

**North Tyneside Council** 



Meeting

Schools Forum

Date

Tuesday 8 September 2020

✓ Present
 D Deputy
 A Apologies
 O Absent

- Location Via Microsoft Teams
- Present

Name	Organisation	Representing	11.03.20	08.09.20
Andrew James	St Aidan's Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Angi Gibson	Hadrian Park Primary	Primary	A	✓
Candida Mellor / Claire MacLeod	Trade Unions	Trade Unions	Claire MacLeod	Claire MacLeod
David Baldwin	Churchill Community College	Secondary	✓	$\checkmark$
David Bavaird	Norham High School	Governor - Secondary	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	~
David Watson	St Thomas More	RC Schools	~	✓
Gavin Storey	Cullercoats Primary	Primary	✓	$\checkmark$
Jill Wraith	Benton Dene Primary	Primary	Judith Driver	~
Jim Coltman	Diocese	C of E Diocese	~	А
Joanne Thompson	Holystone Out of School	Early Years PVI	✓	✓
John Croft	Sir James Knott	Nursery	A	✓
John Newport	Marden Bridge Middle School	Middle	✓	$\checkmark$
Karen Croskery	North Tyneside Student Support Service	PRU	~	$\checkmark$
Kelly Holbrook	Longbenton High School	Secondary	N/A	✓
Kerry Lillico	Grasmere Academy	Academy	A	✓
Laura Baggett	Monkhouse Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Marie Flatman / Mo Dixon	Tyne Met	16-19 Provider	Chris Wall	Mo Dixon
Matt Snape	Marden High School	Secondary	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Michael Young	Spring Gardens Primary	Primary	~	$\checkmark$
Paul Mitchell	Whitley Bay High School	Governor – Secondary	A	~
Peter Gannon	Silverdale School	Special	✓	✓
Peter Thorp	Redesdale Primary	Governor - Primary	0	✓
Philip Sanderson	Kings Priory	Academy	✓	$\checkmark$
Sharron Colpitts- Elliott	Rockcliffe First School	Primary	✓	~
Stephen Baines	Holystone Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Stephen Easton	Marine Park First School	First	✓	$\checkmark$
Steve Wilson	Whitley Bay High School	High	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	✓
In Attendance:				
Mark Longstaff	Head of Commissioning & Asset Management	NTC	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Claire Emmerson	Senior Manager - Finance Strategy & Planning	NTC	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Noel Kay	Senior Business Partner, Finance	NTC	✓	✓
Diane Thompson	Finance	ENGIE	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	0

Christina Ponting	Senior Manager - Schools HR	ENGIE/NTC	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Mary Nergaard	PA to Head of Commissioning & Asset Management	NTC	~	~
Diane Buckle	Assistant Director of Education	NTC	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	N/A
Mark Taylor	Strategic Commissioning Manager	NTC	~	$\checkmark$
Kevin Burns	Senior School Improvement Officer (Vulnerable Learners)	NTC	N/A	~
Mark Mirfin	Senior Manager (SEND)	NTC	N/A	✓

	Item	Action
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	See Table above.	
	The Chairwelessed even uses to the Cahaala Famure	
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the Schools Forum.	
2.	Attendance Register / Membership	
	No current vacancies	
	Paul Quinn has now retired and will be replaced by Kelly Holbrook.	
	Paul Mitchell is the new Secondary Governor representative	
	Gavin Strorey has been re-elected for his locality	
3.	Public Meeting / Observers	
	The Chair welcomed the public to the meeting	
4.	Declaration of Interest	
	Item 6.3 - Stephen Baines, Kerry Lillico, Jill Wraith	
5.	Minutes of the last meeting of 11 March 2020	
	Minutes agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.	
6.	Matters Arising	
6a.	Page 2, Item 6 – Matters Arising: Outstanding EYSIS Report	
	Report circulated	
6b.	Page 4, Item 6.2 – Special Leave SLA: Update on maternity / union SLA	
	Information was sent to Schools separately	
	83% distributed	
	Shortfall in funding discussed. Slightly lower than expected for this year	
	<u>ACTION:</u> Separate report to be sent to Forum members when August	СР
	data is available.	CI
6c.	Page 5, Item 6.3 - Update from Sub-Group - High Needs: Update on ARPs	
	that are not full	
	Updated to be provided under Item 6.4	
6.1	Annual Review of Schools Forum Constitution	
	a) Election of Chair Christina Ponting	
	Nominations were requested.	
	<ul> <li>It was noted that the existing Chair is available to continue until 31</li> </ul>	
	December and is willing to stay on until that date.	

	<ul> <li>Forum agreed and David Baldwin was re-e Forum until 31 December, at which time a</li> </ul>	
b)	Election of Vice Chair	Christina Ponting
	<ul> <li>Peter Gannon was re-elected as Vice Cha</li> </ul>	
c)	<ul> <li>Declarations of Interest – All Members</li> <li>None</li> </ul>	David Baldwin
d)	<ul><li>Members Attendance</li><li>As noted in Item 2</li></ul>	Christina Ponting
e)	<ul> <li>Notification to all Schools / Governors Mem</li> <li>Annually and as changes occur a notification including vacancies.</li> </ul>	
f)	Action Plan / Self-Assessment	Christina Ponting
	<ul> <li>Last action plan was concluded in Novemb</li> <li>CP recommended that Forum wait for new reviewing the action plan</li> <li>Guidance expected before November meeting</li> </ul>	Schools Forum guidance before
	nance Update	Claire Emmerson
CE	<ul> <li>National Funding Formula Update</li> <li>E talked through the presentation. Main points</li> <li>Changes to Schools Block Funding for 202 based on Oct 19 census. 2021/22 allocatin 2020 census</li> <li>Basic entitlement increased by £180 (prima</li> <li>Free School Meal factor increased by 2.2%</li> <li>Premises costs static</li> <li>IDACI factor will use 2019 data instead of 2</li> <li>Small rural schools to see an increase in th £45k (primary) and £70k (secondary)</li> <li>No change to Area Cost Adjustment</li> <li>Still no move to a hard NFF so the LA can formula. Although, most LAs are now mov.</li> <li>Min per pupil funding rates shown on screet</li> <li>Funding floor set at 2%. Only relates to pupe LFF modelling for consultation discussed.</li> <li>No figures as yet as want to take this throut.</li> <li>Next steps discussed</li> <li>iscussion followed around:</li> <li>DB asked for clarification on who makes the formula. CE confirmed that it is the LAs de always been consulted and Forum provide LA then considers prior to making its final of the steps.</li> </ul>	e decision on the funding the finance sub-group e decision, however, Schools have s a recommendation which the

<ul> <li>CE noted that she would welcome the sult that the sub-group should look at the mode back to Schools Forum before going out the CE proposed a further meeting of Schools sub-group recommendations. Forum agric <u>ACTION:</u> CE to look at dates</li> <li>DB reminded members that they can join</li> </ul>	elling and bring recommendations consultation. Forum in October to review the eed.
b) Outturn Balances	Claire Emmerson
<ul> <li>CE talked through the briefing paper. Main poi</li> <li>Accounts currently being audited by the ecomplete by end of October, and Audit Ce</li> <li>There is a requirement to report on the poil</li> <li>2018/19 ended with a £0.747m surplus. 2 £3.262m</li> <li>High Needs Block – 2018/19 deficit of £0.2019/20 resulting in an overall deficit of £4 increased by £3.006m. Pressures in SEN</li> <li>CE confirmed that additional funding has of January, LAs can no longer support the from the Dedicated Schools Grant. The D have a recovery plan and can work with th won't need to submit that plan to the DfE. completed which is expected in late Autur</li> <li>Early years – surplus of £0.882m in 2018/</li> <li>Schools and Central Block <ul> <li>Falling Roll - Estimated balance of be transferred to Headroom leavin</li> <li>Schools in Financial Difficulty – Es Minus the MASH contribution of £0 applications of £0.167m (subject to final balance is estimated at £0.38</li> <li>Other Schools and Central Block Ibrought forward to address some commitments in relation to the new revaluations in 2020/21.</li> <li>Central items totalling £2.343m we purpose</li> </ul> </li> <li>Schools Balance – overall balances at the £0.165m. This represents a reduction of a decreasing balances following a long-term 2014/15. The national results of the Cons exercise will be available in the autumn at North Tyneside Schools' balances remain</li> <li>Chart 1 shows the movement in balances that balances will move into deficit in 2020</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Aternal auditor. Hoping to ommittee meeting mid November.</li> <li>Sition of Dedicated Schools Grant 2019/20 ended with a deficit of -</li> <li>920m was carried forward to 5.545m. DSG funding has ID discussed.</li> <li>been received for High Needs. As a deficit and this has to be done fE announced that LAs should still be DfE where necessary but they Up until the spending review is nn.</li> <li>19</li> <li>£0.171m of which £0.121m will g a balance of £0.050m immated balance of £0.573m.</li> <li>0.020m and Headroom Schools Forum Approval) the Sm</li> <li>ems - This balance will be of the 2019/20 business rates a build schools and additional</li> <li>re applied for their agreed</li> <li>end of March 2020 was 21.435m and is the fifth year of a trend of rising balances to stent Financial Reporting (CFR) and will allow the Authority to see if lower than the national average. over the last 20 years. It is likely //21.</li> <li>nees at March 2020 by phase.</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>Schools have completed the budget planning process and submitted their plans. A summary of planned school balances over the next three years by phase was shown in table 4. Whils the planned school balances look bleak, past experience shows that this will improve.</li> <li>DB asked for clarification that schools will find it harder to stay out of deficit. CE confirmed that there is still a downward trend, past experience shows that the final position will be better than predictions show.</li> <li>SW noted that we can't assume that the improvements made in previous years will be achievable this year following the impact of Covid</li> <li>CE agreed that it is difficult to quantify the impact of Covid</li> <li>DB noted that Forum members need to look at their own situation and make contact with government on behalf of their constituents</li> <li><u>ACTION:</u> DB to work with CE to put out a statement to Government on behalf of Forum.</li> <li>DB are requested that all schools receive a copy of the letter and suggested that the letter is copied to local political leaders including the North of Tyne Combined Authonity</li> <li>DB reminded all Forum members that they also need to act individually</li> <li>PM noted that they have written to the Secretary of State setting out estimated figures including estimates of costs incurred as a result of Covid-19.</li> <li>School requesting deficit approvals were discussed as follows:         <ul> <li>3 schools now und reficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in stoructural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools. CE noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that the school suff and provems that this schoene withich have a different set of circumstances linked to tings like pupi numbers.</li> </ul> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is information.</li></li></ul>		
<ul> <li>estimated figures including estimates of costs incurred as a result of Covid-19.</li> <li>School requesting deficit approvals were discussed as follows: <ul> <li>3 schools now out of deficit. DB issued praise to the schools and governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support</li> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working doesly with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that the lA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>plans. A summary of planned school balances over the next three years by phase was shown in table 4. Whilst the planned school balances look bleak, past experience shows that this will improve.</li> <li>DB asked for clarification that schools will find it harder to stay out of deficit. CE confirmed that there is still a downward trend, past experience shows that the final position will be better than predictions show.</li> <li>SW noted that we can't assume that the improvements made in previous years will be achievable this year following the impact of Covid</li> <li>CE agreed that it is difficult to quantify the impact of Covid</li> <li>DB noted that Forum members need to look at their own situation and make contact with government on behalf of their constituents</li> <li><u>ACTION:</u> DB to work with CE to put out a statement to Government on behalf of Forum.</li> <li>DBa requested that all schools receive a copy of the letter and suggested that the letter is copied to local political leaders including the North of Tyne Combined Authority</li> <li>DB reminded all Forum members that they also need to act individually</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>19.</li> <li>School requesting deficit approvals were discussed as follows: <ul> <li>3 schools now out of deficit. DB issued praise to the schools and governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support</li> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>School requesting deficit approvals were discussed as follows:         <ul> <li>3 schools now out of deficit. DB issued praise to the schools and governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support</li> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that this information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>	estimated figures including estimates of costs incurred as a result of Covid-	
<ul> <li>3 schools now out of deficit. DB issued praise to the schools and governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support</li> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that the information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>	19.	
<ul> <li>governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support <ul> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that the is information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>School requesting deficit approvals were discussed as follows:</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that this information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>governors for the work they have done and thanked the LA for their support</li> <li>6 schools in deficit</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>PM noted that a large proportion of the deficit is linked to 3 schools. CE noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools form in monitoring this information. CE noted that this information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 new schools now in deficit, relatively small at this point in time</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE noted that this information is reported in many forums but it is the responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 schools in structural deficit. Work is ongoing with these schools.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the budgets. Schools are not answerable to Schools forum in that way.</li> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>noted that we have a Scheme for Financing Schoools and a Support and Challenge Framework. Schools previously had up to 5 years to come back into a cumulative financial balance however a revised scheme which was introduced in April 2019 reduced this to a maximum of 3 years. For those schools that are new to deficit, this shows that this scheme is working well. The LA is working closely with the 3 schools in the largest deficit which have a different set of circumstances linked to things like pupil numbers.</li> <li>PM asked the role of schools forum in monitoring this information. CE</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team</li> <li>AJ noted that the system works really well when the school is not in a structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>	responsibility of the school and their governing body to manage the	
<ul> <li>structural deficit.</li> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>	• JW noted that the LA is both challenging and supportive of schools in deficit and that they are very fortunate to have this support. Thanks was issued to the team	
<ul> <li>In year monitoring has now commenced</li> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Schools balances are expected to be heavily impacted by cost of Covid-19. Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.</li> <li>Schools were given the opportunity to apply for grant funding to cover</li> </ul>		
	Schools completing Covid-19 tracker identified an estimated £0.800m+ impact.	

	out with a total of CO 000m haing allocated. Orant and ditiona discussed	
	out, with a total of £0.082m being allocated. Grant conditions discussed. Eligibility criteria was less favourable	
	<ul> <li>DB noted there is a potential impact on this year as well as future years</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>High Needs current forecast for High Needs spend is an in-year pressure of</li> </ul>	
	£2.470m, with a cumulative pressure of £7.015m when combined with the	
	balance brought forward of £4.545m. It has been confirmed that we don't	
	need to submit a recovery plan but we do need to start looking towards	
	one.	
	Early Years Forecast – predicting to remain on budget     Crowth Deliver – The DfF established essentiate Crowth Fund in 2010/20	
	<ul> <li>Growth Policy – The DfE established a separate Growth Fund in 2019/20. This fund wasn't used for Growth and was therefore added to the remaining</li> </ul>	
	balances to be redistributed to Schools. When setting the 2020/21	
	allocation, Forum agreed to retain £0.250m of the £0.750m Growth Fund	
	on the understanding that a Growth Fund Policy was developed	
	<ul> <li>Draft Policy circulated as appendix A of this report. This draft policy is to be</li> </ul>	
	reviewed by the finance sub-group they can work with officers to review,	
	update and present a final draft for forum's approval at the next forum	
	meeting.	
	CE asked Forum for any comments to be considered by Finance Sub Group	
	Discussion followed around:	
	Recommendations	
	Schools Forum is asked to:	
	1. acknowledge the 2019/20 outturn position on all DSG balance;	
	Noted	
	2. acknowledge the school budget plans overall summary position and the	
	Deficit Schools positions for both 2019/20 and 2020/2;	
	Noted	
	<ol> <li>acknowledge the forecasts for DSG positions in 2020/21 and the likely impact of Covid-19 on school balances; and</li> </ol>	
	Noted	
	4. Agree the approach to approve the growth policy which can then be	
	used in 2020/21 to allocate funding to schools impacted by basic need	
	growth in year.	
	Agreed	
	c) Growth Fund Claire Emmerson	
	CE talked through the draft policy under item 6.2b. Any comments to be	
	forwarded to CE	
6.3	Falling Roll & Headroom Sub-Group Proposal       Christina Ponting	
	CP and CE talked through the briefing paper that has been drafted on behalf of	
	Sub-Group. Main points to note as follows:	
	Reminder of the action delegated to the sub-group and the background was	
	provided	
	Lengthy and robust debate was carried out by sub-group	

•	The Sub-Group met virtually on 8 July 2020 and agreed Falling Roll would	
	be considered first and only then would Support for Schools in Financial	
	Difficulty / Deficit applications be considered.	
•	Where members of the Sub-Group also represented a School who was	
	eligible for either Falling Roll or Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty /	
	Deficit a declaration of interest was noted, and those members were	
	excluded / removed from discussions / decisions.	
•	Sub-Group were asked if they wished to review the application criteria for	
	Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit and decided that the	
	criteria would remain as previously agreed for the recommendations they	
	were currently making but they would make a further recommendation to	
	Schools Forum which is noted later in the report.	
•	Falling Roll	
	<ul> <li>5 falling roll applications were submitted by the LA. Breakdown of</li> </ul>	
	the funding allocation for these 5 schools was shown in Table 1	
•	Schools in financial difficulty	
	<ul> <li>All deficit Schools were asked to submit a Support for Schools in Einensial Difficulty (Deficit application, including these who foll         </li> </ul>	
	Financial Difficulty / Deficit application, including those who fell outside of the existing criteria.	
	Describle show use to entering users discussed but Out. One was shown a	
	<ul> <li>Possible changes to criteria were discussed but Sub-Group agreed to work towards existing criteria</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Approx. 11 schools applied. Sub-Group agreed that only 3 schools</li> </ul>	
	were eligible.	
	<ul> <li>Each Head Teacher was asked to come in to discuss their</li> </ul>	
	application and the recommendations of the sub-group were shown	
	in Table 2	
•	Remaining balances were discussed as noted in Appendix B	
•	To allocate funds outside of the criteria or for another purpose would result	
	in the Sub-Group operating outside of the remit it had been set. Although	
	the group expressed that a reviewing of the criteria, particularly to support	
	those Schools who had gone into deficit in-year and who if they received	
	funds via the Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit would no longer be a	
	deficit school.	
Discus	ssion followed around:	
•	Falling Roll Criteria – CE noted that falling rolls can only be allocated once.	
-	Whilst they may experience issues in the following year, they can't apply	
	again	
•	Schools in financial difficulty – PG noted that 3 other schools didn't fit the	
	schools in financial difficulty criteria and we were carrying money forward	
	that could help those schools which is why a review of the criteria has been	
	brought to the Forum	
•	MASH post – Historically agreed to fund this post. Decision to be reached	
	at the November meeting if this is to continue	
•	Estimates for Special leave – CP noted that this is difficult to predict.	
	Overall both the number of claims and the value of claims are slightly less	
	but not significantly less. Increased the value to 6% and agreed that the	
	value will also have an inflationary increase in future years. Estimate that	
	the shortfall should reduce. It was noted that it seems to go in 3 years cycle	
	based on trend analysis. Awaiting data for this year on claims and pay	
	award. Grants previously used to offset this will not be used going forward.	

CO	eached 83% in 2019/20. Likely that going forward schools would ontinue not to receive a full-refund as it was 88% in 18/19, but this will be opt under review. Separate report to be circulated as noted earlier	
Schools	nendations Forum having read this report, clearly understand the information and having asked sufficient questions to ensure clarity:	
wi	ote the contents of this report including the funding overview provided thin the report and in summary at Appendix B. oted	
	ng Roll and Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit as noted oposals section of this report, Schools Forum are asked to:	
a.	atify the recommendation of their Sub-Group to: allocate both Falling Roll and Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit funding as noted to those qualifying Schools. <b>Agreed</b> require Schools allocated funds via Support for Schools in Financial	
D.	<ul> <li>Difficulty / Deficit to operate within conditions requiring School to:</li> <li>i. continue to operate within their approved deficit and reduce in- year deficit (before any funding allocation) by a set % per annum, e.g. 25%;</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>have a clear plan of continued deficit reduction resulting in the school being out of in-year deficit within no more than three (3) years following allocation of Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit funds; and exclusion from making any further application to Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit whilst the school remain in deficit;</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>iii. not return to / seek deficit approval once out of in-year deficit for a further 3 year period thereafter. c) carry forward remaining Falling Roll funds from 2019/20 – minus the Academy refund and the £50,000 retention into 2020/21 Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit budget.</li> </ul>	
3. Co	Agreed onfirm Schools Forum require their Sub-Group (pending confirmation	
of	deficit schools at financial year end 2020/21): to allocate funds within the parameters / practice agreed by Schools Forum to those schools who qualify to apply within the financial year ending 31 March 2021, <b>Agreed</b>	
b.	require Head teachers making an application for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit funding to present to the Sub-Group using a standard report template, and Agreed	
C.	<ul> <li>continue to require:</li> <li>all new schools making an application for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit to show an improved in-year deficit position/ plan to return to in-year balance within a 3 year period;</li> <li>those schools in deficit prior to 31 March 2018 to show an improved in-year deficit position / plan to return to in-year</li> </ul>	

	balance within a period agreed with the Local Authority on an individual school basis.
	Agreed
4.	Schools Forum to receive a report in July 2021 from their Sub-Group to confirm:
	a. a review of the Falling Roll eligibility has taken place;
	<ul> <li>b. where no School is eligible for Falling Roll to refund Academies; and if funds remain</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>c. transfer remaining funds from Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty/Deficit (ensuring a carried forward £50,000 balance remains) into Falling Roll;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>d. Sub-Group has received applications for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit and for those Schools meeting the criteria recommend allocations;</li> </ul>
	e. remaining funds from Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty/Deficit for 2020/21 be carried forward to 2021/22 (if the Sub- Group recommended this) and for Sub-Group to note their
	recommendations for this;
	<ul> <li>f. the request of Sub-Group to Schools Forum for ratification of their decision.</li> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>
	Ayideu
Finan	ne wider use of funds currently allocated to Support for Schools in icial Difficulty/ Deficit as noted in the Further Considerations section of this t, Schools Forum are asked to:
5.	Determine if they wish their Sub-Group to review the current eligibility criteria for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit to see if the current criteria can be broadened / updated to provide support for schools who are new to deficit including those who become a deficit school in year, or those schools who are predicting a deficit longer than year 3 timeframe, but who are able to demonstrate a return to in-year balance within a reasonable time frame, or those schools who have already been in receipt of funds from the Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit budget in previous years.
	criteria for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit to see if the current criteria can be broadened / updated to provide support for schools who are new to deficit including those who become a deficit school in year, or those schools who are predicting a deficit longer than year 3 timeframe, but who are able to demonstrate a return to in-year balance within a reasonable time frame, or those schools who have already been in receipt of funds from the Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit budget in previous years.
6. Only	criteria for Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit to see if the current criteria can be broadened / updated to provide support for schools who are new to deficit including those who become a deficit school in year, or those schools who are predicting a deficit longer than year 3 timeframe, but who are able to demonstrate a return to in-year balance within a reasonable time frame, or those schools who have already been in receipt of funds from the Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty / Deficit budget in previous years. <b>Agreed</b> Look to ensure that funds are allocated in year and where this is not possible due to schools eligibility a residual balance is held which could be risk assessed to address future need for schools based on data / trend analysis. <b>Deferred</b> following the actions noted in 5 and 6 above, would allocating funds to obly that were not a School in Financial Difficulty / Deficit be considered, for

	0.	were not in Financial Difficulty / shortfall for eligible schools only	s that would benefit / support schools that ' Deficit, e.g. refund of special leave y – this would exclude this Schools who cial Leave SLA or who were a Nursery, chool.
6.4		Inclusion Strategy	Mark Mirfin / Kevin Burns
6.4		Iked through the presentation or Introductions carried out Impact of Covid has impacted or Iaunch Passion. Purpose and pledges s Multi Agency policy Principles and Practice Standard Impact of Covid 19 discussed Extended provision at Beacon H Redesigning Southlands Developing a suite of performand Multi agency pilot group has dev as a response to Covid-19 Reviewed the SEND Support Set Key priorities shown on screen a o Right support at the right o Needs are changing – pla o Access is simple o Develop a shared offer o Be ready for next stage o 1800 children with EHCPs Finalised more plans than any of Timeliness has improved from 3 ARPS: o Historically had infilled pla o Looking at how ARPS car resulted in increasing the demands on specialist pro o Increasing numbers of ch ASD Next steps for ARPs: o Need to reduce the numb o Need to develop enhance Consultation to be launched. Ur	a screen. Main points to note as follows: a timescales so now looking at Jan 21 hared on screen Is shown on screen ill, Silverdale and Moorbridge ce indicators eloped resources focused on mental health ervice is follows time an for this f education/employment and everyday life ther LA in England 1% to 67% aces in be used. Flexibility in some schools numbers of children in their care, reducing poision ildren with needs related to SEMH and ther of funded unfilled places from sept 2021
	•	Overview of timeline provided SEND Governance Structure was on screen	is revised in Sept 2019. Overview shown mary and Secondary on to the SEND ery board
	Discus	ssion followed around:	

	• DB thanked MM for the presentation and urged that we stick to the timeline and allow Schools Forum to support them in doing that.	
	<ul> <li>DB requested a role description to assist in identifying potential members of the role want groups</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>the relevant groups</li> <li><u>ACTION</u>: MM to send to MN for circulation</li> </ul>	ММ
	<ul> <li>SB confirmed that he is happy to join the SEND Strategic Board. MM to</li> </ul>	
	liaise with SB	
6.5	Meeting Dates for 2020/21	
	Proposed dates circulated.	
	Additional meeting to be scheduled in October	
6.6	Forward Plan – review for 20/21 Academic Year	
	<ul> <li>Forward plan attached on page 3 of the agenda with updated dates.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Any comments to be forwarded to CP</li> <li>DBa queried where the changes at QA would be discussed. ML</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>DBa queried where the changes at QA would be discussed. ML confirmed that ML and Diane Buckle are liaising with TyneCoast and</li> </ul>	
	our Cabinet Member to look at what the post 16 provision will look like	
	and that this is likely to be discussed at the November meeting of	
	Schools Forum	
7.	Any Other Business	
7.1	De-delegated / Centrally Retained Services – Proposed October meeting	
	CE noted that the outline settlement for Central Schools Services Block and	
	the De-Delegated Items also need to be reviewed as part of the budget	
	setting process	
	Timeline discussed	
	DB proposed that this be added to the agenda for the November meeting	
	Other Items	
	DBa noted that SF works very closely with NTC and in past years we have	
	had training on budgets and requested CE update Schools Forum on the overall budget.	
	• CE noted that the LA is facing challenging times ahead. The Authority does	
	monthly returns to government on Covid-19 pressures. The current gap is	
	estimated at £12.5m. Nothing concrete that cen be shared at this point in time. There is a lot of uncertainty as to what the gap could potentially look	
	like. Report going to Cabinet in November.	
	• <u>ACTION</u> : CE to bring an update back to Forum after that.	CE
	DB thanked all for the work carried out during difficult times	
8.	Annual Update – Redundancy Costs (Schools) - CONFIDENTIAL	
	CP talked through the confidential briefing paper. Main points to note as follows:	
	All recommendations shown in the report were agreed by Schools Forum	
	Data of payt meeting	
9.	Date of next meeting           Additional meeting - Thursday 1 October 2020 at 12:30pm	
	Next regular meeting - Wednesday 11 November 2020 at 12:30pm	