

	Title	Actions
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
	Chair welcomed all and acknowledged apologies	
2.0	Schools Forum Membership	
	Vacancies remain for: 1X Primary Governor 2 x Academy Mainstream 1 X Academy Alternative 1X Academy Special 1X Non School	
3.0	Minutes of Previous meeting	
	Agreed as accurate.	
4.0	Matters Arising	
	Peter reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting on October 3 rd . Action Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gary was to bring a detailed report on out-of-area and residential placements to a future meeting. Dan advised that Gary was on leave but confirmed the report would be brought forward. ○ Shirley and Lucy were to look at previous figures related to Leeds position relative to the national average over the years. Shirley provided detailed figures, noting a reduction in the funding gap over time. ○ Lucie was to check figures around sentences and update the report. Lucy confirmed a typo was corrected, and the report was reissued. It is at the end of the agenda pack. 	Gary
5.0	School Funding Proposal 25/26	
	School Funding Proposal 25/26 Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduction: Lucie presented the outcome of the recent consultation with mainstream schools on the funding arrangements for 2025-26. The consultation covered three main areas: transferring 0.5% from the school's block to the high needs block, the school's funding formula, and a contribution towards severance costs for maintained schools. ● High Needs Block Transfer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rationale: Lucie explained the need for the transfer due to a projected significant overspend against the high needs block, with a pressure of £15.27 million for the current year and an increased pressure of £38.2 million for 2025-26. ○ Consultation Outcome: 70% of the 92 responses supported the proposed block transfer. ○ Discussion: 	

- Question raised about implications if the government disallowed the transfer in the future. Lucie and Shirley mentioned that the transfer is reviewed annually, and there is no current indication that it will be disallowed.
- Dan emphasised the need for adequate funding and the strategies to manage the high needs block, including reducing dependence on independent provisions and increasing early interventions.
- Question was asked about the comparability of Leeds approach with other local authorities. Shirley and Dan confirmed that many authorities request similar transfers, and some even request more than 0.5%.
- A member questioned the implications of not doing the transfer. Dan explained that the money would be used for various interventions and support within the high needs block.
- Question was asked about the budget increase for special needs. Shirley mentioned an additional £10 million for Leeds and a national grant of £480 million for special schools, though details were not yet available.
- There was a query around the potential impact on per-pupil funding. Shirley and Lucie noted that detailed modelling was not yet possible due to a lack of data.

• **Voting:**

- Peter initiated the voting process for the high needs block transfer using a Google form.
- A member confirmed the link worked, and several members confirmed they had voted.

High Needs Block Transfer:

Final Vote Count:

- The final vote count was 16 votes, with the proposal passing by a narrow margin of 56% to 44%.

Funding Formula:

- Lucie introduced the discussion on the schools funding formula for 2025/26, explaining that while the full national funding formula (NFF) has not yet been implemented, there remains some flexibility in setting the formula.
- **Consultation Basis:** Due to the lack of detailed information at the time of consultation, the discussion was based on principles rather than specific figures. The ESFA had published a policy update allowing for a minimum funding guarantee (MFG) of between 0% and -0.5%.
- **Options Presented:** Two options were presented for consultation:
 - **Option 1:** A 0% MFG, which aligns more closely with the NFF.
 - **Option 2:** A -0.5% MFG, which effectively represents a reduction in funding. 3
- **Consultation Responses:** Out of 92 responses, 83% supported Option 1 (0% MFG), while 17% supported Option 2 (-0.5% MFG). The main comments favoured Option 1 as it is closer to the NFF and avoids reductions in funding.

Final Vote Count:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options Voted On: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1: 0% Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) ○ Option 2: -0.5% MFG • Voting Outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1: Received 81% of the votes. ○ Option 2: Received 12.5% of the votes. ○ Abstentions: 1 vote. <p>The majority supported Option 1, aligning with the consultation results favouring a 0% MFG.</p> <p><u>Severance Costs Contribution Discussion and Voting Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal: The proposal was for maintained mainstream schools to contribute £2.50 per pupil towards severance costs, totalling £140,000. This aligns with the practice in academies, which do not receive additional funding for severance costs and must cover these costs themselves. • Consultation Responses: Out of 50 responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 33 schools (66%) supported the proposal. ○ 17 schools (34%) did not support the proposal. • Comments: Comments were received both in favour and against the proposal, reflecting the varied opinions among the schools. <p>Final Vote Count:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Votes in Favor: 7 ○ Votes Against: 1 <p>The proposal to contribute £2.50 per pupil towards severance costs was approved by the majority of the maintained mainstream school members.</p>	
6.0	Any Other Business	
	None	
7.0	Meeting Dates for 2023-24 and Forward Plan	
	<p>The forward plan is part of the papers.</p> <p>Forward Plan Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting Date: The next meeting is scheduled for the 16th of January. • Main Agenda Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ De delegated Funds: The primary focus will be on the de delegated funds, including voting on the proposals. ○ Growth Fund: Voting on the Growth Fund will also be part of the agenda. ○ Final Funding Proposals: The final funding proposals will be presented. • Additional Items: There may be a high needs monitoring report, but this is yet to be confirmed. <p>The Next Meeting will be held on the 16th of January 2025</p>	
	Close	