

## SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

### SCHOOLS GROUP:

Maggie Waller (Chair), Julia Shepard (Vice-Chair), Barbara Clark, Gillian Coffey, John Constable, Harry Duffy, Helen Huntley, Maureen Mallinson, Paul McAteer, Kevin O'Driscoll, Jon Reekie, Mary Sparrow, Maggie Stacey, Jo Rockall, Kate Webb, Virginia Barrett, Jean Cameron, Jo Matthews, Nicky Willis, Philip Gregory

### OBSERVERS:

Lynda Bussley

### ATTENDEES:

Angela Mellish

### LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

Robin Crofts, Michelle Perkins (Clerk), Roger Edwardson and Steve Elson

**DATE & TIME: WEDNESDAY, 20TH MARCH, 2013 AT 8.00 FOR 8.15 AM  
BEECHWOOD RESEARCH AND CONFERENCE CENTRE, LONG  
READINGS LANE, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE, SL2 1QE**

## AGENDA

	<u>Page</u>
1. Apologies	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising	<b>(Pages 1 - 6)</b>
4. DfE Review of 2013-14 Schools Funding Arrangements - Consultation Response	<b>(Pages 7 - 20)</b>
5. Schools Forum Membership March 2013	<b>(Pages 21 - 24)</b>
6. Academies Update	
7. 2012-13 Work Programme and Key Decisions Log	<b>(Pages 25 - 28)</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Slough Schools Forum- Meeting held on Wednesday, 27th February, 2013**

- Present:** Maggie Waller, Holy Family Primary School (Chair)  
Julia Shepard, Beechwood Secondary School (Vice-Chair)  
Barbara Clark, Godolphin Junior School  
John Constable, Langley Grammar  
Harry Duffy, Ryvers Primary School  
Helen Huntley, Haybrook College  
Maureen Mallinson, Westgate Secondary School  
Paul McAteer, Slough and Eton Secondary School  
Mary Sparrow, Wexham Secondary School  
Jo Rockall, Herschel Grammar School  
Jean Cameron, Slough Children's Centres  
Jo Matthews, Littledown  
Nicky Willis, Cippenham Primary School  
Philip Gregory, Baylis Court Nursery School  
Maggie Waller, Holy Family Primary School (Chair)
- Officers:** Robin Crofts, Mark Taylor, George Grant, Steve Elson, Rajpreet Johal  
(stand-in Clerk)
- Other Attendees:** Julie O'Brien, Our Lady of Peace Junior School, Eddie Neighbour, Slough  
Grammar School
- Apologies:** Charlie McGeachie, Kevin O'Driscoll, Maggie Stacey, Virginia Barrett,  
Angela Mellish and Michelle Perkins (Clerk)

**PART I**

**197. Apologies**

Charlie McGeachie, Maggie Stacey, Father Kevin O'Driscoll, Virginia Barrett, Angela Mellish, Michelle Perkins (Clerk).

**198. Declarations of Interest**

None

**199. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising**

Minute 190: concerns regarding on-going support from SBC Finance: Maggie Waller reported that a positive meeting had taken place with Ruth Bagley, Robin Crofts, Mark Taylor, Julia Shepard and herself. See also agenda item 5 (below) regarding the new structure and support arrangements.

Minute 192: Early Years: Steve Elson confirmed that Free School Meals data will be used for deprivation funding and that National Insurance numbers are collected already for 5-11 year olds and this will be offered as an SLA service to early years.

Minute 193: DfE Funding Reform 5 – 16: The Chair gave an update on action since the last meeting. An electronic vote was held regarding the two models proposed for primary / secondary ratio (1:1.43 and 1:1.39) and the Schools Forum vote was in

favour of the former (11 votes to 6). The LA was informed of the outcome but the recommendation of the Schools Forum was not accepted. It was noted that this was the first time that this had happened. The ratio of 1:1.39 was submitted to the DfE. The decision regarding the ratio had been delegated to the Chief Executive and Mark Taylor explained that this decision was made in consultation with the Leader and other elected members. He told the Forum that Ruth Bagley had received three letters regarding this and would be responding. Members noted that further letters were to be submitted. Members of the Forum expressed extremely grave concern about unexpected outcomes from the decision in that there were significant unexpected losses (post Minimum Funding Guarantee), far greater than set out in the final model reviewed by the Task & Finish Group and Schools Forum prior to the vote. In one instance cited this will lead to a possible redundancy. John Constable reported that the budget his school (as an example) received from the EFA listed cash values less than those in the model considered by the Task and Finish group. He asked for clarification regarding the basis of any changes, whether these changes were known to the LA and whether they were communicated to schools. It was noted that the changes were in part due to the gains ceiling being made as high as possible in response to the request of the Task and Finish group but it was also likely that other factors affected the outcome also. From those present it was clear that this level of loss was a consistent pattern across the three grammar schools that are academies. Mary Sparrow explained that the reason why many people voted for the status quo was exactly because the impact was uncertain and the evidence base insufficient and this situation demonstrates that. There are secondary schools experiencing far greater losses than were expected. This view was supported by other secondary members and it was felt that the situation was outrageous in terms of the scale of unexpected changes. Julia Shepard referred to the additional losses in Post 16 funding in 2013 which impact greatly on the grammar schools and those schools with larger sixth forms. It was agreed that the further work needed on the formula needs to be progressed immediately (see also Item 6 on the agenda). Primary school colleagues commented on the benefits to the primary phase of changing the ratio, giving a primary perspective, but also stated that they understood the concerns raised by secondary schools. It was noted that this was an elected members' decision.

It was agreed that the LA would carry out an urgent piece of work to analyse the differences in budget and the reasons for those. It was also agreed that the figures submitted to the DfE would be circulated to Schools Forum members.

## **200. DfE Review of 2013-14 School Funding Arrangements**

Paper circulated with agenda. The consultation is seeking views on the new funding arrangements and it was agreed that a joint LA and Schools Forum response should be submitted.

RC provided a brief update on where Slough sits on the various graphs included in the consultation document e.g. middle range of KS3 AWPU amount; low on some where we chose not to use the formula factor e.g. EAL; high end of range on SEN and deprivation factors: high end of range on percentage of funding delegated through pupil led factors – 95.6%.

It was noted that the data behind all the graphs was from October LA submissions and that the DfE is to update from the January submissions.

Need to respond by 26<sup>th</sup> March 2013. It was agreed that Schools Forum members would be invited to a one-off meeting to be arranged by Michelle Perkins to agree the joint response.

## **201. Finance Structure and Support Update**

Mark Taylor gave a verbal update. He referred to the questions submitted by primary Headteachers and these will be responded to. The Local Authority has now looked at the structure of support provided to schools and is in the process of establishing a permanent team to provide the support schools require.

George Grant (Directorate Financial Manager) was welcomed to the meeting and he provided an update on how the structure now sits. Aalia Akhtar provides day to day support plus Kate Appleyard to summer to support schools closure of accounts. The LA is recruiting a Principal Accountant with specific schools experience. Reference was made to the possibility of an additional interim resource being made available. George reported he is keen to learn from mistakes that have been made and he wishes to attend Schools Forum. Previous SLAs have been reviewed.

Schools Forum is to be provided with contact numbers of the finance team.

George has written to schools as a way of introduction.

There was some discussion about budget monitoring as there has been no budget monitoring report to Schools Forum this financial year. December's report will be presented once finalised. Schools were asked to advise what information they would like to see in the report and George Grant agreed to follow this up. Report to be provided at the meeting in May.

Robin Crofts referred to work in the LA to review the interface of Audit with schools so that it was more than simply the audit process itself but more pre and post audit work.

## **202. Formula Review for 2014/15**

Mark Taylor reported that the LA will provide support through the Schools Forum and that the Chief Executive is committed to this work continuing. In the light of earlier discussion, the urgency of the work was agreed. However, it was noted that the Terms of Reference for the necessary research need to be agreed – an outline specification - as this is not a purely financial piece of work. The technical financial modelling and support will need to follow initial research to allow a true needs led analysis to be carried out to gather the evidence required to underpin review. It was agreed that the outline specification would be presented at the Schools Forum meeting in May. Jo Rockall and Maggie Waller offered to initiate the work needed to identify possible sources and expertise for the research.

Helen Huntley commented that budgets in other areas could be more closely involved with schools to get true value for money and improve outcomes for families.

Schools Forum re-iterated welcoming Cllr Mann's involvement in Schools Forum.

A comment was made about the need to improve public access to Schools Forum meetings. It was noted that meetings are open to the public and papers and details of all meetings are on the SBC website along with all other Council meetings.

### **203. Implementation of DfE Funding Reform - High Needs and Post 16**

Report circulated with agenda. Steve Elson took members through the report which is to inform the Schools Forum of the current position regarding the High Needs Block in 2013 – 14.

DfE have intended to simplify the process but it was noted that each special school will have more complex financial arrangements to administer as they will need to deal directly with a number of LAs.

Appendix 1 of report shows a breakdown of the budgeted expenditure for the High Needs Block.

It was noted that the costs for schools of the PRU provision have been negotiated between Helen Huntley and the secondary schools. Jackie Wright is working with Post 16 providers as the Post 16 arrangements are complex with both the LA and EFA funding each single student. The High Needs Block needs to be kept under review; the budget is tight and has a limited contingency. An update will be provided at the Schools Forum meeting in autumn.

There was concern expressed regarding the vulnerability of special schools and PRU funding once any out sourced contract is let as funding relies on the LA commissioning places,. Robin Crofts supported this view as it is important that the infra-structure supports the successful policy of providing locally for vulnerable youngsters which is more cost effective and desirable for families.

Jean Cameron asked if any specific provision is made within the High Needs Block for Early Years and it was confirmed that this is not the case.

Jo Matthews referred to Littledown which has operated a primary PRU facility within the special school thus far. This will not be possible under the new arrangements and therefore a primary PRU will be registered separately during 2013/14.

Steve Elson noted that Early Years and High Needs budgets will come out week commencing 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013.

### **204. Membership Update and Revised Constitution**

Membership: It was noted that the Schools Forum Constitution requires the Membership to be reviewed annually to get the right balance across academies and maintained schools in relation to pupil numbers in each category. The current membership was attached with agenda.

It was noted that the current balance between academies and maintained was correct and also that the representation from primary and secondary academies was in proportion to pupil numbers. It was noted that a key change to regulations is that the phase balance across academy representatives is a matter for the Academy proprietors whenever an election is needed to appoint a new member.

It was noted that there are two vacancies for maintained schools, one of which is as a result of the resignation of Martin Davis who was thanked for his input and support for the Forum whilst a member.

It was noted that it is likely that a further vacancy will arise as the result of Charlie McGeachie resigning from the Forum. The Chair will follow up and check the January pupil numbers and then confirm with the Primary Headteachers what vacancies need to be filled. The clerk will then write to Chairs of Governors and Clerks regarding any remaining Governor vacancy.

It was agreed that Induction training would be arranged for Schools Forum members. Mark Taylor also agreed to look at the provision of training for new Headteachers.

Constitution: the Constitution had been updated in line with local and national requirements and was approved.

#### **205. Academies Update**

Robin Crofts provided an update on academies:  
Willow is now an academy, James Elliman will transfer on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 and dates for Montem, Colnbrook and Foxborough are to be confirmed.

#### **206. 2012/13 Work Programme and Key Decisions Log**

The current Work Programme and Key Decisions Log were noted.

(Note: The Meeting opened at 8.00 am and closed at 10.00 am)

This page is intentionally left blank



# **Review of 2013-14 School Funding Arrangements Response Form**

The closing date for responding is 26 March 2013.

Your comments must reach us by that date.

The information you provide in your response will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations, which allow public access to information held by the Department. This does not necessarily mean that your response can be made available to the public as there are exemptions relating to information provided in confidence and information to which the Data Protection Act 1998 applies. You may request confidentiality by ticking the box provided, but you should note that neither this, nor an automatically-generated e-mail confidentiality statement, will necessarily exclude the public right of access.

**Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.**

**Name:**

**Organisation (if applicable):**

Slough Borough Council and Slough  
Schools Forum joint response

**Address:**

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the review document you can email [Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.uk)

## Section 1: Are we moving towards national consistency?

**Question 1:** Should we set a minimum threshold for the pupil-led factors and, if so, at what level?

If a minimum threshold is set it should include all pupil-led factors to still enable local decisions over the relative proportions of AWPU and other factors and there should be no cap.

**Question 2:** On what basis did local authorities decide on the quantum or proportion of funding to target to deprived pupils?

The funding attributed to deprivation factors in the previous formula was used as the baseline. There was a factor for historical grants that had to be apportioned with the agreement of the Schools' Forum.

**Question 3:** On what basis did local authorities decide on the per-pupil amounts for the prior attainment factors?

As above. A mixture of previous prior attainment factors and an portionment of the historical grants factor.

## Section 2: Areas of concern and possible changes for 2014-15

### Prior Attainment

**Question 4:** Do you agree that local authorities should continue to use EYFSP data as an attainment-related proxy or should we consider use of a different indicator to identify low cost SEN in primary schools? If so, what indicator?

It is important that any replacement for EYFSP is formulated in conjunction with head teachers and governors. It is difficult to identify another indicator but primary schools do need a learning based indicator to enable the formula to operate.

### Pupil mobility

**Question 5:** Would it help to allow an additional weighting to be given if a school experiences in-year changes to pupil numbers above a certain threshold? If so, where should this threshold be set?

It is important that the Mobility factor identifies a greater level of turbulence. A positive step would be to count those pupils that start in non-standard year groups. E.g. other than reception for a primary school and year 7 for a secondary school. We don't think a threshold would then be needed as schools with greater mobility should continue to attract more funding.

### The lump sum

**Question 6:** In areas with large numbers of small schools, could the problem of having a fixed lump sum be overcome by reducing the relevant AWPU?

No answer.

**Question 7:** Would having the ability to apply a separate primary and secondary lump sum avoid necessary small schools becoming unviable? If so, how should we deal with middle and all-through schools?

Local circumstances should allow a differentiated lump sum for different types of schools. Local decisions can then decide about middle and all-through schools.

**Question 8:** We said in June that we would review the level of the lump sum cap (currently £200,000) for 2014-15 in order to establish whether it is the minimum cap needed to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools. If we continued with one lump sum for both primary and secondary, what would be the minimum level of cap needed to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools? If we had separate lump sums for primary and secondary, what would be the minimum cap needed for each in order to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools?

No answer.

**Question 9:** Would using a school-level sparsity measure to target a single lump sum, based on distance between pupils and their second nearest school, avoid necessary small rural schools becoming unviable?

No answer.

**Question 10:** What average distance threshold would be appropriate?

No answer.

**Question 11:** If we had a sparsity measure, would it still be necessary to have a lump sum in order to ensure that necessary schools remain viable? Why? What is the interaction between the two?

No answer.

**Question 12:** What alternative sparsity measures could we use to identify necessary small schools in rural areas?

No answer.

**Question 13:** Would the ability for both schools to retain their lump sums for one or two years after amalgamation create a greater incentive to merge?

Logically it must do.

### **Targeting funding to deprived pupils**

**Question 14:** If you think local authorities will be unable to use the allowable deprivation indicators in order to prevent significant losses to schools with a high proportion of deprived pupils, why do you think that is the case?

It is difficult to gauge whether the allowable deprivation factors work without having another, reliable, indicator of deprivation. We think that it is important to continue to allow the local flexibility to use or not use FSMs and IDACI and to decide the proportions between the two. Between them they give what appears to be the best available coverage of deprivation.

### **Service Children**

**Question 15:** Do you have any evidence that service children (once we account for deprivation, mobility and pastoral care through the Pupil Premium) require additional funding in order to achieve as well as non-service children?

No answer.

### **Other groups of pupils**

**Question 16:** Have the 2013-14 reforms prevented local authorities from targeting funding to groups of pupils that need additional support? If so, which?

The EAL data used for allowable EAL factors was too much of a blunt instrument and meant that Slough has not been able to target funding at a sizeable number of children with language fluency problems particularly new arrivals to the country.

### **Schools with falling rolls**

**Question 17:** In cases where a population bulge is imminent, what is preventing good and necessary schools from staying open?

The impact of free schools need to be recognised. Where local circumstances are not taken into account there is a danger of good schools being adversely affected by unplanned free school provision.

**Question 18:** Are there any other circumstances in which falling rolls are unavoidable in the short term?

The impact of free schools need to be recognised. Where local circumstances are not taken into account there is a danger of good schools being adversely affected by unplanned free school provision.

### Section 3: Options for adjusting high needs funding in 2014-15 and beyond

**Question 19:** Would a formula factor that indicates those pupils who receive top-up funding be a useful addition to help deal with the funding of high needs?

The new system does allow high needs pupils to be identified. There may be a problem though for schools with a low level of notional SEN who take a large number of high needs pupils. They are then dependent on funding from the High needs block that might not be available.

**Question 20:** To address the variation in base funding between neighbouring local authorities, how fast should local authorities be required to move towards the £6,000 threshold? Should it be made a requirement from 2014-15?

This should be standardised as soon as possible so that schools and local authorities can be clear about funding levels when pupils cross borough boundaries.

**Question 21:** Should the Department play an active role in spreading good practice and model contracts/service level agreements?

Of course they should though it may be difficult to identify good practice yet but disseminating good practice in place among schools and LAs would be helpful.

**Question 22:** Do you have ideas about how the pre and post-16 high needs systems might be brought closer together?

Secondary schools have too high a number of funding streams and sources and the confusion around post-16 high needs has not helped this. It would seem sensible for the local authority to hold all high needs funding from 0 to 25. Key is to have a simpler, fair and timely system.



## Section 4: Schools Forums

**Question 23:** Do you think that Schools Forums are operating more democratically and transparently? If not, what further measures could the Department take in order to improve this?

We believe that Slough's Forum would already be seen as best practice. That has happened under the existing framework so we are not sure that any new regulations are necessary. Forums will evolve in a way that suits each local authority.

**Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views.**

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 26 March 2013.

Send by e-mail to: [Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.uk)

Send by post to:

Anita McLoughlin  
Funding Policy Unit  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Sanctuary Buildings  
Great Smith Street  
London  
SW1P 3BT

**Schools Forum Membership March 2013**

A further review has been done of the balance of the current Schools Forum membership across phases and academies and maintained schools. This is based on the January 2013 census data below.

**School Census Data - 17th January 2013**

<b>Total NOR in Academies + Free Schools</b>	12031
<b>Total NOR in Primary Academies + Free Schools</b>	4988
<b>Total NOR in Secondary Academies</b>	7043
<b>Total NOR in Maintained Schools (Exc. Nursery + Special)</b>	13487
<b>Total NOR in Maintained Primary (Exc. Nursery + Special)</b>	10164
<b>Total NOR in Maintained Secondary (Exc. Special)</b>	3323

The data above does not include any nursery or special school  
 The data above is based at numbers on roll as at 17th Jan 2013

12031
13487
25518

**Summary and Recommendations**

**1 Total membership across academies and maintained schools:**

Of the total 25,518 pupils, 47% are being educated in academies and 53% in maintained schools. We currently have 7 academy members and 9 from maintained schools. In line with the percentage split above and to reflect the shifting balance as well as the current vacancies in the maintained sector it is recommended that:

**Recommendation 1**

- An additional academy representative is elected by the academy proprietors (giving 8 members)
- Nicky Willis is approved as substitute for both Gillian Coffey and Barbara Clark
- One current vacancy in the maintained membership is not filled (leaving 8 members).

**2 Academy membership across phases:**

It is for the academy proprietors to elect members and to decide on the phase balance but Schools Forum would wish to suggest that account be taken of the relative number of pupils in each phase. Across the academies, 41% pupils are in the primary phase and 59% in secondary which would suggest 3 primary members and 5 secondary. There are currently 3 primary academy members and 4 secondary.

**Recommendation 2**

- That the academy proprietors group be asked to elect a further member and to consider this being a secondary representative to reflect phase balance.

### **3 Maintained schools membership across phases:**

Across the maintained schools, 75% of pupils are in primary schools and 25% in secondary. There are 3 primary and 3 secondary members currently with a further 2 vacancies in the primary phase (if Recommendation 1 has been agreed to reduce to 8 maintained schools members).

If the 2 vacancies in the primary phase are filled this would mean 5 primary members and 3 secondary, giving 62.5% primary and 37.5% secondary.

#### **Recommendation 3**

- The Primary Headteachers group is asked to elect 2 members to fill the vacancies, being mindful of the balance of types of schools in electing those members.

School	Type of School	Governor (G) / Headteacher (H/T)	Elected by	Term of office ends
<b>Academies (7 members)</b> <b>Primary Academies (3 members)</b>				
Lynch Hill Primary School	Academy	Gillian Coffey (H/T)		Aug-15
Godolphin Junior School	Academy	Barbara Clark (H/T)		Aug-15
Ryvers Primary School	Academy	Harry Duffy (G)		Jan-14
<b>Secondary Academies (4 members)</b>				
Herschel Grammar	Academy Selective	Jo Rockall		Sep-14
Langley Grammar	Academy Selective	John Constable (H/T)		Sep-14
Slough & Eton C of E Business and Enterprise College	Academy	Paul McAteer (H/T)		Sep-14
	Non-Selective	Sub Bea Williams		
Westgate School	Academy	Maureen Mallinson (G)		Apr-15
	Non-Selective			
<b>Maintained Schools (9 members)</b> <b>Primary (6 members)</b>				
James Elliman Primary School	Community	Jon Reekie (G)		Aug-13
<b>Vacancy</b>	<b>Previously Community</b>	<b>Vacancy</b>		<b>Vacancy</b>
Holy Family Primary School	Voluntary Aided (RC)	Maggie Waller(G)		Aug-15
St Anthony's RC Primary School	Voluntary Aided (RC)	Maggie Stacey (H/T)		Aug-15
<b>Vacancy</b>	<b>Previously Community</b>	<b>Vacancy</b>		<b>Vacancy</b>
<b>Vacancy</b>	<b>Previously Voluntary Controlled</b>	<b>Vacancy</b>		<b>Vacancy</b>
<b>Secondary (3 members )</b>				
Beechwood Secondary School	Community	Julia Shepard (H/T)		Aug-15
St. Joseph's School	Voluntary Aided (RC)	Kevin O'Driscoll - (G)		Apr-15
Wexham	Non-Selective Community Non-Selective	Mary Sparrow		Sep-14
<b>PRU (1 member)</b>				
Haybrook College	PRU	Helen Huntley (H/T)		Oct-15
		sub Debbie Richards		
<b>Special (1 member)</b>				
Littledown School	Special	Jo Matthews		Oct-14
		sub Debbie Richards		
<b>Nursery (1 member)</b>				
Baylis Court Nursery	Nursery	Philip Gregory		Aug-15

<b>14-19 Provider (1 Member)</b>					
14-19 Strategic Partnership	14-19 Provider	Kate Webb sub Virginia Barrett			Aug-13
<b>PVI Provider (1 Member)</b>					
First Steps Day Nursery	PVI Provider	To be advised			
<b>Children's Centres (1 Member)</b>					
Slough Children's Centres	Children's Centres	Jean Cameron			Oct-15
<b>Total Membership:</b>					<b>22 members</b>
<b>Academy Primary</b>	<b>Academy Secondary</b>	<b>Academy total</b>	<b>46% pupils in academy</b>		<b>3 primary and 4 secondary is in proportion to phase nos</b>
3	4 (2 Selective + 2 Non-Selective)	7			

<b>Maintained Primary</b>	<b>Maintained Secondary</b>	<b>Maintained total</b>	<b>54% pupils in maintained</b>
6 including 2 vacancies 2 Community, 2 VA (with vacancies previously 1 Community and 1 VC)	3 2 Community Non-Selective + 1 VA Non-Selective	9	

Plus 1 representative each from Special Schools, Nursery Schools, 14-19 providers, PVI providers, PRU & Children's Centres.

Observers

Lynda Bussley (sub  
David Warren)  
Education Funding  
Agency

Attendees:

Angela Mellish

**Slough Schools Forum – 2013 Work Programme**

Wednesday 20 March 2013

- DfE Review of 2013-14 School Funding Arrangements – consultation response
- Schools Forum Membership March 2013
- Academies update
- 2012/13 Work Programme and Key Decisions Log

Wednesday 8 May 2013

- Indicative Outturn 2012-13
- Quarter 3 Budget Monitoring 2011-12
- Review of Accountability for Central Budgets 2011-12
- Schools Forum Operational and Decision Making Framework
- Two Year Old Funding Formula
- Formula Review 2014/15 Terms of Reference
- Review of Scheme for Financing Schools
- Academies update
- 2012/13 Work Programme and Key Decisions Log

Wednesday 3 July 2013

- Schools Outturn 2012-13
- School Budget Plans 2013-14
- Confirmation of Final DSG allocations 2013-14 (subject to DfE notification date)
- Academies update
- 2012/13 Work Programme and Key Decisions Log

This page is intentionally left blank



Schools Forum Key Decisions Log V6 200313			Schools Forum agenda item no.
Issue and Decision	Schools Forum date	Schools Forum agenda item no.	
<b>Fair Funding Formula Consultation for 2013 -14</b>	12/09/12		
Schools Forum agreed the content of the consultation with all schools regarding changes to the Fair Funding formula for 2013, with the principle that the aim in moving to the new formula arrangements is, within restrictions imposed by the DfE regulations, to minimise turbulence for individual schools	12/09/12	6	
<b>Confirmation of DSG Allocation 2012 - 13</b>			
Schools Forum acknowledged final DSG allocation 2012 - 13 and confirmed outline Schools Budget	12/09/12	7	
<b>Headroom</b>	12/09/12		
<b>Headroom to support the development of secondary school places</b>			
Schools Forum agreed that the £30,000 allocated at the July 2012 meeting to support the development of secondary school places, be allocated equally across the three successful free school proposers in Slough whose bids were approved by the Prime Minister in July 2012	12/09/12	8	
<b>Headroom to support the implementation in-year of new resource unit places from September 2012</b>			
Schools Forum agreed that £376,000 be retained to support the implementation in-year of new resource unit places from September 2012	12/09/12	8	
<b>Headroom - PRU activities at Littledown during 2012 - 13</b>			
Schools Forum agreed that £70,000 be set aside but not allocated at this stage, to support PRU activities at Littledown during 2012 - 13, pending further work on the overall funding	12/09/12	8	
<b>Fair Funding Formula Consultation for 2013 -14</b>	03/10/12	3	
It was confirmed that, for formula purposes, Claycots is a split site school and therefore it was appropriate to consult on the option of a formula factor to reflect this.			
<b>Headroom</b>	03/10/12	3	
Schools Forum agreed that the £30,000 allocated at the July 2012 meeting to support the development of secondary school places and intended to be allocated equally across the three successful free school proposers in Slough whose bids were approved by the Prime Minister in July 2012 - be allocated at a later date when sites and intake clearer. LA to contact the three free school proposer groups.			
<b>Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF)</b>	03/10/12	5	
Schools Forum agreed a number of changes to the EYSFF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional provider type 'Academy' at the same rates as the provider type 'primary'.</li> <li>• Provider specific lump sums as a short term position.</li> <li>• Hourly rates for supplements as a short term position.</li> <li>• Base hourly rates equivalent to current staffing rates for EYSFF MFG purposes.</li> </ul>			
<b>Headroom</b>			
Following update that the majority of the students of the three successful free schools will be from Slough and that the sites would not have an impact on intake, Schools Forum agreed to the £30,000 being held and kept under review.	24/10/12	3	
It was confirmed that the £70,000 for Littledown School was formally approved at the last SSEF meeting.	24/10/12	3	
<b>Fair Funding Formula 2013 -14</b>			
<b>Schools Forum recommended the following proposals to the Council for approval:</b>	24/10/12	5	
Not to include a factor for Looked after Children or English as an Additional Language as the DfE datasets do not target the real need in Slough appropriately and recommended that all the other relevant factors be included in the Slough formula.	24/10/12	5	
Agreed to propose Appendix F and G of report to SBC with further discussion to follow amongst Secondary Headteachers re Appendix G which moves 1% of funding to basic entitlement from low attainment and has the effect of smoothing the distribution across non-selective and selective schools to the benefit of the selective schools (later endorsed by Secondary Headteachers 31/10/12 )	24/10/12	5	

Agreed to distribute deprivation funding using 51% free school meals (Ever 6 FSM) and 49% IDACI.	24/10/12	5
Agreed the recommended model for pupil mobility which maps the current turbulence factor to the compliant mobility factor.	24/10/12	5
Agreed the standard lump sum factor.	24/10/12	5
Agreed the split site factor – the final unit value to be confirmed by January 2013.	24/10/12	5
Agreed the factor for rates and PFI. Current formula factors are replicated in the recommended model.	24/10/12	5
<b>De-delegation</b>		
Maintained schools agreed de-delegation of Outreach (former behaviour support) for 2013/14 to support the planned transfer of the management of the service to Littledown and Haybrook from January 2013. Academies present indicated clear support for the service, indicating a willingness to buy in	24/10/12	5
De-delegation of Trade Union staff costs was agreed for 2013/14.	24/10/12	5
<b>Growth Fund</b>		
Schools Forum agreed to retain relevant central funding for significant pupil growth.	24/10/12	5
<b>Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF)</b>		
Schools Forum endorsed the proposals put forward by the Task and Finish group: simplifying the formula by reducing it to 3 factors: 1) Staffing; 2) Central costs and 3) Deprivation with differentiation across different sizes of providers. These factors combine to provide an hourly rate. Deprivation to be based on IDACI and Free School Meals.	17/01/13	5
<b>Split site factor</b>		
Schools Forum agreed that the split site factor criteria in the 5-16 main funding formula should be: "A split site is where a school operates on two (or more) distinctly separate sites. The sites will be in separate, not adjacent streets and not connected by a footpath".	17/01/13	6
<b>Funding Formula 5 - 16 primary: secondary ratio</b>		
No consensus was reached regarding the two options considered: the status quo of 1:1.43 and 1: 1.39. It was agreed that views of Primary Headteachers would be sought following the meeting and it would also be considered at SASH. If no formal agreement could be reached there would be a vote arranged for those Schools Forum members eligible to vote. The result of the vote would be communicated to the LA to inform the LA decision prior to submission to the DfE.	17/01/13	6
<i>Note: A vote was later held regarding the two models proposed for primary / secondary ratio (1:1.43 and 1:1.39) and the Schools Forum vote did not provide a consensus with the vote being in favour of 1:1.43. The final LA decision was to move to the ratio of 1:1.39.</i>	n/a	n/a
<b>Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF)</b>		
Deprivation to be based on Free School Meals	27/02/13	3
<b>Funding Formula 5 - 16</b>		
It was agreed that further work to review the needs led principles behind the formula should be continued immediately with initial research being done to identify potential sources of expertise for the research, prior to any further financial modelling work.	27/02/13	6
<b>Schools Forum Constitution</b>		
The updated Schools Forum Constitution was approved.	27/02/13	8