



North Tyneside Council

Minutes

Meeting Schools Forum **Date** Wednesday 24 November 2021

Location Via Microsoft Teams

Present

✓ Present
D Deputy
A Apologies
O Absent

Name	Organisation	Representing	22.09.21	24.11.21
Andrew James	St Aidan's Primary	Primary	✓	D - Rob Harker
Angi Gibson	Hadrian Park Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Candida Mellor	Trade Unions	Trade Unions	Suzette Thompson	✓
Collen Ward	Coquet Park First School	Primary	✓	✓
David Bavaird	Norham High School	Governor - Secondary	✓	✓
David Watson	St Thomas More	RC Schools	✓	✓
Finn Wilcock	Southridge First School	Primary	N/A	✓
Gavin Storey	Cullercoats Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Jill Wraith	Benton Dene Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Joanne Thompson	Holystone Out of School	Early Years PVI	O	✓
John Croft	Sir James Knott	Nursery	✓	✓
John Newport	Marden Bridge Middle School	Middle	✓	✓
Karen Croskery	North Tyneside Student Support Service	PRU	✓	✓
Kelly Holbrook	Longbenton High School	Secondary	✓	✓
Kerry Lillico	Grasmere Academy	Academy	A	✓
Laura Baggett	Monkhouse Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Marie Flatman	Tyne Met	16-19 Provider	A	✓
Louise Bradford	Diocese	C of E Diocese	Vacancy	✓
Matt Snape	Marden High School	Secondary	✓	✓
Michael Young	Spring Gardens Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Paul Mitchell	Whitley Bay High School	Governor – Secondary	✓	Vacancy
Paul Johnson	Churchill Community College	Secondary	✓	✓
Peter Gannon	Silverdale School	Special	✓	✓
Peter Thorp	Redesdale Primary	Governor - Primary	✓	✓
Philip Sanderson	Kings Priory	Academy	✓	✓
Stephen Baines	Holystone Primary	Primary	✓	✓
Stephen Easton	Marine Park First School	First	✓	A – stood down
Steve Wilson	Whitley Bay High School	High	A	✓
<u>In Attendance:</u>				
Mark Longstaff	Director of Commissioning & Asset Management	NTC	✓ * Part meeting	✓
Claire Emmerson	Senior Manager - Finance Strategy & Planning	NTC	✓	D - Janice Gillespie
Noel Kay	Senior Business Partner, Finance	NTC	N/A	✓

Diane Thompson	Finance	ENGIE	✓	✓
Susan Smiles	Finance	ENGIE	N/A	✓
Christina Ponting	Senior Manager - Schools HR	ENGIE/NTC	✓	✓
Mary Nergaard	PA to Director of Commissioning & Asset Management	NTC	✓	A
Fiona Lucas	Project Support Officer <i>minute taker</i>	NTC	N/A	✓
Diane Buckle	Assistant Director for Education	NTC	✓	O
Kevin Burns	Senior School Improvement Officer (Vulnerable Learners)	NTC	✓	✓
Mark Taylor	Strategic Commissioning Manager	NTC	✓	✓

Item		Action
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	See table above	
2.	Attendance Register / Membership	
	<p>CP provided an overview of the changes to the current membership as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise Bradford is the new representative for the CofE Diocese • Stephen Easton has stood down and will be replaced by Finn Wilcock • Inductions have been carried out • Carrying one vacancy for a Secondary Governor • Four terms have been renewed (Andrew James, Paul Johnson, Colleen Ward and Matt Snape) • Candy Mellor had returned as the Trade Unions representative • 7 terms due to end in the next 3 months. <p>ACTION: CP to liaise with these members on their future plans and fill any vacancies if applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Baines raised the query that if there was a change in localities that this would affect the Schools Forum Membership. Gavin Storey confirmed that this would be maintained until September 2022 until the central belt comes in. CP agreed that a review / change to the constitution could be looked at if required. 	CP
3.	Public Meeting / Observers	
	The Chair welcomed the public to the meeting.	
4.	Declaration of Interest	
	There were no declarations of interest.	
5.	Minutes of the last meeting	
	<p>Minutes agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>A message was received that Tim Jones (TJ) is no longer the Headteacher at Langley First School. CP confirmed that TJ had stepped down from Schools Forum and that she would amend the minutes.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: MN confirmed that TJ has already been removed from the membership distribution list and from the notes template as of the date of this meeting. The reference in the minutes of the last meeting was linked to his attendance in July 2021, before he stepped down.</p>	

6.	Matters Arising	
	Page 8, Item 7 – Catering SLAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark Longstaff confirmed that the response has been sent to the respective Headteacher. 	
6.1	Finance Update Janice Gillespie	
	<p>JG talked through the presentation on screen. Main points to note as follows:</p> <p>a) Financial Update 2021/22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Finances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pressure of £3.902m after first monitoring £2.091m better than budgeted Improvement in Schools in Deficit of £0.909m Issues with identifying funding means some schools forecast at budget until resolved High Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecast pressure of £12.641m Caused by increasing numbers of plans and placements Early Years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In year forecast on target CSSB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact dealt with within NTC overall budget forecast position Deficit Schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some significant movements in the right direction <p>Schools Forum is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note the forecast positions on all DSG blocks; Thank schools for work done to reduce overall school block pressure to date Continue to support LA plans to recover High Needs position <p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>b) Dedicated Schools Grant Indicative Values 2022/23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of the DSG Indicative values for 2022/23 was shown on screen (Table 1 of the report) Overview of the indicative school block funding was shown on screen. This is based on the October 2020 census information, using planned rates The key aspects of the formula for 2022/23 are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum per pupil funding levels will be set at Primary £4,265, Key Stage 3 £5,321 and Key Stage 4 £5,831 Funding floor will be set at 2% per pupil Schools that are attracting their core NFF allocations will benefit from an average increase of 3% to the formula's core factors Growth funding will be based on the same methodology as in 2021/22 No authority will lose more than 0.5% of its 2021/22 Schools block allocation. Two important restrictions will continue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local authorities will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee in the LFF, which in 2022/23 must be between +0.5% and +2.00%. 	

- Local authorities can only transfer up to 0.5% of their Schools block to other blocks of the DSG, with their Schools Forum approval.
- **High Needs**
 - 43% increase in funding since 2017/18 (expected 54% for 2022/23)
 - Costs risen by 62% in same period
 - Internal recharging rates not changed for over 10 years; cost rise driven by volume increases
 - Table 3 of the report was shown on screen which outlines the indicative value of the High Needs block in 2021/22 based on static rolls
 - Chart 1 of the report illustrates costs vs funding
- **Central Schools Services Block**
 - 2021/22 decreased by £0.174m, met from de-delegation allocated for headroom
 - 2022/23 decrease by further £0.150m
 - Need to consider which areas to reduce funding
 - Also need to consider alternative funding arrangements where services are valued, for example High Borran will be 100% funded by per pupil charges
 - The relevant services will be reporting back to Forum in January 2022 to ratify these changes and to agree any services, including additional functions, to be funded by de-delegation
 - Decision required for January 2022.

Discussion followed around:

- Peter Gannon reported that the outcome of the CSSB sub-group, who were meeting on where the £174k would be cut from, could be provided at the January meeting.
- **ACTION: JG to pick this up outside of the meeting and a note to be circulated to Forum by 26th November 2021.**

JG

Schools Forum is asked to:

- Note the update on indicative allocations for each of the four DSG funding blocks;
Noted
- School Forum finance sub-group to work with LA colleagues on CSSB reduction issues
Forum agreed

c) Local Funding Formula 2022/23 Consultation Results

- The Authority asked schools to consider the impact of the following questions:
 1. Do schools agree to continue to use factors in line with NFF, funding permitting?
 2. Do schools agree to allow the Authority to set a minimum funding guarantee and capping based on affordability?
 3. Do schools support a 0.5% transfer from School's block to High Needs block?
- School Forum are asked to consider feedback and advise the LA. LA must take advice and provide evidence unless it intends to challenge decision via Department for Education

- Summary of the Information provided to schools on 0.5% Transfer was shown on screen
 - Based on indicative funding allocation, this model is affordable at +0.64% MFG (within the allowable range of +0.5% to +2%)
 - 19 Schools will have no impact due to MPPF.
 - MPPF triggered by:
 - Lump sum is a large % of funding
 - Low deprivation
 - NFF impact on phase ratios
 - Potential 0.5% transfer
 - Minimum per Pupil Funding (MPPF) Rates:
 - First/Primary (£4,265),
 - Middle-Deemed-Secondary (£4,793),
 - Secondary (£5,525),
 - High (£5,661),
 - All-through (£4,790)
 - High Needs increase 7.75%
 - Overview of what this looks like for impacted schools was shown on screen
 - Minimum deduction 0.3%, £2k
 - Maximum Deduction 0.93%, £72k
 - All schools will receive at least 0.51% increase assuming schools block transfer
 - Maximum increase after transfer 6.34% (impacted by removing capping applied in 2021/22)
 - Information provided on the proposed use of the 0.5% transfer was shown on screen
- Consultation Results:**
- 26 schools responded (37%) which is a reduction from 68% in 2019 and 54% in 2020
 - Responses were received from 20 Head Teachers, 11 Governors / Governing Bodies and 9 leadership figures
 - Engagement lower than expected
 - Majority schools agree to stay with NFF factors and rates (92%)
 - 77% of schools agree for the LA to set Minimum Funding Guarantee based on affordability
 - Schools recommend use of deprivation factors for any surplus allocation (will be subject to APT accessibility)
 - There was no overall agreement on the 0.5% transfer with the majority schools disagreeing with the LA's request to transfer funding to High Needs
 - 92% of schools cited two main reasons for their responses, based on either the lack of clarity in the plans for using the funding or the impact deducting this funding has on already tight school balances
 - Evidence or confidence in plans, need for more information or clarity and existing priorities on school money are strong messages.
 - Schools mentioned delaying decision until:
 - Plans deliver required clarity
 - OFSTED inspection is completed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any planned transfer would need to meet DfE/ESFA requirements before being ratified, especially if sought against advice of Schools Forum <p>Discussion followed around the 0.5% school block funding transfer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Steve Wilson) Forum needs to be careful on how any funds should be distributed and the 37% return rate is disappointing. (Michael Young) information was sent to Headteachers to be passed to Chairs of Governors and some Chairs of Governors do not think that this is a good method of communication. Some Chairs of Governors would like the information sent directly to them. Emails regarding the MFG insulating schools against the block transfer and the MFG hasn't been agreed yet. Transferring 0.5% to have a function which accelerates this process will just create more issues in schools with bodies of 10 hours. Schools are struggling with the amount of 10 hours they can provide. Investing in a project (similar to what Peter Gannon's school does to support schools with challenging pupils) would be more beneficial. What would happen to the block transfer for his school of £7.5k does that include the increased amount provided created by schools protected by the MFG if they wouldn't pay anything where would the additional funds come from? <u>ACTION:</u> JG to provide a response after the meeting. (Gavin Storey) the exact figure on how the high needs block would be increased was not provided. Queries on the SEN side, as classed as an all in one offer, but there wasn't an option of the schools' support team. (Peter Gannon) if Forum decided to look again at this and not make a decision today when is the last point that a decision needs to be made. JG confirmed that a report goes back to Cabinet at the end of January and therefore at the January 2022 meeting there needs to be an agreement. (Angi Gibson) do we have a breakdown of % of schools who returned the survey in each area? <u>ACTION:</u> JG confirmed that this information could be obtained and provided after the meeting. (David Watson) – the Authority have had plenty of time to explain their reasons for the transfer and the time for the consultation was before the plan was brought to Schools Forum. The DSG was to be shared with Members of Forum and this hasn't been done. The schools funding settlement will have to pay for any increase in salaries, there will be no separate pay grant, therefore taking any money from schools' block is a concern. Pressures of gas and electricity price increases is also a worry. The Government are recognising that by indicating the 7.4% increase in high needs they are not expecting the LA to make the 0.5% transfer this year (paper circulated yesterday). Forum should decide today and it would not be to agree to a transfer. (David Bavaird) disagreed with this suggestion and felt that more work should be provided before making a decision. If time allows, we should look at the aspects again and decide in January. A small task and finish group could be set up and report back to Schools Forum as this is a huge decision which affects so many schools. (Philip Sanderson) confirmed that he did do a return to the consultation but it says on the presentation that his school didn't send one. How can Forum have confidence that all schools received the online submission? There is 	<p>JG</p> <p>JG</p>
--	---	---------------------

	<p>a significant impact to all schools to any of these decisions made by Schools Forum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter Gannon recommended that JG updates the slides to show a list of the schools that did respond as well as showing the pie chart. Therefore, schools would have confidence that their input has been included. <u>ACTION:</u> JG to amend the slides and circulate to the group after the meeting. (Michael Young) – Spring Gardens responded to the consultation, as part of the collaborative group, so if this is only recorded as one response this would affect the numbers. MY asked how can we assure schools they won't be impacted by the MFG as we haven't approved the MFG yet? <p><i>Janice Gillespie left the meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Steve Wilson) queried where the decision about whether we go to deprivation or age rated pupil unit fitted within those votes. <u>ACTION:</u> PG to follow up with JG on his question outlined above. <p>Recommendations: Schools Forum is asked to consider the results of the consultation with schools, and vote on the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to continue to use factors in line with NFF, funding permitting Forum agreed – 16 votes for, 0 votes against Agree to allow the Authority to set a minimum funding guarantee and capping based on affordability Forum agreed – 17 votes for, 0 votes against Consider the response to the request to transfer 0.5% School block funding to High Needs and either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support a 0.5% transfer from the Schools block to High Needs block to fund the projects outlined by SEND/SST services 0 votes for, 18 votes against b) Support delaying the decision until January 2022 and allow the LA to provide more information and come up with a better plan on the 0.5% transfer 2 votes for c) Not support any transfer of funds from Schools Block to High Needs Block 14 votes against 	<p>JG</p> <p>PG/JG</p>
6.2	Review of Schools Forum Membership	Christina Ponting
	<p>CP talked through the report. Main points to note as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the last Schools Forum it was noted that due to a status change of a number of Schools (from Voluntary Aided/Maintained School to Academy) in August 2021 and further changes being planned to take place in October 2021 and April 2022, Schools Forum needed to review its membership to determine if there was a need for any changes Schools Forum last reviewed its membership, in January 2018 At that time it was decided there was no need to add additional Academy representatives to Schools Forum as the number of pupils affected was a relatively small number 	

- Table 1 of the report notes the information that was presented to Schools Forum at that time, with a correction to the Academy number of Schools Forum representatives being noted as 2 and not 3 as referenced in Table 1 of the report
- Schools Forum will be aware that post holders are not in the role to represent their individual school or organisation, but to represent their sector or locality
- The change of the status of a number of Primary Schools to join the Bishop Berwick Catholic Education Academy Trust (BBCET) will result in a number of pupils (2,148) being accounted for in an Academy School
- This will result in 13 Academy Schools in North Tyneside by April 2022
- It is therefore proposed to increase its overall membership numbers from 27 to 29, allocating 2 additional representative roles to 'Other School Members – Non Locality Based'. Thereby, increasing the Academy representative roles from 2 to 4
- Table 2 of the report outlines the information on the pupil numbers on the same basis as data was presented / considered in 2018
- The proposed changes to the current membership of Schools Forum to accommodate 2 additional 'Other School Members – Non Locality Based' are noted/ highlighted in Appendix B of the report

Discussion followed around:

- (Paul Johnson) would it mean that some schools were doubly represented if academies hold additional seats in their locality. CP confirmed that individuals holding a locality seat would be representing their locality and not their individual school and it was up to the locality to decide who their representative was to be.
- (Michael Young) does it mean that the areas that previously represented the primaries, and are now part of academies, would lose seats. CP reported that no they would still have their seats as the recommendation to Schools Forum was for increasing their membership, not losing them.
- (Philip Sanderson) – could CP advise how current academy representatives are appointed and if a large number of the catholic schools haven't converted yet how can they be included. CP confirmed that only a small number of catholic schools are yet to convert.

Recommendations:

Schools Forum having read this report and clearly understanding the information provided consider this report and note the following:

- Members are asked to consider the proposal noted and to reach agreement on the recommendation of increasing the 'Other School Members – Not locality based' by 2 to accommodate the addition of new Academy representative roles onto Schools Forum.
- If Schools Forum members agree with the recommendation contained within this report, the updated membership would replace the current membership and new Academy members would be expected to join School Forum and attend from the next available meeting (12th January 2022).
- It is up to the Academy schools to come together and decide how they wish to appoint. New members will be offered support in their role with an Induction/Update session (in line with support offered to all Schools Forum

	<p>members) which ideally can take place before the next meeting in January 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The membership of Schools Forum will be kept under review; so that roles on Schools Forum remain representatives of the category/ type of School operating within the North Tyneside Council area and in accordance with the ESFA Good Practice Guidance for Schools Forums. • Forum agreed 	
6.3	<p>Schools Forum Constitution and Action Plan Review Christina Ponting</p> <p>CP talked through the report on the review of the Constitution and the Self-Assessment. Main points to note as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North Tyneside Schools Forum Constitution and Self-Assessment has been reviewed in line with updated ESFA advice and guidance as at 11th November 2021 • There are no material changes needed to either document. • Changes that are needed are noted via tracked changes in the documents appended to the reports for ease of reference for members. • Members were asked to consider if meetings were to continue virtually as the current recommendation they had in place on this comes to an end in December 2021. <p>Discussion followed around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (David Bavaird) can you have some people attending the meeting in person and some people joining virtually? PG reported that it is either or as currently the technology was not available to support both options. • CP confirmed that the Membership in the 2021 constitution reflects the decision made at today's meeting, but asked for Schools Forum to agree to update the membership to reflect the decision made in 6.2 to present the updated membership numbers. • CP reminded colleagues that they are a locality representative. CP has created a document which puts all of the schools and geographical area in one document to support members in their role and will arrange for this to be sent to members. <p>Recommendations: Schools Forum having read this report and clearly understanding the information provided consider this report and note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Members want to continue to have the meetings virtually or face to face meetings at Langdale. Forum agreed to continue to meet virtually over the following year– 17 votes for. • Members are asked to consider the changes to the document and to confirm if they are clear on the changes and if they are happy for the document to be updated a noted. • If Schools Forum members are in agreement the updated document would replace the current document provided to members and noted on the Schools Forum website. • The North Tyneside Schools Forum Constitution will be reviewed again in September 2022 or asap thereafter once ESFA guidance is updated/ provided. Forum agreed 	

6.4	Special Leave SLA Christina Ponting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update circulated via email before the meeting. • Further updates will be provided at the January Forum meeting. • Forum noted the information provided by CP 	
6.5	Mash Update Christina Ponting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP outlined that in November 2018 an update was given on the MASH hub to confirm that a post could be established to support headteachers / a specific education post when Schools were having to refer to the front door or social care. • MASH is not a statutory role, but Schools Forum agreed to provide 50% of the funding for a dedicated Education post, taken from the DSG, to continue on a definite basis for all maintained schools. Other schools would be invoiced separately. • Forum asked at that time for an update on the role to be presented back to Forum in November 2021. As Julie Firth is unwell and unable to attend the Forum it was recommended that she provide information separately to Forum members (if possible) and attend the next Forum in January 2022 to provide an update at that meeting. • ACTION: Forum agreed for Julie Firth to attend the January meeting to provide the MASH update. 	CP/JF
7.	Any Other Business	
	<p>Self-assessment tool kit Christina Ponting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP reported that a self-assessment tool kit is prepared each year to support Forum to ensure that they are operating in line with ESFA good practice. • The self-assessment reflects that meetings can operate remotely and on support for governors and how they communicate. • Michael had raised the point earlier in the meeting on communicating with Governors. CP outlined that information is distributed to clerks of governors but there is not a central list to distribute to governors as not all schools use LA provided clerking services. • Chairs of Governors had previously asked to receive correspondence via their headteachers. • As part of the changes noted within the self-assessment, from January Head teachers are being asked to support wider Governor awareness by asking / offering for their finance lead and / or chair of governors to attend Schools Forum with them. <p>Discussion followed around the communication to Governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Peter Thorp) suggested to go back to Chairs of Governors on how they would like to be corresponded with. • (David Bavaird) suggested that an update is given at the regular training sessions for Governors at Langdale on the role of Schools Forum to support governor engagement. • (Michael Young) confirmed that he would be willing to be the Governor representative to attend the training on the role of Schools Forum and that Governors be asked to provide their email address so they can receive any communication. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Peter Thorp) queried if all Chairs of Governors receive a copy of the Schools Forum minutes. CP confirmed that Governors do not receive them directly but they are distributed out and Governors are asked to be made aware of them. • <u>ACTION:</u> CP to go out to Governors again to ask if they would consent to giving their email address to Forum Members and to facilitating wider support for Governor engagement. 	CP
8.	Date of next meeting	
	Wednesday, 12 January 2022 at 12:30pm, via Teams.	