

**Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools Forum
via Teams on Monday 27 September 2021 at 9.00 am**

Present

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Gareth Williams | Secondary Academy Headteacher |
| Liam Powell | Secondary Academy Headteacher |
| Martin Towers | Secondary Academy Governor |
| Jane Lennie | Secondary Maintained Governor |
| Jane McKay | Primary Academy Headteacher |
| Ed Petrie | Primary Academy Headteacher |
| Karen Allen | Primary Maintained Headteacher |
| Alison Ruff | Primary Maintained Headteacher |
| Jane Dawda | Primary Maintained Headteacher |
| Kelly Dryden | Special Academy Representative |
| Carolyn Lewis | CE Representative |
| Clive Wright | RC Representative |
| Suzanne Uprichard | PRU Representative |
| Graham Bett | DNCC Representative |

In attendance

Jane Moore, Director of Children and Family Services
 Paula Sumner, Assistant Director, Education and SEND
 Deborah Taylor, Lead Member, Children and Family Services
 Alison Bradley, Head of Service, Education Quality and Inclusion
 Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources

| | | Action |
|-----------|--|---------------|
| 1. | <p>Apologies and Substitutions</p> <p>Apologies were received from Felicity Clarke, Kath Kelly, Julie McBrearty, Claire Allen, Zoe Wortley and Jason Brooks.</p> <p>Gareth Williams was substituting for Chris Parkinson as secondary academy headteacher.</p> <p>Karen Allen welcomed Alison Ruff as the newly appointed Primary Maintained Governor, Jane Lennie as the newly appointed Secondary Maintained Governor and Kelly Dryden as the newly appointed academy special representative.</p> | |
| 2. | <p>Minutes and Matters Arising</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 17 June 2021 were agreed subject to the following comment to be included under agenda item 2022/23 Schools Block Transfer:</p> | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Jane Dawda commented that she understood how difficult it was for the local authority to manage this budget as it was the only budget with no control over; this was the same in schools as there was an increase in need which means that costs are going up and the income does not cover those costs.</p> <p>Matters Arising Graham Bett asked if there had been any response yet to the consultation for the potential transfer. Jenny Lawrence said that she had not checked as it had only been launched on the 20 September and runs until the 18 October.</p> | |
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Fair School Funding</p> <p>Jenny introduced the report which provides an update and analysis of the DfE’s proposals on the next stage of the introduction of the National Funding Formula (NFF).</p> <p>Jenny stated that the consultation is similar to the one in 2017 which was before the National Funding Formula was introduced and for this consultation 10 different areas have been identified where it needs to have more detail and more consultation. Growth funding and premises funding are areas that are quite difficult within the NFF and there are some issues to resolve before moving to a hard funding formula. The consultation is proposing that in 2023/2024 it will be a soft formula but are asking for views on whether local authorities should be made to move towards a national funding formula and as it stands Leicestershire does fund by the national funding formula. The consultation closes on 30 September.</p> <p>Karen Allen highlighted paragraph 12 which refers to more flexibility for local authorities to vary the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and asked what the implications of that were for schools and if Leicestershire had a view of how this flexibility would be used. Jenny said that the Minimum Funding Guarantee is the element that protects schools at the floor so the higher the Minimum Funding Guarantee the higher the protection for those but as the consultation is missing detail this is difficult to ascertain what it actually means so would need to see the proposals before seeing what that looks like. Karen Allen commented that when a high needs transfer was discussed last it was the MFG that hindered making it fair and whilst it does protect schools there are situations to that mechanism in different ways. Jenny agreed and said that the minimum per pupil funding level that affects the transfer will be discussed later on the agenda.</p> <p>Jane Lennie asked if a response to the consultation would be made. Jenny said there would but there was not enough detail to be able to understand its meaning and the consultation questions ask for direct answers. Jane Lennie stated that the high needs should be channelled through every consultation which Jenny said it was.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the report.</p> | |

4. 2022/23 School Funding Settlement

Jenny introduced the report which presents the high-level detail of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Settlement and the National Funding Formula (NFF) for 2022/23.

Jenny said that the DfE published in July the indicative NFF allocations for schools but are not complete as they do not include premises funding and are indicative as based on the October 2020 census and the final school budgets will be set on 2020/21 census data. Jenny said that the funding settlement has changed one or two things in terms of it has added £10k to the sparsity values making a difference to some small schools and there is a 3% increase to the other factors. Jenny added that the settlement includes a guaranteed increase of 2% per pupil allocation therefore schools with falling rolls may not see a 2% cash increase in their budget.

Jenny stated there are still schools that sit on the funding floor which would continue to be raised with the DfE because without the DfE guaranteeing an increase in funding those schools would be at a cash standstill in their budget.

Jenny stated that the NFF operates with a number of protections, notably the Minimum per Pupil Funding level (MPPL) and the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). It remains that local authorities would be funded at the 2020 census and schools at 2021 therefore changes in the census data such as an increase in the number of pupils eligible for FSM may ultimately create an affordability gap which may require amendments to some aspects of the 2022/23 through the minimum funding guarantee.

Jenny said that in terms of the high needs block Leicestershire continues to sit on the funding floor so receive the minimum increase of 8% per head of population. Jenny commented that whilst creating specialist provision it was not necessarily generating high needs DSG especially when a provision in a special needs unit is attached to a mainstream school as those schools are reflected in the main school census and not the high needs census. Jenny added there were issues too in terms of central services including the DSG contribution made to school effectiveness and historic premature retirement costs. The DfE in the NFF consultation are also proposing changes to the way Leicestershire are funded from 2023/24 onwards.

Jenny added that the high needs settlement does improve but not significantly and certainly not enough to recover the deficit.

Jane Dawda referred to the consultation released at the end of July on the sparsity factor and felt that the DfE actually looked at the comments and had added a tapering scale. Jenny said that tapering has always been in place and local authorities could adopt it. In Leicestershire the NFF has been delivered as defined by the DfE without any local changes to any factor. Jenny added that sparsity however does not provide the financial protection to small rural schools as set out by the DfE.

Graham referred to paragraph 7 and the way schools are split and asked

if more detail could be provided for Schools Forum. Jenny agreed to filter out the table and circulate.

JL

Graham Bett asked for clarity on paragraph 8 of the report. Jenny referred to the schools block transfer proposal which has a disproportionate effect across different groups of schools in Leicestershire. Jenny added that because the minimum per pupil funding level and the minimum funding guarantee overwrite the formula so taking out funding could mean that these protections put it back in again so when discussed at the June Cabinet report Leicestershire put a disapplication request to the Secretary of State to see if the Secretary of State would allow a variation to the minimum per pupil level – that disapplication went in to the DFE but they requested more detail and have not made a decision which is why the consultation presents two proposals one of which is within the gift of Leicestershire to deliver with the approval of Schools Forum and the second that will need a Secretary of State decision.

Karen Allen commented that previously Schools Forum voted against a Schools Block Transfer and the next vote will probably be the same. Karen said that Jane said that one option in the consultation could be delivered in Leicestershire if Schools Forum agree and the other one will need Secretary of State decision. Jenny stated that if Schools Forum do not agree the option is deliverable that too would need Secretary of State decision.

Carolyn Lewis asked about the impact of national insurance on budgets and how a helpful message might be shared with schools in terms of the difficulties they face with their budget setting processes. Jenny said this issue had been raised with the ESFA and they suggested conversations were taking place with the Treasury as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

Graham referred to paragraph 11 in terms of the difference between the Government's increase of £7.43m and the planned increase of £5.7m so therefore the difference is what the County Council are planning to take out of schools budgets for the high needs budget. Graham stated that therefore the County Council do not need to do the transfer as the Government has increased the funding. Jenny stated that within the high needs plan £2m had been factored in and what this is doing is reducing the deficit from £43m to £35m and therefore does not resolve the problem. Jane Moore added that it looks like the Government has given the extra funding to prevent the transfer however this is not the case. As a local authority the projection was a financial increase of 5.7% but actually received 7.3% which mathematically looks like the amount of the transfer. This has taken a cumulative deficit of £3.78m so need to reduce to zero in order to not cause the concerns within the local authority but take Graham's point of what it looks like but the local authority will still need to go ahead with the proposals for a transfer.

Jane Lennie referred to the five local authorities that have entered into agreement with the DFE who will provide additional funding to remove the high needs deficits but such an arrangement is not expected to be available to Leicestershire and asked why this was not the case. Jenny

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>said that conversations with the ESFA have taken place around this at regional financial meetings; the 5 local authorities all have transformation plans and bring their DSG back within the level of grant and the current Leicestershire plan does not do this. Jenny added that the DfE are having conversations with other local authorities but have not approached Leicestershire and they are not guaranteeing there is going to be further funding for any further agreements.</p> <p>Kelly Dryden referred to what appears to be inconsistency between the funding protection for special schools. Jenny stated that there are no funding guarantees within the high needs settlement for special schools which has been raised before as mainstream school funding has increased but special school funding has not. The DSG settlement for high needs is quite complex as it takes into account a number of factors and quite interesting that the population factor which is 8% per head is quite a small element of the DSG settlement so the 8% generated the £7.4m. Jenny said that in terms of the units this has been raised with the DfE as pupils are picked up within the mainstream count so those pupils will be part of that 2% per pupil increase but all of their top-up funding comes from the high needs so they cross the two.</p> <p>Martin Towers asked if it was possible to share the letter to the Secretary of State requesting the 0.5% transfer. Jenny said that no request has been made and was dependent upon the outcome of the consultation and any decisions made by Schools Forum. It will be these two things that will form the content of the letter for which the deadline is 21 November. Martin commented that he presumed the letter had been sent based on previous conversations and thought Schools Forum voted to not agree it in a previous meeting and it was said the letter would be going to the Secretary of State as evidence that all options have been explored. Jane Moore stated that the transfer was disagreed two years ago and Leicestershire are now making another proposal which has not formally been presented to Schools Forum for a decision; any request to the Secretary of State would be dependent upon that decision. At the last meeting discussion took place and Schools Forum members were quite clear around views but had not been presented formally for the vote to be taken before approaching the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the report, particularly the approach to be taken in the event of an affordability issue to align school budget allocations to the Schools Block DSG.</p> | |
| 5. | <p>Presentation on the consultation on the proposed Schools Budget Transfer and de-delegation of funding for Union Facilities</p> <p>Jane Moore introduced this item and gave an in-depth overview of the high needs budget, the spend of the budget and work undertaken trying to bring the budget back in line. The presentation would be circulated with the minutes.</p> <p>Jane shared the most up to date financial position of the high needs block and said that the position of this budget changes frequently as there are a large number of variables within this budget which means it fluctuates frequently and explained that the deficit figure for 2024/25 had</p> | |

changed for a number of reasons which were highlighted. Jane said that all the projections on budget spend are based on a projected increase in EHCPs, a projected increase in the cost of placements (both in terms of numbers of placements but also unit costs of placements) and the income for the high needs block. Jane highlighted the funding gap pre savings for the next 4 years if no action was taken. Jane said that the high needs block DSG the Government provide funding for local authorities to spend on statutory services and are duty bound to pay for through the high needs block. The High Needs Development plan has been running for a number of years and projections have been to save £18m by the end of the MTFs based on the initiatives in place and included in this is the proposed transfer, demand savings and benefit of building new provision but also making some changes in the way processes are carried out. In terms of achieving the savings there was still the annual gap of £9m this year, dropping next year but going up again.

Jane said that the Government instructs local authorities what it needs to spend on and set rules on the use of funding including carrying over the deficit and covering it with local authority funding.

Jane said the expenditure of placements alone exceeds the High Needs block by £8.3m and highlighted the placement costs which are provided over and above already provided for children. In terms of projected growth, it is assumed there will be some level of growth for both placement numbers and cost and Jane outlined these to the meeting. Jane highlighted the different types of placement spend and that the local authority has limited choice where children are placed as it has a statutory duty to make a placement based on what comes through on the EHCP. Local authorities lose the majority of Tribunals and are instructed to place that child in a higher cost provision. Jane went through other high needs spend on central services and other statutory provision.

Jane talked through the High Needs Development plan savings and what they relate to. There is also no indication of increased grant post 2022/23. The HNB Programme is the largest in the local authority with the largest amount of savings against it but is the biggest risk programme the local authority is running.

Jane outlined the initiatives taking place and the work around these to help deliver the programme. Jane added that work was being undertaken to look at the assessment process and have introduced a new triage and assessment team that are looking at the thresholds for EHCPs and whether they are met and if not what else could be done. Jane stated that in Leicestershire there was a disproportionately high number of EHCPs and the increase for these is far greater than that of other local authorities so are having to look in close detail at the thresholds around EHCPs but also what else needs to be done to support children and young people instead of having to issue an EHCP.

Jane said that work was being carried out on banding and funding by looking at how the funding could be used fairly around high needs children. Jane added that work was also being carried out with health colleagues about some of the benefits that could be realised through

better use of health funding and shared funding that could be in place for some pupils but actually some of those areas where it is purely a health need is being funded through the local authority's high needs block and the authority is working with health colleagues to ensure each are funding needs appropriately.

Jane outlined the schools that have been opened or redeveloped in terms of the capital investment carried out and a large focus of the strategy has been the development of resource bases as well as a number of new special schools opened and expansion of special schools. Further work is now in progress to develop a second phase of the HNB sufficiency programme.

In terms of the High Needs Block Jane went through the slide which highlighted the areas of concern and what has been carried to address these problems and whether it has worked and the next steps.

Jane had previously highlighted the savings lines that are being projected and the first one was cost reduction savings and this is about avoiding costs through new places, making savings through transferring pupils and how to achieve savings through consistency and decision making.

Jane referred to the demand savings and the majority of this is through increased inclusion and making sure children have the right support at the right time. Jane added there was also demand savings around consistency and decision making and how resources are allocated. Jane highlighted the work around preparation for adulthood and how young people are supported going into adulthood. There are also some additional savings for independent school use.

Jane stated that the local authority has to cover the deficit by setting aside revenue from the local authority budget, 1% increase of council tax equates to £3m but there was no ability to raise Council tax further and alongside the issues of High Needs there was a significant pressure this year in the Adult Social Care budget and continuing pressures of Children's Social Care. The local authority does not have the money to cover this deficit and is being raised with the DfE and HM Treasury to help them understand the impact across the local authority.

Alison Bradley clarified the comments around the return of those children who are in the independent sector coming into the new developments. Alison commented that new provision was not built without careful planning of growth profiles but has been outstripped by demand in some circumstances.

Carolyn Lewis commented that she was a little concerned regarding comments about thresholds and increasing thresholds and in terms of what the laws says for undertaking an EHCP and was important not to lose sight of the legal requirement of a statutory assessment whether the child has or may have special educational disability needs and whether they may need SEND provision through a EHCP. Carolyn also made the point around the amount of funding that schools are required as the legal requirement is that local authorities fund the £6k not schools and do not want to lose site in requesting that schools demonstrate that they have

spent this notional money before even the local authority consider making an assessment. Carolyn stated that she appreciated these points are more process focussed rather than finance but do not want to lose sight of the child and school through a challenging environment.

Jane Moore stated that she did not talk about increasing the threshold but about applying a threshold. Jane said that the local authority was bound by the Code of Practice and cannot depart from it so everything around the application process and decision making for an EHCP either assessment or plan is based on the Code of Practice. Jane said that when questions asked around whether needs can be met, they do not just need to be met through an EHCP and can be met through the system responsibility for the delivery of SEND. Jane reiterated that the local authority was not increasing the threshold and said that Leicestershire has issued far more EHCP's than other local authorities and perhaps issued EHCPs when not needed and other support available. Jane commented that on the point regarding the £6k and said that the local authority provide the £6k and are aware how many schools receive this and would be surprised if any school would not want to demonstrate how it had been used and have a robust system in place to constantly monitor and manage this.

Jane Dawda commented that she was part of the consultation group a few years ago when looking at spending the additional money to open the additional units and although the negative financial positive is talked about but what Jane Moore has presented is a positive way forward and should be recognised that there has been a lot of work that has gone on in the background through a very difficult period for everyone and the restructure of SENA will be a lot more positive.

Jane Moore acknowledged the work of the local authority but there has also been a huge amount of work gone on across the school system by supporting the children by meeting their needs. Jane said the challenge is that even with all the work carried out there was still the deficit and there is clearly not enough money for the system which was developed. The local authority is being really clear about that with the Secretary of State and others because the system is not funded to deliver what the Reform is set out to do.

Martin Towers referred to the transfer of children into the new provision which is more cost effective but had a low transfer rate and asked if there was a way of making this happen. Jane said that this was the area she wished to have the biggest impact when the programme started by moving children from £50-£70k a year placement and placing them into the new provision and being successful. However, Jane added that the code of practice does not easily allow for this and it is often parental preference that dictates where placements will be. The local authority has been in contact with parents and children to alert them to the new provision and is mentioned at annual reviews. Martin Towers asked about disapplication of the code of practice to make it possible. Jane said there was no ability to do this and would be against the rules around assessment and parental choice. Jane added that the Government has not funded SEND Reform and parents can make these choices and the local authority was duty bound to provide certain provision, additionally

school funding reform may also be a factor in increasing demand.

Graham Bett commented that there was a lot of agreement here that Jane and her team are doing as best possible a job in an impossible situation. Graham commented on the improvement work being carried out as mentioned in slide 9 but the financial problem remains the issue. Graham commented that the current system is not fit for purpose and that cannot be solved locally. Graham added that financially it was not possible to solve the problem as it is a national problem and with the appointment of a new Secretary of State this would be a good opportunity to send a clear message to them that the issue cannot be solved locally and the whole system has to be improved. Graham stated that it was not the right thing to do by taking money out of schools as it does not solve the problem but merely opens this up to further cuts to schools in future years.

Carolyn Lewis commented that the local authority was caught as are schools, as are children and families and it almost needs to stop working. Karen Allen commented that the transfer was part of that, and previous discussions were around unless this had been carried out there would not be an opportunity to have discussions with the DfE as they would say all avenues have not been explored.

Jane Moore commented that this was not solvable locally and had previously said the transfer had to go ahead as a result Jane stated that everything locally needs to be carried out as the DfE would expect this and will keep pushing the financial issues back to the local authority. Jane commented that whilst the system needs tidying up, whilst Leicestershire has more EHCPs than anyone else and whilst the local authority has high independent usage it means the Government was still able to push some things back locally. The high needs plan therefore needs to carry on making sure everything is being carried out locally. Jane stated that nationally it was being made clear that the problem is not solvable locally.

Paula Sumner reiterated Jane's points about the challenges locally but said there were still things that could be carried out to make the system more efficient which were being worked on. However, the national challenges are difficult and 93% of tribunals are in favour of parents. Paula said that the presentation shows how the high needs fund would be used in future because headteachers and SENCOs are saying that the Code of Practice was so descriptive and plans have to be so specific and parents expect this therefore deterring the creativity and innovation in schools that could help to meet the outcomes for the most vulnerable children. Paula added that this had been fed back as part of the SEN Review.

Mrs Taylor reiterated that she had listened to all comments and although everyone has their own priorities the main concern is what is best for the children in Leicestershire. Mrs Taylor acknowledged the funding issues but there was no option but to propose the transfer. Mrs Taylor would continue to press with Government the issues the local authority is facing and how these are being addressed and would also keep lobbying national government about the funding and how the process works. Mrs Taylor appreciated the supportive words for the local authority and

wished to reassure members that she was listening and is trying to support as much as she could.

Karen Allen commented that schools have noted the difficulties experienced in SENA for the last 18 months and the long periods to receive additional support from Educational Psychology and those carrying out assessments due to Covid. Karen added that during that time schools have put support in place before the local authority had agreed anything as the support was desperately needed. Karen mentioned that Jane had said that referrals had slowed down but asked how sure are the local authority that the reduction in referrals has not been as a result of SENA and the difficulties getting advice from other agencies and will therefore bounce back again in a couple of months.

Jane Moore acknowledged that over the last 18 months there had been significant challenges within SENA service in terms of implementing the SEND Reform. Jane was confident the right structure was now in place and will have the right people in place to support the service. The Local Authority are challenged around the Educational Psychology Service which is also a national challenge in terms of the number of psychologists available to undertake assessments. Jane added that work has been carried with the Educational Psychology Service and colleagues in schools around mitigating some of this and moving forward on this. Jane talked through the demand and the impact of Covid and the backlog of referrals has been processed in terms of the new EHCP working. The projections within the budget are based on the as is picture of EHCP growth and not based on new areas within the reduction of referrals but Covid will continue to impact on all services.

Graham Bett referred to his previous questions raised and that the £2m should be looked at again and going through the weakest partnership which is the schools is not a good thing. Graham stated that the figures are now different to originally thought and therefore you should be asking for around £270,000 rather than the £2m. Graham added that no amount should be asked for but noted the comments that have been made.

Jane Moore stated that the amount the local authority is proposing was less than what was being asked for. The local authority actually needs to find £34m so alongside the £2m other areas are being looked at to achieve even more savings. Jane stated that it was important that the high needs block does not grow as something that changes the position. There are still huge amounts of money here so hence the transfer request will still go ahead but noted Graham's point.

Jane went through the slide of the presentation that sets out the previous transfers from 2013 up to 2017/18 but stopped making the transfers partly due to the amount of money available in the DSG. Karen Allen commented that there was headroom in the DSG in the past and so it was easy to make a transfer without it impacting on schools as there was a carry forward. Karen said that 2018/19 would have been when the soft formula came in and the local authority would have had to ask Schools Forum to support that. Jenny Lawrence agreed and said the change in 2018/19 was the year the NFF was introduced which brought new requirements in and the 9.995m on the slide was baselined into the high need's settlement at that point. Jane said that other authorities have

continued to make the transfer even past the introduction of the NFF.

Jane went through the treatment of the proposed schools block transfer and explained the two levels of protection that limit the impact of funding changes – Minimum Funding Guarantee and Minimum per pupil funding level. Jane went through the two models for transfer which are in the consultation – the first model is reducing the AWPU by 0.5% and sets the MFG at 2% but increases a cap on gains at 2.1% which can be delivered without Secretary of State approval if approved by Schools Forum and the second model reduces the AWPU by 0.5% but this time adjusts the percentage of the MFG to 1.8% and introduces a cap on funding of 3.4% and reduces the Minimum Per Pupil Funding level by 0.5%. This option would need Secretary of State approval even if approved by Schools Forum. Jane said that both options will need Secretary State of approval if Schools Forum do not approve.

Jane went through the slides in terms of impact for each model on schools and as part of the consultation are in huge detail. Jane added that the consultation is currently running, and the results will come back to Schools Forum for a vote and then go to Secretary of State for approval.

Karen Allen referred to the second model which affects all but asked if the first model had been through any modelling as discussed before in terms of patterns being looked at in the types of schools that were disproportionately affected. Jane highlighted the pattern from previous who were disproportionately impacted and one of the reasons it did not progress was that it was disproportionately affecting those schools in much lower funded areas. Jenny said that similar modelling has been carried out and the graphs are included within the workbook that shows the impact across the schools. Jenny explained the way in which DfE funding works is that there is an impact across small primary schools because of the sparsity factor change in the NFF nationally.

Martin Towers asked if the transfer was still only for the one year. Jenny said that any transfer has to be approved on an annual basis. Karen commented that on a previous funding formula report it was mentioned that local authorities may not be able to carry this out in the future. Jenny said that the NFF consultation is proposing to further limit local authority flexibility in respect of school funding.

Jane Lennie commented that she preferred not to adopt either model but if model one was adopted the view would be that Schools Forum is condoning the under-funding of schools nationally. Carolyn Lewis also made this point at the last meeting. Karen Allen commented the point of this is to take it back to the Secretary of State so if Schools Forum were to agree, but based on previous discussions at this meeting doubt they will agree, and was not in our interests to agree there is the need to demonstrate these tensions to the Secretary of State.

Karen Allen stated that the consultation also asks for a view on de-delegation of funding for union facilities and asked Graham Bett if he wished to raise anything. Graham stated the consultation was out at the moment and hoped that people will want to participate in a scheme that

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>will facilitate discussions between unions and schools. Graham stated he had been involved in these discussions and they are 99% positive and helpful and reasonably creative to avoid future problems but understand budgets are tight. Graham said that he was not sure schools understand this request about union facilities time, which is fully, positively and actively supported by the two headteacher unions e.g. ASCL and NAHT. Graham said that a solution is needed that will work for everyone and explained the object of this is to create a 'pot' so no one school has to pay for representation but to be spread amongst everyone and the total cost is negotiable.</p> <p>Karen Allen stated that schools are open to discussion with unions but the challenge is this mechanism would not be something that everyone contributed to as the only schools it would impact on would be maintained schools as it is de-delegation and obviously maintained schools form a much reducing proportion of total schools in Leicestershire.</p> <p>Graham stated that multi-academy trusts are being approached with the same request therefore what is needed is a geographically cohesive system therefore conversations are taking place with multi academy trusts with the same proposal.</p> <p>Karen stated that this would be part of the next meeting's discussion when then consultation feedback is received.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the presentation.</p> | |
| 6. | <p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There was no further business to discuss.</p> | |
| 7. | <p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Monday 15 November at <u>1.00 pm</u> via Teams.</p> | |