

MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
HELD ON 27 JUNE 2012
AT ST PAUL'S SCHOOL

Schools Members

Governors: Mr M Cocks (Secondary), *Ms N Conway (Primary)*,
Mr C Gill (Secondary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs P Price (Primary),
Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr J Steven (Primary),
Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary), Mr A Woodhall (Secondary)

Headteachers: *Mrs P Alder (Primary)*, Mrs S Moore (Primary), *Ms J Cullen (Secondary)*,
Mrs S Tripp (Special), Mr B Goddard (Secondary),
Mrs L Mansbridge (Secondary), *Ms C Moore (Primary)*,
Mrs P Rutherford (Secondary), *Mrs P Sowter (Primary)*

Non-Schools Members

Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Panel	<i>Cllr R Simbodyal</i>
Early Years Provider	Mrs S Roberts
14-19 Partnership	<i>Mr K Hintz</i>
Teachers' Committee	<i>Mr R Gow</i>
Assistant Director, Early Intervention & Access	Ms E Stickler
Head of Behaviour Support	Mr J Carrick

Observers

Member (Observer):	Councillor A Orhan
Assistant Director, Strategy and Resources:	Ms J Hill
Assistant Finance Business Partner:	Mrs Y Medlam
Resources Development Manager:	Mrs S Brown

Italics denotes absence

1. **INTRODUCTIONS and APOLOGIES for ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Ms Conway, Mr Gill, Mrs Alder, Mrs C Moore, Ms Cullen, Mrs Mansbridge, Mrs Tripp and Mr Gow.

Noted the absences of Mrs Sowter and Mr Hintz.

2. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members present completed the register of business interest form.

Agreed to request members not present to complete and return the register of business interest form.

Action: Mrs Brown

3. **MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

(a) **Schools Forum meetings held on 26 April 2012 and 16 May 2012**

Received the minutes and action sheet of the meetings of the Schools' Forum held on 26 April 2012 and 16 May 2012, which were confirmed as a correct record.

(b) **Commissioning Group meeting held on 12 May 2012**

Received the minutes of the meeting of the Commissioning Group held on 12 May 2012.

(c) Matters arising from the minutes

Members sought clarity as to whether the development of the Additional Resource Provision (ARP) had stopped or there was still a programme to open new provision.

It was confirmed following the discussion at a previous meeting of the Schools Forum that funding had been set aside for an additional ARP to be opened this financial year. Whilst the funding was still available, there had been further discussions on the development of ARPs. It was reported that at the Secondary Headteachers' Conference held earlier in the day there had been a discussion on the development of ARPs. It had been agreed that an evaluation of the current ARPs would be carried out to inform future requirements including arrangements for monitoring and processes for quality assurance.

It was noted that at the Secondary Headteachers' Conference a preference for a partnership model between mainstream and special schools had been identified.

It was confirmed it was unlikely that another ARP would open in September 2012 and this would mean that the budget provision would remain unspent. It was requested this funding be used to support needs in schools and not be redirected. It was stated that there was pressure on the budget due to increases in external placements for pupils with SEN and this pressure together with the underspend needed to be considered as part of the budget monitoring process.

4. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

(a) School Funding Reforms – 2013/14

Received a report, which provided an update on the development of local arrangements to meet DfE requirements as published in the school funding reforms document, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

Noted:

- (i) The information presented was based on the proposals published in the DfE document and confirmation of the final arrangements was still awaited. It was stated that the development work had to be started before the final confirmation had been received because there was a strict timeline for reviewing the current funding formula and mapping the prescribed factors to a new local formula;
- (ii) The number of factors which could be used had been reduced to nine. This had meant the need to map the funding currently applied against 20 factors to the nine allowable factors.
- (iii) Following discussion with the Commissioning Group, the principle for developing a local funding formula had been to seek a model which created the least turbulence and provided the best fit to the current funding arrangements. A further principle which was considered at the last meeting of the Commissioning Group was to consider addressing unfairness in the current funding formula created by obsolete historic grants, e.g. ASTs;
- (iv) The two factors which were mandatory for the local funding formula under the new arrangements were funding for the age weighted pupil unit and deprivation. The remaining factors were discretionary and up to individual local authorities to consider using or not;
- (v) The model presented did not include funding for ARPs or exceptional needs pupils as these would in future be funded from the High Needs block;
- (vi) The PFI shortfall supported the difference between the funding available and the actual cost of the unitary charge;

- (vii) The model presented had used £150k for the lump sum. It was requested that flexibility be agreed on adjusting the lump sum to meet the principle of best fit;
- (viii) The attainment data used for the modelling was for one year group and dataset for the other cohorts was still awaited. When the full dataset was made available, then the full impact of the individual factors would be assessed.

It was stated that the attainment factor for primary used EYFPS scores. This was based on pupils scoring less than 78 points. Following discussion with the Commissioning Group, it was suggested consideration be given to balancing the overall funding available between attainment and deprivation to obtain a best fit for both primary and secondary sectors.

- (ix) English as an additional language (EAL) was not a factor used for the current funding formula but was being considered as part of the new formula to reduce turbulence and redirect funding to those schools that may potentially lose under the new arrangements. This proposal aimed to support non federated infant schools by reducing the effect of a single primary AWPU rate;
- (x) Both IDACI and FSM were being used to allocate funding for deprivation. This was because the DfE had removed local flexibility on how these factors were used and only allowed a narrowly defined stepped approach for IDACI and a use of a single rate for FSM. The model presented had allocated funding based on FSM and the highest two bands for IDACI;
- (xi) It was not possible to have local transitional arrangements. The national requirement allowed the use of the MFG whereby a school or academy would not lose more than 1.5% per pupil funding. In developing the local arrangements, the Commissioning Group had suggested, for the local arrangements, that funding for schools gaining under the new arrangements be capped at +1.5% to support the losing schools. It was stated that final confirmation on the application of the MFG was still awaited.

It was questioned whether this would have a negative impact for individual schools in the longer term. It was stated that it was difficult to comment but it was thought to be unlikely as these arrangements did not include other funding available to schools. The modelling excluded funding provided for High Needs pupils, Post 16, Early Years and Pupil Premium.

There was a discussion as to whether the funding allocated through the pupil premium could be considered part of the overall resource of the school or needed to be considered separately for supporting the achievement of pupils from deprived backgrounds. Some members considered that this funding could not be considered in isolation and it was important to consider it part of the total funding available to the school to support the raising of achievement for all pupils;

- (xii) Members considered the development of the local arrangements should aim to limit the losses to as few schools as possible. The information provided in the local consultation document should include examples based on the type of schools with description of the effect of the change;
- (xiii) The removal of the 90% protection for funding the free nursery entitlement would lead to a loss of the DSG;
- (xiv) The arrangements for SEN were based on a place plus approach with providers receiving £10k per place and the balance as top up based on assessed need.

Resolved to continue to develop a local funding model, which provided the least turbulence in funding for individual schools.

Action: Mrs Medlam

Clerk's Note: Mr Goddard left the meeting at this point.

7. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

(a) Schools Forum Regulations

Received a paper and information on the draft revisions to the Schools Forum regulations, copies of which are included in the minute book

Reported the draft regulations were in response to the changes being introduced as part of the School Funding Reforms.

Noted the revised arrangements had to be in place by October 2012 and therefore the final arrangements would need to be in place by the next meeting.

(b) Combined Services Budgets

Received a paper providing update from the services on the use of the combined services budget, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

Noted:

- (i) the information provided on the activities undertaken by the services.

It was questioned whether the services provided good value for money, for example: how many looked after children were served by the funding allocated and was this best way to support these children. Forum members responded that the reports included information on the number of pupils supported and the outcomes achieved;

- (ii) the combined services funding was a small part of the overall support provided to looked after children. This support aimed to support the looked after children with their school placement and improving their outcomes in terms of educational achievement. The other support provided focussed on health and care needs. These were vulnerable children and young people with wide ranging needs;

- (iii) it was questioned what support was provided to children with disabilities attending early years private, voluntary and independent setting.

Resolved Mrs Leach would discuss the support provided to children with disabilities attending early years private, voluntary and independent setting with Mrs Roberts outside the meeting.

Action: Mrs Leach

8. WORKPLAN

Received the workplan of the Schools' Forum, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Retiring Members

Reported Mrs Moore, Mrs Mansbridge and Mr Hunter were retiring from their work in Enfield and their membership of the Forum.

The Forum thanked Mrs Moore, Mrs Mansbridge and Mr Hunter for their hard work and valued contribution to the work of the Forum over a number of years. Their commitment to the work of the Schools Forum was greatly appreciated.

- (b) Announcement of Final Allocation of Dedicated Schools Grant (2012/13)
Received a paper detailing the final allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2012/13.

Reported notification of the final DSG allocation of £277.837m had been received today.

Noted:

- (i) the final allocation was £401k more than estimated. There reasons for the increased amount were being assessed;
- (ii) the number of children needing school places was continuing to increase and the funding set aside as part of the budget process was insufficient to meet the cost of placing additional pupils. It was requested that the extra DSG received as part of the final notification be used to contribute to the cost of primary school places.

Resolved to allocate the additional DSG of £401k to support the increase in cost for the growth in numbers of pupils seeking a primary school place.

- (c) Lettings Traded Service

Reported there was some concern amongst schools and academies regarding the lettings traded service provide at the Council with delays in schools being reimbursed with the income collected and there were some concerns as to be whether user were receiving their receiving their bills on a timely basis.

Officers apologised for the issues and delays being encountered. It was stated that the service had had some issues which were being rectified and it was envisaged that the situation would be resolved by the end of term.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted the

- (a) date for the next meeting of Wednesday 24 October 2012 at 5:30pm at St Paul's School;
- (b) proposed dates for the future meetings:
- 12 December 2012 at St Paul's School
 - 06 February 2013 at Lea Valley High School
 - 09 May 2013
 - 11 July 2013

10. CONFIDENTIALITY

Resolved that none of the above be regarded as confidential.