

Schools Forum

September 27th 2012 - Minutes

PRESENT:	
Diana Turner	Governor
Peter Reaney	Governor
David Kelham	Governor
Latika Davis	Governor
Ramesh Sirvastava	Governor
Philip Johnson	Governor
June Tandy	Governor
Larry Granelly	Governor
Phil Clucas	Governor
Cathy Clarke	Primary Headteacher
Stella Saje	Primary Headteacher
Jill Humphriss	Primary Headteacher
Chris Errington	Primary Headteacher
Karen Ferguson	Primary Headteacher
Ramjit Samra	Secondary (Maintained) Headteacher
Tony Wilmot	Secondary (Maintained) Headteacher
Patsy Weighill	Secondary (Academy) Headteacher
Iain Blaikie	Secondary (Academy) Headteacher
Philip Hamilton	Secondary (Academy) Headteacher
Judith Humphry	Special School Headteacher
Rachel Gillett	Nursery School Head Teacher
Sybil Hanson	Diocesan Board of Education
Laurel Penrose	14-19 Representative
Steve Dyke	PVI Representative
Ian Froggett	Union Representative NAS/UWT, Chair of ATP
David Hazeldine	County Secretary ASCL
Max Hyde	County Secretary NUT
Cllr Timms	Elected Member
Mark Gore	Head of Service – Learning & Achievement
John Betts	Head of Corporate Finances
Simon Smith	Strategic Finance Manager
Sara Haslam	Schools Funding & Strategy Manager
Clare Morris	Budget Planning Officer, Schools Funding Team

1. Apologies – Apologies were received from the following:

Chris Smart	Governor
Cllr Robbins	Elected Member
John Collins	Trade Union Representative
David Kelham, Governor	Present at the meeting but apologies as had to leave early

2.0 Minutes from Previous Meeting and Matters Arising

2.1 The minutes were agreed as accurate.

2.2 Matters arising:

2.3 The minutes from previous meeting recorded that Simon would look into the issue of academy funding for redundancy costs from the DSG. A draft paper was provided at the meeting.

2.4 Sara provided an update on the Clawback Policy. Schools Forum had previously recommend that the LA considers that the clawback process be put on hold for 1 year due to turbulence to funding. Cabinet have now agreed to revise the policy for balances at the end of 2011/12 in line with Academy regulations. The policy will apply to balances in excess of 12% rather than the previous maintained regulations for balances in excess of 8% for Primary, Nursery and Special schools and 5% for Secondary schools. Some work has begun looking at those schools with balances in excess of 12% and 32 schools have been identified.

2.5 The change to the Clawback Policy is temporary. A review of the policy for balances of maintained schools at the end of 2012/13 will be considered in due course. The EFA is also reviewing the 2012/13 clawback policy for Academies and that information will be taken into consideration when reviewing Warwickshire's future policy.

2.6 Sara will provide a further update on clawback at the October meeting.

3.0 School Funding Reforms Introduction and Context

3.1 Simon provided a verbal update.

- There is little flexibility available for local authorities within the reforms.
- There is a change in the approach to SEN funding.
- Timescales are tight for agreeing a new formula.
- DfE have stated that 40% of schools currently don't receive the appropriate level of funding but there has been no steer as to what is the correct level of funding should be.
- Feedback form the consultation indicates that option one is favoured by schools.
- Schools Forum should explore the feedback and issues to consider which principles are right for Warwickshire schools.

4.0 School Funding Reforms – Options Paper.

4.1 Sara presented a report detailing the work undertaken to establish 4 options and the results of the consultation. Members of the Forum were asked to consider what further information/work is required before a final option is presented for recommendation in October and to Cabinet in December. The following points were raised:

4.2 Split site. One of the changes to the allocation is regarding the split site factor. There is a reduced amount of funding for this due to:

- The proposed changes to the criteria to attract funding
- Some schools have restructured and are no longer on split sites.
- One school currently receives substantial funding for pre 16 and post 16 sites and has not at this point been deemed a split site under the proposals.

4.3 Comments were made about the logic behind the criteria including issues regarding additional catering costs, staff ratios required for supervising pupils moving between sites and travel costs between sites.

4.4 Requested: some additional analysis regarding the split site factor is provided for the next meeting.

4.5 MFG and Capping. Sara confirmed MFG at minus 1.5% per pupil has been guaranteed for 2 further years but that the approach thereafter is unknown. The percentage is applied to funding per pupil in the previous year and therefore it is a cumulative effect. Information has been provided to schools over 3 years to demonstrate the reducing MFG.

4.6 The EFA have given the message that a MFG of 0% would mean non implementation of reforms.

4.7 Additional Needs. There was concern that FSM alone is not an accurate measure of additional needs. However, the most favoured option from the consultation (option 1) does not include prior attainment.

4.8 The measurement for prior attainment proposed in 2 of the options for primary schools is based on an EYFS score of less than 73. It was commented that heads are uncomfortable that this is not an accurate means of measuring additional SEN costs in schools. However it was confirmed that this is the only prior attainment data available for primary schools.

4.9 Simon confirmed it was not possible to use a prior attainment factor in Primary but not Secondary.

4.10 Requested: to review a different balance of FSM/Prior Attainment.

4.11 It was asked whether it was possible to change the AWPU/deprivation values to minimise the impact of winners and losers. Sara confirmed she had looked at an option where the AWPU was between that in option one/two and that in option three/four but that the impact on schools was not improved.

4.12 Consultation response. There was some discussion around the response rate to the consultation being low. However the consultation has been accessible and recent workshops to explain the options were well attended.

4.13 There has been a higher percentage response from Secondary schools which may be due to School Business Managers having greater expertise to understand the proposals.

4.14 Although option one had the most number of schools voting as their favourite option, 63% of schools still didn't vote for option one.

4.15 It was requested:

- **To re-communicate to schools that any additional views can be fed to the Project Board.**
- **To Communicate to Primary schools that the Primary Head teacher members of schools forum would be happy to be contacted directly to discuss the proposals on a one to one basis.**
- **Some analysis of second, third and fourth choice votes be brought to the next meeting.**
- **To bring proposals of the 2 most favourite options to the next meeting.**

4.16 It was commented that schools will have individually voted on the option which most benefits their school. However Schools Forum must consider the best option for all schools and all pupils in Warwickshire. The Project Board have considered the principles not the effect on individual schools.

5.0 School Funding Reforms – Centrally Managed Services.

5.1 Mark Gore presented a report detailing the result of the consultation with schools regarding the de-delegation of centrally managed funding. Members of the forum were asked to consider what further information is required to be brought to the meeting in October where the maintained schools members of the Forum will vote on de-delegation. The following points were raised:

5.2 Sara confirmed the delegation of centrally managed funds does not have to be delegated based on pupil numbers other factors may be considered, such as EAL data.

5.3 Certain funding, historically held centrally by the Local Authority, must now be delegated to all schools. Academies can't de-delegate back to the local authority but the LA can trade services to academies. It was suggested it may be useful to ask academies what services they may be interested in. A service may not be viable if just maintained schools want to de-delegated money to the LA, but if academies want to trade a service may be viable.

5.4 A question was raised as to why supply cover costs for union duties are not met by the unions. The union representatives at the meeting noted that whilst it is a statutory responsibility of employers to release union representatives, this funding arrangement encourages union officials with local knowledge to work closely with

schools and heads to resolve local level issues. If this was not available there would be greater call on national and regional reps who would struggle to cope with the excessive demands. Local issues are resolved much more quickly by local representatives and is probably why Warwickshire has a low level of disputes.

5.5 It was noted that a neighbouring authority had already agreed to de- delegate supply cover budgets for union representatives.

6.0 The Schools Funding Reforms – Revision to the schools Forum Constitution.

6.1 A paper was provided. The revision to Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012 were noted and that Warwickshire complies with the changes.

6.2 An appendix B was provided showing the current membership of Schools forum. It was confirmed that Diana Turner is a member of schools forum as a Primary maintained Governor although she is also a Governor at Bilton School.

6.3 The paper includes a list of people who may speak at the forum. It was confirmed that deputies attending Schools Forum on behalf of members may also speak and vote on behalf of members.

7.0 LA Block LACSEG – Consultation response.

7.1 Warwickshire is spending less than the DfE are proposing to recoup based on a national average and this will cause a significant financial impact on the Local Authority. The Local Authorities response to the consultation was provided for information which was based on the financial implications rather than opinion based.

8.0 Schools Forum – Forward Plan 2012.

8.1 A forward plan containing a provisional programme of possible issues for Schools Forum to consider over the next year was provided.

8.2 Sara confirmed that Warwickshire complies with the Early Years Funding Review and so there is no intention to change early years funding for 2013/14.

9.0 Chair's Business.

9.1 None.

10.0 Next Meeting.

10.1 The next meeting will be held on 18th October, Conference Room, Northgate House, Warwick at 2pm.

