

## SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

### SCHOOLS GROUP:

John Constable (Chair), Ben Bausor, Peter Collins, Gill Denham, Valerie Harffey, Emma Lister, Navroop Mehat, Angela Mellish, Eddie Neighbour, Carol Pearce, Jon Reekie, Jo Rockall, Jamie Rockman, Neil Sykes and Maggie Waller

### LOCAL AUTHORITY:

Steve Mair, Andrew Fraser, Johnny Kyriacou, Sabi Hothi, Steve Muldoon, Neill Butler, Tony Madden

Councillor Christine Hulme (Observer)

### MEETING DETAILS

**FRIDAY, 13TH JANUARY, 2023 AT 9.15 AM  
VIRTUAL MEETING (VIA ZOOM)**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86442204735?pwd=cGZoKzIkeHBBaTFmamFBSHZBUE9ndz09&from=addon>

**Meeting ID: 864 4220 4735  
Passcode: 362444**

## AGENDA

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
1.	Apologies	Chair
2.	Notification of Any Other Business	Chair
3.	Declarations of Interest	Chair
4.	Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 10th November 2022 (including matters arising and action log)	Chair (Pages 1 - 6)
5.	Schools Forum Membership update	Chair
6.	Update on National/Local Funding Issues	Neill Butler
7.	Resource Provision and AP Commissioning	Johnny Kyriacou (Pages 7 - 10)
8.	Growth Fund – confirmation of 2023/24 top slice	Tony Madden (Pages 11 - 16)
9.	DSG Management Plan & DfE ‘Safety Valve’ programme update	Johnny Kyriacou
10.	DSG 2023/24 – Confirmation of DSG settlement	Neill Butler (Pages 17 - 22)
11.	Task Group update	Chair
12.	Academies update	Johnny Kyriacou
13.	2022/23 Forward Agenda Plan	Chair (Pages 23 - 24)
14.	Key Decisions Log	Chair (Pages 25 - 26)
15.	Any Other Business (notified at start of meeting)	Chair

### Declarations of Interest

*The Chair will ask Members to confirm whether they have any declarable interests in relation to any item on the agenda. All Members who believe they may have such an interest must declare it and may only: (a) remain in the meeting while that matter is discussed at the discretion of the Chair or Vice Chair, and (b) speak on the matter by invitation. Examples of declarable interests include: where the outcome of a discussion may provide a personal advantage or avoid disadvantage (pecuniary or non-pecuniary), or where the focus of an agenda item and the likely impact of any outcome is wholly or mainly on a school with which the Member is associated.*

## Slough Schools Forum – Minutes of Meeting held on 10 November 2022

### DRAFT MINUTES

**Present:** John Constable, Langley Grammar School (Chair)  
 Peter Collins, Slough & Eton Church of England Business and Enterprise College  
 Gill Denham, Marish Primary School  
 Valerie Harffey, Ryvers School  
 Emma Lister, Chalvey Early Years Centre  
 Angela Mellish, St Bernard’s Catholic Grammar School  
 Eddie Neighbour, Upton Court Grammar School  
 Jon Reekie, Phoenix Infants School  
 Jo Rockall, Herschel Grammar School  
 Jamie Rockman, Haybrook College  
 Maggie Waller, Holy Family Primary School  
 Ben Bausor, Always Growing Ltd  
 Neil Sykes, Arbour Vale School

**Officers:** Neill Butler, Strategic Finance Manager, People (Children)  
 Johnny Kyriacou, Associate Director, Education & Inclusion

**Observer** Councillor Christine Hulme, Cabinet member  
 (Children’s Services, Lifelong Learning & Skills)

**Apologies:** Andrew Fraser, Interim DCS and CEO Slough Children First  
 Carol Pearce, Penn Wood Primary School  
 Navroop Mehat, Wexham Court Primary School  
 Steve Muldoon, Interim Head of Financial Management

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and explained that there was no clerk available for this meeting. Instead, the meeting would be recorded and transcribed afterwards.

<b>918</b>	<b>Notification of any other business</b> None																											
<b>919</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> None																											
<b>920</b>	<p><b>Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2022.</b>          These were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ben Bausor and Neil Sykes to be added to list of those present attended the meeting.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair asked Forum members to note the introduction of an action log at the end of the minutes, which would be updated as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Minute</th> <th>Action</th> <th>Responsibility</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>906</td> <td>Carry forward to next meeting</td> <td>Chair</td> </tr> <tr> <td>907</td> <td>Completed</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>909, 910</td> <td>Carry forward to next meeting</td> <td>Johnny Kyriacou</td> </tr> <tr> <td>911</td> <td>To be discussed outside meeting</td> <td>Chair/Johnny Kyriacou</td> </tr> <tr> <td>912</td> <td>Complete</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>913</td> <td>Carry forward to next meeting</td> <td>Chair</td> </tr> <tr> <td>915, 916</td> <td>Complete</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>917</td> <td>Carry forward to next meeting</td> <td>Neill Butler</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Minute	Action	Responsibility	906	Carry forward to next meeting	Chair	907	Completed	N/A	909, 910	Carry forward to next meeting	Johnny Kyriacou	911	To be discussed outside meeting	Chair/Johnny Kyriacou	912	Complete	N/A	913	Carry forward to next meeting	Chair	915, 916	Complete	N/A	917	Carry forward to next meeting	Neill Butler
Minute	Action	Responsibility																										
906	Carry forward to next meeting	Chair																										
907	Completed	N/A																										
909, 910	Carry forward to next meeting	Johnny Kyriacou																										
911	To be discussed outside meeting	Chair/Johnny Kyriacou																										
912	Complete	N/A																										
913	Carry forward to next meeting	Chair																										
915, 916	Complete	N/A																										
917	Carry forward to next meeting	Neill Butler																										

921	<p><b>Schools Forum Membership Update</b></p> <p>There are still two vacancies for academy members. The Chair will carry this action forward.</p>
922	<p><b>Update on National / Local Funding Issues</b></p> <p>Neill Butler (NB) noted that schools will be very aware of the real cost pressures at the moment. The main national issue is that the government still intends to move to a minimum starting salary for qualified teachers of £30k by the end of this parliament in December 2024. There is no indication of how this will be funded or what the impact will be on pay differentials for teachers on higher pay points.</p> <p>NB referred to the consultation on the national funding formula which took place during the summer. The main impact on local authorities is the requirement to move by 10% each year on any local formula factors that are not up to the full NFF level. The main area for Slough is the mobility factor which is funded slightly lower than NFF. NB indicated that the impact on Slough allocations of changing the mobility factor rate to 100% of the NFF would be around £200k additional funding into schools' budgets. The main reason for the impact not being higher is the loss of minimum funding guarantee for some schools, giving a net impact of just £200k.</p> <p>MW noted that the reason the mobility factor has not been previously adopted in the local formula was that although Slough schools have a very mobile population, the actual criteria didn't reflect the actual nature of the churn seen. MW advised that it would be interesting at some point to see the modelling and the impact on individual schools.</p>
923	<p><b>DSG Monitoring Report 2022/23</b></p> <p>NB presented the first DSG monitoring report for 2022/23, with a summary to the end of Q2. The half year position showed that the Schools, Central School Services and Early Years blocks are generally on track. The High Needs block is forecasting an overspend of £2.2 million in 2022/23. NB briefly described some of the local authority actions to address the overspend, including structural systems for monitoring spend, and collaborative work with other partners. The result of the LA actions so far has been to reduce the deficit significantly from the 2021/22 level of £4.7 million.</p> <p>Forum members were asked to note the report as the background for the next items on the agenda. There were no questions or comments.</p>
924	<p><b>DSG Management Plan and DfE 'Safety Valve' Programme update</b></p> <p>Johnny Kyriacou (JK) updated Forum members on progress towards joining the DfE's 'Safety Valve' programme. He confirmed that the LA is having fortnightly meetings with the DfE, at which a very credible plan has been presented. JK stated that the DfE appeared to have confidence in the LA's plans; they have been questioning all the areas carefully and believe that what the LA is saying is realistic and achievable. The current intention is to submit the bid in February 2023 to join the program by April; this allows the programme to start in the 2023/24 financial year.</p> <p>The Chair asked for clarification about the timescale for actually being accepted formally on to the programme, as this has been in discussion for a considerable period of time. JK confirmed that the bid has to be submitted to the DfE by February, and if successful would lead to inclusion on the programme by April 2023.</p> <p>JK further confirmed that the programme is expected to last for four years, at the end of which the High Needs block would achieve an in-year balance. Some LAs on the programme have a five year plan; SBC believes it can be done in four years. This is a credible strategy which allows for possible slippage into a fifth year if circumstances change.</p> <p>JK asked for clarification on whether the wider schools community feel well informed about the situation. Although the DSG management plan and the safety valve programme have been discussed extensively at Forum and in the Slough Education Partnership Board, there was very low uptake to a recent opportunity for headteachers to hear directly from the DfE adviser.</p>

	<p>The Chair asked Forum members to comment on whether there is a wider understanding of the position or whether some further communication and clarification from the LA would be welcomed. Peter Collins (PC) commented that he personally was very well informed because of his attendance at the other meetings where this is discussed. However, as chair of the secondary heads' association he was conscious of relatively little engagement from other heads not in a similar position, and that this should probably be interpreted as not having particular concerns.</p> <p>Jamie Rockman (JR) asked whether there could be greater visibility of what the likely impacts are going to be, so that there could be general agreement that joining the programme represents an acceptable level of risk. NB accepted this as a fair request and suggested it could be referred to the DSG Transformation Board. JK further commented that he was happy to provide greater transparency on the impact assessments in the appropriate meetings.</p> <p>Maggie Waller (MW) commented that most governors would be fairly oblivious to the issues unless they were Forum members but that the impact of the deficit reduction on services to schools is what would interest them; could there be some form of briefing for governors at some point? Gill Denham (GD) agreed and further commented that whatever actual headteacher awareness levels, they're worrying more about the impact on services than on the process.</p> <p>Ben Bausor (BB) asked whether there had been any briefing for parents, particularly those children have high needs and might have some concerns. JK confirmed that we there was parent representation on the DSG Transformation Board through Special Voices.</p> <p>PC commented that given that this safety valve scheme is not unique to Slough, it may be worth establishing whether there is any DfE view about how wider communication should be managed, particularly in relation to governors and the parent community. Inclusion in the safety valve programme would be a really positive step forward for Slough and doesn't need to become a 'more cuts, everything's going to go' - for which there is the potential to not handled carefully. The Chair agreed with PC that it could be viewed very negatively unless communication is handled carefully. JK agreed to raise the issue of communication in other relevant meetings.</p>
<p><b>925</b></p>	<p><b>DSG Timetable 2023/24</b></p> <p>NB outlined the timetable for agreeing the Schools Block allocation for 2023/24. The APT (authority proforma tool) was expected to be released before Christmas with confirmed figures for numbers on roll and the resulting final DSG allocation. After the Christmas break there would be a meeting with the 5-16 task Group to finalise options around funding. Final proposals for the growth fund, early years and schools block funding would then be presented to Forum for at the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> January, with recommendations informing the Cabinet decision on 16th January.</p> <p>The LA has a statutory duty to provide mainstream schools with their budgets allocations for 2023/24 by the end of February, together with indicative budgets for 2024/25 and 2025/26. The last stage in the process would be the LA proposals on the Central Services School block, which would come to Forum for approval in March.</p> <p>The Chair thanked NB for the clarity this paper provided, and it was helpful to understand the impact of tight deadlines imposed by DfE. There were no further questions or comments from Forum members.</p>
<p><b>926</b></p>	<p><b>DSG Block Transfers 2023/24</b></p> <p>The Chair advised Forum members that the paper for this item had been send as a supplementary agenda due to the extension of the consultation process. The paper summarised the results of the DSG consultation which closed on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November and refers to the discussions of the 5-16 task group held on the same day</p> <p>NB reminded Forum members that each year the LA can request to transfer up to 0.5% of the total funds out of the schools block into the other DSG blocks, subject to consultation with schools and</p>

Forum approval. The consultation response rate was disappointing – only 7 schools responded. However, the view expressed by those schools that did respond was clearly in favour of the block transfers proposed.

The Chair advised Forum that the paper itself was essentially a summary of the consultation document and explained the role of Forum in the decision process. Forum members were expected to:

- a) approve, or not, the transfer of £100k from Schools Block to CSSB to support the admissions function
- b) approve, or not, the transfer from Schools block to High Needs block, to a maximum of 0.5% less the transfer to CSSB
- c) endorse, or not, the LA recommendation the basic entitlement factor be used to distribute to schools any additional headroom funding in the final DSG allocation.

The Chair further advised Forum members that some of the 5-16 task group members were involved in discussion after the close of the consultation. Comments were circulated to those members of the task group who were not able to attend and were invited to add any further comments. The Chair asked MW and Jo Rockall (JR) to feed back on the Task group recommendations.

JR advised that the Task group's recommendation was to agree to both transfers, and to endorse the distribution of headroom through basic entitlement. Even though the consultation response rate was low, schools did have the opportunity to respond, and the view from those who did was overwhelmingly in favour. The Task Group had discussed issues including the pressure on school's budgets, the increasing complexity of some of the pupils with whom schools are working, and the reduction of some of the services across the town to support them.

MW endorsed JR's comments, adding that the low response level was surprising but may be due in part to the DfE timescales. MW noted that distribution through basic entitlement had always been the principle adopted when there was any DSG headroom to distribute as this was fair to all schools. MW referred to the discussion about the safety valve programme and the need to minimise the risk of the LA not gaining the support of the DfE. It was acknowledged that progress had been made to reduce the in-year deficit, despite the impact on services and the concerns that have been voiced.

*The Chair thanked MW and JR and opened up the discussion to comments/questions from members.*

Angela Mellish (AM) asked why the admissions team needed this extra money and whether this request would be repeated in the future. JK advised that a detailed paper was issued last year when the request was first made. This highlighted that the request was to fund the expansion of the admissions staff team, including additional capacity to support the fair access process and deal with the increasing complexity of Slough's admissions requirements. NB confirmed that block transfers are only for one year and the guidance is clear that agreements cannot be for the longer term.

MW asked for clarification about the funding of the CSSB and whether there were pressures from DfE to reduce it. NB confirmed the historic factors in the CSSB have been reducing by 20% year on year since 2021. The LA did have an opportunity to ask for protection but this had not happened. NB stated his intention to go to the ESFA to ask for retrospective protection – this may be unlikely but it is worth trying. The Chair confirmed that NB will be coming back to Forum in March with proposals for CSSB funding in 2023/24, with some indication of the likely future of CSSB funding.

Valerie Harffey (VH) commented that her experience of the admissions service was better in some respects since the transfer was agreed last year, there were still issues in relation to late offers of places but asked whether it would be worthwhile getting feedback from other schools. JK advised that there was a route outside Forum to raise issues with the service. GD asked whether schools might respond to a consultation about admissions, focusing on whether the service has improved. JK replied that this could be considered. The Chair confirmed that it is not the function of Schools Forum to performance manage any of the CSSB service functions, but in the context of setting the budget Forum does have an interest in ensuring that any funding that is being transferred is being spent wisely and

	<p>with relative efficiency. This requires some level of feedback from the LA on the effectiveness of the services. The Chair therefore asked JK to include some comment on the effectiveness of the services when proposals for the CSSB are brought to Forum in March, and confirmed that he, JK and NB would discuss the format of the information presented outside the meeting.</p> <p>Peter Collins supported MW's view that block transfers for this year should be seen as a supportive measure in terms of giving credibility to the safety valve process, and asked whether establishing with the DfE whether a position from Forum about block transfer in future years would be helpful in strengthening and supporting the safety valve process. JK agreed to consider this.</p> <p>The Chair moved the discussion on to making decisions about the proposals brought forward by the LA. Firstly, he proposed that Forum supported the LA's recommendation to allocate any headroom in the school block funding to mainstream schools and academies in 2023/24 through basic entitlement, in line with previous practice. Forum members unanimously agreed to endorse this proposal.</p> <p>Secondly, the Chair asked for Forum's approval to transfer £100k from the Schools block to the CSSB in 2023/24 to support the admissions service. This was agreed by Forum members, with a caveat from NS that the LA considers alternative methods of funding the admissions function in future years. MW supported this view, but commented that care needed to be taken not to create unnecessary complication in considering alternative funding.</p> <p>Thirdly, the Chair sought clarification of the exact sum proposed for the transfer from the Schools to High Needs block. NB confirmed that the figure of £699k in the paper was based on provisional DSG settlement. The actual figure would depend on the final settlement figure and the request was therefore for a transfer totalling 0.5% of Schools Block funding less the £100k already approved for admissions. The Chair confirmed that the principle is a total 0.5% transfer in total across the two requests. Forum members approved the transfer with no further comments.</p>
927	<p><b>Task Group Update</b></p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the update from the 5-16 Task Group had been covered in the previous agenda item. The group would meet again in early January to consider the final DSG settlement.</p> <p>NB confirmed that the early years block will meet very early in January prior to bring proposals for Early Years Block to Forum.</p>
928	<p><b>Academies update</b></p> <p>JK confirmed that the LA was not aware of any proposed changes of school status from maintained to academy.</p>
929	<p><b>2022/23 Forward Agenda Plan</b></p> <p>The Chair advised that following requests from some members, dates for the proposed meetings through the rest of the year had been amended slightly.</p>
930	<p><b>Key decisions log</b></p> <p>To be updated after the meeting.</p>
931	<p><b>Any Other Business (notified at start of meeting)</b></p> <p>No other business had been notified at the beginning of the meeting.</p>

## Key action log – updated 10 November 2022

Minute	Action	Responsibility
906	a) Nominations to be sought for primary and secondary academy representatives <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Chair
907	<del>a) Forum members to return comments on the National Funding Formula consultation to the Chair</del> <del>b) Consultation response to be completed by 9<sup>th</sup> September</del>	<del>Forum members</del> <del>Chair</del>
909	a) LA to report back on the impact of underspend in relation to post 16 learners with SEND. <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Johnny Kyriacou
910	a) Full DSG Management Plan to be made available to Forum members following agreement with the DfE. b) LA to produce quality impact assessment reports covering the areas of saving within the High Needs provision. <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Steve Muldoon Steve Muldoon
911	a) LA to clarify position in relation to funding for students with SEND placed at the College through fair access. <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Johnny Kyriacou
912	<del>a) LA to update the Scheme for Financing Schools.</del>	<del>Neil Butler</del>
913	a) Clarification of the remit, terms of reference and membership of 5-16, EY and HNB task groups. <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Chair
915	<del>b) LA officers to consider forward agenda plan and advise Chair</del>	<del>Neil Butler</del>
916	<del>a) Update Key Decisions log</del> <del>b) Establish key actions list</del>	<del>Chair</del> <del>Chair</del>
917	a) Secure a permanent clerk to the Forum <b>10/11/22 – carried forward</b>	Steve Muldoon/ Neill Butler
924	a) JK agreed to raise issues of how to communicate the progress on the DSG management plan and safety valve programme with DfE and in other related meetings	Johnny Kyriacou
926	a) JC, JK and NB to discuss format of CSSB report for March Forum meeting, to include some assessment of service effectiveness.	Chair
927	a) 5-16 Task Group meeting to be arranged for early January b) EY Task Group to meet early January	Chair Neill Butler



<b>Schools Forum 13 January 2023</b>	
<b>Report from Executive Director of People - Children Services</b>	
<b>Resource Provision and Alternative Provision Commissioning 2023/24</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	N/A
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	Appendix A – Place Numbers 2023/24
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b>	<b>Johnny Kyriacou</b> <b>Assistant Director for Education &amp; Inclusion</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Johnny.Kyriacou@slough.gov.uk">Johnny.Kyriacou@slough.gov.uk</a></b>  <b>Neill Butler</b> <b>Interim Strategic Finance Manager</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk">Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk</a></b>

## 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report confirms the number of Resource Provision and Alternative Provision places that have been commissioned with Academies for September 2023..

## 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Schools' Forum note the number of commissioned places and the changes in number since September 2022.

## 3 Process

- 3.1 Each year Slough Borough Council must agree the number of Resource Provision places with Slough Mainstream Academies and Special and Alternative Provision places with Slough Special Schools.
- 3.2 Slough BC then has to inform the DfE of the agreed numbers in November each year for the following September. These numbers are used by the DfE as part of the calculation of the High Needs Block DSG for the appropriate financial year. Therefore numbers agreed in November 2022 will form part of the High Needs Block DSH for 2024/25.

## 4 Place Numbers 2023/24

- 4.1 The agreed place numbers by individual Academy for September 2023 are included in Appendix A, together with the change in numbers since September 2022.

**5 Financial Implications**

5.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper.

**6 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Not applicable

**7 Legal Implications**

The are no legal implications.

**8 Equality Implications**

Not applicable

Academy Commissioned Places September 2023

Appendix A

School or college name	Provider type	2023-24 Places								Place Changes From 2022-23								
		Pre-16 places				16-18 places				Total places for schools/academies	Pre-16 places				16-18 places			Total places for schools/academies
		AP places	Special places	SEN units and resourced provision places	Total pre-16 places	Special places	Mainstream places	Total 16-18 places	AP places		Special places	SEN units and resourced provision places	Total pre-16 places	Special places	Mainstream places	Total 16-18 places		
ARBOUR VALE SCHOOL	ACADEMY - SPECIAL	0	278	0	278	47	0	47	325	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CASTLEVIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLNBROOK CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DITTON PARK ACADEMY	FREE SCHOOL - MAINSTREAM	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
HAYBROOK COLLEGE	ACADEMY - AP	70	0	85	155	0	11	11	166	-22	0	0	-22	0	0	0	-22	
LYLESDOWN SCHOOL	ACADEMY - SPECIAL	10	38	0	48	0	0	0	48	-3	0	0	-3	0	0	0	-3	
MARISH PRIMARY SCHOOL	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	55	55	0	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PHOENIX INFANT ACADEMY	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	9	0	0	-3	-3	0	0	0	-3	
SLOUGH AND ETON CHURCH OF ENGLAND BUSINESS AND ENTERPRISE COLLEGE	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ST ETHELBERT'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
THE GODOLPHIN JUNIOR ACADEMY	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	
THE LANGLEY ACADEMY	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-2	-2	
THE WESTGATE SCHOOL	ACADEMY - MAINSTREAM	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-2	-2	
<b>Totals</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>-30</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Schools Forum 13 January 2023</b>	
<b>Report from Executive Director of People - Children Services</b>	
<b>Schools Growth Fund 2023/24</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	N/A
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	None
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b>	<b>Neill Butler</b> <b>Interim Strategic Finance Manager</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk">Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk</a></b>  <b>Tony Madden</b> <b>Development Manager</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Tony.Madden@slough.gov.uk">Tony.Madden@slough.gov.uk</a></b>

## 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out the allocation criteria for the Growth Fund that will apply in 2023/24 and the 'top slice' from the Schools Block DSG that will fund commitments in 2023/24.

## 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Schools' Forum is asked to comment on the proposed allocation of £565k to the Growth Fund in 2023/24 which will form a top slice from the Schools Block DSG.
- 2.2 Schools' Forum is asked to note that the Growth Fund will fund the following additional places at both primary and secondary schools, where expansion is requested and agreed in advance by Slough Borough Council:
- a) Bulge classes;
    - i. 1<sup>st</sup> Year - Fully funding the class in its first academic year
    - ii. 2<sup>nd</sup> Year - Funding the growth in places between October Censuses.
  - b) Permanent expansions at any school not just maintained schools until the increased PAN works its way through the school e.g. an increase from 2 FE to 3 FE would take 7 years for a primary school and 5 years for a secondary school.
  - c) New places in excess of Planned Admission Numbers (PAN).

### 3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The birth rate for Slough rose by 48% over a 9-year period affecting primary admission demand from 2006-7 to 2015-16. Since the peak in births in 2010-11 and 2011-12 births numbers have been declining fairly steadily.
- 3.2 The population growth has been impacting secondary schools for some years and 3 new secondary schools and an all-through have opened in recent years. In addition, 2 non-selective schools plus one grammar school have undergone expansion funded by the LA. Slough's other three grammar schools and a non-selective school have all increased their PANs without capital funding from SBC.
- 3.3 The prescribed methodology for calculating revenue funding for expanding schools means that there is a 'lag' in the period from pupils starting until they appear on the School Census and funding is allocated. To support schools through this period of lag in funding while they are expanding the LA requests a sum of money through Schools' Forum called the "Growth Fund".
- 3.4 The methodology for qualification and allocation of the Growth Fund is reviewed and agreed by Schools' Forum on an annual basis. Schools' Forum is asked to consider the financial impact on schools of expansion and agree an affordable level of additional revenue support. Schools' Forum agreed the methodology to be applied in 2022-23 at a meeting in January 2022. No variations are proposed within this report for 2023-24.
- 3.5 Growth at Free Schools is supported through the ATP form submitted by SBC to the DfE every January. Free School growth is therefore not supported by the Growth Fund except where they are asked to admit pupils above their published admission numbers by the LA.

### 4 EXPANSION OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 All options for creating new places have been explored by SBC including:
  - Bulge classes – generally classes of 30 pupils, opened to provide capacity for new arrivals and supported by the Growth Fund;
  - Permanent expansions –full forms of entry added to an existing school by the LA. They require ongoing commitment from the Growth Fund to deal with the lag in revenue funding (usually 5-7 years);
  - Increased class sizes or numbers above PAN – termly commitment from the Growth Fund where pupils are not recorded on the October School Census;
  - New Free Schools – depending on how they are funded by the DfE, they can require support from the Growth Fund – currently no further new schools are planned or required in Slough. Bulge classes may be requested at new schools by the LA and will be treated the same as any other bulge class.

## 5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

5.1 Guidance on how the Growth Fund should be approved and allocated can be found in the following document published by the DfE: *Schools Operational Guide: 2022-23* (December 2021). Paragraph 258 states:

*“The growth fund can only be used to:*

- *support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need*
- *support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation.*
- *meet the costs of new schools.”*

### **Level of Funding – Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)**

5.2 The methodology for distributing funding is based on an AWPU per pupil, reflecting the proportion of the year which is not funded within the school’s budget share. Note that secondary AWPU is based on an average of KS3 and KS4 AWPU funding.

### **Bulge Classes**

5.3 Bulge classes must be agreed in advance by the LA.

5.4 Slough’s maintained schools receive Growth Funding for September until March and academies receive funding for September through until August. The different funding periods reflect the difference in financial years for each category of school: maintained schools receive their funding from April to March, while academies are funded from September to August.

5.5 Over the last 7 years Schools’ Forum has agreed to a one-off payment of additional funding in the second year of bulge classes at academies. Schools’ Forum is asked to consider applying this again for 2023-24. To date, no bulge classes have been agreed for 2022-23 and if no new bulge classes are agreed then this option would not add any cost to the Growth Fund.

5.5.1 An issue that was first flagged in 2016 is that the lag for academies can be longer than 12 months if pupils are admitted after the October Census. This might be because the class opened after the School Census or opened before with a low starting number. If a bulge class were to open November 2022 for instance with 20 pupils, then an academy would not receive funding for this class until 22 months later (with Growth Funding supporting the first 10 months).

5.5.2 It is rare that a new bulge class will be full as its purpose is to provide capacity for the rest of the academic year for new arrivals; if it were full then the authority may look to open a further bulge class.

5.5.3 A number of options for providing additional funding were originally considered by Schools Forum in 2017. It was agreed that funding would be allocated based on the following table. It should be noted that this methodology does not ‘ghost fund’ places and can still result in the school subsidising some of the cost of a teacher, however it ensures every pupil is funded while remaining affordable.

<b>Funding Calculation</b>
Fund the difference in number of pupils between the first year Autumn School Census and the second year.
For instance NOR October Census 2022 = 10
NOR October Census 2023 = 20
Fund (20 – 10) = 10 places

### **Expansion by a Form of Entry**

- 5.6 The Growth Fund provides financial support for all the years a school incurs a shortfall in funding whilst going through a permanent expansion. Where a school grows from Reception up to Year 6, they will receive funding for a full class for 7 years if they grow gradually by one class a year. Secondary schools will receive funding for 5 years as pupils move from Year 7 to Year 11. If a school doesn’t have an additional class then it wouldn’t be entitled to funding, for instance a bulge class leaves the school in the top year while an extra class joins in the lowest year group. In this case the school would have the same number of classes for 2 consecutive years and Growth Funding support wouldn’t be necessary.
- 5.7 In 2022-23 only 2 secondary schools qualified for this funding. In 2023-24 this reduces to one school, and in 2024-25, unless new expansions are agreed, no schools will qualify for this funding.

### **Larger Classes or Numbers in Excess of PAN**

- 5.8 The Growth Fund will provide financial support for schools that admit pupils in excess of their PAN for each whole term that they make each additional place available at the request of the Local Authority. For instance, where a school makes 96 places available into a year group instead of 90 at SBC’s request, the school would be funded for 6 additional places for each full term the places are available.



- 5.9 Funding Mechanism - Schools will receive AWPU funding for 'the period' that they make each 'additional place' available at the request of Slough.

Additional Place – This is a school place that is over and above the PAN for that year group; it is also higher than the number of pupils in that year group as at the October Census for that academic year. This definition avoids double funding pupils, as schools will receive funding for the number on roll reported as part of this Census.

Funding will only be provided for pupils in year groups, Reception up to Year 11.

The Period - This will be agreed in units of whole terms where possible. This will allow revenue funding to be provided near the start of each term and avoid the need for claw back. In some instances, it may be that the term has already started and places are urgently required by the LA, this would result in funding for a partial term.

Agreement – The funding is not retrospective and will only apply where it is agreed in advance by SBC that funding will be provided.

- 5.10 Academies - There is an issue with funding of academies between April and August as the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) funds academies from April to August in arrears. The time to claim this funding is January each year during the budget build via the APT. Any decisions to create places after this date cannot be recouped from the ESFA. Therefore, the Growth Fund will also fund this period for academies.
- 5.11 Single Payment to Academies - Until now SBC has provided funding to growing academies in 2 tranches. The first tranche paid in September for the period Sep to Mar and the second tranche paid after Easter for the period Apr to Sep. Best practice suggests that academies should be paid for the whole year in one lump sum at the start of the year. On this basis it was agreed at Schools' Forum in May 2021 to correct this from 2023/24.
- 5.12 Non-Academies - As currently happens with bulge classes, the Growth Fund will support non-academy schools from September to March, thereafter funding is provided via the next School Census in October. This is due to non-academies (maintained schools) being funded April to March.

## **Budget requirements for 2023-24**

5.13 The budget requirement for 2023-24 is:

Permanent expansions	£188k
Contingency sum	£377k
<b>Total</b>	<b>£565k</b>

5.14 As the last permanent expansion completes in 2023-24, the only projected requirements for 2024-25 is the contingency sum of £377k.

5.15 Schools Forum have recognised that the calculation and allocation of the Growth Fund has become increasingly complicated in recent years. Therefore, the LA intends to review how the Growth Fund is calculated and a report will be brought back to Schools Forum in the summer 2023.

## **6 Financial Implications**

6.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper.

## **7 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

No alternative options were considered.

## **8 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Not applicable

## **9 Legal Implications**

9.1 Local Authorities are under a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in their area, ensure fair access to educational opportunity and promote the fulfilment of every child's educational potential.

## **10 Equality Implications**

Not applicable

## **11 CONSULTATION**

11.1 Slough Education Partnership Board (SEPB), Slough Association of Secondary Heads and Slough Primary Heads Association are consulted on the wider expansion policy of the council on a regular basis.

<b>Schools Forum 13 January 2023</b>	
<b>Report from Executive Director of People - Children Services</b>	
<b>Dedicated Schools Grant 2023/23 Schools Budget</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	N/A
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	Appendix A – High-level Funding Analysis
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b>	<b>Neill Butler</b> <b>Interim Strategic Finance Manager</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk">Neill.Butler@slough.gov.uk</a></b>  Steve Muldoon <b>Interim Deputy Director Financial Management</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:Steve.Muldoon@slough.gov.uk">Steve.Muldoon@slough.gov.uk</a></b>

## 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out the proposed DSG Schools Budget for consultation with, and recommendation by, Schools Forum ahead of the Council budget being set and approved by full Council.

## 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 To comply with regulation and to furnish Schools Forum with the relevant information regarding schools' funding.
- 2.2 Schools Forum is asked to **reconfirm** its November 2022 decision to transfer £0.714m (0.44%) from the Schools Block to support the High Needs Block and £0.1m (0.06%) to CSSB block to fund the admission team. DfE regulations permit up to 0.5% of the Schools Block to be transferred with Schools Forum approval.
- 2.3 Schools Forum is asked to **recommend** the budget for the DSG blocks, including the mainstream funding formula to Slough Borough Council.

## 3 Summary- 2022/23 DSG Funding Announcements

- 3.1. In November 2022, Schools Forum was presented with the **provisional** DSG allocations, which were published in July 2022. The **final** DSG block funding allocations were announced on 16 December 2022, based on pupil numbers in the October 2022 census. This report gives an update of the final Schools Block allocations to include the growth funding allocation.

DSG Block	2022/23 Funding	2023/24 Funding	Change	Change
	£'000	£'000	£'000	%
<b>Schools Block #</b>	<b>159,653</b>	<b>162,757</b>	<b>3,104</b>	<b>1.94%</b>
<b>High Needs Block</b>	<b>31,525</b>	<b>34,597</b>	<b>3,073</b>	<b>9.74%</b>
<b>Central Schools Services Block</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5.65%</b>
<b>Early Year Block</b>	<b>14,461</b>	<b>15,532</b>	<b>1,071</b>	<b>7.41%</b>
	<b>206,382</b>	<b>213,671</b>	<b>7,290</b>	<b>3.53%</b>

# In addition there is a provisional additional schools block allocation of £5.433 million in 2023/24. When added to the schools block funding above this potentially takes mainstream schools funding to £168.190m. This is an increase of £8.538m (5.35%) above 2022/23 funding levels.

- 3.2. For 2023/24, the growth funding allocation changed from £0.950m in 2022/23 to £0.558 in 2023/24. This reduction in Growth Funding is due to the need for fewer additional classes from September 2023.
- 3.3. The final High Needs Block allocation has been announced at £34.597m, an increase of £1.449m from the provisional allocation announced in July 2021. This is £3.073m more than the allocation for 2022/23 and represents a funding increase of 9.74%. The number of children with Education, Health and Care plans (EHCPs) is continuing to increase, therefore in addition to a number of measures outlined in the DSG management plan.
- 3.4. Schools Forum agreed a 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block and Central School Services Block in November 2022. A detailed breakdown of the high needs block budget will be presented to Schools Forum in March 2023.
- 3.5. The Early Years Block allocations were also published in December 2022, which included an increase in the 2 year olds rate from £6.25 to £6.87 and increase of £0.62 (9.92%). Also an increase in the 3 & 4 year olds rate from £6.10 to £6.27 an increase of £0.17 (2.79%).
- 3.6. Early Years funding rate options for 2023/24 are currently being consulted on with sector providers and a report will be presented to Schools Forum in March 2023.
- 3.7. The Central School Services Block income was confirmed at £0.785m, an increase of £42k compared to 2022/23. This includes a small reduction of funding for historic commitments, and an increase in funding for ongoing commitments.

#### **4 Schools Block Expenditure – Mainstream Funding Formula**

- 4.1 A consultation took place in the autumn 2022 with mainstream schools and academies on options for allocating and headroom in the DSG Schools Block through the Authority Proforma Tool (APT). Most respondents preferred to allocate any headroom through Basic Entitlement and this was endorsed by Schools Forum at its November 2022 meeting.
- 4.2 Mainstream schools and academies funding modelling is currently underway and indications are that there will be funding headroom similar to the amount reported to Schools Forum in November 2022. The deadline for submitting the APT to the DfE is Friday 20 January 2022 so it is too early to give Schools Forum an indication on the impact of final the modelling on individual Schools and Academies.
- 4.3 Also, the Schools Forum November 2022 report highlighted a DfE consultation that took place over the summer 2022 with the outcome that Local Authorities had to move closer to the ‘hard’ National Funding Formula.
- 4.4 Appendix A provides a high-level analysis of the Schools Block DSG and current funding allocations but may be subject to change as the modelling develops.

#### **5 Growth Fund**

- 5.1 The growth fund budget in 2023/24 is £0.565m and a detailed Growth Fund report is being presented to this Schools Forum

#### **6 Financial Implications**

- 6.1 The financial implications have been detailed in the body of this paper. Any additional funding received would go towards mitigating inflationary costs pressures faced by schools.

#### **7 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

No alternative options were considered.

#### **8 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Not applicable

#### **9 Legal Implications**

There are no legal implications for this report.

#### **10 Equality Implications**

Not applicable

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix A

### Slough Schools Forum Schools Block DSG Funding Analysis 2023-24

<b>Funding Stream</b>	<b>£</b>
Primary Funding	78,911,551
Secondary Funding	80,356,380
Premises - NNDR & PFI	2,540,515
Growth Funding	949,045
Total Schools Block DSG 2023-24	<u>162,757,491</u>
2023-24 Mainstream Schools Additional Grant: indicative allocations (Likely to be allocated as grant rather than through the APT)	5,432,809
<b>Allocations</b>	
Total Schools Funding Through APT	160,566,712
Provisional Growth Fund	565,453
Block Transfer of 0.5% from Schools Block	813,788
Schools Block Funding Allocated	161,945,952
<b>Current estimated Headroom</b>	<b>811,539</b>

This page is intentionally left blank



## SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

### PROPOSED FORWARD AGENDA PLAN 2022/23

*This version 09/01/23*

Standing items for all meetings		
Item	Description	Notes
Chair	Apologies/AOB/declaration of interests	
Chair	Minutes of previous meeting	
Chair	Matters arising including rolling action log	
Chair	Forum membership update	As required
LA	Update on national/local funding issues	Verbal notification of any updates
LA	<b>DSG Management Plan update</b>	To include update on DfE 'Safety valve' programme
LA	Academies update	Notification of any changes to school status
Chair	Forward agenda planning	Sets out proposed agenda for the remainder of the year
Chair	Key decisions log	Records key Forum decisions over running 2-yr period

### Substantive Agenda items

Meeting 1 – Thursday 10 November 2022		
Item	Description	Notes
LA	DSG Monitoring Report 2022-23	Period 6 (Q2) report
LA	DfE Safety Valve programme update	Combine with DSG Management Plan update
LA	Provisional DSG settlement 2023-24	Forum to <b>note</b> position and make <b>provisional recommendation</b> on headroom allocation.
LA	DSG Block transfer proposals 2023-24	Forum to consider and make <b>decision</b>
Meeting 2 – Friday 13 January 2023		
Item	Description	Notes
LA	Resource Provision and AP place commissioning	LA to <b>confirm</b> places commissioned in academies for 2022-23
LA	Growth Fund report	LA reviews Growth Fund position and <b>confirms</b> 2023-24 'top slice' from Schools Block and allocation model
LA	DSG Schools Block 2023-24 – confirmed settlement	Forum <b>notes</b> final DSG settlement, <b>recommends</b> local formula to LA, <b>confirms decisions</b> on block transfer requests
Meeting 3 – Thursday 16 March 2023		
Item	Description	Notes
LA	DSG Monitoring Report 2022-23	Period 9 (Q3) report
LA	Schools Block – confirmation of individual schools' budgets	LA <b>confirmation</b> of individual budgets for 2023/24 following APT submission and any subsequent adjustments
LA	DSG HNB centrally retained 2022-23	LA <b>confirms</b> allocation of HNB centrally retained funding.
LA	DSG EY centrally retained 2022-23	LA <b>confirms</b> allocation of EY centrally retained funding
LA	Early Years block	LA <b>confirms</b> funding arrangements for next FY 2023/24
LA	Central School Services Budget (CSSB)	Forum <b>approves</b> CSSB budget allocations for 2023/24
Meeting 4 – Wednesday 18 May 2023 (TBC - date changed due to clashes)		
Item	Description	Lead
LA	Scheme for financing schools	<b>Approval</b> of revised scheme by maintained school reps following consultation.
Meeting 5 – Thursday 6 July 2023		
Item	Description	Lead
LA	DSG Monitoring Report 2022-23	Period 12 (Q4) report
LA	Growth Fund - outturn from previous financial year.	LA <b>confirms</b> outturn from 2022/23 and any consequent update to the allocations for 2023/24

This page is intentionally left blank

## Slough Schools Forum – Key Decisions Log AY 2021/22 & 2022/23

Issue and decision	Forum date	Agenda item	Minute ref
<b>School Forum membership update</b>	09/12/21	4	866
Gill Denham confirmed as academies member			
Chair to write to Coral Snowden and Peter Collins to ask if they wish to continue in post from January 2022			
<b>DSG 2021/22 Monitoring report</b>	09/12/21	6	868
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the current DSG position as set out in the monitoring report			
<b>DSG funding update 2022/23</b>	09/12/21	7	869
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the provisional DSG allocation for 2022/23 as set out in the report			
<b>Schools Block 2022/23</b>	09/12/21	9	871
LA to provide scenario modelling with and without requested 0.5% DSG top slice, to inform decision on block transfer in January meeting			
<b>Early Years update</b>	09/12/21	10	872
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the verbal report on EY funding			
<b>Scheme for Financing Schools</b>	09/12/21	11	873
Changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools, required in relation to the UK leaving the European Union, <b>APPROVED</b> by maintained school members, subject to confirmation from maintained secondary member (absent from meeting)			
<b>Schools Forum membership update</b>	19/01/22	5	879
Peter Collins confirmed as academies member for two years until January 2024			
Coral Snowden's term extended until July 2022			
Nominations to be sought for secondary academy member vacancy			
<b>DSG 2021/22 monitoring report</b>	19/01/22	7	880
Forum <b>NOTED</b> current 2021/22 DSG position			
<b>DSG Management Plan update</b>	19/01/22	8	881
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the verbal update from Johnny Kyriacou on the DSG management plan			
<b>SEND Banding</b>	19/01/22	9	882
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the verbal update from Chelsea Barnes on changes to the SEND banding matrix			
<b>Growth Fund update</b>	19/01/22	10	883
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> the Growth Fund criteria for 2022/23			
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the forecast position for the three years 2021/22, 2022/23 and 2023/24			
<b>Schools Block 2022/23</b>	19/01/22	11	883
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> the transfer of £100k from Schools Block to the CSSB			
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> the transfer of the balancing 0.44% figure (£676k) to the High Needs block transfer.			
Report to brought to March Forum meeting describing in detail the difference that this funding has made and how the funds transferred are being allocated.			
<b>Early Years funding 2022/23</b>	19/01/22	12	884
Forum members endorsed the EY Task Group recommendation and <b>APPROVED</b> Option 1 from the 2022/23 funding consultation			
<b>AOB – School Improvement funding</b>	19/01/22	16	888
Discussion to be arranged between LA officers and the chairs of SPHA and SASH to develop proposals for school improvement funding to take to the School Improvement Board and bring back to Forum.			
<b>DSG monitoring report 2021/22</b>	10/03/22	7	894
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the latest DSG position.			

<b>DSG Schools Block 2022-23</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>895</b>
Kamaljit Kaur confirmed she would follow up NNDR payment mechanism and issue clarification for all schools.			
<b>CSSB budget 2022-23</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>896</b>
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> transfer of £180,815 from High Needs block to the CSSB for 2022-23			
Forum <b>AGREED</b> allocation within the CSSB as proposed by the local authority.			
<b>EY centrally retained budget 2022-23</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>897</b>
Forum <b>AGREED</b> the use of the central retained funding as proposed by the local authority.			
<b>DSG Management plan update</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>898</b>
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the Cabinet report on current status of DSG Management Plan and accompanying verbal update			
Written or verbal update to be given at next meeting			
<b>Task group update</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>899</b>
Work of Task groups (Schools Block, High Needs and EY)			
<b>Forward agenda and Key decisions log</b>	<b>10/03/22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>901</b>
Key decisions log to be updated for May meeting (Chair)			
<b>Forum membership</b>	<b>05/07/22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>906</b>
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the adjustments to members' terms of office to better align with the academic terms.			
Chair agreed to seek nominations to fill primary and secondary vacancies in September			
<b>Update on national/local funding issues</b>	<b>05/07/22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>907</b>
Chair agreed to collate and return Forum response to DfE consultation on national funding formula.			
<b>High Needs Budget 2022/23</b>	<b>05/07/22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>911</b>
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the allocation of centrally retained funding			
<b>Scheme for financing schools</b>	<b>05/07/22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>912</b>
Maintained Forum members <b>AGREED</b> the proposed minor change to the current Scheme raising the tender threshold from £10k to £25k			
<b>DSG 2022/23 Monitoring report</b>	<b>10/11/22</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>923</b>
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the current DSG position as set out in the monitoring report			
<b>DSG Management Plan update</b>	<b>10/11/22</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>924</b>
Forum <b>NOTED</b> the verbal update from Johnny Kyriacou on the DSG management plan and the application to the DfE Safety Valve programme			
<b>Schools Block 2023/24</b>	<b>10/11/22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>926</b>
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> the transfer of £100k from Schools Block to the CSSB.			
Forum <b>APPROVED</b> the transfer of the balancing figure (0.5% less £100k) to the High Needs block, subject to confirmation in January 2023 following final DSG settlement.			
Forum <b>ENDORSED</b> the LA recommendation that DSG headroom be allocated through the basic entitlement factor			