

Minutes of a meeting of the Schools Forum held on Wednesday, 7 December 2016 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 0805, Adjourned 0955
Reconvened 1015, Concluded 1135

PRESENT

School Members:

Bev George, Brent Fitzpatrick, Chris Quinn, Dianne Rowbotham, Domic Wall, Dwayne Saxton, Emma Ockerby, Helen Williams, Ian Morrel, Keven Holland, Lesley Heathcote, Sir Nick Weller, Ray Tate, Sue Hathwaite, Tahir Jamil, Trevor Loft and Wahid Zaman

Nominated Sub:

Alison Kaye, Ian Murch and Irene Docherty

Executive Portfolio Holder – Education, Employment and Skills:

Councillor Imran Khan

Local Authority Officers:

Andrew Redding

Angela Spencer-Brooke

Dawn Haigh

Judith Kirk

Michael Jameson

Raj Singh

Stuart McKinnon-Evans

Business Advisor (Schools)

Strategic Manager, SEND and Behaviour

Principal Finance Officer (Schools)

Deputy Director, Education, Employment
and Skills

Strategic Director, Children's Services

Business Advisor

Director of Finance

DOMINIC WALL IN THE CHAIR

210. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Members - Nicky Kilvington, Nigel Cooper, Ray Tate and Sami Harzallah; Regular Observer - Lynn Murphy (Business Manager, Feversham College)

211. CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

In opening the meeting, the Chair explained that this was the first Schools Forum meeting since the death of Gareth Dawkins. Gareth was a long-standing member of the Schools Forum and the Chair asked Members to remember Gareth, and to recognise the significant contribution that he made in Bradford over many years, in a way that Gareth would have enjoyed. The Chair led the Schools Forum in a round of applause.

The Chair explained that there has been Press interest in today's meeting that the Press may be in attendance.

The Chair expressed his appreciation to Sir Nick Weller, for the clarity and boldness of his Northern Powerhouse Schools Strategy report, and his success in the publication of this.

The Chair provided an overview for Members of the position of discussions on key matters and stressed the importance of today's meeting. He explained that he and the Vice Chair had attended the most recent Education Improvement Strategic Board and had briefed members of this board about the critical issues relating to the management of pressures within the DSG High Needs Block in 2017/18, including the options for contribution from the Schools Block. He explained that a view is forming about the impact of the 'worst case scenario' Minimum Funding Guarantee option, which needs to be interrogated. Today's meeting is a final opportunity for Forum Members to ask for more information prior to January's decision making process. A critical question with every agenda item is whether Members feel that they have sufficient information on which to take recommendations.

The Chair explained that there are now strong rumours that the DfE is about to publish its 2nd stage of consultation on National Funding Formula. He highlighted for members the modelling that has been published already by the NUT on the pressures within education funding nationally. He reported that he has talked directly with 3 other regional Chairs of Schools Forums and that these conversations have confirmed the view about common pressures related to the High Needs Block.

The Chair explained that the DfE has confirmed the final details, following its earlier consultation, on early years funding reform and that these will be picked up under the early years funding agenda item.

Finally, the Chair explained that, although most of the items do not require decisions, it will be helpful for a decision to be made on de-delegation for the purposes of subscribing to Fischer Family Trust, due to the timescale for confirming subscription for next year.

212

212. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Declaration were received from the Chair, Ian Morrel, Sue Haithwaite and Trevor Loft for agenda item 11 "Funding High Needs 2017/18 (including Consultation Outcomes).

ACTION: ***City Solicitor***

213 MINUTES OF 19 OCTOBER 2016 & MATTERS ARISING (minutes)

a) Agree the minutes as a correct record.

b) The Business Adviser on progress made “Action” items:

- **Consultation on High Needs Block funding matters** (item 204 page 11): It was reported that the consultation was published and this is returning on the agenda under item 11. The request for further information on high needs funding matters is picked up in a number of report but especially under agenda item 11.
- **DSG Central Items and De-Delegated Funds** (item 205 page 12): A further report is presented under agenda item 12. It was reported that the Vice Chair presented information on de-delegation to BPIP on 4 November. 6 additional responses were received giving mixed views about the position of de-delegation.

c) Other matters arising

- **Northern Powerhouse Schools Strategy report:** Members will be aware already of publication of the report by Sir Nick Weller on the Northern PowerHouse Schools Strategy. This report makes a number of recommendations, which will be of interest to the Schools Forum in its decision about the use of resources, the development of high needs provisions, and in the context of national funding formula. We recommend that this report is considered more fully by the Schools Forum in the new year.
- **Post 16 Free School Provision:** A request was made at the last meeting for further information on how the Local Authority is managing, and modelling the implications of, the development of new Post 16 free school provision in the Bradford District. A response has been provided as a matters arising document in the agenda reports pack. In responding to this document, the Member representing Teacher Trade Unions expressed his concern about how the Local Authority is controlling the strategic direction of post 16 provision and ensuring that every child has access to a place. He stated that his concern is shared by Union colleagues. He referred to a secondary school that has already decided to close its 6th form. The Strategic Director, Children’s Services, responded by explaining that the role of the Local Authority is to influence and that there has been extensive engagement with partners about the direction of post 16 provision. There are established forums in which strategic provision matters are discussed. The Member referred to specific questions that have been asked about provision in Bradford South that have not yet been responded to. The Strategic Director offered to discuss this matter further outside the meeting. The Chair stated that the Member is welcome to raise this matter again with the Forum if he still has concerns following these discussions.
- **Social Impact Bond:** Members will recall the discussion in the July meeting regarding the Social Impact Bond. An update is provided as a matters arising document.
- **Academy conversions:** The Business Advisor reported that 10 schools have converted to academy status since the last Forum meeting (9 primary and 1 secondary) and that none of these schools are expected to close with a deficit budget. 19 schools have converted so far this academic year.

- **Oastler Letter Panel Update:** The Business Advisor reported that the additional information that was requested by the Panel is being collected and a meeting date for the Panel to conclude its recommendations on the Oastler School deficit budget matter will be set for the New Year.
- **Schools Unbilled Payroll:** Forum Members asked at the last meeting for further information regarding the total value and number of schools that will have converted to academy before the matter is resolved. The Business Advisor reported that £156,000 has been re-paid with £661,000 still to be repaid. 9 schools have converted to academy and it is expected that a further 6 will convert before February 2017.

Resolved –

- (1) **That progress made on “Action” and “Matters Arising” be noted.**
- (2) **That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2016 be signed as a correct record.**

ACTION: City Solicitor

214 MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOLS

No resolution was passed on this item.

215 THE AUTUMN SPENDING REVIEW AND NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA

The Business Advisor (Schools) confirmed the Chair’s statement in the introduction to the meeting, that it is strongly rumoured that there will be an announcement about National Funding Formula before Christmas. At this point however, we are still very unclear about what will be proposed for National Funding Formula for the Schools and High Needs Blocks and what the impact will be on Bradford. There is quite a lot of noise in local press across the country regarding the modelling that has been published by the NUT, which in particular highlights the erosion in the real terms value of education funding.

The DfE has announced the final details of changes in the funding of the Early Years Block. The final position for Bradford is as the DfE initially proposed in its consultation; an increase in the rate of funding for the 2 year old offer but a decrease in the funding of the 3 and 4 year old offer and a restriction on the proportion of spend on deprivation. There is still uncertainty about the medium to longer term funding position for nursery schools, but the DfE has announced that rates of funding for nursery schools will now be protected for 3 financial years starting April 2017.

The Business Advisor also reported that little was said about education funding by the Chancellor in his Autumn Statement other than the identification of capital funding for the development of grammar schools.

Forum Members did not have any comments or questions.

No resolution was passed on this item.

216 THE LOCAL AUTHORITY'S BUDGET CONSULTATION

The Strategic Director, Children's Services presented the Council's (Children's Services) budget position and the proposals for 2017-19 that were currently out for consultation across the District.

The detail of this presentation is recorded in the PowerPoint (these minutes do not repeat the detail). The Strategic Director emphasised that the proposals are based on the key priorities of improving educational outcomes, safeguarding and supporting vulnerable children and families at the point of need and promoting employment and skills for all and on the key principles of early help and support, managing demand and building on strengths, improving placement choice, a school-led delivery system, which includes trading and maximising the benefits of integration and joint commissioning. He also emphasised that the proposals are made in the context of reducing central Government funding (a further £82m of savings by 2020), a growing population, increasing numbers of new arrivals into the District, and increasing demand for services, but also in the context of reducing DSG budget contributions and growing pressure in the High Needs Block. The Deputy Director added that the DSG financial element is hugely challenging for the Council, as it is for schools.

In summary, the Strategic Director explained the proposed budget savings as follows:

- £0.47m, 2017-18 Savings Proposals already approved in February 2016 (£0.15m School Improvement, £0.243m Employment & Skills, £0.077m Youth Offending)
- £1.518m, 2017-18 Savings Proposals already approved in February 2016 where amounts and phasing have altered (Social Care)
- £1.207m, 2017-18 Savings Proposals already approved in February 2016 replaced with compensatory proposals subject to consultation (Social Care)
- £1.808m, 2017-18 & 2018-19 New Saving Proposals subject to consultation (£0.06m School Readiness , £0.3m Employment & Skills, £1.448m Social Care)
- £2.4m, Potential Loss of Dedicated School Grant for Council Services
- Total Savings of £7.4m in 2017-18 and 2018-19 (excluding current year pressure of £3.1m)

Schools Forum Members asked the following main questions and made the following comments:

- The Vice Chair commented that schools with higher proportions of children from vulnerable families are in receipt of the Pupil Premium Grant but there is a tension in that schools are increasingly needing to use their PPG to pay for support services that are no longer available through the Council / not available without charge, pulling this funding away from spend on educational outcomes focused interventions.
- The Chair commented that the stand out impression that comes from this presentation (and the size of the budget reductions) is the necessity to drive immediate and substantial cost efficiencies, within both the Council's budget and the DSG.

- In terms of efficiencies, what strategies are being employed by the Council across its budget? Can these be shared with the Forum e.g. early help, more effective collaboration. A report on this would be welcomed.
- There are significant efficiencies to be found in improving how schools and health services work together.
- How much reserve is the Council proposing to use in its budget across 2017-2020? The Director of Finance stated that it is proposed to use £20m of reserve over the next 4 years, but with £17m of this in 2017/18. Following this, the Council will have £150m of reserve, of which £40m is in schools.

At the end of the Forum's discussion, the Executive Member for Education, Employment and Skills, stated that these were a set of very difficult budget proposals with no easy choices. The budget position is such that the Council is struggling to deliver statutory services. Within this, education is a priority and the Council wishes to work very closely with its partners and with schools in particular.

Resolved –

- (1) Forum Members are asked to give their feedback to the Executive's budget proposals affecting education and Children's Services either to the next meeting (11 January) or directly via the consultation process.**
- (2) That a report be provided to a future Forum meeting on what guiding strategies the Council is employing to deliver its budget savings (strategies such as focusing on early help, delivering further efficiencies, multi agency budget collaboration and transfer of responsibilities).**

217 2016/17 DSG SPENDING POSITION AND ONE OFF MONIES

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented the report, Document GT, which updated members on the forecasted spending positions of centrally managed and de-delegated funds held within the DSG in 2016/17. This document gave members a view of the estimated value of one off monies that would be available to add to the 2017/18 DSG Headroom and a view of the uses of this funding. The presentation focused on Appendix 2.

The Business Advisor explained that the value of one off monies / uncommitted reserve held within the DSG is expected to be lower at March 2017 than held in previous years (£1.75m compared with £3.0m). This is the result, in particular, of the forecasted overspending against the planned High Needs Block budget due to the creation of new additional places from January 2017 and pressure in the cost of EHCP's in mainstream provisions and placements out of authority. As a result, there is little money available for additional investment and it is recommended that the uncommitted reserve within the DSG is held unallocated. Following a Member's question, the Chair reminded the Forum of the discussions that took place in May 2016 on a confidential matter, which placed additional commitment on the DSG's reserve figure presented in Appendix 2.

The Business Advisor explained that it is now proposed to retain the identified sum of £0.5m to protect base rates funding for the 3 and 4 year old offer in

2018/19 rather than in 2017/18.

The Business Advisor highlighted the pressure within the de-delegated maternity / paternity scheme, explaining that this is behind the request for the Schools Forum to review the position of this scheme especially for the secondary phase, which will be considered in the later agenda item.

Forum Members did not have any comments and did not asked any further questions.

Resolved –

No resolution was passed on this item. Forum Members did not ask for any further information.

218 2017/18 DSG UPDATE

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document GU, which provided a forecast of the anticipated DSG budget position and cost pressures in the 2017/18 financial year. It was stressed that this is still an estimated position, but, unless a significant addition sum is allocated to Bradford in the 2017/18 DSG High Needs Block settlement (announced later in December), this is a realistic appraisal of the 2017/18 DSG.

The Business Advisor highlighted the following:

- One of the key principles proposed to lay behind the management of the DSG going forward is that the Early Years Block will be ring-fenced, apart from its contribution to early years SEND costs.
- The actual estimated pressure in the High Needs Block next year is £6.86m. This assumes only £1m of new income from DfE. 50% roughly of this £6.86m pressure comes from the cost of new places (including only a 7/12ths provision for the 2nd tranche of 120). 50% comes from growth in pressure in existing provisions, including growth of mainstream EHCPs / SEND statements and out of authority placements. This pressure is after the Early Years Block has contributed £300,000 for the SEN Inclusion budget. It is also after a 1.5% reduction has been levied on the High Needs Block top up rates and centrally managed budgets.
- A 1.5% contribution from the Schools Block pupil-led factors, on current estimates, will provide a sum of £4m to help offset the £6.86m. This contribution is split 50/50 between primary and secondary when a blanket 1.5% reduction in all factors is applied.
- After these contributions however, it is still currently estimated that the High Needs Block will overspend and the total DSG funding gap is estimated to be £2.3m i.e. more may need to be done to balance the 2017/18 DSG.

The Chair emphasised that, on current modelling, a 1.5% reduction within the Schools Block would not close the DSG gap in 2017/18 fully. This leaves the Schools Forum with a very difficult set of considerations and decisions to make. However, the Schools Forum must make recommendations that set a balanced DSG budget. The Chair asked that Members hold their detailed responses on this until all the agenda items relating to the DSG position, including the updated modelling of school budgets and the High Needs Block, have been presented.

In responding to the presentation, Members made the following comments and asked the following questions:

- Whether modelling can be done on comparative High Needs Block per pupil spending, incorporating a view about the level of spending in higher performing local authorities. The Chair responded that benchmarking has taken place (and has been presented to the Forum) showing that our spending per place in special schools is close to the national median. It is understood that the comparison for alternative provision is more complex because of the diverse nature of provisions can come under the AP designation. However, it will be helpful for more information on the 'national context' to be provided for 11 January meeting.
- Whether the calculations suggest that a contribution of 1.9% from the Schools Block resolves the £2.3m final gap. It was explained that the resolution is more complicated than this as there are restrictions on how monies can be 'moved around'.
- What will be the impact of a 1.5% / sizeable transfer of money out of primary and secondary school budgets in 2017/18? Do we have a clear view about this? The Business Advisor explained that he has collected information on impact through his discussions with schools, but that he welcomed the opportunity to talk with individual members who offered in the meeting to put their schools forward as 'case studies'.

Resolved –

- (1) That a report be provided to the 11 January meeting, which sets out in more detail the options that are available for the management and balancing of the DSG in 2017/18. That this report also provides further information on Bradford's position in the national context.**
- (2) That further work takes place, on a case-study style basis, to interrogate the impact of a 1.5% reduction in the primary and secondary formula funding values in 2017/18 and the options around this, to inform the Forum's discussions on the 11 January.**

219 CONSULTATION OUTCOMES - EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document GV, which asked Members to consider the outcomes of the consultation on the 2017/18 Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF). Members deferred a decision on the structure of the EYSFF to 11 January. As such, this item was treated as 'for information'.

The Business Advisor highlighted the following:

- As set out in the DSG document for the previous item, it is proposed to establish the principle of ring-fencing of the Early Years Block for 2017/18 and for the future.
- There is nothing in the responses to our consultation (that the Forum approved at the last meeting) that suggests our proposals regarding structure of the EYSFF for 2017/18 are not supported and should not be implemented. We proposed a lot of continuity on current arrangements. The Authority asks then that the Forum recommends the structure of the EYSFF as set out in the

- consultation document is implemented for 2017/18.
- The main concern expressed in responses to our consultation is the significant reduction in rates of funding for the 3 and 4 year old entitlement as a result of the Government's Early Years Funding Reform and the impact that this will have on the quality of provision.
- The Government announced the final details of its national formula on 1 December. Our 2017/18 proposals are compliant with what is required from April 2017. We do need to develop further our existing approach to SEN Inclusion funding and we propose to re-convene the EYWG in the new year to do this. Our next steps around structural reform will be working towards a consultation on amended formula arrangements in Bradford for 2018/19, incorporating a universal base rate, as we set out in our consultation document.
- The DfE has confirmed:
 - Our net loss of funding is as set out in the original consultation document. This is unchanged. Our 2 year old rate of funding will increase to £5.20 but we will lose £3m in 3 and 4 year old funding over the next 2 years.
 - The restriction on supplements to 10% does come in at 1 April 2017. The calculation of this is tighter than estimated, which means that we cannot spend as much at 10% on deprivation as we anticipated. This factor in particular affects the funding of nursery classes. The transfer of budget from deprivation to base rate does however protect the funding of PVI sector.
 - The Maintained Nursery School Supplement is confirmed and is extended for at least another year (until April 2020) with further consultation to take place. We are expected to fund nursery schools as currently. However, our value of Supplement funding will be set on our actual current spend so we will not have a balance to allocate (the £275k we set out in the report will not exist).
 - A new Disability Access Fund will be established, estimated to be worth £160,000 in Bradford in 2017/18.
 - A requirement for local authorities to operate SEN Inclusion funds. We have in place already an SEN Inclusion Fund, but we do need to do some work to develop this
- As a result of the confirmation of the tightening of the 10% restriction, we suggest amending the proposal around the use of the £500,000 one off, so that this is allocated in the 2018/19 not the 2017/18 financial year.

The Member representing maintained nursery schools expressed her concern about the potential loss of the Nursery School Supplement and that it is important that the Forum considers carefully how one off monies can be used to support the sustainability of the early years sector.

Forum Members did not have any further comments and did not asked any further questions.

Resolved –

No resolution was passed on this item. Final recommendations on the structure of the Early Years Single Funding Formula for 2017/18 are deferred to the 11 January 2017.

220 INDICATIVE BUDGETS 2017/18 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES

The Principal Finance Officer (Schools) presented a report, Document GW, which provided members with updated indicative modelling of Primary & Secondary delegated budget shares in 2017/18, using the pupil numbers taken from the October 2016 Census.

The Principal Finance Officer explained that this is part of the information presented for the Forum's consideration about the Schools Block contribution to the DSG gap in 2017/18. The modelling shows:

- The position of each school's budget and how this is adjusted for changes in pupil numbers.
- The cost to each school's budget of a '1.5% per pupil Schools Block contribution' to the High Needs Block, which generates a sum of £4m.
- The proportionate sector cost of this 1.5% contribution (£60.70 per pupil secondary; £37.74 per pupil primary).
- What the worst case scenario position would be (how much more contribution could be taken from individual schools before all schools would be on their Minimum Funding Guarantee levels). This would generate a sum of £6m (£2m more than under the 1.5% option).

Forum Members did not have any comments and did not ask any questions on this modelling at this point. The Chair commented again that such a contribution from school budgets in 2017/18 will have an impact, including on staffing levels, and that the Forum is being asked to consider some very difficult decisions.

Resolved –

No resolution was passed on this item.

221 FUNDING HIGH NEEDS 2017/18 (INCLUDING CONSULTATION OUTCOMES)

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document GX, which asked the Forum to consider the outcomes of the consultation on the 2017/18 High Needs Funding Model and gave the Forum sight of the planned number of high needs places to be commissioned by the Authority. Document GX also gave an update on the position of other strategic high needs funding matters. Members deferred a decision on the structure of the High Needs Block funding model to 11 January. As such, this item was treated as 'for information'.

The Business Advisor explained that this was the final agenda item, presented to give Members sight of the issues related to the difficult decisions that will be required to be taken in allocating the 2017/18 DSG budget.

The report set out further information behind the High Needs Block allocation and cost pressures, including the allocated places within the planned model (Appendix 1). It provided sight of the impact of a 1.5% reduction in top up values (Appendix 2). It also provided information relating to 'efficiency and value for money', highlighting some key areas of watch, improvement and review, and information

on the sector-led teaching services review, in response to the requests made by Members at the previous meeting.

In response to the report, Members focused on the information presented regarding the funding of unfilled places (4%). Members asked for a further more detailed breakdown of unfilled places to be presented on 11 January. It was clarified that the cost estimates for the High Needs Block in 2017/18 presented to the meeting included the financing of the 1st tranche of new places as well as 7/12ths of the 2nd tranche and that the cost of additional places that were already filled are also included.

In pulling together the information presented to the meeting so far about the 2017/18 DSG, the Strategic Director, Children's Services expressed his awareness of the complexity of the issues being raised. He advised that it will be helpful for an options impact analysis paper to be presented to the Forum at the next meeting. As it is highly likely that the DSG budget position will be need to be resolved by combining actions, savings and contributions, across the DSG, it will be helpful for the Forum to have full, clear sight of all of these, and the impact of these and how impact could be mitigated, in one report.

The Chair asked Members whether they had any comments at this stage on the option for the sizeable contribution from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2017/18. Members stated generally that they needed further time to consider this and to talk with colleagues, but made the following comments and asked the following questions:

- There is support amongst colleagues for the creation of high needs places. However, there is considerable concern about the implications on schools budgets of a sizeable formula funding reduction in 2017/18.
- The system for the assessment and placement of high needs children in Bradford is currently too slow. The speed of access to assessment services as well to centrally funded high needs support services needs to improve.
- How will high needs provision, responding to growth, be financial sustainable in the longer term if the High Needs Block is currently set to overspend so significantly. What is the Local Authority's strategic plan? What will be the impact of National Funding Formula?
- How can we mitigate against the impact of a formula funding reduction in schools in 2017/18? What are the options for using DSG (and reserve) over more than one year to 'delay' or mitigate the impact of a formula funding contribution?
- How do the issues that Bradford is having to consider fit into the national picture?

Forum Members agreed that an options appraisal report be provided as well as further 'case-study' analysis for the 11 January meeting (actions recorded under minute 218).

Resolved –

(1) Final recommendations on the structure of the High Needs Block funding model for 2017/18 are deferred to the 11 January 2017.

(2) That further information is presented to the next meeting on unfilled places.

222 CENTRAL AND DE-DELEGATED EARLY YEARS & SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDS 2017/18

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document GY, which asked Forum Members to further consider the position of Schools and Early Years Block central and de-delegated items from the DSG in 2017/18, following the initial discussion in the meeting of 19 October 2016.

The Business Advisor explained that Members are asked for a steer, prior to final decisions to be made on 11 January, on whether any Member disagrees with any of the recommendations set out in the report on the continuation or cessation of funds, or whether Members need further information on any of these. He explained that it will be helpful for secondary maintained Forum members to give a specific steer on de-delegation in 2017/18 for the maternity and paternity insurance scheme in the secondary phase, responding to the concerns regarding the financial viability of this fund that are set out in the report (the loss of critical mass). The Business Advisor also highlighted for Members the outline proposal to hold a sum to be used for meeting the cost of deficit budget of primary sponsored academies.

It was explained that most of the report was presented only for further information and to gain a steer (to inform decisions to be taken in January). However, it would be helpful for the Forum to take a decision on the position of the funding of the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) subscription in 2017/18, if possible.

Members made the following comments and asked the following questions on funds other than FFT (focused on the maternity reimbursement scheme):

- That the maternity reimbursement insurance scheme does look to be financial unviable for the secondary phase.
- That if the maternity scheme is ceased for the secondary phase consideration needs to be given about appropriate timing of exit from this (recognising existing commitments).
- In responding to the explanation that the Authority does not currently broker supply insurance arrangements for schools, a Member expressed disappointment that the Local Authority is not prepared to negotiate a District-wide agreement for maternity insurance across schools. Another Member expressed concern about the implications for the cessation of the maternity scheme for smaller schools. It was clarified that cessation is only currently under consideration for the secondary phase and that there are commercial alternatives. It was also clarified that de-delegation is a Schools Forum decision.

The Forum engaged in a rather complicated debate about the subscription to Fischer Family Trust, with a need for clarification on some aspects of the contractual position. From this discussion, Primary maintained members voted in favour (3 out of 3) and secondary members voted against (2 out of 2) the continuation of de-delegation in 2017/18 to subscribe to Fischer Family Trust (FFT) data. However, prior to a final decision, it was agreed that clarification is sought on the contractual and cost position where the primary and secondary

phases are not in agreement. The Vice Chair also stated that she wished to further consult with BPIP regarding the decision to be made for the primary phase.

Resolved –

Primary maintained members voted in favour (3 out of 3) and secondary members voted against (2 out of 2) the continuation of de-delegation in 2017/18 to subscribe to Fischer Family Trust (FFT) data. Prior to a final decision on FFT subscription for 2017/18, to be taken on 11 January, that clarification is sought on the position where the primary and secondary phases are not in agreement about de-delegation. The Vice Chair is to further consult with BPIP regarding the decision for the primary phase.

223 STANDING ITEM - DSG GROWTH FUND ALLOCATIONS

No resolution was passed on this item.

224 STANDING ITEM - BRADFORD EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT COMMISSIONING BOARD

225 OTHER SCHOOLS FORUM STANDING ITEMS

Resolved –

That Single Status is removed as a standing agenda item.

226 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No resolution was passed on this item.

227 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

That the dates of the next two meetings of the Schools Forum be confirmed as:

- Wednesday 11 January 2016.**
- Wednesday 18 January 2017.**

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