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Apologies for Absence

Please remember to mute your microphone when you are not speaking.

Anyone attending Schools Forum as an observer must stay silent throughout the meeting.

The professional headteacher representatives for EPHA, ASHE or ESSET are observers unless they are substituting for a headteacher or governor who cannot attend. Whilst observing they can only ask a question via a Forum member.

To ask a question or to comment on a paper please use the raise hand function. If you cannot use this function, please use the meeting chat.

The meeting chat will also be used for voting purposes. Please type:

* Yes, if you agree the recommendation,
* No, if you do not agree the recommendation
* Abstain, if you do not wish to vote

The agenda and papers will not be shared on screen.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 2a** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE:** Early Years Funding – Alice Tickner

Please see separate PowerPoint presentation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 2b** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE:** Early Years Update

Report by: Early Years & Childcare Sufficiency & Sustainability

Contact details: carolyn.terry@essex.gov.uk

1. **Purpose of report**
	1. To update Forum on the forecast budget requirement for 2022/23 of the two, three & four year old Free Early Education Entitlement (FEEE), including the Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP)

1.2 To update Forum on the proposals to allocate £550,000 of the £3.1 million Early Years Block surplus balance.

1. **Recommendations**

2.1 That Forum notes the forecast outturn for 2022/23 at 5.1.

2.2 That Forum approves the recommendation of the Early Years Sub Group to agrees the proposal to allocate **£550,000** of the Early Years Block surplus balance at 5.3

1. **Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility**

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to Early Years which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s Schools forum powers and responsibilities published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| Early Years Funding Formula – Proposes and Decides | Must be consulted | Checks compliance with regulations. |
| Retained Expenditure - Proposes | Decides | Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree local authority proposal. |

1. **Background**

4.1 FEEE funding supports the statutory universal offer to all three- and four-year-olds and up to 40% of the least advantaged two-year-olds; these are children who meet predetermined eligibility criteria.

4.2 As reported in the September 2022 report: -

* Across Essex, currently 24.8% of all two-year-olds are eligible to access the FEEE funding.
* The take-up of the two-year-old FEEE during the Summer term 2022 was 3,209, which was 77.1% of the 4,164 eligible two-year-olds in the county. Although this take-up figure is down on the previous term of 82.7%, which is not unusual for the Summer term, but remains significantly higher than the national take up level for the Summer 2022 term of 61.8%.

	1. The take up of the universal three- and four-year-old FEEE at the Summer term 2022 headcount was 26,070, which is 93.4% of the eligible three- and four-year-olds. This is slightly lower than the previous term take up of 94.9%.
1. **Financial Implications**

5.1 Table 2 shows the latest forecast outturn for 2022/23 as at Period 7 (October 2022). The **£1.2 million** forecast underspend is due to the Authority’s forecast of children taking up the free early years entitlement being lower than the DfE’s forecast. The underspend has been moved to a contingency as it is likely to be clawed back by the DfE.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Budget£’000 | Forecast Outturn£’000 | Variance£’000 |
| 2 Year Olds | 9,825 | 9,825 | 0 |
| 3 & 4 Year Olds | 79,346 | 79,346 | 0 |
| Early Years SENCOs | 1,300 | 1,300 | 0 |
| EY Quadrant Teams | 766 | 759 | (7) |
| Quality & Improvement | 550 | 477 | (73) |
| Contingency | 0 | (1,153) | (1,153) |
| Education Service Recharge | 151 | 151 | 0 |
| Corporate Overheads | 401 | 401 | 0 |
| Total | **92,339** | **91,106** | **(1,233)** |

5.2 Table 3 shows the Early Years Block underspend total is currently **£3.1 million**, this paper sets out a proposal to allocate **£550,000** of this total, with options for the remaining balance to brought to the May 2023 meeting. If approved the remaining surplus balance will be **£2.6 million**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Early Years Block | £m |
| Opening balance 1st April 2022 | (2.5) |
| 2021/22 Adjustment – July 2022 | (2.6) |
| Revised 2021/22 Balance | **(5.1)** |
| Allocation to providers | 1.0 |
| Agreed Contingency | 1.0 |
| Revised Surplus Balance | **(3.1)** |

5.3 To support improved Early Intervention and Inclusion in Early Years Settings it is proposed to create **4 Early Years Early Intervention Partner full time posts** for a **time limited period of 24 months**. It is proposed that these posts will sit within the ECC Education, Early Years and Childcare Service, to support the Early Years sector with more accurate identification of need, early intervention and inclusion

5.3.1 As has previously been discussed with the Schools’ Forum meetings, Essex is currently experiencing a significant rise in emerging SEND needs for children in the early years. This is partly due to the impact of the COVID19 pandemic and setting closures, but also increasing financial and staffing pressures on early years settings causing reduced confidence and capacity to accurately identify and respond to emerging SEND needs.

This has been further exasperated by children who were unable to attend their early years setting during the pandemic who missed out on up to a third of their early learning and funded entitlement (source DFE research 2021).

It is [universally acknowledged](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/send-old-issues-new-issues-next-steps/send-old-issues-new-issues-next-steps) that the pandemic exacerbated the issues with the SEND system, but the current pressure and stresses on the Early Years sector is temporarily overinflating identified SEND needs amongst early years children further. For instance, some children are being incorrectly identified as having emerging SEND needs, whereas in fact these are more related to transient delays caused by the pandemic such as missing out on social interactions which, with the right level of support in place can be positively addressed without needing to access SEND services.

5.3.2 It is proposed that with the creation of four dedicated Early Years Early Intervention Partner posts, these posts will:

* Work in collaboration with both the existing ECC Education quadrant teams and partnership structures, with the quadrants continuing to hold the long-term relationships with early years settings. However, these posts will bring additional targeted capacity and understanding where settings are experiencing increasing SEND needs or the impact of Covid
* Upskill ECC Education quadrant teams in relation to the ongoing pressures facing the early years sector
* Support early years settings to accurately analyse needs within their cohort of children
* Develop identification and assessment skills of staff within the Early Years sector
* Support early years settings to shape early intervention approaches to directly respond to the needs of the children within their settings
* Model best practice approaches
* Sign-post early years settings to appropriate support and resources – at pre statutory levels
* Support early years settings to accurately identify and support those young children with emerging SEND needs
* Understand the underlying cause of the increase in presenting need (e.g., COVID or emerging SEND) so that the right support is available at the right time – linked to both the Early Years and Childcare Strategy and Early Years Childcare Sufficiency plan
* Connect early years settings with models of good practice
* Gather further insight into the pressures facing the early years settings to support any necessary development and design of services
* Support the implementation of the Balanced System, the Inclusion Framework and the Ordinarily Available model within the Early Years

5.3.3 The intended outcomes for young children and families, as a result of creating these posts are: -

* Increased confidence of early years settings in meeting the needs of the children in their local area / their setting.
* Increased confidence of early years settings that support and capacity is available to support them in upskilling and meeting children’s needs.
* Parents feel supported from the earliest opportunity, reducing the likelihood of complaints and appeals and the feeling of needing to ‘fight the system’.
* Increased parental confidence that the education system can meet their child’s needs, particularly mainstream education. In turn supporting working parents to be able to work.
* Reduction in applications to Essex Early Years Inclusion Grant funding.
* Reduction in EHCNA requests.
* Reduction in refusals to assess at age 3-4.
* Reduction in school deferrals.
* Fewer children ‘awaiting provision’ or EHE at age 4/5 – in turn supporting working families.
* Fewer children on reduced timetables at primary school – lessening the impact on working families.
* Levelling up – equitable offer for all children to access early education.
* Supporting improved connection between LA education teams (SEND) and the Early Years sector.
* Support the Early Years sector to better identify and respond to the specific needs of young children accessing their settings.
* Ensure needs are identified accurately at the earliest opportunity, avoiding further escalation.
* Starting the education journey well - ensuring families are supported in an informed, positive way about their child’s needs, early learning and the support available, to avoid a feeling of ‘needing to fight’. Linked to ‘Start Well, Live Well Local Children’s Partnership Board ambitions.
* Reduce the number of children ‘awaiting provision’, electively home educated or on a reduced timetable at Early Years and Primary age. Removing the burden placed on families, particularly working families, when their young children do not have a suitable full time education placement.

5.3.4 The total cost of the proposed 4 Early Years Early Intervention Partner full time posts, for a time limited period of 24 months, is £549,362. please see table 4 below for the breakdown of these costs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | £ |
| 4 posts salary, NI and pension costs for 2 years | 515,751 |
| New starter costs | 8,335 |
| Travel costs | 8,280 |
| Redundancy Costs | 16,996 |
| Total Cost | **549,362** |

5.3.5 This proposal has been shared with the Schools Forum Early Years and Childcare Reference Group, and they are in full support

1. **Schools Forum Early Years and Childcare Reference Group**

6.1 The Schools Forum Early Years and Childcare Reference Group has continued to meet during 2022, with ongoing representation from all early years’ sector types and each district.

6.2 The key areas of discussion have continued to be around the following areas: -

6.3 Members remain concerned on the increasing number of early years children with emerging additional needs that need more support, alongside concerns over the level of support the sector is receiving for children with SEND from ECC. This is borne out by the significant increase in applications to access the Early Years Inclusion funding leading to further budget needing to be added, for the last financial year, in response to the demand, alongside the increased waiting times for assessment by Health, such as speech and language therapists and paediatricians is further adding to these concerns.

6.4 ECC will be concluding a review into the SEN offer for early years and childcare providers during the Autumn 2022 term.

6.5 Financial pressures on the economy such as increases to the national minimum wage, NI contributions, utility, and food costs are causing sustainability concerns for the early years sector.

6.6 Recruitment and retention of qualified staff is continuing to be an increasing issue for the early years sector.

6.7 Future meetings have been scheduled to coincide with reporting to Schools Forum

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 3** |
| Date: 30th November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: Pupil place funding for the SEMH enhanced provisions**

Report by Ralph Holloway

Contact details: Telephone (03330 322691); e-mail: ralph.holloway@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

* 1. To seek Forum approval for an uplift of the funding for the SEMH enhanced provisions to reflect the increased costs to host schools.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 To approve the increase in the top-up funding paid to SEMH Enhanced Provisions at 5.1.

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to formula change which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools forum powers and responsibilities** published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| Proposes and decides | Must be consulted, voting restricted to School Members | Checks for Compliance with Regulations |

###### 4. Background

4.1 The SEMH enhanced provisions are for children and young people (CYP) who require more targeted support in relation to their social, emotional and mental health developmental needs and who are at risk of permanent exclusion and/or escalation to more specialist provision. All SEMH enhanced provisions are underpinned by Trauma Perceptive Practice (TPP) which is the Essex approach to understanding behaviour and supporting wellbeing. All SEMH enhanced provisions embed these values within their policies and practice. The establishment, purpose and operational procedures for the provisions are set out in appendix one.

4.2 The Essex enhanced SEMH provisions as a valuable and integral part of the Essex school landscape to support inclusion. This proposal seeks to:

* Ensure that all the provisions can operate with the appropriate and purposeful staffing structure to meet the needs of the children and young people;
* Provide greater stability of funding for CEOs, head teachers and the Trusts hosting the provisions negating the need to generate income from schools to supplement the core funding;
* Reduce ECC pressure to place pupils through the Individual Packages of Education Support (IPES) framework;

4.3 The SEMH enhanced provision will receive money for each commissioned place. The number of places is agreed with the provision in line with the physical capacity of the site to safely support the numbers of children with the appropriate ratio of adults.

4.4 The current funding being paid to schools was set in 2011 and has not been adjusted for the last 10 years. It is currently set at £19,952 for primary and £19,800 for secondary.

4.5 Pupils remain on roll of the referring school whilst attending the enhanced provision. At the moment the host school makes a nominal charge to the referring school (circa £300 per term) for the support. This payment is made to support additional aspects such as curriculum adjustments or therapy.

4.6 To date there have been no permanent exclusions of any pupil who has been reintegrated from an SEMH enhanced provision back into their original school or via a managed move to another mainstream or special school.

4.7 Where additional support is needed (generally counselling or therapeutic support) it is commissioned via the host school.

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 The proposal is to recognise the increase in staffing costs that has occurred over the past 11 years. This is the first increase in per place funding during this entire period. The increase suggested will be to £25,000 per place. The challenge for the provisions is that there are not the same savings in terms of economies of scale that can occur in the larger PRU and specialist provisions that ECC commission. The nominal charge made by host schools to referring schools would cease when the new funding is implemented.

5.2 The total increase across all the provisions per annum will be £502,106.

5.3 The impact of this decision on the high needs block surplus is shown in Table 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | £m |
| Opening Balance – 01/04/22 | (3.1) |
| Forecast Outturn 2022/23 | (8.3) |
| Forecast Balance – 31/03/23 | **(11.4)** |
| SEMH Funding | 0.5 |
| Revised Balance | **(10.9)** |

**6. Other Resource Implications**

6.1 There is a danger that the provisions will no longer be financially viable for

host school and thus no longer able to host the provisions for the number of children we currently commission them for. This in effect will mean that there will be a reduction in the number of children being supported. In these circumstances the LA anticipates an increase in permanent exclusions and placements in independent special schools at far greater cost.

6.2 A common theme from consultations and discussions is the struggle to recruit the support staff within the current financial envelope.

A consensus from the head teachers of the host schools was that there needs to be an acknowledgement through the pay offered that this is a more specialised role than the standard support staff. The job market is strong now, and it appears that without more financial incentive this situation will not change.

6.3 ECC and Schools Forum has invested in capital projects on some of the school sites in order to host these provisions. If we do not continue to invest through this revenue source there is a danger that the buildings might not be used for the intended purpose.

6.4 The current cost of a 38-week day placement in an independent special school is £55,000. The SEMH provisions have enabled ECC to keep the number of placements at key stage one and two to a minimum although numbers have risen in Mid Essex in the last year as places in the Essex SEMH special schools are more pressured. The DfE are delivering two new SEMH special schools in Chelmsford and Harlow which, in combination with the SEMH enhanced provisions, will reduce independent placements.

6.5 ECC’s financial forecasting gives us confidence that increased investment in the SEMH enhanced provisions can be sustained without placing financial pressure on the Schools Block. However, if the SEMH provisions were to close there will be significant additional pressure on places in Essex PRUs, Essex maintained SEMH special schools and independent special school provision.

**7.**  **Consultation with stakeholders**

7.1 The development of this proposal has been made in partnership with the following partners:

* CEO and the Business Manager of Learning Pathways Trust;
* CEO and the Business Manager of Hearts Academy;
* CEO of the Sigma Trust;
* Assistant CEO and Finance Cluster lead for Burnt Mills Academy Trust.

**8. Purpose of** **the provision and outcomes sought**

8.1 The primary purpose of the provisions is to:

* Enable Essex pupils to be educated in their local community within a mainstream setting;
* Increase the capacity of Essex schools to successfully meet the needs of pupils with SEMH and to enable them to fulfil their academic potential;
* Prepare pupils with SEMH to successfully transfer to Essex mainstream secondary school provision;
* Support pupils to become more emotionally literate, more self-aware and to be able to self-regulate;
* Reduce the level of permanent exclusions from Essex schools;
* Reduce the number of pupils educated in out of Authority independent school provision;
* Improve parental confidence in the continuum of provision available within Essex and thus increase parental choice;
* Support pupils to reintegrate successfully back into the referring school;
* Empower parents to have greater involvement in their children’s education and to develop their capacity to support their child’s development and progress;
* Promote inclusion in Essex schools by increasing resilience in schools and thus enabling them to meet the challenges of pupils with SEMH.

8.2 The provisions will be measured against the following outcomes/success criteria:

* Reduction in the breakdown of places for pupils with SEMH transitioning from KS2 to 3 following a referral in the provision;
* Reduced numbers of primary and secondary permanent exclusions, particularly in years 7 and 8;
* Reduced numbers of pupils with SEMH requiring a referral to an independent special school;
* Reduced spend on independent special school places for pupils with SEMH;
* Successful reintegration of referred pupils to their home school;
* Reduction in the number of pupils requiring an SEMH special school place;
* Reduction in the number of pupils requiring an EHCP for SEMH;
* Successful individual outcomes for referred pupils.

**9. Background / Supporting papers.**

* Service Level Agreement (draft for agreement with providers)
* Operational Standards (draft for agreement with providers)
* Primary Commissioned Provisions (see Table 3 below)
* Secondary Commissioned Provisions (see Table 4 below)

Table 3 – Primary Commissioned Provision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provision | Host school | Quadrant  |  No. of places commissioned |
| GROW Braintree  | Lyons Hall Primary | Mid  | 4 |
| GROW Chelmsford  | Newlands Spring Primary | Mid | 8 |
| GROW Clacton | White Hall Academy | North-East | 10 |
| GROW Colchester (North) | Braiswick Primary | North-East | 4 |
| GROW Colchester (South) | Monkwick Juniors | North-East | 6 |
| Atrium | Briscoes Primary, Basildon | South | 8 |
| Restart | Canvey Island Junior, Canvey Island | South | 4 |
| The Arc  | Ghyllgrove Primary, Basildon | South | 5 |
| Acorn | Lambourne Primary, Abridge | West | 5 |
| GROW Harlow | Cooks Spinney Primary | West | 8 |
| Phoenix  | Magna Carter Primary, Stansted | West | 4 |
| Rainbow | White Bridge Primary, Loughton | West | 5 |

Table 4 – Secondary Commissioned Provision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provision | Host school | Quadrant  |  No. of places commissioned |
| GROW Colchester | The Stanway School  | Northeast | 8 |
| Moulsham Enhanced Provision | Moulsham Junior School | Mid | 8 |
| Proposed South Quadrant | Bromfords | South | 8 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 4** |
| Date: 30th November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: SEN SHORTFALL FUNDING**

Report by Ralph Holloway

Contact details: Telephone (03330 322691); e-mail: ralph.holloway@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

1.1 To Schools Forum approval to increase the SEN Shortfall funding.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 That Schools Forum approve the proposal to increase the value per pupil of the SEN Shortfall funding at 4.12.

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 There are no school forum responsibilities in relation to retained funding within the High Needs Block.

###### 4. Background

4.1 The SEN Provision Team pay Shortfall Funding to mainstream schools where there is insufficient value in the school’s Notional SEN Fund to meet the first £6,000 of support for pupils in receipt of Top-Up (EHCP or IPRA).

4.2 Schools also receive funding if there is insufficient funding within the notional SEN Fund to ensure there is a minimum of £105 per pupil after deducting the first £6,000 for each EHCP.

4.3 The £6,000 value is that set by the central government and has not changed since the funding reforms came into force in 2013.

4.4 The £105 value is based on the amount ECC funded schools for Top-Up in 2013/14; £420 for one hour of support per year. 25% was then applied to this as this was roughly the % pupils on SEN Support at the time.

4.5 The total value of Shortfall Funding being paid to mainstream schools has significantly reduced over the last two years. This is because Notional SEN Funds have been increasing. The increase to the Notional SEN Fund does not mean that school budgets are increasing, rather existing funding is being captured in the budget lines that go into ‘making up’ the Notional SEN Fund.

4.6 Table 1 below shows the total funding for Primary Schools detailing the budget allocated, Notional SEN Fund value and the value of Shortfall Funding paid



4.7 In 2021/22 the total value of Notional SEN Funds increased significantly (by 16.5%) and that resulted in fewer school being eligible for Shortfall. In turn, the total value of the budget to Primary schools rose by 8%. The increase was as a result of the transition to NFF which puts more funding through additional needs factors.

4.8 This year, in 2022/23 the value of Notional SEN Funds rises further, by 32.4% but the value of the total budget increases by just 2.9%. This will result in only a handful of schools being eligible for Shortfall funding. Again, the increase reflects the two year transition to NFF

4.9 Now that schools are funded by NFF from 2023/24 the Notional SEN Fund will rise in line with the increase in NFF.

4.10 Table 2 shows the position for secondary schools.



4.11 The same issues are occurring in Secondary as in Primary; large increases to the Notional SEN Values but smaller increased in the overall budget available.

4.12 The proposal is to increase the £105 to £150 per pupil. Learning Support staff are paid on Scale3 of the NJC scale, so an average of £19,847, or £16,863 when term time weeks are applied. Add a further 30% for employers NI/Pension contributions and the hourly rate is £600.

4.13 Whilst the NFF is channelling more funding into additional needs this is the reason the call on Shortfall funding is reducing.  However, there are still those smaller schools who are located in less deprived areas who take a significant number of pupils with EHCPs.  For these schools, the majority of the Notional SEN Fund is targeted at funding the first £6,000 of support for pupils with EHCPs.  This means that little remains for the school to spend on provision for pupils accessing SEN Support.  It’s these schools that will benefit from the proposed change to the LAs Shortfall Funding process.

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 The proposed increase to £150 per pupil is not expected to significantly increase expenditure as the transition to NFF has increased the funding within the Notional SEN Fund.

5.2 If £150 was applied, the number of Primary schools that would be eligible for Shortfall Funding would be 12 at a cost of £92,000 and the number of Secondary schools would be 2 at a cost of £29,000. So, even significantly increasing the value for each pupil on roll would not significantly increase the value of Shortfall funding to be paid out.

5.3 The additional cost is affordable within existing resources.

**6. Other Resource Implications**

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 5** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: DE-DELEGATION and EDUCATION FUNCTIONS 2023/24**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

1.1 To present to Schools Forum the Authority’s proposal for de-delegation and education functions for 2023/24.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 That maintained primary school members agree the recommendation of the Finance Review Group (FRG) to approve the proposal for de-delegation for public duties at 4.4;

 **Only the following can vote**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sue Bardetti | Jinnie Nichols | Luke Bulpett |
| Nigel Hill | Claire Styles |  |

2.2 That the maintained secondary member agrees the recommendation of FRG to approve the proposal for de-delegation for public duties at 4.5;

 **Only the following can vote**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sean Moriarty |  |  |

2.3 That all School members agree the recommendation of FRG to top-slice **£1.3m** for premature retirement costs at 4.8;

 **The following cannot vote**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Jeff Fair | Marilyn Smith | Jo Santinelli |
| Suthan Santhaguru | Clare White |  |

2.4 That **all** members agree the recommendation of FRG to approve the education functions funded by the ongoing responsibilities element of the Central School Services Block at 5.3; and

2.5 That all maintained members agree the recommendation of FRG to approve the education functions to be funded by maintained schools at 5.4.

 **The following can vote**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sue Bardetti | Jinnie Nichols | Luke Bulpett |
| Nigel Hill | Claire Styles | Sean Moriarty |
| Simon Wall | Jo Barak |  |

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to de-delegation and education functions, which are taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools forum powers and responsibilities** published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Function | Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| De-delegation | Proposes | Decided by the relevant maintained school members (primary and secondary) | Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree local authority proposal. |
| Contribution to responsibilities local authorities have for all schools | Proposes | Decides | Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree local authority proposal. |
| Contribution to responsibilities that local authorities hold for maintained schools | Proposes | Decided by the relevant maintained school members (primary, secondary, special and PRU) | Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree local authority proposal. |

###### 4. Background

4.1 The School Funding Reforms of 2013/14 required local authorities to delegate funding to schools for the following services:

* Contingencies
* Behaviour Support Services
* School meals Eligibility
* Support for ethnic minority pupils/underachieving groups
* Insurance
* Museum and Library services
* Licences and Subscriptions
* Staff costs supply cover
* School Improvement

4.2 Maintained members of Schools Forum can decide on behalf of all maintained schools to de-delegate funding for the Authority to provide services to all maintained schools.

4.3 Funding cannot be de-delegated from academies however they can choose to procure these services from the Authority or an alternative provider.

4.4 Table 2 shows the Authority’s proposals for de-delegation for maintained primary schools for 2023/24 for Public Duties and shows a comparison with previous years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary | 2020/21Per Pupil£ | 2021/22Per Pupil£ | 2022/23Per Pupil£ | 2023/24 ProvisionalPer Pupil£ | 2023/24ProvisionalBudget£ |
| Basic Entitlement | 3,061.54 | 3,153.82 | 3,158.10 | 3,398.10 |  |
| Public Duties (1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 55,457 |
| Total De-delegation | **1.00** | **1.00** | **1.00** | **1.00** | **55,457** |

* The de-delegation requested for Public Duties enables schools to receive funding for employees who undertake union duties, employees who undertake magistrate duties and for employees who attend jury service. It also enables schools to receive support from the trade unions.

4.5 Table 3 shows the Authority’s proposals for de-delegation for maintained secondary schools for Public Duties for 2023/24 and shows a comparison with previous years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary | 2020/21Per Pupil£ | 2021/22Per Pupil£ | 2022/23Per Pupil£ | 2023/24 ProvisionalPer Pupil£ | 2023/24ProvisionalBudget£ |
| Basic EntitlementKS3KS4 | 4,276.355,207.87 | 4,492.195,470.82 | 4,427.255,391.64 | 4,686.185,623.41 |  |
| Public Duties (1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 3,805 |
| Total De-delegation | **1.00** | **1.00** | **1.00** | **1.00** | **3,805** |

* The de-delegation requested for Public Duties enables schools to receive funding for employees who undertake union duties, employees who undertake magistrate duties and for employees who attend jury service. It also enables schools to receive support from the trade unions.

 **Primary SEMH Provisions**

4.6 In May 2016 Forum agreed that the funding de-delegated for Behaviour and Attendance Partnerships could be moved to the budget to contribute to the funding for the new SEMH provisions. As both maintained schools and academies benefit from SEMH provisions Primary members approved that the Authority top-sliced **£554,000** from the funding for primary schools as de-delegation would only deduct funding from maintained schools.

4.7 In recognition of the financial pressures on schools the Authority proposes to fully fund SEMH provisions from the High Needs Block and primary schools will benefit from the delegation of an additional **£554,000**.

 **Premature Retirement Costs**

4.8 In October 2021 Schools Forum approved to top-slice funding from the Schools Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block to fund **£1,271,793** for premature retirement costs relating to former school employees.

4.9 Table 4 shows the funding top-sliced in 2022/23 and the request for 2023/24

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phase | 2022/23£ | 2023/24£ | Difference£ |
| Nursery | 22,023 | 22,023 | 0 |
| Primary – Maintained | 160,185 | 160,185 | 0 |
| Primary – Academy | 239,643 | 238,214 | (1,428) |
| Secondary – Maintained | 131,288 | 131,288 | 0 |
| Secondary – Academy | 681,197 | 680,974 | (223) |
| Special – Maintained | 17,948 | 17,948 | 0 |
| Special – Academy | 19,509 | 19,509 | 0 |
| Total | **1,271,793** | **1,270,142** | **(1,651)** |

4.10 The request of **£1,270,142** is a slight reduction from 2022/23 reflecting an underspend in the current year. The underspend has been analysed to determine where reductions can be made for 2023/24.

**5. Central Services – Education Functions**

5.1 The responsibilities of services provided by the local authority are split between:

* those that are for all schools, which are funded through the Central Schools Services Block, with the agreement of Schools Forum; and
* those that relate to maintained schools only, which are charged on a per pupil basis, with agreement of the maintained school members of Schools Forum.

 Central Services for all Schools

5.2 Following the termination of the Education Services Grant (ESG), the DfE transferred **£3.1m** directly into the Central School Services Block (CSSB) to fund the statutory responsibilities that the authority has for all schools. The Authority has maintained the amount at **£3.1m** since 2017/18, thus containing inflation. The Authority continues to keep costs as low as possible for schools and within the cost envelope, however this may need to be reviewed for 2024/25.

5.3 Table 5 shows the Authority’s proposals for 2023/24.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Central Services for all schools | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
|  | **£’000** | **£’000** |
| Statutory & Regulatory services: |   |   |
|   |   |   |
| Education Welfare | 1,170 | 1,170 |
| - School attendance |   |  |
| - Employment of children |   |  |
| - Children missing education and elective home education |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| Statutory Regulatory Duties - | 1,577 | 1,577 |
| - Director Education |   |  |
| - Senior Education Management Team |   |  |
| - Planning for education service as a whole |   |  |
| - Revenue budget preparation / external audit |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| Asset Management | 333 | 333 |
| - Management of the LA's capital programme  |   |   |
| - Preparation and review of the asset management plan |   |   |
| - Negotiation and management of private finance transactions |   |   |
|   |  |  |
| Total | **3,080** | **3,080** |

 Central Services for Maintained Schools

5.4 Following the cessation of the Education Services Grant, the DfE changed the funding regulations to allow local authorities to request that the central services for maintained schools are funded by maintained schools. Table 6 shows the Authority’s proposal for central services for maintained schools.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Central Services for maintained schools | 2022/23 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2023/24 |
|  | **Cost of service****£’000** | **Per Pupil****£** | **Cost of service****£’000** | **Per Pupil****£** |
| Asset Management | 289 | 4.77 | 288 | 4.77 |
| - General landlord duties including: |  |  |  |  |
| i) appropriate facilities for pupils / staff |  |  |  |  |
| ii) ability to sustain appropriate loads |  |  |  |  |
| iii) reasonable weather resistance |  |  |  |  |
| iv) safe escape routes |  |  |  |  |
| vi) adequate water supplies and drainage |  |  |  |  |
| vii) playing fields of appropriate standards |  |  |  |  |
| - General health and safety  |  |  |  |  |
| - Management of the risk of asbestos in community schools |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory & regulatory Duties | 2,173 | 35.90 | 2,168 | 35.90 |
| - maintaining computer systems |  |  |  |  |
| - data storage |  |  |  |  |
| - Budgeting and accounting functions |  |  |  |  |
| - planning sufficient school places |  |  |  |  |
| - compliance with Health & Safety regs |  |  |  |  |
| - pupil access to education |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| School Improvement |  |  |  |  |
| - core school improvement function | 440 | 7.43 | 438 | 7.43 |
| Total Education Functions | **2,902** | **48.10** | **2,894** | **48.10** |

5.5 The Authority is maintaining the charge at **£48.10** per pupil to recognise the financial pressures on schools. This will ensure that schools will benefit in fully from the increase in funding for 2023/24 which is provisionally shown in Tables 2,3 and 7.

5.6 The Authority continues to minimise the charge to schools however, this may need to be reviewed for 2024/25.

5.7 There is an income risk to the authority that future academisation will impact economies of scale and could cause a pressure on Education Non-DSG budgets. The authority currently has 235 maintained schools (42.3%).

5.8 The Authority awaits the progress of the White Paper and the consultation on the funding of central services which will determine the role of the local authorities and how services will be funded which will include de-delegation and traded services.

5.9 Table 8 (page 24) shows how the provisional **£1.08 billion** allocation is distributed based on the proposed changes to school funding for 2023/24.

5.10 FRG discussed the proposals on 2 November and recommend that Schools Forum approves them.

**6. Financial Implications**

6.1 Table 7 shows the impact on the High Needs Block forecast surplus.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | £m |
| Opening Balance – 01/04/22 | (3.1) |
| Forecast Outturn 2022/23 | (8.3) |
| Forecast Balance – 31/03/23 | **(11.4)** |
| Agenda Item 2 – SEMH Funding | 0.5 |
| Primary SEMH Provisions – see 4.7 | 0.6 |
| Revised Balance | **(10.3)** |

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

**Table 8 – Allocation of Provisional Funding 2023/24**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Primary 2022/23 | Primary 2023/24 | PrimaryDifference | Secondary 2022/23 | Secondary 2023/24 | Secondary Difference |
| Deprivation - FSM | 9,296,943 | 10,658,099 | 1,361,156 | 5,250,917 | 6,429,631 | 1,178,714 |
| Deprivation - FSM6 | 13,592,015 | 17,497,606 | 3,905,591 | 14,681,138 | 18,416,442 | 3,735,304 |
| Deprivation - IDACI | 13,706,185 | 14,235,934 | 529,749 | 13,273,137 | 14,265,991 | 992,854 |
| Prior Attainment | 35,135,830 | 34,484,654 | (651,176) | 28,413,797 | 29,666,421 | 1,252,624 |
| Mobility | 492,366 | 1,005,175 | 512,809 | 39,147 | 51,519 | 12,372 |
| EAL | 2,414,380 | 3,702,371 | 1,287,991 | 787,174 | 1,234,953 | 447,779 |
| Lump Sum | 57,620,416 | 57,676,026 | 55,610 | 9,825,300 | 10,404,806 | 579,506 |
| Sparsity | 1,984,860 | 1,905,964 | (78,896) | 33,467 | 35,180 | 1,713 |
| Split Site | 227,630 | 221,260 | (6,370) | 689,931 | 700,741 | 10,810 |
| Rates | 5,485,390 | 5,435,141 | (50,249) | 2,619,632 | 2,620,483 | 851 |
| PFI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,357,688 | 3,498,961 | 141,273 |
| Exceptional Premises | 2,912,640 | 2,912,640 | 0 | 101,250 | 101,250 | 0 |
| London Weighting | 2,755,937 | 2,966,218 | 210,281 | 2,464,232 | 2,643,681 | 179,449 |
| Minimum per Pupil | 15,033,801 | 8,121,390 | (6,912,411) | 2,636,149 | 1,502,186 | (1,133,963) |
| MFG | 377,400 | 139,343 | (238,057) | 0 | 20,981 | 20,981 |
| Basic Entitlement | 374,591,805 | 403,272,066 | 28,680,261 | 386,773,271 | 412,624,835 | 25,851,564 |
| Total | **535,627,598** | **564,233,885** | **28,606,287** | **470,946,229** | **504,218,061** | **33,271,832** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 6** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS ADMITTING A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF AFGHAN REFUGEE and ASYLUM CHILDREN**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

* 1. **Purpose of report**
	2. To present Schools Forum with a proposal to provide additional funding to schools that admit a significant number of Afghan Refugees who have arrived under the government’s Afghan relocation schemes and are located in hotels, or children in asylum contingency hotel accommodation, commissioned by the Home Office.
	3. **Recommendations**

2.1 To approve the Authority’s proposal at paragraph 4.6

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to formula change which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools forum powers and responsibilities** published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| Central spend on and the criteria for allocating funding from:funding for significant pre-16 [pupil growth](#_Growth_Fund), including new schools set up to meet basic need, whether maintained or academy | Decides | Adjudicates where schools forum does not agree local authority proposal |

###### 4. Background

4.1 There are a number of premises across Essex that the Home Office is using as either bridging accommodation or contingency accommodation to house:

* Afghan citizens who are able to relocate to the UK under the Afghan Relocations and Assistance Policy (ARAP);
* The most vulnerable and at risk people from Afghanistan under the Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme (ACRS); and
* Asylum seekers whilst their claims are considered.

4.2 The Home Office provides funding for children who have arrived in the UK under the ARAP and ACRS schemes. Funding is provided on a lagged basis after each term has ended. In Essex, this equates to £20 per pupil, per school day, up to maximum of £4,500 for any one pupil.

4.3 There is no similar funding provided for children of asylum seeking families arriving in the UK.

4.4 Given the large number of refugees and asylum seekers in hotel accommodation in Essex, schools have already admitted or will be requested to admit pupils. Any pupils admitted before the October Census will have been included on a school’s census return and therefore funding will be received for 2023/24.

4.5 The Authority is proposing an extension to the growth fund policy to support schools where they have admitted pupils from Home Office commissioned hotel accommodation after the October 2022 Census. In making this proposal, it should be noted that the Home Office may commission other premises (such as re-conditioned care homes) to locate such families. That being the case, the proposal would be intended to cover such situations too.

4.6 The proposal is shown in Table 2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Asylum Contingency Hotels – admissions in 2022-23 academic year e.g. Rochford, IBIS Stansted, Phoenix North Weald | Afghan (ARAP) and ACRS hotels – admissions in 2022-23 academic year e.g. Marks Tey, Chelmsford, Harlow |
| Trigger for primary aged children = 6 or more pupils from the one ‘hotel’ addressTrigger for secondary aged children = 11 or more pupils from the one ‘hotel’ address | Trigger for primary aged children = 6 or more pupils from the one ‘hotel’ addressTrigger for secondary aged children = 11 or more pupils from the one ‘hotel’ address |
| Payment to schools = pupil number x full AWPU to cover up to one full academic year, until October 2023 census picks the children up | Payment to schools = one term of pupil number x 1/3 of AWPU (to recognise that Home Office £20 per day will be applicable after a term) |

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 The Growth Fund allocation was higher than the growth fund requirement in 2022/23, so the Authority set aside a contingency of **£1 million** for a future year where the allocation is lower than the required expenditure. However, given the need to support schools admitting a significant number of refugee or asylum children, it is proposed to move this funding to the Growth Fund to provide funding to schools under the methodology shown at 4.6.

5.2 The Authority receives funding from the Home Office for refugee children under the ARAP and ACRS schemes and this will be allocated to schools at £20 per pupil per day which is paid termly in arrears.

**6. Other Resource Implications**

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 7** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: SCHOOL FUNDING 2023/24**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

* 1. To update Schools Forum of the outcome of the school funding consultation.
	2. To present the Authority’s final proposals for 2023/24.
	3. To update Schools Forum on the Exceptional Premises Factor.
	4. To update Schools Forum on the Autumn Statement.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 To note the outcome of the school funding consultation;

2.2 To agree the recommendation of the Finance Review Group (FRG) that School members approves that the Authority adjusts the KS3/KS4 basic entitlement weighting as necessary to meet the DfE’s minimum / maximum funding requirement, at 4.6; and

2.3 To agree the recommendation of FRG that schools members approves that the Essex Local Formula should use the 2023/24 NFF values increased by the non-fringe area cost adjustment at 4.7.

2.4 To agree the Authority continues to use the Exceptional Premises Factor for Joint Use arrangements at 4.11; and

2.5 To note the additional funding announced in the Autumn Statement for 2023/24 and 2024/25.

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to formula change which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools forum powers and responsibilities** published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| Proposes and decides | Must be consulted, voting restricted to School Members | Checks for Compliance with Regulations |

###### 4. Background

4.1 Schools Forum approved on 28th September that the Authority should consult with mainstream schools on the following proposals for 2023/24.

* To adjust the KS3/KS4 basic entitlement weighting as necessary to meet the DfE’s minimum / maximum funding requirement.
* To fund schools using the 2023/24 NFF funding values increased by the non-fringe area cost adjustment.

4.2 The consultation with schools was held between 30th September and 31st October.

4.3 There were 26 responses to the consultation, however 1 response did not specify the name or school of the respondent. To ensure that each school only submits one response the anonymous response has been discounted. Table 2 shows the 25 responses

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No. of Schools | Responses | % Responded |
| Primary | 448 | 21 | 4.7 |
| All Through | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Secondary | 79 | 4 | 5.1 |
| Total | **529** | **25** | **4.7** |

4.4 Table 3 shows the response to the proposal for secondary schools on adjusting the KS3/KS4 basic entitlement weighting as necessary to meet the DfE’s minimum / maximum funding requirement . As this is a mandatory change that must be consulted on it is no surprise that only 4 schools have responded. It can be seen that the majority of schools responding support the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | % Yes | % No |
| All Through | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Secondary | 3 | 1 | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Total | **3** | **1** | **75.0** | **25.0** |

4.5 Table 4 shows the response to the proposal for all schools that the Essex Local Formula should use the 2023/24 NFF values increased by the non-fringe area cost adjustment. It can be seen the majority of schools responding support the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don’t Know | % Yes | % No | % Don’t Know |
| Primary | 16 | 1 | 4 | 76.2 | 4.8 | 19.0 |
| All Through | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Secondary | 3 | 0 | 1 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| Total | **19** | **1** | **5** | **76.0** | **4.0** | **20.0** |

4.6 Any change to the KS3 / KS4 basic entitlement weighting will be compulsory to meet the DfE’s minimum / maximum funding requirement. The Authority therefore proposes to adjust the KS3/KS4 basic entitlement weighting as necessary to meet the DfE’s minimum / maximum funding requirement.

4.7 There is a significant majority of the schools responding to the consultation supporting the proposal to increase NFF values by the non-fringe area cost adjustment. The Authority therefore proposes that the Essex Local Formula should use the 2023/24 NFF values increased by the non-fringe area cost adjustment.

4.8 The consultation response and the Authority’s final proposals were discussed by FRG on 2 November. FRG endorses the Authority’s proposals and recommends that Schools Forum approve the changes.

Exceptional Premises Factor

4.9 The Authority currently uses an exceptional premises factor for schools that have joint use arrangements, such as sporting facilities, which provides relevant schools with the annual cost of the agreement. For schools to qualify for funding the joint use agreement must be 1% or higher of the total schools budget.

4.10 There is currently one secondary school in Essex that meets the requirement with an annual cost of **£60,000**.

4.11 In moving to the Direct NFF, the DfE requires local authorities to reapply for the disapplication of school funding regulations to allow the use of an exceptional premises factor. The proposal is to continue to use the exceptional premises factor for joint use facilities to ensure relevant schools receive the funding to cover the additional costs. The Authority has submitted the disapplication request to meet the DfE’s deadline.

 Autumn Statement 17th November 2022

4.12 The Autumn Statement announced by the Chancellor on Thursday 17th November allocated a further **£2.3 billion** for 2023/24 and 2024/25. This funding is in addition to the previously announced Comprehensive Spending Review 2021. Table 5 shows the increase in funding.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2023/24£bn | 2024/25£bn |
| Spending Review 2021 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Autumn Statement 2022 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Total Increase | **3.8** | **3.8** |

4.13 It is unclear how the additional funding will be allocated, firstly how it will be split between the Schools Block and High Needs Block and secondly whether it will be allocated through NFF or paid as a supplementary grant.

4.14 The government stated that public sector organisations will not be eligible for the Energy Bill Relief Scheme after 31 March 2022.

4.15 The final Schools Budget settlement is expected the week commencing 12th December 2022.

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 There is one primary school that will provisionally lose funding however, this is not due to the proposed changes to the local Essex funding formula but due to a reduction in the schools rateable value. The school will have a corresponding reduction in rates expenditure.

5.2 The funding for exceptional premises factor joint use is £60,000. There are no financial implications of this funding continuing.

**6. Other Resource Implications**

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 8** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS 2023/24**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

* 1. To update Schools Forum on the results of the consultation with maintained schools.
	2. To present the Authority’s final proposals for 2023/24, which the Finance Review Group (FRG) recommend for approval.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 To note the outcome of the consultation;

2.2 To agree the recommendation of FRG to approves the proposed change to section 3.6 Borrowing by Schools at 4.6; and

2.3 To agree the recommendation of FRG to approve the proposed change to Annex C Responsibility for Redundancy Costs at 4.8.

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to de-delegation and education functions, which are taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools forum powers and responsibilities** published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Function | Local Authority | Schools Forum | DfE |
| Scheme for Financing Schools | Proposes and Consults | Approves (maintained school members only) | Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree local authority proposal. |

###### 4. Background

4.1 Schools Forum approved on 28th September that the Authority should consult with maintained schools on the following proposals for 2023/24.

* To remove reference to the Salix Scheme within Section 3.6 Borrowing by Schools and to state that no schemes are currently available.
* To change the criteria within Annex C – Responsibility for Redundancy Funding to align it with the recent change to Responsibility for Premature Retirement Costs.

4.2 The consultation with schools was held between 30th September and 31st October.

4.3 There were 28 responses to the consultation, however 1 response has been removed as it was from an academy. One response did not specify the name or school of the respondent, so to ensure that each school only submits one response the anonymous response has also been removed. Table 2 shows the 26 responses.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No. of Schools | Responses | % Responded |
| Primary | 221 | 22 | 10.0 |
| Secondary | 4 | 1 | 25.0 |
| Special | 6 | 3 | 50.0 |
| PRU | 3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Nursery | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | **236** | **26** | **11.0** |

4.4 Table 3 shows the response to the proposal to update section 3.6 Borrowing by Schools to remove reference to the Salix Scheme and state that no schemes are currently available. It can be seen the majority of schools responding support the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don’t Know | % Yes | % No | % Don’t Know |
| Primary | 15 | 0 | 7 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 31.8 |
| Secondary | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Special | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| PRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nursery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | **19** | **0** | **7** | **73.1** | **0.0** | **26.9** |

4.5 Table 4 shows the response to the proposal to update Annex C to align the funding of redundancy costs with the funding of premature retirement costs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Don’t Know | % Yes | % No | % Don’t Know |
| Primary | 8 | 9 | 5 | 36.4 | 40.9 | 22.7 |
| Secondary | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Special | 1 | 2 | 0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
| PRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nursery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | **10** | **11** | **5** | **38.5** | **42.3** | **19.2** |

4.6 There is significant support for the first proposal, so the Authority proposes to remove reference to the Salix Scheme at Section 3.6 and state that there are currently no schemes available.

4.7 The second proposal is to replace the existing criteria

* Where the school has an excess surplus balance and no plans to use it.

 With the following criteria

* Where the school has a surplus balance or can afford to fund the redundancy costs through a deficit loan over a maximum 5 years, in accordance with the terms in section 4.9 of the Scheme.

4.8 This aligns funding for redundancy costs with funding for premature retirement costs. Although there are slightly more schools against this, there is no overall clear majority. It would be expected that schools will be against this proposal. The Authority needs to make significant savings between 2023/24 and 2026/27 and can no longer afford to fund decisions taken by schools.

4.9 FRG reviewed the results of the consultation on 2 November and recommends that maintained members of Schools Forum approve the proposed changes.

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 The second proposal will minimise the redundancy costs that will need to be funded by the Authority.

**6. Other Resource Implications**

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 9** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: SCHOOLS FORUM – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

1.1 To present Forum with the Authority’s proposed changes to the Terms of Reference in light of the recent change to the structure of Schools Forum and updated DfE guidance for online meetings.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 To agree the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference.

###### 3. Relevant Schools Forum Power and Responsibility

3.1 Table 1 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to Terms of Reference which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s **Schools Forum** **Powers and Responsibilities**, published in September 2018.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Local Authority | Schools Forum | ESFA |
| Proposes | Decides | None |

###### 4. Background

4.1 The Authority is proposing to make a number of changes to the Terms of Reference for Schools Forum which are tracked changed in Annex A.

4.2 In section 1.1 the regulations are updated to include The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2021 that amended The Schools Forums (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020.

4.3 In section 2.1 the membership table is updated to reflect the addition of a second diocese member that Schools Forum approved in December 2020.

4.4 Section 5.2 is updated with the Authority’s proposal to amend the term of office for the Chair and Vice-Chair to two years from April 2023. This will allow continuity for two years and allows time for a new Chair to establish their role.

4.5 Section 5.3 proposes to move the election from the January meeting to the autumn term as this allows a handover period if a new Chair or Vice-Chair is elected. The Chair and Vice-Chair may stand for re-election in further successive periods.

4.6 Section 7.5 shows the agreed mix of in-person and remote meetings which were approved by Schools Forum in May 2021.

4.7 Section 7.6 clarifies that remote meetings are still public meetings and also that there may be occasions when an in-person meeting may need to be changed to a remote meeting, such as adverse weather.

4.8 Section 14.1 updates the date of approval.

**5. Financial Implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications.

**6. Other Resource Implications**

6.1 None

**7. Consultation with stakeholders**

7.1 Consultation with Schools Forum

**8. Background / Supporting papers.**

8.1 Agenda Item 8 Annex A – Terms of Reference (tracked change)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 10** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 11** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

Any Other Business and Feedback from Associations and Other Forum Members

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 11a** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**High Needs Review Group**

Wednesday 2nd November 2022

Microsoft Teams

**Minutes**

In attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rod Lane (RL) | Sue Bardetti (SB) | Harriet Phelps-Knights (HP-K) |
| Luke Bulpett (LB) | John Hunter (JH) | Pam Langmead (PL) |
| Carole Herman (CH) | Emily Welton (EW) | Ruth Sturdy (RS) |
| Jo Barak (JB) | Philomena Cozens (PC) | Ralph Holloway (RH) |
| Yannick Stupples-Whyley (YSW) |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Report** |  |
| 1 | Welcome and Apologies | Apologies were received from Jeff Fair, Ruth Bird and Simon Wall. In the absence of the Chair, it was agreed that RL chair the meeting. |
| 2 | Funding for SEMH Provisions | RH introduced the paper. The aim of the provisions is to enable short term turnaround of pupils in danger of permanent exclusion. There is a financial benefit in terms of not using Independent Schools.The increase requested is from £19,000 to £25,000.CH asked if the Moulsham secondary provision was hosted at the Junior school. RH confirmed this.PC asked is there any evidence of how effective it is. RH responded it is a short term provision and is the provision of no choice. It provides a good service for those young people.HP-K stated that it is not quite as quick as Grow used to be and we’ve been asked to have outreach and someone is coming to see what we do. The second point is the paper states staffing costs are an issue, which I agree with but mainstream schools are facing that same predicament and there will be a requirement of all provisions to invoice schools the same amount. I’ve had this conversation with you before. RH stated most school are at £300 per term but if funding is increased there will be no need for provisions to claim any more money from schools.RH stated we will try and see what we can do about uplifting the banding levels through the banding exercise, because I think we do need to reflect the fact that there are children with high needs and costs in mainstream, so banding gives us an opportunity to do that.HP-K responded a lot of these pupils do not have EHCPs.RH agreed so the other option is to use the Inclusion Framework to enable early and short term support.HP-K responded the outreach has to be done before the referral.RH responded we have an enormous number of children that are coming through the system particularly with mental health issues. When we prepare the sufficiency plan, we’ll be looking to do more of these provisions because the geographical spread is not great.HP-K asked if the funding would come out of the high needs block.(HNB) RH said yes and HP-K asked if there was sufficient capacity in the HNB to sustain the increase going forward. We do not want to be asked for a transfer of money RH responded the forecasting tells us yes unless something catastrophic comes along.RL asked if the comments would be included in the report before it goes to Forum. RH responded yes.EW asked if there is any data about the number of young people who are going through enhanced provisions who then return successfully to mainstream? How many of those have been permanently excluded? If we are investing further in a sector, we need to make sure it is actually delivering what it is set to do. The vast majority of those who go into SEMH have really significant needs, is there any kind of tie-in with CAMHS.RH responded noEW added when the enhanced provisions for autism were set up, a question raised afterwards around why there was no occupational therapy input, speech and language input into those things. We know that early intervention works and yet is there a way of prioritising those children through that mental health support that means they're getting it consistently every day.RH responded the staffing structure and the cost is reflective of the needs of the young person and it is an in house delivered model because we can't depend upon the offer from CAHMS.SB asked about when obviously this is a short term thing in terms of the children. I can never seem to get any of my children into grow the oldest that my children are too difficult to being Grow. And I'm just thinking about what a mainstream school could do if they had an additional £25,000 for support.I'm just wondering whether that is something that local authority have ever thought about that. RH responded if there is a need for a short term intervention and as a means to ensure we don't need to have a long term education healthcare plan in place, the mechanism for doing that will be the inclusion framework. SB added she supports GROW but wished more can be done in mainstream. Ten places in Clacton are the tip of the ice burg and schools are struggling with pupils with extreme behaviour.RH offered to SB to work together on this issue.EW added a robust outreach system would help. RH responded there is a difficulty with capacity.CH referred to another conversation on with Julie Keating around the new system for pupils going to PRUs. PC added that it cannot be said PRU can do more outreach if less children come through as all PRUs were nearly full at the start of the academic year.Subject to changes addressing the comments, the High Needs Review Group recommend that Schools Forum approves the increase in funding. |
| 3 | Shortfall Funding | RH introduced the report. Schools receive funding if the notional SEN budget is insufficient to fund the £6,000 contribution towards each EHCP. In addition, schools are guaranteed £105 per pupil in the notional SEN budget after each £6,000 is deducted. Where the amount is less than £105 per pupil schools receive additional funding to top them up to £105 per pupil.The funding paid to schools has significantly reduced over the last two years due to transitioning to the Schools national funding formula.The proposal is to increase the £105 to £150 per pupil.HNRG recommends that Schools Forum approves the increase. |
| 4 | Funding for Assessments that take over 20 weeks – verbal update | RH gave a verbal update. The 20 week timescale for assessment for an EHCP is not being achieved. Some cases have taken up to 36 weeks. There are implications for school budgets if payment is not made at 20 weeks.A limited consultation was held with schools and two options were given.The first is to wait until the conclusion of the assessment but to back date funding from week 20.Option 2 was to fund schools at week 20 and make an adjustment for the final band allocated at the end of the assessment.The majority of schools prefer the first option.The plan is to share this with schools next weekSB stated he agreed option 1.PL raised there a few decisions today and that she was concerned that they are communicated to schools clearly and accurately.RH stated the Shortfall funding will go to Schools Forum and hew will prepare a communication for schools that he will run past PL and CH.YSW clarified that schools do not need to apply for Shortfall Funding. It is calculated by the LA and paid to the schools that qualify for funding.HNRG supported option one. |
| 5 | Update on Banding – verbal update | RH gave an update on the Banding Review. All secondary schools have been trained. Primary schools are not as high percentage wise but this could be due to some schools having a few or no EHCPs. There has been a good response from secondary schools.There have been system issues in producing the spreadsheet for mainstream schools. The spreadsheet will go out as soon as possible.Some mainstream schools have banded their pups and stated it was easier than they envisaged.Moderation of Special and Post 16 will commence mid-November.RH asked for more volunteers for moderation. HP-K and SB volunteered to help.EW stated she will share a list with RH later today on volunteers from special schools. It will be useful to have mainstream colleagues moderate special schools and post 16.PL asked how critical was it for mainstream schools to complete the banding in the next few weeks.RH commented it was needed for financial modelling.SB confirmed the banding is simpler than envisaged.PL stressed the need for clarity for schools and LA teamsRH offered to produced FAQs. PL thanked RH. |
| 6 | Any Other Business | PL asked are new pupils banded on the current banding descriptors or the new descriptors. RH responded both, the funding for the new descriptors will not come into until September 2024. |
| 7 | Date of Next Meeting – 7th December 2022 | RL thanked everyone for their contributions and closed the meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 11b** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**Finance Review Group**

Wednesday 2nd November 2022, **Microsoft Teams**

**Minutes**

In attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sue Bardetti (SB) | Harriet Phelps-Knights (HP-K) | Richard Green (RG) |
| Nigel Hill (NH) | John Hunter (JH) | Sean Moriarty (SM) |
| Carole Herman (CH) | Clare Kershaw (CK) | Yannick Stupples-Whyley (YSW) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Apologies for Absence | In the absence of a Chair, it was agreed YSW chairs the meeting.Apologies were received from Jeff Fair, Rod Lane and Ruth Bird. |
| 2 | De-delegation 2023/24 | YSW introduced the report setting out the LA’s proposals for de-delegation, SEMH Provisions, premature retirement costs and education functions for 2023/24.Public duties remain at the same charge of £1 per pupil. FRG recommends that maintained members of Schools Forum approve the proposals for de-delegation.The proposal for Primary SEMH is to top-slice £4.67 per pupil. HP-K and PL thought at the earlier High Needs Review Group meeting it was stated SEMH provisions will be funded by the high needs block. YSW thought it was only the increase in funding but would clarify.YSW explained a slight reduction in the top-slice for premature retirement costs. SM asked if there was an underspend in the current year. YSW explained there was a small underspend and a review of transactions has enabled the identification on which budgets can be reduced. FRG recommends that Schools Forum approve the top-slice for premature retirement costs.YSW introduced the proposals for education functions which remain at the same charge as 2023/24. SM stated he was surprised that the LA was not asking schools to fund the exact cost of education functions for all schools. He felt it would send an important message to the DfE that funding for central services is insufficient.CK replied that the DfE is proposing to consult on removing the CSSB and that we are trying to be fair to schools.YSW said we could use the consultation to lobby for additional funding.SM asked if the statutory duties for all schools were different to those for maintained schools. YSW responded that they were different.SM asked if planning for sufficient school places was for all schools. CK responded that we mainly expand academies. YSW added the budget for sufficient school places is proportioned between maintained schools and academies and therefore we do not charge the full cost of the duty to maintained schools. SM stated it would be helpful if the Forum report stated this.NH stated he was surprised to see the request remaining the same and congratulated the LA for minimising the charge to schools.FRG recommends that all members of Schools Forum approve the education functions for all schools. FRG also recommends that maintained members approve the proposals for education functions for maintained schools. |
| 3 | School Funding 2023/24 | YSW updated FRG on the outcome of the School Funding Consultation. As expected, there was a low response to the consultation. The majority of secondary schools agreed the proposal to change the KS3 / KS4 basic entitlement as necessary. The majority of respondents agreed the proposal to fund the NFF value increased by the non-fringe area cost adjustment for 2023/24.There were no comments.FRG recommends that Schools Forum approves the recommended changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools for 2023/24. |
| 4 | Scheme for Financing Schools 2023/24 | YSW updated FRG on the outcome of the consultation on the proposed changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools. Again, there was a low response to the consultation.Respondents supported the first proposal on amending Section 3.6 Borrowing by Schools. The second proposal on redundancy funding had 11 respondents against the proposal and 10 respondents supporting the proposal.SM queried the redundancy proposal given the overall no response; however, he did not have an issue agreeing with the proposal. NH commented it was necessary as the LA cannot afford to pay for school decisions and it was better, they used the funding for school improvement and other services.FRG recommends that Schools Forum agree the recommended changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools. |
| 5 | Falling Rolls Fund | YSW introduced the report stating there were a number of schools with less than 210 pupils that have falling rolls but due to the current criteria do not qualify for funding. There only option is to reduce staffing which will likely impact on funding.YSW discussed the options and explained the final option of nuancing the existing criteria was the LA preferred model.HP-K asked why we were seeking changes when there is the sustainable schools project to help schools. YSW explained this will help smaller schools.PL asked if the 4 primary schools that met the previous falling roll criteria were contacted. YSW explained all schools were contacted with the criteria of the fund and invited to submit an application. As no schools applied it was assumed they did not meet the criteria that the roll must increase.SM asked if secondaries are excluded. YSW explained that the current criteria will apply to secondary schools. SM asked if this could be made clear.NH congratulated the LA for suggesting nuances to help smaller schools. Large primary schools can cope with a falling roll for one or two years but smaller schools cannot and would need to lose a teacher.FRG agreed the proposed changes in principle but are concerned with how much it would cost.YSW suggested that the paper could be deferred until January’s Schools Forum and that he will update FRG on the maximum cost based on the October 2022 census. If this is received in time for the December meeting it will go ahead, if not it will be discussed with FRG through e-mail.FRG agreed to defer pending an update on the maximum cost. |
| 6 | Any Other Business | None |
| 7 | Closing Comments – Next meeting 7th December 2022 | YSW thank everyone for their contributions and closed the meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 11c** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**School Forum Early Years Sub-group**

**MINUTES**

**Thursday 3rd November 2022**

**7.00pm to 8.30pm**

**Via TEAMS**

**Attended**

Carolyn Terry, Yannick Stupples-Whyley & Sandie Leader – ECC

Rod Lane –Schools Forum Chair

20 providers – see report attached to email

**Apologies**

* Catherine Hamilton Little Sunbeams Epping
* Angela McQuitty Lexden Lodge Kindergarten
* Zoe Orr Harwich Connexions Noahs Nursery Ltd
* Shirley Funnell/ Lisa Willis/Helen Hill Oakey Dokeys Pre-school Limited
* Sarah Drummond Jelly Beans Montessori Day Nursery
* Jo Gridley Childminder

**Review of minutes and action log**

Minutes agreed as accurate, actions completed with one carried forward, see below

**Schools Forum meeting feedback**

Pressures on EY sector re recruitment & retention, financial pressures, and cost of living shared. Schools Forum recognise the issues raised. FEEE payments made for Autumn term & Summer term included increase in rate.

**Early Years Updates**

* New Early Years and Childcare Strategy – launch of Strategy Wednesday 9th November. Councillor Egan is opening event. Approximately 75 providers booked, have closed bookings due to format of meeting. Will look at year 2 priorities at next meeting.
* Budget update – see power point
* Early Years Block underspend proposals – see power point

**Early Years items discussed**

* Cluster meetings for Managers - for support and ideas – wellbeing

Attendees thought these would be good to do in small geographical areas. Childminders especially may find it beneficial for face to face. Mid, West & South quadrants currently have a Coffee & Catch-up online meeting monthly.

Suggested whether the meetings could be a mixture of face to face and on-line.

**Action**: Sandie to find out about North quadrant

* Staff recruitment and retention - support /suggestions/ cost of providing service against staff wages and minimum wage etc
* Financial support – parents & providers
* Free fruit & veg etc
* Living wage rise - £10.70 23/24?
* Support with cost of living

Recruitment & retention discussed; quality of candidates is a concern. Retention policy is being looked at to consider other incentives other than higher salary. EY Recruitment service charge a % of yearly salary. Jennie asked if anyone considered EYTS when advertising for posts. Discussion had regarding the difference between EYTS & QTS.

Some attendees currently use foodbanks and other organisations to support families with food as well as their setting.

* [Neighbourly - where businesses help local good causes](https://www.neighbourly.com/)
* [FareShare | Fighting hunger, tackling food waste in the UK](https://fareshare.org.uk/)
* Greggs – through FareShare
* £20 free shopping from CO-OP from community budget
* Send out donation envelopes every half term for snack, suggestion £1 per week or 20p per session
* Foodbank vouchers

**Items to take to the Essex Schools Forum 30th November**

Staff recruitment & retention, finance & proposals for new posts

**AOB**

Book start –criteria have now changed to children eligible for EYPP and not universal. Families also need to collect from the library. Ferliene felt that families may be reluctant to attend the library or not be able to get to the library, therefore disadvantaging these children even more.

Carolyn explained this was to keep cost down regarding distribution and to encourage families into the library.

Several attendees said that they would be willing to collect from the library on the families behalf, would this be possible?

Carolyn said that this could be reviewed again so that providers have the option to collect.

**Date of next meeting – Thursday 8th December via TEAMS 7.00-8.30pm**

**Future dates – TBA**

**Action Log**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Action for | Date to be completed | Action completed |
| B/F from November meeting - Provide details of settings who are mentoring, and number of settings being mentored as part of Early Years COVID-19 recovery programme | Carolyn – Helen to forward to Carolyn or Sandie | By 8th December |  |
| Add Strategy Year 2 Priorities to December agenda | Sandie | By 30th November |  |
| Coffee & Catch-up meetings – North quadrant, do they happen? | Sandie | By 10th November | Email sent to EYEPs 7th November |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 12** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**Schools Forum Meeting Minutes of Wednesday 28th September 2022**

**held at the Hamptons Sports & Leisure, Tydemans, Beehive Lane, Great Baddow, Chelmsford CM2 9FH**

**08.30am – 10.16am**

*(subject to forum approval)*

In Attendance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rod Lane (RL) – Chair | Jo Barak (JB) | Luke Bulpett (LB) |
| Jeff Fair (JF) | Carole Herman (CH) | Marilyn Smith (MS) |
| Sean Moriarty (SM) | Debs Watson (DW) | Chanel Lassman (CL) |
| John Hunter (JH) | Emily Welton (EW) | Stuart Roberts (SR) |
| Claire Styles (CS) | Harriet Phelps-Knights (HP-K) | Robin Taverner (RT) |
| Nigel Hill (NH) | Pam Langmead (PL) | Lyn Wright (LW) |
|  |  |  |
| **LA Officers** |  |  |
| Yannick Stupples-Whyley (YSW) | Andrew Page (AP) | Clare Kershaw (CK) |
| Val Cleare (VC) - Minutes |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Apologies for Absence and substitute notices**Apologies had been received from Cllr Tony Ball, Ruth Bird, Simon Wall, Jo Santinelli, Philomena Cozens, Richard Green, Clare White. Emily Welton substituted for Simon Wall, and Pam Langmead substituted for Richard Green.  |
| **2** | **Early Years Funding 2021/22 and 2022/23 (Carolyn Terry)**CT updated the Forum on the revised Early Years funding for 2021/22 and 2022/23 and sought Forum’s agreement for an increase in the FEEE funding hourly rates for 2022/23. CT also updated the Forum on the proposals to allocate **£5.1million** of the Early Years Block underspend.CT gave an overview of the percentages of children taking up funding. The take-up of the two-year-old FEEE during the summer term 2022 was 3,209, which was 77.1% of the 4,164 eligible two-year-olds in the county. Although this take-up figure is down on the previous term of 82.7%, which is not unusual for the summer term, but remains significantly higher than the national take-up level for the summer 2022 term of 61.8%. Section 5 gave a breakdown of the financial implications. Table 2 showed the impact of the January 2022 Census on the 2021/22 allocation, in which there has been a budget increase of **£2.7 million**. This table gives a breakdown of what the original allocation was and financial allocation of **£2.652 million**. The Local Authority reported a **£2.5 million** surplus within the Early Years Block. It was agreed that part of the underspend would be as a one-off additional payment of £1 million paid out to the Early Years sector on the number of funded hours paid to each EYCC setting in 2021/2022 financial year. We are also retaining a **£1 million** contingency due to the volatility in funding. This left **£500,000** to be allocated with options to be brought to the September meeting. However, the additional funding resulted in **£3.2 million** being available to be allocated to the Early Years sector, so original plans are being rethought and will be brought to the November meeting.Table 3 showed the impact of the January 2022 Census upon the 2022/23 allocation, where it can be seen the allocation increased by **£4.7 million**. Table 4 showed the proposed increase in hourly rates for 2022/23 based on available funding. There was an update from the Schools Forum Early Years and Childcare Reference Group and the key areas of discussion were under 6.2 with the emerging SEND and understanding transient needs as a result of Covid. ECC will be concluding a review into the SEN offer for Early Years and childcare providers during the autumn 2022 term. Other areas of pressure for the sector are cost of living impact, increase in national minimum wage, utilities, food etc., and recruitment and retention. This is impacting a small number of increases of closures of childcare providers. In Essex we are taking steps to mitigate financial difficulties by starting to limit the number of FEEE funding hours. As a result, parents are needing to pay for more for their childcare. **Questions**SM referred to Table 4 and Section 5.5/5.6 – Will all of the **£4.7 million** be used up of accessed funding that has been identified in the current year?No, because the money is likely to be paid back to the DfE unless more children take up the funding.SM asked how much money is being used?CT & YSW commented it was **£2.2 million**.JH commented on the increase in children with SEND. Is that to be reflected in future years?CT responded we are doing work on understanding what we are seeing. We do not want to label children with SEND.JH indicated if it is an increase in SEND, what does that mean and what can we do to address that?CT responded to bring a report back on this.JF observed there was highlighted concern about sustainability of funding and the pressures providers are placing in the system? Is there difficulty in the Local Authority maintaining its provision because providers are not going to be there or in the right place? It is a real worry.CT agreed and some Local Authorities are finding this. Some providers – there is nothing they can do to the business model. The real increase rate is welcomed but it has helped to close the deficit. It has not addressed the cost of living. There is lobbying with Central Government looking at reductions in rent.JF stated with regards to the political situation we are in, Schools Forum is to highlight concerns. Provision has been good until now and it is likely to be more problematic. YSW referred to the consultation on Early Years funding and it is guaranteed only 1% increase per Local Authority. RL said we might want to wait until the November meeting, when information will be clarified regarding the energy situation. JF believed if you to take energy out of it, we have already covered part of it in the response to the consultation. DW indicated we are waiting on an announcement for nurseries about funding for all maintained nurseries. We met after the last meeting and if we can once we have got the announcement look at the funding. DW stated whether SEND or Covid, all these children are under additional support and the schools are going to need additional support. In September might be waiting on lists for special schools etc. In Early Years we are trying to get the support now. The situation is getting worse; managing needs in our settings is increasingly difficult due to the funding. Intervention starts at 0-5. There is pressure on Early Years staff to get the children into school. For example, looking at the journey before they are in school, those who have not got a place will be on a waiting list, and children will not be in the right place. Children need a different package for different reasons, and it is not getting any better. The next meeting of the Sub Group is 3rd November 2022. YSW spoke about the maintained nursery supplement. The DfE has announced an extra £10 million, a set funding floor of £3.80 per hour and that will benefit Essex because we are below the floor that has been set. **Recommendations**The Forum noted the revised funding for 2021/22 at 5.2 and 2022/23 at 5.5.The Forum noted the revised surplus balance to be allocated to Early Years providers and options to allocate it will be brought to the November meeting, 5.6; andAgreed the increase in the hourly rates for 2022/23 at 5.6. |
| **3.** | **Provisional School Funding Settlement 2023/24 (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)**YSW updated the Forum on the provisional school funding consultation for 2023/24 and the proposal of two changes to consult with schools.Funding has increased nationally by **£1.5 billion** in 2023/24 with the Schools Block increasing by **£930 million** and the High Needs block increasing by **£570 million**. Table 2 showed the provisional allocation for 2023/24. Table 3 showed how the DfE has added the Schools Supplementary Grant into the Schools Block. The **£20.8 million** increase represented the additional funding generated by the DfE inflating the values of the NFF factors. The primary unit of funding (PUF) increased from **£4,507.16** in 2022/23 to **£4,719.90** in 2023/24, and the secondary unit of funding (SUF) increased from **£5,797.24** in 2022/23 to **£6,115.81** in 2023/24. These values are final and will be multiplied by the total number of pupils on the 2022 October Census. Table 4 showed the increase in the value of the minimum per pupil level for 20223/24 and there is a slight uplift. Central School Services Block – the historic commitments were funded at the previous year’s allocation, but the DfE commenced a winding down process reducing in 2019/20 with an annual 20% reduction. The provisional allocation for ongoing responsibilities is **£7.5 million**, which is an increase of **£75,000** due to an increase in the amount funded per pupil. Of the historic commitments the Local Authority will apply to the DfE to request our allocation is protected at **£3.8 million** in 2023/24. The provisional allocation assuming the historic commitments allocation is protected is **£11.3 million**, however **£761,000** is at risk until the DfE approve the request to protect the funding. With regards to the High Needs Block the national increase is **£570 million** in 2023/24 compared to **£1.1 billion** in 2022/23. **Changes for 2023/24**Local Authorities must use all NFF factors where previously the only mandatory factors were basic entitlement and deprivation funding. Local Authorities must move their local formula factor values at least 10% closer to NFF, except where local formulae are already mirroring the NFF. The minimum funding guarantee has been reduced (currently at 2%) and the Local Authority must set this between 0.0% and 0.5%. Table 5 showed NFF values for primary schools for 2023/24 which are looking at just over 2%. Table 6 showed NFF values for secondary schools for 2023/24Section 6.4, Table 7 showed the calculation of the minimum and maximum values for primary schools in 2023/24. YSW referred to the column Area Cost Adjustment (ACA). Essex had a London weighting so some schools got fringe allowance using the non-fringe adjustments, see minimum and maximum funding. We have undertaken some modelling of the formula. All we can use is data from the October 20221 Census and allocated through the funding formula. Section 6.7 it was noted for secondary schools the KS3 value is below the minimum £4,681.94 allowed and the KS4 value is above the maximum £5,647.53 allowed. This can be remedied by changing the KS3/KS4 weighting from 1:1.218 to 1:1.20. The KS3/KS4 weighting in the NFF is 1:1.127.Section 6.8 – A second model was run using the ACA uplifted NFF values for 20223/24 to ensure all schools received an uplift to recognise the geographic cost differences. FRG is recommending changes to the Essex local formula for 2023/24. There will be a consultation – see Annex A – finance model showing proposed changes, and see Annex B – showing draft consultation document.JF highlighted the FRG is keen to make sure consultation does not require a lot of thinking by schools. We have made it as clear as possible. We felt it was helpful to maximise the way funding is done for schools. YSW needed the Forum to ratify the proposed changes and then release the consultation.**Recommendations**The Forum noted the provisional school funding settlement for 2023/24 at 4.3.The Forum agreed the recommendations of the Finance Review Group (FRG) for changes to the School Funding Formula for 2023/24 at 6.10.The Forum agreed to the FRG approved consultation document for schools at Annex B. The Forum noted the provisional school funding settlement for 2023/24 at 4.3. |
| **4.** | **Scheme for Financing Schools (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)**YSW reported on the proposal to maintained school members of proposed changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools for 2023/24.The Scheme for Financing Schools contains a clause permitting schools to borrow from any schemes that the Secretary of State has said is available to schools. Previously this included the Salix Scheme which is currently closed. YSW drew attention to the Loan schemes – Section 4.8. Where the school has a surplus balance or can afford to fund the redundancy costs through a deficit loan over a maximum of 5 years, in accordance with the terms in Section 4.7 of the Scheme for Financing Schools. FRG supported the changes under Section 4.7. **Questions**JB asked what is the likelihood of schools to take out a loan to fund a redundancy?YSW stated previously where a school currently in deficit but reported we have not had many claims. It is at least two financial years since we have had a claim. **Recommendation**The Forum agreed the Finance Review Group’s recommended changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools for 2023/24 at 4.2, 4.3 and 4.8. These proposed changes will be consulted with maintained schools. |
| **5.** | **Any other business, feedback from schools through Associations and from Schools Forum representatives on other Bodies.****ASHE**CH commented most schools are concerned about unfunded pay increases for staff and the impact on budgets and equally energy costs, which leaves schools in huge state of uncertainty. The majority of schools to be able to balance their budgets for a year but beyond that it will be difficult. The other element is the new funding arrangements for PRU’s where costs not paid directly by schools. Concerns from schools what is not part of that agreement is capacity of charged work and this has funding implications and is under discussion. **EPHA**HPK highlighted financial pressures. We did agree at FRG that at area meetings we would brainstorm what would not be happening as a result. Our EPHA colleges supporter programme continues and have 59 new Heads across Essex and expanding the programme as needs be for other senior leaders in schools. Headteacher wellbeing is still a priority. We are still promoting hard to help. Our EPHA priorities looking at reading with SEND focus and outreach from ESSET and SEN schools and those transition points. **ESSET**EW informed things are very similar with lots of concerns around the cost of living, staff absence and career impact. Staff wellbeing is incredibly high on the agenda. Finance pressures are significant and having to absorb all the other pressures in schools. Recruitment is a challenge for us, particularly around support staff because of cost of living increase and staff have left. There is a high turnover which is causing problems and pupils need consistency in staffing. Admissions and trying to plan effectively. There are more and more tribunals. Revalue exercise uncertainty about what that looks like. ESSET is working out an outreach offer and is meeting tomorrow (29/9/22) about how to support mainstream colleagues but will take financial commitment from others. **PRUs**JB reported there has been an increase in SEND, impact of Covid, and an increase in KS3. We started a new funding agreement and slight changes to the referral process and are awaiting all feedback from schools and reviewing this. There will need to be a consistent review this term. Agreed with the need for further outreach support for schools. Cost of living pressures is a concern as well as other schools. **Early Years – Nurseries**CL indicated sometimes we do not get the same support. There are staff retention pressures. There are a lot of children coming through with SEND. A lot of our children who are receiving additional funding for SEND do end up with a diagnosis. There is slow intervention with parents which we are not getting in Early Years. Extra funding gives no support anywhere else. There are business costs, wages, national insurance etc. It is the same for maintained nurseries. We are now not sure about the budget for next year. The point raised about children coming through and what support there is, is quite worrying. Lots of children has not seen anyone and actually need that support and the impact on staff is huge. This is the first time I have reached the point where I have to say no to taking any more children in because of the levels in school and do not have staff to manage SEND children and what about the rest of mainstream? There is an impact managing our teams across the sector. There is work to do this year on how to support transition and earlier, not July. We had 26 schools and started the conversations in April. July is not the right time when have children with needs coming through. From a funding point of view, children get the right support at the right time, not just the children but the staff that are managing their needs in Early Years and schools and everyone needs support to meet those needs. **ESGA**JH agreed with what had been said so far. He added about an item on the news about flu. Immunity has been reduced in the last two years, but now people are mixing more there is a huge increase in flu. They are recommending everyone has a flu jab as soon as possible. Also, Covid is likely to increase over the winter period as well. We are still getting staff being absent with Covid. We are recommending staff get their Covid booster jab. NH echoed everything that had been said. **Unions**JF reported the main concern is funding and retention and pay. We are going through a consultation process about industrial action regarding a pay award. The retention rate in schools is so bad with reduced contracts having been made. There is concern a lot of members are stressed where schools are making best decisions but have been asked to do the impossible. Impacts on headteachers because they are trying to manage the situation. There are huge concerns people are dissatisfied in their employment.**Unison**MS indicated it is retention of staff which will have impact on SEND children and agreed with JF. **Church Rep** There was no representation and no report. **High Needs Sub-Group** - All noted the report.**Finance Review Group** – the FRG had met and is a main item on the agenda. JF stated as a group the de-delegation has been updated. There is uncertainty what the Government is doing or not. We do not know what we are trying to decide on. CK informed we had no information about the increase in energy bills and what the Government’s response would be. However, we have got that now to work through. Also, we are still working out internally about the removal of the Local Authority Brokering Grant. JF supported the response of FRG. We can put forward figures but will do the work for November. CK indicated if there is an increase in the levels of de-delegation, there needs to be a strong case but that is not done yet. All noted the report.**Early Years Sub-Group** – Early Years has met, and information is on the agenda. These minutes were noted. If anyone has any thoughts about Early Years to send them to Carolyn Terry by email (email address for CT is at the beginning of Agenda Item 2). **Any Other Business**RL noted a number of people could not attend this morning’s meeting in person. We agreed this arrangement for the September and January meetings only. How do people feel about it?JF recommended we continue to have a clear and frank discussion and talk outside of the meetings especially in September and January about the budget and decisions. There is more to have a meeting than just seeing a face. You get a better impression of what people are thinking by seeing them in the meeting. When it is face to face it is important to have the whole communication process of being with people which comes into play. SM asked had we investigated having meetings such as this where there is access remotely? Since Covid we have pursued in Governor meetings, however you need the technology. You can do that here at Hamptons Sports & Leisure.CK said the only downside is it will be remote. SM asked if the technology is there, can we not use it? We have to accept it to be hybrid to allow those who do not attend.CK said it is for professional reasons and travelling across Essex where it is a good use of headteacher time.RL agreed we will continue to have the meeting face to face in January.MS added maybe people would be more comfortable wearing a mask.JB stated if had a long journey to get to the venue that will make people decide about meetings. Time out is a factor. JH’s observation – JH was sitting in a corner. We need to make sure people are sitting further apart.SR informed we have moved to a permanent hybrid system for the flexibility. It might be worth exploring.RL confirmed the meeting in November will be via Teams.YSW agreed to provide a hybrid meeting in January. However, there may be no physical attendance if the weather is bad. |
| **6.** | **Minutes of 13th July 2022****Attendance:**With the addition of Sue Bardetti, Jinnie Nichols and Lyn Wright, members were happy to accept these minutes as a true and accurate record of the discussion.**Action**: YSW to amend attendance. |
| **7.** | **Minutes Action Log – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**18/5/22 – Agenda Item 9 – Early Years Update. Owner: Carolyn Terry.**Action**: To bring proposals for allocating £1.5 million of the surplus balance to the July/September meeting.28/9/22 – Agenda Item 2 – proposal to allocate £1million.The proposal to allocate the remaining £500,000 which will be brought to the November meeting was agreed by all. |
| **8.** | **Schools Forum Response to Implementing the Direct NFF****Consultation** (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)YSW updated the Forum on the agreed FRG response to the consultation on behalf of the Forum.The Local Authority had presented an overview of the consultation at the July meeting, where the Forum approved that FRG compose and submit a Response on behalf of Schools Forum.FRG had met on 7th September 2022 where the Local Authority presented their response. FRG agreed that the Local Authority’s response was comprehensive and fair and agreed to submit the same response.**Recommendation**The Forum noted the report. |
| **9.** | **Schools Forum Response to the Early Years Funding Formulae** **Consultation** (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)YSW updated the Forum on the agreed FRG/Early Years Sub-Group response to the consultation on behalf of the Forum.The only questions where the Local Authority and Schools Forum did not agree were:Question 10: Do you agree with our proposed approach to protections in the EYNFF for 2023-24?Question 11: Do you agree with our proposed approach to protections in the 2-year old formula?The funding floor given the cost-of-living crisis is not high enough. The response from the Local Authority and Schools Forum have challenged 1% funding for all.**Recommendation**The Forum noted the report. |
| **10.** | **Schools Budget and Education Functions Half-Year Forecast Outturn Report 2022/23** (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)YSW updated the Forum on the forecast outturn position for 2022/23. The forecast outturn for 2022/23 at Quarter 2 (August 2022) was set out in Annex A. The total forecast DSG grant allocation for 2022/23 after academy recoupment was **£558.6 million**. The Central Schools Block is under pressure due to the inability to reduce expenditure in line with academy conversions. There is a High Needs Block underspend of **£8.7 million**. Top-up funding for maintained schools and academies are forecasting an overspend of **(£988,000)** due to the continued increase in the number of Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). Independent special schools are forecast to overspend **(£463,000)** due to an increase in numbers and an increase in the complexity of pupils. With regards to SEN Services in order to meet increasing costs of pressures and initial plans on how to spend is currently sitting at **£12 million** underspend. This is primarily offset by a**£1.1 million** overspend on Individual Pupil Resourcing Agreements due to increased medical needs, volume of projects and specialist SEND equipment.**Questions**LB stated there is an £8 million underspend in this block.YSW informed over the last two years our financial forecast of what we need to spend is not as much as funding coming in. There is still an increase in pressure. We are balancing the level of expenditure against pressure and additional cost pressures coming in, and trying to balance the budget so that we do not overspend. The forecast expenditure is less than income coming in. CK stated getting the HNB into a balanced position, the budget has been increased significantly. The amount of increase in children in out of county placements, EHCPs and resourcing and more children in the system and Early Years. Pressures in the system are pupil and demand driven. Some investment is coming through the early intervention route. We will speak about this at EPHA tomorrow. With regards to independent school placements, costs have not gone down and then there is re-banding. Managing pressures in the system – Government has invested in the High Needs Block. Our tight management has created this position. We should have a very considered response where we can take considered decisions to the SEND needs that we have got. JF highlighted in Table 2 the risk and opportunities. We are trying to make it in a sustainable way.SM referred to the work Ralph Holloway has done. We are still getting large amounts of money spent on independent school placements. Can we use the situation we are in to accelerate that programme to reduce costs? CK indicated the element funded is at completion stage. We are waiting on 4 step cycles. We are doing as much as we can. It was an ambitious programme 10 years ago. Our special schools are full. Mainstream schools are holding on to pupils with special needs. It was noted tribunals are going through the roof in the SEND system. At the moment because of the high volume of vacancies with EP’s, there are pressures in the system looking at investing in early intervention. Hopefully Hawthorns will open in January.EW stated we need to find a solution that works. Looking at KS3 pressures in PRUs we are finding they are not able to go to school. NH supported CK when he started on the Forum. There was **£100 million** overspend every year to now and CK could manage and put in place. NH supported CK with what she had achieved in 4 years. CK confirmed we have had tighter controls in the SEND system in Essex. We are putting forward a plan and will hold some back for contingency. It is a one off investment and need to think about the best way, invest to save, invest in workforce in SEND, speech and language support, outreach work. We have to think slightly differently. If we build special schools, we will fill them. We need more SLD. We need the right levels of funding to ensure the right packages of support. It is about how we work through inclusion and combining workforce because children’s needs have changed. Here the SENCO and inclusion partner are experts about child’s needs, and we need to think more about the change in needs. It is a challenging position.JF supported CK. RH is looking to minimise/maximise the system to get the best outcome of the best to several. Some of this is uncertainty about the way the Government allows funding. Table 3 showed the forecast DSG position on 31st March 2023 with a total of **£16.5 million** surplus balance. Education Functions showed a total of **£2.8 million**.**Recommendation**The Forum noted the forecast outturn position for 2022/23. |
| **11.** | **Forward Plan – Yannick Stupples-Whyley**YSW read this out and confirmed the dates of future meetings.**Recommendations:**The Forum noted the dates of future meetings and that additional items as proposed by Schools Forum are included in the Forward Plan. |
|  | **Any Other Business**SM stated as his term of office has been extended and he is happy to continue. All were in agreement that SM will continue to be a member of the Schools Forum. NH also mentioned as his term of office has been extended, he is happy to continue. All were in agreement that NH will continue to be a member of the Schools Forum.RL informed after 16 years of being Chair of the Schools Forum, he will not be putting himself forward for re-election in the role as Chair. RL had discussed the matter with CK and YSW and understands that at the next meeting they will bring forward suggested changes to the Standing Orders. RL agreed to continue until the end of the meeting in January 2023 but had decided to step down for the future.PL said a thank you to RLCK would like people to think of coming into the role of Chair. In the early days these meetings used to be half a day. We have spent a lot of work on them. We are appreciative of both Rod Lane and Jeff Fair in the role that Sub-Committees play. It was noted that the new Chair will also be required to attend meetings of the Sub-Groups.  |
|  | **Chair’s Closing Comments** (Rod Lane)RL thanked everyone for attending and for their contributions. **Date of next meeting – Wednesday, 30th November 2022 at 8.30 a.m.** **Via Teams.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 13** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: Minute Action Log**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Meeting | Report | Action Owner | Action | Response | Status |
| 18 May 2022 | Agenda Item 9 – Early Years Update | Carolyn Terry | To bring proposals for allocating £1.5 million of the surplus balance to the July / September meeting. | Schools Forum has agreed £1m to be allocated to settings with a further proposal for £550,000 at Agenda Item 2. Further proposals for allocating the remaining £2.6m will be brought to a future meeting. | In progress |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 14** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: CONSTITUTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOLS FORUM**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330) 138464; e-mail:

yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

* 1. To consider the current membership of the Schools Forum in the light of the continuing transfer of maintained schools to the Academy sector and the change in pupil numbers.

**2. Recommendations**

* 1. To note the arrangements for how meetings will be held at 3.1.
	2. To note that no changes are required to the constitution of Schools Forum at 3.5 and 3.7.
	3. To note Membership at Annex A and Attendance at Annex B.

**3. Background**

3.1 Schools Forum approved a mix of both in person and remote meetings at the May 2021 meeting following the change to the Schools Forum Regulations allowing the use of remote meetings on a permanent basis. Meetings will be held as follows:

* May – remote
* July – remote
* September – in person
* November – remote
* January – in person

3.2 All sub-group meetings will be held remotely.

3.3 Table 1 shows the agreed structure Forum approved in December 2020:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Maintained Schools | Academies | Total |
| Primary | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Secondary | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Special | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| PRUs | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Nursery | 1 | - | 1 |
| Non School Members |  |  | 6 |
| Total | **9** | **13** | **28** |

3.4 T able 2 shows the ratio of pupils between primary and secondary schools as at the May Census 2022.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pupils | Ratio |
| Primary | 118,873 | 1.47 |
| Secondary | 81,058 | 1.00 |

3.5 The ratio between primary and secondary pupils is 1.47:1 which requires no change to the number of primary and secondary representatives.

3.6 Table 3 shows a breakdown of pupils for primary and secondary between maintained schools and academies as at the May Census 2022. It also reflects the 2 primary schools that have converted to academies since May.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No. of Schools | Pupils | % Split |
| PrimaryMaintainedAcademiesTotal Primary | 221227**448** | 54,84964,024**118,873** | 46.1%53.9%**100%** |
| SecondaryMaintainedAcademiesTotal Secondary | 477**81** | 3,80577,253**81,058** | 4.7%95.3%**100%** |

3.7 The above primary pupil split in Table 3 between maintained schools and academies still requires 5 maintained members and 5 academy members.

3.8 A full list of members is shown at Annex A. It can be seen that there are two vacancies, one for a primary academy governor and the other for a secondary academy governor. The Authority is struggling to fill both vacancies but has recently advertised the vacancies again in Education Essex. Should the vacancies remain vacant at the end of the current election process, options will be brought to July’s meeting to ensure the vacancies are filled.

3.9 Table 4 shows the members who are coming to the end of their current term of office.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Last Meeting |
| Richard Green | 30th November 2022 |
| Mark Farmer | 30th November 2022 |
| Rod Lane | 31st January 2023 |
| Ruth Bird | 31st January 2023 |
| Simon Wall | 31st May 2023 |

3.10 Details of attendance are shown at Annex B for Schools Forum, the SEN Sub-Group, the Finance Review Group and the Early Years Sub-Group.

**4. Financial Implications**

4.1 There are no financial implications.

**5. Other Resource Implications**

**6. Consultation with stakeholders**

**7. Background / Supporting papers.**

7.1 Annex A – School Forum Membership

7.2 Annex B – Schools Forum Attendance

 **Annex A**

**School Forum Members (November 2022)**

 **Maintained Schools:**

**Primary School Headteachers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Sue Bardetti | Holland Haven Primary School | November 2021 to November 2025 |
| Luke Bulpett | Brightside Primary School | July 2020 to July 2024 |
| Jinnie Nicholls | St Giles’ & St Andrew’s CE Primary Schools | September 2021 to September 2025 |

**Primary School Governors**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Nigel Hill | John Bunyan Primary | November 2022 to November 2026 |
| Claire Styles | Trinity Road Primary | September 2021 to September 2025 |

**Secondary School Governors**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Sean Moriarty | St Benedict’s Catholic College | November 2022 to November 2026 |

**Special School Headteachers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Simon Wall | Lexden Springs | May 2019 to May 2023 |

**Pupil Referral Units**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Jo Barak | CSS South | September 2021 to September 2025 |

**Maintained Nursery Schools**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School** | **Term of Membership** |
| Debs Watson | Tanglewood Nursery School | November 2020 to November 2024 |

**Academies / Free Schools:**

**Primary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School / MAT** | **Term of Membership** |
| Robin Taverner | St Mary’s Primary, Woodham | July 2022 to July 2026 |
| Rod Lane (Chair) | Lakelands Primary School | January 2019 to January 2023 |
| Harriet Phelps-Knights | Janet Duke Primary School | May 2022 to May 2026 |
| Richard Green | Grove Wood Primary School | November 2018 to November 2022 |
| John Hunter | Felmore Primary | September 2019 to September 2023 |

**Secondary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School / MAT** | **Term of Membership** |
| Ruth Bird | The Chelmsford Learning Partnership | January 2019 to January 2023 |
| Sarah Speller | Tabor Academy | November 2022 to November 2026 |
| Stuart Roberts | Shenfield High School | July 2022 to July 2026 |
| James Saunders | Honywood School | November 2022 to November 2026 |
| Lyn Wright | Sigma Trust | November 2020 to November 2024 |
| Jody Gee | Anglo European School | November 2022 to November 2026 |

**Special**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School / MAT** | **Term of Membership** |
| Ruth Sturdy | SEAX Trust | November 2020 to November 2024 |

**Pupil Referral Units**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **School / MAT** | **Term of Membership** |
| Philomena Cozens | Keys Co-operative Academy Trust | July 2019 to July 2023 |

**Non-School Members**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representation** | **Term of Membership** |
| Jeff Fair (Vice-Chair) | Teaching Unions Rep | January 2022 to January 2026 |
| Clare White | 16-19 teaching institutions | July 2022 to July 2026 |
| Suthan Santhaguru | Anglican Church Rep | November 2020 to November 2024 |
| Jo Santinelli | Roman Catholic Church Rep | November 2020 to November 2024 |
| Chanel Lassman | PVI | May 2022 to May 2026 |
| Marilyn Smith | Support Staff Unions Rep | September 2021 to September 2025 |

 **Annex B**

**School Forum Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **21st** **Apr****2022** | **18th** **May****2022** | **13th** **Jul****2022** | **28th** **Sept****2022** | **% Attendance** | **% Attendance incl. Sub** |
| Rod Lane (Chair) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Jeff Fair (Vice – Chair) | Yes | Sub | Yes | Yes | 75 | 100 |
| Sue Bardetti | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Luke Bulpett | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Jinnie Nichols | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Nigel Hill | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Claire Styles | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Sean Moriarty | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 | 75 |
| Simon Wall | Yes | Yes | Sub | Sub | 50 | 100 |
| Jo Barak | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 | 75 |
| Debs Watson | Yes | Yes | Sub | Yes | 75 | 100 |
| Harriet Phelps-Knights | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Richard Green | Yes | No | Yes | Sub | 50 | 75 |
| John Hunter | Sub | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 | 100 |
| Robin Taverner |  |  | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Ruth Bird | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 | 75 |
| Lyn Wright | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Mark Farmer | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 | 75 |
| Ruth Sturdy | Yes | Sub | Yes | No | 50 | 75 |
| Stuart Roberts |  |  | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Philomena Cozens | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 | 75 |
| Clare White |  |  |  | No | 0 | 0 |
| Chanel Lassman |  |  | Yes | Yes | 100 | 100 |
| Marilyn Smith | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 | 75 |
| Suthan Santhaguru | No | No | No | No | 0 | 0 |
| Jo Santinelli | Yes | Yes | No | No | 50 | 50 |

**High Needs Review Group Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **26th Apr****2022** | **21st Jun 2022** | **7th Sept 2022** | **2nd Nov 2022** | **% Attendance** |
| Jeff Fair (Chair) | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Rod Lane | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Sue Bardetti | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Luke Bulpett | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Harriet Phelps-Knights | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| John Hunter | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Pam Langmead | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Ruth Bird | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Carole Herman |  |  | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Ruth Sturdy | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Simon Wall | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Emily Welton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Philomena Cozens | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Jo Barak | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Clare White / Amanda Thurston |  |  | Yes | No | 50 |

**Finance Review Group Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **26th Apr 2022** | **21st Jun 2022** | **7th Sept 2022** | **2nd Nov 2022** | **% Attendance** |
| Jeff Fair (Chair) | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Rod Lane | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Sue Bardetti | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Richard Green | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Harriet Phelps-Knights | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| John Hunter | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Nigel Hill | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Pam Langmead | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Ruth Bird | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Sean Moriarty | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Carole Herman |  |  | Yes | Yes | 100 |

**Early Years Sub-Group Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **21st Apr****2022** | **16th June 2022** | **8th Sept 2022** | **3rd Nov 2021** | **% Attendance** |
| Chanel Lassman (Chair) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Rod Lane | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Samantha Cottrill | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Maggie Catmull | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Helen Taylor (Vice-Chair) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Jennie Heath | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Terri Ewer | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Jo Gridley | No | Yes | Yes | No | 50 |
| Sarah Lyne | No | No | Yes | No | 25 |
| Annalei Smith | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Lisa Rozee | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Linda Reynolds | Yes | No | No | Yes | 50 |
| Helen Hill | No | No | Yes | No | 25 |
| Beverley Middleton | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Jennie Gregory | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Katherine Waite | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 75 |
| Kelly Stallwood | Yes | No | No | Yes | 50 |
| Zoe Orr | Yes | Yes | No | No | 50 |
| Tina Carnegie- Dielhenn | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 75 |
| Ferliene Willis | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100 |
| Catherine Hamilton | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Claire Owers | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 75 |
| Claire Wall | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Sharlin Paul | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Sarah Drummond | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Sharon Woodrow | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Michelle Wisbey | No | Yes | No | No | 25 |
| Vicky Wellen | No | No | Yes | No | 25 |
| Dawn Saunders | No | No | No | Yes | 25 |
| Antonia Fasae | No | No | No | Yes | 25 |
| Michelle Boreham | No | No | No | Yes | 25 |
| Claire Macklin | No | No | No | Yes | 25 |
| Dawn Saunders | No | No | No | Yes | 25 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Schools Forum | **Agenda Item 15** |
| Date: 30 November 2022 |  |

**REPORT TITLE: Forward Plan**

Report by Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Contact details: Telephone (03330 138464); e-mail: yannick.stupples-whyley@essex.gov.uk

**1. Purpose of report**

1.1 To bring the Schools Forum Forward Plan and confirm the dates of future meetings.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1That the Forum notes the dates of future meetings.

2.2 That additional items as proposed by Schools Forum are included in the Forward Plan

###### 3. Background

3.1Following a review of School Forum Agendas a Forward Plan has been created. The items included are as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Regular and Administrative items** |
| Apologies  |
| Any other business and feedback from schools through Associations |
| Feedback from Schools Forum representatives on other bodies |
| Minutes from previous meetings |
| Forward Plan and dates of next meetings  |
| Sub Group updates (SEN, Early Years, Formula Review) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date of Schools Forum** | **Agenda Items** |
| Wednesday 11th January 2023 | Third Quarter Budget & Education Functions 2022/23 Update (I) |
|  | 2023/24 DSG Budget (D) |
|  | Falling Rolls Fund (D) |
|  | High Needs Funding Review (D/I) |
|  | SEND and PRU Capital Investment Project (D/I) |
|  |  |
| Wednesday 17th May 2023 | Falling Rolls Fund (D/I) |
|  | Schools Budget & Education Functions Draft Outturn Report 2022/23 (I) |
|  | High Needs Funding Review (D/I) |
|  | SEND and PRU Capital Investment Project (D / I) |
|  | Constitution and Membership of Schools Forum (D /I) |
|  | Early Years and Childcare Update (I) |
|  |  |
| Wednesday 12th July 2023 | School and Academy Balances (I) |
|  | Schools Budget and Education Functions Q1 Update 2023/24 (I) |
|  | High Needs Funding Review (D/I) |
|  | SEND and PRU Capital Investment Project (D / I) |
|  |  |
| Wednesday 27th September 2023 | Half Year Budget & Education Functions Update 2023/24 (I) |
|  | Scheme for Financing Schools (D) |
|  | High Needs Funding 2024/25 (D/I) |
|  | School Funding 2024/25 (D) |
|  | High Needs Funding Review (I) |
|  | De-Delegation 2024/25 (D) |
|  |  |
| Wednesday 29th November 2023 | Early Years and Childcare Update (I) |
|  | School Funding Consultation Final Proposal (D) |
|  | Scheme for Financing Schools (D/I) |
|  | Primary SEMH Provision (D) |
|  | High Needs Funding Review (D/I) |
|  | SEND and PRU Capital Investment Project (D/I) |
|  | Constitution and Membership of Schools Forum (D / I) |