

Schools' Forum Meeting

1 October 2014

Attendees:

Members

Andrew Jordon (AJ) (Academies)
Andy Brown (ABr) (Larger Primary Deprived Schools)
Anne Malcolm (AM) (Secondary Schools)
Emma Espley (EE) (standing in for Penny Barker)
Ian Ness (IN) (standing in for Mark Tilling)
Jan Brough (JB) (Small Deprived Primary with High Mobility)
Julie Deville (JD) (Academies)
Julie Thomas (JT) (standing in for Andy Brown)
Leanne Yates (LY) (standing in for Lynne Pawley)
Mandy Hall (MH) (standing in for Peter Cornforth)
Marian Fairley (MF) (Multi-ethnic Primary Mobility Deprived)
Mark Atkinson (MA) (Governors Primary)
Michael Lee (ML) (Academies)
Sue Sharpe (SS) (Small Primary Schools <249) (Chair)
Suzi Yeniceri (SY) (Early Years PVI)

Local Authority Officers

Christine Lowson (CL) (Administrator)
Dean Jackson (DJ) (Child & Adult Services)
Joanne Smith (JS) (Children's Finance)
Sandra Shears (SSh) (Children's Finance)

Apologies:

Alex Fau-Goodwin (AF) (16 – 19 Provision)
Amanda Baines (ABa) (Diocese)
Danielle Swainston (DS) (Early Years)
John Hardy (JH) (VA Primary Schools)
Lynne Pawley (LP) (Middle Primary 250 – 349)
Mark Tilling (MT) (Secondary Schools)
Mary Frain (standing in for John Hardy)
Penny Barker (PB) (Secondary Schools)
Peter Cornforth (PC) (Larger Primaries > 350)
Peter McMahon (PM) (Student Support Unit)

Agenda Item	Action
<p>1 Minutes of the Last Meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting will be agreed at the meeting of 22 October 2014.</p>	

2	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>There were no matters arising to be discussed.</p>	
3	<p>Schools Funding Formula</p> <p>DJ explained that two models of funding had been provided for schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 which was based on the same formula as the 2014/15 year • Option 2 which had been modelled on how the Government funded Hartlepool's DSG. <p>It was noted that the Government had calculated that the amount of funding that Hartlepool requires to finance the school estate was £1.5m less than in the previous year, however, the Government guaranteed a cash freeze. This £1.5m is included in the 2015/16 financial budget however it was further noted that the £1.5m may not be available in future years.</p> <p>It was also noted that the funding models also include £550,000 from the High Needs funding block.</p> <p>SSh tabled three scenario documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario 1 – Post Minimum Funding Guarantee/Capping – Impact on school funding compared to the baseline funding. • Scenario 2 – Post Minimum Funding Guarantee – Change in cash funding compared to 2014/15. • Scenario 3 – 2015/16 Pre-capping formula compared to 2014/15 funding. <p>In all three scenarios the above options apply.</p> <p>Members of Forum were asked if they were satisfied with the options provided and if they would require any further options to be modelled.</p> <p>Some discussion then took place around the options and scenarios and the following points were noted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If changes were to be applied within Option 2 then schools may as well decide on Option 1 as this option was discussed and agreed last year. • If Option 2 was chosen would there be a transition model created? • SS stated that as the representative for small schools she would have reservations around Option 2. • 98.5% of last year's funding figure is guaranteed for all schools. • The October 2013 census has been used for these calculations • The highest and lowest figures are funding per pupil. • With regard to capping, schools cannot lose more than 1.5% of funding or gain more than 1%. • SSh/JS to e-mail a full scenario explanation to all Headteachers . • Primary representatives are to liaise with colleagues at 8.30am on 7 October prior to the Directors meeting. CL to send out meeting invite. 	<p>Finance</p> <p>CL</p>

	<p>ABr left the meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested that a further model be drawn up based on a midway lump sum figure. This model is to be e-mailed to Forum members.</p> <p>A discussion then took place around identifying schools within the scenarios and it was agreed that schools would remain anonymous until Forum had made a decision on which model to use.</p> <p>It was noted that if funding comes into the Authority based on pupil numbers and then goes out to schools based on the same criteria this would be acceptable however if figures start to change then the conversations previously held around deprivation figures would have to be re-visited.</p> <p>A comment was made stating that it may be advisable to move to the Government recommended figures now as this may have to be accepted in the future.</p>	Finance
4	<p>Space to Learn</p> <p>DJ explained that Space to Learn is currently funded with £235,000 which is top sliced from schools budgets. The current years funding end on 31 March 2015. Forum will need to decide whether or not to continue funding Space to Learn.</p> <p>It was noted that the within the legal contract the building reverts to St Hild's ownership on 31 July 2015.</p> <p>DJ stated that issues to be considered are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will funding continue in its current form? • Will funding continue in a different form? • How much funding will be required? <p>He went on to say that an ideal scenario would be that schools continue to fund for a further 16 month until the end of contract in July 2016. This would allow sufficient time for Space to Learn to be transformed into an ICT unit with ICT support. Alternatively schools could agree to fund for a further four month period to the end of the academic year 2014/15.</p> <p>It was noted that Space to Learn will require a business plan to enable it to be self maintaining for the next two years and it would need to offer more services than it currently does.</p> <p>A question was raised around who would be responsible for redundancies if the building reverted back to St Hild's School.</p> <p>It was noted that schools would require much more detail before any decision on further funding can be agreed. It was further noted that a decision on funding will be required at the Forum meeting to be held on 22 October.</p>	

	<p>DJ reported that an agreement is now in place to go to contract with North Tyneside LA with regard to ICT support. A presentation by North Tyneside is to take place shortly. DJ explained that there is enough funding in the budget to cover this agreement with North Tyneside for this financial year; following this SLAs will need to be put in place.</p> <p>It was noted that significant investment would be required to keep Space to Learn 'current'.</p> <p>It was explained that funding currently top sliced for Space to Learn would be returned to the funding formula if schools decided not to continue funding for Space to Learn however this would not make a vast financial difference to individual schools.</p> <p>It was felt that in general the majority but not all primary schools would like Space to Learn to remain but secondary schools felt that it was no longer required.</p> <p>It was noted that the Forum decision on the funding formula will impact on the decision to support Space to Learn.</p> <p>AJ left the meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that Forum members would continue to consult with colleagues.</p>	
5	<p>Trade Union Facility Time – De-Delegated Funding</p> <p>It was noted that Forum had already decided to continue with de-delegated funding but not in the current form.</p> <p>SY left the meeting.</p> <p>It had been agreed that there would be school based representatives with agreed days of the week that could be used for representation to help Headteacher to manage cover. If an emergency occurred on a non-release day then a national union representative would have to deal with the issue or it would have to wait until an agreed representation day.</p> <p>JD left the meeting</p>	
6	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There was no other business to discuss.</p>	
7	<p>Date and Time of Next Meeting</p> <p>Additional Meeting – Wednesday 8 October 2014, 1.00 – 4.00pm</p>	