

**SCHOOLS FORUM
18 OCTOBER 2012
4.30 - 4.53 PM**



Present:

Schools Members

Sue Barber, Primary School Governor
Ed Essery, Primary School Governor
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor
Martin Gocke, Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Louise Lovegrove, Primary School Representative
Joanna Quinn, Primary School Representative
Paul Salter, Secondary School Representative
Trudi Sammons, Primary School Representative
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)

Non-Schools Members:

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)

Apologies for absence were received from:

Liz Cole, Primary School Representative
Trisha Donkin, Primary School Representative
Keith Grainger, Secondary Head Teachers Representative
John McNab, Secondary School Governor
Margaret Saner, Secondary School Governor
Kate Sillett, PVI Provider Representative
Kathy Winrow, Secondary School Representative
Councillor Dr Gareth Barnard, Executive Member for Children, Young People & Learning

17. Declarations of Interest

John Throssell declared an interest in agenda item 4 being Chairman of Governors at Crown Wood School.

18. Minutes and Matters Arising

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2012 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

19. School Funding Reform

The Forum considered a report summarising the results of the Financial Consultation exercise with governing bodies and other interested parties. It set out schools' views regarding a number of changes proposed to the way funds were to be allocated to mainstream schools which the Schools Forum was requested to take into account when making proposals for the 2013-14 Bracknell Forest Funding Formula for Schools which would be formally agreed by the Executive Member for Children, Young People & Learning.

The Forum noted the outcome from the financial consultation with schools. It was reminded that it had received reports on school funding reform which had confirmed that there would be no changes to the national funding system before the start of the next Spending Review Period (2015), but that for April 2013, there would be an impact on local arrangements for schools from the following key changes:

- The simplification and standardisation of the way that resources were distributed to schools through the funding formula, with each local authority required to inform the Department for Education of its new formula no later than 31 October, 2012.
- Creating a national benchmark for funding schools in their general budgets to support pupils with special educational needs;
- Delegation of additional resources to schools for services currently managed centrally by the Council.

A School Funding Review Group with membership from head teachers, governors, school bursars and local authority officers had worked through the new requirements and agreed the questions to be asked of all schools through a 12 week consultation period. Responses had been received from 30 out of 37 schools (81% response rate).

The Forum was advised that, in general, there had been a strong consensus of opinion from respondents, with at least 73% of replies supporting the same proposal on 23 out of 26 questions (88%). The areas where there was less agreement related to:

- Question 4 - The method to be used to distribute funds to schools to recognise deprivation where the most popular option received 40% of responses.
- Questions 13 and 14 - The method to be used to distribute funds to schools from factors that would be non-compliant with the new funding regulation. The most popular option for property related items attracted 53% of responses with the most popular option for non-property related items attracting 57%.

The changes proposed ensured compliance with the draft School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations, 2013.

In response to a question, the Forum was advised that information relating to Kennel Lane School and the College Hall Pupil Referral Unit would be presented to it too.

The Forum was duly invited to consider its decision on each of the questions posed as part of the consultation.

RESOLVED that

- 1 Those schools losing money at April 2013 through the funding reforms be allowed to retain any significant surplus balance without a valid reason until 31 March 2015;
- 2 The decisions in respect of each of the questions posed as part of the consultation be as follows:

Question 1 (Primary Schools Only)

Do you agree that the way schools are funded for 3 and 4 year olds through the Early Years Single Funding Formula should remain unchanged?

That there are no changes to the way schools are funded for 3 and 4 year olds through the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

Question 2 (Secondary Schools Only)

Do you support the use of differential Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 per pupil funding rates for secondary schools?

That differential per pupil funding rates be applied at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.

Question 3 (Secondary Schools Only)

If differential rates are used, do you agree that the current funding ratio of approximately 1 : 1.20 should continue?

That the funding ratio between Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 pupils continues at 1:1.2.

Question 4 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for allocating funds to schools to reflect deprivation?

That Option C: 40% on FSM numbers, 60% on IDACI bandings increasing by a factor of 0.5 for funding schools for deprivation be implemented.

Question 5 (Primary Schools Only)

Do you think the threshold to trigger funding for primary schools for low prior attainment should be set at below 73 or below 78 on the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile?

That the threshold to trigger funding for primary schools for low prior attainment should be set at below 78 on the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile.

Question 6 (Primary Schools Only)

Do you agree that in order to protect the smallest schools, all primary schools should receive the same lump sum payment of £150k, and that the £174k shortfall in current allocations should be financed from a deduction to the unallocated funds currently distributed via fixed lump sum payments?

That all primary schools should receive the same lump sum payment of £150k financed from a deduction to the unallocated funds currently distributed via fixed lump sum payments.

Question 7 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for re-distributing funds to schools that exceed the £150,000 cap proposed for a lump sum payment?

That any funds available after allocating £150,000 to each school as a fixed lump sum payment should be distributed 55% by pupil numbers, 15% on deprivation and 30% on low prior attainment for primary schools, and 65%, 15% and 20% for secondaries.

Question 8 (Secondary Schools Only)

If allowed by the DfE, do you agree that an additional factor should be added to the BF Funding Formula to target relevant funds only to the schools that will incur costs from joint use of sports facilities?

That an additional factor be added to fund relevant schools that will incur costs from joint use of sports facilities.

Question 9 (Secondary Schools Only)

If an additional factor is not permitted to target funds to relevant schools with joint use sports facilities, which method should be used to distribute the funds?

That, in view of the decision relating to question 8 being agreed by the Department for Education, no action is necessary in relation to this question..

Question 10 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for distributing funds to schools to support EAL pupils?

That schools are funded for EAL pupils for the first three years that the pupils are in the education system.

Question 11 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for distributing funds to schools to support Looked After Children (LAC)?

That schools should receive funding for pupils who have been looked-after children at any time.

Question 12 (All Schools)

Do you agree that a factor should be included in the BF Funding Formula to allocate resources to schools facing high pupil mobility outside normal admissions periods?

That a high pupil mobility factor should be included in the Formula for Primary Schools, but should not be included in the Formula for Secondary Schools.

Question 13 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for allocating funds to schools for the disallowed property related factors?

That funds to schools for the disallowed property related factors be allocated 80% by pupil numbers, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment.

Question 14 (All Schools)

Which method should be used for allocating funds to schools for the remaining disallowed factors?

That funds to schools for the disallowed non-property related factors be allocated 80% by pupil numbers, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment.

Question 15

Do you agree that local arrangements for supporting pupils with additional educational needs should be in accordance with the Department for Education recommendation that schools are funded to meet around the first £6,000 of additional need?

That schools are funded to meet around the first £6,000 of additional educational needs for each pupil from their general funding.

Question 16

Do you agree that a fund should be created to support schools that admit levels of pupils with special educational needs significantly above the numbers and needs provided for in their general funding?

That, in principle, a fund should be created to support schools that admit levels of pupils with special educational needs significantly above the numbers and needs provided for in their general funding, pending further information on operational and financial implications.

Question 17

Which method should be used for allocating additional funds to schools to meet around the first £6,000 of additional support needs required by individual pupils?

That additional funds be allocated to schools to meet around the first £6,000 of additional support needs required by individual pupils with 65% of budget allocated by head count data, 15% by deprivation and 20% on low prior attainment, using the prescribed Department of Education model.

Question 18

For reasons of practicality, do you agree that the dividing line for calculating the funding transfer to schools for the first £6,000 of additional pupil support needs should be set at the closest NWPU banding, rather than the actual value needed to achieve the £6,000 threshold?

That the value of additional pupil support to be added to school budgets should be set at the closest NWPU banding, rather than the actual value needed to achieve the £6,000 threshold.

Question 19

Do you agree that all of the services subject to delegation for the first time from April 2013 should be allocated to schools through Option A as detailed in Appendix O of the Review of the BF Funding Formula booklet?

That for newly delegated items, funding should be allocated to schools through Option A as detailed in Appendix O of the Review of the Bracknell Forest Funding Formula booklet.

Question 20

To maintain a strategic approach in the use of the funds for items 1-5 in Table 3, do you agree that the Schools Forum should be requested to de-delegate all relevant funding?

That funds for school contingencies, support to schools in financial difficulties, English as an Additional Language, SIMS and other licences and staff supply cover for official absences should be de-delegated and centrally managed by the Council.

Question 21

In respect of Behaviour Support Services, items 6-9 in Table 3, do you agree that from April 2014, the service should be operated on a trading basis, but to allow sufficient time to prepare the service for change, that for 2013-14 only, the budget is returned for central management by the Council?

That the local CMCD programme, Behaviour and Education Support Team, Anti-bullying Co-ordinator and Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) absences should be de-delegated and centrally managed by the Council for 1 year.

Question 22

If required, do you agree that schools above the MFG and in receipt of per pupil funding increases should meet the cost of financing the protection required for schools below the MFG, with schools receiving the largest financial gain, contributing a larger proportion of their increase (option A)?

That if required, those schools above the MFG and in receipt of per pupil funding increases should meet the cost of financing the protection required for schools below the MFG, with schools receiving the largest financial gain, contributing a larger proportion of their increase (option A).

Question 23 (Primary Schools Only)

Do you agree that any additional funding received through the DSG to reflect deferred entries into reception classes should be allocated to schools on a per pupil basis?

That no specific factor be included for deferred admissions to reception classes, but if a significant financial issue arises, it is dealt as an exceptional item through the school contingency.

Question 24 (All Schools)

Do you agree that when required, the Schools Forum should set up a specific centrally managed budget to allocate in year to schools experiencing significant in-year growth in pupil numbers?

That a specific centrally managed budget to allocate in year to schools experiencing significant in-year growth in pupil numbers be set up.

Question 25 (Primary Schools Only)

Do you agree that in order to target resources to schools facing additional costs in order to comply with Key Stage 1 infant class size regulations that limit pupil numbers to no more than 30 a teacher, that a specific fund is set up, financed from half the funding relevant schools currently receive through the small school 'missing pupil' factor?

That a specific fund be set up, financed from half the funding relevant schools currently receive through the small school 'missing pupil' factor to support schools facing additional costs to meet the impact of infant class size regulations.

Question 26 (All Schools)

Do you agree that where there are real, identifiable costs arising as a result of a new, reorganised or closing school, that the Schools Forum should set aside specific funding to finance the additional costs?

That when necessary, specific funding should be set aside to finance the additional costs arising from new, reorganised or closing schools.

Question 27

Are you aware of any areas of budget pressure or areas of new development that you would like to be added to school budgets, subject to sufficient funds being available?

That further consideration be given to the following items as part of the budget building process:

- *Building maintenance;*
- *Rising cost of utilities;*
- *Funds to update ICT equipment;*
- *Full funding for 4 year olds;*
- *Impact from industrial action;*
- *In-year arrivals of pupils with SEN;*
- *Capacity of borough to assist schools in real emergency situations (floods, roof collapse, heating failure).*
- *Early Years Foundation Stage: compliance to the new framework*

- 3 The Executive Member for Children, Young People & Learning be requested to agree that the Bracknell Forest Funding Formula for Schools be amended accordingly.

20. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The Forum noted that its next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 13 December 2012 at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank