

London Borough of Harrow



EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

THURSDAY 26 JUNE 2003

7.30 PM

COMMITTEE AGENDA (ADVISORY AND CONSULTATIVE)

COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 AND 2
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE

PRE-MEETINGS:

COUNCIL SIDE 7PM, COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 AND 2

HTCC 6.45 PM, ROOM 248

GOVERNORS 6.45 PM, COMMITTEE ROOM 3

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3 representatives of each side)

Chair: Councillor Stephenson

Councillors:

Gate	Mrs Bath	(none)	(none)
Ray	Miss Bednell		
Thammaiah	Janet Mote		

Teachers' Constituency: (nominated by Harrow Teachers' Consultative Committee)

Mr R Borman
Ms P Langdon

Ms H Cowgill
Mr P Large

Ms C Gembala
Ms S Carnan

Governors' Constituency: (nominated by Association of Harrow Governing Bodies)

Ms H Solanki

Mrs C Millard
Ms H Henshaw

Elected Parent Governors:

1. Mr Epie

2. Mr Sutcliffe

Denominational Representatives:

1. Mrs Rammelt

2. Rev P Reece

Arts Culture Harrow Representatives:

1. Mr K Parker

2. Mr V Gresty

Issued by the Committee Services Section,
Law and Administration Division

Contact: Caroline Hart, Committee Administrator

Tel: 020 8424 1323

E-mail: caroline.hart@harrow.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

THURSDAY 26 JUNE 2003

AGENDA - PART I

1. **Appointment of Chair:**
To note the appointment at the meeting of the Cabinet on 20 May 2003, under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 7.2 (Part 4B of the Constitution), of Councillor Stephenson as Chair of the Forum for the Municipal Year 2003/2004.
2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**
To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.
3. **Declarations of Interest:**
To receive declarations of interest (if any) from Members of the Committee arising from business to be transacted at this meeting.
4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**
To consider whether any of the items listed on the agenda should be considered with the press and public excluded on the grounds that it is thought likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that there would be disclosure of confidential information in breach of an obligation of confidence or of exempt information as defined in the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
5. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**
To appoint a Vice Chair of the Forum for the Municipal Year 2003/2004.
6. **Minutes:**
That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
7. **Public Questions:**
To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).
8. **Petitions:**
To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).
9. **Deputations:**
To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

- Enc. 10. **Schools Budget Update 2003/2004:** (Pages 1 - 4)
Report of the Director of Education and Interim Director of Finance.
- Please note: Councillor Dighe (Portfolio Holder, Finance and Human Resources) will be attending for this item.
- Enc. 11. **School Term Dates for 2004/2005:** (Pages 5 - 8)
Report of the Joint Interim Director of Education.
- Enc. 12. **School Re-Organisation and post 16 in Harrow:** (Pages 9 - 18)
Report of the Executive Director – People First.
- Enc. 13. **School Improvement: Reform of the School Workforce:** (Pages 19 - 22)
Report of the Senior Advisor, Professional Development (Education).
14. **Dates of Future Meetings of the Governors Working Party:**
To consider the following dates for future meetings of the Education Consultative Forum Governors Working Group;
- Tuesday 4 November 2003
Tuesday 2 March 2003

AGENDA - PART II - NIL

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	26 June 2003
Subject:	Schools Budget Update 2003/2004
Key decision:	No
Responsible Chief Officer:	Director of Education and Interim Director of Finance
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Finance and Human Resources and Education and Lifelong Learning Portfolio Holders
Status:	Part I
Ward:	All
Enclosures:	None

1. **Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)**

- 1.1 To update the Education Consultative Forum on the position regarding the Schools Budget for 2003/2004.

2. **Recommendations**

- 2.1 **To note the contents of the report.**

REASON: Update at the request of the Governor representatives.

3. **Consultation with Ward Councillors**

- 3.1 Not applicable

4. **Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)**

- 4.1 At the meeting on 9 January 2003 the Education Consultative Forum discussed the proposed Schools Budget for 2003/2004 for notification to the Secretary of State by 31 January 2003. This budget was subsequently confirmed by the Council at the meeting on 28 February 2003 with the following changes:
- That the single status provision within the schools budget should be increased by £172k to £400k.
 - That the introduction of funding nursery classes on actuals be phased in over 2 years reducing the saving by £62k to £88k.

- That the remaining £569k unallocated within the schools budget be allocated to the special educational needs budget within the non Individual Schools Budget (ISB) element of the schools budget.

4.2 Following the distribution of school budget shares in March 2003 a number of issues have come to light which has meant that the budget set for schools for 2003/2004 has been challenging. This report updates the position with regard to the Schools Budget for 2003/2004 and the medium term.

5. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

5.1 This report addresses the Council's Corporate Priority to promote Harrow as a centre of lifelong learning by offering the highest quality education services, by raising aspirations and outcomes of achievement, and by providing activities for cultural, artistic and leisure pursuits which reflect the profile and the interests of all local communities.

6. **Background Information and options considered**

6.1 It is apparent that the financial pressures faced by schools in Harrow are also replicated across the country. Schools in some London Boroughs are reporting deficits of up to £500k.

6.2 The pressures faced by all schools in Harrow in 2003/2004 are as listed below. There are however individual schools where there are specific issues such as falling pupil numbers, reduced class size grant and reduced Additionally Resourced Mainstream Schools (ARMS) and costed statement funding which will make the situation more challenging.

- Loss of recruitment and retention grant. Although it had been stated that this grant was one off funding for two years the reality in High Schools was that it had been used to recruit and retain teachers by awarding extra recruitment & retention points which have on-going funding commitments or to "prop up" core base budget funding.
- Many standards funds which were continuing e.g. Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) and Teaching Assistants were cash limited at 2002/2003 levels although costs in these areas rose by 9% for teachers and 6% for APT & C staff.
- The upper pay spine for teachers who have progressed through the threshold is only grant funded at 80%. The indications are that the percentage of teachers progressing to UPS2 is close to 100%.
- The standards funds which were replaced by Council approved growth within the school budget shares were replaced at 2002/2003 price levels although costs in these areas rose by 9% for teachers and 6% for APT & C staff. In addition the distribution of some of this growth affected individual schools differently as the previous formula was not replicated exactly.
- The cost of incremental drift is greater as the main teaching pay scale has reduced from 9 points to 6 points from September 2002 and there is now the opportunity for teachers to progress on the upper pay spine. The large increase in staffing on-costs from April 2003 (1% national insurance, 5.15% teachers pensions and 1% local government pensions) has made the incremental drift more expensive than in previous years particularly with the relatively stable staffing base which exists in Harrow. The average cost of an increment in 2002/2003 was £600. In 2003/2004 it was £1,000.

- The average teacher's salary has increased as a consequence of having to pay more management and recruitment & retention points and start teachers including newly qualified teachers further up the pay scale in order to recruit and retain high quality staff. In addition the starting salary for teachers increased by 15% from September 2002.
- There has been a reduction in general Key Stage 3 standards funds for schools although the grant in total is similar to last year.

6.3 The majority of schools in Harrow are managing to set balanced budgets for 2003/2004 through a combination of use of reserves, reducing contingencies, cutting expenditure budgets such as ICT equipment, curriculum materials, repairs and maintenance and reducing staffing through natural wastage. There are two schools where a licensed deficit has been agreed by the LEA. To date there are no known staff redundancies.

6.4 The DfES wrote to all LEAs on 2 May 2003 asking them to explain reasons for the increases in different elements of the Schools Budget and in particular why expenditure on SEN and Education out of School had increased by more than the average percentage increase. The DfES also questioned the Authority's use of contingencies and reassurance that these sums would be allocated to schools during the year. A response was sent to the DfES on 12 May 2003 setting out the reasons for the above (a copy is available on the Authority's web site) and no further correspondence has been received to date.

6.5 Members have met with representative Primary Headteachers and all High School Headteachers and have agreed to establish two working groups to investigate the budget pressures faced by schools both for 2003/2004 but more importantly for the medium term. It is anticipated that the findings from these working groups will be reported back to Members in July.

6.6 Chief Education Officers from London LEAs have met with the Secretary of State for Education to discuss the funding for 2003/2004 and future years. Further meetings with representative CEOs and the DfES and Ministers are scheduled to take place to investigate in more detail the issues behind the funding problems. Every opportunity is being taken by Members, officers and schools to make representations to Ministers and MPs to ensure that there is sufficient funding available for the Schools Budget in future years.

7. Consultation

7.1 Schools are being kept updated on the budget position individually and via the Budget Review Working Group and the Schools Forum.

8. Finance Observations

8.1 This is the report of the Director of Education and Interim Director of Finance and deals with financial matters throughout.

9. Legal Observations

9.1 The treatment of any balance, either surplus or deficit is governed by the individual LEA scheme for financing of maintained school. The Scheme is prepared in accordance with Section 48 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (as amended) and approved by the Secretary of State and Members each financial year.

Schools are entitled to keep their surplus balances. If a school ends the financial year with a deficit budget, then the deficit will become the first call on the new budget share of the new financial year. Schools cannot plan for a deficit budget, unless the LEA agrees to this. If a planned deficit was allowed by the LEA this is usually termed a licensed deficit or a short term loan.

10. **Conclusion**

10.1 The report details the latest position with regard to the Schools Budget for 2003/2004.

11. **Background Papers**

11.1 Report to Education Consultative Forum 9 January 2003 Proposed Schools Budget 2003/2004. Letter from Mr Crowne 2 May 2003 Schools' Budgets 2003/2004. Reply to Mr Crowne's letter 12 May 2003 from Paul Osburn.

12. **Author**

12.1 Paula Foulds Education Financial Services Manager
Civic Centre 020 8424 1140
Email:paula.foulds@harrow.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	26 June 2003
Subject:	School Term Dates for 2004-05
Key Decision:	Not applicable
Responsible Chief Officer:	Joint Interim Director of Education
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Education and Lifelong Learning
Status:	Part 1
Ward:	N/A
Enclosures:	None

1. Summary

The Education Consultative Forum on 19 March endorsed the Harrow Teachers' Consultative Committee's (HTCCs) recommended school term dates for 2004-05. However, following liaison with neighbouring boroughs it is proposed to vary the previously agreed dates by one day at the start and end of the school year.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To agree the minor amendment to term dates for the school year 2004-05 which would now start on 1 September 2004 and finish on 22 July 2005. It was previously proposed to start the school year on 31 August 2004 and finish on 21 July 2005.

3. Consultation with Ward Councillors

Not applicable

4. Policy Context (Including Relevant Previous Decisions)

4.1 The Education Consultative Forum on 19 March discussed this matter and endorsed the favoured model proposed by the HTCC regarding school term dates for 2004-05. The favoured model is shown below:

31 st August	- 22 nd October	inclusive	T1	39 days	74 days
1 st November	- 17 th December	inclusive	T2	35 days	
4 th January	- 11 th February	inclusive	T3	29 days	53 days
21 st February	- 24 th March	inclusive	T4	24 days	
11 th April	- 27 th May	inclusive	T5	34 days	68 days
6 th June	- 21 st July	inclusive	T6	34 days	
					195 days

4.2 The Forum requested that neighbouring boroughs be informed of the agreed school term dates for Harrow.

5. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

5.1 We will promote Harrow as a centre of lifelong learning by offering the highest quality education service, by raising aspirations and outcomes of achievement, and by providing activities for cultural, artistic and leisure pursuits which reflect the profile and the interests of all local communities.

6. **Background Information and options considered**

6.1 Each year HTCC undertake a full consultation with partners on school term dates for the following school year. This was duly undertaken and the outcome was reported to the Education Consultative Forum on 19 March and endorsed by the Forum.

6.2 In the Autumn Term 2002 the Local Government Association (LGA) put forward a proposal relating to the possible introduction of a 6 term year across the country. The Association of London Government (ALG) is, in principle, supporting the proposal and is continuing to gather information on a termly basis across the London Authorities. To date no clear picture is emerging although there is some evidence to show that no authority is willing to move to the new term format without neighbouring authorities doing likewise.

7. **Consultation**

7.1 The HTCC undertook its annual consultation with schools, Teachers' Professional Associations and the Association of Harrow Governing Bodies on 5 suggested models of school term dates for 2004-05. Although it was a low response rate, one model was favoured and this was proposed to the Education Consultative Forum for endorsement.

7.2 This issue was also discussed at the Departmental Joint Committee (DJC) prior to presentation at the Education Consultative Forum on 19 March.

7.3 The LEA has informed its 5 neighbouring boroughs of its intended school term dates for 2004-05. 3 of the 5 neighbouring authorities have shared their provisional dates with Harrow. The remaining 2 authorities are still formulating their proposals. Largely there is consistency with Harrow's dates and those proposed by its neighbours. There is, however, greater variance in the dates for the end of the Spring Term and the start of the Summer Term in 2005.

8. **Finance Observations**

8.1 None.

9. **Legal Observations**

9.1 Section 41 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 obliges the LEA to determine the dates when school terms and holidays are to begin and end and the times of school sessions for all community schools. For voluntary aided schools the responsibility rests with the Governing Body.

10. **Conclusion**

10.1 Following consultation and in order to ensure as much consistency as possible with neighbouring authorities, it is proposed to vary the start and finish dates for the school year 2004-05 by one day.

10.2 The **new** proposed dates are as follows:

1 st September	- 22 nd October	inclusive	T1	38 days	73 days
1 st November	- 17 th December	inclusive	T2	35 days	
4 th January	- 11 th February	inclusive	T3	29 days	53 days
21 st February	- 24 th March	inclusive	T4	24 days	
11 th April	- 27 th May	inclusive	T5	34 days	69 days
6 th June	- 22 nd July	inclusive	T6	35 days	
					195 days

11. **Background Papers**

11.1 Letter from Allan Jones, Headteacher of Hatch End High School, on behalf of HTCC to the Education Consultative Forum dated 13 March 2003.

11.2 Minutes of the 19 March 2003 Education Consultative Forum.

12. **Author**

12.2 Geraldine Sparrow, Parent Support and Information Service Manager
Tel: 020 8424 7658, email:geraldine.sparrow@harrow.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	26 th June 2003
Subject:	School Re-Organisation and Post-16 in Harrow
Key decision:	N/A
Responsible Chief Officer:	Executive Director – People First
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Portfolio Holder for Education and Lifelong Learning
Status:	Part 1
Ward:	All
Enclosures:	Annex A - Comments and Discussions from the Post 16 Study Feedback Sessions Annex B - JOINT STRATEGIC GROUP – Draft Terms of Reference

1. Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)

- 1.1 In April 2003 Members received an Information Item detailing the impact of the decision of the DfES not to support a PFI bid for the re-organisation of schools in Harrow. This report outlines up-dated information from the DfES feedback, interim detail of the consultation on capital strategy and developments within Post 16 provision.

2. That the Committee note the Report

REASON:

The potential re-organisation of schools in Harrow is a major policy development that will impact across the Council and all stakeholders. To a considerable extent the DfES and others including the Learning and Skills Council determine the timescale. The Council's initial indicative timescale proposed during the Debate held in Spring/Summer 2002 will need to be revised significantly. This report provides Members with current information and progress.

3. Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)

3.1 In July 2002, Members' received a report detailing the outcome of a debate on school organisation in Harrow and agreed recommendations that officers would develop options for consultation to address the major issues raised through the debate:

- A change in the age of secondary transfer from 12+ to 11+;
- Increasing choice for Harrow students at post 16;
- Strengthening provision at the foundation stage.

3.2 In addition, Cabinet requested that officers continue discussions with DfES officials on resourcing the significant capital works that a change in the age of secondary transfer would require. An Information Item was presented to Cabinet in April 2003.

4. Relevance to Corporate Priorities

4.1 School re-organisation and Post 16 proposals will contribute to the Corporate priority of Harrow as a centre of Lifelong Learning, by contributing to raising attainment and improving the management of school places to meet demand, thereby ensuring investment in buildings for education and community purposes.

5. Background Information and options considered

5.1 Following the announcement of the DfES that Harrow PFI's bid for Cluster investment and re-organisation was unsuccessful Officers have met with the DfES for feedback.

Meeting with DfES for Feedback

5.2 Officers and Headteachers from Rooks Heath and Canons High Schools met with DfES officials for feedback. It was reiterated that the process had been very competitive, with only 15 out of 56 bids made being supported. Those bids that were supported were each limited to £60m PFI credits. Harrow's bid which totalled between £87m and £152m had not scored sufficient points as part of the evaluation and was therefore not selected. The main reason given was that the brief did not address some of the key issues set out in the Government's education agenda. Although the education content of the bid was highly regarded, it was not possible in Harrow's submission to give the same emphasis to issues relating to urban and rural deprivation, increasing pupil's very low attainment and addressing failing or underachieving schools in the way that successful bids were able to do.

5.3 The DfES official explained some of the emerging issues from the consultation on the new approach to capital Building Schools for the Future. The consultation will close at the end of May and although no decisions have been made, it would appear that there maybe a type of bidding process and that the Joint Venture Company approach to procurement is likely to feature in some form. If the timetable is maintained, there should be guidance published during the Summer with submissions required in the Autumn.

5.4 It was stressed about the need for Harrow Members to have some reassurance from the DfES that capital funding would be available for a school re-organisation before a consultation on options would be undertaken. Officers and headteachers expressed their concerns about the proposed timescales in respect of further delays to the process. It was suggested that Harrow developed a strategy for meeting with Ministers, to discuss school re-organisation and capital requirements. In addition, it was proposed that the Harrow bid should be reviewed to ensure that it adopted an approach that would meet the Government's policy objectives of securing investment in Secondary Schools.

School Re-Organisation Next Steps

5.5 It is proposed that officers continue to work with Members to develop a strategy for meeting with Ministers in June/July.

5.6 Work will continue on developing options to implement a school re-organisation, to identify sites and an implementation strategy. Part of this will include the continuation of informal discussions with secondary headteachers and Chairs of Governors about school capacity and capital requirements. These discussions will be used to inform the development of a bid to the DfES for capital as required by the guidance due to be published in the Summer.

Post 16

5.7 As part of the work to inform and develop Post 16 provision in Harrow, a study was commissioned jointly with the London West Learning and Skills Council (LSC) and Harrow. The study included gathering a wide evidence base involving discussions with stakeholders, for example, college principals and headteachers, a Year 10 Student Survey, Year 6 Pupil Survey and the analysis of data on destinations, attainment, progression etc. Through the discussions with stakeholders models for Post 16 provision were assessed against criteria. From this assessment and further analysis a series of recommendations to progress developments in Post 16 provision are being developed.

5.8 The findings of the study have been disseminated to stakeholders and participants in the study. The feedback from these sessions is summarised in Annexe A. Officers are working with the LWLSC to consider the recommendations and address the Post 16 agenda.

Post 16 Next Steps

5.9 In partnership with the London West LSC a Joint 14-19 Strategy Steering Group will be established. The Steering Group will comprise representatives from Colleges and Schools in Harrow, other providers including for example, Connexions. The Group will be chaired jointly by the Chief Executive of the LSC and the Executive Director (People First) in the first instance. The draft terms of reference are in Annexe B. As there are currently 14-19 working groups within Harrow. For example the 14-19 Curriculum Group, the Pathfinder Steering Group. It is proposed that the Joint Steering Group will encompass these groups to ensure that there is a coherent approach.

Post 16 Timescale

- 5.10** An indicative timescale is detailed in the table below. The Post 16 Strategy Steering Group will develop this timescale and work programme further.

Establish Post 16 Strategy Steering Group and agree work programme and timescale. Dissemination of Post 16 Report including consultation on models of provision for Post 16	June 2003 to September 2003
Report to Cabinet on outcomes of consultation and proposals for options to implement developments at Post 16	October/ November 2003
Consultation on options for implementation including provision details, locations and timescale	November to January 2004
Report to Cabinet outcomes including recommendations for implementation and statutory process timescale.	February 2004
Determination of Statutory Notices	May 2004
Implementation	September 2005

Consultation

- 6.1** A wide ranging consultation will be undertaken on any proposals or options for Implementation to change the age of transfer to 11 plus and increase choice in Post 16 provision in Harrow.

7. Finance Observations

- 7.1** At this stage there are no financial implications

8. Legal Observations

- 8.1** At this stage there are no legal observations.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1** The School Re-Organisation and development of Post 16 in Harrow has potential to achieve a step change in provision across the Borough. There are challenges in maintaining a common timescale, but it is important that momentum and support for change generated by the Debate on School Organisation is embraced. It is intended that a further report is presented to Cabinet in July outlining the DfES capital strategy and a timescale for consultation on options for implementation if appropriate. The Joint 14-19 Steering Group will be established and the report will detail progress and a timescale for action.

10. Background Papers

- 10.1 Cabinet Report July 2002
- Education, Arts & Leisure Report January 2002
- Governors' Consultation Paper January 2002
- Cabinet Information Item April 2003

11. Author

- 11.1 Geoff Wingrove, Head of Strategy and Resources 0208 424 1513.

This page is intentionally left blank

Comments and Discussions from the Post 16 Study Feedback Sessions

Representative Primary Headteachers

The Headteachers asked about the development of the models and the assessment criteria. It was considered that there was a provider bias in the models and criteria. The clients/parental views did not appear to be incorporated and those views expressed by parents were not reflected in the assessment. For example the contribution that 6th form pupils give to a school's ethos and culture - expectations and aspirations.

In relation to the cluster models, it was suggested that for the perception to change then it was important that Students were registered with the schools. There was a need for the provision to re-assure parents that the provision retained a school ethos. Some parents expressed concern about the age range of a college 18 –23 year olds. For some students this would not be an issue but for others this environment was not considered appropriate.

The Heads did not consider that they had been consulted on the models. It was explained that the consultants had worked with three recognised and working models and that Harrow College had proposed the spokes and hubs model.

The perceptions of the colleges amongst parents were not positive. Although it was acknowledge that this can be misinformed, it was a common perception. It would be important for colleges to provide a school day type of experience.

Increasing the opportunity for vocational courses, flexibility and work training were welcomed, although further information was required. There was some discussion about the need for some colleges in the cluster model to have specialisms.

It was agreed that Primary headteachers had an important role in the development of Post 16 provision and promoting opportunities to parents.

High School Headteachers

Discussion about the statistical base used by the consultants and it was generally recognised that this was a snapshot and that further work was needed to analyse curriculum patterns.

It was felt that the current pattern of school organisation in Harrow was a contributory factor in the loss of pupils at 11+ and this aspect should not be lost when looking at post 16. The 11+ and 16+ consultations should be run together if possible.

Agreed the need for a strategic group looking at 14-19, but it was felt that the existing groups working in this area should be subsumed into the new group rather than proliferate groups.

Recognised that the quality debate on provision was at the centre of perceptions. Harrow provided a very good system of education throughout the age range continuum but some parents and students had different perceptions.

Need to provide a further session to examine the partnership model in much greater detail.

Agreed the need for all stakeholders to meet together to discuss outcomes of the discussions held with different groups.

Colleges Senior Management

Felt strongly that there was a need for all parts of the education service to be aspirational about what it wanted to achieve.

Attention needs to be given to an analysis of accommodation and curriculum offer as the next stage of work.

Agreed the need for a 14-19 Strategic Steering Group but felt that other groups should be subsumed.

Need to address perceptions of parents and students on the quality of provision in the colleges. Recognition that there was a great deal of quality provision and able students currently.

Need to clarify with LWLSC the timing of the Strategic Area Review.

Strong support to increase skills offer and work based learning and to increase pathways. Guidance systems needed to rely on accurate, up to date information so that students have clear advice on provision available.

Need for strong political support for changes in the post-16 offer and for more awareness throughout the school sector.

Agreed the need to share the management and governance framework being developed between Park and Stanmore as this issue is central to effective partnership working.

Agreed to stakeholders meeting to discuss the outcome of the consultative feedback sessions.

JOINT STRATEGIC GROUP

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

Main Purpose

To develop a strategic framework for Post 16 provision in Harrow. To undertake work that enhances and extends the available evidence base. To use the evidence base to develop options for realistic and sustainable Post 16 provision. To give guidance and leadership on the development of an implementation action plan.

The Steering Group will also:

- ◆ ensure all key partners use their expertise, knowledge and resources to improve choice and quality of Post 16 learning in Harrow
- ◆ further develop and promote a collaborative approach and joint arrangements
- ◆ ensure the effective flow of information among stakeholders
- ◆ agree and follow a common media protocol
- ◆ form and give leadership to working groups, such as the Joint Planning Team, that will be responsible for specific areas of work.
- ◆ oversee the implementation of the action plan
- ◆ contribute to Strategic Area Reviews

Membership

Executive Director, London West LSC
Executive Director (People First)
College Principals
Representative Harrow Headteachers
Chief Executive, London West Connexions
District Manager, Job Centre Plus
Manager, West London Learning Partnership
Representative, Work Based Learning Providers
Manager, Voluntary Sector Network
Manager, Business Link
Director of Planning, London West LSC
Director of Operations, London West LSC
A representative of Head Teachers from each borough
A representative of specialist schools
A representative of the voluntary sector

Facilitation

The Steering Group will be chaired jointly by the LSC and Harrow Service and secretariat, London West LSC
Consultant support

Indicative Tasks

June 2003 – September 2003

- Establish Joint Steering Group
 - Engage all members in a Planning/Away Day
 - Agree Terms of Reference
 - Consider the recommendations in the Post 16 Study, linkages with Area review and inspections, and draw up an action plan

July 2003 – September 2003

- Develop and extend the evidence base for Post 16 option development including:
 - Further Data identification collection and analysis
 - Curriculum mapping
 - Collation and analysis of Asset Management Data to identify capital requirements and sources
 - Identify demand and appropriate provision for learners with Special Needs
 - Investigate and develop revenue options
 - Investigate and develop proposals on personnel issues
 - Investigate and develop management models for joint provision across colleges and schools
 - Undertake a consultation on possible models of
- To develop possible operational and policy options for consideration and decision by LSC and Harrow Council

October 2003 – January 2004

- Undertake consultation on options to implement to increase Post 16 provision

January/February 2004

- Report to Cabinet and LSC Board to agree options for implementation

January/February – April 2004

- Publish statutory notices for provision as required
- Continue developing implementation strategy

April/May 2004

- Decisions determined and implementation as appropriate.

Frequency of Meeting

To be agreed. Full Steering Group minimum monthly and as required during phases.

Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	26 June 2003
Subject:	School Improvement: Reform of the School Workforce to Raise Standards and Tackle Workload
Key decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Adrian Parker (Senior Education Adviser)
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Bill Stephenson (Education and Lifelong Learning)
Status:	Part 1
Wards:	All
Enclosures:	None

1. Summary

- 1.1 The proposal for a reform of the school workforce to raise standards and tackle workload is a national initiative rooted in the school improvement agenda.
- 1.2 The reform will take place within a developing statutory and guidance framework, e.g. new teachers' pay and conditions and school support staff development paths, based on the National Agreement.
- 1.3 Schools in Harrow have been effectively reforming the school workforce for many years to enhance teaching and learning. Local reforms are often already beyond the expectations set out in the new national framework.
- 1.4 Reforms of the school workforce over the next few years will build on schools' creative, imaginative and informed vision for teaching and learning.
- 1.5 The DfES envisages a key leadership role for the LEA in implementing the reform initiative and has provided a fully funded Standards Fund grant for the purpose.
- 1.6 Concerns about current and future funding levels of school budgets present a considerable challenge to the envisaged implementation of the proposed reforms.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **The Forum is requested to consider the report and agree the establishment of a Workforce Agreement Steering Group to plan and monitor local implementation of the National Agreement.**

3. **Consultation with Ward Councillors**

3.1 Not applicable

4. **Policy Context**

4.1 The workforce reform initiative will have policy implications for teachers and support staff, both in schools and employed directly by the LEA.

5. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

5.1 The workforce reform initiative is an element of the national strategy to raise standards in schools and will contribute to the strategic priority to promote Harrow as a centre of lifelong learning.

6. **Background Information**

6.1 DfES published "*Time for Standards*" in autumn 2002. This key document sets the initiative for workforce reform in the wider school improvement agenda and offers a vision of "future teaching and learning" within which reform will be implemented.

6.2 "*Time for Standards*" sets out three key priorities in order to produce, what is envisaged as, a transformational change in the school workforce:

- I. more time during the school day for planning, preparation and assessment (PPA);
- II. a concerted attack on bureaucracy that gets in the way of effective teaching and learning;
- III. extra support inside and outside the classroom.

6.3 The National Agreement (January 2003) which developed from the proposals in "*Time for Standards*" and was signed by all relevant professional associations and trade unions, apart from the National Union of Teachers, includes a national seven point plan for creating time for teachers and headteachers.

- I. A progressive reduction in teachers' overall hours over the next four years.
- II. Changes to teachers' contracts, to ensure all teachers, including headteachers:
 - do not routinely undertake administrative and clerical tasks (from September 2003);
 - have a reasonable work / life balance (from September 2003);
 - have a reasonable allocation of time in support of their leadership and management responsibilities (from September 2003);
 - have a reduced burden of providing cover for absent colleagues (from September 2004), and;
 - have guaranteed planning, preparation and assessment time within the school day, to support their teaching, individually and collaboratively (from September 2005).
- III. A concerted attack on unnecessary paperwork and bureaucracy for teachers and headteachers.
- IV. Reform of support staff, defined as all adults working in school other than teachers, roles to help teachers and support pupils. Personal administrative assistants for teachers, cover supervisors and high level teaching assistants will

be introduced.

- V. The recruitment of new managers, including business and personnel managers, and others with experience from outside education where they have the expertise to contribute effectively to schools' leadership teams.
- VI. Providing additional resources, at an estimated cost of £1 billion to employ an extra 10,000 teachers and 50,000 extra support staff, and national "change management" programmes, to help school leaders achieve in their schools the necessary reforms of the teaching profession and restructuring of the school workforce. These resources are included in the three year budget projections made available to the LEA by DfES.
- VII. Monitoring of the progress of the initiative by the signatories to the agreement through Workforce Agreement Monitoring Group (WAMG).

6.4 Although now being refined, this national action plan is now being implemented through various developments:

- I. Changes to teachers' pay and conditions implementing those changes planned for September 2003 have been set out in this year's School Teachers' Pay and Conditions document;
- II. Consultation has taken place on:
 - proposals for the introduction and qualification standards of the High Level Teaching Assistants (HLTA) grade;
 - a proposed framework for teacher and support staff relationships. This addresses the issues of what work High Level Teaching Assistants might be asked to do in schools and of the management and supervision of those assistants, and;
 - the development of alternative career development routes and appropriate qualifications for support staff. Three such routes are envisaged, broadly pedagogical, e.g. towards High Level Teaching Assistant grades; behaviour & guidance, e.g. trained counsellors, and; administration and organisation, e.g. school bursars.

6.5 The DfES has set out a clear role for the LEA in the reform initiative in several areas:

- I. leadership in developing a vision with schools for teaching and learning and associated staffing structures;
- II. support to schools, headteachers and governors, especially in change management;
- III. informing schools about the initiative and disseminating good practice, including the outcomes of the national Pathfinder project which is piloting aspects of workforce reform in 32 schools across the country, including Newton Farm First and Middle School in Harrow LEA;
- IV. liaising with the DfES, the Learning & Skills Council, the National College for School Leadership and local consultative groups.

A two year and fully funded Standards Fund grant has been made available to the LEA to undertake this role.

6.6 In Harrow, it is proposed to establish two steering groups:

- I. a cross-departmental officer group to provide coherence to the LEA approach to the initiative, and;
- II. a wider group – the Workforce Agreement Steering Group - that will plan and monitor the local implementation of the initiative. The steering group will report to the School Improvement and Effectiveness group (SCIE) and will include

headteacher, teacher, teaching assistant, high school manager, governor and trade union / professional association representatives.

7. **Consultation**

7.1 The local proposals have already been discussed at the School Improvement and Effectiveness group (SCIE) and the LEA Departmental Joint Committee (DJC). Discussion at ECF is the final element of initial consultation with representative headteachers, school staff and governors. Future consultation will be through the Workforce Agreement Steering Group, reporting to SCIE.

8. **Finance Observations**

8.1 Extra resources for schools to implement the proposed reforms were identified as part of the medium term budget strategy. However there is currently considerable concern in schools nationally and locally about the financial implications for school budgets in doing so. Officers from Education Financial Services are working with representative headteachers to identify current and future pressures on those budgets. The financial implications of the proposed reforms need consideration as part of those discussions.

9. **Legal Observations**

9.1 Changes in contracts, job descriptions and conditions of service are proposed in the National Agreement. Education Personnel Services and Harrow Legal Services will provide advice and support to headteachers and governing bodies in implementing these changes.

10. **Conclusion**

10.1 Schools in Harrow have for many years been developing staffing structures, staff training programmes and working conditions to provide effective teaching and learning opportunities for their students. The proposed reforms present an important opportunity for schools to further develop and modernise their workforce in order to further raise standards and reduce teacher workload. Concerns about current and future funding levels present a considerable obstacle to the envisaged implementation of the proposed reforms.

11. **Background Papers**

11.1 "Time for Standards: Reforming the School Workforce" (DfES – 2002)
Reference: DfES/0751/2002 or www.teachernet.gov.uk/management/remodelling

12. **Author**

Adrian Parker (0208 424 1317 or adrian.parker@harrow.gov.uk)