

REGULATORY AND OTHER COMMITTEE REPORT

NAME OF COMMITTEE:	Schools Forum
DATE OF MEETING:	9 October 2013
SUBJECT:	School Funding Reform: Findings from the Review of 2013/14 & Arrangements and changes for 2014/15
REPORT BY:	Tony Warnock (Head of Finance – Children's and Specialist Services)
NAME OF CONTACT OFFICER:	Tony Warnock
CONTACT OFFICER TEL NO:	01522 553250
CONTACT OFFICER EMAIL ADDRESS:	tony.warnock@lincolnshire.gov.uk
IS REPORT CONFIDENTIAL?	No

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consult the Schools Forum on the Local Authority's (LA) proposals for the funding of schools from April 2014. In June 2013, the Government announced a number of changes to school funding arrangements for 2014/15. The LA outlined details of that announcement in a report to the Schools Forum on 26th June 2013 and since then consultations have taken place with various groups. Having considered the responses, the LA is now in a position to present its latest proposals for the funding of schools from next year, for the Schools Forum's consideration.

DISCUSSION

Background

The DfE introduced radical reforms to school funding arrangements on 1st April 2013. On 5th June 2013, following a review of those arrangements, the government published 'School Funding Reform:

Findings from the Review of 2013/14 & Arrangements and changes for 2014/15'. The latest proposals are largely a refinement of the changes made in 2013/14 and the impact upon most schools is likely to be much more modest.

Once again, the LA has to follow a similar process to last year, including consulting with various bodies, e.g. all schools. The LA has to submit a proforma to the Education Funding Agency (EFA) by 31st October 2013, outlining how the LA plans to fund county schools from 2014/15.

A report to the Schools Forum on 26th June 2013 explained the DfE's latest reforms; repeated the principles that the LA was once again minded to adopt, and; asked for the Schools Forum's views on the LA's provisional ideas for dealing with issues raised by the DfE.

Recent work

Since that meeting of the Schools Forum, the LA has:

- Consulted all schools (5th September to 19th September);
- Consulted the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee (6th September); and
- Consulted a working group of Schools Forum representatives¹ (24th September).

Once again, due to the DfE's tight timescales for the completion of this work, the consultation with schools had to be conducted in a relatively short period of time. However, in anticipation of that, the LA forewarned schools on the 12th July that the consultation would take place from the 5th September. The response rate to the consultation was disappointing and lower than last year (12% of primary and secondary schools responded).²

The LA set out 8 questions in the consultation document. These are shown in Appendix 2, together with the percentage of schools in favour or against, and an outline of the key comments that emerged. All of this information was considered by the working group on 24th September and their conclusions are also shown. Taking in to account all of the feedback, Appendix 2 sets out the LA's current proposals for consideration by the Schools Forum.

It is clear from this recent work and Appendix 2, that once again the majority of schools that responded support the LA's proposals. Furthermore, having reviewed the schools' responses and considered the issues again, each proposal was supported by a large majority of the working group. The LA's proposals set out in this document are therefore unchanged from the proposals presented to all schools on 5th September.

Next steps

As stated above, a critical milestone in this process is the submission of a proforma to the EFA on 31 October 2013, setting out the LA's proposals for the future funding of schools.

The views of the Schools Forum will be considered by Children's Services Directorate Management Team and the Executive member, Cllr Mrs Bradwell. A report will then be drafted for Cllr Mrs Bradwell to approve formally the LA's proposals for the future funding of schools. That report will be considered by the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee on 18th October. The LA will then be in a position to meet the DfE's requirement to submit the proforma by the 31st October.

Thereafter, the data from the October schools census will be cleansed. The DfE should then publish the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2014/15 by December 2013. On 15th January 2014, the LA will consult the Schools Forum on the size of the central DSG budgets for 2014/15 and that will enable the LA to fine tune the values to be allocated through each formula factor next year. A revised proforma will then be issued to the DfE in mid January 2014. After that work is complete, the LA will

¹ Members of the Working Group are shown at Appendix 1.

² 28 (10%) primaries and 10 (19%) secondary schools responded. Other sectors were not expected to respond as this consultation is likely to have little or no impact upon them.

begin to calculate the budget shares for individual schools for the 2014/15 financial year and details will be published in mid February 2014.

Relevant members of the Schools Forum are required to decide whether to agree to the de-delegation of a number of budgets for 2014/15. It would be helpful for the LA's planning purposes for those decisions to be made at this meeting, rather than the meeting in January 2014. The budgets that require consideration are set out in Appendix 3, together with brief background to the decisions made for 2013/14 and information on the use of those budgets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Schools Forum is asked to:

- a. Note the contents of the report;
- b. Consider the feedback from the consultation with schools and the working group;
- c. Approve the LA's proposals for the future funding of schools.

Maintained primary and secondary school representatives on the Schools Forum are asked to:

- a. support the proposals for de-delegation of the budgets outlined in Appendix 3.

APPENDICES (If applicable) - these are listed below and attached at the back of the report.
--

<p>Appendix 1 - A list of members of the working group held on the 24 September 2013</p> <p>Appendix 2 - Consultation questions and responses</p> <p>Appendix 3 – De-delegation of budgets for maintained schools 2014/15</p> <p>Appendix 4 - Intervention budget and Interim headteachers budget</p>

BACKGROUND PAPERS

PAPER TYPE	TITLE	DATE	ACCESSIBILITY
Report to Schools Forum	School Funding Reform: Findings from the Review of 2013/14 & Arrangements and changes for 2014/15	26 June 2013	County Offices, Newland, Lincoln, LN1 1YQ

MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP HELD ON THE 24th SEPTEMBER 2013

The LA would like to thank the following for their contribution to the development of the proposals set out in this report.

Name	Organisation	Role
John Beswick	Stickney CoE primary school	Governor
Prof. Ken Durrands	Grantham Kings Grammar school	Governor
Michael Follows MBE	Boston John Fielding special school	Governor
Vicky Cook	Welbourn Church of England Primary School	Headteacher
Patricia Ruff	Dunholme St Chad's Primary School	Headteacher
Simon Hardy	Faith schools	Representative
Ellenor Beighton	Market Rasen De Aston secondary school	Headteacher
Jenny Wheeldon	Scothern primary school	Headteacher
Keith Batty	CfBT	Assistant Director
Tim Culpin	CfBT	Head of School Improvement
David Bennett	Horncastle Queen Elizabeth Grammar School	Governor
Dave Thompson	Teaching and Learning Centre	Headteacher
Roger Hale	Caistor Grammar school	Headteacher
Elizabeth Bowes	Mouchel Schools Finance Team	Team Leader
Julie Hulme	Mouchel Schools Finance Team	Senior Accountant
Michelle Grady	LCC	Assistant Head of Finance
Mark Popplewell	LCC	Assistant Head of Finance
Tony Warnock	LCC	Head of Finance

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Note: the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee was supportive of the LA's proposals, as set out in the consultation with schools, and looked forward to receiving feedback from the consultation at its meeting in October 2013.

Consultation question	School responses	Schools' comments	Working group response	The LA's latest proposal
Q1 Do you agree that the secondary school lump sum should be increased to £0.175m?	<p>Primary: Yes – 82% No – 18%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 80% No – 20%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the secondary sector.</p>	<p>There were few comments. Clearly, primary schools were generally supportive and the only concern centred on the impact upon primary school budgets (note: there will be no impact). Mixed views were expressed by secondary schools. One supported the protection of small schools whilst another questioned the educational opportunities for pupils in small secondary schools.</p>	<p>A detailed discussion took place. The challenges faced by some secondary schools and the LA's strategic approach to this were discussed.</p> <p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to increase the secondary school block allocation to £0.175m, with that being funded from the secondary sector's age weighted pupil unit value.</p> <p>This marks a partial reversal of the change made for 2013/14. One again, the minimum funding guarantee will continue to offer protection to schools.</p>
Q2 Do you agree that the sparsity factor should not be introduced in the primary sector?	<p>Primary: Yes – 75% No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the primary sector.</p>	<p>There were few comments. No common concerns were cited.</p>	<p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school budgets.</p>
Q3 Do you agree that the sparsity	<p>Primary: Yes – 75%</p>	<p>There were very few comments.</p>	<p>One member suggested that a more</p>	<p>The LA proposes to introduce a sparsity factor for secondary schools. This will be set at a rate of</p>

<p>factor should be introduced for secondary schools at a rate of £0.1m per school, and without tapering?</p>	<p>No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 60% No – 40%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the secondary sector.</p>		<p>strategic approach to small secondary schools was necessary.</p> <p>The working group supported the LA's proposal. One member of the Schools Forum voted against.</p>	<p>£0.1m per school and operate without tapering.</p> <p>This will be funded from the age weighted pupil unit value in the secondary sector.</p> <p>Like the proposed increase in the lump sum factor (see above), this will partially offset the loss in funding suffered by some small secondary schools in 2013/14. Unfortunately, not all small secondary schools will benefit due to the DfE's qualifying criteria (i.e. a school must have < 600 pupils on roll and an average sparsity distance of > 3 miles).</p>
<p>Q4 Do you agree that the LA should not introduce a factor to support schools with falling rolls?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 75% No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 100% No – 0%</p> <p>This question is more relevant to the secondary sector at present.</p>	<p>There were few comments that dissented from the LA's proposal. One primary school suggested that the difficulties outlined in the consultation regarding subjectivity of funding allocations could be overcome. Two secondary schools objected to the DfE's exclusion from this funding of schools that are not assessed by OFSTED to be good or outstanding.</p>	<p>The working group recognised the significant impact falling rolls were having on some small secondary schools, but concluded that the introduction of this factor could not solve these complex situations. The LA's approach to these issues was outlined.</p> <p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school funding.</p>
<p>Q5 Do you agree that the LA should seek to maintain the same overall level of funding for low</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 100% No – 0%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 80%</p>	<p>There were very few comments. No common concerns were cited.</p>	<p>The working group acknowledged that the LA's funding of SEN is a little above the national average and that there is no</p>	<p>The LA proposes to maintain the current level of low cost, high incidence SEN funding in the secondary sector. Although more pupils will qualify for funding due to the DfE's amendment to the qualifying criteria (i.e. those that do not attain the expected level at Key Stage 2 in English or Maths)</p>

cost, high incidence SEN to ensure stability in funding, rather than re-direct more funding into this factor from other pupil-led factors?	No – 20% This question is relevant to the secondary sector.		justification at this time for increasing the funding distributed through this factor. The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.	the impact upon individual secondary schools should be very modest indeed.
Q6 Do you agree that the LA should not introduce a factor for pupil mobility?	Primary: Yes – 82% No – 18% Secondary: Yes – 100% No – 0%	There were a few comments from primary schools, but mixed views were expressed. Some schools felt that the impact of pupil mobility was not recognised by the LA. By contrast, one school stated that these children attract the pupil premium and another recognised that the DfE's proposed use of October census information would severely undermine the effectiveness of this factor.	The working group acknowledged that the sums that would be allocated to schools would not be material and so the introduction of this factor would run counter to the government's vision for a simplified funding formula. The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.	The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school budgets.
Q7 Do you agree that a factor for Looked After Children should be introduced in primary and secondary schools in 2014/15?	Primary: Yes – 79% No – 21% Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%	There were few comments. Those against the proposal suggested that the pupil premium should provide sufficient funding.	The working group concluded that the impact of this funding should be monitored; good practice guidance should be issued to schools; a protocol should be agreed between schools to allow the	The LA proposes to introduce this factor. Funding released from the unwinding of transitional protection arrangements this year can be used to finance this additional cost, so there should be no negative impact upon schools' existing budgets.

			funding to follow pupils mid year, and; the funding should be used to enable LAC to access education, as some don't attend school.	
Q8 Do you agree that the funding for the Looked After Children factor should be set at £1,200 per pupil?	<p>Primary: Yes – 79% No – 21%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%</p>	There were a few comments. These were mixed and there was no common theme.	The working group considered the sum proposed was reasonable and acknowledged that it would be for each school to determine how best to deploy the additional resource.	The LA proposes to set the rate at £1,200. As indicated above, the funding released from the unwinding of transitional protection arrangements this year can be used to finance this additional cost, so there should be no negative impact upon schools' existing budgets.

DE-DELEGATION OF BUDGETS FOR MAINTAINED SCHOOLS 2014/15

As reported previously, the DfE funding reforms for 2013/14 required LAs to delegate more budgets to schools. However, they also permitted the de-delegation of some services.

In October 2012, the maintained schools representatives for the primary sector and the maintained school representatives from the secondary sector voted on whether to permit the de-delegation of a number of budgets.

The maintained primary school representatives voted to support de-delegation of the budgets for schools in financial difficulty and exceptional unforeseen costs, equality for minority communities, criminal records bureau and union activities. For the reasons explained below, the LA is proposing the de-delegation of the budgets in Table 1 only, for 2014/15. The proposed per pupil amounts are similar to the amounts for 2013/14, but the total budgets returned are expected to be c.5.5% lower than 2013/14 due to an increase in the number of schools that have converted to academies.

Table 1 – Primary maintained schools

Service	Total budget £m	De-delegation amount per pupil £
Schools in financial difficulty and exceptional unforeseen costs	1.229	35.37 ³
Equality for Minority Communities	0.173	4.99

Noted: The decision to de-delegate the funding for equality for minority communities next year, was made by maintained primary school representatives in June 2013.

³ This comprises: school intervention @ £10.88 per pupil (£0.378m); interim headteachers @ £11.32 per pupil (£0.393m), and; schools in financial difficulty @ £13.17 (£0.457m)

For 2013/14, the maintained secondary school representatives voted to support the de-delegation of budgets for equality for minority communities and criminal records bureau. For the reasons explained below, the LA is proposing the de-delegation of the budgets in Table 2 only, for 2014/15. The proposed per pupil amount is similar to 2013/14, but the total budget returned is expected to be c.15% lower than 2013/14 due to an increase in the number of schools that have converted to academies.

Table 2 – Secondary maintained schools

Service	Total budget £m	De-delegation amount per pupil £
Equality for Minority Communities	0.007	1.00

The Schools Forum is asked to note the following points:

1. Schools in financial difficulty and exceptional unforeseen costs

The DfE reforms no longer permit the LA to hold a budget for school redundancies. For 2013/14, Schools Forum representatives of maintained primary schools voted to create a budget for schools in financial difficulty. The LA's Staffing Reduction panel continues to meet to consider requests for redundancies and access to those funds. The LA's long established policy of charging schools for a share of redundancy costs remains in place. However, a tightening of those arrangements was introduced in 2013/14, such that a contribution from this budget will only be made for schools that are likely to overspend within the next two financial years if no action is taken. The costs incurred against this budget in 2013/14 have been low so far, but it would be prudent to continue to set aside funds each year. As indicated below, any unspent funds at the end of each year will be earmarked for the benefit of the maintained schools in that sector only. A budget for this was not de-delegated for maintained secondary schools in 2013/14. That was mainly because there are relatively few maintained secondary schools; several of them are unlikely to fall in to financial difficulty and so would probably not be supportive of retaining a budget, and; there would not therefore be the critical mass to operate an effective insurance type funding model, as can be applied in the primary sector.

The DfE intends the budget for exceptional unforeseen costs, if established, to finance costs which it would be unreasonable to expect governing bodies to meet. More specifically, the 2013/14 budget was created to finance the long established school intervention work undertaken by CfBT and the provision of interim head-teachers. So, as reported in the consultation exercise last year, the funding is used to: support schools that have issues raised via the LA's Schools Causing Concern process or OFSTED inspections, and; to appoint interim headteachers when school leaders are absent or posts remain vacant. Without such funding, many primary schools would be unable to address critical issues in a timely manner and that could have a damaging impact upon the outcomes for the pupils in those schools. Further detail on the use of the funds this year is set in Appendix 4. A budget was not de-delegated for maintained secondary schools in 2013/14, for similar reasons to those explained in the paragraph above.

2. Disclosure and Barring Service (formerly Criminal Records Bureau (CRB))

The de-delegation of the CRB budget in 2013/14 enabled the existing service to continue and avoided the bureaucracy of charging individual schools for the admin costs. In June 2013, the Disclosure and Barring Service commenced the Single Certificate and Online Monitoring service. This was introduced at very short notice and affects the current charging process and the approach to clearances for schools. The current charging process, as agreed by Schools Forum, is as follows: secondary maintained schools are charged 100% of the costs, whilst primary maintained schools have de-delegated a portion of the budget back to the LA which covers the admin charge for each DBS application. This is £13.75 per application. Schools are then charged the DBS charge of £44 per application. The total cost is therefore £57.75 per application. The LA is currently considering various options in relation to the online monitoring service and any developments on that will be reported to schools. It is proposed that for simplification purposes, the LA does not de-delegate the admin costs in 2014/15 and, instead, schools will be charged the full cost including the admin element. The impact of this on schools overall should be neutral - the costs will simply be paid for in full by schools, rather than the admin element being funded by de-delegation of part of their budget.

3. Union activities

The DfE's school funding reforms for 2013/14 required LAs to delegate the budget for union activities to all schools. As permitted, the LA asked the Schools Forum representatives of maintained schools if they wished to de-delegate their share of the funds. The Schools Forum's maintained primary school representatives voted in favour; the secondary maintained representatives voted against. Irrespective of those decisions, it was inevitable that the funds available for union activities would be significantly reduced without some form of buy-back arrangement with academies. It could be argued that the DfE's requirement to delegate this particular budget is unfair, in the sense that many academies are likely to gain from the LA's positive relationships with the trade unions which only maintained schools are funding. The budget provides core funding to a number of the recognised trade unions for schools, to enable positive working relationships and effective consultation and negotiations to take place at a local level through the Council. This has enabled the Council to consult on school employment policy changes and it has supported the implementation of the workforce remodelling agenda on behalf of schools. It has helped ensure that schools met part of their statutory duty to provide paid time off for trade union duties regarding consultation, as this was undertaken by the regional representatives of these trade unions rather than individual school representatives. It is important to note that last year's decision not to de-delegate funds does not negate individual schools of their responsibilities as outlined in the Industrial Relations Policy in the School Employment Manual, which maintained schools are expected to adopt alongside the ACAS Code of Practice on Trade Union Duties and Activities. The policy provides for approved paid time off for trade union duties for any recognised trade union representatives on a school site in line with the statutory requirements of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, and the ACAS Code describes what constitutes a trade union 'duty' and 'activity'. There may be further developments on this matter before the start of the 2014/15 financial year and, if so, further information will be brought to the Schools Forum meeting in January 2014. Due to the unfairness of the current system, the LA does not at this time propose to seek the de-delegation of funds in 2014/15 for union activities.

4. Equality for Minority Communities

This budget provides funding to support schools and pupils from ethnic minorities and other groups. At the Schools Forum meeting on 26th June 2013, John O'Connor presented a report and the maintained primary school representatives voted to support the de-delegation of funds for the Equality for Minority Communities service for 2014/15.

Please note:

1. Only maintained schools can have funds de-delegated. Academies will therefore receive a share of the delegated budget within their budget share each year. As de-delegation does not affect academies, academy representatives on the Schools Forum are not entitled to vote on these issues.
2. The decision to de-delegate funds for maintained schools should be considered and voted upon separately by each sector.
3. It is presumed that where there are no maintained school representatives for a particular sector on the Schools Forum, a decision to de-delegate cannot be made and therefore no de-delegation of funds can take place.
4. As stated above, with the conversion of a few more schools to academies since 31st March 2013, the total amount secured for services through de-delegation will reduce if the per pupil deduction remains unchanged from the 2013/14 level.
5. Where budgets are de-delegated for maintained schools, any underspendings arising at the end of the financial year will be earmarked for the benefit only of the maintained schools in that sector.
6. At its meeting in January 2014, the Schools Forum will be consulted on any major changes to central DSG budgets for 2014/15. It is important that realistic budgets are set using the most up-to-date information, so the LA considers it appropriate to make decisions on those issues at that time.

Questions for Maintained primary school representatives:

Q1 Do you agree that for 2014/15, the LA should retain funding for 'Schools in financial difficulty and exceptional unforeseen costs' in primary schools (i.e. to help deal with redundancy costs, school intervention and provision of interim head-teachers), applying the same per pupil rate as for 2013/14?

Questions for Maintained secondary school representatives:

Q1 Do you agree that for 2014/15, the LA should retain funding for Equality for Minority Communities in secondary schools, applying the same per pupil rate as for 2013/14?

Intervention budget

The intervention budget has been used to support and challenge those primary maintained schools graded as satisfactory or requiring improvement by OfSTED. In September 2012, 81 maintained primary schools in Lincolnshire were judged to be satisfactory. During the 2012/13 academic year 61 of these schools were inspected and 37 were judged to be good or better. This means that 79% of maintained primary schools are now good or better, the highest amount ever achieved in Lincolnshire, an increase of 15% in a year. No schools were placed in a category. When you consider that in 1 week, 5 schools in Norfolk were placed in a category it shows how successful Lincolnshire has been.

The intervention budget has allowed CfBT Education Services to focus on supporting satisfactory schools where needed. The sort of activities provided have been broad and varied and in line with the schools' needs. They include:

- Enhanced Education Adviser allocation to provide regular support and challenge for senior leaders
- Whole school teaching and learning and leadership and management reviews to support school leaders in identifying key barriers to improvement and agreeing specific actions to address issues
- Assistance with completion of key school improvement and self-evaluation documentation
- Detailed analysis of school data – published data and internal pupil tracking – so that a school has an accurate view of performance against national and local benchmarks
- SEND health check undertaken where concerns identified over progress of vulnerable groups; support to SENCo in completing relevant documentation and effective in-school provision
- Assistance in completing relevant CPD audit and agreeing CPD plan to ensure staff have competencies to address areas for development and overcome underperformance in teaching and learning; relevant support brokered for all school staff
- CPD for non-teaching/ support staff to ensure their contribution to school improvement
- Assistance in designing focused monitoring and evaluation programmes to ensure actions undertaken are having expected impact
- Undertaking paired monitoring activities with senior and middle leaders to ensure self-evaluation is accurate and outcomes contribute to school self-review and further school improvement priorities
- Provide support in setting out staff performance management/ appraisal ensuring objectives are correctly focused on pupil outcomes
- Attendance at SLT meetings to model high quality evaluative discussion
- Provision of consultant support for subject leaders to ensure accurate depth of subject knowledge and quality of school curriculum
- Governor training and attendance at governor meetings so that governors are effective in their duties and make good contribution to strategic drive
- Ensure all key staff have a working knowledge of the expectations of the OfSTED framework and are prepared for future HMI/ section 5 visits

OfSTED have been very complimentary of the support provided by CfBT Education Services. Comments include:

The school has received good support from the local authority education adviser. Work has included undertaking a review of data, joint lesson observations and support for the governing body.

(Boston St Nicholas Church of England Primary School)

The school has made good use of the expertise from the local authority which has been helpful in raising the quality of teaching and learning. Regular meetings of local authority representatives with senior staff provide valuable data on pupils' progress and clear priorities for the future.

(Hemswell Cliff Primary School)

Strong support provided by the local authority has galvanised improvements and identified priorities are now ably managed within the school.

(Caythorpe Primary School)

Supporting those schools that have been judged requiring improvement has also been a key role during the year. 26 schools have been judged as RI. HMI visits to such schools are very similar to monitoring visits to schools in Special Measures. The Education Services has been able to support in this process. Once again HMI have been very complimentary and have used our school improvement plans as models for other local authorities.

There is however still a way to go before all schools are judged to be good or better. 20 maintained primary schools remain satisfactory and will almost certainly be inspected this year. It is important that these schools continue to receive the successful support that the satisfactory schools have received to date.

All of the RI schools are likely to receive up to three visits from HMI this year and they have a very limited time to move to a judgement of Good. Of the 26 RI schools, 24 were previously judged to be satisfactory and were unable to move to Good at their last inspection despite the additional support provided. For these schools in particular, it is imperative that CfBT Education Services continues to provide the support that is given to Satisfactory schools, with additional, intensive intervention to address the issues within the timescales set by HMI. To support their move to Good we intend to:

- Continue with all of the things we have done previously (as above)
- Offer enhanced adviser allocation in addition to the core offer
- Work with school leaders of these schools to develop accurate self-evaluation documentation with well planned strategies for improvement
- Work with senior leaders to strengthen school leadership and sustained capacity to improve
- Support school leaders in identifying appropriate and timely CPD for class teachers who are identified as yet to be consistently good or better
- Offer school reviews for governors so that governors have an accurate view of where they need to build further strengths
- Offer reviews of spending of Pupil Premium funding where gaps in performance have been identified.

We are hopeful that some funding will be provided by the National College to support the work of LLEs/NLEs but this is likely to be small so will have a limited impact on schools. A continuation of the intervention funding will ensure that appropriate support and challenge can be provided to

those schools that require it. The amount can be reduced in line with the number of pupils that are now taught in schools that have converted to academy status in the last 12 months.

We will continue to work closely with all partners including the DfE, NCTL and the Diocese to ensure that all Lincolnshire pupils receive a good education.

Interim Headteacher's Budget

This budget has been used to pay the salaries of the team of Interim Headteachers (IHT). These experienced and highly skilled headteachers have been placed in primary schools to cover short and long term absences of headteachers. This is how the majority of their time is used. The skills and expertise of the team is also used to support other leaders within Lincolnshire maintained schools through coaching, mentoring and running courses. This has led to even greater impact across the county.

Interim Headships

This is to cover long or short term absences in primary schools where there is no viable alternative leadership solution. The schools are usually those graded by OfSTED as satisfactory/requires improvement or inadequate or those that are deemed to be vulnerable should effective leadership not be in place. Schools provided with the services of an Interim Head are charged for the number of working days provided at the rate of pay of their substantive head.

During the year the team have worked in a variety of schools in different, but always challenging circumstances. A clear remit is agreed with the school which identifies specific priorities. At the end of the placement the governors are asked to evaluate the performance of the IHT. The following are a reflection of the overwhelming positive comments received:

The IHT has done a phenomenal job at the School and the Governing Body, parents, staff and children owe her a debt of gratitude. She has provided clear but collaborative leadership and has delivered a clear road map for the School to continue its journey to excellence.

The IHT provided an excellent service to both schools in the federation during my absence – she continued the work of school improvement and has left us well placed to face the coming inspection. Her ongoing support and advice since my return has been similarly invaluable. I cannot praise her or thank her enough.

When OfSTED or HMI have visited placement schools they have been equally complimentary:

The local authority provided very effective support when leadership and the quality of teaching became fragile at the time of the section 5 inspection. They immediately provided a strong seconded headteacher to stabilise the school and to introduce essential improvements.

'The interim headteacher's good leadership of teaching, together with effective performance management and well-focused professional development, is enabling staff to improve their teaching skills and accelerate pupils' progress.'

'The school draws on the local authority for external support in a number of ways. The local authority was quick to provide an interim headteacher with the experience and skills needed to continue to move the school forward'

School Leadership Support

Provided to executive heads, headteachers and acting heads, in a variety of circumstances, though particularly those in schools graded by OfSTED as satisfactory/requires improvement or those deemed to be vulnerable or at a time of crisis. These may be established leaders, those new to headship or those in acting roles. The support provided is tailored to the needs of the school and the leadership team, and aims to enhance the skills of the school leadership to provide sustainable improvement by building capacity.

The Excellence in Leadership Programme has been extremely successful with satisfactory schools with well over the Lincolnshire average moving to a good judgement. The mentoring and coaching can mean that an IHT is not needed at a later date.

Leadership Programmes and Conferences

Interim Headteachers participate in various leadership programmes from middle leaders and those aspiring to headship, to those who are new in headship roles and beyond. These programmes have proved to be invaluable in ensuring that there remains a pool of appropriately trained and skilled leaders within the county at a time when recruitment to leadership roles is increasingly challenging. The Interim Headteachers can use their experience working in a variety of schools to mentor and coach other leaders. At the recent Leadership Induction Programme for newly appointed Heads 100% of the evaluations were good or better.

There is a continued need for the Interim Headteacher Team funded by the Local Authority.

Although the performance of primary schools in Lincolnshire in terms of OfSTED grades continues to improve at a rapid rate there are still many issues to tackle. There are no maintained primary schools in a category at present but there are still 20 graded as satisfactory and 26 as requiring improvement. Those that are requiring improvement are placed under extreme pressure through monitoring visits by HMI similar to those schools judged as requiring Special Measures. This can take its toll on the health of the headteachers.

With over 200 primary schools still maintained by the local authority there will also be a number of occasions where headteachers will be absent and there will not be an adequate replacement within the school. This can leave a school very vulnerable. This is often more likely because of the number of small schools who do not have enough staffing to allow an adequate replacement for the Headteacher.

Over 40 maintained primary schools in Lincolnshire appointed new headteachers last year. Nationally schools found it very difficult to recruit headteachers. The fact that Lincolnshire was so successful was partly due to the IHTs contribution to the training of leaders within the county.

We continue to work closely with our partners to find alternative solutions and will try to broker solutions with local leaders but there is still a need for other arrangements on many occasions. The amount needed for the Interim Headteachers should be reduced in line with the number of pupils that are now taught in schools that have now converted to academy status in the last 12 months.