

<p style="text-align: center;">THE SOUTHWARK SCHOOLS FORUM MINUTES OF THE MEETING Thursday 16th October 2014</p>
--

-
1. **Attendance and Apologies**
See Annex A. Michael Davern substituted for Betty Joseph.
 2. **Declaration of Interests**
Members were asked to declare any pecuniary or other interests they might have that were greater than the interests of other members of the Forum in any matter on the agenda for discussion. There were none.
 3. **Election of Chair**
The Clerk called for nominations, Sister Anne-Marie Niblock was proposed. There being no other nominations, Sister Anne-Marie was elected as Chair for the 2014/15 academic year.
 4. **Election of Vice Chair**
The Chair called for nominations. Keith Fox was proposed. There being no other nominations, Keith Fox was elected as Vice Chair for the 2014/15 academic year.
 5. **Minutes of the Meeting of 10th July 2014**
These were agreed as a true record.
 6. **Matters Arising from the Minutes of 10th July 2014**
Melissa Williamson inform the Schools Forum that the Local Authority was not now proposing to hold back centrally any of the funding for Looked After Children from the grant for Pupil Premium. This was welcomed.
 7. **Dedicated Schools Grant 2015-16**
 - 7.1 This report, previously circulated, provided details of the key changes to the funding arrangements for 2015-16 and the potential changes for 2016-17 with the associated risks to Southwark's schools.
 - 7.2 A key point is that the government is not proposing to introduce a national funding formula in 2015-16, as a high funded Local Authority (LA) any changes both in the Schools Block and the Early Years Block, without adequate protection, would be detrimental to schools in Southwark.
 - 7.3 The previous non-recoupment academies will be converted to recoupment academies and therefore be included in the LA school funding formula and the Dedicated Schools Grant. The overall LA approach to budget setting in 2015-16 will be a prudent one with the priority to protect the overall funding levels for schools.

The report was noted.

8. Dedicated Schools Pupil Grant Growth Fund Budget 2015-16

8.1 A report setting out a summary of the arrangements for funding roll expansion in schools in 2015-16 had been circulated.

8.2 Melissa Williamson explained that the government is switching the funding of growth in pupil numbers for Free Schools and non-recoupment academies from central EFA funding to that from each Local Authorities Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) – the detail of which is still being determined by the EFA.

The various appendices to the report gave the names of the current academies and free schools in the borough, estimated costs of expanding a form of entry in a primary and secondary academy, the EFA funding flow chart and the current funding source.

8.3 These changes bring with them financial risks including that in Southwark there are a lot of non-recoupment academies with a potential full year impact in the region of £4m and that the cost is expected to be ongoing – year on year as the expansion works its way through to the next year's census.

8.4 The Growth Fund itself agreed to by the Schools Forum in 2013 and it is proposed to continue this fund by top slicing the DSG in 2014-15 by £700k which is equivalent to an extra 13.5 forms of entry.

8.5 The Schools Forum was also asked to note that Southwark is not proposing, although it may do so, to create a further fund by top slicing the DSG to resource "good" schools that may be experiencing falling rolls where local planning data shows that the surplus places will actually be needed in future.

8.6 Following a question it was confirmed that the Criteria is now being expanded to include secondary school places in anticipation of the growth currently being experienced in primary schools feeding through to secondary schools. Also, it is a LA decision regarding where the growth takes place in line with its strategic planning i.e. "commissions" places.

8.7 Craig Voller asked about the evidence base for the need of 13.5 forms of entry, Kerry Crichlow said that the LA carries out demographic analysis including cross London. The funding is ring fenced, with the outturn presented to the Schools Forum and any underspend goes back into the next year's DSG. Details of the Scheme are set out in Appendix B to the report.

The Chair then asked members to vote on whether they agreed to the top slicing of the DGS by £700k for the Growth Fund:

In Favour 9, Against 0, Abstentions 2

The remainder of the report was noted.

9. Dedicated Schools Grant 2015-16 Centrally Retained Budgets

9.1 The previously circulated report set out the proposals to centrally retain budgets from the DSG Schools Block and were based on the same approach as in previous years.

- 9.2 Craig Voller was concerned that when added together the De-delegated and Centrally Retained amounted to £5m that was not going to schools directly. It was explained that the de-delegated budgets related to spend in and on schools and the detail was set out in Appendix B. The Centrally retained budgets (Appendix C) related to the LAs statutory responsibilities.
- 9.3 Keith Fox said that a number of Headteachers were concerned over the exact detail of the policy in funding maternity cover in schools and how it was applied when Headteachers themselves required maternity cover. The LA agreed to circulate the existing policy to the Schools Forum with any comments on its application.
- 9.4 Sarah Alexander asked about Summerhouse which they thought greatly assisted with keeping permanent exclusion levels down in the borough. Pauline Armour confirmed that the LA strategies, supported by the schools, had meant that the level had been at zero for some years.
- 9.5 Elaine Garlick said that although the Schools Forum gets a financial Outturn Report each year it would be good to see exactly what the impact is of the actual spend. Sarah Alexander added that it would be useful to get an in-year picture as well.
- 9.6 Detail of the budgets was examined by members – it was noted that LGfL was piloting a website for schools to check eligibility for free school meals that would mean the service by the LA may not be needed. The amount for licences was in fact a re-charge by the DFE for those they had negotiated.
- 9.7 Michael Davern pointed out that the existing funding system for Trade Union Facility Time cover support is needed and has to be “purchased” direct. Steve Morrison pointed out that the Table under section E omitted to show that there was a NUT rep at Kingsdale.
- 9.8 The Clerk then confirmed the voting arrangements in that representatives of maintained primary schools could only vote on the funding decisions for their constituencies and the secondary school representative for maintained secondary schools.

The voting was as follows:

De-delegation – Maintained Primary Schools

Contingency:	In Favour 4, Against 1, Abstention 1
Behaviour Support Services:	In Favour 5, Against 0, Abstention 1
Free School Meals Eligibility:	In Favour 4, Against 1, Abstention 1
Licences/subscriptions:	In Favour 4, Against 0, Abstention 2
Staff Costs Maternity:	In Favour 5, Against 0, Abstention 1
Staff Costs Trade Union:	In Favour 3, Against 1, Abstention 2

De-delegation – Maintained Secondary Schools

Contingency:	In Favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 0
Behaviour Support Services:	In Favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 0
Licences/subscriptions:	In Favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 0
Staff Costs Maternity:	In Favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 0

Staff Costs Trade Union: In Favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 0

- 9.9 The voting on whether to agree to the proposed Centrally Retained Budgets where all schools and academy representatives could vote was then taken.

In Favour 7, Against 0, Abstention 5

10. Dedicated Schools Grant 2015-16 – High Needs Block

- 10.1 The previously circulated report provided an update on the funding arrangements to providers for the LA commissioned places funded from the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 10.2 Melissa Williamson explained that the key change is that funding moves to one based on students in places as at the day of the previous year's census and individualised learner record rather than places commissioned. Any growth needs to be negotiated with the LA.
- 10.3 Pupil Referral Units will be funded on £10,000 per place, an increase of £2,000. However, the top-up funding will be reduced by that amount to compensate. The DfE are considering changes to the Schools Forum membership so as to strengthen the representation of SEN providers.
- 10.4 Rebecca Sherwood referred to the fact that nursery schools could and do take children with complex special needs including autism and had the LA thought about commissioning places in those nurseries. Pauline Armour said that it had been considered previously but turned down by schools – and suggested that the Nursery Headteachers raise it again with the LA's SEN Team.

The report was noted.

11. SEN Mainstream Schools Funding Review

- 11.1 This report, previously circulated, provided an update by the Schools Forum SEN Working Group.
- 11.2 Paul Deeney reported that at the July meeting of the group the Terms of Reference were agreed and in addition to the ready reckoner for use by SENCOs a review of the current SEN banding system was needed.
- 11.3 The September meeting of the working group looked at the national SEN funding arrangements and a first look at a new band system. The group is aiming to brief and consult with schools in January 2015 with a report back to Schools Forum later that month.
- 11.4 Paul Deeney confirmed that under the current banding system the increments between bands can be quite significant. The Chair said that care needs to be taken with the introduction of any change as it may lead to staff redundancies if monies are significantly moved around.
- 11.5 Keith Fox said that at the Headteachers Executive concern was expressed that the Education, Health Care Plans (EHCP) that were replacing Statements of SEN were leaving schools having to pick up the cost of what

was previously paid for by Health. Pauline Armour commented that it was not what she had understood the legislation change was bringing about. If there are specific examples of where this is happening then the LA should be informed so they can be challenged.

The content of the report was noted.

12. Draft Early Years Single Funding Formula Progress Report

- 12.1 This previously circulated report gave an update on the progress the Review Group had made in reviewing the borough's Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) including a draft consultation document.
- 12.2 Gareth Evans, Children's and Adult Services, said that the reviews intentions were:
- A transparent and consistent approach
 - Base rates that reflected the different cost drivers
 - Manage a potential move to a national formula
 - It is affordable
 - That the approach is extendable to 2 year old funding
- 12.3 Craig Voller asked for details of what exactly the different PVI providers would consist of, Neil Gordon-Orr said that the smaller ones in the 0 to 50 range are on average 8 or 9 children, perhaps in a Church Hall. Those in the 51 to 100 pupils range are perhaps part of a private nursery chain or the voluntary sector.
- 12.4 A number of members stated that they had trouble in moving to equal funding rates per child when the children are in such diverse provision. For example a nursery school with a qualified Headteacher and qualified teachers, the nursery class in a primary school with again with highly qualified staff including nursery nurses. As, then compared to a small PVI with one member of staff and a few children.
- 12.5 Neil Gordon-Orr stated that high quality provision in all types of providers was important. All providers were providing the Early Years Foundation Stage and were subject to Ofsted inspection framework and it was unfortunate that the PVI representative on the Schools Forum could not attend to give more information on PVIs.
- 12.6 It was noted that the Group itself was concerned about the turbulence that would be caused with its associated potential destabilisation to provision and it would be better to increase funding to the lower funded providers rather than reduce funding to existing providers.
- 12.7 Elaine Garlick asked whether the LA has to use PVI providers, Neil Gordon-Orr said that over 1,000 children were in the PVI sector and they were an essential part of the service. The LA was asked whether nursery schools could get an additional payment, Fay Hammond said that they already received a lump sum of £200k, which supported the sustainability of nursery school providers; the PVI sector do not receive this.

- 12.8 The LA would consult all providers, and the Schools Forum said that it should be open to all schools not just early years providers.
- 12.9 The Chair then summed up the views of the Schools Forum in that there was very clear concern about the impact on the maintained sector provision of the current proposals as set out in the consultation document. It was acknowledged that was more work to be done in the modelling but the Schools Forum could not support the consultation in its present form.
- 12.10 Fay Hammond said that the LA would take away the views of the Schools Forum and review the position.

13. Provisional Formula Factor Data Submission to the DfE for 2015-16

- 13.1 The circulated report set out the provisional formula funding factor rates for 2015-16 that were being submitted to the EFA.
- 13.2 Melissa Williamson said that the provisional rates for each element of the Funding Formula have been set at the same rate as used for 2014-15. The final rates will need to be agreed by the Schools Forum at its January 2015 meeting and will need to reflect:
- October 2014 pupil numbers
 - Other data such as that used for social deprivation
 - The delegated and De-delegated budgets
 - Non-recoupment academies numbers
 - Minimum Funding Guarantee ceiling
 - The actual 2015-16 DSG settlement
- 13.3 The Schools Forum noted that the principles to be applied were those they had previously agreed to.
- 13.4 The Schools Forum noted the report and voted In Favour 6 with 2 abstentions and none against to applying the principles to update the formula with the new data.

14. Any Other Business

- 14.1 The item put forward by the Betty Joseph relating to historical additional funding support and academy conversion could not be taken as she was unable to attend the meeting to speak to make any submission.

15. Dates for Next Meeting

11 th December 2014	29 th January 2015	19 th March 2015
14 th May 2015	9 th July 2015	

There being no further business the meeting closed.

Annex A**SCHOOLS FORUM ATTENDANCE SHEET
16th October 2014****VOTING MEMBERS**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PRESENT
Sarah Alexander	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Craig Voller	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Keith Fox	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Gregory Doey	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Elaine Garlick	Primary School Governor	Yes
Omolayo Sokoya	Primary School Governor	Yes
Rebecca Sherwood	Nursery School Headteacher	Yes
Simon Eccles	Special School Headteacher	Apologies
Paulette Bertram	Early Years – Private/Voluntary and Independent Settings	Apologies
Steve Morrison	Academy	Yes
Mickey Kelly	Academy	No
Mike Antoniou	Academy	Yes
Yomi Adewoye	Pupil Referral Units	Yes
Sister Anne-Marie Niblock	Secondary School Headteacher	Yes
Vacant	FE SEN	
Vacancy	Diocese Board	
Betty Joseph substitute Michael Davern	Trade Unions	Michael Davern attended

Senior Officers in Attendance

Fay Hammond	Children's & Adults Services - Yes
Merril Haeusler	Apologies
Jim Eshelby	Apologies
Pauline Armour	Head of Early Help Services
David Cross	Clerk
Kerry Crichlow	Director Yes