

Meeting title: Nottinghamshire Schools Forum
Date and time: 22 October 2015, 2pm to 4pm
Location: National Watersports Centre, NG12 2LU

Membership

'A' denotes absence

A	Ms L Regan	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Ashfield)
	Ms S Bates	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Broxtowe) – (Vice Chair)
	Ms A Allcock	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Bassetlaw)
A	Mr J Wilson	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Gedling)
	Mrs H Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Mansfield)
A	Ms H Richardson	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Newark)
	Ms L Toom	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Rushcliffe)
A	Mr R Hawley	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
	Mr D Vasey	Academy Head Teacher
A	Mr C Pickering	Academy Head Teacher (substitute was in attendance)
A	Mr C Weaver	Academy Head Teacher (substitute was in attendance)
	Mr J McGeachie	Academy Head Teacher
	Ms D Trusler	Academy Head Teacher
A	Ms K McIntyre	Special school Head Teacher
A	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 Group Member
	Ms C Walton	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Mr C Cuomo	Diocesan representative - (Chair)
	Ms C Meese	Diocesan representative
	Mr J Jeffries	Trades union representative
A	Ms H Allister	Trades union representative

In attendance:

Mr C Pettigrew	Corporate Director, CFCS
Mr J Slater	Service Director, Education Standards & Inclusion
Mrs S Summerscales	Acting Senior Finance Business Partner
Mrs T Gardner	Assistant Accountant, CFCS

		ACTION
1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Carlo Cuomo welcomed all members to the meeting and John Slater introduced Colin Pettigrew as the new Corporate Director of CFCS</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Helen Richardson, Julian Wilson, Louise Regan, Ryan Hawley, and Hazel Allister</p>	
3.	<p>Business Item – Analysis and agreement for Early Years and Schools Funding 2016-17</p> <p>Carlo Cuomo advised that there were two communication items regarding the consultation that he would like to introduce first.</p> <p>An email from Louise Regan which was submitted on behalf of Ashfield Heads. This was read out to the members</p> <p>Donna Trusler arrived for the meeting</p> <p>The second item was a letter that was sent in from five Rushcliffe secondaries. The forum members were provided with a copy.</p> <p>Dick Vasey arrived for the meeting</p> <p>Helen Atkins could not understand if five heads had signed the letter why there were only three secondary responses. Forum members were advised that the letter had been included in the additional comments which had been circulated, however as the actual response forms had not been submitted the letter was not included in the response analysis.</p> <p>James McGeachie commented that it was not stipulated anywhere in the consultation document that responses must be on the response form.</p> <p>Carlo Cuomo advised the letter had been circulated to the members on arrival and for them to note the content.</p> <p>Chris Walton was amazed at the number of responses received for the Early Years Single Funding section and asked how many had been consulted. Chris was advised that the data received from colleagues showed 564 providers not including schools</p> <p>John Slater informed members any new changes would need to be modelled so all schools could see impact.</p> <p>Sue Summerscales advised that modelling was only carried out for the proposed changes as agreed at the previous forum meeting</p> <p>James McGeachie commented that when the draft version of the consultation was brought to their attention, due to the timetable were unable to make any</p>	

changes

Ly Toom commented that they would require more time to talk to the areas they represent.

Sue Summerscales informed the members that the same process and time scale had been used as the previous year when consultation for 2015-16 and was not aware that such comments about the process had been highlighted before.

John Slater – for 2013-14 there was enormous changes to the formula and the approach was different, couple of years following this people have been happy to leave the formula as agreed. For 2017-18 we would reflect and review the process

Chris Walton was surprised at the return % for the PVI's, the members were informed this was based on all PVI, child-minders and playgroups and that papers versions of the consultation were sent out to those with no email accounts, the Early Years team had actioned this and if more clarification was required we would talk with colleagues.

Carlo Cuomo– asked members if this was a general feeling regards the consultation process.

Adrienne Allcock – commented that some questions were confusing

Donna Trusler– with only a 6.7% secondary responding, this was a concern

Carlo Cuomo asked members why they thought responses were so low

Dick Vasey – could not understand what was meant about representing their area as he was not aware he was representing an area. He posed the question who are we representing?

Sally Bates suggested a discussion on accountability and who the forum members represent. This would be an agenda item for the next meeting in December.

Adrienne Allcock – commented it could be a number of things, maybe the document is too lengthy, maybe heads feel the consultation is done and does not receive recognition and consultation is only in name, even though she recognises this is not the case.

Chris Walton – didn't realise that the sector they are representing is not just PVI, but child-minders and playgroups and that communication is a problem.

Sally Bates– suggested that at the next forum meeting members discuss the process going forward and the communication of the consultation. Is it to be LA lead? If a presentation of changes to the formula was required by area Forum Members would be expected to attend and support the delivery of this

Dick Vasey – School Forum representation was on the agenda for the next secondary head teachers briefing which is due to take place end November.

Carlo Cuomo started the voting process

Early Years Single Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
1	Do you agree that if the government increases the per pupil funding, over and above the increase already proposed by this consultation that this is passed on to child care providers?	12	0	1
2	Do you agree that the base hourly rate for 2 year olds child care should be equivalent to the amount of grant funding that is received by the authority, currently £4.88 per hour?	0	5	7
3	Do you agree that the per pupil unit of funding for 3-4 year olds should be increased to £2,280 per annum. This equates to an hourly rate of £4.00 for PVI's and £3.90 for maintained primary schools?	6	0	7
5	Do you agree that the deprivation supplement is reduced from £0.55 per hour to £0.05p per hour for eligible children only?	9	3	1
7	Do you agree with ceasing the sustainability factor?	7	1	5

Val Holland – was not sure what this sustainability factor was. Requested to know where this funding appeared as PVI's do not know about this. Sue Summerscales advised this comes from the Early Years Block and has been given out since the Early Years Single Funding Formula was introduced and was only given to maintained schools.

James McGeachie – referred to a consultation question regards deprivation, where the allocation was reducing from 55p to 5p to avoid double funding in the Early Years Formula. However the same thought process had not being applied to the Schools Block. The consultation had contradiction within it if the question was allowed for one sector and not another.

Chris Walton and Karen O'Connell agreed it was not equitable

Sue Summerscales explained this had been a request from the Early Years working group and was covered in the report which was presented and bought to the June 2015 forum meeting.

Adrienne Allcock was concerned that the sudden removal of the sustainability factor that impacts on 19 schools would mean the schools would be unable to offer the provision with teachers. The savings would amount to £196,000 only but withdrawing this would have a huge impact on communities.

John Slater advised new guidance from DfE, had been issued and it states that it is no longer necessary for units to be teacher led.

Claire Meese - it would be helpful if the above guidance could be circulated.

JS

Following the vote on the sustainability factor John Slater made a request, this is a phased withdrawal to help and give time for the 19 schools affected to plan.

Claire Meese – there was no room left for small schools to plan.

Adrienne Allcock proposed a phased removal of the sustainability factor, Tony Colton seconded this.

The plan was to withdraw the sustainability factor over 2 year.

Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions
7	0	5

Chris Walton informed the forum that Birmingham City had increased their hourly

2 year olds – had been increase from £4.89 to £5.44

3 / 4 year olds – had been increased from £5.35 to £5.62

Sally Bates commended Birmingham City Council for their action, but pointed out that Nottinghamshire is funded as part of F40, and all schools are looking at significant deficits

James McGeachie asked if question 4 of the Early Years section was a vote for the increase to be temporary or for it to come from the reserve.

Members were advised that the vote would be for both elements – the increase to be temporary and for the increase to come from reserves.

The point was stressed to all members, the vote for question 4 would be for one year only, and would have to be reviewed every year.

James McGeachie asked where the Early Years increase would come from if not from reserves. Forum members were advised this would have to come from the schools block.

Early Years Single Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
4	If you answered yes to question 3 do you agree that the increase should be funded on a temporary basis from the Schools (Non ISB) Reserve?	11	0	2
6	Do you agree with ceasing the meal allowance factor?	0	8	5

Schools Local Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
1	Do you agree that the primary to secondary ratio should be maintained at 1:1.265 for the 2016-17 financial year?	12	0	1
2	Do you agree that the 2015-16 AWPU rates should be proportionally adjusted in order to maintain the overall primary to secondary funding ratio of 1: 1.265 for 2016-17?	13	0	0
4	Do you agree with retaining the Prior Attainment factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?	12	1	0
6	Do you agree with retaining the Looked After Children factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?	13	0	0
7	If the factor continues to be included, do you agree that a fixed unit value of £3,000 should continue to be used to allocate this funding in 2016-17?	11	1	1
8	Do you agree with retaining the EAL factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?	13	0	0
9	If the factor is retained, do you agree that the same percentage of total funding should be allocated through the EAL factor with a single unit value in 2016-17?	10	0	3
10	Do you agree with retaining the Pupil Mobility factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?	13	0	0
11	Do you agree that the same percentage of total funding should be allocated through the Pupil Mobility factor in 2015-16, with a single unit value?	12	0	1
12	Do you agree with the proposal not to adopt a Sparsity factor for 2016-17?	13	0	0
13	Do you agree with retaining the Lump Sum factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?	13	0	0
17	Do you agree that Nottinghamshire should not apply for an exceptional factor in order to pay a further allowance to amalgamating schools in the second year after amalgamation?	10	0	3
18	Do you agree with retaining the Split Site factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2015-16?	9	0	4
20	Do you agree to continue with the current arrangement to pay rates centrally?	13	0	0

Schools Local Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
21	Do you agree to continue with the exceptional factors for joint use and rental?	8	0	5
22	Do you agree that the growth fund should continue?	13	0	0
23	Do you agree that the growth fund should remain at £1.0m as it was for 2015-16?	12	0	1

With reference to the prior attainment question Ly Toom highlighted the comment that this is being used for HLN, John Slater acknowledged this and was aware that a discussion was being had.

Sally Bates requested a report be brought to the next meeting demonstrating the use of the Pupil Growth Fund.

A question was asked if the forum is not able to change the percentage why are they being asked the question.

Sue Summerscales explained the modelling was only for proposed changes that had been agreed at the last meeting. Early Years Single Funding Formula and the lump sum where the only proposals – the question was, should these have been the only questions as these were the only proposals?

Any proposed changes to factors would need some direction from the forum, to develop models and no direction had been given.

Toni Gardner - the forum would be unable to vote on different models at this meeting as all schools would not have been shown the impact or had a chance to comment on any changes.

Chris Walton left the meeting

Val Holland asked regards question 2 on the Early Years Consultation what would happen here. Informed the budget would overspend.

Schools Local Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
3	Do you agree that the same percentage of total funding, deprivation indicators and weightings should be used to allocate deprivation funding in 2016-17 as were used in 2015-16?	4	5	3

Carlo Cuomo cautioned the members that here they were taking a vote on the % of the budget to be spent on deprivation the true impact would not be seen merely by stipulating a percentage they would rather have.

Dick Vasey understood the frustration felt by James McGeachie and requested a vote to work on this for the future.

MS

Dick Vasey proposed the vote be put aside and Sally Bates second it, this was then voted on.
8 were in favour but with a proviso that this happens for 2017-18.

Schools Local Funding Formula Consultation Question		Schools Forum Vote		
		Yes	No	Abstained
5	If the factor continues to be included, do you agree to retaining the current proportion of funding, & method for distributing that funding?	5	1	6
16	Do you agree with the proposal to keep the lump sum value at £100,000 in 2016/17 for the secondary phase?	9	0	3
19	Do you agree to continue with the current methodology and funding for split site schools?	5	0	7
14	Do you agree with the proposal to increase the lump sum for the primary phase?	3	4	5
15	If you answered yes to question 14 what value do you think the primary lump sum should be set at? £110,000 £120,000 Other	N/A	N/A	N/A
24	As a representative of a maintained primary school, do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2016-17:			
a	Contingencies for pre-agreed amalgamation transitional support?	5	0	0
b	Free school meals eligibility assessment?	5	0	0
c	Staff costs / supply cover (trade union facility time)?	3	0	2
d	Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners?	3	0	2
e	Contingency for crisis communications? – a new de-delegation proposed for 2016-17 supported by the Schools Forum	5	0	
24	As a representative of a maintained secondary school, do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2016-17:			
b	Free school meals eligibility assessment?	1	0	0
c	Staff costs / supply cover (trade union facility time)?	0	0	1
d	Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners?	1	0	0

<p>4.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There was no other business, Carlo Cuomo summarised the need for the consultation process to be review and items to be bought back for the next meeting where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil Growth Fund • Accountability of forum members • Consultation process going forward <p>James McGeachie request we start looking at future consultation as soon as possible, possibly the next meeting</p>					
<p>5.</p>	<p>Confidentiality</p> <p>It was confirmed that there was no confidentiality items.</p>					
<p>6.</p>	<p>Date and time of next meeting(s)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="188 837 1302 987"> <tr> <td data-bbox="188 837 576 913"> <p>Thursday 10th December 2015</p> </td> <td data-bbox="576 837 1302 913"> <p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="188 913 576 987"> <p>Thursday 11th February 2016</p> </td> <td data-bbox="576 913 1302 987"> <p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Thursday 10th December 2015</p>	<p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p>	<p>Thursday 11th February 2016</p>	<p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p>	
<p>Thursday 10th December 2015</p>	<p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p>					
<p>Thursday 11th February 2016</p>	<p>2-4pm National Watersports Centre (Ordinary)</p>					