

REDCAR & CLEVELAND SCHOOLS' FORUM**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF HELD ON MONDAY 19 OCTOBER 2020
HELD REMOTELY THROUGH MICROSOFT TEAMS****MEMBERS PRESENT:**Maintained School Primary Head Teacher:

Miss T Cooper, South Bank Primary School (Chair)

Maintained School Secondary Head Teacher:

Mrs C Chadwick, Saltburn Learning Campus (Vice-Chair)

Special School Representative:

Mr P McLean, Kirkleatham Hall Special School

Academy Representatives:

Ms S Walker, Skelton Primary School, Mr S Glover, Tees Valley Collaborative Trust, Mr A Wappat, Outwood Academy Trust
Mr R Unthank, Galileo Academy Trust, Mrs A O'Gara Ironstone Academy Trust, Mrs L Marron, Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust, Mr M Robson, Northern Education Trust

Special School Academy Representative:

Miss R Glover, Mo Mowlam Academy

Local Authority:

Councillor C Morgan

16-19 Representative

Mr J Faulkner, Redcar and Cleveland College

Trade Union Representative

Ms R Richardson, NASUWT

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms C Mahoney, Assistant Director Education and Skills
Mrs E Laird, Directorate Accountant (Children's Services)
Mr S Dawson, Clerk to Schools Forum
Mr B Richardson, KTS Academy

The meeting started at 3pm and the required quorum was met at all times during the meeting.

		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
1.1	Apologies were received from Mr M Bloomfield, Cllr A Barnes, Mrs N Jamalizadeh, Mrs A Hill, Mr L Beaumont and Mr J Tombs	Clerk to update the Attendance Register
1.2	There was a round of introductions at the start of the meeting to welcome new representatives to the meeting	
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	A discussion on Trade Union Facility Time was notified for discussion as Any Other Business.	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	Schools' Forum members were given the opportunity to declare any pecuniary interests or other conflicts of interest relating to items on the agenda for the current meeting. There were no declarations of interest.	
4.	APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR	
	A discussion took place on the importance of the position of the Chair of Schools' Forum and that it would only mean that whoever was appointed to the role would need to attend the pre-agenda meetings . A nomination was received from Miss T Cooper at the meeting.	
	Decision: Miss T Cooper was appointed as Chair for the 2020/21 academic year.	
5.	APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR	
	A nomination was received from Mrs C Chadwick at the meeting for the position of Vice-Chair.	
	Decision: Mrs C Chadwick was appointed as Vice-Chair for the 2020/21 academic year.	
6.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
6.1	Minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2020 were circulated prior to the meeting. Having given members an opportunity to highlight any inaccuracies, the minutes were accepted as a true record of proceedings:	
	Decision: The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2020 were approved for signature by the Chair as a true record of proceedings.	
6.2	Matters Arising from the minutes	
	There were no matters arising from the minutes that would not be discussed during the course of the current meeting.	

		ACTION
7.	MEMBERSHIP UPDATE	
7.1	Membership	
7.1.1	The Clerk provided an updated on membership with a number of changes since the previous meeting. Mr L Beaumont had been reappointed for another term of office after his previous term of office had expired. Miss T Cooper had replaced Mrs H Blakeley as the Maintained Head Primary School Head Teacher representative. There was no change to the Secondary School Head Teacher representative with Mrs C Chadwick continuing in the role. It was noted that Huntcliff Secondary School was expected to become an academy during the academic year and that it had been discussed previously that if that was the case, then Mrs Chadwick would continue as an interim academy representative until the end of the academic year. That had been agreed at the previous meeting.	
7.1.2	Mr P McLean had replaced Mrs K Robson as the Special School Representative. In relation to the Maintained School Governor representatives, the term of office for Mr J Tombs had expired following the previous meeting. The Clerk had sought nominations from governors where their school was not already represented on Schools' Forum. The only nomination received was from Mr J Tombs, who had been reappointed for a new term of office.	
7.1.3	With regards to the academy representatives, Ms S Walker had been reappointed for another term of office along with Mrs A O'Gara, Mr R Unthank had replaced Ms S Hindmarch and was representing Galileo Academy Trust. The other change was that Mr M Robson from Northern Education Trust had replaced Mr S McLean. The membership that was in place was representative of the schools across the borough and included a good mix of secondary and primary schools, as well as those from special schools, faith schools, multi-academy trusts and a single academy trust.	
7.1.4	<u>Attendance register</u> An attendance register had been circulated prior to the meeting to allow members the opportunity to monitor attendance at the meetings and to ensure that all sectors were being equally represented. There were no issues to bring to the attention of Schools' Forum representatives in relation to attendance.	
8.	GROWTH FUND UPDATE	
8.1	A document was circulated prior to the meeting which was to provide an update on the position of the Growth Fund for the financial year 2020-21. Mrs E Laird explained that the local authority had seen an increase in funding which was due to an increase in the pupil admission numbers (PAN) across the borough.	
8.2	The initial amount that had been received was £247,860 and it had previously been agreed that half of that	

		ACTION
	<p>funding would be used to establish a Growth Fund. The final amount set aside was £123,930 and a clear criterion for the use of the Growth Fund was agreed by Schools; Forum. There had been one claim of £49,000, in 2019-20, for Belmont Primary School, which left a closing balance of £74,930. That was carried forward to the 2020-21 financial year. As part of the 2020-21 budget setting process, Schools' Forum agreed that £47,350 should be added to the Growth Fund. That meant the total amount available in the Growth Fund was now at £122,280.</p>	
8.3	<p>A representative questioned how a school would be able to access that funding, with Mrs Laird explaining that it was possible that a school could access the funding if it was to meet basic needs. That could be funding that would support a school in-year where there had seen an increase in pupils numbers whereby they had increased the PAN but would not receive an increase in funding based on census information until the following year. That could be due to new housing being built within an area.</p>	Mrs E Laird to look into the possibility of growth funding being used where a school had been asked to take on additional children which had resulted in the school being above the PAN.
8.4	<p>A representative raised a query on behalf of their multi-academy trust. One of the schools in the Trust had been asked by the local authority to take an additional two children. That was due to demand in the area and would take the school above the PAN. The Trust had been in touch with the local authority to see if that was something whereby the school could claim for those additional children. Mrs Laird explained that was something that she could look into and would discuss that outside of the meeting.</p>	
8.5	<p>Decision: Schools' Forum representatives noted the position of the Growth Fund and agreed for any residual balance to be carried forward to the next financial year.</p>	
9.	TRANSFER OF 0.5% SCHOOLS BLOCK TO HIGH NEEDS BLOCK FY 2021-22	
9.1	<p>Mrs Laird explained that a consultation had been sent to all schools within the borough to consult on the proposal to transfer 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for the 2021-22 financial year. The local authority had requested that responses to the consultation be received by Friday 16 October 2020. There had only been four responses received to the consultation with three of those positive responses and one that was negative.</p>	
9.2	<p>It was noted that for the previous three years the local authority had requested a 0.5% transfer from Schools Block to the High Needs Block. In the previous financial year, that had been affordable through the funding formula which was possible due to a decrease in business rates for some schools and a reduction in support for the Growth Fund. The local authority had also been able to add an additional £4,000 to the lump sum element</p>	

	ACTION
<p>of funding. That had been a one-off for the previous year with aspects such as the reduction in rates no longer a saving in the current year.</p>	
<p>9.3 Mrs Laird provided an updated on pressures within the borough with the numbers of children and young people with Special Educational Need (SEN) Statements or an Educational Health and Care Plan (EHCP) continuing to increase. Those would have an impact on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). There had been an additional 74 children with an EHCP between January 2019 and January 2020 which would cost an additional £480,000. There were also an additional 65 children under a statutory assessment or with a draft EHCP. The rate of growth was slowing but looking at the percentages in the tables within the report, there was a high proportion of children and young people with an EHCP compared to other local authorities. There were increased numbers within Post 16 education as well as those within independent provision. Another challenge was that despite the increase in children and young people with an EHCP in Post 16 provision, there was also an increase in the number that were not in educational or training (NEET).</p>	
<p>9.4 The initial allocation for High Needs in 2021-22 would be £20.955 million which was an increase from the previous year. The Teacher's pay and pension grants would be incorporated in the basic entitlement for special schools and academies which would see the unit rate increase from £4,000 to £4,660.</p>	
<p>9.5 With regards to how the local authority was funded, 50% of the funding was based on the baseline funding from 2017/18. All local authority's would receive an increase of at least 8% in the next financial year and for Redcar and Cleveland that would be higher at 11%. Funding in the previous academic year had been £18.841 million which was an increase from £16.4 million in the previous financial year. However, the local authority had spent £18.8million. The biggest impact on spending was due to top-up funding with over £1.3 million additional being spent that anticipated for individual pupil support, specialist further education, out of borough top ups and independent schools.</p>	
<p>9.6 There had been a deficit in the DSG High Needs Block for 2019-20 of (£1.859 million) with that rising by £0.9m during 20-21 The cumulative deficit predicted at the end of the financial year was (£3.4 million). As such, the local authority would be required to produce a DSG Management Plan which would outline how the local authority planned to recover the deficit. A template had been provided by the Department for Education (DfE) to develop a Management Plan to be brought to the next meeting. Unfortunately, the template did not work well,</p>	<p>DSG Management Plan to be included as an Agenda Item for the next meeting</p>
<p>9.7 A representative discussed the expected costs for the current academic year and if that included the additional places at Mo Mowlam Academy from January 2021. Those places had not been commissioned as yet. Ms C Mahoney explained that she would follow that matter up following the meeting. It</p>	<p>Ms C Mahoney to follow up the issue of places not being</p>

	ACTION
<p>was confirmed that the amount that was detailed as expected costs for 21021-22 of £21.114 million included the additional places at Mo Mowlam Academy. It also included the additional places for the North East Autism Society (NEAS). However, despite the increased funding, it would still mean that that it would be difficult to achieve a break even position. The intention was to look at the top ups that were awarded to schools and a decision had been made to split the Resource and Support Panel. It was expected that the amount paid in top ups would reduce slightly.</p>	<p>commissioned at Mo Mowlam Academy</p>
<p>9.8 Mrs Laird discussed the potential financial impact on schools from a transfer of 0.5% and that the transfer should be affordable, with all schools expected to see an increase in funding through the minimum funding guarantee. It may be that the local authority would look to cap the per pupil gains that some schools would be expected to receive, as had happened in previous years.</p>	
<p>9.9 A representative questioned if a vote on the proposal would take place at the meeting or if that could be delayed. The representative discussed a communications protocol that had been agreed previously whereby their academy Trust head office should have been forwarded details of the proposal; as opposed to sending that through to the individual schools. The central team had only become aware of the consultation on the day that it was due to end. Ms C Mahoney was not aware of any protocol that had been agreed previously but that was something that that could be adhered to in the future. With regards to the vote that would need to take place at the current meeting as there was a time limit in place of 21 November 2020 for a decision to be made.</p>	
<p>9.10 A representative discussed previous years and that it was initially three years ago when the issue had first been raised and that the local authority was no closer to resolving the issue. It may be that the local authority would have to go back to basics and looks at what it was spending and if that was being spent in the correct areas. Another suggestion was that more work was required in pre-school and Early Years which would reduce the amount of spending as the children and young people progressed through education. Ms C Mahoney agreed with that comment and that it was important to look at how everything was working and to look at alternatives if there was a better way of doing something,</p>	
<p>9.11 With regards to the proposal, a vote of the school representatives was required, with non-school representatives not eligible to vote. With the meeting taking place virtually it was agreed that the vote would take place by using the raise hand function on Teams for those that supported the proposal. Those that were against the proposal would leave their hand lowered.</p>	

		ACTION
9.12	<p>Decision: There were 12 school representatives eligible to vote at the meeting with the following votes cast:</p> <p>Those in favour – 9 Those against – 3</p> <p>It was therefore agreed through a majority vote that a transfer of 0.5% from the Schools Block would be transferred to the High Needs Block for the 2021-22 financial year.</p>	
10	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
10.1	The Trade Union representative had circulated a document to the Clerk during the meeting in relation to Trade Union facility time and it would explain what the trade unions would be looking for in relation to facility time. The Clerk would circulate that to all representatives.	Clerk to circulate document on trade union facility time to all representatives.
10.2	The Clerk questioned if representatives would be looking for a report to be brought to a future meeting to detail the spending against facility time. The Trade Union representative explained that it was difficult to be able to detail the support as it would highlight where that support was taking place. With regards to the Service Level Agreement, that had not been circulated to schools as yet to be able to buy into the service. It was highlighted that where a school did not buy into facility time, it would mean that support would not be available during school hours and that if a Trade Union representative was required then it would need to be out of school hours. It was decided that a report on trade union facility time was not required.	
11.	ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	
	<p>The following items were agreed for discussion at the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSG Management Plan • Pupil Premium Spending for Looked After Children • Update from the Resource Panel and the SEND Panel 	
14.	DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS	
	<p>The dates and times of future meetings were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 23 November 2020 • Monday 11 January 2021 • Tuesday 29 June 2021 	

	ACTION
All meetings would start at 3pm with those to continue remotely until there was clarification that face to face meetings could take place.	

Meeting closed at 4pm

These minutes have been approved by Schools' Forum as a true record of proceedings:

Chair: _____

Date: _____

REDCAR & CLEVELAND SCHOOLS' FORUM**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF HELD ON MONDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2020
HELD REMOTELY THROUGH MICROSOFT TEAMS****MEMBERS PRESENT:**PRU Representative:

Mr L Beaumont, Archways

Maintained School Primary Head Teacher:

Miss T Cooper, South Bank Primary School (Chair)

Maintained School Secondary Head Teacher:

Mrs C Chadwick, Saltburn Learning Campus (Vice-Chair)

Special School Representative:

Mr P McLean, Kirkleatham Hall Special School

Maintained School Governors:

Mr M Bloomfield, Belmont and Chalenor Primary Schools

Academy Representatives:

Ms S Walker, Skelton Primary School, Mr S Glover, Tees Valley Collaborative Trust, Mr A Wappat, Outwood Academy Trust
Mr R Unthank, Galileo Academy Trust, Ms L Marron, Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust, Mrs A Wilson, Ironstone Academy Trust

Special School Academy Representative:

Miss R Glover, Mo Mowlam Academy

Local Authority:

Councillor C Morgan

Trade Union Representative

Ms R Richardson, NASUWT

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms C Mahoney, Assistant Director Education and Skills
Mrs E Laird, Directorate Accountant (Children's Services)
Mrs M Wheeler, Education Advisor – SEN
Mrs J Johnson, Virtual School Head Teacher
Mr S Dawson, Clerk to Schools Forum
Cllr A Barnes, Cabinet Member for Children
Mr B Richardson, KTS Academy

The meeting started at 3pm and the required quorum was met at all times during the meeting.

		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
1.1	Apologies were received from Mrs A O’Gara, Mrs N Jamalizadeh, Mr M Robson, and Mr J Faulkner	Clerk to update the Attendance Register
1.2	The Clerk reported the sad news that Mr J Tombs who had been a member of Schools’ Forum for a number of years as well as being Chair of Governors at Lockwood Primary School, had sadly passed away. It was noted that as well as being a dedicated Chair and governor for the school that he served, Mr Tombs was very much about doing his best for all of the children in the borough which fit into the ethos of Schools’ Forum and he would be sadly missed. A minutes silences was held to remember Mr Tombs.	
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	There were no matters notified for discussion as Any Other Business.	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	Schools’ Forum members were given the opportunity to declare any pecuniary interests or other conflicts of interest relating to items on the agenda for the current meeting. There were no declarations of interest.	
4.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
4.1	Minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2020 were circulated prior to the meeting. Having given members an opportunity to highlight any inaccuracies, the minutes were accepted as a true record of proceedings: <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>Decision: The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2020 were approved for signature by the Chair as a true record of proceedings.</p> </div>	Written response to be provided to the school that was requesting growth funding
4.2	Matters Arising from the minutes Item 8.4 – With regards to the discussion on growth funding where a school had been asked to take two additional children in a Year Group and had then resulted in the school exceeding the pupil admission number for that Year Group, the local authority had looked into the matter further. There was no indication from the local authority when making the request that the school would be able to access the growth funding. Based on the criteria for growth funding and two additional children in one Year Group, it would not meet the criteria to access any additional funding. A representative questioned if the local authority had responded to the school to advise of the response , with an agreement that would be provided in writing to the school.	

		ACTION
	<p>Item 9.6 – Mrs E Laird discussed the DSG Management Plan, which was intended to be brought to the current meeting. It had been noted that the template that the local authority was provided with by the Department for Education, was not in a format where it could be used. There had been some amendments to the template. However, it was still not in a format that could be used, with other local authorities voicing similar concerns. It was hoped that for the next meeting, the local authority would be able to provide detail on the management plan.</p>	DSG Management Plan to be deferred to the next meeting
5.	MEMBERSHIP UPDATE	
5.1	<p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>The Clerk provided an update on membership and the only change to note was that there was now a vacancy for a maintained primary school governor, with the Clerk to contact governors from schools that were not already represented on Schools' Forum. The intention was to look for someone to be appointed in time for the next meeting.</p>	Clerk to look to recruit a maintained primary school governor
5.2	<p><u>Attendance register</u></p> <p>An attendance register had been circulated prior to the meeting to allow members the opportunity to monitor attendance at the meetings and to ensure that all sectors were being equally represented. There were no issues to bring to the attention of Schools' Forum representatives in relation to attendance.</p>	
6.	PUPIL PREMIUM GRANT FOR CHILDREN IN OUR CARE	
6.1	<p>Mrs J Johnson attended the meeting to provide an update on Pupil Premium Grant spending for Children in Our Care. A briefing report had been circulated prior to the meeting which highlighted that there had been no change to amount of Pupil Premium funding that would be provided for each Child in Our Care. That would remain at £1,300 per child and would now be received in three instalments across the year. In the previous year, that had been received in two instalments. For the current financial year, the local authority had received an additional £45 per child. However, that had not been received in time to be able to pass that on to schools. That would be added to an emergency pot where schools could request additional in an emergency.</p>	
6.2	<p>There was a slight change to the personal education plans (PEPs) with one of the sections now mandatory for schools to complete and to link the Pupil Premium Plus to the individual targets for each child. That was to ensure that there was greater accountability for the funding and to outline the direct impact upon the progress of the children. The previous form had not been completed as well as it should and there was data missing; with the new form to address those issues.</p>	
6.3	<p>Ms Johnson explained that she would be happy to attend another Schools' Forum meeting at the end of the academic year to provide an overview of what the remaining Pupil Premium had been spent on. The intention</p>	.

	ACTION
<p>6.4 was to upskill as many of the Designated Teacher's as possible to ensure that everything was recorded in the PEPs.</p> <p>A representative discussed a training session that had taken place where examples of best practice had been discussed and asked if those examples would be available for Designated Teachers. Mrs Johnson explained that there was a Designated Teacher briefing due to take place in January 2021 and that information should be available for that briefing. The Designated Teachers would have to outline what the funding was spent on. It was noted that the e-PEP, which was the electronic form, had a section that was an automatic fail safe that needed to be completed to provide the information that was required.</p>	
<p>7. UPDATE ON THE RESOURCE PANEL</p>	
<p>7.1 Mrs M Wheater attend the meeting to provide an update on the Resource Panel and some of the changes that had been made. In 2019-20 there had been 764 cases with 445 of those being new referrals and 319 being returning cases. Where those were returning cases, it meant that a request had already been received by Panel and there may have been additional support that was now required and it would need to be referred to Panel again to access any additional support. Of the new referrals that had been received, there were 251 from primary schools and 194 for secondary schools. There were 119 of the children that had an Educational Health and Care Plan and 196 children for SEN Support. There were an additional 130 children down for Quality First Teaching.</p> <p>7.2 There had been some issues identified with the Resource and Support Panel in the previous academic year including confusion between EHCP and non-statutory requests for high needs funding or for a change of placement. There were some referrals that only required specialist teacher support, that were coming to Panel. There was also an extensive amount of paperwork that needed to be completed for each referral with one Panel having 74 new and 30 returning referrals. The Panels had to be split between primary and secondary schools due to the level of referrals and amount of paperwork coming to each Panel. There was uncertainty over identifying which Educational Psychologist service was required. There was confusion over who to contact with a new email address set up for all referrals. Another issue related to funding for an EHCP which would come at the end of a 20 week process as opposed to a school being able to access that immediately.</p> <p>7.3 Due to the issues that had been identified it had been decided to split the Panels with only learners with an EHCP to go to the Multi-Agency EHCP Panel. All other referrals would go to the Resource and Support Panel unless the paperwork was already complete for an EHCP. Where high needs funding, specialist teachers or an Educational Psychologist was being requested for someone with an EHCP, that must now be accessed through the annual review process.</p>	

	ACTION
<p>7.4 It was highlighted that for anyone that did not have an EHCP and was only requesting support through the Specialist Teaching Service, that would be accessed directly through the Resource and Support Panel and would be filtered, with the schools to be contacted directly. There was currently a waiting list for the Specialist Teaching Service of 4 months and the offer would be more through outreach as opposed to assessments. There had been training for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Co-Ordinators (SENDCos) with resources available to be able to support schools.</p>	
<p>7.5 The Educational Psychologists had been divided between two areas of work with Sarah Volkman providing statutory assessments and advice and Christine Sketchley carrying out other work with the family. There was also Cath Perdomo who was working more around Early Years.</p>	
<p>7.6 New paperwork had been trialled during the summer term and had been forwarded to SENDCos in September 2020. The form had been simplified and would make it easier for Panel members, with less information being requested in the pen profile. As outlined, there was a new direct Resource and Support Panel email. If a school was requesting high need funding then there must be a costed provision map and a SEN Support Plan with evidence of a graduated response. The minutes from Panel meetings would be sent out following panel to the referring schools within 5 days outlining the support that had been offered.</p>	
<p>7.7 A flowchart had been developed to help with the referral and outline which Panel the child or young person would be referred to. It should be clear for SENDCos when applying and what form would need to be completed. There were two panels with the Multi Agency EHCP Panel meeting every two weeks. Those would discuss new cases at both first and second stages, change of placements from an annual review and funding or support for an Educational Psychologist or the Specialist Teaching Service. The Panel consisted of the SEN Manager, and Educational Psychologist, SEN Advisor, Social Care Lead, Designated Medical Officer and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) Lead. The Education, Health and Care Statutory Assessment Pathway was outlined with a number of stages along the way.</p>	
<p>7.8 The second panel was the Resources and Support Panel which would be where the child or young person did not have an EHCP. That Panel would meet every three weeks with the panel members outlined. There were a number of potential outcomes for support which were detailed being and Educational Psychologist, the Specialist Teaching Service, High Needs funding outreach from resources provisions, inclusion support, SENDCO mentors, STRIVE, and Home and Hospital.</p>	
<p>7.9 If there was clear evidence of a graduated response, a costed provision map and Panel believed that an EHCP may be need, the Panel would recommend that a SARS1 form be completed by the school. That would</p>	

		ACTION
7.10	<p>complement the existing papers and it would then go to the next Multi Agency EHCP Panel. The new Panels appeared to be working well at the present time and there was an increase in the Educational Psychologist advice being provided. There was also increased accountability.</p> <p>Ms C Mahoney explained that it was intended that an update be provided for a future meeting on the Panels and use of high needs funding. The process had recently changed so it was important to review that first. However, it was important that there was scrutiny in place on what was going to Panel</p> <p>Mrs M Wheater left the meeting</p>	Updated on SEN Panels to come to a future meeting
8.	UPDATE ON THE DSG FUNDING BLOCKS FOR 21-22	
8.1	Three documents were circulated prior to the meeting which outlined three of the funding blocks that made up the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which was the main source of government funding for the provision of education.	
8.2	<u>Schools Block Budget</u>	
8.2.1	The Schools Block funding was provisionally issued to the local authority under the National Funding Formula (NFF). The provisional allocation was £100.705 million excluding any growth allocations which was expected in December 2020. The local authority was expecting to be provided with a new Authority Proforma Tool (APT) in December 2020 which would include the updated numbers on roll and pupil led factors based on the October 2020 census. That would be brought to the meeting in January 2021.	
8.2.2	There were no structural changes to the NFF. However, there were some changes to the values of some factors. That related to the Indices Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) which had been updated for 2019. The local authority was uncertain what impact that would have on schools as it was not something that was mapped. The other change related to the Teachers' Pay Grant and Teachers' Pension Employer Contribution Grants which had been incorporated into the per pupil funding. The per pupil funding would increase, with an additional £180 per pupil provided for primary schools and £265 for secondary schools to cover the pay and pension grants. The minimum funding for primary schools increased from £3,750 to £4,000 as announced in 2020-21 and would increase by a further £180. Similarly for secondary schools the basic entitlement had increased from 5,000 to £5,150 plus an additional £265 per pupil.	
8.2.3	A decision had been made at the previous meeting to support a transfer of 0.5% from the Schools Block to support High Needs with that to be taken before the teacher's pension and pay grants were added. In the	

	ACTION
<p>previous year, the local authority had been able to meet the transfer without having to cap schools and all schools had received an additional element for the lump sum. If that was not possible, for the next year, then the transfer would need to come through capping schools that would gain the most through the formula. It was intended that the transfer would be affordable through the growth fund. A representative discussed the growth fund and questioned how that would be determined, with Mrs Laird explaining that was measured within local authorities at middle layer super output area (MSOA) level. Growth was measured by counting the increase in pupil numbers in each MSOA in the local authority between the two most recent October censuses. Only positive increases in pupil numbers would be included, so a local authority with positive growth in one area, and negative growth in another, would not be denied growth funding. In the previous year, there had been an increase in those areas and the growth fund had not been used in the current financial year. It was agreed previously that a growth fund would be established which was to increase capacity in schools which had seen growth through building extensions or additional classrooms at those schools. The growth fund had been accessed previously by Belmont Primary School and was intended to be provided until the school received the lagged funding in the following year. It was uncertain what the growth funding would be for the next financial year or if any funding would be received and where a school had increased the Pupil Admission Number to take in additional children. With regards to capping the gains that some schools would make through the formula; it was not expected that there would be too many school that would benefit too wildly.</p>	
<p>8.2.4 There would only be one item for de-delegation which related to Free School Meals eligibility, with that to remain at £3.88 per pupil as it was in the current financial year. Information on the SEN Notional budgets was outlined with the proposal that there would be no changes to the Notional SEN budget in the next financial year. With regards to Free School Meal eligibility, a representative questioned if the local authority would be notified through the job centre if someone became eligible for Free school Meals. Mrs Laird explained that would only be the case if the parent applied for Free School Meals. The local authority would be aware if someone was claiming for hardship through the local authority.</p>	
<p>8.3 <u>Central Schools Services Block Budget</u></p>	
<p>8.3.1 The Central School Services Block Budget was provided through the DfE to local authorities to carry out functions on behalf of maintained schools and academies. The main area to note related to historic commitments with £135,616 to be received in 2021-22 for historic commitments. That was a reduction of 20% from the previous year with the historic commitments to unwind over time and would see a 20% reduction each year. That was primarily for Inspire2Learn (I2L) and it was important that it was better used with the intention for I2L to become self-funding. An additional £661,255 would be received in relation to ongoing responsibilities which would include services such as Admissions and Attendance and Welfare. A representative discussed</p>	

	ACTION
<p>the historic commitments and questioned if the 20% reduction would continue until it reached zero, with Mrs Laird confirming that was the case. This would be the second time that the historic commitments had been cut by 20%. The additional element received for ongoing responsibilities would not reduce with that only relating to the historic commitments and it would be 20% of the previous years budget as opposed to 20% of the baseline figure.</p>	
<p>8.3.2 Ms C Mahoney discussed 12L and the intention had been for it to become self-sustaining in the current financial year. However, that was not possible due to the current circumstances with Covid-19. However, that was the intention and that it would become financially viable. A representative questioned if the local authority had looked at any other areas where there was a similar facility, with confirmation that was something that the local authority was looking at. However, there was a plan in place which had been shared previously and that could have been implemented if not for Covid-19.</p>	
<p>8.4 <u>High Needs Block</u></p>	
<p>8.4.1 The initial High Needs Block allocation for 2021-22 was £20.955 million. An additional amount which would be 0.5% of the Schools Block budget would be transferred to the High Needs Block. The amount detailed in the report took into consideration the Teacher's Pay and Pension Grants which as outlined previously would not be taken into consideration. That would mean that the amount transferred would be lower than what was detailed. It was noted that there were no structural changes to the NFF and that only the value for the basic entitlement factors for special schools had increased to £4,660 which was to reflect the teachers pay and pension grants.</p>	
<p>8.4.2 Another important aspect to note was the import/export adjustment which would be updated and based on census information in January 2021. That would determine if the local authority was a net importer or exporter of High Needs pupils. That would mean that children from within the borough with High Needs would attend provision outside of the borough. The local authority was a net exporter and it was important that information was recorded accurately when the census was being completed by schools on where the pupil resided.</p>	
<p>8.4.3 As reported previously there was a deficit on the High Needs Block with that estimated to be £2.945 million to be carried forward. The figures had been updated to reflect the places being commissioned through Mo Mowlam Academy.</p>	

		ACTION
8.5	<u>Early Years Block</u>	
8.5.1	Mrs E Laird explained that there had been no guidance received as yet in relation to Early Years. In the previous year, the local authority had received £4.38 per hour for the universal and additional entitlement. That was the lowest rate that could be received. Funding would be based on the January 2020 census which could be helpful for the local authority due to the demographics in the area. However, the guidance was required to be able to accurately predict what would be received.	
8.5.2	Currently all providers would receive £4 per hour along with deprivation funding. The school currently used the IDACI to determine the deprivation funding. Although someone may be living in a deprived area, it did not necessarily mean that the child was living in deprivation. The intention would be that the children would need to be living in an area of higher deprivation and also be eligible for Pupil Premium. That had the potential to increase the rate that would be paid to all providers and increasing that from £4 to £4.09 per hour. The intention was to see if there was appetite from schools to do that or whether the current funding should remain as it was. The local authority had been in contact with the DfE to find out when the guidance would be produced but had not received an answer as yet. It could be that the local authority did not find out the allocation until the final week of term.	
8.5.3	The Chair explained that it was difficult to be able to decide unless there was some modelling carried out to see what the impact would be. It was confirmed that the schools would continue to receive their basic rate of funding as well as receiving Early Years Pupil Premium which would not be affected. The proposal was that the additional amount that was received for deprivation would also need the child to be qualifying for Pupil Premium funding.	
8.5.4	A representative discussed pupil numbers which had been reducing at Early Years and were predicted to continue and fall. They questioned if the change would be for the next 12 to 24 months or if that would be flexible. That was uncertain at the current time with the local authority uncertain on what funding would be received. There was no information available as to why other local authorities received a higher funding rate. There was uncertainty on pupil numbers and it would be important to see the numbers recorded when the census was completed in January 2021. It was hoped that there could be more information available to discuss at the next meeting.	
9.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	A representative outlined potential funding that would be available for local authorities for those in crisis and could be used to support families. A discussion took place regarding funding and it was important that it did not just apply to food. There was a coordinated approach taking place so that the most deprived families could	

		ACTION
	receive additional support . It was not only those that were eligible for Free School Meals and that there were also families where the parents had been furloughed that were struggling at the present time. Carl Faulkner, CEO for Ironstone Academy Trust was also helping to organise hampers for vulnerable children with some excellent work place within the borough. It was also important to consider other aspects such as support with bills as well as school uniform .as well as taking into consideration other holiday periods such as Easter as well as Christmas this year. The local authority was looking at as wide a range of initiatives as possible to be able to support those families.	
10.	ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The following items were agreed for discussion at the next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSG Management Plan • Schools Block Services to Schools Budgets 2019/20 	
11.	DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The dates and times of future meetings were <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 11 January 2021 • Tuesday 29 June 2021 <p>All meetings would start at 3pm with those to continue remotely until there was clarification that face to face meetings could take place.</p>	

Meeting closed at 4.25pm

These minutes have been approved by Schools' Forum as a true record of proceedings:

Chair: _____

Date: _____

REDCAR & CLEVELAND SCHOOLS' FORUM**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF HELD ON MONDAY 11 JANUARY 2021
HELD REMOTELY THROUGH MICROSOFT TEAMS****MEMBERS PRESENT:**PRU Representative:

Mr L Beaumont, Archways

Maintained School Primary Head Teacher:

Miss T Cooper, South Bank Primary School (Chair)

Maintained School Secondary Head Teacher:

Mrs C Chadwick, Saltburn Learning Campus (Vice-Chair)

Special School Representative:

Mr P McLean, Kirkleatham Hall Special School

Maintained School Governors:

Mr M Bloomfield, Belmont and Chalenor Primary Schools

Academy Representatives:

Ms S Walker, Skelton Primary School, Mr S Glover, Tees Valley Collaborative Trust, Mr A Wappat, Outwood Academy Trust
Mr R Unthank, Galileo Academy Trust, Ms S Williams, Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust, Mrs A O'Gara, Ironstone Academy Trust,
Mr M Robson (Northern Education Trust)

Special School Academy Representative:

Miss R Glover, Mo Mowlam Academy

Local Authority:

Councillor C Morgan

Trade Union Representative

Ms R Richardson, NASUWT

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms C Mahoney, Assistant Director Education and Skills
Mrs E Laird, Directorate Accountant (Children's Services)
Mr S Dawson, Clerk to Schools Forum
Mr B Richardson, KTS Academy

The meeting started at 3pm and the required quorum was met at all times during the meeting.

		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
	Apologies were received from Mr J Faulkner, Mrs N Jamalizadeh, Cllr A Barnes and Mrs S Taylor-Watson	Clerk to update the Attendance Register
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	A discussion on Early Years during lockdown was notified for discussion as Any Other Business.	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	Schools' Forum members were given the opportunity to declare any pecuniary interests or other conflicts of interest relating to items on the agenda for the current meeting. Miss T Cooper declared that she was involved with the Resources and Support Panel which made decisions on high need funding and support available for schools..	
4.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
4.1	Minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2020 were circulated prior to the meeting. Having given members an opportunity to highlight any inaccuracies, the following amendment was agreed before the minutes were accepted as a true record of proceedings: Item 7.1 – Numbers of children to be updated to reflect the number of new cases that had been brought to the Resource and Support Panel meetings along with details of existing numbers.	Clerk to amend the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2020
4.2	Decision: The minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2020, as amended were approved for signature by the Chair as a true record of proceedings.	
	Matters Arising from the minutes Item 4.2 – With regards to the discussion on growth funding at the previous meeting, Mrs C Mahoney had spoken to the Team that had received the initial communication about the potential access to growth funding and advised there had been nothing communicated in writing to advise that a school could access that funding for taking in an additional two children. As highlighted at the previous meeting, increasing numbers in a year group by two would not meet the criteria to be enable a school to access any growth funding.	

		ACTION
5.	MEMBERSHIP UPDATE	
5.1	<p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>The Clerk provided an update on membership and reported that Mrs S Taylor-Watson had been appointed as a primary school governor representative following an election. Information had been circulated to those in the Private Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Sector to see if anyone was interested in that position. There had been some initial interest. However, the Clerk had not received any nomination forms as yet. That was something the Clerk would look to address and ensure that there was a PVI sector representative in place for the next meeting. It was also intended that Ms S Williams would replace Mrs N Jamalizadeh as the representative from Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust. Mrs Jamalizadeh had not attended a meeting since being appointed with Ms Williams usually attending as a substitute in her place. It was agreed that Ms Williams would be appointed as an academy representative.</p>	<p>Clerk to identify a PVI Sector representative</p> <p>Clerk to update the membership list</p>
5.2	<p><u>Attendance register</u></p> <p>An attendance register had been circulated prior to the meeting to allow members the opportunity to monitor attendance at the meetings and to ensure that all sectors were being equally represented. There were no issues to bring to the attention of Schools' Forum representatives in relation to attendance.</p>	
6.	DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2021/22	
6.1	<p>A document was circulated prior to the meeting which provided an overview of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2021/22. As with previous years, the DSG was split into four funding blocks. Schools' Forum had agreed previously for the local authority to adopt the funding factors in the National Funding Formula. The funding had been updated to reflect the information from the October 2020 census. The funding would be impacted by a reduction of 125 children and young people across both phases in the borough.</p>	
6.2	<u>Schools Block</u>	
6.2.1	<p>An appendix was outlined which provided detail of the value for each element that would be allocated. There were no structural changes to the formula although there were some slight amendments to two of the factors being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the incorporation of the 2019 Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) which had increased overall funding of this factor by 12%, as more areas had moved into higher levels of deprivation • the inclusion of the funding previously received through Teachers' Pay Grant (TPG) and Teachers' Pension Employer Contribution Grants (TPECG) by an increase in basic per pupil funding and an increase in the minimum per pupil funding 	

	ACTION
<p>6.2.2 An allowance had been included in the Schools Block for the growth fund of £0.257 million. As there has been no requirement for growth funding in 20/21, it was proposed to distribute that fund as part of the overall funds. It had been agreed at a previous meeting to transfer 0.5% from the Schools Block to Support High Needs. That was calculated after the removal of the Teachers Pay and Pension Grant allocations. That would mean that £0.464m would be transferred from Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2021/22. To ensure that was affordable, it was intended that per pupil gains to schools were capped at 3.25%. That would impact on 26 schools.</p>	
<p>6.2.3 Mrs E Laird discussed the Notional SEN budget and it was proposed that there would be no changes from the 20-21 formula with 8% of Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding, 16% of deprivation funding and 80% of low prior attainment funding contributing to the allowance. That would equate to a funding allocation of £12.6m across the borough.</p>	
<p>6.2.4 The local authority would need to complete the Authority Pro-forma Tool (APT), with details of its local formula by 21 January 2021. An appendix was detailed which showed the provisional allocations to schools for 2021-22.</p>	
<p>6.3 <u>Schools Block De-Delegation for Maintained Schools</u></p>	
<p>6.3.1 There was only one item which was subject to de-delegation for maintained schools. That related to Free School Eligibility. It was proposed to continue with the current arrangement at the rate of £3.88 per pupil.</p>	
<p>6.3.2 It was noted, that it now only related to primary schools with Huntcliff Secondary School becoming the final maintained secondary school to convert and become an academy from 1 January 2021. Maintained primary school representatives asked to vote for the proposal to support the de-delegated budget for Free School Meals admin.</p>	
<p>6.3.3 Decision: All maintained primary school members voted in favour of the proposal to support the de-delegated budget for Free School Meals Admin at £3.88 per pupil.</p>	
<p>6.4 <u>High Needs</u></p> <p>Information for the High Needs Block for 2021/22 was included for information purposes. It detailed that the local authority would receive an increase in funding through the National Funding Formula allocation. In</p>	

	ACTION
<p>addition, an additional amount would be received for the Basic Entitlement Funding. There was also an Import/Export adjustment included in the funding. With the 0.5% transfer to the High Needs Block, the updated budget for 21-22 would be topped up by a further £0.464 million to £21.461 million.</p>	
<p>6.5 <u>Early Years</u></p>	
<p>6.5.1 Mrs Laird discussed the allocation for Early Years which had been received late in December 2021. There was slight increase in the participation rates for 3 and 4 year olds due to an increase in numbers. However, there would be a decrease in the number of disadvantaged 2 year olds. There would be an increase of 6p for the universal entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds. Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) for disadvantaged 2 year olds would be paid at £0.53 per hour with the Early Years Disability Access Fund paid at £615 per year. The grant allocation to the Local Authority would be adjusted in Summer 2021 to reflect the January 2021 census, with a further adjustment to reflect January 2022 census information, at the end of the 2021-22 financial year. However, the Department for Education (DfE) had stated that Early Years funding for Summer 2021 would be kept under close review due to the impact of coronavirus.</p>	
<p>6.5.2 It was proposed to amend the Early Years formula in relation to deprivation to bring the borough in line with other local authorities. Previously, funding for deprivation was provided through only the residential postcode of the child. It was proposed to provide deprivation funding based on eligibility of the child to EYPP as well as their postcode. By changing the way that deprivation funding was provided, the local authority was able to increase the basic hourly rate for universal and additional hours to £4.12 per hour. It was difficult to provide information on how that would impact schools as it was expected that there would be an increase in the number of claims for EYPP. Based on the methodology for 2020/21, there would 61 out of 113 PVI settings that would see no change or a gain. It would also mean that 14 out of 44 schools would see either no change or a small gain. For some, the change would be minimal, with others expected to gain by up to £2,000. A table was detailed on the passport rate with Mrs Laird explaining that the local authority would not be able to afford a passport rate of 95%.</p>	
<p>6.5.3 With regards to the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) factors for the Early Years Block, the same factors from the National Funding Formula had been applied.</p>	
<p>6.6. <u>Central Schools Block</u></p>	
<p>6.6.1 The funding allocation for ongoing responsibilities was being allocated according to a formula at a per pupil rate. The final allocation for the local authority would be £0.669 million. A proposal was submitted for how the local</p>	

		ACTION
	<p>authority would spend that funding which included £105,000 for licenses, which was a figure that was generated by the DfE. The contribution for responsibilities that local authorities held for all schools, included services such as inclusion, as well as attendance and welfare. There was another element of funding received for historic commitments which was £122,816 for services from Inspire2Learn as well as a contribution to safeguarding of £12,800. That was for the Local Children's Safeguarding Board. As outlined in the previous meeting, that funding was beginning to unwind and would continue to do so until there was no additional funding received for the historic commitments.</p>	
6.6.2	<p>Schools' Forum were asked to note the proposals for the Schools Block, including capping gains to schools at 3.25%. The minimum funding guarantee was to be set as 2%. In addition, the growth fund would be distributed through the National Funding Formula. Schools' Forum was also asked to note the continuation with the agreed notional SEN allocations in the schools block. Schools' Forum was asked to approve the proposed spend for the ongoing responsibilities element for the 2021-22 Central School Services Block.</p>	
6.6.3	<p>Decision: All school representatives voted in favour of the proposed spend for the ongoing responsibilities of the 2021/22 Central Schools Services Block.</p>	
7.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
7.1	<u>Early Years During Lockdown</u>	
7.1.1	<p>A question had been raised prior to the meeting in relation to Early Years and the potential impact during lockdown if school nurseries were closed to the majority of children and the potential loss of funding. Ms C Mahoney wished to clarify the position for the local authority and that the local authority was not looking at taking away any funding from schools that had a Nursery. It was important that school nursery settings reviewed their risk assessments on the number of children that they were safely able to access the provision. That was following the announcement that all Early Years settings should be open for all children. That had led to concerns that schools may not be safe and the implications for the rest of school which was closed to the majority of children. The issue had been raised with the DfE at a recent meeting to outline the concerns. Schools would have to consider their risk assessments alongside advice from health and safety. Schools had been advised that they would only be open to vulnerable children as well as children of critical workers. However, in that respect there had been a considerable number of requests for places, with some schools having up to 75% of children accessing school.</p>	

		ACTION
7.1.2	A member discussed an issue with their school where there had already been two positive cases of Covid-19 and one of those had been in the Nursery. Opening school nurseries to a wider number of children did not seem to be the right thing to do when that was not happening in the rest of the school. The indication from the DfE was that it would allow more parents to be able to return to work.	
7.1.3	The current lockdown was different from the previous lockdown and there was a significant increase in the number of children and young people attending. There was one school where there were 65 children on roll and all of those had an Educational Health and Care Plan, which would mean they were identified as vulnerable and should be attending school. The change of wording to that of critical worker and the list of those workers being updated meant that schools would be open to a greater number of children. That was little that had been updated in the guidance with the exception of the participation rate and engagement with disadvantaged children. The local authority was again due to meet with the DfE and would be looking for further clarification for school nurseries.	
8.	ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The following items were agreed for discussion at the next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Pupil Premium Spending for Children in Our Care • Update on the SEND Resource Panel 	
9.	DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The next Schools Forum meeting was scheduled to take place on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 29 June 2021 at 3pm <p>Meetings would continue to take place remotely until there was clarification that face to face meetings could resume.</p>	

Meeting closed at 3.40pm

These minutes have been approved by Schools' Forum as a true record of proceedings:

Chair: _____

Date: _____

REDCAR & CLEVELAND SCHOOLS' FORUM**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF HELD ON MONDAY 29 JUNE 2021
HELD REMOTELY THROUGH MICROSOFT TEAMS****MEMBERS PRESENT:**Maintained School Primary Head Teacher:

Miss T Cooper, South Bank Primary School (Chair)

Maintained School Governors:

Mr M Bloomfield, Belmont and Chalenor Primary Schools

Academy Representatives:

Ms S Walker, Skelton Primary School, Mr S Glover, Tees Valley Collaborative Trust, Mr A Wappat, Outwood Academy Trust
Mr R Unthank, Galileo Academy Trust, Ms S Williams, Nicholas Postgate Catholic Academy Trust, Mrs A O'Gara, Ironstone Academy Trust,
Mr M Robson (Northern Education Trust), Mrs C Chadwick (Saltburn Primary School)

Special School Academy Representative:

Miss R Glover, Mo Mowlam Academy

Local Authority:

Councillor C Morgan

Trade Union Representative

Ms R Richardson, NASUWT

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms C Mahoney, Assistant Director Education and Skills
Mrs E Laird, Directorate Accountant (Children's Services)
Mrs M Henley, Lead for SEN
Mrs M Wheeler, Education Advisor - SEN
Mrs J Johnson, Virtual Head Teacher
Mr S Dawson, Clerk to Schools Forum
Mr B Richardson, KTS Academy

The meeting started at 3pm and the required quorum was met at all times during the meeting.

		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
	Apologies were received from Mr J Faulkner, Mrs L Marron, Mr P McLean, Mr S Harrison, Mrs S Hill and Mr L Beaumont	Clerk to update the Attendance Register
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	There were no items notified for discussion as Any Other Business	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	Schools' Forum members were given the opportunity to declare any pecuniary interests or other conflicts of interest relating to items on the agenda for the current meeting. Miss T Cooper declared that she was involved with the Resources and Support Panel which made decisions on high need funding and support available for schools..	
4.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
4.1	Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2021 were circulated prior to the meeting. Having given members an opportunity to highlight any inaccuracies, minutes were accepted as a true record of proceedings:	
4.2	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;"> <p>Decision: The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2021 were approved for signature by the Chair as a true record of proceedings.</p> </div>	
4.3	<p>Matters Arising from the minutes</p> <p>Item 5.1 – With regards to membership and the appointment of PVI Sector Representatives, although there had been some interest in the position, there had been no nominations received. The Clerk would look to identify someone from within the PVI that could be appointed to Forum.</p>	Clerk to identify a PVI Sector representative
5.	APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR	
5.1	Miss T Cooper indicated her willingness to continue as Chair for the 2021/22 academic year with no further nomination received.	
5.2	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;"> <p>Decision: Miss T Cooper was appointed as Chair for the 2021/22 academic year.</p> </div>	

		ACTION
6	APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR	
6.1	Mrs C Chadwick indicated her willingness to continue as Vice-Chair for the 2021/22 year with no further nominations received . Mrs Chadwick advised that she would be leaving on maternity leave so it would mean that she would be unable to attend meetings for a period of time.	
6.2	<p>Decision: Mrs C Chadwick was appointed as Vice-Chair for the 2021/22 academic year.</p>	
7.	UPDATE ON RESOURCE AND SUPPORT PANELS	
7.1	Michelle Henley and Monica Wheatley attended the meeting to provide an update on the Resource and Support Panel, with a copy of the presentation circulated prior to the meeting. A panel meeting had taken place in the previous week, where 46 cases had been discussed, which was the highest number of cases brought to a meeting in the current academic year.	
7.2	Since September 2020, there had been 327 cases discussed at the Resource and Support Panel. That included 155 new referrals, 98 Specialist Teacher referrals and 75 Returning Cases. The returning cases may have been where those had been brought back for additional funding or further advice and support.	
7.3	The Panel met approximately every three weeks, during term time. The Panel consisted of the Lead for SEN, an Educational Psychologist, Designated Clinical Officer, Lead for Inclusion, Early Help as well as someone from alternative provision such as the Lead from Strive. The referrals would need to be submitted by 1pm on the Wednesday before a panel meeting so that papers could be circulated. Each case would be heard independently. There had been a change to the paperwork so that a provider could indicate what support was required. That would make that clear for Panel when considering the referrals and there was also an opportunity for the school to attend.	
7.4	There had been changes made to the Panels in the current year with only those cases which were non-statutory coming to the Resource and Support Panel. Any children and young people that had an Educational Health and Care Plan would come to the Multi-Agency Panel. That had reduced the number of referrals brought to the Resource and Support Panel. However, it had increased the number of referrals to the Multi-Agency Panel. In addition, the local authority had changed the way that referrals were submitted for The Haven, with those going through the Inclusion Team. The local authority had also started to offer transition support for children and young people in Years 5, 6 and 11.	
7.5	An overview of the support that could be accessed was detailed which included access to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational psychology – multi-agency collaborative approach 	

	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialist teachers – learning and Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) • Learning Support Assistant • Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Co-Ordinators (SENDCo) mentors • Early Years SENDCo • Increased funding • Placements in resource provisions – primary resource bases, Freebrough Hub, STRIVE • Direct route to Statutory Assessment • Advice from Resource Provision Specialists • Support from the Inclusion team 	
<p>7.6 An overview was provided of the referrals with a small percentage coming from Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). The majority of referrals were predominately from primary schools. There was also a significant amount of support provide through the Educational Psychologist for Social Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) with that work in demand. There were also a significant number of referrals for Specialist Teaching support. An overview was provided in relation to the referrals and which schools those were received from.</p>	
<p>7.7 The paperwork had been updated, with additional personal information requested. There was an opportunity to request support through Early Help or to highlight if Early Help were currently involved with the family. There was an opportunity to provide an update on what was working well for the child or young person and to detail any services that had been involved in the previous two years. A school would also have to provide documentary evidence of a graduated response if requesting funding, included a costed provision map. Where the child had ASD, there would normally be an opportunity request a ASD assessment. Another changes had been to request a parental signature which was due to issues with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) where parents had not been signing.</p>	
<p>7.8 On average, there were 22.2 referrals for each Panel and during each meeting discussions would take place over what alternatives may be requires such as Speech and Language. The minutes from each Panel would be forwarded within 5 working days, with schools contacted directly with any decisions.</p>	
<p>7.9 A representative questioned if there was a reason why South Bank Primary school and Outwood Academy Normanby were outliers in terms of the numbers and if that followed a historical trend. It was highlighted that South Bank Primary School was one of the Primary Resourced bases so the needs were higher. Outwood Normanby had a complex cohort that required additional support with the trend around SEMH needs. It was also highlighted that there were 49% of students at Outwood Academy Normanby that were</p>	

	ACTION
<p>eligible for Free School Melas compared to 11% of students at Outwood Academy Bydales, which provided additional context on the level of need at Outwood Academy Normanby.</p>	
<p>7.10 Looking at the cases that had been brought to Panel, the majority of those were new referrals at 155 of those. Those were children and young people that the local authority would generally see at different meetings. As highlighted, the Panel had split before the current academic year and it had been noted that there had been a number of referrals that were only requesting support thorough the Specialist Teaching Service. There was a smaller Panel in place, following the full panel meetings with the Specialist Teachers and if suitable there was the option to get in touch directly to offer support to a school. There was currently a waiting list for that support although that list was reducing with 28 learners currently on the list with the majority in Primary Schools.</p>	
<p>7.11 There were links to Health and Social Care to ensure that there was a collaborative approach, with those being partner led. Parent led health assessments were being requested so that panel would have an overview of the child before those were brought to the meetings and there was an opportunity to liaise with services such as Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.</p>	
<p>7.12 A representative discussed the list of referrals and questioned if Overfields Primary School had been missed off in error. It was highlighted that the local authority did not receive many referrals from the school. However that was something that could be checked following the meeting.</p>	
<p>7.13 Mrs M Henley provide an update on funding with a total of £66,083 being allocated through Panel from high needs. There had been £350 per meeting more allocated at each meeting than in the previous academic year. As well as changing the paperwork, the local authority had also changed the way that schools were funded with the requirement for costed provision maps. It would ensure that funding would be allocated in the correct way and to meet the needs of the child. The local authority was also allocating funding for a fixed term basis depending on the needs of the child. A review would take place after six months to decide if that would continue. Funding would also be allocated for transition or additional staffing and strategies.</p> <p>Mrs M Wheater and Ms C Mahoney left the meeting</p>	
<p>8. MEMBERSHIP UPDATE</p>	
<p>8.1 <u>Membership</u> The Clerk provided an update on membership with Mr L Beaumont reappointed as the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) representative. It was also highlighted that the term of office for Mrs C Chadwick would expire at the end of term with her position being an interim measure from becoming an academy. That was something that would be discussed during the update on Schools' Forum constitution. The term of office for Mrs A Hill was also due</p>	

		ACTION
8.2	<p>to expire on 24 September 2021, with Mrs Hill indicating that she would be willing to continue. Representatives were happy that Mrs Hill could continue in the role. Mr A Wappat explained that there may be a change to the representative from the Outwood schools, with any changes to be confirmed between academies. As highlighted previously, the Clerk would be looking to identify a PVI sector representative. It was also highlighted that Mrs S Taylor Watson who had been appointed as a governor representative, had resigned from her position as a governor which meant that she was no longer eligible to be representative of School's Forum. The Clerk would discuss the options for replacing Mrs Taylor-Watson when reviewing the Constitution.</p> <p><u>Attendance register</u> There were no issues identified in relation to attendance.</p>	
9.	SCHOOLS' FORUM CONSTITUTION	
9.1	<p>A copy of the Schools' Forum constitution was circulated prior to the meeting. There were two items to discuss with the first of those relating to meetings. It had been highlighted that there was a permanent change made to the Schools' Forum Regulations which would mean that meetings could continue to take place permanently. It was suggested that a section be added to highlighted that meetings could take place face to face, remotely or a blended approach of both.</p>	Clerk to update the Constitution.
9.2	<p>The second change was in relation to membership. There was again a vacancy for a governor representative with Mrs S Taylor Watson no longer being a governor. In addition, there were a lower number of maintained schools from when the Constitution was last reviewed following the academisation of Saltburn Primary School and Huntcliff Secondary School. There had been an interim arrangement to increase the number of academy representatives following academisation with Mrs C Chadwick taking up that position. The suggestion was for that increase to be made permanent. There was an increased number of academies across the borough and membership of Schools' Forum must be broadly proportionate based on the number and type of schools. There was one Maintained Primary School Head Teacher in place as well as one Maintained governor, along with a place for a Maintained Special School representative. The suggestion was to remove the second maintained school governor position and to increase the number of academy representatives to 11. That would enable someone from Steel River Academy Trust to take up a place on Schools Forum.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Decision: Schools Forum constitution to be updated to include a section on a blended approach to meetings in the future, In addition, the number of maintained school governors would be reduced to one with the number of academy representatives increased to 11. It was intended that Mrs C Chadwick would become a permanent representative from 1 September 2021 along with Mrs S Hill from Caedmon Primary School.</p> </div>	

		ACTION
	Mrs A O'Gara left the meeting	
10	PUPIL PREMIUM FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN	
10.1	Mrs J Johnson presented information on screen to provide an update on proposed changes to the funding procedure from September 2022 as well as an update on spending for previous financial year for the Virtual School.	
10.2	The Virtual School arrangements for Pupil Premium Plus (PP+) would remain unchanged for the next academic year. A total of £1,300 would be given at the beginning of each term in three termly instalments (Autumn £500, Spring £400, Summer £400), for each Child in Our Care (CioC). Additional funding could also be requested throughout the year by completion of an additional funding request form for new requirements or emergency situations. Once the Department for Education (DfE) release the funding allocation for the next financial year, those amounts could be increased	
10.3	It was essential that the Virtual School provided strong transparency and accountability and was accountable for the impact of the PP+ funding. That should not be used to pay for services or support that another child would receive from the school's general budget. Currently, the Virtual School asked that PP+ spend should be recorded in the child's personal education plan (PEP) to report on its use and impact. Under the current system, there was a significant proportion of the funding given directly to schools that remained unaccounted for and was not detailed in the PEP. That had been repeatedly requested and training had been provided for all Designated Teachers (DT) to provide that information as well as raising that at various forums.	
10.4	As such, the Virtual School would move to a proposed system where funding would not be released in advance of the term. Funding should be provided for all CioC without delay and so that schools could prearrange interventions. It created additional workload for the Virtual School to agree individual smaller amounts rather than one larger amount at start of each term. All funding should be spent on CioC as any underspend must be returned to DfE at end of the financial year	
10.5	The proposal was to come into effect from September 2022 with the existing system to remain, in terms of frequency and amount. However, funding would only be released termly when the Personal Education Plan (PEP) for each child was completed and submitted to Virtual School, rather than automatically in advance of each term.	
10.6	Once the PEP was completed, the Virtual School would immediately agree or amend funding requests and the PP+ funding would be immediately sent to school. Schools would also be able to request additional funding (between PEPs for emergency situations) as was the current arrangement. The PEP document would be	

	ACTION
<p>trialled from September 2021 onwards although funding would still be given in advance</p>	
<p>10.7 Mrs Johnson provided an update on spending in the 2020/21 academic year with PP+ of £553,420 received. The Virtual School also received additional funding of £79,730 due to changes in the census information providing total funding of £633,150. The majority of that was provided directly to school. In addition, the funding supported staffing in the Virtua School.</p>	
<p>10.8 In addition, there were a number of additional areas where the funding was used including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welfare Call for attendance and welfare monitoring • Staff Training and memberships • Designated Teacher Training • Adoption Tees Valley • Funding for Placements and Alternative Education • Additional Support • Middlesbrough Football Club Foundation • Laptops • Counselling/Assessments • Rewards • Book Tokens • Book Scheme for Early Years • Headstart programme 	
<p>10.9 As highlighted, the total received was for £633,150, with the Virtual School only accounting for £598,000. The Virtual School was not able to retain any funding it did not spend with that to be returned., However, it had been able to retain £35,000 for catch up tutoring in the current term so that did not need to be returned.</p>	
<p>10.10 A representative questioned if there was anything that the Virtual School had for measuring impact such as an improvement in attendance or a reduction in exclusions. Mrs Johnson explained that she would be looking at providing a document during the summer that would highlight all of that information which could be provided.</p> <p>Mr M Robson left the meeting</p>	

		ACTION
11.	EARLY YEARS HIGH NEEDS FUNDING	
11.1	Mrs E Laird discussed High Needs funding for Early Years and was aware that there was a SEN inclusion fund for Early Years. Normally that would be funded through high needs funding.	
11.2	Local authorities were required to have special educational needs inclusion funds (SENIF) for all 3 and 4-year-olds with SEN who were taking up the free entitlements, regardless of the number of hours taken. Those funds were intended to support local authorities to work with providers to address the needs of individual children with SEN.	
11.3	Currently, the local authority provided £8.50 per hour for children with SEN on a needs assessed number of hours for 1 to 1 supervision. For children in assessment places at places such as Woodlands Nursery, the rate was £12.82 per hour which was equivalent to Range 5 as a specialist facility.. The proposal was to increase the 1:1 rate to meet the national living wage requirements. That would see the rate increase from £8.50 to £9.72 with that to be backdated to April 2021 It would cost an additional £38,000 from the Early Years budget. With regards to the increased payments, there were 12 places at Woodlands on range 5 as well as some through Dots and Spots. It was proposed to increase that rate to £12.82 as a number of those would go on to access specialist provision through KTS. That would be an additional £15,000 from the Early Years budget.	
11.4	A representative discussed the other private nurseries such as Rosedene and questioned if those would see a similar increase as Woodlands. Mrs Laird explained that Rosedene would receive £9.72 through 1:1 support as she was not aware that there were any children on a Range 5 in that provision. It was only those such as Woodlands and Dots and Spots where the children had an EHCP on the higher ranges that would receive the higher amount. If a child was assessed at Range 5 when joining the school, then it would receive the relevant funding for that child. It was believed that there should be some children at Rosedene that should be assessed at range 5.	
11.5	A representative discussed their Nursery and was grateful for the increase in funding, However, including oncosts, staffing would be £13 per hour with the school believing that they were losing out with funding. Schools were not refusing the support but were being mindful of the costs to the school. The schools received the £9.72 on top of the hourly rate of £4 for each child. It was noted that the budgets were challenging for schools.	
12.	DSG OUTTURN POSITON	
12.1	Mrs E Laird provided an update on the Dedicated Schools Grant Outturn position for 2020/21. The final outturn was a net deficit of (£2.7 million). It would be recorded as unusual reserves in the accounts and sit on the balance sheet as a negative amount of money.	

		ACTION
12.2	The deficit had increased by £575,000 with that split across four different areas being Non-Traded, Traded services, Free School Reserves and Growth Fund Reserves	
12.3	Across the four blocks that was approximately £588,000 with a surplus of £40,000 to individual schools and 57,000 to central schools block. The main factor was due to the high need block with a deficit of £1.2 million. However, that was partially offset with a surplus for Early Years of £566,000 which was unexpected. The budget for Early Years would be adjusted in July 2021 to account for the January 2021 census with that amount expected to reduce by £160,000. A summary was provided in relation to the high needs overspend. It detailed where the money was spent with the single biggest issue being the top up funding for those in mainstream school as well as the special schools and SEN units. Out of borough top ups had reduced slightly.	
12.	As part of deficit, the local authority was required to produce deficit recovery plan.	
13.	DEFICIT MANAGEMENT PLAN 21/22 – 24-25	
13.1	As outlined previously, the local authority was required to develop a deficit management plan to recover the deficit on the DSG. A summary of the Plan had been circulated with a full version available for anyone that would like to have a look at the detail. There was the potential that a sub group could be established if required.	
13.2	Part of the conditions, was to develop a plan on how the local authority would recover the deficit. As reported in the previous year, there had been the need to develop a plan due to having a deficit. However the level of deficit had increased. The local authority would have to ensure the plan was regularly updated and could be required to meet with the DfE at any given time. There were only two local authorities to date that had been asked to share their recovery plans. It would be a live document and the local authority would need to keep Members updated on progress as well as the Section 151 Officer and Director Children's Services. The intention was to share it with Schools Forum in the first instance.	
13.3	The local authority had been forwarded a file which would be pre-populate with the census data. The local authority had applied the growth in the census numbers and assumed that would continue for the next three to four years. That was the baseline being used and it would have been significantly worse if not for some of the measures that had already been put in place. Included in the plan were mitigated actions for savings for each area.	
13.4	Mrs M Henley provided an updated on some of the areas where the local authority was looking to reduce the deficit. The number of places commissioned at Mo Mowlam Academy Already had increased to 75 places. However that was still under commissioned by 11 places. That would mean that costs for transport were reduced as well as increasing the number of special school placements with that being carried in a more cost	

	ACTION
<p>effective way. The new Free School would be in place in the next year with 20 places for Redcar and Cleveland and five assessment places. That would provide places for children and young people in the borough with SEMH needs and would also reduce the need to travel outside of the borough.</p>	
<p>13.5 The local authority had started a journey with Freebrough Academy with a 10 place support for ASD students. There was placement funding available and the students would be dual registered at Freebrough and their own school. That was for young people that would normally have been in a special school. It would mean that for children and young people after Year 6, they would be accessing mainstream provision and reducing the impact on specialist provision. It was hoped that would be extended to other secondary schools.</p>	
<p>13.6 There had been early discussions with KTS Academy about increasing provision, with that being dependent on KTS being able to take over another building. The local authority was looking to reduce the commission with Discovery which would mean that the children remained in the borough and within their cohort.</p>	
<p>13.7 There was an extension planned for Kirkleatham Hall School worth £2.7 million which would be funded through the DfE and partly through the school and local authority. That would increase the number of places by 12. Although that did not seem a lot of places, the school was currently not fit for purpose and it would improve the offer in place.</p>	
<p>13.8 The local authority was also looking at Covid-19 funding to cover an Educational Psychologist as well as training. The local authority was looking at providing SEND support for pupils. In addition the diversity pathway had been joint commissioned and would begin in September 2021. That would provide a bubble of support for children and young people as well as families. That would start at the trigger point with triage and would provide support for those without a diagnosis and ensure that those with high needs were placed onto a pathway. It was about early identification and support across the board and would hopefully reduce the need for specialist provision and upskilling parents to identify that more readily. That would lower costs with some outreach work being provided.</p>	
<p>13.9 There would be a review of the support bases as there was a significant spend in those. The local authority was working at streamlining the provision. In addition, there would be a review of Post 16 cohorts in special schools with the focus of linking colleges such as Redcar and Cleveland College and Prior Pursglove College to keep the young people in the borough and to reduce the high costs at places such as Darlington. It was to ensure that young people would attend college with specialist provision and provide a foundation for learners and those to SEMH.</p>	

		ACTION
13.10	If the local authority received £12 million, it would be better off by £870,000 better from starting those projects under the baseline of doing nothing. The following year that would increase to £1.6 million and £1.8 million the year after. What was uncertain was what the DSG would look like and if there was an increase in high needs. It was assumed that there would not be.	
14.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	Mrs E Laird advised representatives that the census date for Pupil Premium was changing and would be based on the October census as opposed to the January census. It was important for schools that they identified those that were eligible for Free School Meals early in the term to be eligible for the additional funding.	
15.	ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The following items were notified for discussion at future meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falling Pupil numbers • Local Impact from Covid-19 and plans that have been put in place. 	
16.	DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS	
	The following meeting dates for 2021/22 were agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday 18 October 2021 • Monday 22 November 2021 • Monday 10 January 2022 • Monday 27 June 2022 <p>A discussion took place about whether meetings should continue to take place virtually or if representatives would prefer face to face meetings should it be safe to do so. There were a number of representatives that preferred the virtual meetings as it saved on time with travelling for meetings. It was suggested that next meeting take place virtually and for it to be reviewed at that point. It was agreed that the Clerk would forward an invite out to all representatives for the next academic year so that those could be confirmed in diaries.</p>	Clerk to send an electronic invite out for meetings in the 2021/22 academic year

Meeting closed at 4.15pm

These minutes have been approved by Schools' Forum as a true record of proceedings:

Chair: _____

Date: _____