

Schools' Forum Meeting

8 September 2015

Attendees:

Members

Chris Hargreaves (CH) (Trade Unions)
 Fr Graeme Buttery (GB) (Primary Governor)
 Julie Thomas (JT) (Mid sized Schools FSM < 50%)
 Mark Tilling (MT) (Secondary Schools)
 Grant Carswell (GC) (Secondary Schools)
 Penny Thompson (PT) (Early Years)
 Sue Sharpe (SS) (Small Primary Schools <211) (Chair)
 Jo Heaton (JHe) (Diocese of Durham)
 Julie Deville (JD) (Academies)
 Alan Chapman (AC) (Academies)
 Andrew Jordon (AJ) (Academies)
 John Hardy (JH) (VA Small Primary Schools)
 Andy Brown (ABr) (Academies)
 Suzi Yeniceri (SY) (Early Years PVI)
 Marian Fairley (MF) (Observing)
 Lynne Pawley (LP) Large Schools FSM >50%)
 Helen O'Brien (HB) large Schools FSM < 50%
 Amanda Baines (AB) (VA large Schools and FSM <50%)
 Sarah Tait (ST) (Academies)

Local Authority Officers

Mark Patton (MP) (Assistant Director Education)
 Sandra Shears (SSh) (Children's Finance)
 Kelly Armstrong (KA) (14-19 Partnership Manager)
 Louise Allen (LA) (SEN Manager)
 Jacqui Braithwaite (JBr) (Principal Educational Psychologist)
 Elliott Stirk (ES) (Senior Accounting & Finance Officer)
 Emma Rutherford (ER) Virtual Head
 Jackie Webb – (JW) Attendance Team

Agenda Item	Action
1 Apologies: no apologies received	
2 Minutes from the last Forum & Matters Arising The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record.	
3 Breakdown of De-delegated Services update SSh spoke to a report outlining the areas to be reviewed by Forum - attendance and inclusions and vulnerable pupils. Forum were asked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To note increase in license fees – proposal to increase the per pupil rate to £5.58 per pupil. • To note the ratio change for attendance to 50:50 from 40:60. • To consult with the schools they represent regarding delegate services for a period of two years and report back with decision at 	

	<p>22 September meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academies to consider agreeing to buyback de-delegated services for two years and report back with decision at 22 September meeting. • To agree centrally retained funding for 2016/17 as detailed in the report. <p>Comments/questions from Forum: JD pointed out that the list of statutory duties is a list of Acts and the non statutory list is a list of what actually happens/is provided and that it would be more helpful for members if the lists were set out in similar terms or an expansion of the statutory duties. JW noted that this information is available on the buyback information that will be sent out to schools.</p> <p>ABr commented that he understood need for stability for the LA but some school budgets are already set or they cannot commit to buy in for more than one year at a time.</p> <p>JD noted that academies need to show best value and this is why buying in more than one year at a time may not be possible and that they require a more bespoke service.</p> <p>SSh noted that some services may no longer be able to be provided by the LA due to the impact of budget instability on staffing levels.</p> <p>JD raised the issue of school meals. MP noted this is due to be discussed at the Director's Meeting with All Headteachers this term.</p> <p>Agreed actions: Forum agreed to go to their schools and feedback views on 22 September.</p>	All
4	<p>Early Years Education</p> <p>PT gave a verbal update to the Government's offer of 30 hours child care which is due to be implemented in 2017/18, although she noted that there has been no further details or guidance issued as yet. PT has registered Hartlepool's interest in being an 'early implementer' and will examine what the early implementer pack consists of. PT plans to working with schools and other providers to scope but pointed out that the amount of funding available is not known yet.</p> <p>PT noted that 90% of children in Hartlepool go to school nursery; she considers that private nurseries should be able to manage the 30 hour offer but there are concerns that some schools may drop nursery sizes in order to be able to provide 30 hours for fewer children.</p> <p>Issues discussed included the difficulty that typical providers (schools and nurseries) have in covering for atypical working hours of some parents (e.g. night shifts etc).</p> <p>School meal provision will also need to be considered for 3 and 4 year</p>	

olds. PT noted that there has been no indication of additional funding for children who have additional needs.

JH asked what the number of working parents is in Hartlepool. PT was able to provide number of eligible children is 566. Eligibility is based on a two parent family working at least 8 hours a week each and single parent working at least 8 hours a week.

LP asked if there would be any funding allocated for building space. PT noted that the Government have not given any information regarding this but schools and nurseries will need to increase provision. JH pointed out that schools cannot just use a nursery for 6 hours a day and that extended hours and weekend working need to be considered (would not mean school staff working but nursery space would need to be used).

5 High Needs Block

SSh spoke to report which outlines the financial pressures on the High Needs Block and the options for addressing this.

The pressures on current funding are:

- Independent school fees
- Per 16 special schools
- Alternative resource provision
- Individual pupil support
- Post 16-15 provision top ups

To manage the projected overspend of £250,000, it is proposed to review autumn and spring top up funding – an increase to the hourly rate but a reduction in weeks which will reduce in year costs by £170,000 and £250,000 in a full year. If weeks are not reduced, the hourly rate would be reduced to £9.00.

Recommendations:

Reps to go back to their groups for consultation and report back to Forum on 22 September regarding:

- 2015/16 proposal for 38 week funding model for the IPS, increasing the hourly rate to £10.74.
- 2016/17 proposal to agree the continuation of the 38 week IPS funding model whilst carrying out a review of all areas of IPS funding. Or agree to reduce the contribution from High Needs to the schools block.

Comments/Questions:

JD commented that it was difficult to consult on this without knowing what the provision will be across the town.

MT stated that his understanding was that if base approached for support, they are duty bound to provide support.

ABr said in relation to historical cases of 1:1 funding, panel may decide

	<p>support is no longer needed which may reduce pressure on budget and asked shouldn't reviews take place before the decision on how to use the funding is taken in order to take this into account. KA pointed out that there are currently 350 children funded in this way and the process to review all of these would be too lengthy to take place before decision. ABa and JD raised the point that schools have termly reviews of these children and should be able to provide information more quickly.</p> <p>AC raised the issue of the amount paid for independent schools fees in Hartlepool and there was general consensus that schools are keen to keep as many Hartlepool children in the town as possible.</p> <p>MF commented that resources need to be focused on primary level as this is where issues are first picked up.</p> <p>AC noted the need for a townwide solution to the gap in provision for high functioning autistic children with challenging behaviour as they don't meet Catcote criteria and have to go to Aycliffe.</p> <p>MT asked how many children funded through panel have had their cases reviewed (he had originally thought this was done on an annual basis), LA said that only those who have been through annual statutory assessment. MT asked if the panel process can be changed or a new mechanism set up in order to speed up process of review.</p> <p>Agreed actions: Timescales to be examined – KA to contact panel members regarding proposals. Forum to go back to groups for response at meeting on 22 September.</p>	<p>KA</p> <p>All</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Outcomes from KS2-4 Behaviour Support Review</p> <p>The review was raised at the last Forum meeting as some schools were not aware of the outcomes. MP will circulate the relevant Children's Services Committee report to Forum members.</p> <p>MP discussed the review which had concluded the need for an increase in PRU places in Hartlepool in the form of 10 KS2 places, 10 KS3 places and 20 KS4 places. There are currently 26 places funded at PRU. The LA will apply to EFA for the required additional places.</p> <p>The steer from schools was that the places in the different key stages should be in separate provision (sites).</p> <p>Funding would be required to cover staffing and consideration is needed as to how staffing can cover the range of curriculum needs and changes in needs across key stages and the different needs of pupils.</p> <p>PRU provision should be seen as a revolving door, not a permanent school place for children and young people and children and young people should be in mainstream provision as soon as possible after their time at PRU.</p>	<p>MP</p>

	<p>The LA is working with the EFA regarding funding. There is a need to quickly identify sites for the places to be provided – models for provision are to be worked up.</p> <p>Schools Forum will be involved in decisions regarding building provision</p> <p>ABa asked why early intervention and KS1 were not included in this review. There was also some confusion around when the review took place and what consultation with headteachers/schools took place. Understanding was that (for some HTs) children would be supported in school rather than separate provision being established.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Schools Formula 2016/17</p> <p>SS spoke to report and noted that funding levels are the same for 16/17 as this year. Two models were provided for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the status quo 2. Reducing deprivation to 12% <p>MP reminded the Forum that their decision needs to be based on what the schools they represent want and that, when LA officers are tasked with working to provide models, for the Forum to consider and make decision based on the work that LA officers have carried out.</p> <p>SS asked Forum how they wanted to discuss the issue of lump sum and deprivation. MT proposed that deprivation factor needed to be discussed first. JT asked about the difference in performance of LAs taking into account funding and deprivation factors.</p> <p>Forum aware that the deprivation figure has reduced in last five years from 22.8% to 15%. AJ suggested that three different models be produced using the deprivation factor. Forum agreed that the lump sum will remain the same in the models that will be worked up.</p> <p>JH asked if the IDACI could be considered (normally use FSM).</p> <p>Forum agreed that models to be worked up for 9%, 12% and 15%, the impact of using FSM and IDACI, keeping all other factors the same. SSh will aim to circulate to Forum on 15 September in order that there be enough time for Forum to consult with their schools so that a decision can be made on 22 September.</p>	<p>SSh</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>SPTCD Awards and Structural Decision</p> <p>RC spoke to the pay and conditions document and asked for the views of the Forum. RC noted that the preference was to keep parity across schools in Hartlepool and gave a summary of nationally set pay ranges and outlined the decisions that Schools Forum need to consider regarding this. All schools need to respond by 11 September and RC will return to the next Forum meeting on 22 September with an update. She noted that pay changes cannot be implemented until schools have decided but any</p>	

	<p>changes would be backdated to September.</p> <p>LP raised potential problems with backdating changes to September regarding decision making after start of pay system being implemented and exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>MF asked about how this will affect grade differentiation, RC explained it would narrow the gap a little but not entirely.</p> <p>SS asked if it would be useful for schools to write out to their schools to remind them to respond and gain idea of intentions. Forum agreed. RC is happy to speak to any schools regarding guidance/advice on this.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p>Capital Sub-Group membership</p> <p>MT requested agreement for changes to membership due to headteachers leaving/being appointed. Reps are needed for the following - headteachers from academies, secondaries and special schools. MT noted that the membership structure may need to be adjusted to reduce number of secondary reps and increase academy reps.</p> <p>AC will discuss with Zoe Westley who to rep special schools. Academies to discuss and decide reps (AJ to co-ordinate response). To be brought back to 22 September meeting.</p>	<p>AC AJ</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Space 2 Learn Update</p> <p>MP asked for Forum's decision but as some reps have not had a response from the schools they represent it was agreed for decision to be made at the next meeting (22 September).</p> <p>Forum reminded that the funding for Space 2 Learn is centrally retained funding and is made up of two elements; £140k per year in total, £90k for S2L and £50k for broadband. MP noted that a decision for continuing to fund for two year was preferred.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Mid term Transfers</p> <p>SSh spoke to report and noted that the protocol had been updated so that the LA would be responsible for arranging transfers between schools and ensuring that the funding follows the child. It was noted that there isn't currently a protocol for mid-term transfers for primary schools.</p> <p>ABr asked if this will cause additional work for the LA to arrange, SSh said that it would mean very little extra work as the LA are already aware of mid-term transfers. PT noted that this method is already used in early years.</p> <p>ABa noted that when a child moves from one Hartlepool school to another after joining the first Hartlepool school from outside the area, the funding doesn't follow the child from outside the area but does need to go from the first Hartlepool school to the second. This means that the first Hartlepool school the child attended misses out on funding and is a cause of instability</p>	

	<p>in budgets. It was also noted that budgets are set on the October census data and pupil premium funding is based on the January census.</p> <p>MT asked if a model could be worked up to show the effect of this based on figures from Autumn 2014 term. SSh to carry this out and circulate this to Forum members for 15 September and to be brought back for decision at 22 September meeting.</p> <p>The Admissions Forum have requested a piece of work from the admission team to examine where moves are happening as there it has been noted that there has been an increase in mobility recently.</p>	SSh
12	<p>Next Forum Meeting in Autumn</p> <p>Tuesday 22 September 2015, 8:30 – 12noon, CETL, Main Hall</p> <p>Wednesday 21 October 2015, 8.30 – 12noon, Borough Hall, Croft Room</p>	
13	<p>Agenda Items for Next Full Forum Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De-delegated Services – forum to report back • High Needs Block - forum to report back • Schools Formula 2016/17 • SPTCD Awards and Structural Decision • Capital sub-group membership • Space 2 Learn decision on continuing funding. • Mid-term transfers, Autumn 2014 model – SSh • Pupil premium and free school meals update - PT 	
14	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>LP raised issues around forms for pupil premium and FSM as she has parents who are struggling to complete these. PT noted that there has been a query from Members regarding whether every child who is entitled to FSM is receiving them; Danielle Swainston (Assistant Director, Children's) has discussed this with John Morton (Assistant Chief Finance Officer) who assured her that this is the case.</p> <p>PT pointed out that pupil premium and FSM entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds are handled by two different sections of the LA and she will raise issues with Carol Purdy in Chief Executive's department and bring back to the next meeting.</p>	PT