

# Schools' Forum Meeting

**21 September 2017**

**Attendees:**

Members

Mark Tilling (MT) (Secondary Schools) (**Chair**)  
 Stephen Hammond (SH) (Academies)  
 Andrew Jordon (AJ) (Academies)  
 Neil Nottingham (NN) (Academies)  
 Jo Heaton (JHe) (Diocese of Durham) John Hardy (JHa) (VA Small Primary Schools)  
 Julie Thomas (JT) (Primary Academy >50%FSM)  
 Lynn Chambers (LC) (Large Schools FSM > 50)  
 Amanda Baines (ABa) (VA Primary Schools Large & Mid FSM<50%)  
 Sue Sharpe (SS) (Large – Deprived – Primary)  
 Penny Thompson (PT) (Early Years)  
 Helen O'Brien (HO) (Large Primary Schools FSM<50%)  
 Zoe Westley (ZW) (Special Schools)  
 Chris Simmons (CS) (Governors)  
 Alan Chapman (AC) (Academies)  
 Kieran Sharp (KS) (Student Support Unit)  
 Tracey Gibson (TG) (Secondary Schools)

Local Authority Officers

Mark Patton (MP) (Assistant Director Education)  
 Louise Allen (LA) (Head of Service SEND)  
 Joanne Smith (JS) (Children's Finance)  
 Rachel Clark (RC) (HR Business Partner)  
 Sandra Shears (SSh) (Children's Finance)  
 Judith Oliver (Administrator)

Observers

Oliver Harness (Secondary School Improvement Advisor)  
 Victoria Robinson, Northern Education Trust  
 Louise Robson, Catcote  
 Emma Straker, Catcote  
 Paul Thompson, Chair of Governors, Springwell

Agenda Item	Action
<b>1. Apologies for absence - Mary Frain</b>	
<b>2. Minutes from last Forum and Matters Arising – 5 July 2017</b>  The minutes of the meeting were approved as a true and accurate record. All actions from the meeting are complete or on the agenda for discussion today.	
<b>3. Facility Time (D)</b>	
3.1 MT provided a background to the item, highlighting that there were some discrepancies between re-charges for facility time by different schools. RC attended meeting with Headteachers on Tuesday and item was brought back to Schools' Forum for further discussion on how to go forward from September 2018.	
3.2 It had been agreed at Schools' Forum previously that facility time would be de-delegated to a central pooled fund, to supply costs for releasing of staff to undertake trade union facilities across Hartlepool, as a shared resource. There are advantages of pooled arrangements and the local authority support pooled arrangements.	
3.3 There was a pool funded arrangement in 2015 whereby the then Head of English Martyrs requested funding for NUT representative to backfill cover for one day a week for one year, upfront, due to the disruption to teaching and the	

curriculum. This request was approved by Schools' Forum and continued for two years.

- 3.4 RC noted that there was a difference last year in the way the supply for cover costs was managed, and school have arranged the timetabled teaching week / curriculum so not to disrupt the teaching of young people, and also provide NUT representative facility without the need to provide backfill cover. The Local Authority always understood there was actual supply cover arrangements in place for one day a week.

This is now a grey area as to the framework what Schools' Forum agreed to previously.

- 3.5 There are also arrangements with:

- St Hild's for ATL representation, where adhoc release arrangements were negotiated as this union has smaller membership across the town, and timesheets submitted for reimbursement.
- Manor for NASUWT representation, day release/week basis, with timesheets to be submitted on a termly basis from September.

- 3.6 RC noted that Schools' Forum must make the decision as to the amount of money that should be paid for this, and also if timesheets should be submitted, as there is a feeling that equity is not there in terms of the current arrangements.

- 3.7 MT noted that the Facility Time Regulation states that cover costs should be provided, but it is how this is interpreted. It was agreed that it is important to have local representation, as if have to rely on regional officers this can cause delays in schools, which can cause further disruptions.

Schools' Forum has always agreed that facility time is a good idea, but it is the mechanism of payment and the cost is the query.

- 3.8 JT noted that the query is that English Martyrs are claiming 1/5 of a member of staff for them to be released to undertake trade union duties, and an agreement is needed how Schools' Forum will pay for this in the future.

- 3.9 RC confirmed that English Martyrs are claiming this, and this is claimed at the start of the academic year.

- 3.10 SH confirmed that 1/5 of salary is re-charged for their teacher to use a Wednesday to undertake trade union activities, and his timetable has been scheduled around him not to teach on a Wednesday in order to undertake these activities. This was undertaken to ensure that pupils were not being taught by supply teachers every Wednesday, and that they have stability by receiving all their teaching on English from the same teacher, and should be cost neutral to the school. TG agreed it is important that facility time does not interfere with the pupils and their learning.

- 3.11 The original understanding was that a supply teacher would cover a Wednesday, but this is no longer the case. SH noted that they have been careful in curriculum planning stage to undertake this.

- 3.12 SS noted the concern wasn't around what arrangements individual schools have, but that there is clarity across all of the schools concerned.

- 3.13 RC noted that arrangements need to be clear in the future as to whether direct cover costs will be paid, or if salary can be paid to release a member of staff from their role to undertake training even where the school do not have direct supply cover costs to be reimbursed.
- 3.14 RC noted that there isn't an agreement from September 2017 onwards, so a decision will be required as to where remain status quo for 2017 and agree new arrangements for 2018, or to change arrangements from September 2017.
- 3.15 SH confirmed that the Directors' at English Martyrs will not agree to pay 100% salary for a member of staff to be allowed day release for trade union facilities, and not be able to re-charge the time back at salary rate, rather than supply rate, as this will then become a cost to the school.
- 3.16 If supply rate re-charge was to be agreed a figure would need to be agreed at Schools' Form to move forward. It was proposed that as £200 per day is the teacher supply rate, then £200 should be the amount re-charged.
- 3.17 SH noted that English Martyrs would only provide trade union facility release if this was cost neutral to the school.
- 3.18 RC requested that timesheets for facility time be submitted on a termly basis, as it is important to have a record of facility time undertake should this be required for any reason.
- 3.19 CS felt that schools should not be penalised for supporting facility time, as it is for the benefit of representatives at all schools, and that forum should pick up the full costs, it is about being open and transparent on recharges.
- 3.20 Vote : to remain as status quo for 2017 financial year only and to review the reimbursement rate :
- For 3 (Three) Against 9 (Nine) Abstentions 4 (Four).**
- Voted against status quo.
- MP noted that whilst funding is released on a financial year basis, it is on the understanding that funding spreads across 2 financial years, and covers September to August. Members confirmed they understood this.
- 3.21 Vote: Supply rate of £200 per day to be re-charged for trade union facility time:
- For 14 (Fourteen) Against 2 (Two) Abstentions 1 (One).**
- Agreed that a set rate per day be charged for trade union facility time.
- This will be re-visited prior to 2018-19 Academic Year.
- 3.22 Agreed that all schools affected would need to go back to schools to discuss further.
- 3.23 Vote: Reimbursement to be on production of a timesheet on a termly basis.
- For 11 (Eleven) Against 2 (Two) Abstentions 2 (Two).**

	<p>Agreed that timesheets be submitted for reimbursement on a termly basis.</p> <p><i>Rachel Clark left the meeting.</i></p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Space to Learn (D) – verbal update</b>	
4.1	MP noted that a Forum decision has been made in relation to Space to Learn (S2L) to cease funding from 2018 onwards, meaning that it will close from August 2018. The S2L Management Committee did try to put a model in place, whereby Space to Learn would remain open, however, this has not been possible.	
4.2	Staff have been made aware that their employment will be terminated from 31 August 2018, and will be supported through council processes on redeployment and redundancy as appropriate.	
4.3	Officially the facility will close on 31 August 2018, the land belongs to the diocese and the building belongs to St Hild's.	
4.4	A decision is required in relation to the contents of the facility when it closes. As the contents were purchased by Schools' Forum, a Forum decision is required. The contents referring to is the high end projection and sound equipment.	
4.5	MP noted that there is a proposal to move relevant equipment to the new Centre for Excellence in Creative Arts (CECA), rather than leaving the equipment to be run down and maybe not used. MP proposed that if agreement is reached, then the equipment would be moved in a phased manner so that wouldn't put in jeopardy any commitments up until the end of the school year.	
4.6	MT asked if there was a cost for the equipment to be moved, and MP confirmed that there would be no cost to Schools' Forum for this..	
4.7	Another alternative could be to sell the equipment as an asset and any funding pro-rated to schools.	
4.8	SS asked if all schools would have access to the equipment as it is her understanding that the new facility is for secondary. MP confirmed that the building is for primary, secondary and community use.	
4.9	JHasked if the current facility of being able to loan ICT equipment would be available on the same basis, and MP to take this back to the Coordinating Committee at CECA to confirm this.	<b>MP</b>
4.10	TG noted that work has been undertaken in relation to the future use of Space to Learn building for a year, and she believes the new facility is in the best interests of all schools.	
4.11	MT asked if the CECA Coordinating Committee will be producing a plan of how schools can access the new facility. MP confirmed this, and a clear offer will be presented to all schools, of what is available and what costs will be.	
4.12	Vote: Agree, in principle, to remove the equipment from Space to Learn, to use in the new Centre for Excellence in Creative Arts from August 2018.	

	<b>For 16 (Sixteen)</b>	<b>Against 0 (None)</b>	<b>Abstentions 0 (None)</b>	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	--

<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p>	<p><b>Early Years Duties (I)</b></p> <p>MP apologised for the delay in the paper being submitted to Schools' Forum which was requested two meetings ago.</p> <p>The paper submitted provides a clear breakdown of the Early Years support that schools and academies are entitled to as part of statutory entitlement, centrally retained funding elements and through additional capacity delivered as part of the current School Improvement service level agreement.</p> <p>There were no questions to the report.</p>	
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p> <p>6.7</p> <p>6.8</p>	<p><b>Pupil Referral Unit Review of Commissioned Places (I)</b></p> <p>MP provided a background to the item, in that the Council currently commission 24 fte places at the PRU for those children and young people permanently excluded from school, with an additional 12 places for home and hospital provision.</p> <p>Due to the pressures on the High Needs Block and commissioned places in the town, a piece of work has been undertaken to look carefully at the all commissioned places across the town. The first step of this has been to look at the commissioned places within the PRU, and due to the number of pupils (fte) accessing the PRU over the last three years, the Council are proposing to reduce the number of placements from 24 to 12 fte places from September 2018. This will be presented to a report in Children's Services Committee in October 2017 to decommission 12 places from 31 July 2018.</p> <p>MT asked if there is any financial saving from these changes that will go back into the High Needs Block. MP replied that this does depend on what is agreed regarding the de-commissioned places. If places are re-commissioned to another provider, then money will go there, however, if they are not re-commissioned then the money will be uncommitted.</p> <p>KS asked where the de-commissioned places will go, and MP confirmed a decision has not been taken on this yet because consultation with schools is required.</p> <p>KA asked what the staffing implications would be for the PRU and MP confirmed that this would be for the PRU to understand. KS noted that it could be that some staff could TUPE over different providers, but this would be dependent upon their skills and what the requirements are at new placements.</p> <p>KS noted the trends at the PRU over the last 4 years are that there are 16 / 17 permanently excluded students. MP responded that although this number may be accurate, they were not full time equivalent because Hartlepool's aim is always to place a child back into a school as quickly as possible following a permanent exclusion.</p> <p>KS noted that the PRU currently occupies approximately 50% of CETL, and that if their facility is reduced by twelve places, then they may have to move to a smaller facility.</p> <p>KS noted that the Council need to be mindful of the academisation process.</p>	

<p>6.9</p> <p>6.10</p> <p>6.11</p> <p>6.12</p> <p>6.13</p>	<p>TG noted that the paper didn't explain why there was the need to reduce placements by 12. MP noted that the placements are not being used. The information in the table at 2.2 shows the number of pupils accessing the PRU, and this translated to the fte equivalent, which has to be used. Pupils are accessing the PRU, but due to the time they attend, they are not attending full time.</p> <p>TG noted that whilst there are 24fte placements at the PRU, and these can be used for respite provision. Schools are being charged for respite provision, however, these places are already paid for. JS confirmed in addition to the charges to schools the PRU receive place funding from the LA. .</p> <p>ZW noted that the local authority has to undertake a return in November regarding planned places and if reducing 12 placements this will need reporting on. MP confirmed that they do not have to stipulate the provider of the placements. It is proposed that additional placements will be used for SEMH provision.</p> <p>SS asked if the 12 SEMH placements would be for primary or secondary, MP confirmed this would be schools and the local authority to decide as a partnership.</p> <p>KS registered his concerns in relation to staffing, but recognised what the LA was trying to do to move forward. It is important to look at the town as a whole, and hopefully things will become clear as work progresses.</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p>	<p><b>HNB review: initial generic queries (I) – verbal update</b></p> <p>MP noted that a piece of work had been undertaken in order to produce the report for the meeting on 27 September 2017. The report brings forward what the LA thinks is the best solution to move forward to try and bring HNB spending under control.</p> <p>MT recognised the amount of work that has been undertaken into working through this and to come to a solution. It does need recognising that there is a finite amount of money, and need to make the best use of the money available for young people for them to get the best education they can.</p> <p>MT highlighted that DSG reserves had been used to fund the HNB overspend for a number of years to reduce the impact on schools budgets. . The table in 4.1 of the report showed DSG reserves of £1.099m. However, this money has now been either spent or committed , so need to ensure that something is done differently to get the best from the money available.</p> <p>TG noted that the DfE guidance has a section stating that national funding for 2017/18 hasn't been confirmed fully as yet, so Schools' Forum are being asked to vote on unconfirmed figures.</p> <p>TG referred to the DfE guidance, stating that there are lots of phrases and comments regarding funding, baseline funding and the likelihood of future funding.</p> <p>JS stated that the ESFA have confirmed the baseline funding and the minimum</p>	

funding for 2018/19. An estimate has been used to provide indicative funding allocations as provided in paragraph 9.2 of the report. These figures are an estimate and subject to change.

- 7.7 TG noted that reference had been made to money transferring between HNB and Schools block. JS confirmed that the adjustments to the base is not new funding but movement from the HNB to the Schools Block for the ARP palace funding as schools will keep AWPU under the new formula. Baseline funding has been confirmed, and estimate of an extra £300k has been used on the settlement of the national funding formula for HNB.
- 7.8 AC noted that item 2.2 in the report does not have data for post 16 funding. There are currently 45 sixth form pupils and figures on this level of funding does not appear in the report. JS noted that they are in the report and the money is in the budget already. AC noted that this impacts on the HNB and needs to be considered in part of the budget. JS noted that the funding is in the table at 9.3 of the report, and £750k has been allocated for Post 16 top up.
- 7.9 ZW asked the rationale behind this, and asked if it is proposed not to make any changes to the post 16 funding. JS confirmed that there have been changes in previous years and this has been factored in to the budget projectiosn on the assumption that funding for post 16 will not change.
- 7.10 TG noted the DfE have stated LAs will see an increase of 0.5% per head in 2018/19 and 1% in 2019/20. JS noted that the LA has been provided further information on 2017/18 spending to the ESFA. TG asked if this has been to Schools' Forum for approval. JS noted that this information would have been submitted via a baseline return. TG noted that this information is not shared and JS confirmed that this is part of information that would be submitted in relation to the national funding formula as a matter of course. JS confirmed that the baseline budget will not go down, and the new formula will be based on 50% of historic spend and 50% based on formula ie pupil data.
- 7.11 JHe referred to item 7.5 where the total cost of Small Steps is £165k and asked for a breakdown to be provided.
- 7.12 ZW referred to item 2.4 all children and young people be assigned to a new banding range, and asked if this was for mainstream only. LA noted that banding could be undertaken in a group or individual moderation, and all banding has been conducted. ZW stated that Catcote and Springwell young people had not been banded under this system.
- There were two events held regarding the bandings and discussions have taken place with Catcote staff and consultations have also taken place at the school. Consultations have already been undertaken in terms of children's needs in conjunction with schools. ZW noted that this banding hasn't been undertaken, however, she is willing to look at this.
- 7.13 ZW noted that pupils have been banded in terms of a financial model and what it would look like, yet new bandings have only been known from Monday. LA noted that children are banded in agreement with the document in terms of the descriptor of need and not against a financial equivalent. Banding has taken in place in relation to needs rather than money attached to a child, this is also the same for Springwell and Catcote.

**JS**



7.14	SS noted that she wasn't in disagreement with the principles of the banding of children in school, however, this was visited quite quickly and feels that some of bands will need to be revisited to ensure that children are assigned correctly, and staff and schools are comfortable with this.	
7.15	SS feels there needs to be more training on the back of this, to ensure everyone understands the banding, and that children are banded correctly.	
	LA confirmed that the allocation of a band to pupils was completed at a set point in time to enable financial modelling to take place. SENCOs have been working with schools on this, and have also been involved assigning children in the process. There have been two group moderation exercises where all schools were invited, and these were well attended. Discussion and agreement of the bandings took place. It was agreed that there can be fluctuation of needs, and this will change throughout the process. Additional dates will be planned to re-visit documentation.	
	MP noted that banding is an ongoing process, and he would like to think with interventions that are put in place, particularly at lower levels, that children would move down as well as up the bandings.	
	MP noted that bandings can be amended, wording in descriptors can be amended, but there is still only a finite amount of money and this needs to be in budget.	
7.16	AB noted it is difficult when children have involvements with other agencies or if they have a diagnosis, as it is difficult obtaining further information and some processes can take up a long time to go through the correct pathways, and until diagnosis is confirmed the child may be on the wrong banding. These children will not be on the correct banding until such time, when schools will be providing additional support such as 1:1 support, and additional funding would have been allocated had they been on the correct banding.	
7.17	AC noted that the terminology in the SEND report does not sit easy with him. The report refers to 'profound' a lot, however, in his experience over the past 10 years he can only recall four students where they would have been banded at 1 due to level of support they require.	
7.18	JHe asked for clarification if the SEND document was in draft form, as some Headteachers were involved in the formation of the document, and progress seems to have ceased. LA confirmed that the document is still in draft form, and at the Working Group created to look at the document have suggested that, because of the moderation exercise and work involved to get this point, that the document needs to be re-visited. LA confirmed that the changes will be wording changes and nothing fundamental. It is expected that the document will be finalised by the end of the autumn term.	
	JHe asked if there were representatives from different school sectors and if they were minuted. LA confirmed meetings were not minuted, as they were discussions working around the document. LA to provide JHe with a list of people involved.	LA
7.19	JH requested a percentage breakdown of provision of out of town placements between primary and secondary.	JS

7.20 SS expressed concern in relation to the speed that bandings took place, and people's competence taking these forward. SS wants to make sure that children have been accurately banded, as potentially schools will be losing a significant amount of money.

JH asked if any analysis has been undertaken in relation to why there is an increase in EHC plans. JHe also asked what the contribution is from social care and health in relation to this.

7.21 In relation to independent residential school fees SS asked as to what percentage is funded from social care, as not all the funding can come from the HNB. SS concerned that with the rise in EHHC plans as this could potentially see an increase request for further funding.

7.22 TG asked if funding can be moved from the HNB to the Schools block, and asked what will this look like in terms of budget and how will this affect the HNB and schools block. SSh confirmed that yes monies could move between blocks and the impact of the £0.550m transfer has been tabled in Appendix 3 of the report in the fourth column.

7.23 MT requested a breakdown of residential and out of town funding into primary and secondary.

7.24 CS enquired that as commissioned services are the most expensive, if any work had been undertaken with TV LAs to see if they would work co-operatively to commission these services as a block, which would be costed more competitively.

7.25 CS asked if there has been any thought that the LA could develop some services in the town, whereby Hartlepool are a provider rather than a commissioner, and placements would be offered to other LAs if there was availability. Need to think creatively about making things work, and bringing in funding at the same time.

7.26 MP responded that commissioners work hard to get the best value for money and noted that there is an established NE framework shared across all NE LAs, which ensures people get value for money. MP informed the meeting that TVCA submitted a bid for a special free school with SEMH as the main theme, to be sited locally. Unfortunately the bid was unsuccessful, however, it is understood that there will soon be a further round of funding so will look at every opportunity possible for additional funding.

MP also reminded schools that for many of those children placed out of town Hartlepool schools had been approached but had indicated that they were not able to meet the needs of these children.

SEN provision doesn't sit with the local authority, but schools, and it becomes more challenging if schools were asked to provide additional places, on a funding basis that isn't particularly clear at the moment.

7.27 MT noted that residential placement funding has increased from £0.1m to £0.671m this year, however table in 5.3 only refers to <5 or <10 pupils, and

JS

	would like further clarity on these numbers.	
	MP confirmed that the LA have to be careful in relation to provision with low numbers, and publishing this data, as this could potentially identify an individual. It was agreed that rather than recording <10, 5-10 could be used for example.	JS
7.28	<p>AC noted it is essential to reduce the number of students going out of town and there needs to be a suitable provision in Hartlepool to keep them in their home town.</p> <p>For years ASD, SEN, SEMH funding has gone out of borough. Trend is on the increase and the number of children is increasing year on year, with more complex and challenging issues than ever before.</p> <p>MP agreed there is expertise in Hartlepool and a piece of work was started at the SEMH Working Group meeting yesterday to look at how capital funding can be used to try and increase provision over the next three years. This links in with the twelve places from the PRU, and need to start thinking creatively as to where these placements are best placed. All parties will need to work collectively to ensure starting to make a difference in out of borough placements. He did again reiterate, however, that for some children currently placed out of town that Hartlepool schools had been approached about meeting needs, but had indicated that they could not.</p>	
7.29	<p>TG referred to item 8.2 of the report linking to needs-led placing, AWPU and notional SEN funding. Whilst is known that funding comes in, a breakdown on SEND funding isn't provided in schools' budget lines. Schools know how much they spend on SEND in school and have to account for that. However, if she was asked how much funding had been allocated for AWPU of a child with additional needs then she would not be able to provide this figure, as there isn't a breakdown in her school budget lines.</p> <p>JS confirmed that the SEN funding is a notional amount, and within that are certain percentages of funding that calculates SEN funding. This information is provided in the budget proforma and also at the back of the SEND Policy. TG understands that, but unsure why she has to account for AWPU at school. Confirmed that there is a graduated response to needs as identified in the code of practice and the LA need to be able to demonstrate how AWPU is spent each year. TG thought an exact cost for each child was required. JS confirmed this was not the case schools only need to demonstrate the use of notional SEN funding which includes a percentage of AWPU.</p>	
7.30	SS noted that there are financial pressures on ARPs and it is proposed to taper the reductions in this funding over a two year period, linked to the reduction of IPS funding of 18%. Point 15.4, however, refers to a funding model where no mainstream school loses more than 2.8%. SSh is to clarify this figure.	SSh
7.31	KS noted that in relation to CS comments (item 7.24 above) that the PRU is working, in conjunction with committee members on a PRU+ model within Hartlepool. Curriculum mapping, staffing numbers and costing has taken place, and this has been shared with MP.	
7.32	HO expressed concern that the impact in the reduction of HBC will have at schools in relation to redundancies an timescales. This will be all areas of the town as all schools will be affected.	

7.33 ZW noted comparisons are being made about banding levels and with other LAs, however, Hartlepool does not receive as much funding as some other local authorities. It is misleading to say children are funded far higher than elsewhere. Children in other LAs are also able to have 2 bandings linked to them, so they attract two sources of funding. With this in mind fair comparisons are not provided.

7.34 MT stated that it has been identified that there is an increase in young people moving to Hartlepool, however the funding is not following them. This causes confusion as the LA they have moved from retain the funding. Agreed need to include a point on the budget that more high needs children are coming into Hartlepool for provision, and this is putting the budget under pressure, as their funding does not come to Hartlepool.

JS noted that because the HNB is historically based on 12/13 baseline figures, there have been minor increases over the years. Now that there is a new national funding formula it is hoped that the formula will assign resources to cover these children.

7.35 ZW noted that there is nothing in the report regarding out of authority placements, and this needs including with a clear plan on how to reduce the places. ZW concerned immediate issues will be addressed, however, this will create a bigger pressure on the budget if the out of borough placements isn't tackled. ZW concerned that most of the children the HNB covers are protected legally through EHC plans and there has never been a challenge on plans legally. However, will have to start building a solution as things will only get worse.

Springwell, Catcote and a number of mainstreams already provide provision and are willing to expand, and this needs to be looked at as projections could be that schools may not be able to open as cannot guarantee to keep children safe.

AC confirmed he cannot compromise the safety of staff and students if not funded adequately. If Catcote are unable to meet the needs of the young people then they will have to go out of town, which doesn't make sense when there is the option of provision in Hartlepool.

7.36 TG noted the funding that Schools' Forum agreed was £0.550m, and asked if that wasn't enough funding why did Schools' Forum agree on that figure, and questioned if re-modelling work should be undertaken. MT noted that £0.550m is the historic funding transfer. As part of the solution to reduce the overspend on the block, officers are suggesting that £0.550m is taken out of School Block into HNB. The LA also inform that the majority of NE LAs move funding from Schools Block to the HNB, and some the other way around. Without this transfer from Hartlepool Schools Block into the HNB, further amendments to the funding ranges of the bandings would have to be made.

7.37 CS requested actual costs of the 21 young people who access provision out of Hartlepool, so exact figures are known. MT confirmed £1.648m is the figure, however, a breakdown was requested, as there is a sense that much of this provision can be met within Hartlepool. Figure to be broken down into needs too.

7.38 JHe asked if these young people had been placed out of town because of

JS

	<p>parental choice, or that they have been placed out of town because we couldn't meet their needs. AC confirmed that this is because of social needs.</p> <p>LA confirmed that in terms of meeting identified needs, before looking for placements out of town the LA consult with schools as part of the legal process. If schools cannot meet provision, then the LA would consult with the NE neighbouring authorities to see if they have provision to meet the need.</p> <p>7.39 Agreed that any either SSh or JS can be contacted if there are any further questions.</p> <p>7.40 SSh reminded members that drop-in sessions are scheduled for the next day and later in the week. Invites have been circulated to all schools.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Agenda Items for Next Full Forum Meeting</b></p> <p>The meeting on 27 September 2017 is a single item agenda.</p> <p>The date of the next full forum to be agreed at this meeting.</p>	<p><b>MT</b></p>
<p><b>9.</b></p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>MP noted that when Schools' Forum discussed school budgets and ESG earlier in the year, the position came where the local authority applied to the Secretary of State for disapplication as it was felt that statutory obligations could not be met without this funding.</p> <p>Schools' Forum sent correspondence to the Secretary of State and confirmation has been received via the finance team that "This request [for disapplication] is fully approved as we have now received full justification that the £35 rate is required for essential services provided to schools. The level of cuts required by a £25 rate would result in the authority being unable to maintain services at the level required by statutory responsibilities."</p> <p>Disappointment was expressed by MT that Schools' Forum have not received official confirmation regarding this from the Secretary of State.</p> <p>ZW referred to meeting in January where a discussion took place regarding where funding (£89k) was being used for therapies, for example, where funding was not met by the PCT or Health, and maintained schools were paying a contribution to this. The HNB report states that £21k has gone towards occupational therapy.</p> <p>ZW was seeking clarity on what OT is being funding, as her experience is that her school cannot get support and are paying out of their own budget. Funding is £146 for special schools and £35 for maintained schools.</p> <p>ZW felt a disparity about what money is paying for and how this benefits the children.</p> <p><b>Date and Time of Next Meeting –</b></p> <p>27 September 2017 at 1pm</p>	

