# LEEDS SCHOOLS FORUM

**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 15 November 2018, 4.30 – 6pm at Merrion House**

| **Membership** *(Apologies in Italics)* | |
|---|---|
| **GOVERNORS** | **HEADTEACHERS** |
| **Primary (5 seats)** | **Primary (6 seats)** |
| *Sue Knights* — *Little London & Alwoodley Primary* | Peter Harris — Farsley Farfield Primary |
| *Gillian Simpson* — *Shakespeare Primary* | Sarah Griggs — Valley View Primary |
| *Sara Nix* — *Rawdon Littlemoor Primary* | Julie Harkness — Carr Manor Community School |
| Deryn Porter — Cobden Primary | *John Hutchinson* — *St Theresa's Catholic Primary* |
| *Ritchie Halls* — *Windmill & Low Rd Federation* | Claire Harrison — Wetherby Deighton Gates |
| | *Helen Stott* — *Allerton C of E Primary* |
| **Secondary (2 seats)** | **Secondary (3 seats)** |
| Doug Martin — Pudsey Grangefield | *Delia Martin* — *Benton Park* |
| vacancy | Lucie Lakin — Wetherby High |
| | *vacancy* |
| **Special (1 seat)** | **Special (1 seat)** |
| *Amanda Jahdi* — *East SILC* | Diane Reynard — East SILC |
| **Non School** | **ACADEMIES – Mainstream (9 seats)** |
| *Peter Best* — *PVI Providers* | David Gurney — Cockburn School |
| *Susan Knowles* — *PVI Providers* | Ken Morton — Brigshaw LP MAT & Ashtree |
| *Patrick Murphy* — *Schools JCC* | Adam Ryder — Bruntcliffe Academy |
| *Richard Noakes* — *Diocese of WY & Dales* | John Thorne — Co-op Academy Priesthorpe |
| Steve Kelly — Leeds City College 16-19 Providers | Emma Lester — Woodkirk Academy |
| *Angela Cox OBE* — *Catholic Diocese* | *Ian Goddard* — *Ebor Gardens/Victoria Primary* |
| | Siobhan Roberts — Cockburn John Charles |
| | tbc |
| | tbc |
| | **Academy – Special School (1 seat)** |
| | Scott Jacques — Springwell Leeds Academy |
| | **Academy – Alternative Provision** |
| | Ben Mallinson — Stephen Longfellow Academy |
| **Local Authority Reps:** | |
| Phil Mellen, Deputy Director Learning | Louise Hornsey, Principal Financial Manager |
| Tim Pouncey, Chief Officer Strategy & Resources | Simon Criddle, Head of Finance |
| Andrea Richardson, Head of Learning for Life | |
| **Minutes:** | |
| Iram Mir, Leadership Assistant | |

| Item | | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **1.0** | **Apologies, introductions & future membership** | |
| 1.1 | Peter Harris (PH) outgoing chair extended a warm welcome to members and observers. Introductions took place and apologies were noted. | |
| 1.2 | Phil Mellen was introduced to members as the new Deputy Director for Learning. | |
| 1.3 | Lucie Lakin (Headteacher, Wetherby High) was welcomed as the new maintained secondary school representative. | |
| 1.4 | PH chaired the meeting for the first two items and then handed over to the new chair once the formal election had taken place. | |
| | | |
| **2.0** | **Membership Matters** | |
| 2.1 | Helen Stout, Headteacher Meadowfield Primary and maintained primary seat, has now resigned following the school's conversion to an academy. | |
| 2.2 | A number of Primary Heads have reached the end of their term of office. These seats will be advertised to maintained primaries.<br>**Action Agreed:**<br>Letters to be sent to primaries with names of new members to be confirmed at the next meeting. | TP |
| 2.3 | Tim Pouncey informed members that there are two academy vacancies. Nominations were sought from the academies and four people applied. Schools Forum's terms of reference state that if such a situation was to arise then the decision would fall to the academy proprietors group. Tim said it was unclear whether such a group existed and asked members to suggest the most appropriate way forward.<br>**Action Agreed:**<br>It was decided that the Academy Trusts would be written to to ask them to make the decision. | TP |
| | | |
| **3.0** | **Election of Chair and Vice Chair** | |
| 3.1 | John Thorne was duly elected as Chair for Schools Forum and chaired the rest of the meeting. | |
| | | |
| **4.0** | **Minutes of the 14th June 2018 meeting** | |
| 4.1 | The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record. | |
| | | |
| **3.0** | **Matters arising** | |
| 3.1 | Arising from 4.1 - The Stephen Longfellow Academy to be a future agenda item. | |
| 3.2 | **Arising from 5.3** – Schools Forum would like to know what the additional change is. Fresh information to be brought to the next meeting. | |
| 3.3 | **Arising from 7.7** – Work has started to analyse the placement costs and numbers. A report will be tabled at the January or February Schools Forum meeting. | |
| 3.4 | **Arising from 7.6** – It was proposed the AIP clawback guidance be brought to a future Schools Forum meeting for information. Val Waite (Head of Learning Inclusion) will be invited to a future meeting. | VW |
| 3.5 | **Arising from 10.01** – Members were alerted to the change of date for the February Schools Forum | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | meeting - Wednesday 13/02/2019 *( a change from the previous date of 21/02/2019)* | |
| | | |
| **4.0** | **School Funding Proposals 2019/20** | |
| 4.1 | The Chair informed members that there was only one item on the agenda today which members are being consulted on. Members will be asked to vote on certain recommendations at the end of the meeting. | |
| 4.2 | Louise Hornsey explained that local authorities are required to consult with schools on proposals for funding arrangements and report back to their Schools Forum. Schools Forums are then responsible for either making decisions or providing views on the various proposals, in line with the powers set out by the DfE. The attached report presents the outcome of a recent consultation with mainstream schools on funding arrangements for 2019/20. The majority of respondents supported the council's proposals to transfer funding to the high needs block from the schools block (£2.5m) and the central school services block (up to £800k). The majority of maintained schools responding to the consultation also supported a contribution by maintained schools towards severance costs (a total of £200k, to be applied as a rate of £3.12 per pupil). In relation to the school funding formula, the votes were almost evenly split between the two options presented for consultation. The report provides further details of the council's view on the direction for the funding formula in 2019/20, taking into account feedback received from schools. | |
| 4.3 | The Chair stated Schools Forum is asking to make the following recommendations:<br>• To consider and vote on a proposal to transfer £2.5m from the schools block to the high needs block.<br>• Schools Forum's decision on whether to accept this proposal. In the event that Schools Forum does not agree, the DfE are able to adjudicate if the local authority requests this.<br>• To consider and vote on a proposal to transfer up to approximately £800k from the central schools services block to the high needs block (with the final amount being subject to confirmation of costs and funding).<br>• This transfer can be made by the local authority following consultation with Schools Forum.<br>• Maintained school members of Schools Forum are asked to consider and vote on a proposal for a contribution in 2019/20 of £200k by maintained schools towards the severance costs of maintained school staff, to be applied as a per pupil amount of £3.12.<br>• Schools Forum's decision on whether to accept this proposal. In the event that Schools Forum does not agree, the DfE are able to adjudicate if the local authority requests this. | |
| 4.4 | The Chair said the local authority is required to consult with Schools Forum on the funding Formula. However the local authority retains the final decision on the formula. Schools Forum is asked to comment on the proposed principles for the schools funding formula for 2019/20. The report submitted today was based on 2017 pupil data. | |
| 4.5 | The Chair invited comments on the proposal to transfer £2.5million from the schools block to the high needs block to meet the short fall. | |
| 4.6 | Members asked how up to date the High Needs figures stated in the report are. Tim Pouncey said the figures are regularly reviewed. A lot of the numbers are driven by the number of children that are supported. There are additional pressures with challenges to face in 2019 and also uncertainty about future funding. | |
| 4.7 | A member asked officers whether there would be a saving to the High Needs Block as the Stephen Longfellow provision has lower numbers compared to the original assumptions. LH said the mechanism for funding this provision is different as the High Needs Block deductions for Stephen Longfellow are only for sole registered pupils and any further funding is provided directly by the ESFA so does not affect the High Needs Block for Leeds. Based on the latest census data there are 28 sole | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | registered pupils at The Stephen Longfellow Academy and this has been used as the basis for the High Needs budget. | |
| 4.8 | Simon Criddle said the DSG deficit is cumulative deficit and in order to balance this the £2.5million transfer was recommended. Ken Morton said that Schools Forum need to err on the side of caution. Tim Pouncey said the transfer of the £2.5million will go back to schools - to SILCs, academies, mainstream schools through FFI. | |
| 4.9 | Dave Gurney stated that he has been a Schools Forum Member for a number of years and this situation of pressures on schools budgets have been around a very long time. The SILCs are in a desperate deficit situation with increased pressures all round and it all needs to be looked at again. This will be the third year that Schools Forum is being asked to transfer funds. | |
| 4.10 | Louise Hornsey acknowledged the concerns. The funding cap has meant that the LA has not received the full national funding formula. Phil Mellen stated that other authorities are going through the same pressures as Leeds and they are discussing the same issues and asking for the same amount of money to be transferred. | |
| 4.11 | Louise Hornsey alerted members to the detail of the transfer from the schools block to the high needs block. The council consulted on a £2.5m transfer from the schools block to the high needs block. Detailed information was provided to schools on the background to the proposals as part of the consultation document and the briefing sessions. The full consultation document was attached as an appendix to the papers submitted to Schools Forum. | |
| 4.12 | **Key points were:**<br>• The ESFA expects most movements from schools block will be due to pressures on high needs budgets.<br>• The high needs block in Leeds, in common with many around the country, is under considerable pressure due to increasing demographic growth and complexity of children's needs.<br>• There were overspends on the high needs block of £4.8m in 2016/17 and £2.4m in 2017/18 with a further £2.5m projected for 2018/19, despite some savings being implemented.<br>• If the cap on gains had not been in place Leeds would have received additional high needs funding of £7m in 2018/19 and £5m (indicative) for 2019/20.<br>• The local authority can transfer up to 0.5% (£2.5m) from the schools block with Schools Forum approval, with the option to transfer more with approval from the DfE.<br>• A £2.5m transfer would leave an extra £5.6m in the schools block compared to the amount allocated to schools in 2018/19.<br>• A schools block transfer was one of the options supported by the previous high needs consultation focus groups. | |
| 4.13 | **LH outlined the consultation responses:**<br>75 responses were received to this proposal. 54 (72%) supported the proposal and 21 (28%) did not. A number of comments expressed disappointment that the increase in the council's high needs funding is being capped by the government. Comments were also received that a transfer from the schools block may mean that the issue of the current pressures caused by the cap on gains is not obvious to the ESFA. As previously confirmed to Schools Forum, the council has discussed this issue with the ESFA however at this stage no additional funding has been forthcoming. | |
| 4.14 | The majority of respondents supported the original proposal, and therefore the local authority is still proposing to transfer £2.5m from the schools block to the high needs block. The movement of up to 0.5% (£2.5m) from the schools block is a Schools Forum decision. In the event that Schools Forum | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | does not agree with our proposals, the DfE can adjudicate if the local authority wanted to request this. The proposed transfer from the schools block to the high needs block only relates to proposals for 2019/20. In 2020/21 it is possible that a further request could also be made to transfer funds from the schools block to the high needs block. This would depend on the savings that can be made through other means or if additional funding was forthcoming. If a further transfer was required it would form part of a separate consultation during the next financial year. The council is required by the DfE to present a range of evidence to support our proposal to transfer funding from the schools block to the high needs block. The local authority has carried out a self-assessment against the requirements in order to demonstrate | |
| 4.15 | **The consultation responses from the central schools services block to the high needs block was as follows:**<br>There were 75 responses were received to this proposal. 61 (81%) supported the proposal and 14 (19%) did not. Very few comments were received about this proposal, and as indicated by the results the comments were generally supportive of the proposal. The council is proposing a transfer of up to £800k from the central schools services block. The precise amount that would be transferred from the central schools services block is subject to the costs and funding relating to this block being confirmed. | |
| 4.16 | In relation to the CSSB transfer to the High Needs Block, Schools Forum members said they want assurances that if they vote on transferring the money services would not be cut. Officers assured members that services will not be cut if the money was transferred. | |
| 4.17 | LH advised members of the details of the proposed **Schools Funding Formula**. The local authority is responsible for proposing the schools funding formula and for consulting on this with Schools Forum. This proposal is only for 2019/20, and the council will be required to consult again next year on the 2020/21 funding formula. Members stated that there is a huge difference for a small number of schools between option 1 and 2. The council is required to apply a funding formula in order to allocate schools block funding to schools. The ESFA sets a range of factors the local authority are able to use in the formula. Within each of these factors there are also certain restrictions that can applied. | |
| 4.18 | The local authority's view is that option 1 provides the greatest stability in the formula as it delivers the same priorities as in 2018/19 - a 0.5% minimum per pupil increase in funding, a 2.3% cap on gains per pupil and the same minimum funding level per pupil. The rest of the funding formula is substantially the same as in 2018/19 however the pupil led factors have been scaled back by 0.2% compared to the national funding formula in order to deliver these priorities and take into account the transfer of £2.5m to the high needs block. | |
| 4.19 | LH said the council also modelled a second option to demonstrate the effect of increasing the minimum per pupil funding level while protecting the cap on gains at 2.3%: this would result in a reduced minimum increase per pupil of 0.25%. As part of the consultation schools were advised that the final formula the council adopts will not necessarily be one of the options, stated in the report as feedback from schools will be taken into account when considering the final arrangements. In addition the final funding allocation for 2019/20 will be confirmed by the ESFA in mid-December 2018. | |
| 4.20 | An update was given on PFI issues. Members were informed that conversations are happening with the ESFA about PFI schools that may require a disapplication request but that will not have an impact on today's decisions. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4.21 | **LH read out the consultation responses**<br>There were 77 responses received on the funding formula, with the results being essentially evenly split between the two options:<br>• 36 preferred option 1<br>• 39 preferred option 2<br>• The remaining two said they had no preference | |
| 4.22 | A number of schools acknowledged that they had responded on the basis of the option that benefitted them the most, although some chose the option that they felt was best for the city as a whole. Some concerns were expressed that the impact of the transfer to the high needs block was being felt disproportionately by some schools, for example under option 1 there are a small number of schools who see a much lower increase than they would under option 2. Some comments were also received that some schools would gain more than the indicative national funding formula and that this funding should be distributed to other schools. | |
| 4.23 | Members stated that it will be ideal to look at something in between option 1 and 2. Schools Forum asked for a further modelled of the options to be done to see what it would look like but still be mindful to those schools that are negatively impacted. The Chair said that a decision still needs to be taken today and a vote with the caveat to bring further remodelled details to the January meeting.<br>**Action Agreed:**<br>**Louise Hornsey to look at some further re-modelling.** | LH |
| 4.24 | LH gave the background to the proposal to the **contribution towards severance costs for maintained schools**. The council consulted on a proposal for maintained schools to contribute a total of £200k towards the severance costs of maintained school staff, which are charged to the council. The council is requesting that maintained schools contribute £200k (£3.12 per pupil) towards severance costs for maintained schools. | |
| 4.25 | **Consultation responses**<br>38 responses were received from maintained schools to this proposal. 29 (76%) supported the proposal and 9 (24%) did not. Some schools commented that they had worked hard to minimise redundancies and therefore did not feel it was fair to be asked to contribute towards these costs for other schools. However under the regulations the council can only apply this contribution as a per pupil amount, rather than passing on the actual costs to individual schools. | |
| | | |
| **5.0** | **Voting** | |
| 5.1 | The Chair clarified to members that vote one was for mainstream schools and academies only, vote two was for all Schools Forum members and vote three was for maintained mainstream. Schools Forum was quorate so the following voting took place: | |
| 5.2 | **<u>Vote One</u>**<br>Schools Forum is asked to consider and vote on a proposal to transfer £2.5m from the schools block to the high needs block. It is a Schools Forum decision on whether to accept this proposal. In the event that Schools Forum does not agree, the DfE are able to adjudicate if the local authority requests this.<br>(only mainstream schools and academies voted)<br>• In favour — 9<br>• Against - None<br>• Abstained - 3<br>This motion was carried | |
| 5.3 | **<u>Vote Two</u>**<br>Schools Forum is asked to consider and vote on a proposal to transfer up to approximately £800k | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | from the central schools services block to the high needs block (with the final amount being subject to confirmation of costs and funding). This transfer can be made by the local authority following consultation with Schools Forum.<br>(all Schools Forum members voted)<br>• In favour — 15<br>• Against - None<br>• Abstained - None | |
| 5.4 | **Vote Three**<br>Maintained school members of Schools Forum are asked to consider and vote on a proposal for a contribution in 2019/20 by maintained schools towards the severance costs of maintained school staff, to be applied as a per pupil amount of £3.12. It is a Schools Forum decision on whether to accept this proposal. In the event that Schools Forum does not agree, the DfE are able to adjudicate if the local authority requests this.<br>(only maintained mainstream schools voted)<br>• In favour –- 6<br>• Against – none<br>• Abstained – none | |
| 5.5 | Schools Forum was asked to comment on the proposed principles for the schools funding formula for 2019/20. Members indicated their broad support for option 1 but with adjustments so that the schools seeing the greatest difference between the proposal and the national funding formula would have this difference reduced. | |
| | | |
| **6.0** | **AOB** | |
| 6.1 | None noted. | |
| | | |
| **7.0** | **Meeting dates for 2018-2019** | |
| 7.1 | **Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 17 January 2019, 4.30pm at Merrion House**<br><br>Date of Future Meetings:<br>• Wednesday 13/02/2019 (please note this is a change from the previous date of 21/02/2019)<br>• Thursday 13/06/2019 | |