and adults' healthcare provision across the borough.

The value of the PCT contract is £445k.

Appendix 1 details the level of provision which is funded by PCT in Bromley Schools.

3.4.2 LBB Commissioning

LBB currently commissions O/T at:

- Riverside, Beckenham

There are 12 children and young people on Bromley Healthcare's caseload for LBB commissioned contracts with BHC delivering 2 days of therapy per week

Appendix 2 details the level of provision which is funded by LBB in Bromley Schools.

In addition to the above, in the event of a SEN Tribunal directing that individual pupils must have specifically defined OT provision, LBB separately commissions the therapy by way of individual 'spot purchased' contracts.

There are a total of 99 children and young people receiving OT therapy in Bromley schools, from a total school population of 46,396, i.e.0.21%.

3.5 THERAPY PROVISION IN OUT OF BOROUGH (INDEPENDENT & MAINTAINED) SCHOOLS

An analysis of SaLT provision for Bromley children being funded in Out of Borough (Independent and maintained) schools has been undertaken across those schools which typically provide for speech, language and communication needs as a child's primary disability.

Appendix 3 illustrates the level of SaLT and OT provision that is available in these schools.

The ratio of SaLT provision to pupils is considerably higher in independent special schools and also in the maintained out of borough schools reviewed than that provided in Bromley schools. The highest ratio is provided at Moor House, which is a specialist speech, language and communication school which has 10 full time therapists and 3 therapy assistants with a pupil role of 71, thus providing a ratio of 1:5 ½. The cost of a place at Moor House is £32,000. The school which provides a better comparison to Riverside, St Paul's Cray is Parkwood Hall, where there is one full time therapist and 2 therapy assistants, with a pupil role of 79, making a ratio of 1:26. Riverside provides a ratio of 1:100.

3.6 PROJECTED GROWTH IN NUMBER OF PUPILS

The current school population in Bromley is 46,396. This figure is forecast to increase by 1.3% in 2013/14 and by 2.8 % in 2014/15. There is however a higher projected growth of children and young people with complex needs who will require therapy input.

3.7 THE VALUE OF EARLY INTERVENTION

Speech, language and communication is the most common type of need in primary aged children with Statements of SEN. Those who struggle to communicate are at high risk of poor outcomes, including educational achievement, behaviour and vulnerability, mental health, employability and criminality.

Early intervention is provided to those children with the most complex speech and language needs through the Pupil Resource Agreements. 169 pupils have received Pupil Resource Agreements, which include a short period of very intensive SaLT therapy, in the school year September 11 – July 12. Of those, 37 Agreements have ceased, as children are accessing 'School Action' and 'School Action Plus' and only 21 have been issued with Statements.

Appendix 4 provides further analysis on the value of Early Intervention.

A number of older pupils are in specialist out of borough independent provision specifically for speech and language difficulties. Most have been placed via Tribunal. Had there been appropriate SaLT provision in the borough, the LA would have been able to argue to maintain these children in Bromley schools. Also, early intervention may have prevented some of these children from requiring this at a later stage.

3.8 SUMMARY

Current provision of therapy services in the borough is limited and is not comparable with other therapy provisions in out of borough schools (both independent and maintained).

The current commissioning process is not coherent or cost effective. Statutory changes are being introduced in the Health and Social Care Act 2012 and the Care and Support legislation which impose a duty on Health and Local Authorities to commission jointly, with clarity as to who is the responsible commissioner.

A joint strategy to commissioning might include a move towards an early intervention strategy which could provide co-ordinated and targeted support which would develop sustained capacity.

There is a need to ensure that what is provided is fair and equitable. The current delivery methods should be re-aligned with PCT providing a 'core service' which LBB could then top up flexibly in response to changing needs.

There is a need to develop a system of data collection which helps to evaluate outcomes.

In line with Bromley Council policy to increase local specialist provision for the growing number of children with complex SEN, a spend to save option may be considered an appropriate cost effective way forward.

Spending to save in borough would ensure that LBB would be in a stronger position to meet needs and avoid costly placements (often via tribunal) out of borough.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 This review which will inform member decision making will contribute to the delivery of the priorities for Children’s Services as set out in the Education and Care Services plan in line with statutory guidelines and local priorities.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Further modelling will need to be carried out. There are potential for efficiencies to be obtained through contract reposition and the bringing together of the current separate contract arrangements. Careful consideration will be needed to ensure that any consolidation of contracts continues to meet the requirements of the commissioners whilst meeting the needs of users.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Local Authority has a statutory duty to meet the needs of all children inclusive of those pupils with a disability or a special educational need in the school environment to promote and assist the student’s learning process. Part of that duty is the liaison with other agencies to provide support and specialist assistance such as SaLT and Occupational Therapy.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no direct personnel implications arising from this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	N/A
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	The Bercow Report : A Review of Services for Children and Young People (0 – 19) with Speech, Language and Communication Needs: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/.../DCSF-00632-2008

**SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY PROVISION IN LB BROMLEY SCHOOLS
COMMISSIONED BY CCG**

PROVIDER : BROMLEY HEALTHCARE

September 2012

Special Schools:

	No. pupils on Caseload	SaLT days per week
Riverside (St Paul's Cray)	80	4 days
Marjorie McClure	50	3 days
The Glebe KS 3 & 4	39	1 day

Provisions:

Alexandra Infs 1 st class	8	½ day
Burnt Ash Prim	15	1 day
Churchfields Prim	13	1 day
Crofton Infants	7	½ day
Hawes Down Infants	8	½ day
Hawes Down Juniors	10	½ day
Hillside Prim	12	1 day
James Dixon Prim	8	½ day
Midfield Prim	13	1 day
Poverest Prim	13	1 day
Princes Plain KS1	9	½ day
Tubbenden Prim	18	1 day

Other Schools/Provisions:

Darrick Wood Primary and Secondary	17 primary 13 secondary Total: 30	5 days across all DW campus	This provision is funded for 2 ½ days CCG and 2 ½ days LBB
Green Street Green	21	4 days SLT, 5 days SLT assistant	
Raglan	24	4 days SLT 5 days SLT assistant	This provision is funded for 4 days SLT CCG, 5 days assistant LBB

Other Settings:

Portage	52	2 days
Phoenix Classrooms	48	2 days
Petts Wood Play Group	4	½ day 4x term

This page is left intentionally blank

**SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY PROVISION IN LB BROMLEY SCHOOLS
COMMISSIONED BY LBB**

PROVIDER : BROMLEY HEALTHCARE

September 2012

Special Schools:

	No. pupils on Caseload	SaLT hours per week
The Glebe 16 -19	7	1 day
Riverside (Beckenham)	52	3 days
Burwood	5 (other children seen on request by SEN)	3.7hrs once a fortnight

Provisions:

Alexandra Infs 2 nd class	7	½ day
Crofton Infants 2 nd class	7	½ day
Princes Plain KS2	7	½ day

Other Schools/Provisions:

Darrick Wood Primary and Secondary	17 primary 13 secondary Total: 30	5 days across all DW campus	This provision is funded for 2 ½ days CCG and 2 ½ days LBB
Darrick Wood Pre School for Deaf Children	9	½ day	
Raglan	24	4 days SLT 5 days SLT assistant	This provision is funded for 4 days SLT CCG, 5 days assistant LBB
Hayes SPALD	13	3 days	

Pre-School SEN Provision

Robins Classroom	13	1 day
SPEACS	36	1 ½ days

Other

Assistive Technology Project	11 (referred by SSDP)	½ day
Pupil Resource Agreements (Inclusion Support)	Core of 30	1 day

This page is left intentionally blank

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY AND OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY IN OUT OF BOROUGH SCHOOLS

Oct 12

Name of School	Primary Need	Age Range	No. Bromley pupils	No. pupils on roll	No. Speech & Language therapists	No. Occupational therapists	Delivery Method	Cost of school place	Notes
Eagle House, Mitcham	Autism & Social Communication Disorder	4 - 11	5	65	2 x full time	1 x full time	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£24,000 - £52,458 *	* Fee dependent upon specific needs of individual
Helen Alison	Autism	5 - 19	8	67	2 x full time therapists and 1 assistant	1 x part time	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£36,644 - £61,752 **	** Cost of therapy included in base cost of school place
Parkwood Hall	SLCN/MOD/SLD	8 - 19	26	79	1 x full time therapist and 2 assistants	1 day per week	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£34,435	SaLT therapy included in base cost of school place 1 pupil additionally funded for OT £6,000 p.a.
The Link, Primary	Language & Communication Difficulties	5 - 12	2	35	4 x full time therapists	1 part time	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£28,000	Cost of therapy included in base cost of school place
The Link, Secondary	Language & Communication Difficulties	11 - 19	2	52	3 x full time therapists	2 days per week	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£28,000	Cost of therapy included in base cost of school place
Moor House	Speech, Language & Communication	7 - 16	14	71	10 x full time therapists and 3 assistants	3 full x full time and 2 assistants	All pupils access SaLT and OT in class, group work and individually	£32,000	Cost of therapy included in base cost of school place
St Mary's, Bexhill	MLD, BESD	9 - 16	6	57	7 x full time			£55,000 - £75,000 (All boarding)	Cost of therapy included in base cost of school place

Abbreviations:-

SaLT – Speech and Language Therapy

OT – Occupational Therapy

SLCN – Speech, Language and Communication Needs

MOD – Moderate Learning Difficulties

SLD – Severe Learning Difficulties

BESD – Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties

This page is left intentionally blank

STATISTICS ON VALUE OF EARLY INTERVENTION

'Vocabulary at age 5 is a very strong predictor of the qualifications achieved at school leaving age and beyond.

Of children with persistent speech, language and communication needs, a high percentage go on to have reading difficulties.

Two thirds of 7 – 14 year olds with serious behaviour problems have language impairment.

Children with speech and language difficulties experience more frequent bullying, partly because of the way they speak but also because they often lack the skills to negotiate social situations.

40% of 14 years old referred to child psychiatric services have a language impairment that has never been suspected.

40% of employers report difficulty in finding employees with an appropriate level of oral communication skills.

60% of young people in young offenders' institutions have communication difficulties.'

The majority of speech, language and communication needs are identifiable from second year of life. Some may become apparent as the school curriculum becomes more demanding, e.g. at secondary school. This includes difficulties with reading and writing, accessing curriculum, poor behaviour and difficulty socialising with peers.

Between 6% and 8% of children are likely to have significant speech, language and communication difficulties, with an additional 1% with severe, complex and long term needs requiring specialist, targeted support.'¹

¹ Speech, Language and Communication Needs: Tools for Commissioning Better Outcomes: Commissioning Support Programme

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED12062

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee

Date: 6 November 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: EDUCATION PROGRAMME 2012-13

Contact Officer: Kevin Gerred, Partnerships and Planning Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4024 E-mail: kevin.gerred@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 The report provides a programme of scheduled reports for the year ahead, based on items scheduled for decision by the Education Portfolio Holder and items for consideration by the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Members of the Education PDS Committee are invited to comment on the Education Programme at Appendix 1.**
- 2.2 **The Education Portfolio Holder is invited to comment on the Education Programme at Appendix 1 and note its content.**
- 2.3 **Members are asked to note the Attendance Schedule for the Autumn 2012 Programme of Council Member Visits at Appendix 2.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: As part of the Excellent Council stream within Building a Better Bromley, PDS Committees should plan and prioritise their workload to achieve the most effective outcomes.
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People: To secure the best possible future for all children and young people in the Borough, including a clear focus on supporting the most vulnerable children and young people in our community.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: No specific budget head
 4. Total current budget for this head: £N/A
 5. Source of funding: Council's Base Budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: No statutory requirement or Government guidance:
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for members of this Committee to use in controlling and reviewing their ongoing work.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

Work Programme

- 3.1 The Programme at **Appendix 1** provides information on items scheduled for decision by the Education Portfolio Holder, items for consideration by the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee and proposed information briefings for Members on which no decision is required.
- 3.2 The Programme provides a reference on future work and enables it to be amended in the light of future developments and circumstances.
- 3.3 The focus of Education PDS Committee work should be on (i) holding the Education Portfolio Holder to account, (ii) pre-decision scrutiny and (iii) policy development.

Executive Working Party

- 3.4 There is one standing Executive Member Working Party focusing on Special Educational Needs the next meeting is scheduled for 27 November 2012.

Council Member Visits

- 3.5 The Attendance Schedule for Council Member Visits is attached as an appendix to this report for information. All Elected Council members and Co-opted members were invited to attend the Autumn Term 2012 visits and so far this term three visits have taken place with a further six scheduled before the end of December.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Financial, Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of the Operation of Policy Development and Scrutiny Arrangements in Bromley – April 2005• Scrutiny Toolkit – April 2006• Report 'PDS Working Practices' – 17/5/07 Executive and Resources PDS Committee.• Minute 5 – Executive and Resources PDS Committee, 17/05/07• Minute 58 - CYP PDS 8/10/08• Minute – 16/3/09 Full Council (decision regarding changes to Executive Decision Making arrangements, as a result of which there are no longer scheduled Portfolio Holder meetings).

EDUCATION PROGRAMME

Information Seminar – 15 November 2012 (7pm start)
Matters to be Considered
(1) Setting the Scene (Director of ECS and lead members)
(2) School Places
(3) Raising the Participation Age
(4) Role of the Virtual School Head Teacher for Looked After Children
(5) SEND Green Paper including the National Pathfinder Project

Education PDS Meeting - 23 January 2013	
Title	Notes
Items for Pre-Decision Scrutiny	
(1) Membership of School Governing Bodies	Standing Item
(2) The School Funding Settlement for 2012/13, the Pupil Premium and Dedicated Schools' Grant: Authorisation to Consult on the DSG	Annual Report
Policy Development and Other Items	
(3) Education Work Programme – Future Items for the Education PDS Committee	Standing Item
(4) Effective Governance (Role of the Local Authority)	Scheduled at draft agenda meeting on 22/5/12
(5) Update from the SEN Executive Working Party	Standing Item if meeting has taken place
(6) School Governance	Scheduled at draft agenda meeting on 25/9/12
Information Items	
(7) ECS Contract Activity Report	Standing Item
(8) Youth Services - Update	Scheduled at 12 June PDS meeting
(9) Update on Bromley Youth Council Manifesto Campaign Programme	
(10) Academy Programme in Bromley: Update	Standing Item
(11) Education Policy & Legislative Changes: Update	Standing Item
(12) Annual Report: Adult Education College	Annual Report

Education PDS Meeting - 19 March 2013

Title	Notes
Items for Pre-Decision Scrutiny	
(1) School Re-organisations: Outcomes from Consultation	
(2) Membership of School Governing Bodies	Standing Item
(3) Draft Portfolio Plan 2012/13 priorities/aims (inc end of year performance report)	Joint report to Education/Care Services PDS
(4) Standards of Attainment Bromley Schools 2012	Annual Report
(5) Asset Management Planning: Education Capital Programme (Property)	Move to next budget sub meeting date TBC
(6) School Admissions Policy: Consultation Outcomes and Determination of Policy	Annual Report
(7) Update from the SEN Executive Working Party	Standing Item if meeting has taken place
Policy Development and Other Items	
(8) Annual Report of the Education PDS Committee 2012/13	Annual Report
(9) Development of Free Schools - Update	
(10) Education Work Programme – Future Items for the Education PDS Committee	Standing Item
Information Items	
(11) ECS Contract Activity Report	Standing Item
(12) Academy Programme in Bromley: Update	Standing Item
(13) Education Policy & Legislative Changes: Update	Standing Item

Items for future Education PDS Meetings	
Title	Notes
Policy Development and Other Items	
(1) Increasing Use of Online Applications	Annual Update Report
(2) Literacy in the Early Years	Annual Update Report
(3) Membership of the Local Joint Negotiating Committee for Tutors in Adult Education 2013/14	Annual Report

Budget Sub-Committee – 18 December 2012 (@ 7.00 pm)	
Title	Notes
School Improvement	
Section 106/Community Infrastructure	
Levy Funds	

Budget Sub-Committee – 13 February 2013 (@ 7.00 pm)	
Title	Notes
ECS Budget Monitoring Report 2012/13	
The School Funding Settlement for 2012/13, the Pupil Premium & Dedicated Schools' Grant: Authorisation to Consult on the DSG	Annual Report
Dedicated Schools' Grant: Consultation Outcomes	Annual Report
Asset Management Planning: Education Capital Programme (Property)	

Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting – 30 October 2012
Place Planning Working Group - no meetings scheduled
Future Delivery of the Bromley Behaviour Service (first meeting to take place 14 Nov 2012)
Executive Member/Officer Working Party for Special Educational Needs: 27 November 2012

(as at 15/10/12)

COUNCIL MEMBER VISITS: ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE - AUTUMN TERM 2012

<p>Leesons Primary School (9.30-11.00am), Thu 4/10</p> <p>CANCELLED</p> <p>Cllr Peter Fookes Cllr John Ince Cllr Douglas Auld Cllr Neil Reddin Note: Visit cancelled by school -visiting Council Members informed by email dated 26/9/12.</p>	<p>Oaklands (10.00-11.00am) and Oakleigh (11.00am-12noon), Wed 10/10</p> <p>Cllr Judi Ellis (both) Cllr John Getgood (both) Cllr Roger Charsley (both) 1/10: Proprietors agreed a maximum of 3 visitors. (Cllr Fookes unable to be included on this visit).</p>	<p>Bromley College (9.30-11.00am), Fri 19/10</p> <p>Cllr Robert Evans Cllr Peter Fookes Janet Latinwo (Ed Co-opted) Darren Jenkins (Ed Co-opted) Cllr Mrs Anne Manning Cllr John Getgood Dolores Bray-Ash (Ed Co-opt) Cllr Julian Benington</p>	<p>Bertha James (11.00am-12noon → stay for lunch), Wed 24/10</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Anne Manning Cllr Roger Charsley Cllr Peter Fookes 1/10: Centre Manager agreed that 3 visitors can be accommodated</p>	<p>St Cecilia's (2.00-3.00pm), Fri 9/11</p> <p>Cllr Judi Ellis Cllr John Getgood Maximum of 2 for this visit. (Cllr Fookes unable to be included on this visit).</p>
<p>Glebe (9.30-11.30am), Fri 16/11</p> <p>Cllr Peter Fookes Darren Jenkins (Ed Co-opted) Cllr Mrs Anne Manning Cllr John Getgood Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP Joan McConnell (Ed Co-opt)</p>	<p>Heatherwood (3.30-4.00pm) and Ashling Lodge (4.00-4.30pm), Thu 22/11</p> <p>Cllr Judi Ellis (Ashling only) Cllr Roger Charsley (both) Cllr Peter Fookes (both) 1/10: Manager agreed that 3 visitors can be accommodated.</p>	<p>Crofton Infant School (9.30-11.30am), Fri 30/11</p> <p>Cllr Peter Fookes Cllr Judi Ellis Darren Jenkins (Ed Co-opted) Cllr Douglas Auld Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP Joan McConnell (Ed Co-opt) Dolores Bray-Ash (Ed Co-opt) Cllr Neil Reddin</p>	<p>Pratts Bottom (9.30-11.00am), Thu 6/12</p> <p>Cllr Peter Fookes Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP Dolores Bray-Ash (Ed Co-opt) Darren Jenkins (Ed Co-opted) Cllr Neil Reddin</p>	<p>Springfield (10.00-11.00am), Mon 10/12</p> <p>Cllr Stephen Carr Cllr Judi Ellis Darren Jenkins (Ed Co-opted) Cllr Mrs Anne Manning Cllr John Getgood Cllr Roger Charsley 2/10: Centre Manager agreed that 2 groups of 3 can be accommodated. (Cllr Fookes & Joan McConnell unable to be included on this visit).</p>

Notes: (1) Deadline for responses was 14/9/12
(2) Oversubscription Criteria: (i) Ward Member (ii) Elected or Co-Opted Member of CS PDS (iii) Elected or Co-Opted Member Ed PDS.

This page is left intentionally blank