

Public Document Pack



Contact: Sangeeta Brown
Resources Development Manager
Direct: 020 8379 3109
Mobile: 07956 539613
e-mail: sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

THE SCHOOLS FORUM

Wednesday, 20th January, 2016 at 5.30 pm in the Chace Community School, Churchbury Lane, Enfield, Middlesex EN1 3HQ

Schools Members:

Governors: Mrs I Cranfield (Primary): Chair, Mr Clark (Primary) Ms Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr T McGee (Secondary)
Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary)

Headteachers: Ms H Ballantine (Primary), Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit), Ms A Gaudencio (Primary), Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Ms H Knightley (Primary), Mr M Lavelle (Secondary), Ms A Nicou (Primary) Mr P De Rosa (Special), and Ms H Thomas (Primary)

Academies: Ms R Stanley-McKenzie, Ms I Dawes

Non-Schools Members:

Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

16 - 19 Partnership:

Teachers' Committee:

Educational Professional:

Head of Behaviour Support:

Early Years Provider:

Cllr D Levy

Mr K Hintz

Mr S McNamara / Mr T Cuffaro

Ms E Stickler

Mr J Carrick

Vacant

Observers:

Cabinet Member:

Education Funding Agency:

School Business Manager

Cllr A Orhan

Mr Owen

Ms A Homer

MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ARRIVE AT 5.15PM WHEN SANDWICHES WILL BE PROVIDED, ENABLING A PROMPT START AT 5.30PM

1. MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To note:

- a) Apologies from Mr Lavelle;
- b) Note this is Ms Stanley-McKenzie's last meeting;
- c) Welcome Claire Gopoulos.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members are:

- Asked to complete and return the attached register of Business form
- Invited to identify any personal or prejudicial interests relevant to items on the agenda.

3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES (Pages 1 - 12)

- a) School Forum meetings held on 9th December 2015.
- b) Joint meeting of the Education Resources Group and Schools Forum on 12th January 2016.
- c) Matter arising from these minutes.

4. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR DECISION (Pages 13 - 58)

- a) Schools Budget 2016/17: Update
- b) Scheme for Financing - Update
- c) Central Services Funded from the DSG – strictly private & confidential.

5. WORKPLAN (Pages 59 - 60)

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7. FUTURE MEETINGS

- a) Date of the next meeting is Wednesday 2nd March 2016 at 5.30pm, venue to be confirmed.
- b) Proposed dates for future meetings:
 - ?? May 2016
 - 6th July 2016
 - 12th October 2016
 - 18th January 2017
 - 1st March 2017
 - 19th April 2017
 - 5th July 2017

8. CONFIDENTIALITY

To consider which items should be treated as confidential.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING**Held on Wednesday 9th December 2015 at Chace Community School****Schools Members:**

Governors: Ms I Cranfield (Primary) Chair, Mrs J Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs L Sless (Primary), Mr T McGee (Secondary), Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary), Mr Clark (Primary)

Headteachers: Ms H Ballantine (Primary), *Mr P De Rosa (Special)*, Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit), Ms H Knightley (Primary), Ms A Nicou (Primary) and Ms H Thomas (Primary), Mr M Lavelle (Secondary), *Ms A Gaudencio* substituted by Ms L Whitaker (Primary)

Academies: Ms R Stanley-McKenzie, Ms L Dawes

Non-Schools Members:

Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Cllr D Levy

16 - 19 Partnership

Mr K Hintz

Teachers' Committee

Mr S McNamara

Head of Behaviour Support

Mr J Carrick

Early Years Provider

Vacancy

Education Professional

Ms E Stickler

Observers:

Cabinet Member

Cllr A Orhan

Education Funding Agency

Mr O Jenkins

School Business Manager

Ms A Homer

Also attending:

Chief Education Officer

Ms J Tosh

Head of Finance Business Partner

Mrs J Fitzgerald

Assistant Finance Business Partner

Mrs L McNamara

Resources Development Manager

Mrs S Brown

Resources Development Officer

Ms J Bedford

* Italics denote absence

1. MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCEa) **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr De Rosa, Mr Hintz, Ms Dawes, and Ms Homer.

b) **Membership**

The Forum welcomed Ms Dawes, Mr Lavelle and Ms Homer and noted Ms Stickler had been nominated the lead Education Professional.

Reported the deadline for receiving nominations for the Early Years Provider vacancy was December 2011. If nomination were received by this deadline, then the Authority would approach individuals and ask them to consider joining the Forum.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to complete and return the Register of Business Interests form.

Mrs J Leach, as the Head of Service for Disabled Children, registered an interest under item 4(b): Review of Services Funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant – 2015/16; in particular to the services for children with disabilities.

3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(a) Schools Forum Minutes held on 14 October 2015

Received and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum held on 14 October 2015, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

(b) Schools Forum meeting with MPs held on 20 November 2015

Received and agreed the minutes of the meeting of the Schools Forum with MPs held on 20 November 2015, a copy of which is in the minute Book.

(c) Minutes of Joint Meeting of Schools Finance Board and Education Resources Group

Received and noted the minutes of the joint meeting of Schools Finance Board and Education Resources Group held on 1 December 2015, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

Clerk's Note: Mr Lavelle arrived at this point.

(d) Matters arising from these minutes

(i) Meeting on 14 October 2015: Item 4(c): Schools Budget Update 2015/16 and 2016/17

Reported that the Forum had previously agreed that the cost associated with union duties be reimbursed on actuals and the current monitoring report was indicating an overspend of £25k against the budget provision. This overspend was due to additional costs following changes in the union representatives and also an increase in membership for some of the unions.

(ii) Meeting on 20 November 2015 with the Enfield Members of Parliament (MPs)

Noted

(i) A member of the Forum commented that he was dismayed that MPs had not shown up for the meeting, especially as the meeting had been re-arranged to accommodate the MPs' diaries.

The Chair advised the member that both of the absent MPs had to attend other urgent meetings and had sent representatives to attend on their behalf.

(ii) The MPs were keen to further understand the pressures on individual schools.

The Forum was advised that the MPs would be provided with a copy of the notes from the meeting.

Resolved any member wishing to send additional information with examples of the impact of the cuts were having on their schools should send these to Mrs Brown.

Action: Schools Forum Members

(iii) Ms Tosh stated that the Chief Executive had asked her to send a letter to the MPs seeking an update on what actions had been taken to support and address the issues raised at the meeting.

Action: Mrs Tosh

Clerk's Note: The Forum agreed to take Item 5a on the agenda first to enable Ms Fitzgerald to the leave the meeting.

4. ITEM FOR INFORMATION

a) Local Authority Budget 2016/17: Consultation

Reported the Local Authority had published its Budget Consultation for 2016/17. The document and the online response form were available on the Enfield Council website. To support residents, businesses, other stakeholders and partners, the Council had arranged local focus groups and public meetings. The details of the meetings were also available on

the website.

Noted:

- (i) Government funding had declined from £191m in 2010/11 to £111m for 2015/16, with further reductions required over the next 4 years. It was currently forecast that, by 2018/19, the funding will have reduced to £81m. This forecast did not include any changes following the Chancellor's statement to the Houses of Parliament.
- (ii) The DSG continued to be protected, with schools receiving a flat cash settlement by maintaining the Per Pupil rate. The Chancellor, in his statement, mentioned 'schools would be protected in real terms', but it is unclear what was meant by this statement. Details of the settlement for the Schools Budget were due to be published later in December 2015.
- (iii) The Council's budget was facing significant pressure due to the reduced funding and growth in the numbers of the elderly and school age children, as well as an upturn in the property market that had resulted in higher costs in paying private landlords for rents. The Care Act, the implementation of which had been delayed, would become another pressure in future years. Other pressures included the increase in new borrowing to meet, among others, the requirements of the schools expansion programme.
- (iv) To meet the savings target, the Council was currently required to find cuts of approx. £70m over the next four years. So far, £20m in savings had been identified as part of the Enfield 2017 programme, which included a 50% reduction in staff back office functions. For 2016/17, further cuts of up to £17m were planned, to work towards meeting the required target of £70m. All service areas were being considered for meeting the savings target.
- (v) The recent budget monitoring report was indicating an overspend for Children's Services of £2.3m. This was a result of the additional funding required for the increase in needs and also more children and young people coming into the borough.
- (vi) To support the pressures, the Council was considering an increase of 1% in the Council Tax, which had been frozen since 2010/11. The increase of 1% would result in approx. £1m in additional revenue.

It was observed that the increase should be higher. It was stated that early responses to the consultation were indicating support for a rise in the Council Tax and there was some support for a higher increase. However, any increase over 1.99% would require a formal consultation process to be carried out. After meeting the cost of the consultation, there would not much additional money raised.

Cllr Orhan stated that she would seek to continue this discussion with the Cabinet members. She felt the increases suggested were unlikely to make a significant impact on the level of savings required. The Forum was advised that, by 2020, most of the Council's spending would be on Children's, Adult and Environment Services.

It was queried whether the facility of adding a £2m precept for social care was being considered. It was stated that this ring-fenced provision would be considered as part of the budget setting process.

- (vii) It was commented that schools were either facing or in deficit, and whether there had been any discussion about what the Council could do to support the Schools Budget. It was stated that the Schools Budget was considered separately. It was suggested that pressures facing schools should be raised at Council meetings.

Cllr Levy advised the Forum that the Labour Group had discussed the issues facing schools and had invited Council officers to attend their meeting in January 2016 to present and discuss the issues further.

Cllr Orhan explained that the Administration was working towards making the changes required to meet the reduction in funding provided by the Government. There were

concerns that, with the reduced funding that would be available in 2020, most local authorities would only be able to support statutory duties. The Council and the Schools Forum needed to work together.

It was observed that schools were judged on pupil attainment as part of the inspection process and the work schools had been doing to narrow the gap between pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds and their peers had been supported by the additional funding provided through the Pupil Premium. If this funding was not forthcoming, then this would have a direct impact on schools' abilities to narrow the gap.

It was queried if the Council tax was increased whether the Schools Forum would be able to inform the distribution of the additional money received from the Council Tax.

The Forum was advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be receiving and discussing the outcomes from the Budget Consultation at their meeting on 1 February 2016 at 7pm. This was a public meeting and members of the Forum were invited to submit a written response to the Consultation and / or attend the meeting.

Cllr Orhan stated that ring-fencing income from raising Council Tax could lead it to becoming a political issue, and without a significant contribution from the Government in school funding, it was difficult to see a way forward.

- (viii) The Forum members were asked if they knew whether schools had raised with their parents and communities the financial pressures they were facing. It was commented that schools were concerned that talking about financial issues to parents may cause alarm about this and other issues. It was questioned if the local residents had been provided with information on the current situation facing the Council and schools.
- (ix) It was commented that the number of families and children with complex needs coming into Enfield was increasing. Schools had been able to manage this increase by employing Teaching Assistants and other support staff by providing an appropriate level of funding. With schools facing challenging times with their budget and reducing the number of support staff, the Pupil Referral Unit was seeing an increase in the number of pupils with complex and challenging needs being excluded. Currently, the Unit was being asked to accommodate up to five new pupils each week. The Unit was now over capacity and these pupils were being placed in expensive alternative provision. With less support services available in schools, the Education, Health and Care Plans were not always available and some of the pupils had more than five services attached to them.

The significant and continuing increase in referrals for pupils with complex needs was resulting in more funding required from the DSG. The Forum was advised a placement in an alternative provision could cost in excess of £1k per week. It was important to ensure pupils with high complex needs were provided with early help and so reduce the burden for the future.

It was commented that research and experience of special schools indicated that early help and intervention was the only way to keep children in the borough and avoid huge costs in later years. The Forum suggested some examples and case studies should be shared with the MPs.

It was suggested that it may be helpful to circulate a briefing note on the financial position from the Schools Forum for all schools to consider and share, as appropriate, with their parents. It was further recommended that the briefing note be simple and focus on key areas raised at the meeting with the MPs. This could also be used to support a press release from the Forum.

Resolved to:

- Circulate a copy of the presentation with the minutes
- Draft a briefing note on behalf of the Schools Forum for all schools

Clerk's Note: Mr McGee left at this point.

5. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION & DECISION

(a) Schools Budget: 2016/17: Update

Received a report providing an update on the Schools Budget 2016/17, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

Reported a draft budget, for 2016/17, had been prepared using the local data from the October Census. The DfE had indicated that the funding settlement and dataset to be used for the funding formula would be published mid to late December 2015. Once the funding settlement and dataset had been received, the budget would be recalculated and presented to the next meeting of the Forum.

Clerk's Note: Ms Fitzgerald left at this point.

Noted:

- (i) It was estimated the overall resources available for 2016/17 would be £1.977m less than 2015/16. This was because no balances were available to carry forward and the reduced funding received for disadvantaged two-year-olds.
- (ii) The budget pressures included the need to fund growth for academies and free schools and the additional costs of the increased number of pupils with high complex needs. The pressure for high needs was estimated, at this time, as £1.4m. This was based on known placements and for out-borough SEN children reaching 18–19 years. The pressure had also been exacerbated by an increase in the number of the post-16 SEN placements. With the introduction of the SEND reforms, there was a duty to support young people up to the age of 25; some of these young people had left education but were now returning to college but extra funding was provided. Using all the known information and pressures, it was estimated that there was a budget gap of £4,928m.
- (iii) The contextual changes included an increase in primary pupil numbers and an overall decrease in the number of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM). It was questioned if anything was being done to assess the drop in FSM eligibility. It was stated that the DfE had indicated that the IDACI indicator for deprivation was being updated but it was unclear when this would be available. It was confirmed that the budget proposals included the same unit rates as 2015/16.
- (iv) The approval required for de-delegation of the central licences would only include the CLEAPSS license, as all the other licenses were purchased by the DfE and the cost top-sliced from the DSG.
- (v) The funding for the 14-16 Practical Learning Options was not a de-delegation item and was a separate item to be agreed as part of a pooling arrangement.
- (vi) The Forum was advised of the options available to bridge the gap. The Forum was reminded that previously the Forum had agreed to use the available balances to support the budget gap but this option was not available for 2016/17. It was noted a reduction in the AWPU by £25 would produce a saving of £1.25m, subject to the effect of the minimum funding guarantee. It was commented that there had been a meeting of the Schools Finance Board and Education Resources Group to consider and identify reducing the funding for the centrally retained services.
- (vii) It was remarked that schools had been invited to meet with the Education Psychology Service to pilot a change in the operational arrangements, so that an initial EP report would not be required for the Panel.
- (viii) Owing to the tight timeline for discussing in detail the options for meeting the budget

gap and setting the budget, it was suggested that there be an extra meeting of the Forum. It was stated that there was a meeting of the Education Resources Group planned for Tuesday 12 January 2016 and this could be a joint meeting with the Forum.

Resolved to:

- Continue the growth fund for 2016-17 at a cost of £1.163m.
- Hold a joint meeting of the Education Resource Group Meeting and Schools Forum on Tuesday 12 January 2016, at 8am at Highlands School.

ACTION: ALL

(b) Central Services Funded from the DSG

Received a report providing information on the Central Services funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), a copy of which is included in the Minute Book

Resolved this item would be discussed at the meeting of 20 January 2016.

The Forum members were asked to bring the report to the meeting.

ACTION: ALL

6. ITEM FOR INFORMATION (Cont.)

School Funding Arrangements for 2016/17

Received a report providing information on the School Funding Arrangements for 2016/17, a copy of which is included in the Minute Book.

Reported the Forum, at the previous meeting, had been advised that there were two primary schools expanding on split sites and consideration was being given to funding these schools as traditional split-site schools. The paper circulated had been sent to all schools and academies for comment. The comments would be summarised and reported to the next meeting of the Forum. At this meeting, the sector representatives would be asked to consider the proposals.

7. WORKPLAN

Any additional items arising from the meeting would be added to the workplan.

ACTION: Mrs Brown

8. FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted:

(a) The next meeting would be held on Wednesday 20 January 2016 at Chace Community School.

Resolved, if the papers for this meeting could not be published and circulated to meet the required timeline, they would be circulated by the Friday prior the meeting.

(b) Dates of future meetings were as follows:

- 02 March 2016
- ?? May 2016
- 06 July 2016
- 12 October 2016
- 18 January 2017
- 01 March 2017
- 19 April 2017
- 05 July 2017

9. CONFIDENTIALITY

No items were considered to be confidential.

MINUTES OF JOINT MEETING OF EDUCATION RESOURCES GROUP AND SCHOOLS FORUM 12 January 2016

Attendance:

Education Resources Group: Eve Stickler (Chair), Ms L Dawes, Peter De Rosa, *Annie Gaudencio*, Bruce Goddard, Julie Messer, Sally Quartson, Jenny Tosh, Jayne Fitzgerald, Louise McNamara, Sangeeta Brown

Schools Forum:

Governors: Ms I Cranfield (Primary): Chair, Mr Clark (Primary), Ms J Ellerby (Primary), Mrs J Leach (Special), *Mrs L Sless* (Primary), *Mr T McGee* (Secondary), Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary)

Headteachers: Ms H Ballantine (Primary), Mr P De Rosa (Special), Mr B Goddard (Secondary), Ms M Hurst (Pupil Referral Unit), *Ms H Knightley* (Primary), Mr M Lavelle (Secondary), Ms A Nicou (Primary), Ms H Thomas (Primary), *Ms A Gaudencio* (Primary) substituted by Ms L Whitaker

Academies: *Ms R Stanley-McKenzie*, Ms L Dawes

Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee
16 - 19 Partnership
Teachers' Committee
Education Professional
Head of Behaviour Support
Early Years Provider

Cllr D Levy
Mr K Hintz
Mr S McNamara, substitute Mr T Cuffaro.
Ms Stickler
Mr J Carrick
Vacancy

- *Italics denote absence*

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Levy, Mrs Sless, Ms Knightley and Mr Hintz.

The Group congratulated and extended their best wishes to Janet Leach and Gordon Stubberfield on receiving MBEs.

2. Minutes from the Last meeting held on 1 December 2015

(a) Meeting with MPs

Reported a follow up letter to ask on progress, since the meeting, would be sent to the MPs.

(b) Schools Budget – 2016/17 - Update

Reported the settlement was received just before Christmas. The settlement was based on flat cash for the Schools (SB) and Early Years (EYB) Blocks, that is no change to the per pupil amount provided for these blocks. The final amount for the SB was slightly higher than projected due to pupil numbers and the confirmation that the Carbon Reduction Credit was already accounted for elsewhere. The EYB information was based on January 2015 figures and not January 2016, so there may be some changes after the January 2016 Pupil Census.

There was an increase in the High Needs Block of just over £660k.

The extra funding meant an additional £900k in resources than previously projected. The pupil data had also been received just before Christmas. The data showed a significant variation to the local projections. This variation was due to:

- a change in how the IDACI scores and then aligned to bands to indicate deprivation. The 2015 updates from 2010 showed more pupils were now identified to be living areas in Bands 1-3 (the more affluent areas);
- free school meal data had been received for all academies and the data showed a reduction in numbers than previously calculated.

The changes meant a reduction in the funding required for the funding formula.

The current position was that the budget gap had reduced from approximately £5m down to £3m. Work on formulating the draft budget was continuing and the draft would be presented to the Schools Forum next week.

The Group were advised that it was a difficult time of transformation and resource reduction within the LA and that this was the context within which Louise had been working to develop the draft budget. The Group thanked Louise for the work she was doing.

3. Central Services Funded from the DSG: Update

Reported, as agreed at the last Schools Forum meeting, this meeting had been set up to enable the Schools Forum members to be part of the in depth discussions held with the Education Resources Group. The Group was advised that some services had added updates, appendices and revisions to their pro-formas and these had been circulated with the agenda. Attendees were provided with a paper which had assessed and used the feedback from the Headteachers' Conferences, the Education Resources Group, the Departmental Management Team and Service Managers to compile information into a table which included possible options for achieving some savings through reductions of budgets.

The Group were advised that the savings were a suggestion and if these were accepted then further work with Service Managers will be required on how they would manage the resultant cut in their budgets and the viability of their services moving to a Service Level Agreement and if so when it would be feasible.

The first section of the table outlined those areas where a Schools Forum decision was required and the second section was where the school representatives on the Schools Forum were required to make a decision. The remainder were areas for the Local Authority to consider the feedback from the Schools Forum and formulate a decision based on the impact to children and young people.

Noted:

- (a) It was questioned how the proposed 7% reduction had been arrived at? It was stated that this was based on the figure being used by the Council in it's recent calculations and therefore applying the same principle.
- (b) 40 SEN School Res Independent and 42 SEN Special Day Independent: It was questioned whether these services and also the transport costs for these services were being reviewed. It was stated that the transport for both these areas were part of a separate review.

The Group were advised that there need to be further considered discussion on how children with high and complex needs were met. The position for the borough was that there were finite number of places in Enfield's special schools and when these places were filled and mainstream schools were not able to meet the needs of such children with extremely complex needs the alternative was to consider independent provision. Therefore, there was a need for a discussion on how the needs of these children could be managed and met in less costly in-borough provision. It was reported that Rob Leak was keen that this work to be prioritised and carried out by the SEN Strategy Group.

It was commented that the Schools Forum had in the past supported and funded a programme to expand provision in-borough to bring pupils back. The expansion included more places in special schools and development of out of school activities to provide wraparound provision which enable families to cope and manage the needs of their children. This strategy had been and continued to be successful and further consideration needed to be given as to how the current increase being experienced could be used to replicate this strategy.

The Group was advised that the immediate need was for in-borough provision for pupils with autism and the current projections indicated that an extra 100 places were required.

It was reported that special school Headteachers were also discussing this issue and the options available and what best mix of provision was: expansion, additional places in mainstream provision either managed by the host school or by arrangement and in partnership with a special school. With the number of pupils and the level of numbers of complexity in need, it was felt there was a need to look at something different whether this is expansion or a new academy.

It was stated that the LA was also working with external organisations such as National Autistic Society to develop a strategy.

- (c) It was remarked that Secondary Headteachers had been forced to consider cuts to their budgets and wanted to consider how the reductions in central services would support them. It was

confirmed that the representatives were sharing the views of secondary Headteachers' Conference. The information circulated provided a basis for a discussion.

- (d) 5 Capital – it was confirmed that this was historic funding which now supported the Primary and School Expansion Programme. The impact of withdrawing this funding may mean that there will not be any funding for some of additional items requested by schools and the LA would need to borrow more for additional capital funding.

The Group were advised the LA had been allocated a higher amount of capital funding. It was questioned how much was allocated and whether this could be used to fund the repairs and maintenance. It was stated this funding was for larger projects and any spend had to follow the Council's approval process.

Suggested funding was withdrawn.

Agreed to confirm the level of capital funding that had been allocated.

Action: Jenny

- (e) 9 Skills for Work – It was confirmed that this funding supported the development of links with employers to deliver work experience and also support pupils with a particular needs which could not be addressed by schools and support the junior citizenship programme. The service was now part of the Environment department.

Suggested should be offered as SLA.

- (f) 14 Hire of external premises – it was reported that the Asset Management combined the three budgets to support schools. This budget funded historical items to help schools with costs of playing fields and where schools needed additional provision through a mobile class.

Suggested funding was withdrawn.

- (g) 16 HR TDA – it was confirmed that this was the continuation of a historical grant.

Suggested funding be withdrawn.

- (h) 23 Physical Education – It was reported that the Service Manager had requested that the service could manage with half the funding being raised through an SLA. It was commented that the Headteachers had considered this should be an SLA

Agreed to review further.

- (i) 20 Libraries – recommended all the funding should be met through an SLA.

- (j) 15 HR – recommended that these services should continue to be considered as part of the de-delegation process.

- (k) 19 SIS Intervention: it was stated that there had been an error in the information sent out and that there were two elements to the service:

- 19a – Data and MI Support: it was confirmed that this was a historic grant and when funding arrangements changed was included within the DSG. It funded a member of staff and central subscription. It was requested that funding of £110k be maintained for this service.

It was commented that support provided was really useful and helpful to both existing and new Headteachers had found it helpful to have a central resource.

- 19b – the remaining funding was originally for the Reading Recovery programme and now funded a range of literacy interventions.

It was commented that this service could be provided in an alternative way.

Recommended to retain £110k for Data and MI Support and remove the balance.

- (l) 24 Place to Be: – It was commented that LA was in the process of finding and confirming the lead contact at this organisation.

It was commented that Headteachers felt it was unfair for some schools to be supported / subsidised and other having to pay. There needed to be transparency. It was stated that the process for reviewing commissioned services had begun and arrangements would be formalised.

Suggested funding was withdrawn.

- (m) 25 Play Development – it was suggested that this service be offered as an SLA. The Group were advised that this was a sensitive area and the whole team were under threat due to the changes required to Council services. SLA

Suggested funding was withdrawn.

- (n) 7 Early Years Social Inclusion – it was reported that this service supported two areas: Nurture Groups and intervention. The service could begin to consider an SLA but it would difficult to manage an SLA for the total cost of the service from April 2016. There needed to be some central funding to support the co-ordination and management of the development of an SLA.

It was suggested that there needed to be some consistency in the decision making and the reasons for retaining some funding centrally. It was stated that it was difficult for some services to move to a buyback as the DSG was the only source of funding for the service.

It was noted that some of these services were comprised only of staffing and this would lead to a redundancy situation.

It was questioned if the removal of this funding would not affect the money (£60k) provided for running a Nurture group. It was stated that there were clear guidelines on the running of Nurture Groups and the funding provided for the Nurture Group was not part of this discussion.

It was commented that information needed to be provided on all aspects of the budget.

It was queried how quality of the Nurture group was monitored. It was stated that this was managed by the service and might have to be part of the SLA.

Suggested £100k be retained and the balance offered as an SLA.

- (o) It was queried could any service afford more than 7% reduction. It was stated that 7% was a starting point and would need to be considered as part of the discussion whether services had access to any other funding to cover the activities carried out by the DSG funding.
- (p) 13 and 47 HEART – it was reported that this funding supported the team for LAC.

It was observed that schools were unclear as to the benefit received from this service. It was stated that extra information and case studies had been included in the pack on the work of the service. The way the service was formed and operated could be considered part of a review.

It was suggested that the funding be reduced.

- (q) 18 SIS – it was reported that the service worked with all irrespective of size. The service received funding from the ESG to support schools causing concern and this would be reduced due to Government reductions to this grant. The service provided an SLA for training. A reduction of 7% would mean a reallocation of how work was managed and delivered.

It was commented that some secondary schools used another external company to deliver on some of the areas provided by the service and whether there was an issue of double funding. It was stated that all secondary schools were also supported by the service and received visits.

It was observed that there was a mixed economy of provision in Enfield if you included teaching schools and there was a collective responsibility to support those schools that could not buy the level of support they required and whether the group was in a position to make a decision which would jeopardise the support available to these schools.

It was noted that buying from external provision was not always the best solution with experience showing some of the external providers determining the service provided against the amount of money they received and thereby waste of resources. Members concurred that aspects of the external service was always good, but the LA were also now using consultants.

It was remarked that schools in some instances needed to go out to address a specific need.

With all schools having access and being supported by the service, there was a concern where a school had chosen not to buyback there would be no opportunity to provide early intervention.

Suggested that the percentage for reduction be reviewed and also information provided on the level of support received by each school.

- (r) 4, 12, 21 & 46 Joint Service for Disabled Children, Out of School Activities, Foundation Stage Support and Pre School Support (EISS): – As stated above, these services were developed to support the pupils brought back in borough from out of borough provision. The support required by these pupils was a statutory requirement and if the current provision was withdrawn then the pupils would need to be placed in out borough provision. At the moment, the funding for (r) Joint Service for Disabled Children and Out of School Activities was used to support between 8-900 pupils to receive up to £500 per year for a comprehensive wraparound service.

The Foundation Stage Support and Pre School Support were two services providing early intervention. The activities carried out by the Pre School Support service included home visiting, portage and working with the PVI providers to prepare children to cope in an education setting.

Teaching Assistants were deployed by the service to support Foundation Stage and Pre School pupils in either schools or PVI settings.

It was proposed for the service to be reviewed to ensure equity in terms of delivery.

It was commented that the concern with the service was that the Teaching Assistants provided were not aware of how the school operated and as part of the review consideration needed to be given as to how the money could be used in a different way including providing individual schools with the funding to engage Teaching Assistants.

It was questioned whether academies accessed these services. It was confirmed that this was not the case and this was the reason to review the service and ensure there was equality in access and delivery.

Agreed that the percentage reduction could be managed over the four service areas.

- (s) 22 Parenting Support Unit – it was confirmed that this service received no other funding from any other funding streams. The service worked closely with BSS and also provided clinical supervision to Parent Support staff within a number of schools, offered access to a duty team, offered parenting programmes for vulnerable families and worked closely with families throughout the year, not confined to the academic term. The service was used by both primary and secondary schools. Additional material had been offered in advance of the meeting giving information on the early help service offered to those in need and those schools where the service had worked with the children and families.

It was commented that many schools employed their own PSA and it not be delivered through an SLA. It was stated that the service would be reviewed to consider alternative delivery options.

It was observed that the service, similar to the Joint Service for Disabled Children, aimed to provide a wraparound service for those children below the threshold for social care intervention but clearly in need of support and in danger of being excluded.

It was commented that one of the issues with service was the perceived variability in quality. It was stated that this issue would be considered as part of the review.

Agreed to consider an increase in the percentage and also review the service.

- (t) 29 SIS Professional & Development – Agreed to retain the service at the current level.
- (u) 31 Admission – it was observed that the service provided good quality support, advice and guidance. Agreed that the service be reviewed to consider if any savings could be achieved.
- (v) 8 Early Years Team – it was reported that the service had had the brokerage and commissioning element of the service already reduced and a reduction in this budget would mean cutting teachers posts and the remaining staff would be limited to managing the statutory work around monitoring.

It was observed that the continued reduction in funding would impact on the provision available to support and improve quality in PVI settings. It was noted support to Children's centres may also be affected by the reduction in funding. It was suggested that consideration may need to be given as to how schools could support PVIs in their local area.

It was stated that the data and information required for children's centre was provided by another service.

- (w) 10 EPS – it was reported that this funding was specifically for out borough settings. The Group were advised that the funding for this service was being cut by 50% due to the reduction in ESG and loss of CAMHS grant.
- (x) It was questioned why Enfield was paying for this when other Local Authorities did not pay for children in schools. It was suggested the arrangements be reviewed to ensure that where other local authorities needed to be charged that they were charged.

Agreed to review the service.

- (y) 11 EWS – the funding was used to support pupils with high needs in out borough provision and those supported by the LAC and Youth Offending service. Agreed to maintain the percentage reduction.
- (z) 17 Learning Consultant – There were two members of staff who supported and worked with schools.

It was commented that some secondary schools didn't use the service and wanted to move to an SLA. It was stated that the Learning Consultants worked with both primary and secondary schools closely.

- (aa) 28 Speech therapy – it was reported that this was a contractual arranged with the CCG being the major funder of the contract. There had been issues of quality and level of provision. A group was meeting to look at these issues.

It was commented that there was real concern amongst Headteachers in considering reductions as there was an increase in demand for this service.

- (bb) 37 SEN Equipment – it was confirmed that this budget supported any school that required specific specialist equipment to support pupil with SEN equipment and aids.

It was commented that schools were not aware of this budget and purchased their own equipment. There was a real concern around storage and removing equipment when the pupil had out grown the equipment. It was stated some equipment was made for a particular pupil and so could not be reused.

Agreed budget and storage facility for reusable equipment would be reviewed.

- (cc) 30 Youth – it was reported that this service was experiencing significant cuts in other areas.
- (dd) 44 Appeals – it was reported that there had been recent changes in the regulations concerning appeals and these were being reviewed and further information would be brought back to the next meeting of the Schools Forum.

4. Dates of meetings for the Education Resources Group

Dates of future meeting confirmed as:

Group	Date	Time	Venue	Comment
Education Resources Group	12 January 15	8.15 - 10.15am	Highlands	
Schools Forum	14 October 15	5.30 - 7.30pm	Chace Community	
Schools Forum	9 December 15	5.30 - 7.30pm	Chace Community	
Schools Forum	20 January 16	5.30 - 7.30pm	Chace Community	

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO. 15

Agenda – Part: 1

Item: 4a

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Schools Forum: 20 January 2016

REPORT OF:

Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services

Contact officer: Louise McNamaraE mail: louise.mcnamara@enfield.gov.uk**Subject: Schools Budget 2016/17 and Formula Factors****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report sets out details of the initial 2016/17 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation which was announced on 17th December 2015, together with the October 2015 dataset to be used to calculate formula budget shares for primary and secondary schools.

Information on the proposed formula factors and associated unit values as detailed in the report will be submitted to the DfE on 21st January 2016 for approval.

The report provides updated information on the proposed budget for 2016/17 including budget pressures to be funded within the resources available from the 2016/17 DSG.

The report seeks the approval of Schools Forum to finalise the unit values for the primary and secondary funding formula..

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Schools Forum is asked to note and agree

- The unit values for the primary and secondary funding formula as set out in Appendix B
- Whether certain services should continue to be de-delegated in 2016/17 as set out in paragraph 5.3
- Proposals for bridging the budget gap

The Schools Forum is asked to note

- The 2016-17 DSG settlement and draft budget set out in Appendix A
- The formula allocations to schools based on the proposed formula factors set out in Appendix C

3. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2016-17**3.1 DSG Settlement**

The current DSG methodology introduced in 2013-14 has been continued in 2016-17, set out in 3 spending blocks for each authority: an early years block and schools block and a high needs block. The underlying schools budget will be kept at flat cash rate per pupil for 2016-17. The Minimum Finding Guarantee (MFG) will be continued, meaning that no school or academy will experience a reduction compared to their 2015-16 budget of more than 1.5% per pupil (excluding sixth form and pupil premium funding).

Enfield's initial 2016-17 DSG settlement was announced on 17th December 2015 at £306.724m (excluding £.418m Early Years Pupil Premium funding). It should be noted that the in year

funding adjustment made for growth in Non Recoupment Academies in 2015-16 will not be continued in 2016-17.

The Early Years Block allocations for 2, 3 and 4 year olds will be updated during 2016-17 to reflect January 2016 census data and including our forecast of these revised allocations and £1.234m funding from the Education Funding Agency to fund post 16 pupils in special schools the total resources available to fund expenditure in 2016-17 is estimated to increase to £310.207m as set out in Appendix A.

The forecast resources available for 2016-17 are £0.916m less than in 2015-16 due partly to the lack of funding for NRA Growth. In 2015/16 resources were also supplemented by a one-off contribution from reserves which is not available in 2016-17. These reductions were offset by an increase of £3.159m in other elements of the DSG allocation, resulting in the net reduction in resources of £0.916m. This overall decrease in resources combined with a net increase in spending requirements of £2.035m results in a budget gap of £2.951m. Consideration of how to address this gap and achieve a balanced budget position will be made at this meeting.

There will be further consideration of the Early Years data from the January 2016 census when this is available which may impact on the bottom line position and require adjustment to the budget at a later date.

3.2 Schools Block

The value of the schools block in the settlement is £258.530m based on a Guaranteed Unit of Funding (GUF) per pupil of £5,204 and the pupil count from the October 2015 census for primary and secondary schools and academies, uplifted by the increase in reception pupils between October 14 and January 15. There will not be any in year adjustments to this initial allocation.

3.3 Early Years Block

The value of the Early Years Block in the settlement is £17.308m based on a Guaranteed Unit of Funding of £5,016 per pupil for 2 year olds and £3,948 per pupil for 3 and 4 year olds. The announcement for the Early Years Block is provisional as the figures are based on the January 2015 census and will be revised when the January 2016 census data is available. The actual allocation for 2016-17 will be based 5/12 on the January 2016 census and 7/12 on the January 2017 census but the cash adjustment to reflect January 2017 pupil numbers will not be received until 2017-18. The total DSG stated in Appendix A includes an estimate of £2.249m to reflect the in year adjustment, giving a total Early Years block estimate of £19.557m.

3.4 High Needs Block

The value of the High Needs Block in the settlement is £32.120m (including £1.234 from the EFA). This includes funding for special schools and ARPs. The Department for Education increased funding nationally for high needs block allocations by £92.5m. Enfield's share of this additional funding is £660k and whilst any increase is welcomed it falls far short of matching the increased pressures in this area.

For the 2015-16 budget allocation, authorities had the opportunity to make a case for additional funding where they felt the increase in required High Needs places was exceptional. Enfield submitted a detailed bid but only secured funding for 1 additional place. This exercise was not repeated for 2016-17 so authorities were given no opportunity to provide details on the increased high needs pressures they were facing.

The draft budget included in Appendix A includes £1.456m of high needs budget pressures based on current forecasts. There is ongoing review of these forecasts and any change in the overall pressure in this area will be reported back to Schools Forum in March.

4 Draft Budget and Formula Factors 2016/17

4.1 Draft Budget

A draft budget has been produced based on the DSG settlement data and revised estimates of pressures and other budget changes. This is shown in Appendix A. The budget gap is currently estimated at £2.951m.

4.2 Proposed Formula Factors 2016/17

At the end of October 2015 the authority submitted a provisional pro forma to the DfE detailing the national formula factors and indicative unit values for the primary and secondary funding formula based on 2014 data. Since the last Forum meeting the formula has been updated to reflect the October 2015 dataset which shows

- Increase in primary pupils
- Increase secondary pupils
- Decrease in FSM eligibility
- Decrease in the number of pupils in the higher IDACI bands

The October 2015 dataset reflected the 2015 English Indices of Deprivation data (IDACI) which replaced the 2010 data that had been used for the last 3 years. The data indicated a significant reduction in the number of pupils in the higher bands which are funded through the formula. This trend was experienced across London and nationally to a slightly lesser extent. This change has resulted in significant funding changes for some schools with many now receiving no funding through this factor but overall funding allocations per pupil will be protected to 98.5% through the MFG.

Formula factors for 2016-17 are set out in Appendix B. The proposed factors have not changed from 2015-16 and at this stage the unit rates are unchanged apart from a minor adjustment to the AWPU rate to reflect the licences budget being managed centrally (except CLEAPPS) and a minor increase for union duties to reflect actual cost. If schools continue to de-delegate funding for union duties this adjustment will have a net nil effect on their budget.

Schools were consulted on a proposal to increase the value of the primary split site factor to reflect the increased financial pressures faced by schools operating on 2 sites. Only the 2 primary schools operating on split sites responded to the consultation in favour of the increase. One of the schools does not meet the current split site criteria of the 2 sites being at least 0.5m apart but the school does operate on 2 distinct sites separated by a road. It is proposed to amend the split site factor criteria to remove the distance limit and to increase the allocation from £25k to £55k for each additional site.

Recommendation: Schools Forum is asked to note and agree:

- the formula factors and unit rates detailed in Appendix B which will be submitted to the DfE by their prescribed deadline of 21st January 2016
- to note and agree the variation to the split site criteria for primary schools and an increase in the rate for additional sites

4.3 Schools Formula Budget Shares

The application of the formula factors in Appendix B and the revised data set issued by the DfE in December produce the schools formula budget shares as set out in Appendix C. These budgets include MFG allocations, where applicable, and the impact of the funding cap for schools who gain more than 3%. It should be noted that these figures exclude any allocations from the Early Years or High Needs Blocks

4.4 Budget Gap

As shown in Appendix A there remains a budget gap of approximately £3m. As noted above High Needs pressures of £1.456m based on current placements have been included in the draft budget shown in Appendix A. As pressures are continuing to rise and the demand in this area is quite volatile it is also considered prudent to build in a further contingency of £500k or more if resources allow when the budget is finalised and reported back to March Schools Forum.

At the December Schools Forum options for closing the budget gap were detailed in the budget report. These options included reducing formula funding and reducing central budgets. It is not anticipated that there will be any DSG reserves available to contribute to the 2016/17 budget position. As the school's formula allocations need to be submitted to the DfE by 21st January 2016, it is essential that a decision regarding closure of the budget gap is reached at this meeting as any change to unit rates will have to be included in this submission to the DfE and there will then be no scope to make changes at a later date.

Following discussion of the next item on the agenda, the Forum will need to consider the options for closing the budget gap to ensure a balanced budget is delivered.

Options to close the gap were detailed in the report to the December 15 meeting and are as follows

- Reduce Schools Formula Funding
- Reduce Centrally Retained Budgets (Schools and Early Years Block)
- Reduce Centrally Retained Budgets (High Needs Block)

From previous discussions a reduction in the AWPU was felt to be the fairest way of allocating a saving across schools. As a rough guide a reduction in the AWPU of £25 produces a saving of £1.070m but due to a high number of schools now on the Minimum Funding Guarantee this is reduced to £0.340m.

Details of possible reductions in the centrally retained budgets are noted in paragraph 5 below and are detailed for discussion in the next agenda item.

5.0 Central Services funded from the DSG

5.1 Centrally Retained Services – (Schools Block & Early Years Block)

Centrally held services funded from the schools block and early years block have to be agreed annually by Schools Forum. Following discussions with headteachers and the Education Resources Group a number of savings have already been proposed for some of these budgets as detailed in spreadsheet circulated for discussion and agreement in the next agenda item.

5.2 Centrally Retained Services – High Needs Block

Schools Forum is asked to make recommendations regarding savings to the centrally retained services in the high needs block in order to achieve a balanced budget position.

5.3 De-delegated Services

Under the Schools and Early Years 2012 regulations certain services can be provided centrally if the Schools Forum, on behalf of the maintained schools in a phase, gives agreement to the de-delegation of part of their budget to fund the service. This approval for de-delegation is required on an annual basis. It should be noted that academies are not required to agree to this process, but may buy back services from the Local Authority from their allocated budget share.

The Table of De-delegated Services below has been prepared on the same basis as previous years

Table 3: De-delegated Services 2016-17

Budget	Sector	Total Budget	Allocation per pupil / FSM *
		£	£
Licenses & Subs - CLEAPPS	Prim & Sec	6,000	0.12
Free School Meals Eligibility	Prim & Sec	59,909	6.40
Maternity	Prim	273,146	8.54
	Sec	86,162	4.78
Staff Advertising	Prim & Sec	15,003	0.30
Primary Pool	Primary	18,231	0.57
Union Duties	Prim & Sec	143,528	2.87
Public Duties	Prim & Sec	2,000	0.04
Library & Museum Services	Prim	22,389	0.70
Long Service Awards	Prim & Sec	5,501	0.11

Budgets would be delegated on a per pupil basis with the exception of the Free School Meal Eligibility assessment budget which will be allocated on FSM eligibility. The maximum level of de-delegation per pupil is £14.62 per pupil secondary and £19.65 per pupil primary which is low compared to other local authorities.

It is proposed that with effect from 2016/17, the Licences and Subscriptions funding is now held centrally for all licences apart from CLEAPPS (Consortium of Local Education Authority for Provision of Science Services). The DfE now arranges the majority of licence cover for schools and academies centrally and the DSG is top sliced for the cost of this cover. As we have no control over this arrangement it would seem reasonable that this funding is retained centrally. CLEAPPS is still arranged locally and the table details the expected cost.

For 2016/17 there are various options in relation to de-delegated services:

- Option 1** – Continue to delegate this funding and operate these services on a de-delegated basis
- Option 2** – Delegate this funding to schools and offer services on an SLA basis where this is appropriate
- Option 3** – Delegate funding to schools with no de-delegation/SLA

Funding for Practical Learning Options is currently delegated to schools at a rate of £6.52 per pupil, within the AWPU allocation. This has previously been subject to a pooled arrangement but can now be treated in line with one of the 3 options detailed above.

6.0 Other Schools Funding

6.1 Pupil Premium

The DfE have confirmed that the rates for 2016/17 will remain at 2015/16 levels. i.e. £1,320 for primary 'FSM Ever 6', £935 for secondary 'FSM Ever 6', £1,900 for Looked After Children and children adopted from care and £300 for the children of service personnel. The year 7 catch-up premium will continue in 2016/17 and the rate will be confirmed early in 2016. Summer school funding for secondary schools will not continue in 2016.

The latest Pupil Premium allocation for 2015/16 totals £19.239m but this is expected to reduce in 2016/17 due to reductions in FSM eligibility.

6.2 Sixth Form Funding

The Spending Review settlement resulted in protected 16-19 funding for 2016/17 and the base rate maintained at £4,000 for full time students aged 16-17 years (£3,300 for 18 year olds).

School sixth forms will receive their 2016/17 indicative allocations (funding factors, lagged student numbers (including where relevant 16-25 high needs places), comparison with 2015/16 equivalent by the end of January 2016. This indicative allocation will be sent directly to schools and will appear on the 'EFA Info Exchange' portal. Similarly to last year the Education Funding Agency (EFA) will set a deadline in April to receive business cases where exceptional circumstances have effected their 2016/17 indicative allocation.

Considerations will be given to:

- Cases affecting lagged student numbers, 5% of students or a minimum of 50 students, whichever is lower
- Full time/part time split and other funding factors - overall impact of 5% on total funding or £250,000, whichever is lower, and
- other cases not covered above, reviewed individually

Formula Protection Funding (FPF) introduced in 2013/14 to protect funding per learner reductions (resulting from the introduction of funding per student calculation) will be phased out over the next 6 academic years (final year of FPF will be 2020/2021). EFA will detail mechanism for phasing out FPF on their website by end of January 2016.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO. 16**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 20 January 2016

REPORT OF:Interim Director of Children's Services and
Interim Chief Education Officer

Contact officer name and email:

Sangeeta Brown

Sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

Item: 4b

Subject:**Scheme for Financing – 2016/17: Revision****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The DfE have recently published revisions to the regulations governing the arrangements for the Scheme for Financing and also the revisions identified as part of changes to the local arrangements. This report provides information on the revisions and seeks the Schools Forum approval to amending the local scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Forum is asked to consider and approve the required revisions to the Scheme for Financing.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Local Authority is required to agree and publish annually a Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools. The Scheme aims to cover the financial relationship between maintained schools and the Local Authority.
- 3.2 This report informs Members of any proposed amendments to the Scheme for 2016/17.

4. UPDATES

- 4.1 The Schools Budget 2016/17 update report (elsewhere on the agenda) includes a change to the arrangements for funding primary schools on a split site. If this proposal is agreed then this change will need to be included in the Scheme for Financing.
- 4.2 The EU thresholds for tendering have been revised and the new thresholds are as follows:

- Services £164,176
- Supplies £164,176
- Works £4,104,394

Schools were advised of this change but this report seeks formal approval from the Forum to amend the Scheme to reflect this change.

- 4.3 The DfE recently published revisions to the regulations governing the arrangements for admission appeals. Currently, the Local Authority is the statutory admission authority for community schools and therefore the cost of the appeals has been met from the DSG. For other types of maintained schools, the Governing Bodies are the admission authority and they have been charged for the cost of admission appeals.

It is proposed that the Local Authority service encompasses the admission appeals for all maintained schools and, in line with the regulations, the Scheme for Financing is amended to include the following: *Costs incurred by the authority in administering admissions appeals, where the local authority is the admissions authority and the funding for admission appeals has been delegated to all schools as part of their formula allocation.*

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 – REPORT NO. 18**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 20 January 2016

REPORT OF:

Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer: Sangeeta Brown

E-mail: sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk**Recommendation**

To note the workplan.

Agenda – Part:	5
Subject: Schools Forum: Workplan	
Wards: All	

<u>Meetings</u>		<u>Officer</u>
January 2015	Schools Budget: 2015/16: Update SEN - Autism & ARP Update SEND Reforms - Update	JF JT JT
March 2015	School Budget 2015/16: Update Enfield Traded Services to Schools Scheme for Financing	JF SB SB
July 2015	Schools Budget – Update (2015/16) School Funding Review (2015/16) Funding Arrangements (2016/17) SEND & High Needs – Update Support for Schools in Financial Difficulties	JF SB SB JT/JC SB
October 2015	Schools Budget: 2016/17: Update Outturn Report 2014/15 Schools Balances 2014/15	JF JF SB
December 2015	Schools Budget: 2016/17: Update, Inc. De-delegation Central Budgets: Annual Report Local Authority Budget (2016/17)	JF JT ES
January 2016	Schools Budget: 2016/17: Update Scheme for Financing Central Budgets: Annual Report	JF SB JT
March 2016	School Budget 2016/17: Update Enfield Traded Services to Schools Pupil Places strategy High Needs - Update Universal Infant FSM	JF SB MT JT SB

Dates of Meetings

Date	Time	Venue	Comment
08 July 2015	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Enfield County School	
14 October 2015	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community School	
09 December 2015	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community School	
20 January 2016	5:30 - 7:30 PM	Chace Community School	
02 March 2016	5:30 - 7:30 PM		

This page is intentionally left blank