

MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting title: Nottinghamshire Schools Forum
Date and time: 20 October 2016, 2pm to 4pm
Location: National Watersports Centre, NG12 2LU

Membership

'A' denotes absence

	Ms A Allcock	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Bassetlaw)
	Mrs H Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Mansfield) – (Vice Chair)
A	Ms H Richardson	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Newark)
	Ms L Regan	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Ashfield)
	Ms L Toom	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Rushcliffe)
	Ms L Corner-Brown	Maintained Primary Head Teacher (Broxtowe)
A	Mr R Hawley	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
A	Mr C Weaver	Academy Representative (sub in attendance)
A	Mr C Pickering	Academy Representative
	Mr D Vasey	Academy Representative
A	Ms D Trusler	Academy Representative
	Mr J McGeachie	Academy Representative
A	Ms D Wigley	Special School Head Teacher
	Mr A O'Malley	Academy Special School Head Teacher
	Mr T Colton	Governor - Maintained Secondary
	Ms V Holland	Governor - Maintained Primary
	Ms C Walton	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Ms K O'Connell	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Mr C Cuomo	Diocesan Representative - (Chair)
	Ms C Meese	Diocesan Representative
	Ms L Maddison	Trades Union Representative
	Mr J Jefferies	Trades Union Representative

In attendance:

Mr C Pettigrew	Corporate Director Children Families and Cultural Services
Ms M Clay	Acting Service Director – Education Standards & Inclusion
Mrs T Rabbitts	Senior Finance Business Partner
Mr M Sharpe	Place Planning & Admissions Team Manager
Mrs N Hughes	Senior Professional Practitioner
Mrs T Gardner	Assistant Accountant, CFCS Finance

		ACTION
1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Carlo Cuomo welcomed all members to the meeting.</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Ryan Hawley, Dawn Wigley, Jo Myers, Helen Richardson, Christopher Pickering, Craig Weaver (Michael Davies in attendance) and Donna Trusler.</p>	
3.	<p>Item 3a Minutes from Forum 13th September 2016</p> <p><u>Item 4c – Analysis Of High Needs Block (Health & Education)</u> No update but the query has been raised with the relevant colleagues</p> <p><u>Item 4e – Tackling Emerging Threats to Children</u> An email sent from Terri Johnson was read out to members ‘Just to confirm we are offering each school one free performance of LUVU2 and the workshop. Each performance can only cater for 100 children / 120 absolute maximum and therefore some of the larger academies have in the past bought two. When we have had some spare performances (if not all schools take them up) we have given the second half price or indeed the second free if schools are ones where we have had issues. I did mention that this might be a problem if the school formula is per child. We would need to fund a few more sessions if schools press the issue’.</p> <p>Helen Atkins pointed out that when the funding was agreed, members were told this offer would be free to school when in fact it is not. Marion Clay advised she would relay this message back to Steve Edwards.</p> <p><u>Item 4d – Cost Recovery Mechanism (CRM)</u> Marion Clay confirmed the Local Authority had met with Outwood Grange where officers confirmed the position regards the cost recovery. Members confirmed that they had received the cost recovery letter.</p> <p>Dick Vasey arrived</p> <p>Minutes were approved as accurate</p>	<p>MC</p> <p>MC</p>
4.	<p>Item 4a – 2017-18 Consultation Paper</p> <p>Tamsin Rabbitts presented the consultation paper and summarised what was included.</p> <p>Further clarification was sought around question 5 ‘Do you agree with leaving the meal allowance unchanged if this is still a permitted factor within the Early Years funding block?’ Which was explained in detail</p>	
	<p>Item 4b – Primary Growth Fund verbal response</p> <p>School Forum were asked to consider if the pupil growth fund (PGF) should automatically continue as funding support for schools which had expanded by a half</p>	

	<p>form entry i.e. PAN from 30 – 45, (1 – 1 ½ F E, or (45- 60) 1 ½ - 2 FE) from Key Stage One into Key stage Two.</p> <p>Mike Sharpe indicated that there were 17 schools which had expanded by ½ form entry and that if the proposal were to be introduced that each year, for the lifetime of the Basic Need programme which began in 2013, the additional spending needed would be approximately £250,000 – (9 x £28,000).</p> <p>The additional funding would have to be top sliced from the dedicated schools grant, and be approved through the consultative route.</p> <p>Ly Toom explained that in the previous year the forum had agreed to allocate Pupil Growth Fund to Primary schools for Key Stage 2 also where the pupil numbers were 25 and over.</p> <p>A school had approached Ly as they have an increase of 15 pupils and while this increase was in Key Stage 1 the school have received the pupil growth fund grant bi-annually and there was a request for this to continue into Key Stage 2 like it was for school with an increase of 25 or more pupils.</p> <p>Officers explained the one form / half form circumstances and how this was a national criteria linked to the admissions and infant class size regulations.</p> <p>Louise Regan and Chris Walton arrived</p> <p>Mike Sharpe explained that the criteria was agreed for Key Stage 2 and did state 25 pupils or more.</p> <p>Helen Atkins asked why the form entry would be raised by 0.5 of a class as this stores up problems for KS2. Mike Sharpe explained that this depends on the local demand.</p> <p>Forum members were informed it was more complicated than just agreeing to increase the pupil growth contingency. Funds would need to come from all primary schools and the top slicing would need to be consulted on.</p> <p>Louise Regan – if 25 pupils is the criteria and school doesn't meet this, then it does not qualify. In order for an additional £250,000 to be added to the PGF – (that currently stands at £1, million) an additional £1,000 would need to be garnered from each primary school. £1,000 for any school is a lot, for a small school this deduction in budget would be more significant. The impact of this would need to be modelled, without modelling this cannot be agreed. James McGeachie agreed with Louise Regan</p> <p>Carlo Cuomo – this could be a consideration for the 2018-19 Consultation.</p>	
	<p>Item 4c – Secondary Pupil Growth Fund</p> <p>Mike Sharpe presented the paper and took the members through the supporting document.</p> <p>A discussion followed concerning numbers of pupils that were in catchment and how many were from expanded catchment, physical extension and increase in PAN</p> <p>Helen Atkins asked if the primary growth fund is funded from the primary schools then would the secondary growth fund be funded from the secondary sector – officers confirmed this was correct.</p>	

	<p>Recommendation/s</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the contents of the report – report noted • Consider the implications of establishing a secondary growth fund <table border="1" data-bbox="204 371 1311 443"> <thead> <tr> <th>Votes for</th> <th>Votes against</th> <th>Abstentions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Members stressed vote was ‘at the moment’ and not to be disregarded for the future.</p> <p>Before a vote was taken, members stressed this was requested that ‘<u>at the moment</u>’ be incorporated in the recommendation.</p>	Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions	0	3	1	
Votes for	Votes against	Abstentions						
0	3	1						
	<p>Item 4d – Trade Union Budget – CONFIDENTIAL ITEM</p> <p>Claire Meese arrived</p>							
	<p>Item 4e – Early Years Centrally Retained Funding</p> <p>Nicola Hughes presented the paper, and reiterated some of the points regarding funding that were talked about at the last forum meeting.</p> <p>Louise Regan – the current national consultation has impacted some authorities badly, are we one of the lucky ones? It was confirmed that Nottinghamshire historically is a lower funded authority and the new distribution criteria should see an increase to the per pupil amount coming into the authority.</p> <p>Currently Nottinghamshire only retain around 2.34% centrally</p> <p>Karen O’Connell requested a full understanding of what the 2.34% is being spent on, as she was not comfortable with the increase to 5% and what this would mean to providers.</p> <p>Val Holland – If the authority is badly funded then with new funding the local authority should devolve as much as possible.</p> <p>Chris Walton – seconded what was requested by Karen O’Connell</p> <p>A discussion was had around the role of the forum with regards to voting and the central spend. Carlo Cuomo summarised that the agenda item could not be taken forward until members had clarification around this.</p> <p>Val Holland – Pre-School Alliance is no longer around so what is the centrally retained money been used for?</p> <p>For the next meeting members requested a paper similar to the High Needs Block showing the breakdown of the centrally retained money.</p>	<p>IK - MC</p> <p>TR</p> <p>IK - MC</p>						
<p>5.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>F40 letter dated 13th October was distributed to members to share with their sectors.</p> <p>Colin Pettigrew provided feedback that following the budget consultation and subsequent decision taken by full Council in February 2016, all non-discretionary</p>							

	funding for transport would end as of September 2018. This would affect amongst others Faith schools.			
7.	Confidentiality One item was marked as confidential, "Item 4d Trade Union Budget".			
8.	Date and time of next meeting(s) <table border="1" data-bbox="204 439 1259 539"> <tr> <td>Thursday 8th December 2016</td> <td>2-4pm National Watersports Centre</td> </tr> </table>	Thursday 8 th December 2016	2-4pm National Watersports Centre	
Thursday 8 th December 2016	2-4pm National Watersports Centre			