

**THE SOUTHWARK SCHOOLS FORUM
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Thursday 13th December 2012**

- 1. Attendance and Apologies**

See Annex A. Georgie McCall substituted for Sharon Donno as the Nursery School representative. Irene Bishop substituted for Sister Anne-Marie Niblock as the maintained secondary school representative Keith Fox, Vice Chair, took the chair for the meeting.
- 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. Lynn Charlton, Irene Bishop, Keith Fox and Jacqui Louis, declared their interests as Headteacher Executive members. Betty Joseph, as the Trade Union rep, declared her interest in Item 4a on the agenda, Yomi Adewoye for the item on Pupil Referral Units, Lynn Charlton for the item relating to the Education Business Alliance.
- 3. Minutes of the Meeting of 18th October 2012**

These were agreed as a true record.
- 4. Voting Procedures**

The information paper previously circulated by the Clerk was noted.
- 5. Funding for Reimbursement of Trade Union Activities**
 - 5.1 A report by Melissa Williamson with Human Resources input by Gillian Walsh had been previously circulated. This issue been discussed at previous meetings of the Schools Forum and now the LA was setting out three options that it could take and was seeking the Schools Forum views on each.
 - 5.2 The three options all required the funding to be delegated to schools but then schools, either directly through their own actions, or through their Schools Forum representatives could opt for one of the following considered were:
 - Option1: Schools employing trade union reps would have to recharge other schools.
 - Option 2: The LA to operate a voluntary subscription service that all schools and academies would be asked to contribute to.
 - Option 3: The LA to formally request “de-delegation” for the Schools Forum to agree and ask academies to contribute to the budget to fund these activities
 - 5.3 Gillian Walsh said that most LAs budget was lower than Southwark’s of £132k and Melissa Williamson confirmed that her survey of other LAs showed that the majority were seeking de-delegation with some form of Option 3.

- 5.4 Mickey Kelly asked why the NAHT representative was not funded. Gillian Walsh confirmed that they had insufficient members to attract central support. Also Gillian confirmed that the trade union representatives for support staff were part of the Council's overall support for non-teaching staff. Betty Joseph explained that trade union representatives are specifically trained to deal with employment and re-organisation issues.
- 5.5 Keith Fox noted the unfairness of the present system which was to a greater extent being addressed by Option 3 where maintained primary and secondary schools would return the delegated funding and academies would either subscribe or make their own provision. Mickey Kelly thought that Option 3 is the least burdensome to maintained schools and allows academies to buy in to the service.
- 5.6 Fay Hammond thanked the Schools Forum for their views and the LA will bring back a formal proposal to the next meeting which will reflect the comments and deal with the need for demarcation between a trade union representative's duties for their employer and those for maintained schools in the event that an academy did not wish to enter into a traded agreement.

6. School Funding Reform – Early Years Overview

- 6.1 A report setting out the new funding regime for early years through the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), with its impact and issues, and the first draft budget for the Schools Forum to comment on, had been distributed with the agenda. Fay Hammond believed that this level of detail at an early stage will lead to a better understanding by the Schools Forum at budget setting time in January 2013.
- 6.2 Merrill Haeusler confirmed that there had been a working group involving Headteachers aiming to develop the options and outcomes of the funding covering nursery schools, nursery classes, the central early years contingency and Free Entitlement to Early Education (FEEE) to private, voluntary and independent providers, including academies. There were also monies for central budgets including the EY Consultants Team and the Early Help model.
- 6.3 The key issues included:
- a) the funding to the LA would be based on actual pupil numbers with adjustments in year and so led to an element of uncertainty at budget setting time.
 - b) the LA will no longer get the extra funding for being below the 90% floor for 3 year participation (worth £2.9m)
 - c) the need to fund the summer term 2013 costs of full time places which will cease at the end of the 2012/13 academic year.
 - d) the hourly rate to the PVI providers was below the average for Southwark's neighbouring LAs and it is advisable, subject to budgetary pressures, to increase this by 6.2% to bring it up from £3.86p per hour to £4.10 per hour.
- 6.4 Georgie McCall confirmed that the maintained nursery school Headteachers were still working with the LA on what is a quite a complex series of changes for nursery schools. Mickey Kelly said there was a need to "level" the funding to providers so they can all provide professional staff and that parents were still looking for full time provision and asked if there is equity in the

admissions process? Merrill Haeusler confirmed that there were still a number of full time places for vulnerable children. Gillian Reeve said that the PVI sector were used to constantly adjusting their numbers to make ends meet and that in certain areas not many parents could afford the higher rates.

- 6.5 The Schools Forum noted the issues and agreed that, subject to budget pressures, the hourly rates for PVI providers should be increased by 6.2%.
- 6.6 Early Years Centres Funding – noted that the budget will remain the same pending a staffing review and assessing the impact of the new offer for 2 year-olds.
- 6.7 Community Nurseries – it was noted that the reduction of their subsidy will continue and be completely withdrawn in 2015-16.
- 6.8 Central Expenditure – the proposal to maintain the budget level was noted but those members of the Schools Forum not directly involved in the primary “Early Years Help” model thought its detail should be made available.
- 6.9 The Schools Forum noted that the LA had applied the agreed funding principles to the nursery class and maintained nursery schools elements of the early years budget.
- 6.10 There are elements of the budgets treated as “Exceptions” under the schools funding reforms that relate to the Early Years Block, that the Schools Forum will review under Item 7b later on the agenda.
- 6.11 Finally, the Schools Forum noted the proposal to continue to provide up to 100 full-time places to support the most vulnerable 3 and 4 year-old pupils.

7. Early Years Block – Funding for Two year-olds

- 7.1 A paper had been circulated that outlined the government’s proposals to provide in September 2013, fifteen hours of free entitlement to free nursery education for 20% of the country’s most disadvantaged two year old children. This will be extended in September 2014 to 40%.
- 7.2 The government funding provided permitted statutory places from September 2013 but also £1.768m for “trajectory building” to enable some places to be provided before September 2013 and also some extra place in advance of widening the criteria in September 2014. There is also capital funding of £1.174m.
- 7.3 The revenue funding is based on an hourly rate of £6.07. The LA is proposing to pay £6.00 an hour, retaining the balance to build a budget to fund placements for two year-olds with special educational needs. Although from the government pilot programme the hourly rate may not be sufficient to attract providers to meet the anticipated demand.
- 7.4 Gillian Reeve was concerned that 2 year olds should only be placed in appropriate settings and there are issues over how lunch times are classified. Additionally, parents will see some children getting a “free place” whilst others have to pay.

- 7.5 The Schools Forum agreed the LA recommendation that the hourly rate should be £6 and that the balance of the notional funding should be retained for additional SEN support. The other government conditions of the funding were also noted.

8. Early Years Block – Nursery Classes and Nursery Schools Formula Funding

- 8.1 This report gave the Schools Forum an update on the progress of revisions required to the funding formula as a result of the government's new funding reforms.
- 8.2 It was noted that, following the consultation with schools, and with no comments received back from schools on the funding of early years in primary schools, the LA was proposing to proceed with the funding as modelled in the consultation document.
- 8.3 However, with regards to maintained nursery schools, this was proving more complex, especially the impact of having one lump sum rate for all schools and the impact of the changes to there being a reduction in the number of formula funded full time nursery places. Work was ongoing.
- 8.4 The Schools Forum noted the report and it will receive formal proposals at its January 2013 meeting.

9. High Needs Block – Overview of Changes

- 9.1 This previously circulated report set out the impact of the School Funding reforms for Special Educational Needs (SEN) High Needs Funding from April 2013.
- 9.2 Fay Hammond explained that there was no growth in funding by the DfE, that the financial risk for post 16 SEN was being transferred from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) to Local Authorities (LAs), and this was extremely complex with the accuracy of some data being provided relating to 2011 being questionable. The annex to the report set out a matrix of the funding to the different types of providers both pre and post reforms.
- 9.3 There were also major changes to hospital school funding that will move from LAs to the EFA and that inter-authority recoupment will cease. Providers will deal direct with the LA that places the pupil in their provision (the Commissioner). Also units in mainstream schools will be treated exactly the same as special schools i.e. on a "place plus top up" basis with no funds being provided through the new schools block funding formula.
- 9.4 Following a question from Keith Fox it was confirmed that the LA will have responsibility for SEN and Learning and Language Difficulties (LLD) for those aged 16 to 25. The report provided, in detail, the risks and detail of each change.
- 9.5 There were, however, a number of proposals that had already being discussed at previous Schools Forum meetings relating to the planned growth of provision in the borough's special schools. These related to Spa, Haymerle and Tuke. Irene Bishop noted that these had been planned back in 2010. The

Schools Forum agreed that the financial commitment to this growth needs to be met.

- 9.6 The Schools Forum then reviewed the centrally held SEN budgets, in particular the funding for Speech and Language Therapy (SALT). The funding for this was being cut as there is a government reduction in the Early Intervention Grant (EIG) of 27%. The LA would like this to be replaced by an increase from £48k to £100k in the funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Irene Bishop sought clarification as secondary schools already paid for this support. Merrill Haeusler confirmed that it replaces what Health paid for and relates to special schools. This increase was supported by the Schools Forum.
- 9.7 The LA reported that the demand for placements in independent special schools was increasing and a zero base budget review was under way. The Schools Forum noted that this budget may need to be increased depending on demand.
- 9.8 The Schools Forum noted the overall complexity and also that, according to Annex A, the LA will need to build up its support to the administration for this area especially as there is a reduction in Further Education provision as a result of changes to Lewisham and Southwark Colleges.

10. High Needs Block – Pupil Referral Units

- 10.1 The report previously circulated set out the LAs proposals under the government's funding reforms for funding Pupil Referral Units as from April 2013. It was pointed out that this paper only related to secondary PRU, known as the Southwark Inclusive Learning Service (SILS) and did not cover the primary provision (Summerhouse).
- 10.2 The funding reforms requires that all PRUs are to have a delegated budget with the relationship between the LA and the PRUs moving to a Commissioner and Provider rather than the LA having direct management responsibilities. SILS currently consists of provision for KS3 and KS4, the Young Parents Education Centre and SILS 6 which is traded service for sixth day and beyond provision for fixed term exclusions.
- 10.3 It was noted that academies do not receive a share of the PRUs budget as this is a statutory LA responsibility but they are charged the same price for services as maintained schools. A budget review has taken place and the current budget should in fact be less under the new system by perhaps up to £0.5m which can be distributed to secondary schools and secondary academies through the funding formula. However, this new system will also require the PRU to charge for services.
- 10.4 Irene Bishop stated that SILS was providing a valuable service to young people and schools but if the price charged was too high it would lead to more permanent exclusions by schools. The Schools Forum looked at perhaps a flat rate plus an amount per pupil as a charge to schools and academies.
- 10.5 The Schools Forum noted the report but deferred any further comment until the Local Authority had discussed the proposals further with Headteachers of

secondary schools and academies through SASH (Southwark's local association).

11. High Needs – Funding of Pupils with SEN Statements in Mainstream Schools

11.1 This report stated that there would be no changes to the current Southwark model as a result of the School Funding reform. This was noted.

12. High Needs – Funding of SEN Units in Mainstream Schools

12.1 This report sets out the required change to a “place plus” system whereby the school receives £10k for each commissioned place and a top up based on the pupils actually attending the Unit. Further there will be no lump sum, nor will the school receive any funding via the formula factors for any pupil attending the UNIT (e.g. AWPU, deprivation, etc).

12.2 The LA said that it will be meeting with the Headteachers of those schools with Units in the new year. Mickey Kelly said that there was need for more units in schools. Simon Eccles noted that there were no units in secondary schools and academies.

12.3 The report was noted.

13. Schools Block – Overview

13.1 The report previously circulated gave details of the value of the DfE re-calculated per pupil unit for 2013-14 which gives the LA less per pupil than the previous methodology, namely £6,123 compared to £7,244. In addition Local Authority Central Services Expenditure Grant (LACSEG) will disappear and all funds are automatically delegated to all schools.

13.2 The LA has determined that the budget for Bulge/Temporary Expansion Classes as discussed at the October meeting can now be reduced to £702k. This was agreed by the Schools Forum.

13.3 The report was noted.

14. Schools Block – Delegated Exceptions

14.1 This report previously circulated, sets out the proposals regarding certain central budgets that can, with agreement of the Schools Forum, be retained centrally in 2013-14. The Schools Forum had received detailed papers in July 2012 and scrutinised each in turn.

14.2 Headteachers Executive – Lynn Charlton pointed out that this budget had been reduced in 2013-14, Irene Bishop said that it helped with the LAs communications with schools and Keith Fox said that it was his school that employed the School Business Manager that supported the activity.

14.3 The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA's proposal: In favour 8, Against 0, Abstention 1

- 14.4 Southwark Cathedral Education Centre – it was noted that it is only a small budget – the resource being diocesan wide and provided for 9,000 pupils of which, however, only 28% were from Southwark schools. It was also noted that it was not restricted to the Church of England.
- 14.5 The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted on option 1 as whether to support the proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 1, Against 0, Abstention 9.
- 14.6 The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted on option 2 as whether to support the proposal to top slice from all schools at a reduced budget level: In favour 5, Against 0, Abstention 4.
- 14.7 The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted on option 3 as whether to support the proposal to delegate the budget to all schools: In favour 0, Against 8, Abstention 2.
- 14.8 The Schools Forum did support providing funds but at a reduced level in line with the number of Southwark pupils, perhaps at a level of £10k.
- 14.9 Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) – a statutory responsibility. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 8, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.10 Critical Incident Support – a service to support schools with incidents such as the death of a pupil. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 8, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.11 Schools Audit – a programme for all maintained schools. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 9, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.12 Health & Safety – a service providing strategic advice. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 9, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.13 Intervention Fund – used to support schools of concern with school improvement support. This budget had been reduced from £450k to £300k. Following a question from Keith Fox, Merrill Haeusler confirmed that this does not duplicate any government funding for such schools and that if an underspend it then goes back into the DSG pot.
- 14.14 The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 9, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.15 Education Business Alliance (EBA) – Lynn Charlton declared an interest in that she was the primary Headteacher representative on their management board and praised the work they were doing. However, a lot of the work of the

EBA is with secondary schools, often relating to work experience (which is changing) and seeking business representatives to engage with the students.

- 14.16 The Schools Forum felt that it would be useful for the LA to explore the options proposed directly with the representatives of the secondary schools through SASH so as to better inform the Schools Forum of what the secondary phase felt was their preference.
- 14.17 Co-ordinated Admissions Scheme – relating to the LA’s statutory functions. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 8, Against 0, Abstention 0.
- 14.18 Servicing of the Schools Forum – LA to review further and bring back.
- 14.19 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) – contributes to the costs of the capital programme team and other professional costs. The school/academy and PVI representatives then voted as whether to support the LA proposal to top slice from all schools at the current budget level: In favour 8, Against 0, Abstention 0.

15. Entitlement to Free School Meals

- 15.1 This had been discussed at the previous Schools Forum where concern had been raised on how schools that were part of Southwark’s primary schools free healthy meals programme were having problems on getting accurate data as to parental eligibility for statutory free school meals.
- 15.2 Kerry Crichlow reported that on a close scrutiny of school’s October Pupil Census Data and discussing the problem with the DfE, it was clear that certain schools were overstating the numbers eligible for free school meals as per the statutory rules. Also, because the DfE and the LA uses data covering a six year period (Ever 6) for social deprivation purposes, those schools who have been overstating the numbers would attract more than their relevant share of Pupil Premium as well as social deprivation funding in the new Funding Formula.
- 15.3 The relevant schools have been contacted and a review of their data is underway which is to be completed in January. A possible outcome is that the LA has to use the October 2012 census data, as "cleaned" by this review, for free school eligibility funding, rather than the “Ever 6” referred to above.
- 15.4 The Schools Forum will be kept informed, if necessary, by email.

16. Minimum Funding Guarantee – A Request for an Exception

- 16.1 A report circulated set out the LA’s need to make a request to the DfE so that an exception can be granted to exclude certain funding that some schools received in 2012-13 from being built into the Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2013-14. If this was not granted, then those schools would receive protection, when now not relevant, for one off funding relating to: bulge classes; after school club transition funding and funds for regeneration that they no longer should get.

16.2 The Schools Forum unanimously agreed this request.

17. Dates of Next Meetings

15.1 These were noted.

The meeting closed at 6.15pm.

Annex A

SCHOOLS FORUM ATTENDANCE SHEET

13th December 2012

VOTING MEMBERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PRESENT
Lynn Charlton	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Craig Voller	Primary School Headteacher	Apologies
Keith Fox	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Jacqui Louis	Primary School Headteacher	Yes
Elaine Garlick	Primary School Governor	Yes
Canon Grahame Shaw	Primary School Governor	Yes
Sharon Donno	Nursery School Headteacher	Apologies - substitute Georgie McCall
Simon Eccles	Special School Headteacher	Yes
Gillian Reeve	Early Years – Private/Voluntary and Independent Settings	Yes
David Sheppard	Academy	Apologies
Mickey Kelly	Academy	Yes
Mike Antoniou	Academy	Apologies
Yomi Adewoye	Pupil Referral Units	Yes
Sister Anne-Marie Niblock	Secondary School Headteacher	Apologies
Dr Irene Bishop	Diocese Board	Substitute for Sister Anne-Marie as secondary school representative
Betty Joseph	Trade Unions	Yes

Senior Officers in Attendance

Kerry Crichlow	Assistant Director - Yes
Fay Hammond	Head of Children's Services Finance - Yes
Merril Haeusler	Deputy Director - Yes
Jim Eshelby	Assistant Director - Yes
David Cross	Clerk