

## Schools Forum

### March 7th 2013 - Minutes

<b>PRESENT:</b>	
Diana Turner	Governor
David Kelham	Governor
Peter Reaney	Governor
Latika Davis	Governor
Phil Clucas	Governor
Philip Johnson	Governor
Ramesh Sirvastava	Governor
Cllr June Tandy	Governor
Chris Smart	Governor
Stella Saje	Primary Headteacher
Chris Errington	Primary Headteacher
Rachel Gillett	Nursery School Headteacher
Gill Humphriss	Primary Headteacher
Karen Ferguson	Primary Headteacher
Ranjit Samra	Secondary (Maintained) Headteacher
Tony Wilmot	Secondary (Maintained) Headteacher
Patsy Weighill	Secondary (Academy) Headteacher
Iain Blaikie	Secondary (Academy) Headteacher
Philip Hamilton	Academy Headteacher
Judith Humphry	Special School Headteacher
Sybil Hanson	Diocesan Board of Education
Steve Dyke	PVI Representative
David Hazeldine	County Secretary ASCL
Sam Kincaid	County Secretary NASUWT
Ian Froggett	Union Representative NAS/UWT, Chair of ATP
Andy Summers	NUT Vice Chair TRP
Cllr Rickhards	Elected Member
Cllr Tomms	Elected Member
Wendy Fabbro	Strategic Director – People Group
Sarah Callaghan	Head of Service – Learning & Achievement
Julie Lessiter	Education Funding Agency
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:

Laurel Penrose	14-19 representative
Cllr Robbins	Elected Member
John Collins	Trade Union Representative
Cathy Clarke	Primary Headteacher

## 2.0 Minutes from Previous Meeting and Matters Arising

2.1 It was requested that the following amendments be made to the Minutes of the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December.

- Page 1 bullet point 1. Correction to name spelling - Iain Blaikie not Iain Blackie.
- Page 5 bullet point 2. Wording should be: *For cases of Primary expansion, Governors would be reluctant to accept expansion if there was an **adverse** effect on the budget.*
- Page 6, 8.2. To be revised as follows: *It was commented that although there would be no claw back, school balances **is** a key issue that should continue to be monitored. This is particularly important in the context of lobbying for reallocation of regional funding. We need to continue to show management of balances in a reasonable way.*
- Page 6, 8.3. To be revised as follows: *It was confirmed the reserves of the LA include **maintained** school reserves.*

2.2 The following matters were arising.

### 2.3 Out of County SEN Provision.

2.4 At the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December Wendy Fabbro gave Schools Forum a verbal update on Out of County SEN Provision. Further to this a report was provided at the meeting (7<sup>th</sup> March) - WCC Placements of pupils with Independent Education Providers. This report was provided for information flow and a further report will be brought to the next meeting. It was requested that the further report include details of the direction in reviewing the provision and what ideas are being put forward.

2.5 Wendy thanked David Hazeldine for his assistance providing questions to be covered in the Out of County SEN Provision report.

2.6 The minutes of the previous meeting page 3, point 4.3 bullet point 1 state that the total cost of out of county residential care is allocated to Learning and Achievement. It was questioned whether some element is charged to Social Care. Wendy said this would be clarified in the future report.

2.7 **Balances Control Mechanism Policy 2012/13.** A comment was made that if reserves information is only available for maintained schools this makes it difficult to review future formulas. If reserves rise then that is an indication that the formula is not allocating funding appropriately.

### **3.0 Questions to Education Funding Agency**

3.1 Julie Lessitier from the Education Funding Agency was introduced and presented a paper with responses to questions which had been put to the EFA prior to the meeting. A copy of the responses is attached to these minutes.

3.2 The EFA's response to question 1 regarding whether the National Funding Formula will address the issues of small rural schools, refers to 'unavoidably small but necessary schools' being considered in future national work. It was questioned when is a rural school 'necessary'? It was confirmed that the term "necessary" was in connection with travel implications.

3.3 It was stated that a national funding formula will be introduced in the next spending review (2015 – 2018). It was commented that LA formula reviews are costly and therefore it would be helpful if there are minimal changes to the current formula prior to the national formula being introduced. Julie said the EFA understood this view.

3.4 Julie confirmed there have been two Post-16 funding consultations with the opportunity to comment.

3.5 It was commented that following the raising of the participation age, Pupil Premium should be taken into post 16 as a matter of urgency.

3.6 Simon pointed out that John Betts sits on a national working group and therefore any further concerns/comments could be discussed with John who can voice these direct to the EFA.

3.7 Julie was thanked for her attendance at the meeting and answers to the questions that had been raised.

### **4.0 Review of 2013-14 School Funding Arrangements - Consultation Response**

4.1 As part of the national schools funding reforms the DfE had noted that a review of the impact of the changes would take place during the first year with the intention that if minor changes were required, these would be considered for 2014/15 onwards. Sara presented a report that suggests a joint response from the LA and Schools Forum to the consultation paper that has been issued. Schools Forum were requested to offer recommendations for additions or amendments to the response.

4.2 Question 4 – *Do you agree that local authorities should continue to use Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) data as attainment related proxy or should we consider use of a different indicator to identify low cost SEN in*

primary schools? If so, what indicator? It was commented that KS1 data should be used in addition to EYFS. It was also pointed out that the EYFS data has changed.

4.3 The suggested response to question 5 was: *There seems merit in having a threshold over which mobile pupils are funded to avoid over funding for small pupil movements. It is suggested that this threshold level is set at 10%.* A comment was made regarding the movement of service troops from Germany and whether this will have any effect on the Warwickshire barracks and demand for places at schools.

4.4 Question 8 – *If there was still one lump sum for both primary and secondary sector, what would be the minimum level of cap needed to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools? If there was a separate lump sum for primary and secondary schools, what would the minimum cap be needed for each in order to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools?* It was suggested more guidance is required to understand necessary (or desirable) schools.

4.5 The following comments were also made:

- There is a range of funding per pupil in different LAs. The idea that funding follows pupils therefore doesn't apply for example if a pupil from Birmingham moves to Warwickshire they don't bring the same level of funding. Lobbying regarding national allocations is continuing.
- It is too early to make changes to the formula. We need to wait to see how the new formula affects schools before changes are made. Some schools have reserves to counter the effect of changes and therefore it will take time to see the full affect.

## **5.0 Disadvantaged 2 year old funding – extension to the EYSFF**

5.1 Sara presented a report.

**5.2 Agreed: To recommend the rate of £4.95 per hour for disadvantaged 2 year olds for a maximum of 15 hours/week to be included in Warwickshire's Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF). This will be subject to final approval by Cabinet.**

5.3 Concern was raised regarding the identification of these disadvantaged pupils and it was noted that this would be part of the considerations in rolling out the new initiative.

## **6.0 Pupil Growth Fund**

6.1 Sara presented a report and Schools Forum were recommended to agree the criteria by which the Pupil Growth Fund is allocated to schools during 2013/14.

6.2 The DfE have made it clear that the criteria for allocating such funding should be based around the Local Authority's statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient pupil places where required throughout the county. This means that the funding will be offered to schools where the LA has requested it to expand to such a degree that they incur additional costs.

6.3 Whilst the policy should only be relevant where additional costs have been incurred; some expansions can take place within the current teaching structures of the schools and additional costs are marginal. Funding should only be offered to schools when there is agreement with the Local Authority that an additional class is required. This will take into account the Infant Class Size Regulations and the physical size of the building to accommodate more pupils. However, the option to have mixed aged classes will always be considered.

6.4 There was discussion around the level of TA support that was appropriate for an additional class. It was suggested that 15 hours/week was more appropriate than 25 hours/week.

6.5 It was pointed out Special schools do not have admission numbers and therefore negotiations with the LA around taking additional pupils are not valid. When school requirements for new housing developments are considered, no account of the likely percentage of pupils with special needs is taken into account.

6.6 Also, such a policy would not provide interim funding to schools that are expanding as a result of parental choice. This would be the same for both academy and maintained schools but in particular is at odds with the government academy agenda that academies can free to expand should they want to.

6.7 Schools Forum voted on 3 options for the level of financial benefit that should be provided:

1. Teacher support funding only.
2. Teacher and 15 hrs/wk TA support funding.
3. Teacher, 15hrs/wk TA support and premises support funding.

**6.8 Agreed: A school will be eligible for Pupil Growth Funding when:**

- 1. The Local Authority requires the school to expand to meet its statutory duties regarding the provision of places, and**
- 2. There is agreement by the Local Authority that a new class structure is required**

**3. The level of funding provided will be:**

<b>£23,000</b>	<b>Representing the average cost of a classroom teacher in</b>

	<b>Warwickshire primary schools for a 7 month period (Sept to Mar) including NI and super on costs</b>
<b>£4,500</b>	<b>Representing 15 hours of an average TA in Warwickshire primary schools for a 7 month period (Sept to Mar) including NI and super on costs</b>
<b>£27,500</b>	<b>TOTAL ONE OFF CONTRIBUTION</b>

6.9 Whilst this allocation does not mean that these costs will always be incurred exactly by schools, the intention is that the funding is a contribution to additional costs, whatever they might be.

6.10 The policy will be applicable to both maintained and academy schools in 2013/14 and is expected to be allocated to schools in the autumn term. The core intention is that this funding offers a one off contribution towards the additional costs that are incurred by the necessary establishment of a new classroom. Some schools where there is an annual need to increase classrooms could access the funding over a period of years. However, it is expected that after this initial financial support, the schools funding formula will provide a budget to the school on a per pupil basis for these additional pupils.

6.11 The Schools Forum will be updated later in the year regarding the number of schools meeting the eligibility criteria.

## **7.0 Secondary Alternative Provision Allocations**

7.1 A paper was presented and the following comments were made:

- Eastern area ABP support the de delegation of 7.8% as a short term action, however, in the long term the strategic picture needs to be resolved.
- The key issue is the fundamental context that there is insufficient provision for BESD. The de delegation of 7.8% of ABP funding is a short term response to a long term deep structural issue.
- Appendix A provided with the report shows the funding by area based on the current methodology and the proposed allocation method. The financial effect of revised allocations based on FSM ever 6 and the de delegation of 7.8% results in a loss of funding in the central and northern areas in particular.  
This significant variance in loss of funding was not considered reasonable.
- The current system has been successful and to remove funding could have negative effect.
- The report refers to 23 pupils with “complex and acute needs” who have since September 2012 come to live in Warwickshire having moved from another authority or has sought a school place after a

period of elective home education. There is a need to know more about the provision for these pupils prior to September 2012 and how this was funded.

- Concern was raised on behalf of the central area ABP. The central area chair did not support the recommendations as due to the lateness of the proposals there had been no chance for discussion and there could be a major effect of the ability to deliver provision.

**7.2 Agreed: The way in which funding is allocated to ABPs will be based on FSM ever 6 years in 2013/14.**

**7.3 Agreed: 7.8% of ABP funding will be de delegated to pay for the education of pupils with complex and acute needs in 2013/14.**

## **8.0 Dedicated Schools Grant for 2013-14**

8.1 Simon presented a report.

**8.2 Agreed: Allocation to services as outlined in the report, including the reallocation of funding across the three blocks.**

8.3 It was noted that whilst a balanced budget had been set, there were high risk areas, especially around the High Needs Block and it was agreed that further analysis of the expenditure within the High Needs Block would be reported to the Forum in May and October.

## **9.0 Schools Forum Constitution and Election Process 2013-14**

9.1 New head teacher and governor elections will take place over the next month or so for the Schools Forum, ready for the May meeting. The change in the schools that pupils attend in Warwickshire means that there needs to be one less maintained secondary representative and one more primary academy representative.

9.2 Schools Forum were asked to agree the split of governors or head teachers in the maintained sectors.

**9.3 Agreed: Primary maintained sector will be represented by 5 Head teachers and 6 Governors. Secondary maintained sector will be represented by 2 Head teachers and 1 governor.**

**9.4 Agreed: Extend the term of office to 2 years for members other than the primary and secondary sector representatives, inclusion of a Trade Union representative as a non-schools member, current schools forum member to nominate themselves for re-election if required, Local Authority to facilitate elections on behalf of the academy representatives.**

9.5 The suggestion that the election process is carried out electronically was welcomed.

## **10.0 Academies Conversion Update**

10.1 A current Position Statement on Status of Warwickshire Schools was provided.

## **11.0 Schools Forum - Forward Plan**

11.1 A Forward Plan containing a provisional programme of possible issues for Schools Forum to consider over the next year was provided.

11.2 The change of date for the October meeting was highlighted. This is on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> October.

11.3 A review of BESD provision and out county update will be provided at the May meeting.

11.4 Further analysis of the High Needs Block will also be provided at the May and October meetings.

## **12.0 Chairs Business**

12.1 None.

## **13.0 Next Meeting**

13.1 The next meeting will be held on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013, Conference Room, Northgate House, Warwick at 2pm.