

**Meeting title:** Nottinghamshire Early Years & Schools Forum  
**Date and time:** 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021, 2pm to 4pm  
**Location:** Virtual – Windows Teams

## Membership

*'A' denotes absence*

	Mr A Rossington	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Gedling
A	Mr B Waldram	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Newark
	Mrs H Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Mansfield - (Vice Chair)
	Mr D Phillips	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
A	Mr A Seymour	Academy Representative
	Ms A Hall	Academy Representative
	Dr P Smith	Academy Representative
	Mrs H Angus	Academy Representative
	Mr J MacDonald	Academy Representative - (Chair)
	Mr N Holmes	Academy Representative
	Mr N Robinson	Academy Representative
	Mr M Rooney	Special School Head Teacher
	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 N Frith	Church of England Diocese Representative
	Mr D Moore	Catholic Diocese Representative
	Mr J Jefferies	Trades Union Representative_NASUWT
A	Ms L Maddison	Trades Union Representative_UNISON

## ***In attendance:***

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
Ms K Hughman	Group Manager, Education, Access and Partnership
Mr S Ray	Team Manager, Schools & Families Specialist Services
Mr C Jones	SEND Strategic Development Lead
Mr C Savage	Group Manager, Psychology Services
Mr J Hawketts	Group Manager, Commissioning & Placements
Mrs T Gardner (Clerk)	Assistant Accountant, Children and Families Finance

<p><b>1. Welcome</b></p> <p>James MacDonald welcomed all members to the virtual meeting with a special welcome to Daniel Moore (Roman Catholic Dioceses) and Neil Robinson (Academy Representative) our latest two members.</p>	
<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Ben Waldram, Andy Seymour and Colin Pettigrew.</p>	
<p><b>2. 2a. Minutes – 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020</b></p> <p><u>3c review of Schools Forum Membership</u> The Catholic Diocese representative has now been filled with our new member Daniel Moore.</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 advised that there was no definite answer, believes it is unlikely but will chase it again – carried forward to the next meeting.</p> <p>A request for details of which academies had contributed to the trade union buy in will be chased</p> <p>Minutes approved as accurate and correct</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p><b>MC</b></p> <p><b>MC</b></p>
<p><b>2b. Minutes – Extra ordinary meeting 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021</b></p> <p>Minutes approved as accurate and correct</p>	
<p><b>3. 3a – Early Years &amp; Schools Forum Constitution</b></p> <p>Toni Gardner presented the paper. Forum members agreed with the recommendation and felt it was a sensible approach.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Consider reconstituting the composition of the Governor Membership to ensure that it is consistent throughout the document and fairly represents the pupil numbers within the school community. The proposal is 2 x Maintained Governors, 2 x Academy Governors, 1 Special School Governor – Total 5</li><li>2. That a further round of nominations is undertaken to appoint in line with the new constitution. (The 3 recently received are currently on hold)</li></ul> <p>Both recommendations were agreed unanimously.</p>	
<p><b>3b. 2021-22 Schools Funding Formula Update</b></p> <p>Sue Summerscales presented the paper and advised that Nottinghamshire was able to mirror the National Funding Formula (NFF) factors.</p> <p>Members were informed that the free school meal data mentioned at the November 2020 meeting, had increased though it wasn't quite as high. This together with other changes in the dataset offset the financial impact enabling Nottinghamshire to mirror the NFF. The disapplication request for the Minster School had been submitted, approved and the necessary adjustment made to their 2021-22 budget allocation.</p>	

<p>The growth funding was allocated on the same basis with no formula change – Nottinghamshire received £3.6m.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION/S</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notes the content of the report – report noted</li> <li>2. Approves the amount of growth funding centrally retained for 2021-22, £2.662m. - Agreed unanimously</li> </ol>	
<p><b>3c. Central School Services Block Funding 2021-22</b></p> <p>Sue Summerscales presented the paper and explained in detail the work that had been undertaken, how budgets &amp; services had been reviewed and the adjustments that had been made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £575,000 recharged to the HNB for the education element of LAC placements in independent residential special schools which is eligible expenditure for that block.</li> <li>• £114,000 contribution from the local authority budget towards the Psychology Service which protects that service from any reduction.</li> </ul> <p>Members were advised of the new commitment for 2021-22 for additional employers’ pension contributions claimed by the local authority for centrally employed teachers, which was rolled into ongoing responsibilities element of the central school services block.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve the Authority’s application to centrally retain funding within the Central School Services Block for the services set out at <b>Appendix A</b>.</li> </ol> <p>Agreed unanimously</p>	
<p><b>3d. Early Years DSG Funding Central Expenditure 2021-22</b></p> <p>Irene Kakoullis presented the paper.</p> <p>Explained that the paper was to advise on the hourly rate and to seek approval for the central spend on the Early Years Block.</p> <p>Members were advised that the rate was lower than last year; we are unable to continue with the temporary 10p from underspend due to the block predicting an overspend. Members were also advised that several schools and academies had not completed their January census correctly which has also had an impacted on the level of funding received into the local authority. Irene Kakoullis reassured members that if there was an underspend, this would be bought back to forum.</p> <p>Irene Kakoullis then explained the central early years spend and Appendix one.</p> <p>Karen Richards thanked the officers for navigating them around this budget. The problem with the January census data and how it had been completed by several schools and academies was not helping the situation. The new hourly rate is not enough, but this is more a central government problem. The 10p was temporary, but very valuable to settings. January 2021 is going to look very different with an even bleaker picture due to the pandemic.</p>	

<p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approves the Authority’s proposal to retain £1.461m of early years funding to be used for sufficiency and assessment functions within the Early Childhood Services and Schools and Families Specialist Service.</li> </ol> <p>Agreed unanimously</p>	
<p><b>3e – DSG Financial Monitoring Report Period 10 2020-21</b></p> <p>Mark Needham presented the paper and explained the financial position for the current financial year of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).</p> <p>The overspend was explained and members were advised that not all census data had been received (early years) but we would continue to monitor.</p> <p>Matt Rooney joined the meeting</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Early Years &amp; Schools Forum notes the content of the report. – reported was noted</li> </ol>	
<p><b>3f – High Needs Presentation</b></p> <p>Marion Clay started the presentation and advised that different officers would be presenting. It would initially be herself followed by Karen Hughman, Simon Ray and Jon Hawketts.</p> <p>Presentation slides will be sent to forum members</p> <p>Marion Clay advised that Nottinghamshire still do not access their fair share of funding and intends to write again to central government through elected Members. The content will say that we are grateful for the increase in funding and the gap is getting smaller, but we are still at the bottom. Nottinghamshire is a high performing authority, but we are still predicting a 2.7 million overspend.</p> <p>Irene Kakoullis commented that the slides were powerful and didn’t realise the differences were so stark</p> <p>David Phillips asked, how far had the advocating for increased funding got? Charles Savage replied that the advocating we have done is in part why there has been movement towards fairer funding, but the current DfE consultation could undo some of this momentum, and he would speak about this later in the meeting.</p> <p>Home to school transport annual contribution from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is £1.764 million, but the total expenditure is forecast to be £11.137 million.</p> <p>There has been no request to top slice from the Schools Block for the past two years; there is chance that we will have to come back to forum and request money from the DSG for 2022-23 and this may need to be included in the next school budget consultation.</p> <p>Expansion of new and existing schools was discussed, Nottinghamshire had not been successful in the first wave of funding for special school expansion, and officers were not aware of the program being re-run.</p>	<p><b>TG</b></p>

Matt Rooney asked – Is the 0.748m capital monies part of the High Needs Block (HNB) or from somewhere else? Marion Clay confirmed the capital funding is not from the HNB.

Karen Hughman advised that we have had mixed success with the special school hubs and that they were requesting 2 additional posts for alternative provision.

Simon Ray took over the presentation

Matt Rooney – what is the 6% increase needed for in the partnership team?

Charles Savage – The 6% increase is for the Devolved Partnership funding rather than the Partnership Team. The rationale is to use a proportion of the overall increase in the High Needs Block to build capacity in mainstream schools

Karen Hughman added that it is used by the school behaviour and attendance partnership to support pupils with SEMH needs and those at risk of exclusion. Schools will make decisions about how it is best spent.

Pauline Corfield – will a report come out that shows us the impact of the hubs and the district SENDCOs?

Marion Clay – it will but the actual move to locality working has been significantly delayed by Covid

Jon Hawketts took over the presentation and discussed the slides from number 19 “Post 16 High Needs” warned that new plans for pupils was showing no sign of decreasing, work was underway to attempt to reduce the average length of stay in post-16 education and to challenge individual programme costs.

Matt Rooney - the current per-place average (for INM EHCP) is around £44k. Does trend data show this changing year on year too? Is it likely to increase further in the coming year?

John Hawketts – Yes and Yes; the average cost per placement has increased in each of the past 3-4 years and is likely to do so in the coming year, too. Moreover, the budgetary impact of increased placements costs in any one year is not met in full until the following financial year, i.e. there is a lag effect on the budget. The issue of ever-increasing fees is not unique to Nottinghamshire but is a national issue. We work with our colleagues in Councils across the East Midlands to manage and mitigate cost increases, e.g. we have a single region-wide process for managing any fee increases to ensure individual authorities do not ‘get played off’ against each other by providers. And in Nottinghamshire we are also establishing volume discounts with providers with whom we commission the greatest volume of placements.

Karen Hughman presented the following 4 slides.

Pauline Corfield – Health related education is excellent value for money and a great service.

Charles Savage continued the presentation from the Additional Family Needs (AFN) slide. The current High Needs consultation was discussed, and members were encouraged to make representation.

There is concern that any change to the formula and allocation to local authorities could undo the gains which NCC has seen to date especially around the historic spend element of the formula. If in the past you spent more, you received more; Nottinghamshire officers do not think this is value for money or encourages inclusion for children with SEND.

Matt Rooney - applying the proportionate relationship between levels AFN - HLN - HN.

Should the starting point for the special school HN (£17,163) be lower than the highest HLN (£20,900) as it currently is, or should it change to follow the proportionate model you suggest? i.e. should HN1 start at a total of £21,000 (£10k place + £11k top-up)?

	<p>James Macdonald thanked everyone involved in the presentation; there was a suggestion that members would find it helpful to see the Nottinghamshire's response, and encouragement to make representation was requested of members by the chair.</p> <p>Members were advised that though we could make a submission as the Nottinghamshire Forum, it would probably be better if numerous people made their own submission. Matt Rooney suggested the more support for this the better and suggested a small forum working party to co-ordinate a response, members could submit a joint response as well as an individual one.</p> <p>Charles Savage is happy to attend and would at that meeting share his submission – with a note that this was Charles' own submission and not one representing Nottinghamshire or Councillor Owen.</p>	
	<p><b>3g – Risk Protection Arrangements (RPA) – Local Authority Maintained Schools (LAMS) Consultation</b></p> <p>Sue Summerscales (SS) presented the paper on behalf of Claire Dyson, the NCC Risk &amp; Insurance Manager</p> <p>On the 1 April 2020 the Department for Education extended the RPA Scheme for Academies to LAMS. As the Council and its LAMS are tied in to a long-term agreement with Zurich Municipal until April 2022 the Council LAMS have not been able to join the RPA scheme. Risk &amp; Insurance are preparing to retender the insurance contract and would like to know if maintained schools are interested in joining the RPA or continuing with the Council insurance services. The recommendations of the report ask for feedback on the consultation documents.</p> <p>Fiona Jones suggested that a side by side level of cover with costs would be helpful SS commented that this was provided in Appendix A. Also the length of the new NCC agreement.</p> <p>Members felt papers are fine; additional information could be significant cover you wouldn't get with RPA but would with NCC and when any change would come into effect needs to be made very clear.</p> <p>David Phillips – detail of cover is essential especially for a school like Chilwell that has a joint use . What is the level of cover offered by the RPA, is there any difference from the LAMS?</p> <p>Comments will be fed back to the Insurance team.</p>	<b>SS</b>
4.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>The format for future forum meeting was discussed. There was difference in preferences by members, a mixed approach of face to face and virtual was suggested and a further discussion is required. June 2021 meeting would be virtual.</p> <p>Forum members were informed that this would be Sue Summerscales last Forum meeting as she was planning to leave the local authority at the end of March 2021. Best wishes and thanks for all the work was conveyed by members and the chair, with Marion Clay adding that she will certainly be missed and not just by Forum.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Confidentiality</b></p> <p>No item marked confidential</p>	

<b>6.</b>	<b>Date and time of next meeting</b>				
	<table border="1"><tr><td data-bbox="135 232 539 277">Thursday 17 June 2021</td><td data-bbox="539 232 651 277">2-4pm</td><td data-bbox="651 232 1018 277">Virtual – Microsoft Teams</td></tr></table>	Thursday 17 June 2021	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams	
Thursday 17 June 2021	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams			