

## Leicestershire Schools' Forum

### Notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 26 November 2013, 2.30 pm at Beaumanor Hall

#### **Present:**

Tim Moralee Alex Green Sonia Singleton Brian Myatt	Secondary Academy Headteachers
Jean Lewis	Primary Academy Governor
David Lloyd Karen Allen Heather Sewell	Primary Maintained Headteachers
Ed McGovern	Primary Academy Headteacher
David Thomas	Primary Maintained Governors
Sue Horn	Academy Representative - Special
Andy Reeve	Trade Union Representative
Ian Sharpe	CE Representative
Tim Moralee	PRU Representative
Louisa Hallam	Early Years PVI provider

#### **In attendance:**

Ivan Ould, Lead Member for CYPS

Gill Weston, Interim Assistant Director of Children and Young People's Service

Jenny Lawrence, CYPS Finance Business Partner

Charlie Palmer, Head of Strategy, Education of Vulnerable Groups

Julie Drake – Head of Strategy, Commissioning

David Atterbury – Head of Strategy, Education Sufficiency

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>  Apologies were received from Lesley Hagger, John Bassford, Tony Gelsthorpe, Brenda Carson, Nigel Leigh, Julie Kennedy and Jason Brookes.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting and matters arising</b>  The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18 September 2013 were agreed as a true record subject to amending Jean Lewis' position to Primary Academy Governor in those present.	

	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
--	------------------------	--

	<p><b>a) Forum Representatives</b>  Jenny Lawrence confirmed a letter of thanks, on behalf of the Schools' Forum, had been sent to John Herbert</p> <p><b>b) School Funding Formula 2014/15 and Funding Age Range Changes</b>  Jenny Lawrence referred to the question raised by Tony Gelsthorpe regarding clarification regarding a request to change pupil numbers. Jenny asked for it to be stressed it was the pupil number count within the formula and not the LA approving pupil number changes.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Special Educational Needs and Disability Approach to personalisation</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b>  The report presents information that updates Schools' Forum regarding the Children and Families bill and in particular Support and Aspiration: a new approach for SEN and Disabilities.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  Julie Drake explained the background to the paper and Forum noted the fundamental changes across the board expected next year. Work to align SEN budgets and school funding had been taken forward by a number of SEND pathfinders including Leicester City. Julie also referred the Forum to Appendix 1 produced for the DfE by SQW which sets out clear framework for implementing personal budgets.</p> <p><b><u>Comment/Issues raised</u></b>  Karen Allen queried whether, children who have considerable medical needs and not a statement, could get an equivalent of a statement. Julie commented that detail had not been worked through but the focus was still education. Julie added that children and young people of complex needs would have one plan instead of two plans.</p> <p>The Forum needs to be aware that Local Authorities are required to offer personal budgets. By next September work should have started on developing education, health and care plans coming into the system and plans for personal budgets as an option, in train.</p> <p>Jean Lewis commented that we would see little adaptation and change as the circumstances of the children changed and the emphasis seemed to be an initial assessment. How is this going to be developed? Julie said that the review process remains and if there were to be any changes that would be required before annual review. Julie advised the Forum to consider responding to the SEN Code of Practice consultation.</p> <p>David Thomas referred to the funding implications for future funding and queried "comes from the school". Julie said that this was at the discretion of the headteacher and urged Members to</p>	

	<p>read Appendix 1 in particular the report by SQW support and Aspiration, Introducing Personal Budgets, October 2013. Julie added that the funding implications were still unclear.</p> <p>Jenny commented that Schools' Forum still had a statutory role in SEN arrangements and a lot more discussion was still to come. It was agreed Julie Drake would attend Schools' Forum again when more information was available.</p> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b> The Schools' Forum noted the paper.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Oakfield Consultation</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b> The report presents the results of a consultation undertaken by the Local Authority concerning the future of Oakfield School.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Charlie Palmer explained what a Pupil Referral Unit was and outlined the reasons for the consultation taking place. Charlie presented the options to the Forum which were taken to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 11 November. A paper to Cabinet in December was currently being written to agree devolving secondary provision to behaviour partnerships and maintain primary on site provision. In addition primary provision was looking for a better site. Charlie commented that he had been in discussion with primary and secondary partnerships to prepare the Cabinet paper.</p> <p><b><u>Comments/Issues</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary heads delighted PRU remaining open as concerned it may be sponsored.</li> <li>• Concern for primary heads that PRU is on a first come first serve basis.</li> <li>• Similar role of Behaviour Support Team needed for the PRU.</li> <li>• Concerns primary panels would not be in a position to take on the role like secondary behaviour partnerships.</li> <li>• Challenge in this field of working is enormous – how can we develop secondments?</li> <li>• Early intervention key – funding could be invested in primary schools.</li> <li>• Jenny confirmed the budget proposals that the LA are putting together for 2014 maintain a current funding level for Oakfield. It was envisaged that funding would go to Oakfield for 30 places or partnerships for 21 places but waiting per pupil is different at KS3 than it is at primary.</li> <li>• Discussion with primary heads regarding use of funding delegated to schools around the locality partnerships.</li> <li>• Discussion took place on the individualised budget impact on behaviour partnerships which was unclear.</li> <li>• Primary provision sustainable – discussion still to be had.</li> <li>• Best way forward for primary pupils with PRU intervention discussed and the working day relationships between that</li> </ul>	

	<p>facility and groups of primary schools around the county.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary children back in primary schools rather than Oakfield – keep skills when children have a statement of special needs.</li> <li>• Partnership working with PRU entering into KS1 or KS2 – sometimes they get de-schooled. Work needs to be carried out in the long term and in key stage 2.</li> <li>• If young people go into the PRU and the assessment requires specialist school places are there places there. It was confirmed they are and the funding.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b> The Schools' Forum noted the paper.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Fair Access Consultation</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b> The report presents the Local Authority's consultation on the proposed changes to the Fair Access protocol.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Charlie Palmer explained what the Fair Access Protocol was and that it was intended to ensure that effective arrangements are agreed with schools to ensure that vulnerable children out of school are allocated a school place quickly and fairly. The protocol has been revised and a consultation was open until 20 December in order for contributions to be made.</p> <p><b><u>Comments/Issues</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referring to flow chart in the protocol reference was made to contact school. In the past had behaviour partnership team who did a really good job. Concerned no-one in those posts. Charlie commented that role was taken on by partnerships in secondary schools and monitoring could be part and parcel of that role.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b> The Schools' Forum noted the report.</p>	
6.	<p><b>School Place Planning</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b> To provide the Schools' Forum with an overview of the current position regarding the provision of Primary and Secondary School places in Leicestershire, and seek comment on the challenges ahead.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> David Atterbury made reference to the attached report to the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny committee of the 9 September. There are four key themes within the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic role of the LA in relation to school place planning.</li> <li>2. Pressures upon additional primary school places in particular within Braunstone Town and Hinckley.</li> </ol>	

	<p>3. The provision of secondary school places including the impact of age range changes.</p> <p>4. Capital funding arrangements.</p> <p><b><u>Comments/Issues Raised:</u></b></p> <p>A general discussion followed with specific questions asked in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of new housing and the pressure this might place upon existing schools during transition.</li> <li>• The impact of city pupils seeking to access county schools.</li> <li>• Possible funding solutions where free schools were proposed in the context of potential top slicing of the DSG.</li> <li>• JL advised that the Secretary of State had agreed the local authority proposal, as agreed by Cabinet, on 15<sup>th</sup> October to vary the pupil numbers within the funding formula to support transition arrangements for schools with age range changes or affected by them.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b></p> <p>The Schools' Forum noted the paper and the challenges and issues. A request was made for David to attend Forum to provide further updates as matters progress.</p>	
7.	<p><b>2014/15 School Funding</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b></p> <p>To provide Schools' Forum with an update on 2014/15 school funding including the outcome of the submission to the Secretary of State to vary the pupil number count for schools undertaking, or affected by, age range changes. Also to provide background on the expected Schools' budget settlement for 2014/15 and how that is likely to impact on budgets.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>Jenny presented the outcome of the application to the Secretary of State which was approved by Cabinet on 15 October to Forum members. The EFA have confirmed that the Secretary of State intends to approve the proposal at the point that the 2013 finance regulations are laid. Jenny referred to paragraph 10 in the report which outlined the impact of the changes for maintained schools and academies. The changes would be made for 2014/15 budgets and was in the LA's pro-forma submission in October which has been approved in principle by the EFA.</p> <p>Jenny informed the meeting that the next course of action was the receipt of data for 2014/15 budget and the final budget submission which had to be in by the end of January. Jenny explained that the DSG settlement was within three blocks and outlined the expectations for 2014/15 for each block.</p> <p>Jenny explained that for 2015/16 the DfE intend to move to the next phase of National Fair Funding Formula which would only effect the Schools Block settlement. This information gives</p>	

	<p>uncertainty in advising schools about planning and on how that will affect the local authority funding settlement.</p> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b></p> <p>The Schools' Forum noted the paper.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Schools' Budget Outturn 2013/14</b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose</u></b></p> <p>To set out the estimated 2013/14 Schools Budget outturn and the financial performance of the Schools' Budget as forecast at the end of October.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>Jenny outlined that any over or underspend on Dedicated Schools' Grant would carry forward £2.5M was held in contingency to deal with uncertainties around a number of High needs issues including the Post 16 SEN funding changes education. That funding had now been released.</p> <p>Jenny briefly summarised the reasons why the 2014/15 budget would be challenging.</p> <p><b><u>Comments/Issues Raised:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversubscription of classes raised.</li> <li>• If school going to grow or decline – same mechanisms open to all those schools about the age ranges. Jenny explained that whilst growing numbers on roll have the same outcome as age range changes they are required to be treated in different ways</li> <li>• Information released by the EFA and associated deadlines not clear – disjointed information.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Decision</u></b></p> <p>To note the estimated financial position of the Schools' Budget for 2013/14.</p> <p>That Schools Forum notes the current forecast position on the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve and its use.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><b><u>Secondary Academy Representatives</u></b></p> <p>Jenny informed the meeting that there were currently 4 vacancies on the Schools' Forum for secondary academy representatives. All Chairs of Secondary Academy Schools had been emailed and nominations asked for by the end of the month. It was mentioned that Katie Rush at Brookvale would pick this up. It was agreed that Tim would email Katie Rush by the end of next week and if by the</p>	TM

	next meeting things are no further forward headteachers would be approached.	
--	--	--