

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting
12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm
Virtual meeting.

Members:	Position	Voting	Attendance
Victoria Richmond	Primary Maintained Headteacher	Voting	Absent
Karen Joy	Special Maintained Headteacher	Voting	Absent
Karen Bennett	PRU Maintained Headteacher	Voting	Absent
Heidi Barton	Primary Academy Headteacher	Voting	Present
Cathy Reid	Secondary Academy Headteacher	Voting	Present
Paul Jackson	Special/PRU Academy Headteacher	Voting	Present
Stephen Avis	CFO Multi Academy Trust	Voting	Present
Richard Warnham	Governor Primary Maintained	Voting	Present
Barbara Fincham	Governor Primary Academy	Voting	Present
Clive Mailing -Vice Chair	Governor Secondary Maintained	Voting	Present
Peter Martin – Chair	Governor Secondary Academy	Voting	Absent
Justin Stuart	Governor Special and PRU	Voting	Present
Hannah Cartwright	Early Years Representative	Non-voting	Absent
Simon Cook	16-19 Provider Representative	Non-voting	Present
Kirstin Barker	C of E Diocese Representative	Voting	Present
Clare Redmond	RC Diocese Representative	Voting	Present
Vacancy	Teaching Unions Representative	Non-voting	Absent
Stuart Gardiner	CFO Multi Academy Trust	Voting	Present
In attendance:			
Celia Buxton	Assistant Director of Education and SEND LA.		
Maria Beaney	Finance Business Partner LA.		
Sarah Phillipson	Transcribed Governance Professional?		
Martin Daniels	Finance LA		
Leeanne Farach	Director of Children Services		

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting
12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm
Virtual meeting.

No.	Discussion.
1.	<p>Apologies and attendance.</p> <p>As noted above. The meeting was quorate.</p>
2	<p>Declarations of Interest.</p> <p>No Changes to the previously shared declarations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clive Mailing – declared an interest with St Augustine's business case section as he is Chair of Governors. • Kirsten Barker – declared an interest in St Johns business case section as she is part of that School. • Justin Stuart – declared an interest in the Walderslade Primary school business case section as he is part of the same Trust.
3	<p>Minutes from the previous meetings on 1st December 2022.</p> <p><u>Accuracy:</u> The Minutes were agreed as an accurate representation of the meeting.</p> <p>PJ proposed and seconded by CR.</p> <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p><i>Action – CB to write to the affected provisions to make them aware of the process regarding the funding going forward. COMPLETED.</i></p> <p><i>Action – CB to come back to the Schools Forum with a strategic approach to the dip in numbers going forward.</i></p> <p>Q – Under SEN Strategy and place planning report, the minutes state, "The current strategy aimed to work with schools to ensure that children and young people meet their needs in the most appropriate setting. The LA work with mainstream schools to assist them to support a higher number of children with Education, Health and Care Plans. In 2019, 36% of SEN risen to 42% compared with 40% nationally. Is this correct? There are a different set of figures in the later transfer funding documents, so can I check which ones are correct?"</p> <p>A – The LA will check the data and return it to the Forum to confirm. They could be looking at a particular cohort.</p>
4	<p>Dedicated Schools Grant Allocation Update – Maria Beaney</p> <p>MB explained that The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) requires all Local Authorities (LA) to provide information to its Schools' Forum about its Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) regularly. Table one in section 2.1 of the report (shown below) outlines that the LA has reduced its DSG allocation to £95,018,710. These are unexpected DSG adjustments due to LA's School's block allocation being reduced by £851,695 as one maintained School converted to academy status. The high needs block was reduced by £228,000 to allow for additional pupils placed outside of the LA under the input and output adjustment but increased by £34,186 for additional free school places between the last update and the DSG allocations. Total adjustment £1,045,509.</p>

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

Table 1 - 2021-2022 DSG Allocation after academy deductions

	March Allocation £	November Allocation £	Adjustment £
Schools Block	42,775,278.	41,923,583	(851,695)
CSSB	892,539	892,539	0
High Needs Block.	34,142,981	33,949,167	(193,814)
Early Years Block	18,253,421	18,253,421	0
Total.	96,064,219	95,018,710	(1,045,509)

The biggest allocation change comes with the Academy DSG for next year, which will be £288.5million, just over £220 million on the School's block.

Table 2 - 2022-2023 DSG allocation before and after the academy recoupment

	Before Academy Recoupment £	After Academy Recoupment £
Schools Block	220,245,783	218,531,902
CSSB	958,342	958,342
High Needs Block	49,547,567	37,779,416
Early Years Block	17,712,224	17,712,224
Total	288,463,916	274,981,884

Table 3 - 2022-2023 school block allocation breakdown

	School Block Breakdown £
Primary & Secondary funding	214,435,627
Premises funding	3,674,083
Growth funding	2,136,073
Total	220,245,783

Table 4 - 2022 DSG allocation comparison to the 2021 allocation

	2021-22 School Block Breakdown £	2022-23 School Block Breakdown £	Percentage Increase
Primary & Secondary funding	197,218,761		
Protected teachers' pay and pensions grant	9,098,596	214,435,627	3.9%
Premises funding	1,965,243	3,674,083	87.0%
Growth funding	1,791,745	2,136,073.	19.2%
Total	210,074,345	220,245,783	4.8%

MB noted to the Forum that the pupil basic elements of funding have had almost a 4% increase between one year and the next. This is the funding that the local authority received to pay for that particular Formula.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

	<p>MB noted that the report also highlighted the LA per-pupil funding rates for 2022-23 and compared local authorities across the UK.</p> <p>The Schools' Forum noted this report.</p> <p>Q – Why was Medway spending more per pupil than Kent (£80)? A - All LA are trying to move to a national funding formula; it's taking time to do this. You might see on the primary, for example, Medway is receiving less than Kent, but on the secondary, we're receiving more than Kent, so it's varying degrees; Kent, for example, has a couple of London weightings within their schools and therefore they attract higher funding. Also, Medway has higher deprivations than some London schools. That is all built into the Formula based on pupil numbers and data; that's why some of the unit costs can look different compared to local authorities.</p> <p>Q – Now, looking at the comparison with the high needs, I note from the minutes of the last meeting that there was a fair bit of conversation about transfers of funds to the high needs budget. This information does show more information around local authorities and how they have made decisions regarding transferring amounts into the high needs budget. This might help members to feel more comfortable? Would that be correct? A – The Kent forum agreed to a 1% transfer from the school block to the high needs block. Medway is starting from a lower high need's unit cost also.</p> <p>The Schools' Forum noted this report.</p>
5	<p>High Needs Recovery Plan update – Celia Buxton</p> <p>CB explained that this report is regarding the transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, which this Forum rejected at the last meeting, as a means of offsetting the high needs. For 2022-23, Medway requests the 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block into the High Needs Block. This will equate to £1.093 million or £26 per pupil. We understand and appreciate the sensitivity of this request but believe not to request schools' support for a transfer means we will be failing in our duty to do all that we can to help manage this budget challenge. This request effectively repeats the one-off transfer made in 2021-22.</p> <p>The detailed work on this is still ongoing but what is very clear, is that Medway do not have the same proportion of children, young people with the EHCP in their mainstream schools, as is nationally.</p> <p>Part of that, is because the LA put a lot of the resource in the system to a smaller number of cases in very high-cost provisions, and have more children in that independent sector, particularly in the independent specialist sector.</p> <p>The revisions to the high need's deficit recovery plan, is to have a focus on improving the support around schools to be able for them to cater more effectively for children and young people with the EHCPs. In order to do this the LA, recognise that there isn't the resource in the system at the moment. This is not only additional funding, but the development of skills within schools, whether that's a training offer, additional funding that can be used within localities, and autonomously governed and owned by schools, to direct that resource to where the need is most required in a much timely fashion and only been able to access additional support if gone through pre-process for an individual child.</p> <p>This will allow local system leadership to work collegiately to address the issues that are arising on a daily basis, and to put in place some pre-emptive activity, plan together to meet the needs of these more complex children who are coming through as business as usual.</p>

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

CB explained that this proposal is recognising that the LA needs to put this process in place and ultimately, have this as an ongoing sustainable system, where the LA are not putting so much into those high cost, very, very complex cases, but are able to have more availability of resource within the mainstream system.

To get to that position, the LA are going to need a transition period, to develop that support around mainstream schools, while still maintaining the status quo for the children that have currently got EHCPs.

Slight change to the report shared, the LA are now not asking for the 0.5% but for £850,000. £150,000 for this year, and possibly for next year to start to develop that work and to set the system up on a spend to save case. Once this is up and running, and the LA see a reduction in the children going into more high-cost specialist provision, then the high needs budget may well be able to sustain this support in localities moving forward without the need for a transfer.

If agreed, the Inclusion funding will be administered by Medway in consultation with schools and report back to the Schools' Funding Forum. The LA asked the Schools forum view of the best group/s to provide the quality assurance and the governance of this funding or if another group needs to be created. This group will not only support the commissioning and governance function of this funding but include robust quality assurance and identification of future priorities.

This will be supplemented by wider engagement with children and young people, parents/carers, and practitioners through the development of a broader Inclusion Strategy for Medway.

Q – The Forum can only agree one year at a time, although the LA might have aspirations to do it on an annual basis or till, we get to a more level playing field. We can only agree one year at a time in any case. Is that correct?

A – Yes, it is, I wanted to be really clear that there was an expectation there, because I understand that last year, when it was agreed for transfer costs offset to the deficit, it was stated there was only for one year, whereas I know the local authority planning had been for a longer-term solution.

Q -The use of this money, is not to pay for deficit, but to transfer skills and facilities to mainstream schools is something that I would agree with, however my concern is that Kent have been trying to do this for a little while and they are still going to be transferring 1% of their budget into high needs. There is a difficulty between thinking this might save money and therefore can reduce the deficit. The evidence from Kent would suggest that that's not the case, therefore, I'm worried that we were doing this transfer, and might end up with more children in our mainstream schools, who would have been in high cost extra provisions. Where is the evidence to show that that will be successful in reducing the overall spend?

A – Kent is in its third year of asking for 1% transfer. The training programmers and development leadership inclusive leadership programmers started in January, and the provision of nurture training across all of the schools in Kent, and providing release time for staff also started last September.

So, they're quite new in terms of the introduction of that training and support with schools, this is due to the size of Kent and the commissioning function around that.

In terms of their early impact, it's been very well received and welcomed by schools in terms of impact on outcomes, yet to see that for young people. However, the funding started right at the start of the COVID pandemic. And so, for the first year, no progress was made. They have built up their pot of money, so Kent have been doing this for a while on paper, they have not had impact on the ground since last September, and things have been coming on board since then.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting
12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm
Virtual meeting.

The LA are confident that because Medway is smaller, because there's a there's a tighter group of schools that can work together around this, that it can deploy this resource to best meet the need. This gives the system leadership a pot of money to actually be able to focus on what they want and to have ownership of it.

Conversations have been had previously around funding following the child, in Medway we can move that forward. The other thing which they haven't done in Kent, which I am proposing is to put that locality money in. Kent haven't done this yet - Their programme is around training and support for School, so whole school approaches, specialist teaching and learning service and supporting that across and some pilot work, because it's so large, what they haven't done yet. And what I'm confident that Kent can do in a much quicker and more effective way is to have a fund within those localities that is for the deployment of the heads and the schools within that area.

A Schools forum member noted that he was happy to support it this time, because it's different, it's not trying to pay off the deficit. However, if the LA do come back next year to ask for this again, and schools have not seen anything happening or things are just the same, then he wouldn't vote for it again. Medway needs to be much faster to see the impact.

Q – I note that it says that Medway has 33.8% of EHCPs students in mainstream, whereas Kent is only 31%. So, I'm just noticing that I'm also really pleased to hear that you will be talking to educational leaders. I'm not aware that any conversation has gone on yet I also note from the minutes of the last meeting, that there was also going to be a transparent conversation about alternative provision. And again, I'm not aware of that conversation. I think heads have come a long way and in terms of working with the local authority, I do not want to be in situation where system leaders are not being spoken to, and there has been no discussions, then the LA come to a meeting without any of the prior work being done.

A - That paper that is ready to come to schools, once the LA have an agreement or disagreement with it, which outlines the action, how they will be done and when. All are included in the AP review for funding, the special school funding, the introduction of a more robust commissioning service to make sure that the costs are managed in a better way in terms of use of an independent sector. It will be circulated after this meeting, pending the outcome of this meeting. It is on the agenda for the Medway partnership group, and MELLA on the 21st timer. The LA want this to be led by school leaders. It has to be produced by them.

Q - But in response to that, the LA are asking me to vote on this as Chair of the Medway secondary heads without seeing the paper and without having any chance to consult on it?

A – The Main integral activities are in the report shared, but the detail isn't there yet, as it hasn't gone to the system leaders.

LF added that as the Director of children services at Medway the relationship with the local authority in terms of school leaders will be led by system leadership by school leaders, hence having the paper ready. The introduction has spoken about collegiate and the LA is very keen to start moving it that way because it has identified that it radically needs to change its relationship with school leaders.

LF gave her assurances that the LA can absolutely say that this process will be to work with you.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

A Schools forum member added that all systems leaders have an issue that requires the collective to step up and deal with what?. The comparisons with Kent are really clear and stark. Kent will have the same challenges that Medway has, and it will require the collective to step forward and sacrifice. Whilst there are fewer kids in special schools in Kent, and less children than in Medway in the mainstream schools, there are significant more children coming into further education. Is there is an appetite for the LA to do a cost analysis to see what it costs, as transferring money into the higher needs budget, is there is a risk, that it just exacerbates the issue that there are more children in special schools, on five day a week, a provision that is costing the LA a fortune, and is setting an expectation that carries on until the age of 25.

Q- Can you assure us, that the transfer won't exacerbate some higher volume going into special schools?

A – The money is solely focused on improving capacity in mainstream schools, it's not about proving our capacity in special schools. The work that the LA need to do with special schools is to make sure that they have the most complex needs, and are not filled with young people whose parents have pushed for an EHCP. What the LA also need to do in terms of the capacity for its special schools is to look at that post 16 issue and post 19 issue and have some really honest conversations about the expansion of those and how they are working in terms of preparation for adulthood and developing independence of young people, rather than just sustaining young people in specialist provision until they're 25. So, they're all of those are part of the conversations that we're expecting to have going forward.

Q - The paper that you just alluded to earlier on, will the plan be to shift that balance in outcomes. So that we see more young people and particularly their parents feeling confident about transitioning out of what they might have been accustomed to, into something that creates greater independence rather than dependence for young people?

A – Yes it will do.

A Schools forum member requested that the LA make sure that within the paper that this is considered, and while the Schools forum only agree this every 12 months, there is a point about systemic change that might take three or four years to really start to see the impact on, so members may not see huge differences, because this is about changing the culture.

Q – In the appendix, that data was really helpful but there was a column that said educated elsewhere. Could you give me an example of what that might mean?

A – This could be where a young person might have home tuition for a period of time, for electively home educated. The LA also have a number of independent settings, or providers that are possibly even not registered, but are providing short term provision or home tuition.

A Schools forum member noted that there was a lot of positivity in this paper and would be supportive of the transfer, however schools feel that central government support was to come, either writing off or writing down some of the high needs deficit, then the LA/ schools position would be stronger if it was seen by central government that the LA were trying to address this rather than doing what the vast majority of other local authorities are doing which is, making at least a 0.5% transfer to the high needs block.

CB added that where the DfE have written off or removed the deficit, they are holding those local authorities to developing a sustainable system, so that the budget is spent within its means on a yearly basis. The priorities are around that and increasing the capacity of mainstream schools, to support children, young people with EHCPs, as well as reducing that high-cost provision and ensuring that provision is value for money.

By aligning what the LA is doing with what the DfE will be requiring, when this will assist in getting the LA to the top of the list for the safety valve funding and putting the schools/LA in a good position to have sustainable system to move forward, which will keep within the funding bracket.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

	<p>Q – If this is not voted for today what would be the plan going forwards?</p> <p>A- It was expected to get to this point next April, however the LA have got there much quicker which is why some of it is staggered in a way. The LA is also reviewing the alternative provision funding and putting commissioning function in that will bring some savings to the spend on independent specialist provision. The LA also needs to review special school funding, as there are children with the same needs in different special schools getting different amounts of money.</p> <p>Regarding the top up funding that comes with the EHCPs, part of the strategy was to review that to consider adding a banding system so that it was an open and transparent funding arrangements for children with EHCPs. These reviews will ultimately start to bring down the high need's costs, but they will not happen immediately. There's a lot of work to do over the next year to 18 months.</p> <p>If the Forum does agree this, the process will be delayed until the funds have built sufficiently to start that process of development. This is a kick start. The process of transition will take time as well. There are lots concurrent actions required. The paper will outline this with timescales. The statutory override, expires in September 2023, and LA don't yet know whether the government are going to extend that. So, this gives a matter of urgency in getting this work done, but also because actually it will be better for children, young people to be integrated more into their local system and their local communities.</p> <p>Eligible to vote: All School and Governor members (including Faith schools). EYFS and 16-19 providers cannot vote.</p> <p>CR abstained on the grounds that there has not been a consultation with schools/ system leaders.</p> <p>Decision: All members voting agreed to the LA request to repeat the 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block into the High Needs Block. This will equate to £1.093 million or £26 per pupil.</p>
6	<p>Final 2022-23 Growth Fund Budgets – Maria Beaney</p> <p>MB advised that the growth fund budgets have linked policies: Growth Fund policy, which is funding for schools where the local authority has asked the School to open up a new place in September. The Schools in Financial Difficulty policy - business cases that will be discussed at agenda point 9.</p> <p>MB report advised the Forum on Growth Funding and Pupil Number Variations</p> <p>Explaining that the Permanent PAN Increases must be funded via the Funding Formula and not through the growth fund and the centrally retained funds held by LA. This means the LA require the Schools' Forum approval to adjustment the school/academy pupil on roll number, used in the Funding Formula on all funding factors and not just on the Basic Entitlement (AWPU).</p> <p>Estimated pupil numbers have been used for the new PAN increases and have also been weighted to take account of the different School and academy funding years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 7/12ths have been used for maintained schools - i.e., September 22 – March 23 b) 7/12ths have been used for academies - i.e., September 22 – March 23 c) The ESFA will fund 5/12ths for academies under point b - i.e., April 23 - August 24 d) £6,000 per new class for the first year of opening.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

The table below shows a number of new School's places required from September 2022 relating to PAN increases. Classes opened in prior years and are moving through the School Total 353 pupils. This will be an adjustment to the pupil numbers as part of the funding Formula, Due to the new class opening from September, the AAP T return which the local authority has to fill in or show seven twelfths of that funding for that particular class. So, the LA will only fund it on 18 pupils, and then as it's an academy, the SFA will give the other five twelfths, i.e., the other 12 pupils from their funding to take it from April to August. That's exactly the same process it has been every other year. It is 353 total pupils, which will cost approximately £1.2 million.

There is no new class growth funding budget associated with this group of schools as the final year of protection was 2020-2021.

Table 1 – On-going Identified School PAN Increase

School	Year of Support	Academy	Maxium Pupil Increase Per Class	Number of Pupils by Year Group							Total Pupils	Total Pupils	
				R	1	2	3	4	5	6			7
Bligh Federation	6 of 7	Y	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	-	180	18	
Halling	5 of 7	N	20	20	20	20	20				100	12	
Rochester Girls (Rochester)	3 of 5	Y	30							30	150	18	
Phoenix (Chatham)	3 of 3	Y	45	45							90	26	
Rainham Mark Grammar School	5 of 5	Y	30							30	150	18	
Holcombe Grammar	5 of 5	Y	30							30	150	18	
Sir Joseph Williamson	5 of 5	Y	30							30	150	18	
Riverside	5 of 7	Y	30	30	30	30					120	120	
Leigh Academy Rainham	2 of 5	Y	180							180	900	105	
				125	125	80	80	50	30	-	300	1,990	353

Please note - new classes are shown in red and highlighted and total 353 (pro-rated to reflect the different financial years) and are reflected in the funding formula proposals later on the agenda.

Decision – The School forum eligible members voted and approved the ongoing PAN commitments as per table 1 above.

Table 2 below shows the new schools places required from September 2022 where the PAN changes have been agreed with the place planning team. The new class growth funding associated with this group of schools is £1,122,450.

Table 2 – New School Places from September 2022

School	Year of Support	Academy	Maxium Pupil Increase Per Class			
				R	Total Pupils	Total Pupils
Maritime Academy	1 of 5	Y	180	Year 7	180	105.0
Rochester Riverside CofE Primary	1 of 7	Y	30	Year R	30	18.0
			210	-	210	123.0

Please note - new classes are shown in red and highlighted and total 123 (pro-rated to reflect the different financial years) and are reflected in the funding formula proposals later on the agenda.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

Decision – The School forum eligible members voted and approved the new specified school PAN increase as per table 2 above.

Table 3 below shows the new schools places required from September 2022 but where the place planning team are still negotiating with schools and the cost associated with this group of School or schools is £331,500.

Table 3 – Newly unspecified school places

School	Years of Supprt	Academy	Maximun Pupils	Total Pupils (7)	Total Pupils
Area 1	1 of 1	Y	30	30	30
Area 2	1 of 1	Y	30	30	30
				60	60

Please note:

The pupil numbers have not been adjusted to reflect part year funding encase the School identified is an academy.

Q – Why do we not know if they are needed?

A – We don't know the area they are needed, but we do know they will be needed.

Q - So in September, there will be two schools' academies in Medway with an extra class, is that correct?

A -The Maritime was going to open with 240 pupils, and it's open with 180. So, there is a need for the class, but the LA is not able to confirm where those classes are going to be yet.

Q – In terms of head teacher planning, the LA is speaking to head teachers, so that they will be aware, so we are sure this will be needed, spent and provided we just don't know which schools?

A - There are conversations going on with schools as those classes are required. The LA has reduced its surplus capacity. The LA are not in a position yet to be able to confirm which schools they are.

Decision – The School forum eligible members voted and approved the 1 newly unspecified school PAN increase as per, table 3 above.

CR declared a conflict of interest and abstained from the conversation.

Table 4 below shows the new Year 8 bulge class places required from September 2022. Bulge classes are funded for one year only and the cost associated with this group of School or schools is £165,750.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

Table 4 – New bulge classes for 2022 year only

School	Years of Support	Academy	Maximun Pupils	Total Pupils (9)	Total Pupils
Howard (Yr8 21/22 to Yr9 22/23)	1 of 1	Y	30	30	30

Decision - The School forum eligible members voted and approved the to approve the new bulge class PAN increase as per table 4 above.

Schools in Financial difficulty due to Pan size class management:

MB report outlined that in 2018-19 Medway created a Schools in Financial Difficulty policy due to PAN Class Size, which has been revised several times since it was introduced.

MB noted that one school business case has already been pre approved prior to the January 2022 meeting at a cost of £51,180. A contingency of £298,820 has been created to include the business case to be discussed at the January 2022 meeting.

If all of the actions outlined above are approved by the Schools Forum members, the 2022-23 growth fund budget will be £1,969,700 compared to the £511,400 allocated in 2021-22.

Q - To confirm that's been taken into account when we look at the funding formula number seven, the LA are not going to be taking that off the funding formula figures, as this has already been done. If not approved the funds would return to the funding Formula?

A – Yes that is correct.

Q - Can I ask in terms of the policy a school who are eligible to apply, I think it was 33% under PAN, has this changed as some of the business cases don't seem to meet this threshold?

A – The policy hasn't changed it came back to the schools forum every year for review. It may be they don't meet it now, but did then – the detail for each case will be reviewed on agenda Item 9.

Decision – The School forum eligible members voted and approved to ratify the pre-approved business cases as noted above.

Decision – The School forum eligible members voted and approved to the contingency budget to fund the SIFD business cases not yet submitted or pre-approved as per section 3.5 above.

Decision – The school forum eligible members voted and approved to ratify the Growth fund budget of £1,969,700 for 2022-23.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

7	<p>Final 2022-23 Centrally Retained & De-delegated Budgets</p> <p>MB advised that the Schools Block Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funds budgets delegated to schools/academies (via the funding Formula) and funding retained by the Local Authority (LA) to support schools.</p> <p>From April 2018, the DSG was spilt into four blocks of funding, one of which is the LA's central services school block (CSSB) funding which requires ratification and approval by the Schools' Forum.</p> <p>Statutory Functions of the Local Authority</p> <p>The CSSB DSG funding is intended to provide funding for LAs to continue to operate and run their statutory functions and for 2022-23 the DSG allocation awarded is £958,342 (21/22 £892,539) broken down as follows:</p> <p>Table 1 – How is the CSSB funding spent?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Service</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Total Budget 2022-23 £</th> <th style="text-align: right;">2022-23 SB retained Services £</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C&A Directorate Management Team</td> <td style="text-align: right;">435,443</td> <td style="text-align: right;">234,177</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education Management Team</td> <td style="text-align: right;">250,833</td> <td style="text-align: right;">250,833</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Schools Forum Administration</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SACRE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15,094</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15,094</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Achieve Officer</td> <td style="text-align: right;">32,623</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18,691</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Admissions and Medway Test – Excluding Appeals.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">414,557</td> <td style="text-align: right;">414,557</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governor Services</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19,990</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19,990</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£1,173,540</td> <td style="text-align: right;">958,342</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2022/23 budgets are shown as gross and remain provisional until they are approved by Council in February.</p> <p>Any underspends at the year-end will be carried forward to fund the statutory functions of the LA in 2023-2024.</p> <p>Decision - The Schools forum eligible members voted and approved The Central Service School Block funding of £958,342 for 2022-23.</p> <p>De-Delegated Services</p> <p>MB stated that the De-delegated services is a short list of budgets that are currently held centrally that must be delegated to schools/academies through the funding Formula in 2022-23. However, the LA can ask the Schools Forum's approval for them to be 'de-delegated' in order for these funds to be pooled centrally and managed by the LA.</p> <p>Any underspends at year-end will be carried forward to De-delegations or to the Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.</p> <p>De-delegation applies only to mainstream maintained schools (so not academies, special schools or PRUs) as only these schools would benefit from the services that are funded centrally. It is, however, possible for academies, special schools and PRUs to buy into these services as part of the LA's 'buy-back'</p>	Service	Total Budget 2022-23 £	2022-23 SB retained Services £	C&A Directorate Management Team	435,443	234,177	Education Management Team	250,833	250,833	Schools Forum Administration	5,000	5,000	SACRE	15,094	15,094	Achieve Officer	32,623	18,691	Admissions and Medway Test – Excluding Appeals.	414,557	414,557	Governor Services	19,990	19,990	Total	£1,173,540	958,342
Service	Total Budget 2022-23 £	2022-23 SB retained Services £																										
C&A Directorate Management Team	435,443	234,177																										
Education Management Team	250,833	250,833																										
Schools Forum Administration	5,000	5,000																										
SACRE	15,094	15,094																										
Achieve Officer	32,623	18,691																										
Admissions and Medway Test – Excluding Appeals.	414,557	414,557																										
Governor Services	19,990	19,990																										
Total	£1,173,540	958,342																										

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

Trade Union Facilities

For 2021-22 the Schools Forum approved a de-delegation of £1.59 per pupil from both primary and secondary schools, which enables the teaching unions to represent their members in disciplinary, grievance, and complaints hearings and to respond to LA consultations on policies and procedures which affect teaching staff in Medway schools.

The budget is used to reimburse schools that employ the union reps, so the schools concerned don't bear the cost of covering their absence. Giving teachers access to local expert trade union support can benefit both schools and the LA in terms of improved employee relations in schools.

The cost of this service is the same for both academies and maintained schools but has been pro-rated to reflect the different financial years for academies and maintained schools.

Decision - Primary representatives - The School forum eligible members voted and approved 2022-23 to de-delegate £1.59 per pupil.

Decision - Secondary representatives - The School forum eligible members voted and approved 2022-23 to de-delegate £1.59 per pupil.

Central Services

Pre-2019-20 the local authority received an education service grant which paid for the LA's statutory services in respect of schools. In 2017-18 this grant was rolled into the School's block DSG. At their meeting in October 2018, the School's forum members provisionally agreed to de-delegate £66 per pupil for both primary and secondary schools again in 2021-22. The Council is requesting to delegate this funding again in 2022-23. Table 2 below shows how this funding will be spent.

Table 2 – Schools Top Slicing

Responsibilities for maintained schools	Total Budget 2021-22 £	School Contribution %	Schools Contribution 2021-22 £
Functions relating to LA pensions:	635,435	43%	272,296
a) Administration of teachers' pensions			
b) Retrospective membership of pension schemes. *			
c) Dismissal or premature retirement*			
* When costs cannot be charged to the school directly.			
* General Landlord Duties	259,996	10%	26,383
National curriculum assessments and virtual head teacher.	100,000	100%	100,000
Monitoring of school improvement.	173,937	100%	173,937
Total	£1,169,368	49%	£572,616

22/23 Budgets are provisional until agreed by Council in February.

Decision - Primary representatives - The School forum eligible members voted and approved 2022-23 to de-delegate £66 per pupil.

Decision - Secondary representatives - The School forum eligible members voted and approved 2022-23 to de-delegate £66 per pupil.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting

12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm

Virtual meeting.

8

2022-23 Final Schools and Academy Funding Formula – Maria Beaney

The final 2021-22 schools and academies funding formula, funding factors remain the same as the provisional Formula (shown in appendix 1. CONFIDENTIAL)

The funding unit costs remain the same as the provisional formulas and in line with National figures except for the lump sum which has reduced to £83,000. This is a reduction of £10,000 when compared to the lump sum previously reported to the Schools forum. The lump sum is the only funding factor not set at the national funding formula level. The authority would need an additional £3.6m of grant to match the national level of £121,300.

Rate fundings will no longer be passed to maintained schools or academies, it will be paid direct to the LA. This will be a straight in and out for schools and academies. And there should be no effect at all, however as the rates have been included in prior years in the per pupil amount, these have to be included for this year, but not next.

Under this Formula, there will be 77 schools who will gain funding and 17 (6 last year) schools who will lose funding:

- All 17 schools who have lost funding, have seen a reduction in pupil numbers. The budget reductions range from, a reduction of £6,014 (3 pupils) to £172,890 (37 pupils.) 3 of the 17 schools have submitted business cases for funding support and 1 school is already working with the LA on their budget as the drop in funding was anticipated after their budge classes had finished moving through the School.
- 22 schools have gained funding but lost pupils. Each School has seen an increase in the average funding on a per pupil basis.
- 4 schools (3 Primary and 1 secondary) will see a reduction to the per pupil funding ranging from £18 - £589, however all four schools are receiving more than the MFG amounts of £4,265 and £5,525.

2022-23 Schools Block Dedicated Schools Grant (SB DSG)

The Funding Formula is used to distribute the Schools Block element of the DSG to all mainstream schools and academies fairly and transparently.

The total SB allocation available for distribution after allowable deductions is £216,757,082 in 2021/22 an increase of 4.27%) calculated as follows;

Initial Allocation Schools Block	£ 220,245,782
Less: 2022-23 Growth Fund	£ 1,969,700
Less: HN Block Transfer	£ 850,000
Less: Outreach Service	£ 505,000
Less: 2021-22 Overspend	£ 164,000
Total for Allocation in Funding Formula	£ 216,757,082

Table 1 below shows the total funding allocated for each funding factor in 2022-23 and 2021-22 for comparison.

MB highlighted to the forum members the minimum funding guarantee, where 3.2% of funding last year was given out on minimum funding guarantees, this is now down at 2.5%. So as the LA are able to put more and more through this Formula, those figures are closing. The LA are continuing to give out over a million pounds more in growth funding than actually received in growth funding. That's partly the due to new classes have been

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting 12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm Virtual meeting.

agreed, and as some of the historical decisions feed out of the system. It is expected that the gap will reduce significantly.

Funding Factor	2021-22	2021-22	2022-23	2022-23
	Allocation £m	Percentage	Allocation £m	Percentage
Basic Entitlement – Primary	77.744	37.40%	80.409	37.09%
Basic Entitlement – Secondary	79.840	38.41%	84.423	38.95%
Deprivation	19.618	9.44%	21.369	9.86%
Prior Attainment	13.233	6.37%	13.362	6.16%
EAL	1.453	0.70%	1.604	0.74%
Mobility	0.223	0.11%	0.509	0.23%
Lump Sum	7.163	3.45%	7.802	3.60%
Split Sites	0.121	0.06%	0.124	0.06%
Sparsity	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Rates	1.714	0.82%	1.700	0.78%
Exceptional Circumstances (Listed Building & Monument)	0.073	0.04%	0.076	0.04%
School Amalgamations	0.059	0.03%	0	0.00%
Sub Total	201.241	96.80%	211.378	97.51%
MFG	6.645	3.20%	5.389	2.49%
Total Delegated	207.887	100.00%	216.767	100.00%

Rounding differences will occur in the above table and relate to the LFF.

Table 2 below highlights the difference between the DSG School Block allocation provided and how the Formula has allocated the funding.

Funding Factor	SB DSG Allocation £m	Formula Allocation £m	Variance £m
Pupil Funding	216.150	213.602	(2.548)
Premises Factors	1.960	1.900	(0.060)
Growth Fund – including last year's PAN on going adjustments	2.136	3.225	1.089
Block Transfers and other movements	0	1.519	1.519
Total Funding	220.246	220.246	0.000

Included with the block transfers and other movements are the £850,000 schools block transfer to the high need block and the £505,000 2022-23 outreach contract and the repayment of the 2021-22 overspend on the schools' block.

Additional Information:

- a) Primary pupil numbers (excluding nursery pupils and PAN variations) have increased from 24,894 in 2021-22 to 24,995 in 2022-23; an increase of 101 pupils.
- b) Secondary pupil numbers (pre-16) have increased from 17,303.5 in 2021-22 to 17,757; an increase of 453.5 pupils. The 0.5 represents at least one dual registered pupil or a pupil funded for part of the year.
- c) 76.2% of funding is distributed through the basic entitlement factor in 2022-23 compared to the 76% in 2021-22 or the 75.8% in 2020-21.

Minutes of Schools' Forum Meeting
12th January 2022 at 2.00 pm
Virtual meeting.

	<p>d) 93.18% of funding is distributed through pupil lead factors compared to 92.65% in 2021-22 or the 92.89% in 2020-21.</p> <p>e) Primary schools will receive at least £4,265 per pupil and £5,525 for secondary schools. Medway average per primary School is £4,464 per pupil and £5,938 for secondary schools.</p> <p>Q – Appendix 3 – some figures are estimates for next year. Is that based on census or something else?</p> <p>A - All based on the October census, except for the low prior attainment that's based on an average over the past couple of years, due to the exams not being undertaken last year. All pupil-led data is based on the October 21 census data and adjusted where the LA knows it will be opening new classes.</p> <p>Q - First of all, just to comment, which is I'm pleased that we're getting towards the National funding formula and the stopping schools getting more than 6% clause. Can I just confirm this? These funds don't include any additional grants that the School might get?</p> <p>A – Yes that is correct the only one included is the ones that we've had in prior years, the teachers' pay and pension grants, which were rolled in last year.</p> <p>The School's forum members thanked MB and MD for all their hard work with the Formula.</p> <p>Decision - The School forum eligible members voted and approved to agree and ratify the transfer £850,000 from the School's block to the high needs block.</p> <p>Decision - The School forum eligible members voted and approved to agree to repay the 2021-22 DSG Schools Block overspend of £164,000.</p> <p>Decision - The School forum eligible members voted and approved to agree and ratify the transfer £505,000 from the School's block to the high needs block to pay for the outreach contract in 2022-23.</p> <p>Decision - The School forum eligible members voted and approved to agree to recommend Medway's Cabinet to approve the Final Schools and Academies Funding Formula 2022-23. This will then be reported to the Council's Cabinet on February 8 2022 for 'political approval' – as per ESFA instructions.</p>
9	Funding support business cases item – CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES.
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>None.</p>
11	<p>Date of the next meeting 18th May 2022 at 2pm.</p>

Meeting ended at 16.00

Signed by Vice-Chair Date: