

Meeting title: Nottinghamshire Schools Forum
Date and time: 10th December 2020, 2pm to 4pm
Location: Virtual – Windows Teams

Membership

'A' denotes absence

	Mr A Rossington	Maintained Primary Head Teacher
	Mr B Waldram	Maintained Primary Head Teacher
	Mrs H Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - (Vice Chair)
A	Ms L Corner-Brown	Maintained Primary Head Teacher
	Mr D Phillips	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
A	Mr A Seymour	Academy Representative
	Ms A Hall	Academy Representative
	Dr P Smith	Academy Representative
A	Mrs H Angus	Academy Representative
	Mr J MacDonald	Academy Representative - (Chair)
	Mr N Holmes	Academy Representative
	Mr M Rooney	Special School Head Teacher
A	Ms P Corfield	Academy Special School Head Teacher
	Mr C Barnard	Governor Maintained Primary
	Ms F Jones	Governor Maintained Primary
	Ms L Gapski	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Mrs K Richards	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Ms L Knott	14-19 Partnership Representative
	Mr Nigel Frith	Church of England Representative
	Mr J Jefferies	Trades Union Representative
	Ms L Maddison	Trades Union Representative

In attendance:

Mr C Pettigrew	Corporate Director Children Families & Cultural Services
Mr K Palframan	Group Manager Finance Strategy and Compliance
Mrs M Clay	Service Director Education, Learning and Skills
Mr L Jones	Service Director Children Families & Cultural Services
Mrs I Kakoullis	Group Manager Children and Families
Mr M Needham	Finance Business Partner, Children and Families Finance
Mrs S Summerscales	Senior Finance Business Partner, Children & Families Finance
Mrs T Gardner (Clerk)	Assistant Accountant, Children and Families Finance

1.	<p>Welcome</p> <p>James Macdonald welcomed all members to the forums virtual meeting on Microsoft Teams.</p>	
	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were received from Lynn Corner-Brown, Andy Seymour, Halina Angus and Pauline Corfield.</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes – 12th November 2020</p> <p><u>Minster School – application of the minimum per pupil methodology</u> Sue Summerscales updated members regards Minster – the disapplication to change their Minimum Per Pupil (MPP) has been approved. The Local Authority did also enquire if we would get the additional funding due to this change, but unfortunately the ESFA have advised the DSG would not be increased to include the change for Minster.</p> <p><u>3c review of Schools Forum Membership</u> Still without a Catholic Diocese representative, updated required for the next meeting. Members were advised that we had received 1 academy nomination, and 3 governor nomination, the next governor trust board is in January 2021, nominees will be sent, and an update will be given to members at the next meeting</p> <p><u>3d Trade Union Facilities Financial Year 2020-21</u> Early years representatives requested if and how they could contribute towards the trade union buy in. Marion Clay believed it was only for schools and academies and that a discussion would be required with HR and trade unions. Not yet answered, advised this was unlikely but would seek guidance – carried forward to next meeting.</p> <p>A request for details of which academies had contributed to the trade union buy in will be chased</p> <p><u>Forum name change</u> James MacDonald advised that we had received the following response to our request to change the name of our forum.</p> <p>I can confirm that the governing regulations refer to ‘schools forum’ and the vast majority of local authorities use that designation. You can rename the meetings so long as they are easily searchable on the internet when entering ‘schools forum’.</p> <p>James MacDonald to talk to IT and will update the forum at the next meetings with regards the name.</p> <p><u>DSG Financial Monitoring Report Period 7 2020/21</u> Laurence Jones confirmed what Marion had previously mentioned and added that the £500,000 was not just for special schools, it was to explore ways to provide therapy to avoid the need to go to INM’s. We are currently looking at a several million overspend so very little in reserve. The overspend and challenges needs a more in-depth conversation, and it will be picked up at the February meeting. Karen Hughman would bring these challenges and share information with the special trust board.</p> <p>Minutes approved as accurate and correct</p>	<p>ACTIO N</p> <p>MC/BB</p> <p>AW/M C</p> <p>AW</p> <p>JM</p> <p>KH</p>
3.	<p>3a – DSG Budget Monitoring</p> <p>Mark Needham presented the paper and advised that an amendment was required on the 2020-21 forecast outturn table on page 1.</p> <p>The Early Years previous variance should read £0.868m and not minus £0.044m making the total of that column £3.490m, all other figures are correct. Revised figures are below.</p>	

Previous Variance £m	Funding Block	Budget £m	Forecast Expenditure £m	Forecast Variance £m
-	Schools	509.903	509.903	-
2.336	High Needs	77.997	80.124	2.127
0.868	Early Years	49.985	50.886	0.901
0.286	Central Services	5.795	6.081	0.286
3.490	Total	643.680	646.994	3.314

The central services gap is not yet resolved, and the intention is to address this next year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Forum:

1. Notes the content of the report – report noted

3b. 2021-22 Schools Consultation Results

Sue Summerscales gave a summary on the consultation, the level of responses and asked members to refer to Appendix A where the outcome of the consultation was detailed.

Explained that the questions start at number 4 as 1, 2, and 3 request details such as name, establishment and email.

Question 4

In order to continue with the principle to mirror the NFF as far as possible the local authority would need to increase the unit values for each factor as detailed in Appendix 1.

Agreed unanimously.

Sue Summerscales explained that the following two questions were to address how to meet the gap in funding due to the increase in FSM eligibility as previously discussed resulting in a potential shortfall of approximately £2m.

There wasn't a requirement to vote on a particular model as comments from the September meeting was to set questions similar to 20-21 as the funding gap would not be known until we had worked on the school budgets with October 20 census data.

Matt Rooney asked if once this information was known would it come back to forum for a final approval. Members were advised we do not take this back to forum, but an update would be given in February 21 detailing factors and units used.

Question 5

The current MFG is set at 1.84% to allow schools to receive a minimum increase above their 2019-20 baseline. For 2021-22 the local authority would need to set the MFG at between +0.5% and +2.00% (subject to affordability). In consideration with Models 1 – 3 (Appendix 2) which illustrate the impact of an MFG at 0.5%, 1.00% and 2.00%.

Agreed unanimously

Members were advised that there is no gains cap in the National Funding Formula (NFF) or on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation to the local authority.

The teacher pay grant and teacher pension grant would not be affected by any introduction of a gains cap as these grants are protected.

The forum were asked what it saw as a priority, should the MFG be set at 2% so all schools gain 2% on a per pupil basis?

The impact on the models in the consultation was as follows: -

Model 1 – 33 schools would be in receipt of MFG and 156 would have a gains cap. Ranging from -0.03% to -9.12%

Model 2 – 36 schools would be in receipt of MFG and 159 would have a gains cap. Ranging from -0.01% to -9.7%

If a gains cap was introduced this would need to reduce to pay for the MFG level

Model 3 – 53 schools would be in receipt of MFG and 172 would have a gains cap. Ranging from -0.03 to -9.12%

Anne Hall – we need to stay as close to the NFF as the DSG will allow, model 3 gives a 2% MFG the same as the NFF so all schools see an increase and would seem the best option – Fiona Jones agreed with the suggestion of adopting model 3.

Sue Summerscales advised members that when officers work on the school budgets we will aim to set the MFG at 2% and balance with the gains cap if required.

Question 6

In order to make the formula affordable a gains cap may be required for 2021-22. In consideration with Models 1 – 3 (Appendix 2) which illustrate the impact of a gains cap set at 2.80%, 2.75% and 2.6%.

Agreed unanimously

Question 7

As a representative of a maintained primary school, do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2021-22?

- Free school meals eligibility assessment?
- Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners?
- Contingency for crisis communications?
- Trade Union Facilities?

It was agreed that we would have a primary vote and secondary vote for all de-delegation strands

Primary – agreed unanimously

Secondary – agreed unanimously

Ben Waldram asked if 'support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners' should be changed. Karen Richards agree and asked why mention ethnicity? Would 'minority groups' not suffice? thinking travelling communities, white working class.

Marion Clay advised she would take this away and would get back to members.

MC

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the Schools Forum:

1. Notes the content of the report – report noted
2. Undertakes the votes required to recommend the schools local funding formula for 2021-22 for approval by the County Council Policy Committee on 10 February 2021 and for submission to the ESFA on 21 January 2021 – vote outcome listed above

	<p>3. Consider and agree the approach to be taken to the level of the MFG and gains cap to ensure affordability of the 2021-22 formula – vote outcome listed above.</p>							
	<p>3c. 2021-22 Early Years Consultation Proposals</p> <p>Irene Kakoullis presented the paper, and members were advised that we would look to remove the temporary 10p that was included in 2020-21 due to affordability, but any hourly rate increase announcement for 2021-22 would be passported to providers with none retained for central services.</p> <p>If approved consultation to be launched next week and would run until 8th January 2021.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>That the Schools Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider and agree the proposed questions to be included in the consultation for early years funding rates for 2021-22. <p>Proposed questions agreed unanimously.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Agree the date for an extraordinary Schools Forum meeting to agree the formula. <p>A 30 minute meeting on 14th January 2021 was the agreed date for the extra-ordinary school's forum to agree the early years formula. All members were required to attend.</p>							
	<p>4. Any Other Business</p> <p>Colin Pettigrew thanked all members of the forum for all their work in such challenging times, James Macdonald second this.</p>							
	<p>5. Confidentiality</p> <p>No item marked confidential</p>							
	<p>6. Date and time of next meeting</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="148 1420 1016 1491"> <tr> <td>Thursday 25 February 2021</td> <td>2-4pm</td> <td>Virtual – Microsoft Teams</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thursday 17 June 2021</td> <td>2-4pm</td> <td>TBC</td> </tr> </table>	Thursday 25 February 2021	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams	Thursday 17 June 2021	2-4pm	TBC	
Thursday 25 February 2021	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams						
Thursday 17 June 2021	2-4pm	TBC						