

**Leicestershire Schools' Forum**  
**Notes of the meeting held on Thursday 4 December 2014,**  
**2.00pm at Beaumanor Hall**

**Present**

<b>Tim Moralee</b> <b>Brian Myatt</b> <b>Alex Green</b> <b>Sonia Singleton</b>	Secondary Academy Headteacher
<b>Suzanne Uprichard</b> <b>Michael Murphy</b> <b>Bill Nash</b>	Secondary Academy Governors
<b>David Lloyd</b>	Primary Maintained Headteachers
<b>Jean Lewis</b>	Primary Academy Governor
<b>Tony Gelsthorpe</b>	Primary Maintained Governors
<b>Heather Stretton</b>	Trade Union Representative
<b>Nigel Leigh</b>	Post 16 Provider
<b>Suzanne Uprichard</b>	PRU Representative

**In attendance:**

Ivan Ould, Lead Member for Children and Family Services  
 Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources Department  
 Lesley Hagger, Director, Children and Family Services  
 Gill Weston, Assistant Director, Education, Learning and Skills  
 Chris Bristow, Strategic Lead SEND Reform, Children and Family Services  
 Francis Lawlor, Service Manager (16-19/25 Learning), Children and Family Services  
 Adrian Stephenson, Behaviour Partnership Consultant  
 Wendy Philp, School Food and Catering Services Manager

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies</b>  Apologies were received from Richard Spurr, John Bassford, Ian Sharpe, Karen Allen, Chris Davies, David Thomas, Ed McGovern and Alison Deacon.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes</b>  The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2014 were agreed as a true record. There were no Matters Arising.  The Chair welcomed everyone to meeting and reported that Sue Horn had resigned as one of the Special School Headteacher representatives.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Universal Free School Meals Capital Funding</b> Wendy Philp introduced her report and gave an update on the allocation and the completion of work following the Government	

	<p>announcement of £150M capital funding to improve kitchen and dining facilities. Leicestershire had received £886,000 for all maintained schools to provide free school meals to infant children from September 2014.</p> <p>Wendy reported that the introduction of the new free school meals had increased services and provision for meals to approximately 30,686 meals a day, with the uptake running at 79%.</p> <p>An initial assessment of all schools was undertaken to ascertain how they cope with providing additional meals. The decision taken was to ensure that funding was allocated as fairly as possible, providing sufficient cooking facilities and equipment. To date six dining centres have been converted into full kitchens and two outstanding to be completed by March 2015.</p> <p>A bid had been submitted on behalf of Oxley Primary School following the Government's announcement of the next round of capital funding for a conversion to a production kitchen. This had previously been on hold due to the cost of upgrading of the electric meter. The outcome of that bid would be known by 20 January 2015.</p> <p>A contribution of £50,000 had been allocated to Brownlow Primary School in Melton Mowbray as well as a successful bid from the Academies Maintenance Fund, for a new building (kitchen and dining room) in Melton to be completed by the end of March 2015.</p> <p>Wendy confirmed that there were no resources issues, contractual or procurement implications arising from her report.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether the conversions had received a positive impact on the cost of transport? Wendy responded yes, that schools only pay transport costs if meals are transported in. Schools money pays for transport so that has therefore reduced.</p> <p><b>Schools' Forum noted the allocation of the school meals capital funding.</b></p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p>Implementation of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM)</p> <p>Jenny introduced her report, as a result of discussions with schools relating to the implications for primary schools on the implementation of the Universal Infant Free School Meals programme.</p> <p>Following Schools' Forum in February 2014 and September 2014 and discussion around the implications of the programme, the Local Authority had asked schools and academies to submit their experiences of the implementation. Six responses had been received.</p> <p>Jenny outlined that there was not enough information to base</p>	

	<p>conclusions on and therefore it was not known whether the grant had been sufficient for the implementation.</p> <p>From the information received, it appears everything was going well in primary unless schools want to tell the Local Authority otherwise.</p> <p>Jenny reported that given the low number of responses, the Local Authority would not be sharing the outcome from the assessment with the Education Funding Agency.</p> <p>Jean raised concern that a lot of reception parents do not see the difference between free school meals and free meals and what they should be applying for, which has an effect on pupil premium. Jean asked if this item could be re-visited at a future meeting.</p> <p>Jenny responded, will be able to tell in January census. The Local Authority can go back to schools to ask how is this happening, but no guarantee of funding to carry this on.</p> <p>Suzanne asked if this was applicable to maintained primary schools. Jenny responded yes, that the X had been omitted from the first page.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Behaviour Partnership Update</b></p> <p>Francis and Adrian introduced their report which sets out the finances and performance of the five secondary Behaviour Partnerships.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finances have increased since the introduction of KS3 in September 2014.</li> <li>• Further work required to set out overall expenditure and differences of the 5 Partnerships.</li> <li>• The performance of the Partnerships has vastly improved to become a successful programme. There has been a reduction in exclusions over the past few years, the number of programme managed learners was at 78 in 2013/14, learners receiving advice and guidance for those at risk of being programme managed was 130. Fewer learners are moving out of the County because schools and Partnerships are developing the ability to provide local solutions for local learners. Overall the Partnerships are providing excellent value for money.</li> </ul> <p>The following points were raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partnership working has strengthened the links between secondary schools;</li> <li>2. Young people central to the programme are receiving a good deal to meet their needs; the learners are achieving good outcomes which increases the expectations on learners and the Partnerships to ensure they are re-engaged into education and progress into education or training at 16;</li> <li>3. Behaviour Partnerships are a catalyst for change within secondary schools across the County; the process of dialogue and co-operation about the way the schools work internally is well informed and effective. It strengthens a schools capacity</li> </ol>	

to develop individual youngsters.

Brian raised concerns about the longevity of funding for the Partnerships; and in particular the employment and training of its people. Behaviour Partnerships is a productive and successful arrangement that requires planning on a medium to long term basis.

Jenny responded that the Authority share the frustration not having longevity of budgets and not knowing what the High Needs resource will be. From the 2014 Autumn statement – if current Government is re-elected they have said they wish to move towards multi-year budgets.

David Lloyd raised concerns, although positive work being done, he felt that mental health CAMHS support for this area was impenetrable.

Lesley reported at a recent Health and Wellbeing Board meeting, an agreement that she would lead on a piece of work with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to look at new pathways to develop mental health support for young people and would like to have a Headteacher representative involved to support that work.

Adrian emphasised that the 5 Partnership Co-ordinators were key in linking Behaviour Partnerships with other services, capacity of these co-ordinators to act as success in these partnerships.

There was an issue raised regarding funding for City children – youngsters in County schools permanently excluded in order to access funding from City. Lesley suggested dialogue with the new Director of Children's Services in the City to find solutions that reduce the number of permanent exclusions in County schools for City resident learners.

Nigel asked whether studio schools were excluded from the Partnerships? Adrian responded that in Hinckley and Bosworth they were included, but North West Leicestershire were not. The Memorandum of Understanding is that all learners are entitled to support from the Partnership. It is the intention of the Partnerships to look at the process of transition at 16 – the Partnerships need to do more work around positive progression at 16 and tracking outcomes up to 18.

Mr Ould said the success of the Partnership was outstanding and he regards their services as essential for children in Leicestershire and gave his full support.

Mr Ould reported that he had recently raised an issue with Edward Timpson relating to the problem for Behaviour Partnerships for Looked After Children placed in Leicestershire by other authorities without notification. Mr Ould reported that Paul Burnett, Chair of the LSCB, had written to a number of local authorities, as they are required to notify the LA and LSCB when these young people come in. Mr Ould asked colleagues to feedback to him any problems relating to this matter.

	<p>Jean asked if there was any progress on this aspect of Behaviour Partnerships being rolled downwards into primary schools?  Gill responded there was a lot of progress - Oakfield had established a one stop shop approach and introduced primary behaviour forums on a monthly basis. A telephone advice line had been set up. Need to join that up to ensure year 6 children are transitioning into secondary properly. A report was being taken to Scrutiny Committee in January outlining proposals to provide a viable model linked up with the Specialist Teaching Service, and the Behaviour Partnerships model alongside the Special Schools model.</p>	
6.	<p><b>2014/15 Schools Budget Outturn</b></p> <p>Jenny detailed the expected position of the 2014/15 budget. Expected to know the 2015/16 funding settlement week commencing 15 December. In setting next year's budget, terms and conditions in the Dedicated Schools Grant have to carry forward any underspend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEN area - contingency funding - changes and requirements for Post 16 education increasing in participation age, moving SEN system driven by individual statements. This contingency is released to special school budgets for 2015/16.</li> <li>• A number of pressures on DSG – pupil number growth – we know Leicestershire will need to bring new schools into the system, free schools and academies required to start-up funding. Notionally £1M is set-aside in the DSG reserve but with new schools expected over a period of years need to consider how an ongoing sustainable budget can be established.</li> <li>• 2015/16 we know there are changes to how the 2 year old DSG is calculated – will be on participation. The funding rates have been confirmed and the loss of grant is estimated to be £2.6M.</li> <li>• Significant financial implications from sponsored academy deficits which revert back to the Local Authority - £2.5M set aside for deficit will have been used by early 2015/16.</li> <li>• Age range changes – funding set aside we feel is sufficient.</li> <li>• Lost funding for 21 places at the PRU when the Behaviour Partnerships became responsible for KS3 provision, no reduction in the Partnership budgets.</li> <li>• Budget proposals presented to Schools' Forum in February 2014. Long term implications noted on page 58 to protect as much as possible.</li> <li>• Tim asked whether there was any suggestion nationally regarding picking up academy overspends? Jenny responded no, set out in a Statutory Instrument. Conversations at LA feeling more and more DfE and EFA wanting to push financial implications and responsibilities back to the LA to resolve instead of nationally. Academy deficits have a rigorous process now the LA issue Notice of Concern to those schools and align a member of the finance</li> </ul>	

	<p>team to monitor to limit any financial implications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heather understands Leicestershire does not have many sponsored academies? Jenny responded yes, but planned ones.</li> <li>• Alex asked what was happening about sponsorship in Leicestershire? Jenny agreed to bring a paper back to the next meeting.</li> <li>• Lesley emphasised the importance to all work together so that schools do not get to the point of sponsored arrangement. Regular meetings with the DfE we strongly urge them not to send such letters to schools.</li> <li>• Alex commented that very few schools were big enough in Leicestershire to take on that role of sponsorship. Academies would like to support other schools but can not take on the financial risk.</li> <li>• Gill reported that the Local Authority does engage in discussions about schools in Category 4 which DfE deemed as requires sponsorship – robust evidence presented as to what we are doing to support those schools.</li> <li>• Tim said the success strategy was the work through LEEP, schools had improved significantly.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>Mr Ould reported at the last F40 meeting he had been asked to continue as Chair for the next 2 years. At a meeting in Staffordshire recently things remain unchanged, fair funding for children in England, money £17M to £25M for next year. We do not know when politicians can/will agree.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Date of Next Meetings</b></p> <p>Monday 23 February 2015  Thursday 18 June 2015  Monday 21 September 2015</p> <p>All the above from 2.00 – 4.00 pm at Beaumanor Hall.</p>	