

# CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

## AGENDA



**Wednesday 23 June 2021**

**at 4.00 pm**

**in the Council Chamber,  
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

**A limited number of members of the public will be able to attend the meeting with spaces being available on a first come, first served basis. Those wishing to attend the meeting should phone (01429) 523568 or (01429) 523193 by midday on Tuesday 22 June 2021 and name and address details will be taken for NHS Test and Trace purposes.**

Councillors, Ashton, Boddy, Fleming, Groves, Harrison, Lindridge and Moore.

Co-opted Members: Jo Heaton, C of E Diocese and Joanne Wilson, RC Diocese representatives.

School Heads Representatives: Mark Tilling (Secondary), David Turner (Primary), Zoe Westley (Special).

Six Young Peoples Representatives

Observer: Councillor Fleming, Chair of Adult and Community Based Services Committee

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

**3. MINUTES**

- 3.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2021 (*previously circulated and published*).

**4. PRESENTATION**

- 4.1 The Role of the Children's Services Committee – *Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services*



**5. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK ITEMS**

No items.

**6. KEY DECISIONS**

- 6.1 Proposal to Increase Capacity for SEND Education Provision – *Director of Children's and Joint Commissioning Services*

**7. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**

- 7.1 To Seek Nominations for Appointments to Schools Admission Forum – Verbal Update – *Legal and Democratic Services Team Manager*

**8. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- 8.1 Education Recovery Programme – Verbal Update – *Assistant Director, Education*

**9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

FOR INFORMATION

Date of next meeting – Tuesday 20 July 2021 at 4.00 pm



# CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

23 JUNE 2021



**Report of:** Director of Children's & Joint Commissioning Services

**Subject:** PROPOSAL TO INCREASE CAPACITY FOR SEND EDUCATION PROVISION

---

## 1. TYPE OF DECISION

- 1.1 Key Decision - test (i)
- 1.2 Forward Plan Reference Number: CJCS 111/21

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to share proposals with committee to prudentially borrow £1.550m to increase capacity for Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND) Education Provision at Catcote Academy. The borrowed funding will be paid back through the High Needs Block (HNB).
- 2.2 For this Committee to refer the request to Finance and Policy Committee, to then seek Council approval for prudential borrowing.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Children and Families Act 2014 and subsequent SEND Code of Practice: 0-25 years clearly sets out the duties placed on local authorities in relation to children with additional needs. Local authorities are required to ensure that provision is available to meet the needs of children with Special Education Needs and/ or Disabilities (SEND).
- 3.2 The local authority is required to undertake a strategic needs assessment understanding the supply of provision and the current and future demand. Hartlepool's SEND JSNA can be found at [https://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/downloads/file/5753/send\\_jsna\\_2020](https://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/downloads/file/5753/send_jsna_2020)
- 3.3 Nationally there has been a steady increase in the number of children with SEND over the last three years from 2.8% (2017) of the child population with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) to 3.3% (2020). There has also

been an increase in the number of children with SEN support plans from 11.6% (2017) to 12.1% (2020). Locally the increase in children needing support has significantly increased from 434 children and young people with EHC plans in 2014 to 725 in 2021.

- 3.4 High Needs provision and support is funded through the High Needs Block (HNB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which the local authority receives. The Local Authority in consultation with Schools Forum make decisions on how the HNB is spent and consults stakeholders where required.
- 3.5 In addition to the High Needs Block funding (revenue) the local authority has recently received SEND capital funding. In 2018/19 the Authority was allocated £0.500m payable in 3 equal installments over financial years 2018/19 to 2020/21. A further £0.116m was received in May 2018 and a further £0.233m was allocated in December 2018. £0.500m is receivable in financial year 2021/22. This is to support the development of SEND provision in the area but the amount received does not meet the needs identified in the town.
- 3.6 The above capital monies was allocated to Springwell School to make modifications for children with Profound and Multiple Disabilities (which includes significant health needs). . Of the above monies there is £0.201m left to support the project at Catcote Academy.

#### **4. CATCOTE ACADEMY**

- 4.1 Catcote Academy is the only secondary phase special school for children and young people in Hartlepool. It provides high quality provision and graded as good (Ofsted 2020). Children, young people and their families tell us that they really value the provision and feel part of the Catcote family.
- 4.2 The current main building on Catcote Road has not had investment for a significant number of years with “temporary” arrangements to teach children in a demountable being in place for approx. 15 years. The current building is not fit for purpose due to:
  - The building was not built to meet the varying needs that are now evident in the school population
  - The complexity of children and young people’s needs have significantly increased over the last five years and the accommodation has not been adapted to meet these needs
  - There are currently more children identified needing specialist provision than the current building can manage. This means that in Sept 2021 we have a significant number of children that are being educated off site at other buildings in Hartlepool. This is not appropriate for the children who are not part of the main Catcote family on Catcote Road or the staff who have to travel to various venues to teach.
- 4.3 There are currently 48 children being educated in the demountable and there are 22 children with Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) who will be

educated at Centre for Excellence in Creative Arts (CECA) and Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) as an interim arrangement from Sept 2021.

- 4.4 In addition there is a Looked after Child identified that needs specialist provision. This child has highly complex needs and if Catcote does not have the extra capacity created will have to be placed out of area in a residential provision which we do not believe is the right plan.
- 4.5 Based on all the above there is a requirement to invest funding at Catcote Academy to build additional provision to meet the needs of the children - those already attending and those due to start in Sept 2021.
- 4.6 Catcote Academy is the only secondary school in the town that has not had external investment to rebuild the school. The other five secondary schools have been rebuilt with funding provided from the Durham and Hexham Diocese or the Department for Education (DfE) under either the Buildings Schools for the Future Programme or the Priority School Buildings Programme.

## 5. PROPOSALS

- 5.1 A Schools Capital report was presented to Children's Services Committee on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 which set out the situation in relation to SEND provision and proposed a new build at Catcote to increase the provision and it highlighted a shortfall of £2.050m. The Local Authority has recently received a SEND capital allocation of £0.500m therefore the proposal is to borrow £1.550m.
- 5.2 This will fund a significant extension to the school to replace the demountable and to add capacity to meet needs of the MLD group of children and future demand in the forthcoming years.
- 5.3 Officers hoped that there may be some opportunities to bid for academy funding through the DfE. However this is not currently available and it is unknown due to COVID pressures whether this will be available in the foreseeable future. The children and young people needing Catcote provision cannot wait for an unlimited time for the provision to be built.
- 5.4 Officers will continue to seek external grant funding for this project. Any successful bids would reduce the amount of prudential borrowing required for this project. However, a commitment is needed to approve the prudential borrowing to enable the commencement on site to deliver the project within the timescale.

## 6. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are significant risks if this build does not go ahead:
- Children and young people currently using the demountable will have to continue to access this temporary accommodation which is not conducive to high quality education
  - We would need to look for other education options for the MLD children identified to start in Sept 2021. This could cost between £0.880m and £1.3 m per year and would be against the principle that our children should be educated within their Hartlepool community.
  - There would be no provision available at Catcote for children and young people from 2022 onwards other than those transferring from Springwell who could be accommodated within the numbers if there were sufficient leavers. Early mapping work with mainstream primary schools indicates there will be a cohort of at least 10 children who due to their extreme vulnerability with MLD needs will need to be accommodated at Catcote. If the provision is not accommodated at Catcote the children who need to be placed in out of area provision at a cost of £40-60k per annum per young person plus transport costs.
- 6.2 There is a risk that the costs could increase as the building is undertaken. However significant surveys have been undertaken and officers are confident that we understand all requirements and these have been included within the proposed costs. The plans have been submitted to the One Stop Shop (planning) and all feedback has been included within the costs.
- 6.3 Between 2015/16 and 2019/20 the HNB has overspent by £1.482m. Proactive action in conjunction with Schools Forum delivered savings to the block by restructuring top up payments, freezing rates and reviewing all areas of expenditure. The HNB underspent by £0.848m in 2020/21.
- 6.4 Additional funding of £1.998m has been received for 2021/22. The authority in conjunction with Schools Forum are considering how best to use this additional funding.
- 6.5 Officers have been discussing with DfE the pressures within the SEND system and they have told us that the statutory duty to provide sufficient school places, including places for children with special educational needs and disabilities, sits with local authorities. To support LAs, the DfE have allocated High Needs Provision Capital Allocations (HNPCA) to support local authorities. Hartlepool have been allocated £500k through this fund for 2021/22. Funding for future years will be determined as part of the next Spending Review.

In keeping with their duties under the Children and Families Act 2014 to keep provision for children with SEND under review, the DfE expect local authorities to work with all types of institutions across their area, including academies, to ensure that sufficient provision is available to meet the needs of children in their area.

With regard to funding for academy expansions specifically, we primarily provide funding for new special places via the local authority, either through HNPCA allocations mentioned above, or for mainstream places, through Basic Need Allocations. However, it would be open to an eligible academy to apply to CIF for support for an expansion. But this isn't a given, as CIF is a competitive process with finite funding and not every application can be successful.

## 7. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of the project is £2.750m. Basic Need grant funding of £0.499m and SEND capital grant funding of £0.701m have been identified to support the project. It is proposed to fund the shortfall of £1.550m from prudential borrowing.
- 7.2 Over a 25 year period the annual cost of repayment would be £0.078m. It is proposed to fund this repayment from the HNB.
- 7.3 The Regulations allow the schools budget to be used for prudential borrowing for the purpose of facilitating the modernisation and rationalisation of the school estate, where the revenue savings expected to be achieved as a result are equal to or more than the expenditure expected to be incurred in borrowing the money.
- 7.4 If this project was approved the annual cost (without transport costs) to the HNB would be:-

	£'000
22 Places at £10k per place	220
22 Top Ups at 5ii £10,850	239
Annual Prudential Borrowing Repayment	78
Total Cost to HNB	537

- 7.5 If the 22 young people could not be educated at Catcote Academy the local authority would need to find provision out of town. This would cost the HNB between £40k and £60k per year per pupil. Therefore, the cost to the HNB (without transport costs) would be between £0.880m to £1.320m per year. It needs to be noted that there would still be a group of children being educated in the temporary demountable.
- 7.6 On the basis of the above figures the cost of this proposal provides a saving to the HNB of between £0.343m and £0.783m.

## 8. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 The Children and Families Act 2014 requires that the council keeps local provision for children and young people with SEND under review, to co-

operate with its partners and to plan and commission provision for those children and young people.

- 8.2 The 2014 Act also extended the rights of parents to express a preference for the school they wish their child to attend meaning that places at the school must (in certain circumstances) be allocated to children from outside of the area. A memorandum of understanding will be put in place between the Catcote Academy Board of Trustees and the council to reinforce the expectation/obligation that this additional funding/provision will (insofar as it is permitted by law) be utilised to meet the needs of children within Hartlepool.
- 8.3 The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 requires that the council must consult the schools forum regarding the schools budget in connection with SEND. The views expressed by Schools Forum are not determinative or binding on the council but they must be fed into the decision making process and given conscientious consideration.

## **9. CONSULTATION**

- 9.1 The school have been significantly consulted on the needs of the children and how they can meet the needs. Families via the Parent Carer Forum have clearly said they want their children educated in Hartlepool.
- 9.2 Schools Forum – Schools Forum considered this proposal at a meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Schools Forum were wholly supportive of the proposal to ensure that children with SEND were supported within the right environments. However Forum wanted funding opportunities to be considered e.g. use of future High Needs Capital Provision Capital Allocations, further exploration of Condition Improvement Fund (CIF) applications and use of any underspends in the High Needs Block. It was noted that there was concern that we were being reactive however it was acknowledged that the High Needs Block Review that is being currently undertaken will be addressing the need to be more proactive. The minutes from the Schools Forum will be made available to committee prior to the meeting and the chair of Schools Forum will attend the committee to present Schools Forum information.

## **10. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 10.1 Children and young people identified in this report have been assessed as needing specialist education provision. It is important that all children have the opportunity to succeed. There are no specific child and family considerations.

## **11. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 11.1 It is important that children and young people identified needing specialist support through an Education, Health and Care Plan are offered the highest



quality provision. This will allow them to fulfil their potential. This report sets out the proposals to ensure that needs are met.

## **12. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

- 12.1 There are no staff considerations.

## **13. CONCLUSION**

- 13.1 As detailed in this report increased SEND provision is required to meet current and future demand for the young people of the Town. The proposal to develop a local unit funded from grant funding and prudential borrowing is the most cost effective solution to the HNB budget, providing an overall saving of between £0.343m and £0.783m.
- 13.2 As set out above in this report it is important that children that live in Hartlepool are able to be educated in Hartlepool. The additional capacity at Catcote Academy will ensure that more children can be educated within their community.

## **14. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 14.1 Members are asked to:
- a) Note the contents of the report
  - b) Refer this report to Finance and Policy Committee to support a sustainable solution for the provision of additional capacity for children with SEND and to seek approval from Council to Prudentially Borrow £1.550m saving the HNB annually between £0.343m and £0.783m.
  - c) Note the loan repayment cost will be met from the HNB and will not impact on the General Fund Budget of the Council.

## **15. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 15.1 Schools Capital Works Programme 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 – Children's Services Committee

## 16. CONTACT OFFICER

Danielle Swainston  
Assistant Director, Joint Commissioning  
Level 4, Civic Centre  
Victoria Road  
Hartlepool, TS24 8AY  
Telephone: 01429 523732  
e-mail: [danielle.swainston@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:danielle.swainston@hartlepool.gov.uk)

Sign Off:-

Director of Resources and Development



Chief Solicitor



## Schools' Forum Meeting

### 10 June 2021

#### Attendees:

##### Members

Carole Bradley (CB) (Primary - Large <50%)  
 Julie Deville (Primary Academy >25%<50% FSM)  
 Emma Espley (EE) (Secondary)  
 Mary Frain (Primary – VA Large)  
 Tracey Gibson (TG) (Secondary)  
 Martyn Gordon (MG) (Horizon School )  
 Lisa Grieg (LG) (Academy – Special)  
 Mandy Hall (MH) (Primary Academy >25% FSM)  
 Jo Heaton (JH) (Diocese – C of E)  
 Andrew Jordan (AJ) (Secondary Academies >50% FSM)  
 Sue Sharpe (SS) (Primary - Large Deprived)  
 Chris Simmons (CS) (Academy Governors)  
 Mark Tilling (MT) (Secondary)  
 David Turner (DT) (Primary – Small)  
 Lee Walker (LW) (Primary Academy >50% FSM)  
 Zoe Westley (ZW) (Special)  
 Rachel Williams (RW) (Diocese – RC)  
 Jo Wilson (JW) (VA Large)

##### Local Authority Officers

Amanda Whitehead (AW)  
 (Assistant Director Education)  
 Danielle Swainston (DS)  
 (Assistant Director Joint  
 Commissioning)  
 Jacqui Braithwaite (JB)  
 (Integrated Services for  
 Learning Manager)  
 Sandra Shears (SSh)  
 (Children's Finance)  
 Jo Stubbs (JS) (Administrator)

Agenda Item	Action
<p><b>1 Apologies -</b></p> <p>Apologies were submitted by the following:</p> <p>Lynne Chambers (Primary &gt;25% &lt;50% FSM) (Julie Deville substituting)            Stephen Hammond (Academy – Secondary)            Mark Hughes (16-19 Sector)            Neil Nottingham (Primary Academy &gt;50% FSM)            Linda Richardson (PVI)            Rachel Williams (Diocese – RC) (Mary Frain substituting)</p>	
<p><b>2 Minutes of the Last Meeting – 25 March 2021</b></p> <p>Minutes approved.</p> <p>A request had previously been made for further information on the balance in the SEMH capital pot for a future Head teachers meeting. SSh gave a brief verbal update explaining how the balance had materialised and that it</p>	

	<p>could be used for revenue funding. SSh agreed to send a written update to SS</p> <p>CB queried whether school clinics were still taking place. DS confirmed that they were. She would cover the details as part of her update on the High Needs Block Medium Term Financial Strategy. She urged anyone with urgent needs to contact her directly.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the task and finish group for Early Years funding referred to under AOB had met since the meeting with a future meeting scheduled.</p> <p><b>Outstanding Actions Log</b></p> <p>High Needs Task and Finish Group – CB was due to meet with AW and John Hardy next week so would hopefully be able to provide an update to the Forum soon.</p> <p>Salary disclosure – no change on the position</p> <p>SEMH – This was covered under the minutes.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that a record be kept of any recommendations forwarded to Children's Services Committee from the Forum. This would enable feedback from the Committee as to why they had accepted or rejected said recommendations. Members supported this and also suggested that Forum meetings be scheduled to enable the availability of minutes prior to Committee meetings. It was also suggested that the Chair of the Forum be invited to Committee meetings which included Forum recommendations to enable them to give feedback on behalf of the Forum. SSh advised that this information was already included on existing reports however the Chair could also be invited to attend to feedback should the Forum wish it. She noted that a number of Forum members were also co-opted onto Children's Services Committee and were therefore able to give their feedback should they wish. However it was felt that as they may not always be members of both Forum and Committee it would be preferable that the Chair attend. The Chair asked that the Chair of Children's Services Committee be made aware. She also requested that SSh discuss the timetabling of meetings from September onwards with the Forum Chair.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Horizon School and Alternative Provision 2020/21 Final Outturn</b></p> <p>SSh gave an update on the final outturn position for the Horizon School and Alternative Provision services. Schools Forum had previously agreed to fund an annual cost baseline of £0.750 million from the High Needs Block for the Horizon School for 2019/20 and 2020/21. For 2020/21 the net contribution was a net £0.675 million. The final outturn for the Horizon School was an underspend of £0.090 million, exceeding the estimated outturn projection of £0.072 million underspend. This underspend had been returned to the High Needs Block. The final outturn for Alternative</p>	

	<p>Provision was an overspend of £0.035 million, also lower than had been estimated. This overspend related mainly to clawback income of funding for permanently excluded pupils which had been overspent due to a significant number of pupils being managed in the Horizon School or through alternative provision during the latest financial year.</p> <p>Members were confused with the table in the report which indicated that grant funding which had not come from the High Needs Block had been underspent and therefore felt that it should have been retained by the Horizon School and not returned to the HNB.. SSh advised that this grant funding had already been spent in 2020/21 as required under the funding rules.</p> <p>Members noted the underspend for the Horizon school. SSh acknowledged this but indicated that the vast majority of this came from 'other income' and would not be sustainable for the following years. MT advised that the clawback overspend would be corrected in future years when the young people involved moved out of the system. MG advised that the number of permanently excluded children had moved from a previous high of 36 to the current number of 3. From September they expected to have 12 permanently excluded children in the authority. The Horizon School had made 2 outreach places available for each Secondary school which would hopefully help avoid permanent exclusions.</p> <p>Members requested more information on the outreach availability for primary schools. MT confirmed this was being rolled out but would primarily involve Y6 children requiring transition support for the move to secondary school. He invited any primary schools to discuss the situation with their allocated secondary school</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>High Needs Block Final Outturn 2020/21</b>	
	<p>DS confirmed a final outturn underspend of £0.847 million, exceeding the best case projection of £0.385 million. Details of the reasons for this underspend were given however it was felt that the main reason was the national coronavirus situation and the fact that many children who would otherwise have been identified as requiring funding had not been in school for much of the year. In future years this underspend might be needed to help fund any unmet needs resulting from this unusual year. The underspend was particularly unusual as a number of nearby authorities had overspent on their High Needs Block.</p> <p>Members referred to the transfer of £0.329million from schools included within this underspend and queried whether this could be returned to the schools. The Chair asked if a disapplication request would need to be made to the Secretary of State. SSh confirmed this was not required. SSh</p>	

	<p>suggested that until the MTFs review was finalised that no decision should be made on this funding.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Proposal to increase capacity for SEND Education Provision</b>	
	<p>DS presented a consultation report on proposals to prudentially borrow £1.550 million to increase capacity for Special Educational Needs and/or disabilities (SEND) Education Provision at Catcote Academy. The annual cost of borrowing would be met from the High Needs Block. Since 2017 the number of children with SEND had increased from 2.8% to 3.3% in 2020. There had also been a 5% increase (to 12.1%) in the number of children with SEN support plans. Locally the number of children needing support had increased from 434 in 2017 to 725 in 2021.</p> <p>The main Catcote Academy building had been using a temporary demountable building for teaching purposes for 15 years, currently utilised by 48 children. There were no specialist spaces such as those for ICT, art and gym provision available as all were being used as regular teaching areas. A further 22 children with moderate learning difficulties were due to be taught at the CECA and CETL buildings under an interim arrangement from September 2021. An additional Looked After Child had also been identified as having highly complex needs and requiring specialist provision. Should Catcote not have the necessary capacity this child would need to be placed out of area in a residential provision. Therefore it was felt that additional funding was needed in order to meet the needs of these children.</p> <p>The cost of the proposed project was £2.750 million. Grant funding through Basic Need (£0.499 million) and SEND (£0.701 million) had been identified leaving a shortfall of £1.550 million. It was proposed to fund this through prudential borrowing. The annual cost of repayment would be £0.078 million over 25 years, to be funded through repayment from the High Needs Block. This would provide an ultimate saving to the High Needs Block of between £0.343 million and £0.783 million). A report on this proposal was due to be considered by Children's Services Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021. The views of the Forum would be included within this report. Final approval would be made by Council following referral to Finance and Policy Committee.</p> <p>He acknowledged that timescales were an issue but felt that 3 working days was insufficient time to allow for a full consultation process. CS referred to his time as Chair of Children's Services Committee a number of years ago and noted that the demountables had been unsuitable then. He expressed his wholehearted support for the funding proposals saying the children involved deserved better.</p>	

<p>MT supported the proposal but queried whether other funding avenues had been explored and whether the use of other sites such as CETL had been explored. He also queried what would happen to the cost of the loan if the High Needs Block was overspent. DS advised that use of sites such as the CETL was currently not an option as they were still needed as Council accommodation. This was a future possibility but not in time to meet the needs of the current Catcote cohort. The funding would be attached to the High Needs Block and would need to be paid back with or without an overspend as would be the case if these children were placed out of authority.</p> <p>TG queried what impact the additional 22 children would have on the CECA building plan given the covenant on the building. DS indicated that this usage was temporary and minimal. SSh confirmed that prudential borrowing through the HNB had been approved in principle by the ESFA but it would need to be approved by Council. If approval was granted the work could be completed by Easter 2022 meaning the temporary arrangements would be in place for 2 terms.</p> <p>The Chair indicated her support for the proposal but felt the High Needs Block review was needed. DS acknowledged the timing wasn't the best but there were no other options in terms of the childrens' needs. There had been no way to plan for this in advance as the needs of the children had only just become apparent.</p> <p>JD endorsed the proposal and the effort to be proactive. She queried whether other funding streams for Academies had been maximised and asked whether any funding bids had been submitted previously with professional input. LG confirmed that external advisors were employed to help with their grant funding while DS commented that the Department for Education had made it clear that local authorities were responsible for special needs support through High Needs Block capital allocation. Officers had explored every option and would explore all options to repay these monies early.</p> <p>CB expressed her support on behalf of all her representative schools. However she was concerned at the lack of forward planning through early years.</p> <p>JHe questioned why the ESFA had already been consulted on this matter. SSh advised that the question had been asked in principle prior to commencement of the consultation process. This did not mean the proposal was a 'done deal'.</p> <p>The Chair noted Forum members frustration at the reactive nature of this proposal. DS acknowledged this. Primary schools were being asked to provide information on any possible future needs going forward in order to avoid this happening again. She noted that Catcote Academy had enough capacity for Years 3-5.</p>
---

	<p>ZW commented that the proposal was about investing now for the future. If this borrowing was not approved the pressure on the High Needs Block would be massive and provision would need to be sought out of town. It was unfair that children with significant needs did not have a building suitable for their needs and this was not a lot of money out of a huge budget.</p> <p>CB queried how this borrowing would be viewed externally given the current underspend. DS advised that the Department for Education were aware of the situation and had not indicated that this would affect future funding.</p> <p>CS accepted the Forum misgivings around timescales but felt this should not give the impression that members were not fully supportive of the funding proposal. He urged the Chair and officers to express strong support for this to Children's Services Committee. JHe reiterated this, saying all member wholeheartedly agreed with the proposals and the need to help the children involved.</p> <p>DS queried whether members wished for their comments to be included within a report to Committee or as an extract from the minutes. The Chair asked that the minutes be forwarded to Committee members in advance of their decision. She also confirmed that she would be happy to attend the meeting to provide feedback from the Forum.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. That the report be noted</li> <li>II. That the wholehearted support of the Forum for the proposal be put forward to the Children's Services Committee</li> <li>III. That the minutes of the minutes be forwarded to members of the Children's Services Committee prior to the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> June</li> <li>IV. That the Forum Chair be invited to attend the Children's Services Committee meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> June</li> </ul>	
<b>6</b>	<b>High Needs Block Medium Term Financial Strategy Update – Presentation</b>	
	<p>DS gave details of the initial work carried out as part of the review including a review of IPS funding, banding of Horizon School pupils and a review of those accessing home and hospital and plotting pathways. She noted that the system was congested and needs should be identified as soon as possible. A number of questions were included for members' consideration including whether schools should be asked to complete a survey on the issues raised, whether IPS funding and its allocation should be reviewed and whether the banding document was fit for purpose.</p>	



	<p>Members indicated they would be happy to complete a survey. A number of options to tie this review into other groups and updates was also suggested. DS confirmed that she would continue to bring updates and options for different elements to the Forum.</p> <p><b>Zoe Westley left the meeting</b></p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>That the update be noted</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p>The Chair reminded members that the position would become vacant at the end of the academic year. Under current rules the position would revert to a secondary school representative. TG highlighted the reduced number of secondary heads in comparison to primary. The Chair asked that this item be added to the agenda for the next meeting.</p> <p>JHe asked that in future minutes of the Sub-Capital Group be shared with the Forum. The Chair asked that this be actioned. MT acknowledged this.</p> <p><b>Danielle Swainston left the meeting</b></p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Date and Time of next Forum meeting</b>	
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> July at 10.00am	
	The meeting concluded at 12 noon	