



North Tyneside Council

Minutes

Meeting Schools Forum Wednesday 13th January 2016
Location Langdale Centre 12.00 – 2.00pm

		Representing	
Present	David Baldwin	Headteacher Churchill Community College	Secondary/Middle
	Mark Longstaff	Head of Commissioning & Investment	NTC
	Jon Ritchie	Deputy Partnership Director, ENGIE	NTC
	Elaine Appleby	School Finances Advisor	NTC
	Christina Ponting	HR Business Partner	NTC
	Phil Kemp	Trade Union Representative	Unions
	Mike Homer	Headteacher, Valley Gardens Middle School	Secondary/Middle
	Jill Forster	Headteacher, Benton Dene Primary School	Primary
	Di Donkin	Headteacher, St Thomas More Academy	Academies
	Rebecca Watson	Representing Principal, Kings Priory	Academies
	Paul Durgan	Woodard Trust	Trust
	Michael McHugh	Governor, St Mary's RC Primary	Primary
	Collette Bland	Headteacher, St Mary's RC Primary School, NS	RC Diocese
	Jim Crinson	Headteacher, Collingwood Primary School	Primary
	Ann-Marie Crozier	Tyne Metropolitan College	Post 16
	Andrew James	Headteacher, Holy Cross RC Primary School	Primary
	Dave Erskine	Headteacher, Southlands School	Special
	Gavin Storey	Headteacher, Cullercoats Primary School	Primary
	Kehri Ellis	North Tyneside Learning Trust	Trust
	Jim Stephenson	Headteacher, John Spence Community High	Secondary/Middle
	Alex Thompson	Children's Care	PVI
	Sharron Colpitts-Elliott	Headteacher, Rockliffe First School	Primary
	Anna Peach	Representing Longbenton Community College	Secondary/Middle
	Peter Thorpe	Governor, Redesdale Primary School	Primary
	Adrian Smith	Governor, Valley Gardens Middle School	Secondary/Middle
	Karen Croskery	Headteacher, Moorbridge	PRU
	John Croft	Sir James Knott Nursery	Nurseries
	Fiona Lucas	Project Support Officer (Minutes)	

1. Apologies for absence:	
Philip Sanderson (Rebecca Watson attending in his place), Paul Quinn (Anna Peach attending in his place)	
Christina Ponting will contact those representatives not in attendance, without allocating a substitute, to remind them of the requirements set out in the Schools Forum constitution about attendance.	CP
The chair welcomed representatives to the meeting.	

2.	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting (9.12.15)</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting held 9th December 2015 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Matters arising</p> <p>3a EFA seeking national comparisons between pupils in North Tyneside settings with pupils in ARPs against other pupils. Mark reported that there has been no further response from the EFA and Mark will continue to follow this up.</p> <p>3b Centrally retained funding – Jon reported that DD and Jon have spoken about this funding and will be discussed further under the centrally retained items. Jon and DD are still to meet to conclude any outstanding items.</p> <p>3c Early Year Finance update - Mark reported that this would be raised under agenda item 4.</p> <p>3d Early Year Finance update - Jon had circulated the information which showed the net effect of accepting or not accepting the early years finance proposals – included in agenda item 5.</p>	<p>ML</p> <p>JR</p>
4.	<p>Early Years Funding 2016/17 <i>Early Years Funding 2016/17 report circulated in advance of the meeting</i></p> <p>Mark reminded colleagues that there was potential re-alignment into the early years block. The early years sub group were asked to revisit some of the rationale and review some of the proposals following the previous Schools Forum. The report circulated in advance of Forum was an update on the progress of the sub group.</p> <p>Mark confirmed that the proposal at last Schools Forum of the £313k requirement into the early years block was no longer required. With regards to increasing the hourly rate by 10p per hour, the sub group agreed that the proposal would be for private, voluntary independent providers only to have that 10p per hour increase. The final change was to look at the pressures in terms of the 2 year offer and the phased reduction in the grant payment in relation to Sir James Knott Nursery. This would now be phased over a 2 year period.</p> <p>Chair thanked the sub group on the work involved in producing this report.</p> <p>Action: Schools Forum approved the Early Years Working Group’s proposals for the Early Years Block 2016/17.</p>	
5.	<p>Schools Funding 2016/17 including centrally retained and de-delegated items, and High Needs <i>Report circulated in advance of the meeting</i></p> <p>The aim of the report was to confirm the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for North Tyneside including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note the Government settlement • Agree the centrally retained items 	

- Agree the amounts to be distributed across the 3 blocks, therefore agreeing the 2016/17 High Needs and Early Years budget blocks
- With regards to the maintained schools, agree the de-delegated items.

1. Revenue funding – summary from the 17 December 2015 local Government finance settlement

Jon reported that the per pupil amount into North Tyneside has remained the same. There are now 315 extra pupils in the borough, the majority of which are in the primary sector, which increases the Schools Block by £1.4m.

The High Needs Block is provisional based on the number of pupils within the borough. The pressure discussed in December 2015 has been reduced by £0.320m due to additional funding being provided by the Government.

The total DSG allocation in the settlement is £140.465m.

Recommendation 1:

Forum noted the details of the settlement in respect of the DSG.

2. Centrally retained items

Jon reported that this was based on historic levels and appendix B lists the proposed centrally retained items.

Schools Forum had previously expressed concerns about centrally retaining amounts for schools meals (£0.307m) and this will be a SLA via schools and no longer part of the centrally retained items. Similarly, the proposed retention relating to Early Years had been reduced by £0.216m

Forum agreed to vote on the centrally retained sums within Appendix B line by line.

DD asked if we had any indication of how many years in the future this minimum funding guarantee would last. JR clarified that we know the funding for 2016/17 but have no certainty for future years. The consultation process is expected to be released in the spring and Schools Forum will be briefed accordingly.

DD highlighted that due to changes in funding, forecast pressures from High Needs and other pressures (eg National Insurance changes) schools were facing a challenging financial future. She explained that the secondary head teachers had recently discussed this and concerns were raised about the Early Years centrally retained item and whether there was clear evidence that this was having a positive impact on pupils and schools.

DD raised the question of whether Schools Forum should agree to centrally retaining this money. Further, it was suggested that the work supported by this funding could be funded by other funding streams, including the Local Authority if this was deemed to be a priority area. She expressed her opinion that this centrally retained money would go a long way to offset the financial pressures that schools face and that Schools Forum needed to be guardians of the DSG, keeping as much money to fund

schools directly and to be certain that the way the money is spend is most effective.

Jill Baker was invited to join the meeting to provide clarity about this area and why we need to centrally retain this money and its impact on schools.

Jill clarified that the funding was used to support both early years and early intervention. Historically this money was called early years and was identified to pre school children. The changing landscape over the last 5 years has been that the funding has been utilised in different ways to support earlier intervention with families. Some of the specific areas that schools have benefited from are:

1. Delivery of parenting programmes. In 2013 the parenting programme was revised. In 2013/14 there were 178 referrals from a range of professionals to the parenting programmes. In 2014/15 there were 615 referrals to families with 84% of referrals reported to have had a positive impact on the families. This is evidence on how early intervention impacts on families. The children within these families range from 2 – 14.
2. A programme has been developed alongside those families called 'ready to go' for parents of those children. While the children are in their 15 hours child care, the parents are learning how to support their children to be school ready. The impact by the time those children leave the provision is that they are more school ready. This has been running for 2 years and the evidence of the impact is that those children are: attending school, more able to speak, more toilet trained and the parents have an understanding of their learning.
3. Troubled families work – in phase 1 (ended March 2015) there were 3 criteria and families had to meet 2 out of the 3 criteria, one of the criteria was schools attendance. Children not attending (85% or more) were identified as being on the cohort of troubled families. Of the 460 families worked with between 2012 and 2015, 45% had poor school attendance and of the total successful claim at the end of the phase 1 of 99.3%, 35% were school attendance related where attendance had improved to over 85% for three successive school terms. In phase 2 of the troubled families programme the criteria has expanded to 6 and the education criteria is still there. The criteria includes persistent absence, fixed term exclusions, and children with behavioural issue. The education criteria means that in order to make a claim every child in the household must be attending school 90% or higher over 3 school terms.
4. Analysing the number of looked after children (LAC) – NTC drilled down on the number of LAC over the last 3 on the analysis of the quantitative data (age, live) and worked with 12 social work/family partner/front door staff to analyse the cases. A number of themes emerged: – most of our LAC are either under 1 or 15+; most of our LAC become LAC because of domestic violence, substance misuse or mental health issues. LAC numbers are higher from some geographic areas more than others. Of young people 15+ who become LAC 16% are unknown to the local authority at the point of referral - eg: no early help assessment/referrals/social work intervention or any issues arising in school. As a result of this work, the Local Authority are currently looking at re-configuring teams to be locality based and to include police, health visitors and school nurses as well as LA staff. Schools are involved in the discussions on what the pathways should be including configuring weekly locality allocation meetings to quickly identify and allocate workers to families.

AJ queried if the troubled families agenda was statutory through the Local Authority and therefore schools were supporting through their funds something is statutory. JB confirmed the troubled families programme is a payment by results programme ie: outcomes for children and families must be demonstrated as 'significant and sustained' - which the LA have signed up to until 2020 but it is not a statutory service.

In addition to the 28 indicators of what makes a family 'troubled' (the 28 have been locally developed by all our partners and are grouped under 6 criteria) families must also be either high cost to the public purse and/or those who would benefit from whole family working. Between 2015 and 2020 the LA must work with and 'turn round' 1480 families. As an impact of not transferring the DSG funding, the troubled families programme would still exist but the removal of the funding will undermine the delivery of the offer.

AJ informed the group of the value of the work of the troubled families programme in their locality but highlighted that his school has employed a family and support worker.

DD welcomed this level of detail but stated that it would be helpful to have the full cost of the service as described, then how it is funded from various funding streams and what proportion of this centrally retained fund contributes. Some of this work seems to overlap with Education Welfare Officer (EWO) work in terms of attendance. There is a lot of funding for LAC and some of it is centrally retained that could be used in that way. St Thomas More have also employed their own family support worker.

JR outlined the costs of the service which are (for 2015/16) a gross cost of £6.3m, excluding overhead recharges for property. Funding from fees and charges (parents child care; government grants; public health funding) was budgeted at £3.4m before the current level of DSG contribution, giving a net cost of £2.9m.

DD felt that it was important not to lose sight that the local authority has many functions to administer and the Forum need to be careful not to stray into a situation where if Forum doesn't agree to funding then work would stop. There are some links to education within the programme but a lot is social work.

SW agreed with DD asking that if schools forum do not agree to centrally retain an element, would further funding come from some where else? JB reported that if the funding isn't there it would reduce the service to the statutory minimum and would result in the reconfiguration of the service.

JB clarified that none of this centrally retained funding funds work with LAC. What the local authority have learned with the work with LAC is the 15+ are unknown to us and that this work needs to be done.

DE queried if this funding wasn't centrally retained could schools buy into services instead for EWOs.

GS asked what has happened in terms of the original early years provision as more data might be required on the impact and how much is being used for early years provision. JC informed the Forum that Oaktrees had made a difference to our children. Some of this work impacts as more of the reception children are ready for

school than they were in the passed. Jill's work is valuable and worth keeping. JB confirmed that Oaktrees works on the whole family scenario.

JF confirmed that they employ 1.6FTE liaison officer and they also have families which have worked successfully with family partners. There needs to be more data in terms of school readiness.

PD reminded the group if the £1m did not support early years then the money going back to schools would not be a large amount. Therefore would it be better to combine the funding instead.

SCE confirmed she would strongly support an SLA for EWO's.

DD queried if an SLA for EWO's would be instead of the centrally retained funding. Is there some kind of transition possible to be offered.

JR recommended that if the schools are concerned they are not informed then a sub group from Schools Forum could feed into early intervention and prevention work undertaken by the Authority.

CB reminded the Forum of the huge value of the service, but whether the level of funding from the DSG is correct. Over time, other services which contribute to this funding have reduced the amount, although Schools Forum have channelled the same level of money. Some schools are now providing individual services which is a level of duplication. CB would have reservations agreeing to that level of funding but may agree to a lower level of funding.

GS felt that if the amount of funding was changed then more clarity would be needed before agreeing a set amount.

JR confirmed that the continuation of the centrally retained items does not need to be spent in the same way. It could be proposed at that level with the working group to look at how it spends the money. By agreeing at that level, with a sub group to work how it's spent. It would provide flexibility to work it through starting before the financial year but not committing a reduction.

Vote - transfer all of the money to support early years provision / intervention (£1,084,200) For – 5, Against – 15, Abstain – 2.

JR proposed that whilst Forum were not minded to continue retaining this money for this purpose, it could make the decision to retain the proposed £1.084m and come back on 16 March 2016 to consider how the money would be used.

Vote – to still centrally retain this funding but not centrally retain it deliver early years provision. This would allow us some time to work up proposals on 16.3.16. Forum disagreed with this vote taking place.

Vote – agree not to transfer all of the money. Is forum happy with the proposal that we won't centrally retain any of this money in this budget but mindful that it

is likely to draw £0.500-0.600m back from the Local Authority transition arrangements. Forum would then decide where to transfer this money to. **For – 17.** **Against – 3.** **Abstain – 5.**

Vote - Proposal that the funding now goes through the AWPU on a straight line per pupil basis (rather than by weighting it according to Key Stage) and all going into the schools block. For – 18. Against - 5. Abstain 2.

Schools Forum confirmed the remainder of the Appendix B centrally retained funds as follows:

Budget set aside to support local authority and trust objectives

No decision needed

Budget to fund the schools support service

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

Budget to support vulnerable schools. Allocations to individual schools made annually by school improvement staff.

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

Budget to improve quality and variety in school meals

Already discussed

Budget to maintain High Borrans outdoor education facility.

Already agreed in July.

Budget for the education improvement partnership (secondary schools)

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

Collective contribution to ongoing pension costs incurred when allowing teachers to leave schools prematurely.

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

Budget for costs associated with de commissioned school buildings

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

School admissions service

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

DSG contribution to Home to School Transport costs

No-one wished to speak against the local authority's proposal to centrally retain this.

Therefore Schools Forum agreed to continue to centrally retain.

Support for schools with falling rolls.

Already confirmed.

3. Agree the block to block transfers

This item refers to table 1 of the addendum report, although the amounts need to be updated to reflect the decision with regards to centrally retained items above.

Schools Forum had already agreed they accept the financial pressures for High Needs following the discussion at the December 2015 meeting. DD suggested instead of paying the forecast pressure this year could we defer part of it into 2017/18. JR reported that if the funding was spread over 2 years this would put an extra £0.375m into the budget for this year for the Schools Block. The potential risk was noted regarding the consultation on the national formula in the spring and the potential that the residual pressure may need to be accounted for within a new financial regime.

Proposal to defer the payment of £0.375m into 2017/18 budget

No-one wished to speak against this proposal. **Therefore Schools Forum agreed to spread the High Needs pressure over two years.**

Recommendation 3: Schools Forum agreed to table 1 – base budget proposal as amended through the discussion.

4. Subject to changes arising from recommendations 2 and 3 above approve the core budget option as set out in sections 3 (c) and (d).

One of the main changes to the formula this year related to deprivation factor – at the meeting in October Schools Forum discussed the formula that was subsequently submitted to EFA by 31 October 2015. The change related to revised deprivation data which was released in December by the DfE, specifically in relation to the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI). IDACI is measured by local super output areas and across the country these had been re-assessed for the first time since 2010. North Tyneside is now less deprived than it was 5 years ago. Band 6 is the highest level of deprived and previous years there were 386 children identified and within the new criteria there are now 16 children. This impacts the application of our formula as it used the number of pupils in each band when allocating deprivation funding.

Jon outlined the two options for Forum to consider on the deprivation factor, although it was noted there were many different combinations possible. The proposed options were to: (1) maintain the per pupil rates as were used last year or (2) to rebalance the formula so the relevant weightings of funding were broadly the same.

Forum discussed the two options and determined the preference was to maintain the rates per pupil as previously consulted on in the autumn term.

Proposal to Schools Forum: to use the revised core option for deprivation (using the same figures as last year) but amending the deprivation total. No-one spoke against this option and therefore **Forum agreed to the revised core option as set out in the papers.**

	<p>It was therefore agreed to run the formula as proposed by the Local Authority adjusted for the decisions of Schools Forum noted above.</p> <p>5. Approve the de-delegated items as set out in section 4 and appendix C. Nobody spoke against the proposal therefore Schools Forum agreed to de-delegate in this way.</p> <p>For information, Elaine reported that as the deprivation allocation was different to the previous year it may be necessary to look at the notional SEN proportions to confirm that the required EFA criteria in this area was adhered to.</p>	
6.	<p>Falling Rolls and Headroom 2015/16 allocation process</p> <p>Anyone want to speak against the idea of accepting this paper – No. Forum agreed the paper.</p>	
7.	<p>Update on Education Psychology Service and implication of EHC plans</p> <p>The information report would be circulated to Forum members 14.1.16 by Jon Ritchie.</p>	JR
8.	<p>Update from HR working groups (verbal update by Christina Ponting)</p> <p>Two HR working groups:</p> <p>Business manager working group: they have been allocated a piece of work on job descriptions – all schools have received the work undertaken on this.</p> <p>Headteacher group – they agreed to look at some work on work load; change management; how staff were coping in schools on a day to day basis. Concluding some options that schools could consider a paper would be brought back to Forum in March 2016.</p>	
9.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>9a Schools Forum – term of office ending for 4 members. Jon reported that the terms of office, at the conclusion of this Forum, would cease for Di Donkin, Colette Bland, Karen Croskery and Dave Erskine. The future representatives for each group would be agreed within their groupings unless the Local Authority was asked to facilitate a vote.</p> <p>Chair thanked these people for their contribution to Schools Forum, in case they decide not to stand for a further term of office.</p> <p>9b Dave Erskine, on behalf of the SEND working group, extended an invitation to any members of Forum/or schools to attend this working group. Action: Mark to circulate to all schools and members of Forum with the action plan; the remit of the group and request for further members to the group.</p>	ML
10	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>Wednesday 16th March 2016, 12.00 lunch for 12.30 start until 2.00pm</p>	

Current agenda items:

- DSG and Schools Revenue Monitoring (to December)
- Exceptional SEN allocations 2015/16
- Provisional date for update on the scheme for financing schools / school regs (if required)
- SEN Review progress update
- Forward Plan

A copy of the full forward plan is on the internet alongside these minutes for reference.