

Minutes of the Schools Forum Sub Committee

Wednesday 20th January 2021

Present: Jenny Baker – Chair
Angela Fright
Emma Ferrey
Keith Grainger
Richard Stok
Marion Bent
Liz Cole
Kashif Nawaz
Martin Gocke
Gareth Barnard
Debbie Smith – part attended

Minutes: Sam Morgan

Item	Comments / Action	By Whom
1	Apologies Apologies were recorded from Paul Clark, Stuart Matthews, Anneken Priesack	
2	Declarations of Interest None Richard Stok declared a family connection to Holly Spring during the course of the meeting.	
3	Confirmation of confidential location All confirmed.	
4	Minutes of previous meeting There were no amendments or comments made.	
5	Terms of Reference KN reported that the former report (December) was unanimously accepted. Terms of Reference are therefore formally adopted until August 2022.	
6	Updates (EF) SLAs <ul style="list-style-type: none">Finalised for Brakenhale and Jennetts Park.Some minor adjustments for Kings Academy and Sandy Lane.Beginning the process are Rainbow, Binfield, Harmanswater, Owlsmoor, The Pines. Q. RS – Please clarify that provision for Meadowvale would include Rainbow provision and SaLT. EF confirmed that all would be incorporated into one SLA. Task and Finish Group <ul style="list-style-type: none">JB and MB have volunteered to be part of this group.EF will be leading work on the funding matrix, the aim of which is to ensure clarity over funding available for individual children.EF and JB met yesterday to review the different options and to simplify the offer.EF to circulate draft options document to Schools Forum Sub Committee.Final document will form the basis of discussion moving forward.Options are clear; minor adjustments are needed on modelling and costs.The final model will be presented on the 11th March.	EF

Schools Forum Sub Committee – 20th January 2021

Signed: _____ Date: _____

<p>Q</p> <p>Q</p> <p>Q</p> <p>Q</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is hoped this this will be rolled out in September 2021, pending conversations with PC in the meantime. <p>MG noted that there are no mainstream representatives. During the meeting, KG was appointed Secondary representative. LC will email Primary Heads but if not, happy to represent. RS was appointed as non-school representative.</p> <p>MB – what is the timeline? EF – these are not set but dates will be linked to Sub Group meetings. JB noted that it is imperative that there is representation from a finance perspective so that all discussions are viable. AF was appointed as Finance representative.</p> <p>MG – what is the outline of the aims? EF – the aims are to provide consistency, transparency and to be clear on how children are funded and how that will deliver across different settings. It is not just about cost savings. KN agreed but noted that the cost elements are a consideration. EF will circulate the HNFM document discussed with JB. KN has a meeting with PC 21st January and will update the group.</p> <p>AF – what are the expectations in terms of modelling? EF – there will be ongoing discussions with each setting, some may change some details. JB – it will also form part of the EHCP which will need to match so that schools can meet needs. EF confirmed that there will be a finance representative on the Task and Finish group.</p>	<p>LC</p> <p>EF KN</p>
<p>7</p> <p>Q</p>	<p>Outstanding SPCF Bids</p> <p>KN reported on behalf of PC. Wildridings and Kennel Lane are outstanding. There were some further queries on College Hall and Meadowvale but PC hasn't had a chance to work on this. An update will be provided after meeting tomorrow.</p> <p>MG – Is there a time limit on spending? EF – Yes, but quite a long time as runs over 3 years. Funding has to be advertised on BF website.</p> <p>EF to consult with the two schools and update at next meeting.</p>	<p>EF</p>
<p>8</p> <p>Q</p>	<p>Project for the High Needs block</p> <p>KN shared a presentation (see attached) Proposal was sent to CMT which was acknowledged and noted. Resources have been set aside to focus on the High Needs block. Transformation Team are working on this project. KN to share more details on the transformation plan at the next meeting.</p> <p>KD – what are the high level priorities? KN – to address the pressures on the High Needs Block and enable delivery of the commissioning plan. KN to forward commissioning plan to SM for circulation with minutes.</p>	<p>KN</p> <p>KN / SM</p>

Q	<p>RS – Who has responsibility for SEMH Provision until a Governing Body can be formed? EF – SEMH sits within the Project Team which RM will hold responsibility for. Feasibility study deadline is next month and next steps will be sourcing a provider, site and budget. EF to provide a specific update at next meeting. KN requested that this to be a standing agenda item. JB noted that the new Commissioner should be on this group when in post.</p>	EF
9	<p>Specialist Resource Provision</p> <p>EF has spoken to Heads of both Birch Hill and Sandy Lane. There is a statutory process which takes 4 weeks and prior to that there will be an informal consultation with parents. Model letter has been sent. After February half term, the formal proposal will be launched. EF has produced a FAQs for parents. Both provisions are for ASD/other learning difficulties and will be in place in September.</p> <p>Q</p> <p>RS – How is this different? Meadowvale is underutilised. EF – Has had discussions with the Head – there are more children with ASD than can accommodate. The aim is to have an intensive EY so that progression through school could become more mainstream over time. This should be possible if the work is put in early enough.</p>	
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>Q</p> <p>MG – Capital Programme Bids – Birch Hill Modular Refurbishment bids £15k, Holly Spring £120k – where does this fit with the development strategy? KN – was not aware of this but needs discussion with the school particularly if there are revenue implications. All developments are done in partnership with the LA. All similar settings will have an SLA.</p> <p>Q</p> <p>RS – Please clarify specification for Holly Spring. KN – Unable to answer but will update at the next meeting. RS declared a conflict of interest.</p> <p>KD – It is essential to have sight of the budgets (page 110 in the Forum papers). KN – Any project that does appear in the Schools Forum will have been part of the Sub Committee first.</p> <p>KD – The aim of this group is to provide support KN to enable prioritising of work. JB asked KN if he needed anything further from the group. KN thanked the group. By the next meeting it is hoped that we will be better placed to understand the needs of schools.</p>	KN
	<p>Next meeting: Wednesday 10th March at 15:15. There being no further business, the meeting closed at 16:24pm.</p>	

Schools Forum Sub Committee

Action Plan

Item	Action	Responsibility	Completed Yes/No	Comments
06	EF to send draft document to MB.	EF		
06	EF to circulate the HNFM document discussed with JB.	EF		
06	KN to update following meeting with PC 21 st January.	KN		
07	EF to consult with the two schools and update at next meeting.	EF		
08	KN to share more details on the transformation plan at the next meeting.	KN		
08	KN to forward commissioning plan to SM for circulation with minutes.	KN	Yes	
08	EF to provide a specific update on SEMH provision at next meeting.	EF		
10	KN to clarify specification for Holly Spring School.	KN		