

	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	
4.1	Matters Arising: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed Report on Out-of-Area and Residential Placements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Peter Harris mentioned that Gary was expected to bring a more detailed report on out-of-area and residential placements to a future meeting, likely in February. Dan confirmed that Gary was working on a piece of resource provision work and would be late arriving. The report is expected for the February meeting. 	Gary
5.0	School Funding Arrangements 25/26	
5.1	Lucie's Presentation on School Funding Arrangements 2025/26:	
5.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lucie presented the final proposals for the school funding formula for 2025/26, details of the Growth Fund criteria and value, and the proposed expenditure for the Central School Services Block (CSSB). 	
5.3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. School Funding Formula: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The final school's block funding allocation for 2025/26 is confirmed at £765 million, an increase of £9 million compared to 2024/25. ○ A 0% Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) has been retained, with a cap on gains of 2.53%. ○ The proposed transfer of 0.5% from the school's block to the high needs block is confirmed at £3.82 million. ○ The proposed Growth Fund is £870,000. ○ These figures are still subject to final checks and verifications, prior to a decision being taken by the Director of Childrens & Families. 	
5.4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Growth Fund: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Leeds allocation for growth funding and falling rolls fund has reduced from £3.731 million in 2024/25 to £2.953 million in 2025/26. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The estimated growth requirements for 2025/26 have also reduced, and the proposed Growth Fund is £870,000, split between primary (£107,000) and secondary (£763,000) schools. ○ Schools Forum is asked to vote on agreeing the value of this fund. 	
5.5	<p>4. Growth Fund Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Schools Forum is asked to approve the criteria for allocating the Growth Fund, retaining the existing criteria for primary and secondary schools. ○ Additional resources and rental costs for existing schools are retained at £150 per pupil. ○ Leadership costs for new and presumption free schools are retained over a four-year period. ○ Criteria for additional resources for new presumption free schools are retained at £250 per pupil. 	
5.6	<p>5. Falling Rolls Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For 2025/26, it is proposed not to operate a falling rolls fund, as the criteria for increased pupil numbers in the next few years are not met. ○ The funding received (£141,000) will contribute to the £870,000 Growth Fund. 	
5.7	<p>6. Central School Services Block (CSSB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The CSSB funds statutory duties for both maintained schools and academies. ○ The Leeds allocation for 2025/26 is £5.571 million, an increase of £446,000 compared to 2024/25. ○ The increase is mainly due to the centrally employed teachers' element of the teachers' pay and pension grant and the core schools budget grant being rolled into the CSSB. ○ A further reduction of 20% on historical commitments is noted, but an additional £68,635 is requested to fund unavoidable prudential borrowing costs. ○ Schools Forum is required to approve each element within the CSSB block. 	
5.8	<p>7. High Needs Block:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The estimated high needs funding for 2025/26 is £133.8 million, £9.4 million higher than assumed in the medium-term financial strategy. ○ A more detailed report will be brought to the next Schools Forum meeting. 	
5.9	<p>Follow-Up Questions and Comments:</p>	
5.10	<p>1. Growth Fund and Resource Provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Member asked if any aspect of the Growth Fund would be allocated to resource provision due to the local authority's announcement. Shirley clarified that Growth Fund cannot be used for resource provision. 	
5.11	<p>2. Funding for Undersubscribed Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Member asked about funding for traditionally undersubscribed schools that have increased their numbers. Shirley explained that Growth Fund cannot be used for such circumstances. 	
5.12	<p>3. Falling Rolls Fund Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Member questioned the criteria for the falling rolls fund, noting the oddity of schools triggering funding but not being eligible to receive it. Lucie explained the criteria and the decision not to operate the fund for 2025/26. 	
5.13	<p>Actions:</p> <p>1. Detailed Report on High Needs Block:</p>	Lucie

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A more detailed report on the high needs block will be presented at the next Schools Forum meeting. 	
5.14	Voting Outcomes for School Funding Arrangements 2025/2026:	
5.15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Growth Fund Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved with 18 votes in favour. ○ Criteria include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing criteria retained. ▪ Additional resources and rental costs retained at £150 per pupil. ▪ Leadership costs for new presumption free schools retained over a four-year period. ▪ Additional resources for new presumption free schools retained at £250 per pupil. 	
5.16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Total Growth Fund Allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved with 20 votes in favour. ○ Allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ £107,000 for primary schools. ▪ £763,000 for secondary schools. 	
5.17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Statutory Duties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved with 19 votes in favour. ○ Funding: £2.079 million. 	
5.18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Centrally Employed Teachers Pension Costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved unanimously. ○ Funding: £577,000. 	
5.19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Prudential Borrowing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved unanimously. ○ Funding: £515,000. 	
5.20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Admission Service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved unanimously. ○ Funding: £1.558 million. 	
5.21	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Schools Forum Servicing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approved unanimously. ○ Funding: £36,000. 	
5.22	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Copyright Licenses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This item did not require a vote, it was for information only. ○ Estimated cost: £874,000 	
5.23	All the proposals for the school funding arrangements for 2025/2026 were approved.	
5.24	Dan made two key points before the de-delegation paper discussion:	
5.25	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notional Funding Thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leeds is significantly different from national benchmarks regarding notional budget thresholds, with Leeds at around 6% compared to the national average of 12-12.5%. ○ Dan proposed a task and finish meeting to discuss this issue and develop proposals, inviting volunteers from the meeting to participate. He emphasised the need for a proper conversation before making any changes. ○ ACTION – If you wish to be part of a task and finish group, please email Dan. 	
5.26	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. DE Delegation Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dan highlighted that the majority of those who voted in the consultation were in favour of the DE delegation, despite some marginal results. 	ALL

<p>5.27</p> <p>5.28</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He stressed the importance of considering the potential unintended negative consequences of not delegating the trade union facilities agreement, such as the loss of teacher time for mandatory training and the support provided by trade unions in policy development and staff support. <p>Comments and Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Member asked: in what ways Leeds is different regarding the notional funding thresholds. Dan explained the difference in percentages and reiterated the need for a detailed discussion outside the current meeting. 	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>De-delegation of services 25/26</p>	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p> <p>6.7</p> <p>6.8</p> <p>6.9</p>	<p>Overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lucie McAulay presented the DE delegation proposals for 2025/26, which included a total budget of £5.55 million, an increase of £389,000 from the previous year. The consultation received responses from 58 schools (36%), with 53 primary and 5 secondary schools participating. <p>Key Points and Follow-Up Questions/Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contingency and Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £500,000 (reduced from £750,000). ○ DE delegation request: £250,000, with the remaining £250,000 from the de-delegated reserve. ○ 90% support from respondents. ○ Comment: One school supported the contingency fund but preferred not to fund the £50k for the Urgent School Improvement Fund. 2. Maternity and Other Cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £2.95 million (increase of £246,000). ○ 93% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Questions about value for money and comparisons with insurance options. Rebecca White raised a point about shared parental leave. 3. Suspended Staff Cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £150,000 (increase of £50,000). ○ 60% support from respondents. ○ Comment: Clarification on how the funds are used to support schools with suspended staff. 4. Trade Union Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £383,000 (increase of £13,000). ○ 62% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Extensive discussion on the cost, transparency, and benchmarking against other local authorities. Concerns about the high cost per pupil and the impact on schools. 5. School Library Service (Primary Schools Only): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £363,000 (increase of £30,000). ○ 66% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Discussion on the usage and value of the service, with some schools finding it difficult to use. 6. Free School Meals Eligibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £178,000. ○ 88% support from respondents. 	

6.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comments: Questions about the cost per pupil and comparisons with other local authorities. 	
6.11	<p>7. Behaviour Support Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £116,000 (increase of £4,000). ○ 66% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Clarification on how to access the service and its effectiveness. 	
6.12	<p>8. Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups and Bilingual Learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £300,000 (increase of £10,000). ○ 52% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Concerns about the effectiveness and value of the service, with some schools preferring to use the funds directly. 	
6.13	<p>9. School Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed budget: £860,000. ○ 76% support from respondents. ○ Comments: Discussion on the value and effectiveness of the service, with some schools highlighting the importance of the support provided. 	
6.14	<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review of De-delegated Budgets: Commitment to a future review of all de-delegated budgets, considering the timing of the consultation and providing more detailed information and benchmarking. 	Phil
6.15	<p>Additional Comments:</p>	
6.16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Member emphasised the need for a clearer and more informative consultation process. ● Member raised concerns about the effectiveness of support for ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners. ● Member highlighted the value of the headteacher support service. 	
6.17	<p>Here are the outcomes of the voting on the de delegated proposals:</p>	
6.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contingency and support for schools in financial difficulty: Approved (9 in favour, 1 against). ● Maternity and other cover: Approved (9 in favour, 1 against). ● Suspended staff cover: Approved (8 in favour, 2 against). ● Trade union facilities: Approved (6 in favour, 4 against). ● School library service (primary only): Approved (6 in favour, 2 against). ● Free school meals eligibility: Approved (9 in favour, 1 against). ● Behaviour support services: Approved (7 in favour, 3 against). ● Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners: Not approved (2 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstentions). ● School improvement: Approved (8 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention). <p>In summary, all de-delegations were approved with the exception of support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners. These results reflect the decisions made during the meeting based on the votes cast by the participants.</p>	
	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
	<p>None</p>	
7.0	<p>Meeting Dates for 2024-25 and Forward Plan</p>	

7.1	The forward plan is part of the papers. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Date: 27th February 2025• Agenda:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Approval of Early Years Funding○ Update on DSG Monitoring○ High Needs Budget 2025/26	
	Close	

DRAFT