

**Meeting title:** Nottinghamshire Early Years & Schools Forum  
**Date and time:** 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021, 2pm to 4pm  
**Location:** Virtual – Windows Teams

## Membership

*'A' denotes absence*

	Andrew Rossington	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Gedling
	Ben Waldram	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Newark
	Helen Atkins	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Mansfield - (Vice Chair)
A	Steve Border	Maintained Primary Head Teacher - Rushcliffe
	David Phillips	Maintained Secondary Head Teacher
	Dr Philip Smith	Academy Representative
A	Halina Augus	Academy Representative
	Andy Seymour	Academy Representative
	Anne Hall	Academy Representative
	Neil Holmes	Academy Representative
	James Macdonald	Academy Representative - (Chair)
	Neil Robinson	Academy Representative
	Matt Rooney	Special School Head Teacher
	Jamie Hutchinson	Academy Special School Head Teacher
A	Colin Barnard	Governor Maintained School Representative
	Fiona Jones	Governor Academy Representative
	Paul Hawkins	Governor Academy Representative
	Jacquie Sainsbury	Governor Special School Representative
	Laura Gapski	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Karen Richards	PVI - Early Years Group Member
	Nigel Frith	Church of England Diocese Representative
	Daniel Moore	Catholic Diocese Representative
A	Louise Knott	14-19 Partnership Representative
	Joe Jeffries	Trade Union Representative - NASUWT
	Lorraine Madison	Trade Union Representative - UNISON

## ***In attendance:***

Colin Pettigrew	Corporate Director, Children Families & Cultural Services
Laurence Jones	Service Director, Children Families & Cultural Services
Keith Palframan	Group Manager, Finance Strategy & Compliance
Mark Needham	Finance Business Partner, Children and Families Finance
Steven Hawkins	Senior Pupil Place Planning Practitioner
Karen Hughman	Group Manager, Education, Access and Partnership
Jude Burgess	Early Years Strategic Manager
Toni Gardner	Assistant Accountant, Children and Families Finance - (Clerk)

1.	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>James Macdonald welcomed all members to the virtual meeting with a special welcome to Paul Hawkins (Governor - academy) Fiona Jones (Governor - academy) and Jacqueline Sainsbury (Governor – special) our latest three members. We also have a new maintained primary school representative Steve Border – Lady Bay Primary would has sent his apologies.</p>																																																			
	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Steve Border, Halina Angus, Colin Barnard, Louise Knott and Irene Kakoullis (Jude Burgess in attendance for Irene Kakoullis)</p>																																																			
2.	<p><b>Early Years &amp; School Forum Membership / Induction</b></p> <p>Toni Gardner updated members on the current membership vacancies.  Maintained governor – one vacancy. We have received four self-nominations, have now gone to a ballot with a closing date of Friday 9<sup>th</sup> July. An additional education trust board will be held the following week to ratify the results so that the new member can attend the induction and September meeting.  We still have one vacancy in the maintained primary and one in the academy sector to fill, we will go back out for nominations as soon as possible.</p> <p>James Macdonald advised members that an induction was planned in 22<sup>nd</sup> July, primarily for new members but all members are welcome as a refresher. The induction will be held virtually via Microsoft Teams</p>																																																			
3.	<p><b>3a. Minutes – 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021</b></p> <p><u>Trade Union Facilities Financial Year 2020-21</u>  Early years representatives requested if and how they could contribute towards the trade union buy in. We have received this response from Andy Wilson from the HR department. This arrangement will not work for EY settings unless they already covered as a school. It is a scheme to enable staff from Nottinghamshire schools to undertake Trade union work in member schools that includes all maintained and those academies who buy in</p> <p>A request for details of which academies had contributed to the trade union buy in will be chased – Details were sent out with all the papers for the meeting.</p> <p><u>3b Schools Local Funding Formula 2021-22 Update</u>  Members were advised that the table that appeared at the top of page 3, though the monetary allocation was correct the pupil number variation numbers had been mixed up. A corrected table is below: -</p> <p><b>Table 3 2021-22 Growth Funding Allocations</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="146 1532 1307 2063"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">School Name</th> <th rowspan="2">Reason</th> <th colspan="2">Pupil No. Variation</th> </tr> <tr> <th>7/12ths</th> <th>£m</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Suthers Free School</td> <td>Growing School</td> <td>70.00</td> <td>0.364</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hucknall Flying High Academy</td> <td>New Free School</td> <td>5.83</td> <td>0.023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Rushcliffe School</td> <td>Basic Need</td> <td>11.67</td> <td>0.063</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The West Bridgford School</td> <td>Basic Need</td> <td>13.42</td> <td>0.073</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Carlton Academy</td> <td>Basic Need</td> <td>6.42</td> <td>0.033</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Redhill Academy</td> <td>Basic Need</td> <td>13.42</td> <td>0.071</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rosecliffe</td> <td>New Free School</td> <td>66.50</td> <td>0.243</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christ Church C of E</td> <td>Growing School</td> <td>8.75</td> <td>0.030</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Variations</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>196.01</b></td> <td><b>0.900</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Centrally Retained Growth Funding</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2.662</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL Growth Funding Allocation</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>3.562</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School Name	Reason	Pupil No. Variation		7/12ths	£m	Suthers Free School	Growing School	70.00	0.364	Hucknall Flying High Academy	New Free School	5.83	0.023	The Rushcliffe School	Basic Need	11.67	0.063	The West Bridgford School	Basic Need	13.42	0.073	The Carlton Academy	Basic Need	6.42	0.033	The Redhill Academy	Basic Need	13.42	0.071	Rosecliffe	New Free School	66.50	0.243	Christ Church C of E	Growing School	8.75	0.030	<b>Total Variations</b>		<b>196.01</b>	<b>0.900</b>	Centrally Retained Growth Funding			2.662	<b>TOTAL Growth Funding Allocation</b>			<b>3.562</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
School Name	Reason			Pupil No. Variation																																																
		7/12ths	£m																																																	
Suthers Free School	Growing School	70.00	0.364																																																	
Hucknall Flying High Academy	New Free School	5.83	0.023																																																	
The Rushcliffe School	Basic Need	11.67	0.063																																																	
The West Bridgford School	Basic Need	13.42	0.073																																																	
The Carlton Academy	Basic Need	6.42	0.033																																																	
The Redhill Academy	Basic Need	13.42	0.071																																																	
Rosecliffe	New Free School	66.50	0.243																																																	
Christ Church C of E	Growing School	8.75	0.030																																																	
<b>Total Variations</b>		<b>196.01</b>	<b>0.900</b>																																																	
Centrally Retained Growth Funding			2.662																																																	
<b>TOTAL Growth Funding Allocation</b>			<b>3.562</b>																																																	

	<p><u>3f High Needs Presentation</u> Presentation slides have been sent out to members</p> <p>Minutes approved as accurate and correct</p>	
4.	<p><b>4a – Final accounts 2020-2021</b></p> <p>Mark Needham presented the paper. Paul Hawkins – Mark mentioned that the general carry forward is low, do the NCC have a number/percentage of what the carry forward should be. Officers advised that NCC have never had a set amount of how much the carry forward should be, but for any eventualities we probably should have a carry forward.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the contents of the report</li> <li>2. Note the carry forward of underspend detailed in paragraph 4 into 2021/22</li> </ol> <p>Both points noted.</p>	
	<p><b>4b. Growth Fund</b></p> <p>Steve Hawkins presented the paper.</p> <p>Before ‘Covid’ authorities had been advised that there would be a review on how the growth fund was allocated to authorities with a possible change to the formula. To date we have no further information of how future years allocation will be worked out.</p> <p>James Macdonald ask how ringfenced the growth allocation was. Steve Hawkins – The ESFA prescribe it should be used to fund growth, it is part of the schools’ block and DSG, therefore governed as any other transfer.</p> <p>The anticipated spend for the next couple of years is as follows: - 2022/23 – 2.7 million 2023/24 – 2.4 million 2024/25 – 2.3 million This is only a very rough guide. While we don’t know future funding it’s difficult to say how much in reserves is required.</p> <p>Criteria for 3<sup>rd</sup> term (summer term) of growth for academies For schools and academies that are in receipt of growth fund, a maintained school their budgets are from April the pupil numbers used will be the previous October numbers so growth is within their budget, however for an academy their budgets are from September and due to the lag a summer term allocation is given.</p> <p>In the November meeting we should have an update with regards 2022/23 and future growth allocations, we will feed this back to forum but do need options for what we could do.</p> <p>Andrew Rossington – with cuts in SEN for schools could we look at transferring some of this money to the High Needs Block</p> <p>Comments and views posted on teams: -</p> <p>Karen Richards - Completely agree with you James. It's a lot of money when we are struggling to finance other areas. Worth bearing in mind in case we get penalised for being prudent with regards saving for future years. It is public money which has been allocated for existing rather than future pupils?</p>	

<p>Anne Hall - Fully agree with James and Karen. Seems a huge amount to be holding when there are such struggles elsewhere.</p> <p>Laura Gapski - It's a long shot but the EY overspend arose because of a 'growth' in places over Autumn and double funding. Could this be considered also please?</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 and agrees the allocations listed in appendix A for payment to primary schools for 2021-22. Noted and agreed</li> <li>2. Continues to monitor the use of this fund throughout 2021-22. Agreed</li> </ol>	
<p><b>4c. DSG Budget Monitoring</b></p> <p>Mark Needham presented the paper.</p> <p>Explained that the early years block is as per budget but under review. there are currently 2 options that the ESFA and the local authority are looking at with regards funding received. The traditional 5/12<sup>th</sup> and 7/12<sup>th</sup> on the two January census or a possible alternative including Summer and Autumn census. Mark Needham pointed out that the reserve table does not include the current amount in growth.</p> <p>Andrew Rossington – Including growth do we have a reserve position of £10million? Mark Needham – No the current position is growth (5.755) plus £60k - £5.8million James Macdonald – Including growth the reserve is just under 1% of the total block</p> <p>Mark Needham drew attention to paragraph 5 of the report and explained the risks associated with the forecast.</p> <p>Laura Gapski – Does Laurence have any learning about how the Early Years budget will be arranged? Laurence Jones – Nothing above what we have done, nothing different to previous year until we have income information.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notes the content of the report – report noted.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>3d. Specialist Places High Level Needs – Verbal update</b></p> <p>Laurence Jones – Nottinghamshire have a potential storm coming with regards specialist places.</p> <p>150 special provision written in plan with no schools. The options are, manage places in the short term until September 2022, increase special places and Independent non Maintained (INM) The cost for INM's would quickly eat into the reserve and officers wanted to make members aware as soon as possible. Where we end up with children in special schools the cost will be lower with better outcomes for the children, INM's the average rate is £55,000 and can stretch above £100,0000</p>	

	<p>David Philips -what are the next steps in continuing to tackle the concerns that we have had about overspend in INM provision? And level of confidence to manage in house to reduce commitment growth.</p> <p>Karen Hughman – we will have to measure how the new initiative is going alongside HLN and AFN that needs can be met. Would like to ask members to encourage Heads and CEO's to discuss and encourage district working. Interrogating the data so that we are using this resource and finding what is affective in meeting the needs of pupils in mainstream.</p> <p>Laurence Jones – we have a situation where schools are unable to meet needs or parents have lost confidence in schools meeting need without any discussion. Helen Atkins - the issue is the process of EHCP allocation? Other services working with children are advising parents to apply for EHCPs and special school places with no communication with schools. Jacqueline Sainsbury – Yes, several agencies are advising parents to apply for EHCP</p> <p>The process starts well before EHCP's, paediatricians are putting parents down the EHCP route. Karen Richards - it can be a real challenge for colleagues in early years to access effective, targeted support which, for some children, might well vastly reduce their level of need moving into primary school. Obviously, this would not necessarily apply to those with extremely complex needs, but I still feel that early intervention opportunities continue to be missed, despite the hard work of providers and the team at County Hall.</p> <p>What is the LA doing to address paediatricians and the route they are advising parents towards? Karen Hughman – The LA have made and continue to make multiple representation to medical colleagues and agree with Helen Atkins Laurence Jones – Also agreed with Helen Atkins, stating that locality working would help to identify children early.</p>	
	<p><b>3e – Future Early Years &amp; School Forum Meeting – verbal discussion</b></p> <p>James Macdonald – would like members to consider future Forum meetings and suggested that we went for a hybrid model where we have face to face for September and December meeting with November, February and June meeting held virtually. Recommending that the face to face ones could be held in locations around the county in members settings.</p> <p>Paul Hawkins – Will there be an option for people to dial into the face to face meetings? Fiona Jones – adequate parking will also be required.</p> <p>Members agreed with the chair's suggestion, September meeting to be held at either Retford Oaks or St Giles – November meeting with be virtual – December meeting to be held at Chilwell Secondary school with February and June meetings to be virtual.</p> <p>Dates for the 21-22 academic year were agreed</p>	
4.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>None</p>	
5.	<p><b>Confidentiality</b></p> <p>No item marked confidential</p>	

**6. Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 16 September 21	2-4pm	St Giles or Retford Oaks
Thursday 11 November 21	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams
Thursday 9 December 21	2-4pm	Chilwell School
Thursday 24 February 22	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams
Thursday 16 June 22	2-4pm	Virtual – Microsoft Teams