

Cheshire West & Chester Council

## **Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum**

**Monday 9 July 2018**  
**4.30pm – 6.30 pm**

To be held at

Queen's Park High School  
Queen's Park Road  
Handbridge  
Chester CH4 7AE

Refreshments will be available from 4pm

Schools Forum Clerk  
Children and Families  
Cheshire West and Chester Council  
Telephone 01244 972901



# Notes for members of the public

## **Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum**

---

The Council welcomes and encourages you to be at its meetings and Committees.

If you plan to attend, please report to the reception desk at the main entrance.

If you feel there might be particular problems with access to the building or car parking please contact the officer named on the front sheet.

---

You are requested to remain quiet whilst the meeting is taking place.

### **Fire evacuation**

If the fire alarm rings you should make your way to the nearest exit with your belongings, as quickly as possible, and leave the building. Please follow any instructions from staff about evacuation routes.

---

The agenda is sometimes divided into two parts. You are allowed to stay for the first part. When the Forum is ready to deal with the second part you will need to leave the meeting room because the business will be of a confidential nature, for example, dealing with individual people, contracts and financial affairs of other parties.

## Agenda for Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum 9 July 2018

1.	4.30	Introductions and apologies		
2.	4.35	Minutes and matters arising of last meeting  2.1 To agree the minutes from part two of the meeting held 12 February 2018  2.2 Matters arising		Page 4-8
3.	4.45	SIMS framework/contract update	Mark Parkinson	Verbal
4.	4.50	Reducing Inequalities – Improving Self-Regulation and Academic Resilience in Early Years	Sarah Lister	To follow
5.	5.05	SEND Update on High Need Strategic Review and SEND Funding Audit Summary	Debbie Gittins	To follow
6.	5.20	DSG 2017-2018 final outturn	Natalie Cole	Page 9-12
7.	5.40	Financial year 2017-2018 analysis of schools balances (including Academies)	Natalie Cole	Page 13-18
8.	5.50	Annual review of Schools Forum membership, constitution and terms of reference – including sub group membership	David Charlton	Page 19-31
9.	6.00	Directed revisions to schemes for financing schools	Natalie Cole	Page 32-33
10.	6.10	f40 National funding formula briefing paper	David Charlton	Page 34-45
11.	6.20	Any other business		
12.	6.30 Finish	Next meeting: Monday Queen's Park High School Monday 8 October 2018  Schools Forum and finance sub group meeting schedule and forward plan		Page 46-47

**Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum, Queen's Park High School,  
Chester, 12 February 2018**

**Present:**

Marie Allen  
David Charlton (Chair)  
David Curry  
Steve Dool  
Kate Docherty  
Kerry Forrester (sub for Cheryl Bullen)  
John Freeman  
Carol Gahan  
Duncan Haworth  
Philip Hopwood  
Luci Jones  
Kath Lloyd  
Kathryn Magiera  
John Murray  
Sam Myers-Whittaker  
Sue Pearson  
Sue Yates  
Harry Ziman

**Representing:**

Academies - Special  
Secondary headteachers  
Secondary headteachers  
Academies - Primary/Secondary  
Primary headteachers  
Primary headteachers  
  
Secondary governors  
Primary governors  
Primary governors  
Special governors  
Academies - Primary/Secondary  
Primary governors  
Dioceses  
Academies - Primary/Secondary  
Special headteachers  
Primary governors  
Secondary headteachers  
Academies - Primary/Secondary

**Officers:**

Natalie Cole  
Charlotte Fenn (Clerk)  
Mark Parkinson

**Official observers:**

**Observers/public:**

## **1. Introductions and Apologies**

Apologies were received from Anna Jones, Sue Anderson, Hilary Berry, Cheryl Bullen, Sarah Curtis, Ian Devereux Roberts, Councillor Meardon, Katie Tyrie and Caroline Vile.

## **2. Minutes and Matters Arising of Last Meeting**

### **2.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

### **2.2 Matters Arising**

#### **2.2.1 Item 2.2.1 Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF) for 2018-2019**

Forum members asked if a new Early Years Minister had been appointed following the recent cabinet reshuffle and the letter drafted by Councillor Meardon sent. As far as anyone was aware no minister had been appointed as yet; the matter regarding to whom the letter should be sent was left for Councillor Meardon to pursue.

#### **2.2.2 Item 4 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Allocations for 2018-2019 and Budget Setting**

In response to the request for statistics on exclusions and comparisons with our statistical neighbours, Mark Parkinson confirmed that data had been requested but not yet received; the Schools Forum Clerk was asked to follow up on this action.

Natalie Cole reported that modelling as to the impact when more schools hit the deminums for 2019-2020 had been presented to the Finance sub group. It was noted that it would still be affordable and would not have a detrimental impact on other schools due to the 0.5% cash increase.

### **2.2.3 Item 7 Any Other Business - Academy Representative Vacancy (primary/secondary)**

David Charlton reported that no nominations for an academy representative had been received by the January deadline. Academy members reported that they were aware of colleagues who were interested in representing Academies on the Schools Forum but had not yet been nominated by their Trust. It was decided that the deadline be extended to mid-March and the Schools Forum clerk was asked to recirculate the request for nominations.

### **3. Early Years Funding Formula for 2018-2019**

Natalie Cole took Forum Members through the report which detailed the proposed budget allocation for the early years block and funding of the two, three and four year old entitlements for 2018-2019.

Natalie informed Forum members that the only change to the formula was the increase in the base rate. Forum members' attention was drawn to appendix B and the factsheet, which had been produced for providers, which showed the allocations for each of the early years funding elements and the proposed budgets for 2018-2019.

Forum members sought further information regarding the central spend funding in particular the £400,000 allocated to Early Years Consultants. Mark Parkinson responded that the figures included salary on costs, the placement officer Sue Lawson was responsible for the take up strategy, the Early Years Consultants, lead by Sarah Lister, worked with early years providers, nurseries and child minders carrying out moderation, looking at quality of provision and good practice. It was noted that the Early Years Workers were based in Childrens Centres. Offices agreed to provide a breakdown of the £400,000 and the number of early years providers and child minders.

It was noted that the Early Year subgroup would be reviewing the use of the formula funding in due course.

David Charlton informed Forum members that although Katie Tyrie, Nursery Heads representative, had been unable to attend the meeting she had emailed to say that she supported the proposal.

David Curry informed the group that, in the absence of Sue Henderson, he was happy to support the proposal as it was broadly in line with what had been discussed by the Early Years sub group.

**Resolved that the Schools Forum approved the proposed increase in base rate funding for 2018-2019. (Vote: unanimous).**

#### **4. Special Educational Needs (SEN) Funding for Mainstream and Special Schools – Funding from the High Needs Block 2018-2019**

Natalie Cole introduced the report which provided an update for Schools Forum on proposed changes to allocations from the High Needs Block for 2018-2019 for commissioned places and top up funding.

Natalie drew Forum members' attention to paragraph 3 which outlined a number of recommendations by the High Needs sub group which had been endorsed at previous Schools Forum meetings.

Forum members' attention was drawn to paragraph 5 which outlined the proposed commissioned places for 2018-2019. It was noted that most of the special schools were full and the commissioned numbers broadly mirrored where pupils were.

Natalie referred members to paragraph 10 which outlined the proposed changes to special schools band funding rates. It was noted that the Education and Skills Funding Agency, in response to the LA's request to disapply the permitted -1.5 per cent regulations, required the LA to gain the agreement of the schools affected by the proposals. Natalie reported that agreement had been sought from the schools affected, three schools had refused to agree; two schools were not affected as the permitted -1.5 per cent reduction applied in their case.

Mark Parkinson informed Forum members that it had been agreed at the High Needs sub group that a letter should be sent out to the three schools asking them to explain their decision to the sub group and advising them of the financial impact if they refused to agree to the proposals. School Forum members asked for the letter to include an acknowledgement that it was being sent with their support.

The group had a frank discussion regarding the schools' decision not to agree to the proposal and the financial impact. It was acknowledged that the three schools may not be fully aware of the impact of their decision or the financial pain other schools would be experiencing. If the efficiency factor proposal was not adopted the overspend would continue to grow and the situation would still need resolving for 2019-2020 resulting in a reduction in top up rates for mainstream schools in future years.

Forum members acknowledged the amount of work done by the High Needs sub group in recommending the package of measures to address the High Needs spend. John Freeman, who chaired the High Needs group, informed Forum members that the group had tried to be fair to all sectors and constructive with the proposals put forward, none of the options considered were particularly palatable. Sue Yates pointed out that for some of those on the group the impact on their own school was significant.

Philip Hopwood sought confirmation as to which three schools had not agreed. Mark Parkinson report that the three were Greenbank, Dorin Park & The Russett.

Officers were optimistic that the schools would agree to the proposal, once the consequences and impact on other schools had been explained.

Natalie drew Forum members' attention to table 2 which provided a breakdown of commissioned places in other provisions. It was noted that there was no change to

places for resource provision. Natalie reported that following the amalgamation of West Cheshire College and South Cheshire College CWAC were no longer responsible for commissioning places as the college now came under Cheshire East.

Harry Ziman sought clarification as to whether the reduction to sixth form commissioned places would have an impact on the ability for pupils to access a place. Natalie responded that this would not restrict places; payment would only apply when a SEN pupil attended.

Forum members' attention was drawn to paragraphs 7-9 which outlined the changes to resource provision funding following changes by the ESFA to the funding mechanism for pre-16 places.

David Charlton put to the vote proposals two and three together (commissioned places in other provisions and changes to resource provision funding) and proposals one and four (commissioned places in Special schools and changes to special school band funding rates).

**Resolved that the Schools Forum** agreed the four proposals within the report on financial arrangements for pupils with special educational needs in 2018-2019:

- i. Commissioned places in other provisions and Changes to Resource Provision funding (vote: unanimous);
- ii. Proposed commissioned places in Special schools and proposed changes to special school band funding rates (vote: unanimous); and
- iii. that the letter sent to Greenbank, Dorin Park and The Russett acknowledged that it had the full support of the Schools Forum.

## **5. Central Spend budgets 2018-2019**

Natalie Cole introduced the report which outlined the proposed level of prescribed central spend budgets for 2018-2019. Forum members' attention was drawn to paragraph 4 which outlined the net decrease for central expenditure on children under five.

**Resolved that the Schools Forum** approved the proposed changes to the level of central spend budgets for 2018-2019 for the activities defined in the Section 251 statement. (vote: unanimous).

## **6. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2017-2018 Forecast Third Review**

Natalie Cole introduced the report which provided an update on the financial forecast outturn position for 2017-2018 for centrally held DSG as reported at the Third Review.

Forum members' attention was drawn to paragraph 3 which summarised a number of key variances which contributed to the net overspend for 2017-2018 of £0.180m.

**Resolved that the Schools Forum note the Third Review position on the DSG.**

## **7. Any Other Business**

### **Non-teaching staff pay award**

Duncan Howarth raised concerns regarding rumours of a proposed pay raise, from 1 April, for some non-teaching pay scales of around 9 per cent and the impact it would have on school budgets. It was believed that the proposal was currently with the Unions. Officers were unable to provide any further information but agreed to look into it further and ask HR to send out clarification.

### **8. Next meeting**

Next meeting 19 March 2018 - there were no proposed items for this meeting and unless any urgent business should arise this meeting would be cancelled.

Next meeting 9 July 2018.

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2017-2018 – Final Outturn**

#### **Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of the report is to report on the 2017-2018 final outturn position for the centrally held DSG budget and to seek a recommendation from School's Forum as to how the underspend is allocated.

#### **Recommendations**

2. The Forum is asked:-
  - i. To note the final outturn on the 2017-2018 centrally held DSG.
  - ii. To endorse the planned allocation and retention of the unspent reserve as recommended by The Schools Forum Finance Sub Group and detailed in paragraph 10.

#### **Forecast Outturn**

3. At the Third Review stage the outturn forecast for the centrally held DSG was for balanced position. At year-end the final outturn position was an underspend of £0.612m.
4. The net underspend is due to the following primary variances.
  - i. An overspend of £0.288m on high needs budgets which is slightly lower than £0.323m forecast at Third Review. The outturn position is mainly due to the increase in demand for Independent and Non Maintained School placement fees (£0.305m) and increase in top up payments for Alternative Provision arising from an increase in exclusions (£0.184m). This is partially offset by fewer children placed in other Authority's schools (underspend of £ 0.081m). There is a further underspend of £0.120m on the budget for non-SEN independent school places which have not been required in year.
  - ii. There is a slight overspend of £0.031m on the early years block based on the actual take up of the free and extended entitlement. This is a reduction to the £0.254m overspend forecast at Third Review due to the expected increase in funding now anticipated based on the take up at the January 2018 census point.
  - iii. Current year rates rebates accounts for an underspend of £0.185m which is unchanged from Third Review. Staff savings arising from vacancy management and the implementation of the 0-19 contract accounted for an underspend of £0.211m which is a slight increase on £0.147m reported at Third Review.

- iv. The de-delegated schools budget, which is ring-fenced to maintained schools underspent by £0.1m. This is a slight decrease from Third Review which was reporting an underspend of £0.180m. This is primarily due to an increasing call on the maternity cover contingency in primary schools over recent months.
- v. There are a number of variances not evident at Third Review which resulted in the more favourable outturn position that previously forecast.
  - a. Utilisation of the School Monitoring and Brokering Grant rather than the DSG budget for School Improvement resulted in an underspend of £0.268m.
  - b. Slippage against planned spend for funding allocated to the Cheshire West Education Improvement Board (CWEIB) resulted in an underspend of £0.046m
  - c. Delay in agreement of contract costs for the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) schools resulted in an underspend of £0.058m.
  - d. An underspend of £0.063m arose from a reduced call on allocations from the Growth Fund.

### Position of the DSG Reserve

5. At the end of 2017-2018, the unapplied grant reserve from underspends on centrally held budgets is £1.283m. Of this, £0.1m relates to underspend on de-delegated funds for which we have an existing agreement from Schools Forum that unspent funds will be carried forward and used in 2018-2019 to offset further de-delegation from schools. Therefore £1.183m remains currently unallocated - £0.671m brought forward from 2016-2017 and £0.513m from 2017-2018. The variances relating to this underspend are shown in the table below.

Budget heading	Variance 2016-2017	Variance 2017-2018	Total 2016- 2017 and 2017-2018
	£000	£000	£000
S251 Misc budget (CWEIB allocation)	-58	-46	-104
Staffing vacancies	-126	-206	-332
Designated teacher funding	-10	-7	-17
Personal Education Allowances	-68	2	-66
PFI contributions	-6	-58	-64
School improvement advisers	-57	-268	-325
Growth fund	-30	-63	-93
Rates	-406	-185	-591
High Needs Block	147	408	555
Non SEN Independent Sch Fees	-120	-120	-240
Early years Block	61	31	92
<b>Total</b>	<b>-671</b>	<b>-512</b>	<b>-1,183</b>

6. Prior to 2016-2017, all centrally held underspends were returned to schools via the funding formula in the following year. It had been the case that for several years schools had received additional one off funding due to slippage in centrally held budgets and significant capacity building investment in early years which could not be spent. Early years funding became aligned with take up in 2016-2017 and the capacity for significant further underspends was significantly reduced. At the same time, pressures were increasing on high needs budgets and for the first time overspends were being incurred in this area of central spend.
7. Schools Forum endorsed the retention of the unspent £0.672m from the 2016-2017 allocation in reserves to offset forecast pressures in high needs in 2017-2018 and if not required, to be considered as resources available to set the 2018-2019 budget. Overspends on high needs did materialise in 2017-2018 and shortfalls in high needs budgets are again anticipated in 2018-2019 with the failure to implement the efficiency factor for special schools. However, underspends elsewhere across the DSG have mitigated that position with a further increase in reserves occurring instead.

#### **View of the Schools Forum Sub Group**

8. At the Schools Forum Sub Group meeting of 19 June 2018, the group discussed the variances that have arisen and the potential for those to recur in 2018-2019. The group also discussed the risk of future high needs pressures from increasing demand and how the funding in reserves could be used to mitigate further cuts to schools block and top up funding in 2019-2020. Given the future ringfencing of the Schools Block funding under the National Funding Formula, the group also felt that it would also be prudent for the Local Authority to hold a level of reserve going forward as this will not be able to be met by the system in future years.
9. At this stage of the year, in advance of the notification of funding arrangements for 2019-2020 and of the pressures arising from the new academic year, the group felt that the use of the reserve should be factored into discussions at budget setting. There were however several plans put forward by the Director of Education to allocate some of the reserve immediately to support specific issues. The group supported these proposals which are outlined in the table below. There remains a balance therefore of £0.815m to take forward to 2019-2020.

Budget Heading	Proposal	Use of reserves £000
S251 Misc (CWEIB allocation)	Carry forward for CWEIB to carry out planned work on transitions	104
PFI	Retain to support transitional arrangement to new Governing Body agreements phasing in an increased contribution from PFI schools and a reduction in the	64

	affordability gap from 2019-2020	
School intervention	Allocate funding to support the work of the Exclusions Task Group in developing strategies to reduce the number of exclusions in the Borough.	200
Balance of funds	To review in autumn term during budget setting for 2019-2020	815
Total		1,183

### **Allocation of 2017-2018 Carry forward**

10. It is proposed to allocate the 2017-2018 carry-forward as follows:-

- £0.1m earmarked for de-delegated budgets.
- To allocate £0.368m of reserves for the proposals shown in paragraph 9.
- The balance of £0.815m to be held to offset further pressures and mitigate the impact of high needs pressures on Schools Block and top up funding in 2019-2020.

### **Next Steps**

11. Subject to the views of Schools Forum, unspent DSG will be allocated as per the above and reported to Council at First Review.

**Agenda Item 7**

**Maintained School Balances Financial Year 2017-2018 and Academy Balances 2016-2017**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. To inform Schools Forum of the final outturn position of maintained schools in the Borough for the 2017-2018 financial year. In response to a request from Schools Forum, this report also includes academy balances for the latest reported position for the 2016-2017 academic and financial year accounts.

**Recommendations**

2. For Schools Forum to note the outturn position and movement in balances for both schools and academies and the mechanisms in place to support schools with deficit balances (maintained schools only).

**Background**

3. Under the Scheme for Financing Schools, schools can carry forward from one financial year to the next any surplus or deficit relative to the school's budget share. Following the closure of accounts for the financial year, a cumulative surplus or deficit is determined for each school to be transferred to the school in the following financial year. This balance represents the funds available to an individual school at a determined point in time at the end of the financial year.

**Outturn Position 2017-2018 for maintained schools**

4. The net surplus in maintained school balances for 2017-2018 is £10.291m. A summary of the balances by sector is shown in the table below with individual school balances included as an annex to this report.

School Balances outturn position 2017-2018 (subject to audit)

	<b>Primary Schools</b>	<b>Secondary Schools</b>	<b>Special Schools</b>	<b>Alternative Provision</b>	<b>All Schools</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Revised budget	113,439	50,341	17,273	1,848	182,901
Net expenditure	105,730	49,351	15,816	1,713	172,610
Net surplus	7,709	990	1,457	135	10,291
% surplus to budget	6.8%	2.0%	8.4%	7.3%	5.6%

5. The net surplus is made up of £11.829m of surplus balances across 116 schools and £1.538m of deficit balances. There are 21 schools with deficit balances which is an increase of two on 2016-2017. A breakdown by sector

and the number of schools with surplus and deficit balances is shown in the table below.

	<b>Primary Schools</b>	<b>Secondary Schools</b>	<b>Special Schools</b>	<b>Alternative Provision</b>	<b>All Schools</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Total surplus	8,234	2,003	1,457	135	11,829
Total deficit	-525	-1,013	0	0	-1,538
Net surplus	7,709	990	1,457	135	10,291

Number of schools with a surplus balance	99	7	8	2	116
Number of schools with a deficit balance	19	2	0	0	21
Total number of maintained schools	118	9	8	2	137

### **Movement in School Balances**

6. The overall position shows an increase in school balances of £0.347m since the end of 2016-2017 when the net surplus balance was £9.944m. The movement in balances held by sector is included in the table below.

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Primary Schools</b>	<b>Secondary Schools</b>	<b>Special Schools</b>	<b>Alternative Provision</b>	<b>All Schools</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
2016-2017	7,229	865	1,781	69	9,944
2017-2018	7,709	990	1,457	135	10,291
Change	480	124	-324	67	347
% change	7%	14%	-18%	97%	3%

7. Primary school balances have increased by £480k. There are three schools included in the year end outturn who converted to academy on 1 March 2018, one of which has a deficit position. Of the maintained schools, 18 primary schools have a deficit balance which is an increase to the 16 from the previous year. Balances range from a deficit of £99,697 to surplus of £411,004.
8. Secondary school balances have increased by £124k. Two secondary schools have deficit balances, one less than in 2016-2017 with the conversion of Queens Park High School. Balances range from a deficit of £627,717 to surplus of £539,570.
9. Balances for special and alternative provision schools have reduced by £0.257m with no schools in deficit. Surplus balances range from £26,832 to £579,801.

## **Balance Control Mechanism**

10. In agreement with Schools Forum in 2015, the Balance Control Mechanism (BCM) and requirement for schools to submit plans for unspent balances was not operated in the 2017-2018 financial year. This was largely a decision based on equity with academies who are not subject to caps on balances or clawback. However, it was agreed that Officers would continue to review schools with excessive balances and liaise with those schools around spending plans. There are now 28 schools that have held balances in excess of the BCM thresholds for the last three years (8 per cent for primary and special schools, 5 per cent for secondary schools). The forward plans for these schools will be reviewed in the autumn term and for those projecting sustained balances going forward, they will be contacted for spending plans to demonstrate that whilst acting prudently to keep surpluses for future financial pressures, are also planning on spending their allocated funding on current pupils.

## **Maintained Schools with Deficit Balances**

11. The number of schools ending the year with deficit balances has increased from 2016-2017. A number of these schools are set to recover those balances in the next financial year. There are nine schools that do not recover in 2018-2019. Five of those schools have recovery plans agreed and are progressing with those plans whilst four are currently unable to set a balanced position for future years. All schools setting an overall deficit budget for 2018-2019 are having their budgets approved individually where they need to demonstrate that setting a balanced budget would be detrimental to the operation of the school. Schools with approved deficit budgets are being issued with a Notice of Concern which is an internal control on the agreed budget plan. These school budgets will be monitored regularly and deviations approved by the Local Authority. There are currently nine Notices issued.

## **Academy Balances**

12. At the meeting in July 2017, Forum requested that the balances for academies in the Borough as reported in their audited accounts be presented on an annual basis along with those of maintained schools. In order to present a comparable balance to that of maintained schools, the balances reported are only for the general unrestricted and restricted funds and exclude pension and fixed asset funds. The balances for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 are included in appendix A.
13. Forum members should note that in the same way as the balances for maintained schools, these are balances held at a defined point in time (i.e. at the end of the academic and financial year). They do not represent the financial viability of the academy and in the absence of further context, do not explain the way the academy is operating or represent future spending plans or pressures.

## **Next Steps**

14. To publish maintained school balances on the Schools Forum internet site.

**Appendix A** – Cheshire West and Chester academy reported balances for general restricted funds (excluding pension reserve) and unrestricted funds for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017

Provider Name	Academy Trust	2015-2016 Carried forward 31 August 2016			2016-2017 Carried forward 31 August 2017		
		Restricted funds (excl pension reserve) £	Unrestricted funds £	Total £	Restricted funds (excl pension reserve) £	Unrestricted funds £	Total £
Boughton Heath Primary School	Cheshire Academies Trust			41,542			196,727
Kelsall Primary School				317,020			404,599
Mill View Primary School				45,692			157,515
Christleton High School	Christleton Learning Trust	479,000	391,000	870,000			75,000
Queen Park high							14,000
Christleton Learning Trust							933,000
Delamere Cof E Academy	Delamere Cof E Primary Academy	297,000	2,000	299,000	308,000	0	308,000
Neston High School	Neston High School	442,563	446,832	889,395	278,831	622,304	901,135
Tarporley High School	Tarporley High School & Sixth Form	168,977	766,913	935,890	66,046	179,032	245,078
The Bishops' Blue Coat CofE High School	The Bishops' Blue Coat CofE High School	0	810,404	810,404		1,053,897	1,053,897
The Catholic High School	The Chester Catholic Academies Partnership Trust	0	44,297	44,297			40,062
Cloughwood Special School	Cloughwood Academy Trust	193,819	94,930	288,749	324,244	103,351	427,595
The Oak View Academy	North West Academies Trust	180,000	40,000	220,000	-2,000	0	2,000
Rudheath Primary Academy	Focus Trust			227,000			257,000
St Bernard's Roman Catholic Primary School	Holy Family Multi Academy Trust			-13,000			37,000
St Martin's Academy Chester	North West Academies (St Martin's)Ltd	98,000	0	98,000	103,000	0	103,000
The County High School Leftwich	The County High School Leftwich	549,000	164,000	713,000	533,000	217,000	750,000
Over Hall Academy	Over Hall Academy	73,940	59,763	133,703	12,770	50,172	62,942

The Winsford Academy	Fallibroome Trust			607,725			695,423
University Cathedral Free School	University of Chester Academies Trust			169,000			-25,000
University of Chester Academy Northwich				146,000			35,000
University of Chester Ellesmere Port Academy				-328,000			-450,000
University Primary Academy Weaverham				44,000			-27,000
University of Chester Academies Trust				901,000			-358,000
The Russett School	The Russett Learning Trust	995,077	7,099	1,002,176	1,646,959	14,024	1,660,983
Victoria Road Primary	The Aspire Educational Trust	Maintained school					5,000
Barnton Primary	Weaver Trust	Maintained school			20,000	45,000	65,000

Provider Name	Academy Trust	Movement in funds 2015-2016 to 2016-2017		
		Restricted funds (excl pension reserve)	Unrestricted funds	Total
Boughton Heath Primary School	Cheshire Academies Trust	0	0	155,185
Kelsall Primary School		0	0	87,579
Mill View Primary School		0	0	111,823
Christleton High School	Christleton Learning Trust	-479,000	-391,000	-795,000
Queen Park high		0	0	14,000
Christleton Learning Trust				933,000
Delamere Cof E Academy	Delamere Cof E Primary Academy	11,000	-2,000	9,000
Neston High School	Neston High School	-163,732	175,472	11,740
Tarporley High School	Tarporley High School & Sixth Form	-102,931	-587,881	-690,812
The Bishops' Blue Coat CofE High School	The Bishops' Blue Coat CofE High School	0	243,493	243,493
The Catholic High School	The Chester Catholic Academies Partnership Trust	0	-44,297	-4,235
Cloughwood Special School	Cloughwood Academy Trust	130,425	8,421	138,846
The Oak View Academy	North West Academies Trust	-182,000	-40,000	-218,000
Rudheath Primary Academy	Focus Trust	0	0	30,000
St Bernard's Roman Catholic Primary School	Holy Family Multi Academy Trust	0	0	50,000
St Martin's Academy Chester	North West Academies (St Martin's)Ltd	5,000	0	5,000
The County High School Leftwich	The County High School Leftwich	-16,000	53,000	37,000
Over Hall Academy	Over Hall Academy	-61,170	-9,591	-70,761
The Winsford Academy	Fallibroome Trust	0	0	87,698
University Cathedral Free School	University of Chester Academies Trust	0	0	-194,000
University of Chester Academy Northwich		0	0	-111,000
University of Chester Ellesmere Port Academy		0	0	-122,000
University Primary Academy Weaverham		0	0	-71,000
University of Chester Academies Trust				-1,259,000
The Russett School	The Russett Learning Trust	651,882	6,925	658,807
Victoria Road Primary	The Aspire Educational Trust	0	0	5,000
Barnton Primary	Weaver Trust	20,000	45,000	65,000

**Agenda item 8**

**Annual review of the Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum’s membership, constitution and terms of reference**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to review the Schools Forum’s membership, constitution and terms of reference and ensure that the composition of the Schools Forum is compliant with the regulations.

Appendix 1: Schools Forum Membership

Appendix 2: Constitution and terms of reference

Appendix 3: Finance sub group terms of reference and membership

Appendix 4: High needs sub group terms of reference and membership

**Recommendations**

The Schools Forum is asked to

- i. note the changes to the Schools Forum’s members; and
- ii. agree the proposed changes to the Schools Forum finance sub-group membership.

**Background**

2. The Schools Forum’s constitution requires that the membership, constitution and terms of reference be reviewed annually.
3. Officers have reviewed the pupil numbers based on the current make up of schools and academies to ensure that the composition of the Schools Forum is compliant with the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 which states that ‘primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on the forum, having regard to the total number of pupils registered at them’.

**Proposal**

4. Officers have determined that the pupil ratio warrants a revision in the Schools Forum schools and academies membership as outlined in table 1 below:

**Table 1**

Represented group	Pupil numbers October Census		Members		Revised members	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Primary	23,612	50.17	10	50	10 (no change)	50
Secondary	10,017	21.28	5	25	4	20

Academy* primary/secondary	–	13,438	28.55	5	25	6	30
Total		47,067		20		20	

\* includes free schools & studio schools.

5. The changes in membership will be achieved by not filling any secondary vacancies that arise and seeking nominations for an academy representative.
6. No formal revisions to the schools forum regulations have been issued by the DfE, therefore no amendments to the current constitution and terms of reference are proposed other than the revised membership.
7. In consultation with the Chair, the membership of the finance sub group has also been reviewed and it is proposed that the membership should be as shown in table 2.

**Table 2**

<b>Current Membership:</b>	<b>Revised Membership</b>
Chair of Schools Forum	No change
Primary Headteacher	No change
Secondary Headteacher	No change
Special School Headteacher	No change
Primary Governor	Two Governors
Secondary Governor	
Special School Governor	
Trade Union Representative	No change
If not included in any of the above, an Academy Representative and a Maintained School Representative	No change
Local Authority Officers as appropriate	No change
	<b>Observers:</b> Chairs of the Headteacher and Governor Associations if members of the Schools Forum

### **Next Steps**

8. Schools Forum clerk to update the membership on the constitution and arrange for academy nominations to be sought and an election held, if required. Nominations for expected vacancies as a result of impending resignations will be addressed at the same time.

## Appendix 1

### Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum Membership

**Chair:** David Charlton    **Vice chair:** Harry Ziman

The Cheshire West and Chester model comprises 33 members in total, representing both schools and non-schools sectors and is constituted as follows:

#### School members (19)

<b>Primary heads (five)</b>		<b>Term of office ends</b>
Cheryl Bullen	Hoole Church of England Primary School	September 2019
Sarah Curtis	Meadow Primary	December 2020
Ian Devereux Roberts	Frodsham Manor House Primary	September 2021
Kate Docherty	Rivacre Valley Primary	September 2019
Sarah Worthington	Malpas Alport Endowed Primary School	September 2019

#### **Substitutes**

Kerry Forrester                      Tarporley Church of England Primary

#### **Primary governors (five)**

Duncan Haworth	Woodfall Primary	December 2020
Francis Kwateng	St Mary of the Angels Catholic Primary	January 2019
Sue Pearson	Horns Mill Primary	December 2020
Carol Gahan	JH Godwin Primary	December 2020
Kath Lloyd	Westminster Community Primary	December 2020

#### **Substitutes**

Heather Lewis                      Meadow Primary  
Vacancy

#### **Secondary heads (three)**

David Charlton	Weaverham High	December 2020
David Curry	Bishop Heber High	November 2021
Sue Yates	Blacon High School Specialist Sports College	July 2020

#### **Substitute**

Mike Holland                      Hartford CE High

#### **Secondary governors (two)**

John Freeman	Weaverham High	June 2019
David Rowlands	Upton High School	January 202

#### **Substitute**

Vacancy

#### **Special school head and governor (two)**

Mike McCann                      Greenbank School                      April 2019

Philip Hopwood	Greenbank School	November 2020
<b>Substitute</b>		
Alison Ashley	Hebden Green School Head	
Peter Gaskell	Hebden Green School Governor	
<b>Nursery school (one)</b>		
Katie Tyrie	St Mary's Community Nursery	
<b>Pupil referral units (one)</b>		
Andy Stewart	The Bridge Short Stay School	July 2021
<b>Substitute</b>		
Sian Thomas	Ancora House School	
<b>Academies (including Free Schools) members (six)</b>		
<b>Primary/Secondary (five)</b>		
Steve Dool	Neston High	September 2020
Luci Jones	Cheshire Academies Trust	December 2018
Jason Lowe	Tarporley High School and Sixth Form College	March 2022
John Murray	The Catholic High School, Chester	January 2020
Harry Ziman	Kelsall Primary School	September 2020
<b>Substitutes</b>		
Steven Ellis	Boughton Heath Academy	
<b>Special (one)</b>		
Marie Allen	The Russett School	June 2021
<b>Substitutes</b>		
Chris Heptinstall	Cloughwood Academy	
<b>Non-schools members (eight)</b>		
<b>Chair of Primary Headteachers Association (one)</b>		
Hilary Berry	CWAPH	August 2019
<b>Diocesan authorities (two)</b>		
Kathryn Magiera	Witton Church Walk CE School	October 2019
Caroline Vile	Ellesmere Port Catholic High School	April 2020
<b>Private, voluntary and independent early years' providers (two)</b>		
Paula Adolph	Whitby Heath Pre-school	September 2020
Sue Anderson	The Beeches Pre-school	January 2021
<b>Substitute</b>		
Vacancy		

**Trade unions (two)**

Greg Foster            Joint Consultative Negotiating Panel  
Geoff Wright         Joint Consultative Negotiating Panel

December 2020  
May 2021

**Substitute**

Bevanie Robinson

**16-19 providers (one)**

Kerry Kirkwood      Sir John Deane's College

February 2018

**Total:            33**

**Non-voting observers**

Councillor Nicole Meardon, Cabinet Member for Children and Families  
Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) representative

**Clerk** Charlotte Fenn, Schools Monitoring Officer

## **Appendix 2**

### **Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum**

#### **Constitution and Terms of Reference**

##### **Definitions**

The Forum is the Schools Forum for the area covered by Cheshire West and Chester Council. The Constitution complies with The Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012, and in its procedures and terms of reference takes account of advice issued by the Department for Education (DFE).

The Council is Cheshire West and Chester Council in its role as Local Authority.

##### **Membership**

1. The Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum (the Forum) will consist of 33 Members made up of 25 school members and academies members and eight non-school members made up as follows:-

##### **School Members (19)**

- one representative from St Mary's Nursery School
- 10 primary representatives (five headteachers, five governors)
- five secondary representatives (three headteachers, two governors)
- two special school representatives (one headteacher, one governor)
- one Pupil referral units representative

##### **Academy (including free schools) Members (six)**

- five primary/secondary representatives
- one special representative

The proportion of school members and academy members will always be at least two thirds of the membership of the forum.

##### **Non School Members (eight)**

- one Roman Catholic Diocese representative
- one Church of England Diocese representative
- two Private, voluntary or independent sector provider representatives

- one 16-19 provider representative
- two Trades Union representative
- one Chair of the Association of Primary Headteachers (if not a serving headteacher)

In addition the following are entitled to attend and speak at meetings of the School Forum, but are not members and have no voting rights:

### **Observers**

- The Education and Children Portfolio Holder of the Council
  - The Resources Portfolio Holder of the Council
  - Director of Children and Families Service of the Council or their nominated representative
  - Chief Finance Officer of the Council or their nominated representative
  - Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) representative
2. The term of office for Forum Members will be four years from the date of appointment/election at which time elections will take place for school and academy members and nominations will be sought for the non-school members. Should a resignation be tendered from the Forum, an election (or nominations where appropriate) will be held for the vacancy which will ensure that the representational balance is maintained or improved. Each representative group (Headteachers and Governors by phase) will be responsible for the method by which they elect and nominate school and academy member representatives.
  3. The Academy members represent the governing bodies of the Academies situated in the authority's area, so do not necessarily have to be a Principal or a governor. It is for the governing bodies of the Academies concerned to elect their members; if there is only one Academy in the authority's area, its governing body will select the member.
  4. The Council will maintain a written record of the composition of the Schools Forum including the method by which representatives are elected or nominated. The Council will inform all schools of the membership of the Forum and will provide details of any non-school Member appointed to the Forum within one month of appointment. This will be carried out when constituting the Forum and after the appointment of any new or replacement Member.
  5. Elected Members who hold an executive role within the Council and officers who have a role in strategic resource management of the authority are unable to be members of the Forum (these restrictions do not apply to officers employed as teachers or who work for, and those who directly manage, a service which provides education to individual children and/or advice to schools on learning and behavioural matters).
  6. The Education and Children Portfolio Holder of the Council and a representative of the Education Funding Agency will be invited to attend meetings of the Forum as observers.

## **Meetings and proceedings of the Schools Forum**

7. There will be a minimum of four meetings per school year.
8. The meetings of the Forum will be open to the public. Exceptionally, the Chair of the Forum may determine that a meeting or part of a meeting will be held in private. Prior to making any such determination, the Chair must take legal advice and the determination must be in accordance with this legal advice. The reasons for this determination must be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
9. Participation by local authority members and officers will be limited to a Lead Member for education and children's services, a Lead Member for resources, Director of Children's Services (or their representative), Chief Finance Officer (or their representative) or officers who are providing specific financial or technical advice to Schools Forum. Other individuals (including Council officers) will be able to participate where they are presenting a report, but their participation must be limited to their specific agenda item.
10. The meetings are quorate if at least 40% of the total membership (excluding vacancies) is present at the meeting. In the event of a meeting not being quorate, members present may by majority vote decide to continue the meeting and thus be able to offer advice to the Council and/or respond to any consultation, but will be unable to exercise any of the decision making powers of the Forum.
11. The Council will consult the Forum annually on arrangements for substitutes.
12. Each group of Schools Members will agree two named substitutes and provide this information to the clerk. Agendas and papers for meetings will be sent to named substitutes as a matter of course. It is up to individual members of the Forum to contact a substitute if they are unable to attend meetings.
13. In exceptional circumstances Headteachers' substitutes can be drawn from senior members of staff (a deputy headteacher, bursar or other person responsible for the financial management of the school).
14. Members of the Forum are required to make declarations of interest on appointment and when, for example, the Forum is considering matters relating to contracts.
15. Meetings of the Forum will be called allowing at least two weeks notice. Supporting papers will be sent out at least five working days before the meeting.
16. The Council shall appoint a Clerk for the Schools' Forum who shall be in attendance at each meeting of the Forum and will take minutes. Meetings may be recorded for the purposes of the accuracy of the minutes only.
17. Minutes of meetings will be placed on the Council's website and all schools and associated groups will be informed when new minutes are available. All schools and associated groups will be informed of action taken by the Council on Forum advice.

18. Claiming of expenses for Forum Members will be in accordance with the Forum expenses policy document and claims will be made on the specific claim forms and duly authorised. In case of dispute, the official record of attendance signed at the meeting will be used to determine attendance, and mapping tools used to determine mileage claimed.
19. An appropriate budget will be available for each financial year for costs associated with the operation of the Forum e.g. hiring a venue, refreshments and other expenses and clerking costs. This will be a charge against the Council's Schools Budget within the centrally retained budgets. The level of the budget will be reviewed annually by the Council in consultation with the Forum.
20. The Schools Forum may convene various task and finish sub groups to look at specific topics for discussion and consultation and to report back with outcomes and recommendations. The membership of any sub group to be agreed by Schools Forum.

### **Items for Forum Discussion**

21. The Forum will discuss and be consulted upon the following matters:-

#### **Consultation on School Funding Formula**

- a) The Council shall consult the Forum on any proposed changes in relation to the factors and criteria that were taken into account, or the methods, principles and rules that have been adopted, in their formula made in accordance with regulations made under section 47 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, and the financial effect of any such change.
- b) Consultation shall take place in sufficient time to allow the views expressed to be taken into account in the determination of the Council's formula and in the initial determination of schools' budget shares before the beginning of the financial year.

#### **Consultation on Contracts**

22. The Council shall, at least one month prior to the issue of invitations to tender, consult the Forum on the terms of any proposed contract for supplies or services being a contract paid or to be paid out of the Council's schools budget where the estimated value of the proposed contract is not less than the threshold which applies to the authority for that proposed contract pursuant to regulation 8 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.

#### **Consultation on Financial Issues**

23. The Council shall consult the Forum annually in respect of its functions relating to the schools budget, in connection with the following:

Financial issues relating to:

- arrangements for pupils with special educational needs, in particular the places to be commissioned by the LA and schools and the arrangements for paying top-up funding;

- arrangements for use of pupil referral units and the education of children otherwise than at school, in particular the places to be commissioned by the LA and schools and the arrangements for paying top-up funding;
- arrangements for early years provision;
- administration arrangements for the allocation of central government grants

### **Consultation on other matters**

24. The Council may consult the Forum on such other matters concerning the funding of schools as they see fit.

25. The Forum shall also have the following powers:

a) De-delegation for mainstream primary/secondary schools for:

- contingencies
- administration of free school meals
- insurance
- licences/subscriptions
- staff costs – supply cover
- support for minority ethnic
- pupils/underachieving groups
- behaviour support services
- library and museum services
- School improvement

b) in exceptional circumstances only:

to recommend changes to the Council's funding formula subject to approval by the Education and Skills Funding Agency

26. Should a judgment be necessary on whether a matter falls within the remit of the Forum, for example whether an item has financial implications, the Council's Chief Finance Officer and The Director of Education and the Chair of the Forum shall jointly make the necessary determination.

27. For decision-making purposes each Forum member will be entitled to 1 vote on all matters put to the vote other than matters relating to the funding formula in which case only schools members (which includes mainstream schools, Academies, special schools and PRUs) and representatives of the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector will be able to vote. In the case of an equal number of votes for and against a proposal, the Chair shall have a second or casting vote.

28. Where an urgent proposal needs to be considered in advance of a meeting, the Forum may be consulted via post or e-mail.

29. The Constitution, Terms of Reference and Membership of the Forum will be reviewed annually.

30. A Chair and Vice-Chair will be elected by the Forum from its voting membership every two years, or at the first meeting following any resignation. A voting Member who is also an elected Member or officer of the Council may not be elected Chair or Vice-Chair. At any meeting where both the Chair and Vice-Chair are absent, the Forum shall elect, from those voting Members present, a person to take the Chair for that meeting only.

## **Appendix 3**

### **Schools Forum Finance Sub-Group**

Terms of Reference:-

1. To keep under review the formula and allocation of the DSG.
2. To act as a point of scrutiny and interrogation regarding policy options in the DSG, Government consultations and policy.
3. To provide detailed examination of issues identified by the Schools Forum.
4. To make recommendations to the Schools Forum

Membership:

Chair of Schools Forum  
Primary Headteacher  
Secondary Headteacher  
Special School Headteacher  
Primary Governor  
Secondary Governor  
Special School Governor  
Trade Union Representative

If not included in any of the above, an Academy Representative and a Maintained School Representative.

Local Authority Officers as appropriate.

## **Appendix 4**

### **Schools Forum High Needs sub group March 2017**

#### **Terms of Reference:**

1. To find alternative proposals to address the high needs block overspend
2. To provide detailed examination of issues identified by the Schools Forum
3. To make recommendations to the Schools Forum

Membership agreed at the 13 March 2017 Schools Forum:

Sue Yates	Secondary Headteacher
Steve Dool	Secondary Headteacher
Sarah Curtis	Primary Headteacher
Kate Docherty	CWAPH Chair
Sam Myers-Whittaker or CWASSH vice chair	CWASSH
John Freeman or Harry Ziman	Governor

Local Authority Officers as appropriate.

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **Directed revisions to Schemes for Financing Schools for 2018-2019**

#### **Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Schools Forum on the Directed Revisions to Schemes for Financing Schools issued by the Department for Education (DfE) in March 2018 which are to be incorporated in the Cheshire West and Chester Scheme.

#### **Recommendations**

2. The Schools Forum (maintained schools only) is asked to:
  - i. Approve the revisions to the scheme which will be reflected in the updated Scheme to be published July 2018.
  - ii. Provide a view on the change in guidance to allow a de-delegated budget for early retirement and redundancy costs to be created (see paragraphs 7- 8).

#### **Background**

3. The DfE issues statutory guidance on local authority Schemes for Financing Schools which is updated as required. The guidance includes provisions which a local authority's scheme must, should or may include. Schools Forum approval must be obtained for changes made to the local published schemes.

#### **Changes for 2018-2019**

4. There is one directed amendment for 2017-2018, two updates to mirror changes to the School and Early Years Finance regulations and three amendments to wording.

#### **Directed amendment**

5. Following consultation, the Secretary of State directs that from 22 March 2018 the text below shall be incorporated into the schemes of all local authorities in England:

‘Loans will only be used to assist schools in spreading the cost over more than one year of large one-off individual items of a capital nature that have a benefit to the school lasting more than one financial or academic year. Loans will not be used as a means of funding a deficit that has arisen because a school’s recurrent costs exceed its current income. If loans are made to fund a deficit and a school subsequently converts to academy status, the Secretary of State will consider using the power under paragraph 13(4)(d) of Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010 to make a direction to the effect that such a loan does not transfer, either in full or part, to the new Academy school’.

## Updates to the guidance

6. Updates have been made to the guidance, to mirror changes in the Schools and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2018 to reflect changes on balances of closing schools, as detailed under Regulation 25 (9).

‘Where in the funding period, a school has been established or is subject to a prescribed alteration as a result of the closure of a school, a local authority may add an amount to the budget share of the new or enlarged school to reflect all or part of the unspent budget share (including any surplus carried over from previous funding periods) of the closing school for the funding period in which it closes’.

7. Guidance for Annex B: Responsibility for redundancy and early retirement costs has been updated to reflect changes under Schedule 2 Part 7, of the Finance Regulations. This details how a local authority can retain a central budget within the schools budget to fund the costs of new early retirements or redundancies by a deduction from maintained school budgets (excluding nursery schools) only, where the relevant maintained school members of the schools forum agree.
8. The updated guidance on funding the new costs of early retirements/redundancies would be in the form of a new de-delegated budget, operating in the same way as the pooled arrangement for maternity cover. De-delegated budgets have already been set for 2018-2019 and therefore this could not now be put in place until 2019-2020. Schools Forum are asked to consider whether they wish to pursue this option for maintained schools going forward. Key considerations in establishing this pooled budget are how much funding would be required and how allocations from the fund would be allocated to ensure requests did not exceed funding in a given year.

## Updates to wording

9. Additional updates made to the scheme guidance include:
  - i. the removal of wording to reflect that regulations no longer allow local authorities to issue budget shares for a multi-year period.
  - ii. References to the Audit Commission have been removed as this has been abolished.
  - iii. ‘Statement of SEN’ has been replaced with ‘Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP)’.

## Next Steps

10. Officers to publish the revised Scheme for Financing Schools on the Council’s website and Schools Finance intranet site in July 2018 and a communication to schools to be included in the next School Bulletin. Schools Forum is also responsible for communicating revisions to maintained schools.

**Agenda Item 10**

**f40 National Funding Formula Briefing Paper**



## School Funding Briefing Paper – May 2018

F40's main argument continues to be about fairness of allocation. The group has fundamental concerns about the new national funding formula and there is unanimous recognition within our membership that there is still more work to do to tackle remaining locked-in inequalities.

**Therefore, f40 will be campaigning for:**

**Schools**

- A significant increase in the amount invested in education funding to meet the cost pressures facing all schools (f40 is awaiting access to Department of Education datasets in order to be able to calculate the shortfall).
- An index-linked activity led formula which can be used for ensuring sufficient funding in the system and to define what the proportion for additional educational needs should be and can be used to support policy changes in the system to enable schools to meet post-Brexit needs.
- One National Funding Formula (NFF) without the need for Minimum Funding Levels (MFL) and long-term locked in protections. If the MFL is to stay, then it should take account of the additional educational needs (AEN) of schools and be fairly applied to support the different levels of AEN.
- Continued flexibility to move funding to support specific local issues or organisational requirements.
- The setting out of plans for the funding formula from 2020 onwards. Schools need to know whether there will be sufficient funding in the education budget to achieve the aims of the formula and when the government will move to a system of direct funding to schools rather than via local authorities.
- The establishment of rolling three to four-year budget settlements for schools which are inflation-proofed and include funding for cost-of-living increases.

**High Needs**

- Appropriate quantum of funding for the high needs block (which should be index-linked). This needs to take into account the increasing demands of higher needs as

medical improvements take place. It also needs to retrospectively support the increase in post-19 demand for education.

- An increase in capital funding to meet the additional demand for local specialist places at an affordable price.
- Promotion of inclusive behaviours in schools, to stop schools passing a problem on. This would include national support for making cultural change, with change to legislation where necessary.

### **Early Years**

- A review of the early years national formula to make it fit for future use.
- Appropriate quantum of funding for early years providers to take account of the pressures of the living wage and the impact of 30 hours.

### **Central Schools Services Block**

- Clarity on the way that the block will work and be increased in future.

## **1. Background**

- 1.1. This Briefing Paper outlines f40's view of the current school funding situation.
- 1.2. The f40 group represents 41 English local authorities (see list at end of paper) with historically low funding for education. We have been campaigning for a fairer system for the allocation of funding for schools for over two decades.
- 1.3. Throughout this time, our primary objective has been to influence a change in the way the government allocates funding to local education authorities and schools, so f40 welcomes the introduction of the NFF and commends the government for honouring its manifesto commitment to take steps towards providing fairer funding for all children in state funded schools in England.
- 1.4. However, f40 continues to have fundamental concerns about the new formula and there is unanimous recognition that there is still more work to do to tackle continuing unfairness of funding allocation and remaining locked-in inequalities.

## **2. Schools Block**

- 2.1. The NFF is a step in the right direction, but it is based on historical averages rather than on the real cost of running schools and is, therefore, still unfair. As part of the NFF an extra £1.3bn has been made available, which is welcomed. However, there was insufficient narrowing of the differential funding gap.
- 2.2. In f40's opinion, the NFF does not take sufficient account of the interaction between school funding and high needs funding – the 0.5% flexibility provided at present in 2018/19 and 2019/20 is only short-term and if the full "hard" NFF is implemented in 2020/21 as planned, this will provide significant challenges to many local authorities given the current pressures on the high need block and the under-funding position they are in. Each block should be funded sufficiently, thus removing any need to make transfers between them.

- 2.3. The inconsistencies in funding for individual schools with similar characteristics across the country remain too great as a result of the protection of schools that are better funded. We concede that an NFF, allocating the same funding for all mainstream pupils nationally, begins to resolve the problem of a child attracting very different levels of funding wherever they are being taught, but the implementation of the NFF has not yet achieved the desired outcome.
- 2.4. Following the government's consultations, f40 thought the case for fair funding for schools had been won. In advance of the announcement of the NFF, the government agreed that the former system was unjustifiable and unfair, but regrettably they have replaced one unfair system with another. Implementation of the NFF has more to do with stability and the protection of schools against loss, rather than creating a fairer funding system across all local authorities. We contend that an additional "F" is required to create a new NFFF – a National Fair Funding Formula.

### **3. Refinements to the NFF Schools Block sought by f40**

- 3.1. F40 believes that the government's implementation of the NFF falls short of what was expected, does not deliver true fairness and is, therefore, in need of fundamental change. There are five key elements of the Schools Block NFF that f40 is unhappy about and will be asking the government to consider, namely:
  - The amount invested in education funding and the cost pressures facing all schools.
  - The amount of funding for basic entitlement, relative to the educational additional needs.
  - The provision of a 0.5% funding floor, which 'locks in' historical differences and acts as a "sticking plaster" for wider formula shortcomings.
  - The lack of any activity-led analysis or definition of what exactly the government is buying with this funding, or how expectations have changed over time.
  - Other issues – e.g. Brexit, Capital and MATs
- 3.2. F40 will be happy to work with the government and the Department for Education to improve the formula, and in particular to address our five main elements of concern.

### **4. The amount invested in education funding and the cost pressures facing all schools**

- 4.1. F40's main argument continues to be about fairness of allocation. But we recognise that quantum is increasingly central to the overall problem. In the past we had hoped that a fairer funding allocation should be achieved by redistribution from the better funded to the poorest funded, but we now realise that this is not something that the government is prepared to undertake. That leaves no alternative but to collaborate with other campaign organisations that have made the quantum of funding their main goal.
- 4.2. The WorthLess? campaign considers what schools can provide in reality, with the funding they have and how the funding is shrinking as costs rise at a much faster rate than the funding. Their campaign focuses on ensuring there is adequate funding for all schools, with high quality teacher supply to support radical improvement in social

mobility and provide support to the most vulnerable children and families. For that we need quality teacher recruitment and retention.

- 4.3. Whilst these are not absolutely the same as the aspirations of f40 we fully agree that enabling schools in all parts of the country to have the ability to meet the needs of their pupils, to enable them to fulfil their potential without this being at the expense of others (either deprived pupil not receiving additional support or all pupils have the curriculum and enhancements squeezed to pay for the basics such as heating, books or teaching).
- 4.4. The Fair Funding for All Schools campaign is a parent led campaign. Parents are noticing the cuts in funding and the increased requests from schools for contributions to prop up the school budget. The campaign leaders recognise the changing nature of the needs of education establishments, particularly with regard to a need for competitive skills for post Brexit Britain. They feel that lack of funding is narrowing the curriculum and taking the fun out of education with the impact of disengaging too many learners at a time when we need our children to have the best opportunities.
- 4.5 Schools in low funded areas have inevitably had to prioritise meeting their core costs to a greater degree than better funded schools and, as a consequence, have struggled to improve outcomes for vulnerable pupils. The government's failure to 'grasp the nettle' and fully implement the NFFF (the first F meaning Fair) means schools cannot be judged fairly on the outcomes their pupils achieve. It is unfortunate that the Department for Education is seeking further efficiencies from schools, particularly those in the lowest funded areas, which have already cut costs and achieved all the efficiencies possible. The fact is that it is the gap between school funding and schools' costs – for example, pay awards, pensions, National Insurance and apprenticeship levy – that really needs to be addressed.
- 4.6 Any efficiency targets should therefore be used as a means of achieving redistribution. As most efficiencies have already been achieved in low funded schools, this increasing pressure is resulting in additional workload and pressure on teachers and school leaders exacerbating the already challenging issues with teacher recruitment and retention.
- 4.7 F40 is calling for an immediate injection of new funding and the introduction of an annual index-linked review of formula values to reflect the changing demand for school services, the underlying costs and changing priorities. F40 is awaiting access to the datasets held by the Department for Education, which it has been promised. Once we have these datasets we will be able to calculate the shortfall. We will also encourage the Department for Education to examine how annual reviews can be undertaken and what consultation should be associated with it.
- 4.8 The national funding formula for schools should be exactly that; it should provide all the funding that a school needs to for its pupils. Grant funding paid outside the national formula can be inefficient and distorts the fairness of the national formula as it simply retains opportunities for government to add additional funding for some schools. F40 believes that all universal grants paid to schools outside the national formula should be phased out during the national funding formula's implementation period. This should include a review of pupil premium and the PE and sports grant. F40 accepts that grants targeted at individual schools for example, teaching school

funding cannot be paid through the national formula. However, f40 also holds the view that when funding is under so much pressure, the use of an amount for universal infant free school meals does not provide value for money for the public purse and the policy should be reviewed and the funding provided to support schools in funding the basics. Such policies are laudable when there is sufficient funding in the system, but an extravagance when funding is this stretched.

## **5 Basic entitlement relative to educational additional needs.**

- 5.1 Without a clear understanding of what the government is funding it is difficult to determine the basic entitlement compared to the additional educational needs.
- 5.2 Whilst there has been a deliberate movement of funding into additional educational needs, partly to support those so-called “ordinary working families”, we don’t consider that the additional needs indicators support those families and therefore by reducing the basic element of funding this could be having the opposite effect to that intended.
- 5.3 F40 is concerned about the balance of funding to address additional needs at a time when schools are struggling to meet their core responsibilities, as evidenced by the National Audit Office report (December 2016) which indicated cost increases of around 8%. Whilst not looking to reduce additional needs spending, schools need to be able to meet core costs as a first priority. We consider that too much funding is directed towards deprivation and that when Pupil Premium is also taken in to account this could be considered as double funding. The basic funding under NFF is simply too low. It creates distortions which risk replacing one unfairness with another.
- 5.4 We seek more clarity regarding the funding for deprivation in the main funding formula and that contained within the pupil premium. Whilst reviewing the overall level of funding, we advocate the incorporation of existing levels of Pupil Premium into the main formula at the earliest possible opportunity. The use of the same indicator for several funding streams just multiplies funding disparities and causes additional work for schools.

## **6 The funding protections, which lock in historical differences**

- 6.1 One of the key principles set out in the early NFF consultations, supported by f40, was that pupils of similar characteristics should attract similar levels of funding wherever they are in the country (allowing for the area cost adjustment).
- 6.2 Redistribution of funding has not occurred to any noticeable extent, and the NFF has not achieved what was expected. It continues to be the case that similar local schools are not funded on the same basis as others.
- 6.3 The NFF should be applied to all schools on a consistent basis. However, the protections applied ‘lock in’ some of the historical differences for those schools which have been comparatively well funded for several decades. Equally the cost of this protection limits the impact of the new formula and results in the continuation of different funding levels for pupils across the country. Stability for schools in funding is important, but not at the expense of never reaching a fair formula and outcome. In

practice, schools in lower funded areas will be subsidising those in better funded areas who have gained.

## **7 Lack of activity-led analysis**

- 7.1 f40 remains convinced that without an underlying analysis of the costs of running education provision, the NFF can only provide a short-term solution to funding schools and other providers. The historic averages that are currently used will inevitably lose all credence and there is nothing in the formula to replace them or to support any changes in government priorities.
- 7.2 The funding formula model developed by f40 and presented to the Department for Education two years ago attempted to do this based on analysis of staffing ratios and associated school level costs. We urge the Department for Education to look again at our modelling, to consider each element of that model to ascertain the true cost of operating a school and to ensure the funding rates are sufficient in any review of the NFF. We understand that implementation of an activity-led formula is politically difficult, but at the very least, there are parts of it that can be used to create a fairer system.
- 7.3 There are still elements of the NFF that rely upon historical spend and these must be addressed in the near future, e.g. premises related costs including business rates and sparsity. The link of pupil led funding and sparsity funding to the lump sum has also not been fully addressed. Some local authorities compensated for a low lump sum with a high sparsity (for example) and others used the factors in quite sophisticated ways. A formula based upon averages removes this nuance but doesn't necessarily compensate for it appropriately. More work needs to be undertaken to truly understand the costs of small rural schools.
- 7.4 f40 believes that a per pupil MFL is unnecessary and the NFF should undertake this role. We are surprised that the opportunity was not taken to ensure that this is the case. In the circumstances f40 believes the retained MFL needs to protect small schools with low needs and take account of deprivation and other additional educational needs, rather than simply a protection for some schools. At present a large school with low deprivation or additional needs can be supported by a significant amount of additional funding where a school with medium additional needs receives the same envelope of funding for a more challenging cohort of pupils. F40 has argued that the funding needs to support schools in low deprived areas, but not at the expense of other schools. The NFF needs to provide sufficient funding for all schools via the formula so that those with additional needs are appropriately funded too.
- 7.5 The purpose of the MFL is to provide a minimum funding per pupil at a school, but for small schools, the divisor in the calculation will automatically provide a per pupil amount that is above the MFL. This does not mean that a small school can operate as the fixed costs of such a school are higher than the MFL allows, but the MFL mechanism cannot be increased as it would be unaffordable and artificially protect too many schools. For the smallest schools, a different MFL needs to exist that is higher than the general value, or as stated in the previous paragraph the formula should take this into account for all schools without the need for an MFL.

## 8 Other important issues

- 8.1 The Department for Education must set out plans for the funding formula from 2020 onwards. Schools need to know whether there will be sufficient funding in the education budget to achieve the aims of the formula and when the government will move to a system of direct funding to schools rather than via local authorities.
- 8.2 The Department must also establish rolling three to four-year budget settlements for schools which are inflation-proofed and include funding for cost-of-living increases.
- 8.3 The UK leaving the EU is going to provide a new set of challenges for the education system and the funding formula needs to be able to react to them in a positive and proactive way. The government has clearly stated that the 'Brexit dividend' will be used to support the NHS and schools funding and we anticipate that the NFF will be used to distribute this 'windfall' funding to schools. But any such distribution must be undertaken in an objective way that is clearly linked to addressing the current underfunded needs of children and young people across the country.
- 8.4 In a period of austerity when funding is limited, F40 believes that it is imprudent to create additional school-place capacity that is not linked to basic need. Investment in new and additional school places where the need is unproven and often completely unnecessary, is inefficient and impacts on the viability of neighbouring schools.
- 8.5 F40 firmly believes that capital investment is needed to support growth in specific strategic areas. For example, where there is a proven basic need; where efficiencies can be placed in the system by capital means (e.g. adding classroom space to one school to enable the closure of another); and by providing capital to support capacity for SEND pupils in new resourced provision or free special schools enabling education closer to home for those pupils. The additional capital that has already been targeted at SEND is welcomed. However, the allocations at LA are insignificant in addressing the real pressures and increased demand many LAs are facing due to the increase of pupils with high needs.
- 8.6 Over time there has been a significant increase in the roles that schools are expected to fulfil, without any additional funding as a result of cuts in other public services. Schools are the end point in the process and now find that they are having to undertake counselling, support to mental health, social care and family support especially to those at risk of exclusion and also having to buy other therapy services such as speech and language therapy. This places enormous strains on school budgets as they have to buy in services, but do not receive funding for it.
- 8.7 F40 understands that MATs are different to maintained schools and are here to stay, but we would like to see MATs being held more accountable for some of the decisions that they make, especially with regard to pay and distribution of funding between individual academies in the MAT. The management of deficits in MATs is not transparent and MATs are not being treated equally with maintained schools. This is not an acceptable situation.
- 8.8 The concept of notional SEN needs to be national. For 2018-19 there is (in theory if not in practice) one formula for schools and yet there are 150 different definitions of

notional SEN. School's should not, but do, put reliance on these figures for their budgeting and there are different ways of supporting inclusive schools around the country. This is an aspect of the schools' block that needs to be consistent across the country and part of the national formula.

- 8.9 Home to School Transport remains an ongoing problem for rural authorities, particularly as more schools become academies. They are making decisions regarding the school day which impact on the local authority home to school transport arrangements and budgets. LAs have reduced levels of control, but are expected to fund in accordance with the legislation.

## 9 High Needs

- 9.1 The funding of high needs is not keeping pace with demand and medical diagnosis and the introduction of high needs NFF has done nothing to address the problems. F40 is calling for an immediate injection of new funding and the introduction of an annual index-linked review for this block. At this point we are unable to state exactly what level of new funding is required but we will undertake research to identify the amount of underfunding.

More specifically f40 has growing concerns about:

- 9.2 **Demand** – the demand for high needs funding is out-stripping the budgets available to local authorities across the country, resulting in serious deficits in the high needs blocks in over half of all local authorities. Many have no real plans to recover these deficits and cuts to existing high needs services and pupil top-up funding simply makes what provision that is available that much more unsustainable. There is an emerging crisis in high needs funding that f40 urges the government to address before permanent damage is done to very many vulnerable pupils. The Department for Education's attempts to fix the problem by permitting a 0.5% transfer from schools funding to high needs is too little too late: not only does it fail to address the size of the emerging funding problem, but it also hardens attitudes between schools (through their representatives on schools' forums) and local authorities (who advise schools forums). There has been no recognition of the increasing population since 2013-14 in the high needs block and if the funding blocks are to be ringfenced then there is a moral imperative that the high needs block is properly funded rather than permit small scale transfers from a schools' block that is already under considerable cost pressures.
- 9.3 **Complexity of need** – the complexity of the high needs services demanded by more and more children (and their parents) is far greater than was the case just a few years ago. And as medical assessment and methods of treatment improve and intensify, the demand for them increases. The increased demand again creates more workload and greater costs. This complexity makes it harder for the authorities to judge, involves more and more medical services and as a result creates greater work load and greater costs. Such increasing needs requires recognition through the national high needs formula through an annual increase in the high needs funding quantum
- 9.4 **Supply of places** - the provision of places that can handle increasingly complex cases is dwindling and where they do exist, the demand-led market place is driving up

costs. This is often independent provision, at a distance from the LA and significantly more, frequently double, local authority provision costs. The independent sector is tending to dictate the costs associated with the supply and holding local authorities to ransom and consideration needs to be given to setting cost limits. Importantly parents and SEN professionals see increasing benefits in keeping children locally with access to family and local community services. Additional support to avoid family breakdown is essential in avoiding high cost out county placements which increasingly are not in the child's best interests.

- 9.5 **Post-16 extension to 25** - local authorities are seeing a significant growth in the number of children they are funding post-16 as a result of recent policy changes. High needs funding was never provided to take account of this number of children and as such, additional funding needs to be found to meet this new demand.
- 9.6 **Harmonisation of elements 1, 2 & 3 in post-16 high needs funding with school funding** - Consistency is required between schools and colleges: the funding to meet the high needs threshold of £6,000 is included in the national school funding formula but for colleges the £6,000 high needs threshold, known as Element 2, is funded in DSG and transferred through individual local authority declaration to the ESFA. It would be much more efficient and simpler if post-16 Element 2 funding was included in the lagged learner post-16 national funding formula i.e. the same as schools. A one-off national transfer from DSG to FE funding would be all that is necessary
- 9.7 **Impact on SEN Transport** – there has been a major increase in post-16 to 25 transport costs as a result of policy changes introduced by the government. As the number of children with additional needs increases so does the cost of transport which is placing additional demand pressures on LA budgets already facing significant reductions.
- 9.8 **Impact on exclusions** – increasingly exclusions are occurring in primary schools and there is little provision available to meet the needs of these pupils. Evidence from primary headteachers is that behaviour is getting worse at much earlier ages and this may be linked to changes in society heavily influenced by inappropriate computer games and an inability for pupils to follow instructions and authority in schools. With funding being focused at AEN rather than basic entitlement, schools not in receipt are finding more and more that their only option is to exclude the pupils.
- 9.9 **Mental Health and links to health service (e.g. Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAHMS))** - admissions to hospital schools/pupil referral units (PRUS) are increasing based on mental health needs and are approved by CAMHS. Annual increases are in excess of 10% per annum but funding remains static within DSG. New burdens for Tier 4 mental health placements have been transferred from health to education without additional funding. This is contrary to agreed custom and practice with government.
- 9.10 **Inclusion** - As the financial pressures increase on schools' budgets, the ability and willingness for schools to take on more complex children within a mainstream setting will be challenged which is resulting in more children being directed towards specialist provision and in more exclusions. If this continues to happen the full pupil funding in the schools' block, including the £6,000 threshold cost hidden within the national

formula, will need to become more explicit and follow the pupil to the high needs block. It cannot be right that schools block funding is reduced by the primary or secondary unit of funding and this does not appear to transfer automatically to the high needs block.

- 9.11 There are currently no levers for LAs to apply to schools that do not act inclusively. Academies can refuse to accept pupils and it takes around a term for the Secretary of State to direct an academy leaving the Local Authority needing to find specialist provision for the pupil, when they should be in a mainstream school. There was discussion in the White Paper 'Education Excellence Everywhere' that schools should remain responsible (both financially and in terms of standards) for that pupil until they were back on roll at a mainstream school (or in specialist provision). This will also be a challenge for the system but must be better for the pupil than the current system where pupils are effectively moved on as quickly as possible regardless of whether that is in their best interests.
- 9.12 Significant funding pressures are being placed upon local authority budgets and the DSG. The impact of this is to put pressure on schools as they are the group that have been relatively protected. Schools are being asked to take on more and more work that traditionally was undertaken elsewhere (e.g. youth work, parenting support) or was less of an issue in the past (e.g. mental health). Schools need to be suitably funded and trained for this work. The idea of the majority of pupils turning up at school, working happily in a class of 30 and skipping home at the end of the day is long gone. Schools are significantly more complex institutions than they were and the funding for this has not kept pace. It is recognised that austerity measures have limited government funding and that schools have been protected, but the amount of additional work they do, and cost pressures put upon them has more than removed any protection they had.
- 9.13 **Impact on special schools and pupil referral units** – both these categories of schools are funded entirely from the high needs block and thus are not in receipt of the additional funding that has been directed to schools. The high needs block is where the funding is most under pressure at present, and so local authorities are forced to squeeze these budgets. Yet, it is at these schools that the most vulnerable pupils are educated and where the greatest difference can be made to young lives for the future. This is where the reduction of future costs of supporting independence in adults or places in the judicial system happens. Investment in these schools is vitally important, but budget reductions (in real terms) are stopping these schools from having the flexibility to work with individuals and make a real long-term difference.
- 9.14 **Place funding of £10,000** – place funding provides typically 50% of funding for special schools and needs to be increased regularly to meet inflationary costs in special schools. It is unacceptable to require special schools to absorb increased staffing and premises costs and continue to provide the best provision for the most vulnerable pupils in society. Given the pressures on the high needs budgets local authorities are unable to increase top-up funding to compensate. Place funding for special schools is a much more significant contribution to the schools budget than the mainstream school lump sum and must be recognised as such.

9.15 The historic element of the high needs block will need to be better understood if it is to remain part of the formula for the long term. LAs made decisions about how much they used for the HNB based upon their needs at the time. To baseline this into the formula is clearly fairer, but it needs to be part of a review of the quantum of funding that is available for high needs block given what has been stated above.

## **10 Early Years**

10.1 There have been no universal increases in funding rates for early years providers, yet the cost of introduction of the living wage is having a significantly greater impact on nursery sector costs than is the case for employers generally. Alongside this, providers are expected to provide more of their working week at the national funding rate (whereas before the introduction of the entitlement of 30 hours for working parents, the nursery had over 50% of the working week to make up the cost difference) and employer on costs have risen separately from the living wage. Thus, providers are finding it increasingly difficult to provide early education. F40 is calling for an immediate injection of new funding and the introduction of an annual index-linked review for this block. At this stage we are unable to state exactly what level of new funding is required but we will undertake research to identify the level of underfunding.

10.2 Almost immediately after the introduction of the Early Years National Funding Formula, a floor was introduced to prop up authorities at the lowest levels as it was recognised that the lowest funding values were insufficient. The underlying formula is clearly not working as it should, and the area that needs review is the business rates element which distributed the available quantum far more widely than it should compared to the actual rates paid. Some small amount of work on this part of the formula could make it fit for purpose in the long term.

10.3 With the pressures on the high needs block, some local authorities are using the early years block to fund the early years inclusion fund, leading to a reduction in the funding rate payable to providers.

10.4 There is limited interest or appetite in the sector to expand to meet demand for 30 hours as government has eroded their business models and reduced profitability.

10.5 There is a significant recruitment issue across the sector which is exacerbated through the increase to 30 hours which requires more qualified staff. Settings are reporting that they have to limit places due to recruitment issues which then impacts on the local authority sufficiency of places.

10.6 Many f40 nursery schools are outstanding and are set in areas of disadvantage. Nursery schools are required through regulation to have unique cost factors so moving to a single hourly rate across all providers will not be sustainable. The uncertainty of future plans is causing turbulence in our schools which is unhelpful.

## **11 Central Schools Services Block**

11.1 It is still early days for the central services block. The Department for Education has provided no information on how it's going to work and how the quantum will be

increased to cover inflationary costs in the long run. This applies equally to many other parts of the school funding system and f40 would welcome greater clarity. There is scope to use the CSSB to provide the missing flexibility for schools that just don't fit the formula, but this would need to be funded.

11.2 Additionally, f40 would welcome further information as to how the Department intends to manage and/or re-allocate funding that is current identified as "historical commitments" within each local authority's base funding.

## **June 2018**

### **Notes**

1.f40 is a cross-party group which has the support of MPs, councillors, education directors, governors, head teachers, parents and teaching union representatives. The group has 41 member authorities representing over 2.83 million pupils in over 9,000 schools.

2.The members are: Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Central Bedfordshire, Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Cornwall, Derbyshire, Devon, Dorset, East Riding of Yorkshire, East Sussex, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Herefordshire, Kent, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, North Yorkshire, Northumberland, Oxfordshire, Plymouth, Shropshire, Solihull, Somerset, South Gloucestershire, Staffordshire, Stockport, Suffolk, Swindon, Torbay, Trafford, Wakefield, Warrington, Warwickshire, West Sussex, Wigan, Wiltshire, Worcestershire and York.

**Cheshire West and Chester  
Schools Forum  
9 July 2018**

**Agenda Item 12**

**Schedule of meetings 2018-2019**

**Schools Forum** – all meetings 4.30pm – 6.30pm (refreshments at 4pm) unless otherwise stated

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Proposed agenda</b>
Monday 8 October 2018	Queen's Park High School tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final allocation of the DSG 2018-2019</li> <li>• DSG 2018-2019 Forecast Outturn at First Review</li> <li>• School Funding Arrangements 2019-2020</li> <li>• Basic needs capital programme</li> </ul>
Monday 10 December 2018	Queen's Park High School tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DSG 2018-2019 Forecast Outturn at Mid Year Review</li> <li>• Initial Planning for DSG Allocations for 2019-2020 and Budget Setting</li> </ul>
Monday 14 January 2019	Queen's Park High School tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combined Budgets and Miscellaneous Expenditure</li> <li>• DSG Allocations for 2019-2020 and Budget Setting</li> <li>• Draft of 2019-2020 School Funding Formula for January submission</li> <li>• De-delegation – Proposals for 2019-2020</li> </ul>
Monday 11 February 2019	Queen's Park High School tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Years funding formula for February submission</li> <li>• Special Educational Needs (SEN) Funding for Mainstream and Special Schools – Funding from the High Needs Block 2019-2020</li> <li>• Central Spend budgets 2019-2020</li> <li>• DSG 2018-2019 Forecast Outturn at Third Review</li> </ul>
Monday 8 July 2019	Queen's Park High School tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School funding arrangements –national data comparison 2019-2020</li> <li>• School funding arrangements for 2020-2021</li> <li>• Directed revisions to schemes for financing schools</li> <li>• DSG 2018-2019 outturn</li> <li>• Financial year 2018-2019 analysis of schools balances (including Academies)</li> <li>• Basic needs capital programme</li> <li>• Annual review of Schools Forum</li> </ul>

		membership, constitution and terms of reference
--	--	---

**Schools Forum finance sub group** – all meetings 2pm – 4pm unless otherwise stated.

Tuesday 18 September 2018	Nicholas House G2
Tuesday 20 November 2018	Nicholas House G2
Tuesday 18 December 2018	tbc
Tuesday 22 January 2019	tbc
Tuesday 18 June 2019	tbc