

Minutes of a meeting of the Schools Forum held on Wednesday, 21 September 2016 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 0810, Adjourned 0810
Reconvened 1010, Concluded 1110

PRESENT

SCHOOL MEMBERS

Bev George, Chris Quinn, Dianne Rowbotham, Dominic Wall, Dwayne Saxton, Helen Williams, Ian Morrel, Kevin Holland, Leslie Heathcote, Michele Robinson, Nicky Kilvington, Ray Tate, Sue Haithwaite, Trevor Loft and Wahid Zaman.

NOMINATED SUB SCHOOL MEMBER

Anita Hall, Ian Murch, Irene Docherty and Alison Kaye

NON SCHOOL MEMBERS

Donna Willoughby

EXECUTIVE PORTFOLIO HOLDER – EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS

Councillor Imran Khan

LOCAL AUTHORITY (LA) OFFICERS

Andrew Redding	- Business Advisor (Schools)
Angela Spencer-Brooke	- Strategic Manager, SEND and Behaviour
Dawn Haigh	- Principal Finance Officer (Schools)
Jenny Cryer	- Assistant Director Performance, Commissioning and Partnerships
Judith Kirk	- Deputy Director, Education, Employment and Skills
Michael Jameson	- Strategic director, Children's Services
Sarah North	- Principal Finance Officer (Schools)

OBSERVER

Councillor Ward

APOLOGIES

Members: Brent Fitzpatrick, Emma Ockerby, Nigel Cooper, Sir Nick Weller, Tahir Jamil.

Officers: Stuart Mckinnon-Evans, Director of Finance. Regular Observer: Lynn Murphy, Business Manager, Feversham College

DOMINIC WALL IN THE CHAIR IN THE CHAIR

178. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

A declaration was received from the Chair for agenda item 12 "High Needs Block – Funding Additional SEND Provision", (minute 188). During the course of the meeting, Ian Morrell also made a declaration for this item.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*



179. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

A declaration was received from the Chair for agenda item 12 “High Needs Block – Funding Additional SEND Provision”, (minute 188). During the course of the meeting, Ian Morrell also made a declaration for this item.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

180. **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

A declaration was received from the Chair for agenda item 12 “High Needs Block – Funding Additional SEND Provision”, (minute 188). During the course of the meeting, Ian Morrell also made a declaration for this item.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

181. **MINUTES OF 20 JULY 2016 AND MATTERS ARISING**

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported on progress made on “Action” items as follows:

- **Social Impact Bond** – the application has been submitted and is progressing.
- **£1.2m DSG unallocated sum** – this had been referred to the Early Years Working Group (EYWG). Members will see from agenda item 11 that the EYWG has met. A final recommendation has not yet been made by this Group on this matter.
- **National Funding Formula Consultation** – an email was sent out to Members on 25 July following the Secretary of State’s announcement earlier that week. A formal update on this announcement is presented in agenda item 10. No further announcements on the Schools or High Needs Blocks have been made. Proposals for Early Years funding reform have been announced and these are to be considered in agenda item 11.
- **Academies Panel and referral of the letter from the Chair of Governors at Oastler School** – an email was sent on 9 September asking for representatives from Forum Members to sit on this panel. Responses have been received from 4 volunteers (Chris Quinn, Brent Fitzpatrick, Nicky Kilvington and Ian Morrell). Oastler School has been contacted to establish a date for a panel meeting, which is expected to take place before the October Schools Forum meeting. The Chair added that he has written to the headteacher of Oastler School regarding the coverage of this item by the Telegraph and Argus following the July meeting.
- **Update on Academy conversions and free schools** – there have been 5 conversions of maintained schools to academy status since the last Forum meeting, all on 1 September (3 secondary and 2 primary schools). It is not expected that any of these schools will hold deficit budgets. The Authority



still expects a substantial number of conversions to take place before the end of this financial year. The DfE announced its newest wave of free schools at the end of last week. 3 free school projects have been approved for Bradford; 2 post 16 mainstream provisions (16-19) and 1 new secondary mainstream provision. The Chair added that a workshop has been arranged with the DfE on 22 September on free school provision for high needs and invited all interested in learning more about the development of free schools for high needs provision to attend this.

- **Post 16 Strategic review** – Members have received in their packs a copy of the post 16 provision review document, to ensure that all Members are aware especially of the ‘road map’ to improvement.

Resolved –

- (1) That progress made on “Matters Arising” be noted.
- (2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2016 be signed as a correct record.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

182. MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOLS

A Member stated that he is aware that a number of schools have received invoices from the Authority for unbilled payroll costs. He asked that information be provided to the Schools Forum on this matter.

No resolution was passed on this item (please see resolution 13).

183. STANDING ITEM - DSG GROWTH FUND ALLOCATIONS

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that there are no new allocations for consideration at this meeting but that the Forum is asked to consider, under agenda item 12, matters relating to the allocation of growth funding in the secondary sector.

No resolution was passed on this item.

184. STANDING ITEM - BRADFORD EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT COMMISSIONING BOARD

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported that the BEICB has not met since the last update provided to the Schools Forum at the July meeting.

No resolution was passed on this item (please see AOB).

185. SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS - ELECTION OF A CHAIR

The Business Advisor (Schools) asked Members to approve the proposed



approach (by email) for the election of Chair of the Schools Forum for 2016/17. A Member asked whether the current Chair was willing to stand for re-election. The Chair confirmed that he was.

Resolved –

That the established approach be followed for the collection of nominations and the election of the Chair of the Schools Forum for 2016/17.

Action: ***Business Advisor (Schools)***

186. SCHOOLS FORUM ADMINISTRATION 2016/17 ACADEMIC YEAR

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GF**, which asked Members to review the Forum's administrative and membership arrangements for the academic year 2016/17. He explained the basis and purpose of the proposed interim solution, which would be in place for September 2016 to April 2017; to secure effective Schools Forum membership over the critical DSG allocation period whilst also seeking to ensure that membership remains proportionate to the number of maintained schools and academies in the District. He explained that the Schools Forum Regulations were not establish to cope with the volume and speed of transition of maintained schools to academies that is expected in Bradford over the coming months.

Schools Forum Members were supportive of this proposal and did not ask any additional questions on this matter.

- (1) The Forum's Conduct of Meetings & Procedural Matters document be agreed.**
- (2) The interim Schools Forum membership arrangements for the period September 2016 to the end of March 2017, as set out in Document GF, also be agreed.**

Action: ***Business Advisor (Schools)***

187. EARLY PROJECTION OF THE 2017/18 POSITION AND COST PRESSURES

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GG**, which provides an early indicative view of the 2017/18 Dedicated Schools Grant position and which also identifies the cost pressures, which the Forum will have to consider in making final recommendations in January 2017.

The Chair introduce this item by explaining that this is the starting point for the Forum's consideration of the key matters that will pervade its meetings over the coming months. The flow of agenda items is as follows:

- An overview of DSG indicative position for 2017/18 (Document GG item 9).
- Update on announcements made over the summer on the National Funding Formula for the Schools and High Needs Blocks (Document GH)



item 10).

- Presentation on the DfE's consultation on Early Years National Funding Formula (Document GI item 11).

By this point Forum Members will have an awareness of the scale of the funding challenge we face in 2017/18 and beyond, summarised as:

- Pressure in High Needs and needing to significantly increase the quantity of provision without sufficient additional funding from DfE in the short term (in 2017/18) and then without any certainty at this point about the longer term funding position (whether the National Funding Formula will give us sufficient funding to expand and sustain our quantity of provision).
- The likely need to take a substantial contribution from the Primary & Secondary formula in 2017/18 to meet High Needs Block pressures. The impact that this may have on delegated budgets and pressures felt by schools and academies.
- Schools Block National Funding Formula probably will be in place at April 2018 but there is still a great deal of uncertainty. The ring-fencing restriction relating to the Schools Block will likely come in at April 2018, with an overall formula result that is probably not good for Bradford. This is suggested by the theme of the Early Years National Funding Formula proposals (an inadequate weighting towards deprivation).
- Reduction in Early Years funding, with very significant potential financial implications for Nursery Schools, at the same time as seeking to continue to raise quality and to deliver the Government's extended 30 hours entitlement.

The Business Advisor (Schools) confirmed that the critical action points for the Forum at this meeting are:

- Agreeing areas of consensus for our response to the DfE's consultation on Early Years Funding reform, which must be submitted tomorrow (Document GI Appendix 1).
- Agreeing the funding of the 1st tranche of 120 additional SEND places, from January 2017 (Document GJ item 12).
- Agreeing to the publication of our consultation on Bradford's 2017/18 primary & secondary school funding formulae and Schools Block centrally managed funds criteria (Document GK item 13).

In responding to the Business Advisor (Schools) presentation of the Document GG Appendix 1, Forum Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- That the DfE's proposals for the reform of Early Years funding, which includes a reduction of £3m in the funding available for the delivery of the 3 and 4 year old free entitlement and the introduction of a universal base rate, will have a devastating financial impact on the District's Nursery Schools.
- Clarification was sought on whether the outline suggestion for the Early Years Block to contribute £300,000 for the cost of the Early Years Inclusion Panel budget was based on the current level of contribution this Block makes to High Needs costs? The Business Advisor (Schools) confirmed



that this is a correct understanding.

- Clarification was sought on the figure mentioned in the presentation of the document regarding the gap between the funding of mainstream EHCP's / Statements and the cost of provision (salaries of support staff). The Business Advisor (Schools) confirmed that an average gap of £2.65 per hour has been calculated and that this gap has come from, and been increased by, the increased cost of salaries resulting from national changes in employer costs when funding has remained cash flat. He stressed that this was an average calculation.
- A Primary Members reminded the Forum of the view that the primary phase is currently subsidising secondary and he also stated that the time taken for the assessment of children with additional SEND meant that the primary phase is being under funded for the costs of meeting the needs of children with SEND. A Secondary Member disagreed with the statement that the primary phase is subsidising secondary. Further information was asked to be provided on the number of assessments / referrals for Education Health and Care Plans / SEN Statements by phase.
- That the situation, where expenditure pressures are increasing at the same time as income is reducing, has not been seen since the 1990s. What will happen to school carry forward balances? Members agreed that it would be useful for the Forum to see further information on the cumulative impact on delegated budgets of possible reductions in funding as well as increases in costs (such as salary costs for pay awards). The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that some schools are better placed than others to manage further substantial pressures in 2017/18. He also added that the ability of schools to manage will also be affected by the National Funding Formula going forward e.g. we have already warned that the current value of our lump sum funding is already at risk under national arrangements, which would have clear implications for the budgets of smaller schools

(1) That the information in Document GG be noted.

(2) That information is provided to the next Schools Forum meeting on the number of assessments / referrals for Education Health and Care Plans / SEN Statements by phase.

(3) That further information is provided, which will enable Forum Members and schools to understand the cumulative impact on delegated budgets of possible reductions in funding as well as increases in costs (such as salary costs for pay awards).

188. NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA SCHOOLS AND HIGH NEEDS BLOCKS

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GH**, which provided an overview of the latest information from Government, on the introduction of a National Funding Formula for the Schools and High Needs Blocks, in announcements made since the Forum meeting in July.

The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that, due to the delay in the publication



of the 2nd stage of consultation by the DfE, there is still significant uncertainty about the timing and implications of a National Funding Formula. It is hoped that announcements will be made in time for the October meeting. He stated that, because of this uncertainty, and because we can only assume that the ring-fencing of the Schools Block restriction will come into place at April 2018 (thus preventing from this point further contributions to the High Needs Block), there is a line of inquiry on whether we should seek to take the maximum contribution we can from the Schools Block in 2017/18 in order to maximise resources for High Needs provisions, as this may be our final opportunity to do so. This was a line of discussion in the Formula Funding Working Group meeting. It was explained that the most that the Schools Block could contribute would be to the point that all primary and secondary schools are funded at their level protected by the DfE's Minimum Funding Guarantee, which is a reduction of 1.5% per pupil. This would go beyond the simple 1.5% reduction in all pupil-led factors, which is shown in the consultation document. The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that the Forum was not being asked yet to make a decision on this, but that this would need to be further discussed.

The Business Advisor (Schools) explained, following the DfE's current proposals, that 2 out of the 3 DSG Blocks (the Early Years and the High Needs Blocks) would remain locally managed under National Funding Formula arrangements. He also reminded Members that we have previously speculated that the primary and secondary 'hard' National Funding Formula will not favour Bradford, because we speculate that the weighting given to additional educational needs / deprivation may reduce in favour of increasing the basic amount of funding for all authorities. He stated that the proposals for the Early Years Block, which appear to give an inadequate weighting to deprivation, are suggestive that this may be the case.

The Chair clarified for Members that what is shown in the consultation document (Document GK) was not the worst case scenario for primary and secondary schools and academies in 2017/18. Referring back to the earlier discussion on the DfE's proposals for Early Years Funding reform, and the potential significant financial implication for the District's Nursery Schools, he stated that Bradford has a larger number of Nursery Schools than the average of other authorities, with 70% of authorities having fewer than 7 and 30% not having any. The Chair also stated that the need for the Schools Block to contribute to the High Needs Block is not unique to Bradford. 75% of authorities have transferred Schools Block monies to their High Needs Blocks over the last 2 years. 27 authorities have made bigger transfers than we have, up to a 20% increase in High Needs Block spending. He stated that it feels like there is a lack of information coming from Government telling us this.

The Strategic Director, Children Services, emphasised this we do now have sight of the probably movement of funding away from deprivation and that this is not just happening within the DSG and schools budgets. It is critical that we make a substantial volume of noise about this.

Resolved –



That the information in Document GH be noted.

189. REPORT ON EARLY YEARS BLOCK FUNDING MATTERS AND DfE CONSULTATION

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GI**, which provided an update on Early Years DSG funding matters, including the DfE's consultation on the proposals for a National Funding Formula. The report asked for the Forum's view about areas of consensus that should be included in the Authority's response. It was explained that this report was presented in advance of asking the Forum to agree its consultation on Bradford's Early Years Single Funding Formula for the 2017/18 financial year, which it is anticipated would be presented to the 19 October meeting.

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented the key elements of our assessment of the impact of the DfE's proposals on the level of DSG funding into the Bradford District and on individual types of providers. Many of these had already been presented within earlier agenda items. He emphasised that the proposed reduction in Bradford's Early Years Block rate of funding for the 3 and 4 year old free entitlement, £3m in total, will begin from April 2017 and be largely completed at April 2018 i.e. the impact of this reduction will be felt sooner rather than later. Our rate of DSG funding for the 3 and 4 year old offer will drop from £5.08 per hour to £4.57. In estimated terms, this will mean that the average delegated setting base rate of funding for providers would reduce from £4.41 now to £4.11 at April 2019. This reduction takes place alongside an additional reduction in the value of funding for deprivation and the assumed cessation of additional funding to support the additional cost structure of Nursery Schools. The combined result of the DfE's proposed reform will be the flattening of the distribution of Early Years DSG funding, nationally between authority areas and locally between different types of providers and between providers delivering the free entitlements to children from deprived and less deprived backgrounds.

The Business Advisor (Schools) explained that it was currently unclear whether some of the DfE's proposals for formula change are to be implemented from April 2017 or by April 2019. However, he emphasised that rates of funding for providers will decrease at April 2017. The Early Years Working Group is meeting again to consider proposals for Bradford's Early Years Single Funding Formula for the 2017/18 financial year and to make a recommendation on the £1.2m one off monies. One of the key considerations for the EYWG will be our timetable for implementing change in Bradford in response to the DfE's reforms.

In summarising the Authority's proposed response to the DfE's consultation (shown in Appendix 1), the Business Advisor (Schools) explained that the EYWG has recommended that a clearer statement be added about the impact that funding reduction will have on our ability to sustain the improvements that have been made in the quality of early years provision and workforce.

Members agreed that they are satisfied with the proposed response. A Member asked for the composition of the EYWG and this was provided. Another Member stated that, as Nursery Schools are currently unable to convert to academy



status, the option to develop MAT solutions to support future sustainability is not currently available. The Representative of Maintained Nursery Schools stated that the DfE's National Funding Formula proposals for Early Years are contradictory, on one hand stating that Nursery School have different and additional cost bases but, on the other, proposing a set of changes that ignore this.

Resolved –

- 1) That the information in Document GH be noted.**
- 2) The Schools Forum agrees with the Authority's proposed response to the DfE's consultation (shown at Appendix 1) and for this response to be submitted.**

Action: *Business Advisor (Schools)*

190. HIGH NEEDS BLOCK - FUNDING ADDITIONAL SEND PROVISION

Referring to the reports presented under agenda items 9, 10 and 11, as well as the additional **Document GJ**, the Business Advisor (Schools) explained the planned creation of additional SEND places (an additional 120 places in each of the next 3 academic years), how these were to be funded from the High Needs Block and the wider implications on the DSG.

He explained that it is understood that the Schools Forum will wish to fully consider all implications of what has been presented and would wish to make final recommendations on the allocation of the 2017/18 DSG in the round in January 2017. Members are asked to give their outline agreement now however, for the first set of 120 places to be funded from the High Needs Block, to enable these places to be established for January 2017, at an estimated cost of £0.63m for the period January to March 2017 and then £2.52m for a full year (using an estimated cost of £21,000 per place). He explained that these places would be established in interim satellite provisions managed by special schools.

The Strategic Manager, SEND and Behaviour, emphasised the very pressing need to establish the 1st tranche of 120 places. She also made reference to work taking place to deliver efficiencies within the High Needs Block, which would support the identification of more resource to fund an increased quantity of places. The Chair welcomed this reference to value for money and the work that has been done to enable this firm intention to establish additional places to be presented to the meeting today. The Chair also stated that it was important that we do not lose sight of the need for places in both SEND and behaviour provisions and that the work that is taking place around SEND also be completed for behaviour. The Deputy Director, Education, Employment and Skills, stated that it is expected that review work on behaviour will move quickly.

The Vice Chair suggested that it would be helpful if the Forum knew a bit more about the plans for the establishment of the 120 places. The Strategic Manager explained that much of this was still under negotiation, but that 5 different settings have been identified. Diligent work has been carried out by the Authority to



ensure that these places will be established in the correct locations and under secure satellite management arrangements. She added that there has been no shortage of willingness from special schools to co-operate and participate in this work. The Deputy Director added that the schools have been fantastic over this issue.

In the discussion that followed Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- Information was presented to the recent DAP meeting stating that the number of referrals for EHCPs had increased in the District by 97% over the last 2 years.
- How will the 120 places be filled; where will the pupils come from; are these currently in mainstream settings? The Chair responded to say that SEN had presented to the DAP the position that 86 children are currently in mainstream provisions with EHCPs identifying the need for special school place, but it was not necessarily the case that all the 120 will come from mainstream. The Chair also offered his analysis of what has happened / is happening across the country regarding special school places; that there has been an historic reduction in the number of special school places (>1,000 places fewer), the numbers have stabilised over the last 5 years, but now there has been a growth in need, which is driving applications for new special free schools. Bradford needs to move in the direction of developing specialisms within our special school provisions (new free schools) so that our generic special schools can support children currently placed in mainstream settings.
- The budgets of mainstream schools are currently on a knife-edge and there is danger that more funding is removed from mainstream budgets more quickly than pupil transition to specialist places, giving schools a 'double-problem'. The Chair responded to say that there will be a movement of both funding and children out of mainstream following the principle that funding follows the child. However, in terms of the movement of money between the DSG Blocks, we potentially have a final window of opportunity in 2017/18, before National Funding Formula, to move money into the High Needs Block up front to begin to address our sufficiency of provision issues. Any increase in our High Needs Block under NFF is not certain and could possibly be 4 or 5 years away.
- Work needs to take place to address the sufficiency of ESBD places; the pressure is not just in SEND. This pressure needs to be included in discussions about the development of new free school provision.
- The transparency of the application of the funding Ranges Model needs to be looked at, where the level of funding of a pupil jumps when placed in a special school from a mainstream setting.
- What is the 120 / 360 places as a % of current numbers? The Business Advisor confirmed that we have currently approximately 2,000 places funded from the High Needs Block, of which 1,000 are in special schools.
- A Member expressed concern that the growth in special school places will lead to a less inclusive model. The Chair respond to say that mainstream has become a very challenging environment and that the growth in special school places is a national priority and phenomenon. Government has not



provided any strong policy statement on this. A Member added that data shows that Bradford is not becoming less inclusive; it is the level of need that is growing so that the needs of an increasing number of pupils cannot be met appropriately in a mainstream environment. Mainstream is not becoming a less inclusive environment.

- In considering decisions about funding (and moving further amounts from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block) we must also be mindful of the impact reduced mainstream budgets will have on the life chances of mainstream pupils.
- The Vice Chair reminded Members that the position of the sufficiency of high needs places was presented to the Education Improvement Strategy Board earlier this year. The Strategic Director, Children's Services, stated that this presentation has helped the Authority's political leadership to understand the situation and how we respond.

A Member asked for clarity on the % reduction that would be needed from the Schools Block (primary and secondary school funding formulae) to fund the 120 places and asked whether this decision was committing the Forum to the 1.5% reduction that is shown in the primary and secondary consultation document in 2017/18. The Business Advisor (Schools) stated that the 1.5% reduction is also seeking to finance the 2nd tranche of places from September 2017, as well as other cost pressures within the High Needs Block. As such, the % reduction that is needed specifically to fund the 1st tranche of 120 places is lower than this. We would also be looking to use reserve / one off monies to finance the proportion of cost relating to the period January to March 2017. However, in taking the decision the Forum would be accepting a level of contribution from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2017/18. The Business Advisor initially estimated that a reduction of 0.95% would be needed to fund the 1st tranche of places in 2017/18, but he revised this down to an estimated 0.69%, stressing that this is a very rough calculation.

The Chair suggested that a final decision on the funding of the 120 places be postponed until after item 13 on the agenda has been presented. Please see the notes of the discussion recorded under the next item.

Resolved –

The Schools Forum agrees for the first tranche of additional SEND places to be funded from the High Needs Block from January 2017 and on an on-going basis as set out in Document G1.

Action: *Business Advisor (Schools)*

191. **CONSULTATION ON THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FORMULAE 2017/18**

The Principal Finance Officer (schools) presented a report, **Document GK**, which asked the Forum to consider the consultation document, which outlines the proposals for the formulae to be used to calculate budgets for Primary and Secondary schools (and academies) for the 2017/18 financial year and the criteria



that will form the basis of the allocation of additional funding to schools (and academies where appropriate) from DSG centrally managed funds.

The Principal Finance Officer summarised the proposals included in the document Appendix 1, stressing that no structural changes to the primary and secondary formula are proposed other than the changes in data use required by the DfE. She explained the amendment to the IDACI bands and that the weighting within the secondary low attainment factor would be adjusted by the DfE in the dataset we will receive in December.

The Principal Finance Officer stressed that a key purpose of the consultation document, and the modelling attached with this, is to give schools and academies early warning of a reduction in formula funding in 2017/18 that is likely to come from the Forum's discussions on how to meet the growth in High Needs Block cost. She stated that these key messages had been presented to primary business managers last week and will be presented to secondary business managers.

The Principal Finance Office also drew Member's attention to the proposal for the clarification of the criteria to be used to calculate and allocate in year growth funding to secondary schools and academies, as growth in this sector is not quite as straightforward as has been in the phase.

In the discussion that followed Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- Is the 1.5% shown in the document a reduction on some or all formula factors? It was clarified that this was a reduction only in the pupil-led factors. It was agreed that this will be stated more explicitly in the consultation document.
- Is the assumption, with the cost assessment built into the proposed criteria, that growth funding will not usually be allocated to the secondary phase? The Principal Finance Officer clarified that this won't be the assumption. We would actually assume that growth funding would be allocated, but we feel that it is reasonable, given that how a secondary school can adjust to handle changes in pupil numbers is more complicated than in a primary school, that an assessment is carried out to ensure that an additional allocation from the DSG represents value for money.
- Will secondary growth funding be limited to growth in year 7, not for growth in other year groups during the year? It was confirmed that growth funding would only be applied for year 7 growth within the normal admissions round, where this growth comes from the request by the Local Authority for the school to increase its PAN to meet basic need sufficiency. It would not fund pupils admitted on appeal.
- What will the cost assessment look like within the secondary growth fund criteria? The Business Advisor (Schools) stated that this would be a budget conversation with the school. A Member emphasised that this conversation would need to take place at the point the Authority consults with the school about increasing its PAN. The Business Advisor (Schools) agreed that this would be the case.



- What are the positions of school carry forward balances? How challenging will it be for a reduction of 1.5% to be managed by individual schools? The Business Advisor stated that the picture of carry forward balances becomes clearer from quarter 2 budget monitoring returns in October. Some schools will be better placed than others to manage this reduction. He also emphasised that the figure of 1.5% has been used in the consultation document as this is a way of getting a clear message out to schools as simply as possible. He referred to discussion earlier in the meeting regarding the possibility of taking a contribution at a value greater than 1.5% and also that, on current numbers, 1.5% will not be sufficient to balance the DSG allocation in 2017/18 (Document GG shows that there is still a £1.2m budget gap). The Principal Finance Officer explained that we are also providing schools with a view of their worst case scenario in 2017/18 (the point at which the school is funded on the DfE's Minimum Funding Guarantee). The HCSS Budget Software will also enable schools to model the combined impact of income reductions and expenditure increases.
- This cumulative impact of income reductions, including reductions in early years and post 16, and expenditure increases, needs to be analysed.
- A Member commented that a reduction of 1.5% is probably just the 'tip of the iceberg' where we look at the costs that have already been absorbed by schools over the last 2 years and as we look forward to the implications of National Funding Formula and the further growth of costs in schools.

Resolved –

That the consultation document, as set out in Document GK, but incorporating the amendments agreed by Members that are recorded in the minutes of the meeting, be published.

Action: *Principal Finance Officer (Schools)*

192. WORK PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2016/17 ACADEMIC YEAR

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, **Document GL**, which outlined the School Forum's 2016/17 Academic Year work programme.

Resolved –

That the work programme be noted.

Action: *Business Advisor (Schools)*

193. SCHOOLS FORUM STANDING ITEMS

194. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AOB) / FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Resolved –



That information be provided to the Schools Forum on the charging of payroll costs in response to the matter raised by a Forum Member at the start of the meeting.

195. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Schools Forum is Wednesday 19 October 2016.

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Schools Forum.

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

