

Leeds Schools Forum

Microsoft Teams Meeting
 Thursday 19 November 2020 at 16:30

Membership (Apologies in Italics)	
GOVERNORS	HEADTEACHERS
Primary (6 seats)	Primary (6 seats)
Sue Tuck David Kagai <i>John Garvani</i> Jatinder Ubhi Andrew Neal Helen Brough	Ireland Wood St Nicholas <i>Broadgate</i> Swarcliffe Primary Adel St John's Primary Primrose Lane Primary
	John Hutchinson Helen Stott Peter Harris Julie Harkness Jo Smithson <i>Vacancy</i>
	St Theresa's Catholic Primary Allerton C of E Primary Farsley Farfield Primary Carr Manor Community School Greenhill Primary
Secondary (2 seats)	Secondary (2 seats)
<i>Barbara Trayer</i> <i>David Webster</i>	<i>Allerton Grange</i> <i>Pudsey Grangefield</i>
	Delia Martin <i>Lucie Lakin</i>
	Benton Park <i>Wetherby High</i>
Special (1 seat)	Special (1 seat)
Russell Trigg	East SILC, John Jamieson
	Diane Reynard
	East SILC
Non School	Academies – Mainstream (10 seats)
Angela Hynes Helen Gration <i>Patrick Murphy</i> <i>Louise Turner</i> Angela Cox OBE <i>Dan Cohen</i>	PVI Providers PVI Providers <i>Schools JCC</i> <i>16-19 Providers</i> Catholic Diocese <i>Jewish Faith Schools</i>
	David Gurney Danny Carr Neil Miley John Thorne Emma Lester <i>Ian Goddard</i> Siobhan Roberts Joe Barton <i>Anna McKenzie</i> <i>Vacancy</i>
	Cockburn School Dixons Academy Dixons Academy Co-op Academy Priesthorpe Woodkirk Academy <i>Ebor Gardens/Victoria Primary</i> Cockburn John Charles Woodkirk Academy <i>Richmond Hill</i>
Local Authority Reps:	
Sal Tariq, OBE, Director	Academy – Special School (1 seat)
Tim Pouncey, Chief Officer Strategy & Resources	Mary Ruggles
Louise Hornsey, Head of Service, Finance	Springwell Leeds North
Lucie McAulay, Finance	Academy – Alternative Provision (1 Seat)
Val Waite, Head of Learning Inclusion	<i>Vacancy</i>
Shirley Maidens	
Elizabeth Jackson	
Claire Swift	
Viv Buckland, Head of Learning Systems	
Minutes: Lesley Gregory	

Item	Title	Actions
1	Apologies <i>David Webster, Dan Cohen, Barbara Trayer</i>	
2	<p>Introductions and Schools Forum Membership Following an election process the following nominees were successfully appointed to Schools Forum:</p> <p><u>Nursery Providers</u> With the resignation of Vicky Hallas Fawcett two candidates were appointed: Angela Hynes - Bright Beginnings Childcare Centre at The University of Leeds Helen Gration - Montessori Nursery</p> <p><u>Primary Governors</u> Jatinder Ubhi - Swarcliffe Primary Andy Neal - Adel St John's Primary Helen Brough - Primrose Lane Primary</p> <p><u>Academy Alternative Provision and Special School (one seat for each)</u> Mary Ruggles, Springwell Leeds North for Specialist school No nominations forthcoming for Alternative provision</p> <p><u>Academies</u> Action is being taken to fill the remaining seat.</p> <p>Wendy Beesley from Woodkirk Academy joined the meeting as an observer.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all new members to the Forum.</p>	DG
3	Minutes of last meeting	
3.1	The minutes of October's meeting were agreed.	
4	<p>Matters Arising <i>Page Two, Item 5.1 Early Years Action Plan:</i> It was noted that October's minutes mentions an Early Years action plan but the agenda for this meeting referred to the Early Years review. Action: the action plan to be brought to the next meeting.</p> <p><i>Page Four, Item 6.4.5 FFI Top Ups:</i> Information is still being collated and it will be January before the level of need is known. Action: To bring back to January's meeting</p>	VB VW
5	Schools Funding Proposals	
5.1	The paper brought to Schools Forum presents the outcome of the consultation and funding arrangements for 2021-2022. Schools Forum is asked to vote and give views on the proposals.	
5.2	The background figures in the consultation were based on October 2019 pupil data. Final numbers will be confirmed in December and will take account of October 2020 pupil figures.	
5.3	Of the 265 schools consulted 63 responded, compared to 84 the previous year.	

5.4	<p>The council consulted on the following proposals:</p> <p>a) A 0.5% transfer between from the schools block to the high needs block in 2021/22 estimated to be £2.835m.</p> <p>b) Two options for funding formula for 2021/22, taking into account the proposed transfer out of the schools block of approx. £2.835m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: A cap on gains of 3.18%. All other factors are in line with the national funding formula, including the minimum funding guarantee of 2.0%. • Option 2: A reduced minimum funding guarantee of 1% and an increased cap on gains of 3.40%. All other factors are in line with the national funding formula. <p>c) A contribution in 2020/21 by maintained schools to be applied as a per pupil amount of £2.50 estimated to be a total of £165k.</p>	
5.5	<p><u>Proposal A</u></p> <p>Full details and the range of evidence is provided in the consultation documents. Of the 63 response 84% supported this proposal. It was noted that option one benefited those schools most in need. There were a number of comments acknowledging the pressures the High Needs Block was under. It was proposed to submit a letter to the DfE demonstrating the continuing pressures on the High Needs Block and making representation to remove the funding cap. If Schools Forum is in agreement the letter will be sent on behalf of the Forum and the Council. The letter to the DfE will be put past the Chair as the Forum representative. Councillor Pryor, Elected Member for Education is aware that the letter is being prepared. A briefing will also be provided for Leeds MPs.</p>	
5.6	<p><u>Proposal B</u></p> <p>There are two options available in the second proposal for the funding formula. Assuming the transfer of 0.5% from the schools block Leeds cannot fully move to the national funding formula as there will not be enough funding left.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option One: This option is mostly in line with the National Funding Formula and will see 21 schools significantly better off. This option received support from 49% of the responses. • Option Two: Benefits more schools with 106 marginally better off. 43% supported this option. <p>The final funding formula for 2021/22 will be approved in line with the council’s decision making framework.</p>	
5.7	<p><u>Proposal C – Maintained Schools only</u></p> <p>This is in line with last year’s contribution approved by Schools Forum. The proposal achieved 88% of support. Given the majority support it is proposed to that the per pupil contribution from schools is £2.50.</p>	
5.8	<p>AIP Funding: Once the High Needs Block funding has been allocated and a detailed budget worked through for next year, AIP funding will come to the Forum as a matter of routine. AIP funding continues to be identified as a separate line in the High Needs Block.</p>	
5.9	<p><u>Voting</u></p> <p>Proposal A – 0.5% transfer: 20 in favour, none against.</p> <p>Proposal C – severance costs for maintained schools only: 11 in favour, none against.</p>	

<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>Excess Schools Surplus Balance Update</p> <p>The 2019-20 outturn balance presented in July indicated that five primary schools had surplus balances in excess of 15% over the last three years and as a result were subject to claw back. Subsequently these schools submitted their details and plans for the balances.</p> <p>The Schools Forum Panel reviewed the plans and was of the opinion that the balances should be recovered. However, given the exceptional circumstances of this year the authority has taken the decision not to claw back the excess for 2019-20. Nevertheless this will continue to be closely monitored and challenged where necessary.</p> <p>A letter will be sent to the schools advising them of the decision and also set out that this is not setting a precedence for future years.</p>	
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p> <p>7.7</p>	<p>DSG Management Plan Update</p> <p>Due to the overspend in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) the authority is required to develop a plan indicating how the deficit will be addressed.</p> <p>The ESFA provided a spreadsheet for which it had populated some of the details. Unfortunately it was discovered that there were a number of inaccuracies and that the spreadsheet was not working as it should be. Information is being collated and a narrative pulled together to explain where we are with the overspend in the High Needs Block. It gives context to the deficit and identifies historical underfunding of the Block and SEND together with the effect of the cap. Benchmarking has taken place and the situation in Leeds is repeated across the country.</p> <p>A report will be brought to the Forum in February with information on the High Needs Block for 20212-22.</p> <p>The High Needs Block review which took place a couple of years ago undertook extensive benchmarking with other local authorities. This will be revisited and the options identified will be reviewed. At the moment Leeds has a low spend per pupil of £30 compared to £78 for the nearest five comparators. This will be brought back to the Forum in February 2021.</p> <p>There is uncertainty about the direction the High Needs budget is going in, in terms of additional funding for Covid-19. It is expected there will be a rise in need.</p> <p>It was pointed out there this is a very difficult year for early years settings and the backlog of children needing assessments and putting on plans is a concern. These children will be starting school with no understanding of what the best provision for their needs is. Detailed discussions are taking place with Health colleagues around assessments.</p> <p>Action: Remote assessment sessions to be discussed with Health colleagues so that the practice can be factored in if/when we are in this situation again. <i>Please find update at Appendix One of the minutes.</i></p> <p>There have been a number of Early Years colleagues who have left at short notice however the Service will still be able to meet needs and continue to run as normal. A communication of alternative arrangements will be circulated shortly.</p>	<p>VW</p>
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p>	<p>Early Years Review</p> <p>The report explains in more detail what the Early Years Block money gets spent on. The local authority is allowed to retain 5% centrally which can be used on central services eg special</p>	

	education needs and disability (SEND) services as well as providing a contingency pot to assist with costs for exceptional circumstances. In 2019-20 3.7% was retained.	
8.2	Uptake of the two year old offer: Rather than waiting for information from the DfE eligible families are issued with a golden ticket which means they can immediately take up a two year old place for their child. This year a lot of outreach work has taken place with the Family Services team delivering activity packs to families.	
8.3	The amount in the centrally retained services has remained the same this year compared to 2019-20. This is because the Authority picks up any residual costs eg pay awards, in order to ensure the maximum fee goes to providers.	
8.4	Contingency explanation: When the formula was introduced a larger contingency fund was retained. However it was found that this was not necessary so a smaller amount was kept back. This year the contingency fund was used to provide PPE and equipment to providers during the early days of Covid-19.	
8.5	The sufficiency service does not provide direct support to providers. Its duty is to ensure that the local authority has enough 0-5 provision across Leeds. Officers are on hand to have conversations with providers but they are not business advisers.	
8.6	<u>Northpoint Counselling</u> The figure quoted in the report is some years out of date. It would be useful to have more up to date information. Action: information to be provided at the next meeting	VB
10	Any Other Business	
10.1	<u>Induction for new members</u> An induction session will be arranged and made available to all members of the Forum.	
11	MEETING DATES FOR 2020-21 AND FORWARD PLAN All meetings will take commence at 1630 until 1830 Tuesday 19 January 2021 Thursday 25 February Early Years action plan to be brought to January's meeting	VB

Children's Speech and Language Therapy Service (CSLT)

The CSLT service is currently providing support via telephone/video consultations and some face to face appointments. We have developed a prioritization process for deciding who will be offered a face to face appointment. The organization is promoting a Digital First approach in order to minimize the risk of spreading COVID-19, where a remote service is has been exhausted or is not appropriate for the current care required a face to face appointment will be arranged. Further appointments may then either be face to face or remote depending on need.

For all first contacts, we will initially contact families by phone to discuss which options are most suitable the child's care. Children who are school age will be offered either face to face or video consultation or phone consultation with an appropriate member of staff.

Children's Speech and Language Therapy staff may be required to be redeployed to support with other NHS services for those who require urgent care this may affect how quickly we are able to see children. Currently there are no re-deployed staff.

CSLT staff are required to wear full PPE when visiting children in school.

DRAFT