

# MINUTES OF MEETING

**Meeting title:** Nottinghamshire Schools Forum  
**Date and time:** 04 June 2015, 2pm to 4pm  
**Location:** National Watersports Centre NG12 2LU

## Membership

*'A' denotes absence*

Ms L Regan	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Ashfield)
Ms S Bates	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Broxtowe) - (Chair)
Mrs A Allcock	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Bassetlaw)
A Mr J Wilson	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Gedling)
Mrs H Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Mansfield)
Ms H Richardson	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Newark)
Ms L Toon	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Rushcliffe)
A Mr C James	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
A Mr D Vasey	Academy Head Teacher
A Mr D Cotton	Academy Head Teacher
A Mr C Weaver	Academy Head Teacher
Mr J McGeachie	Academy Head Teacher
Ms D Trusler	Academy Head Teacher
A Ms K McIntyre	Special school Head Teacher
Mr R McCrossen	Special school Head Teacher
Ms V Holland	Governor - maintained primary
Mr T Colton	Governor - maintained secondary
A Mr M Quigley	Governor – academy
Ms K O'Connell	PVI - Early Years Consultation Group Chair
Ms C Walton	PVI - Early Years Consultation Group Member
Mr C Cuomo	Diocesan representative - Head teacher – (Vice Chair)
Ms C Meese	Diocesan representative
Mr J Jefferies	Trades union representative - NASUWT
Ms H Allister	Trades union representative – UNISON

## ***In attendance:***

Mr J Slater	Service Director, Education Standards & Inclusion
Mrs S Summerscales	Acting Senior Finance Business Partner
Ms I Kakoullis	Group Manager – Childhood and Early Help
Ms A Holloway	Team Manager SEND Commissioning
Mr C Savage	Principal Educational Psychologist
Mr M Sharpe	Team Manager Place Planning & Admissions
Mrs T Gardner	Assistant Accountant

		ACTION						
1.	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>Sally Bates welcomed new members to the Forum, Adrienne Allcock, Walkeringham Primary and Ly Toom, Willow Brook Primary and all present introduced themselves.</p>							
2.	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Julian Wilson – Craig Weaver – Mike Quigley – Carlo Cuomo (substitute attended Paul Burke) – Claire Meese – Hazel Allister (substitute attended Lorraine Maddison) and Derek Higton.</p>							
	<p><b>Meeting Format</b></p> <p>A request was made and agreed to alter the running order of the agenda. Item 4c Support for Schools to Safeguard Children would be presented after Item 4j Key Stage 2 Pupil Growth / Basic Need due to the presenter Steve Edwards not being available until later in the afternoon.</p>							
3.	<p><b>Minutes of the Previous Meetings – 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b></p> <p>John Slater confirmed that an annual report was presented to the Children and Young People’s Committee on the 9<sup>th</sup> February, a copy of which was circulated to Forum Members on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2015.</p> <p><b>Matters arising</b></p> <p>Sally Bates informed the Forum that the Rushcliffe Heads were seeking support from Kenneth Clarke for the work of F40 campaign group for fairer funding and a suggestion to encourage other schools to contact their MP’s collectively.</p> <p>Sally Bates asked if the Forum would also support the F40 group and the goal of a fairer funding system. Joe Jefferies also a member of the F40 group stressed how support from all parties was greatly appreciated</p> <p>Support from the Schools Forum – F40 &amp; National fairer funding system.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Votes for</th> <th>Votes against</th> <th>Abstentions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Sue Summerscales highlighted that the meeting originally planned for Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> September has been bought forward to Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> September due to venue availability. Time and venue remains the same.</p> <p>The rest of the minutes were accepted as a true record.</p>	Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions	13	0	0	
Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions						
13	0	0						
4a.	<p><b>Schools Budget Final Accounts 2014-15 &amp; Schools Reserve</b></p> <p>Sue Summerscales presented the paper and took the members through Appendix A</p> <p>Val Holland asked how the Early Years Dedicated School Grant (DSG) adjustment came about and why. The Forum were advised that the 2014-15 Early Year’s initial allocation is based on pupil numbers from January 2014, once the January 2015 numbers are received allocations are adjusted to reflect 5/12 of January 2014</p>							

	<p>numbers and 7/12 of January 2015 numbers.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire had an increase in pupil numbers, therefore received additional DSG allocation, but this was not enough to cover the early years overspend.</p> <p><u>Family SEN underspend and carry forward.</u></p> <p>Louise Regan queried the SEN underspend and carrying funds into the new year, as was of the understanding that this was not allowed and should all be spent in year.</p> <p>Alison Holloway advised that in exceptional cases this was permissible and in order to be transparent would look into this further. Members requested a report be bought back with details and criteria for permissible cases.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notes the contents of the report – report noted.</li> </ol>	<b>AH</b>
4b.	<p><b>Review of Schools Forum Membership</b></p> <p>Sue Summerscales presented the papers and explained the changes in membership.</p> <p>James McGeachie was concerned with attendance levels; out of six academy representatives only two were present. Was there something that could be done about this, and was there anything within the constitution?</p> <p>Sue Summerscales responded that there was nothing in the constitution regarding the levels of attendance.</p> <p>Louise Regan agreed with James McGeachie, if we compared with governor membership - three missed meetings and governors would be disqualified for non-attendance.</p> <p>Forum members would like to address non-attendance, as areas and schools are not being represented.</p> <p>Tony Colton asked if governors are aware of the Schools Forum, as there is a lack of general knowledge surrounding the Schools Forum.</p> <p>Sue Summerscales advised members that there is a public Nottinghamshire's Schools Forum website where all papers, membership details etc are available for all to access.</p> <p>Donna Trusler, added that with more academies being part of multi trust academies, Principals and C.E.O. feel more removed from the whole process.</p> <p>James McGeachie asked what the quorate percentage was for Schools Forum; Sue Summerscales advised this to be 40% of membership excluding vacancies.</p> <p>Louise Regan felt that as a representative on the Forum if you were unable to attend, it should be the representative's responsibility to appoint a replacement. Adrienne Allcock agreed with Louise Regan.</p> <p>James McGeachie asked if academy representatives were area based, advised that they were not. Concern was expressed here as you could have a situation where only a certain area of Nottinghamshire is represented.</p> <p>Louise Regan confirmed that the maintained primary sector was in areas.</p>	

Chris Walton suggested a letter be sent to the DFE to highlight the point that the constitution does not address attendance levels.

**Please Note**

Upon investigation attendance levels are a matter for local discretion. A brief paper will be presented at the next meeting.

**Recommendation/s**

1. Notes the content of the report – report noted
2. Agrees to the membership as set out in paragraph 7 of the report

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
13	0	0

**4d Trade Union – Verbal Update**

Louise Regan gave some background detail on the trade union budget what it was used for and the reason why it was looked at in more depth. Thanked Joe Jefferies and the working group for all their work, Sally Bates seconded this.

The group have had a number of meetings which have been interesting with good discussion. A joint letter from Sally Bates and John Slater has since gone out to Academies which has resulted in a number of academies enquiring and paying into the pot.

Protocol on schools and trade unions has been worked on which is currently with HR, once completed this will be circulated to forum members and then more formally to all schools.

Helen Atkins thanked the working group for all the work and felt that the protocol was a vital piece of work.

Donna Trusler advised that the area she represents is unlikely to change their minds and contribute to the trade union pot, and queried their position.

This is a national problem that needs to be played out; individuals are making their contribution but may not have a representative during the school day.

Helen Richardson asked who would be able to use the trade union facilitates, the advice was that only schools that contributed to this would be able to use this, schools that did not contribute would not.

**4e Heads Count**

Adrienne Allcock presented the paper, and explained that when the paper was bought to the Forum for 14-15, members requested more justifications and data to support the request. Adrienne Allcock explained due to the nature of help provided it was difficult to present data in a statistical way.

Sally Bates – help provided is beneficial to new heads.

Louise Regan – support invaluable and very helpful as primary heads can feel very isolated.

Donna Trusler supported this as well.

It was clarified that the heads count covers all head teachers; however the majority that access the service are primary heads, and that new heads are aware of this support and contact details are given to colleagues when appointed into post.

James McGeachie suggested a flyer for secondary heads to encourage take up.

**Recommendation/s**

1. Notes the content of the report – report noted
2. Agrees to make an allocation to Heads Count of £37,950 in 2015/16 from the DSG underspend.

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
13	0	0

**4f Review of Early Years Funding Arrangements**

Irene Kakoullis presented the paper, which is supported by Chris Walton and Karen O’Connell seconded this. Chris Walton explained the national problem facing early year’s providers and how some have actually gone out of business.

Sue Summerscales clarified that this request is not just for PVI’s but also for all primary schools.

**Recommendation/s**

1. Notes the content of the report – report noted
2. Subject to EFA agreement approves, in principle the use of underspend on two year old places to make an additional goodwill payment to schools and PVI providers for 2015/16 only. This will temporarily increase the hourly rate for funded three and four year olds to £4.00 for PVIS and £3.90 for maintained schools backdated to April 2015 at a cost of £1.5m;
3. Approves the use of underspend on two year old trajectory funding to maintain the hourly rate for two year olds at £5.09 for 2015/16 only at a cost of £430k;
4. Approves the inclusion of the EYSFF in the Schools local funding formula consultation for 2016/17, specifically;
  - the base funding rate for three and four year olds
  - the base funding rate for two year olds
  - the criteria for and value of the deprivation supplement included in the EYSFF
  - the meal allowance for children attracting the deprivation supplement and attending a session which spans the lunch period
  - the sustainability supplement for schools whose nursery unit/foundation unit was historically less than 20 places;

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
13	0	0

Action approved in principle, would require approval from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) for disapplication of the regulations.

4g

**SEN Review 2015**

Alison Holloway presented the paper.

Helen Akins was shocked that the paper had come to the Forum for a request for Funding to review SEN, in the Mansfield area there is a partnership set up that works

If the Local authority wishes to review SEN, then it should be funded from within the Local Authority. Previous reviews where Head teachers have been the driving force behind them at the request of the Local Authority has been carried out by Heads with no additional resources, and did not agree with the request presented.

Sally Bates advised that all are entitled to their own individual views; an approval of the recommendations is in the hands of the Schools Forum.

John Slater commented that if not approved by the Forum to fund from the school's underspend the funding would be found from elsewhere but at a cost of another service. The SEBD review and implementation was successful and would like to extend this way of working to the three year statutory SEN review, with a senior position as per the recommendation which would benefit schools.

Helen Akins – SEBD review worked due to the commitment of Heads and the work that was invested by them with a lot of this being done in spare time, with no resources targeted to the schools / Heads involved. The Local Authority is constantly reviewing, when we need to just get current processors embedded first. Primary schools in Ashfield do not want the High Level Needs (HLN) budget in its current format.

Charles Savage – High Level Needs budget, it's not the Local Authorities intention to put this out to schools. The review would benefit being a joint thorough review like the SEBD review which worked because of resources and time invested. He posed the question, what sort of review would the Forum want, as resources would impact this.

Helen Atkins – queried the pilot study phase, behaviour leaders have requested information and as yet nothing has been received from the Local Authority. She takes on board comments made by both John Slater and Charles Savage however how the money has been spent on the pilot phase needs to be more transparent and wishes to highlight this matter to forum members.

Sally Bates was concerned with the lack of transparency surrounding pilots, it needs to be resolved and requested this be an agenda item at the next Forum meeting.

James McGeachie – current system is not working and welcomes a review. The question was whether 0.6 FTE was required as some Rushcliffe Heads are already aware of what is happening with regards this.

Louise Regan was concerned that from discussions around the table a pilot for this was already underway, therefore why was the Forum been asked to approve this?

Chris Walton advised as it is a statutory requirement to review SEN, why is a recommendation been brought to the forum.

**JS/CS**

	<p><b>Recommendation/s</b></p> <p>1. Does the Schools Forum want a review of SEN</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="156 280 1369 353"> <tr> <th data-bbox="156 280 560 315">Votes for</th> <th data-bbox="560 280 963 315">Votes against</th> <th data-bbox="963 280 1369 315">Abstentions</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="156 315 560 353">1</td> <td data-bbox="560 315 963 353">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="963 315 1369 353">N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>Based on the above result a decision was made not to vote on recommendation 2.</p>	Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions	1	N/A	N/A	
Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions						
1	N/A	N/A						
4h	<p><b>Support for School Based EIS &amp; HR Investigations</b></p> <p>John Slater presented the paper on behalf of Marion Clay. This was a complex area and HR always use their own people, funding was required for the back fill of personnel so that this function can be carried out.</p> <p>James McGeachie asked if this was only available to schools &amp; academies that buy back the HR package.</p> <p>Helen Akins asked as her schools had already bought back the HR &amp; EIS package should this service not already be included. John Slater explained it was a budget under pressure which required a bit of support. She also asked why this amount had not been included in the original cost of the sold service.</p> <p>Adrienne Allcock pointed out that though many schools may buy the HR package only a few schools buy back the EIS package causing pressure</p> <p><b>Recommendation/s</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the contents of the report – report was noted.</li> <li>2. Agree to make an allocation, from the DSG underspend, of £50,000 per annum with effect from the current financial year to support maintained schools with the costs of providing an EIA during a school based investigation.</li> <li>3. Monitors the fund on a yearly basis to ensure funds are allocated in line with the agreed criteria</li> </ol> <table border="1" data-bbox="156 1388 1369 1462"> <tr> <th data-bbox="156 1388 560 1424">Votes for</th> <th data-bbox="560 1388 963 1424">Votes against</th> <th data-bbox="963 1388 1369 1424">Abstentions</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="156 1424 560 1462">8</td> <td data-bbox="560 1424 963 1462">1</td> <td data-bbox="963 1424 1369 1462">4</td> </tr> </table> <p>Vote was for 2015-16 only, for 2016-17 onwards this should be included in EIS buy back package.</p> <p>Tony Colton left the meeting.</p>	Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions	8	1	4	
Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions						
8	1	4						
4i	<p><b>Cost Recovery Mechanism (CRM) Audit</b></p> <p>Charles Savage presented the paper.</p> <p>Louise Regan – Ashfield schools are more than happy to pay the £10,000 and feels the full cost should be charged, as it's not sufficient enough to act as a disincentive.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Schools Forum notes the content of this report – reported noted</li> </ol>							

**4j Key Stage 2 Pupil Growth / Basic Need Fund**

Mike Sharp presented the papers.

Louise Regan was in support and commented that the funds were managed very well and schools were challenged upon request of an allocation

Val Holland requested clarifications around whether the schools in receipt of this allocation received the (AWPU) Basic Entitlement for these pupils. Sally Bates clarified that for 2015-16 schools are funded on their 2014 October census, therefore schools would not receive the basic entitlement. Pupil growth fund is to cover where there has been a large increase in pupil numbers and a school is required to employ an additional teacher to comply with key stage 1 infant class size regulation.

Mike Sharp made an amendment to page 3, point 18 first paragraph. Amount £22,832 was changed to £26,832

**Recommendation/s**

1. Agrees to extend the use of PGF allocations to support staffing costs in key stage 2 for those schools that have increased their PAN by 20 pupils or more, following school expansion.
2. Agrees to maintain the total Pupil Growth Fund at £1m for financial year 2016/17 (£800k staffing PGF and £200k non-staffing PGF), in preparation for the increased demands placed on school budgets following school expansions and meeting the additional demand for school places.
3. Approves the use of £81,000 from the carry forward underspend to ensure that the 3 schools who increased their PANs by 20 or more in 2012/13 can receive PGF allocations from September 2015 to support Key Stage 2 staffing costs.
4. Continues to monitor the allocations of PGF on an annual basis

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
12	0	0

**4c Support for Schools to Safeguard Children**

Steve Edwards presented the report via a power-point presentation.

Adrienne Allcock asked that with a 1/3 of the funding request going towards training would this be free at point of delivery. Steve Edwards confirmed this would be free not just for schools but also free to parents.

Karen O’Connell has worked with Childline and they dealt with an abundance of calls of this nature, and she fully supports this proposal.

Steve Edwards asked for representatives from the Forum to engage and work with the Local Authority in the development of the programme.

Chris Walton – programme is geared around school age pupils, and asked about extending this to younger children.



Steve Edwards felt this was a valid point, an interesting question and would welcome their contribution.

Ly Toom felt that this could only be approved for 16-17 the allocation should be reviewed annually.

Sue Summerscales advised members that this particular paper's recommendation would be in principle as it would first need Secretary of State approval.

Chris Walton and Karen O'Connell volunteered to be part of the programmes working group.

**Recommendation/s**

1. The Schools Forum approves, in principle, the use of the Schools Budget Reserve to fund the initiatives.
2. The Schools Forum agrees to receive a detailed report in September 2015.

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
12	0	0

The forum agreed in principle, on the understanding this would come back annually for the approval of future spend.

A detailed paper to be bought back in September as per the recommendations and to include points discussed such as 'free at point of delivery' and 'younger children'.

Recommendation that this paper be placed early on the agenda for September.

**5 Any Other Business**

There was no other business

**6. Confidentiality**

The issue confidentiality was not raised.

**8. Date and time of next meeting(s)**

Tuesday 15th Sept 2015	2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)
------------------------	--