

Leeds Schools Forum Extraordinary meeting

Microsoft Teams Meeting Tuesday 1st February 2024 at 17:30

Membership (Apologies in	n Italics)		
GOVERNORS		HEADTEACHERS	
Primary (6 seats)		Primary (6 seats)	
David Kagai	St Nicholas	Peter Harris (Chair)	Farsley Farfield
John Garvani	Broadgate	Julie Harkness	Carr Manor Community School
Victoria McWalker	St Margaret's Horsforth	Emma Wraighte	Fieldhead Carr
Stratis Koutsoukos	St Nicholas	Rebecca White	Sharp Lane
Bradley Taylor	Kirkstall Valley	Kate Cameron	Calverley C/E
Vacant		Vacant	
Secondary (1 seat)		Secondary (1 seat)	
David Webster	Pudsey Grammar	Delia Martin Substitu	ute Helen Williams
		Benton Park	
Special (1 seat)		Special (1 seat)	
Russell Trigg	East SILC, John Jamieson	Louise Quinn East SILC	с
Non School		Academies – Mainstream (11 seats)	
Vacancy	PVI Providers	David Gurney	Cockburn School
Vacancy	PVI Providers	Katherine Somers	Dixons Academy
Nick Tones	Schools JCC	John Thorne	St Mary's Academy Menston
Christopher Thornton	16-19 Providers	Joe Barton	Woodkirk Academy
Dan Cohen	Jewish Faith Schools	Rob Dixon	Cockburn School
Peter McQuillen-Strong	Catholic Diocese	Rachel Colbourn	Bramhope Primary
		Sarah Talbot	East Ardsley
		Kate Burton	Alder Tree Primary
		Simon Princep	Abbey Grange CofE
		Ailsa Hoyland	Bruntcliffe Academy
		Vacant	
Officers			
Tim Pouncey, Chief Officer	Strategy & Resources	Academy – Special School (1 seat)	
Louise Hornsey, Head of Service, Finance		Vacant	
Chris Sutton, Admissions a	nd Family Information Lead		
Lucie McAulay, Head of Service, Finance		Academy – Alternative Provision (1 seat)	
Val Waite, Chief Officer Learning Inclusion		Vacancy	
Dan Barton Deputy Directo	or, Learning	Academy – Special Provision (1 seat)	
Shirley Maidens, Finance		Mary Ruggles	

Item	Title	Actions
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Chair welcomed all and acknowledged apologies	
2.0	Schools Forum Membership	

2.1	Vacancies remain for:		
	1 x Primary Governor		
	1 x PVI Nursery Provider vacancy		
	1 x Alternative Academy vacancy		
	1 x Primary Headteacher vacancy		
	1 x SILC Governor		
	1 x Non-school representatives		
3.0	Growth Fund 2024/25		
3.1	This additional Schools Forum meeting was called to consider and agree on the Growth Fund		
	criteria and values as presented in a revised Growth Fund 2024/25 report. This report now		
	makes provision for the updated growth fund requirements as defined in the Schools		
	Operational guide 2024/25 and the Growth and Falling Rolls Fund guidance 2024/25. The		
	criteria and values proposed within the report now supersede those discussed and approved at		
	Schools Forum on the 16 ^{th of} January 2024.		
3.1.2	SM explained what the three options are, as listed on the report that was circulated as Part of		
5.1.2	the agenda.		
	 To pay all eligible schools on the current criteria (Age Weighted Pupil Unit or AWPU) 		
	ii. To pay all eligible schools on the minimum required funding with the		
	exclusion of those primary schools currently in receipt of growth		
	funding which will be retained at the current primary AWPU value.		
	iii. To pay all eligible schools on the basis of growth funding received		
	with the exclusion of those primary schools currently in receipt of		
	growth funding which will be retained at the current primary AWPU		
	value.		
	The minimum amount to pay in growth fund to all schools is now £1550.26.		
	A superior use as a data stand. This is a the second in and set Carl, how have a Call with		
3.1.3	A question was raised about why Trinity is on the appendix and not Cockburn Lawrence Calvert.		
	It was explained that Cockburn Lawrence Calvert is not a presumptive free school, so their funding is provided directly by EFSA.		
	Tunung is provided directly by EFSA.		
3.1.4	SF representatives from Cockburn School queried why the schools was not on appendix 1 to		
	receive growth funding but has experienced recent growth. Cockburn increased places by 30 in		
	Year 10 in 2020, and by an extra 30 pupils in Year 8 in 2022, these were temporary bulges and		
	were compensated at the time but did not get any further funding.		
	It was agreed that this would be discussed outside of this meeting with SM, to enable officers		
3.1.5	to go back and clarify the details.		
3.1.6	A SF member advised the forum that in the last 2/3 days he has been lobbied to vote in three		
0.1.0	different directions by Head Teachers and just wanted to make the forum aware of this.		
3.1.7	A question was raised regarding the three options. Option one is from the DfE guidance that all		
	schools should be funded, so, are there different criteria for options two and three?		
	LM advised that EFSA have said that whilst the criteria is the same, the values do not have to		
	be, LM confirmed that all options still meet the DFE required criteria.		

3.1.8	There were discussions about the funding that is received for growth. Various comments were		
	 made: Do all three options included in the growth funding allocation support schools that are 		
	 Do all three options included in the growth funding allocation support schools that are growing? 		
	 Do not feel that we should divert money away from growing schools, so options two and three should not be considered and why are they preferable? 		
	 It was noted that paragraph 2.5 in the report shows there is a balance left which has 		
	been used towards other schools' growth, LCC officer advised that this is calculated on		
	last year's growth, so there may not be enough in the growth fund in future years, which is why we need to look at it year on year.		
	Why options two and three when we have enough funding for option one, to fully use		
	the funds for schools that are growing and not putting it into options two and three		
	that are not growing?		
3.1.9	LM advised that the minimum value of Growth Fund has been introduced by the DFE, so we		
	have modelled an option on this, and that the other options are put forward, to give everyone the full picture and a variety of options to consider.		
3.1.10	Comment was made about affordability, and there is a notion that bulge cohorts will be funded.		
	SM there is no separate funding for bulge cohort, it is paid from this growth funding budget.		
	Minimal amount is set aside within the growth fund for unknown growth, but it is not expected		
	to be as high. This is demonstrated within a line with Appendix 1.		
3.1.11	Question was asked about how the LA would prefer the vote to go, DB said that the LA has not		
5.1.11	expressed a preference and it is a Schools Forum decision.		
3.1.12	Question was asked about the reference to the Growth and Falling Rolls fund in section four of		
5.1.12	the report. The impact of this decision on future years is that growth funding may not be		
	enough for future years and would this will this impact on a Falling Rolls Fund.		
3.1.13	LM advised that Falling Rolls is a separate funding allocation and so would not be required to		
	supplement the growth fund.		
3.1.14	LM further advised that this is the funding for 24/25 but we will have to look at 25/26. If SF		
	agree on option one and the funding reduces in future years, the criteria and values will be		
	reassessed. Schools need to be aware of this, so they are not reliant on this money year on year.		
	year.		
3.1.15	A comment was raised that as we are talking about a significant amount of money, are the		
	schools aware of what they are going to receive? In Appendix 2 formula funding, it looks like primary schools are losing money that potentially they were they expecting to have.		
3.1.16	LM advised that we provided schools with similar amounts within the consultation with a caveat that these are indicative allocations and that this is the best information we had		
	available.		
	A vote was taken, and the chair advised the forum that he would abstain unless he was required to have a deciding vote.		
	Option one was carried with 14 members in favour.		
	To pay all eligible schools on the current criteria (Age Weighted Pupil Unit or AWPU)		

4.0	Meeting Dates for 2023-24 and Forward Plan	
	The next meeting will take place via MS Teams on Thursday 22nd February 2024 at 1630-1830.	
	Close	

4 | Page