

Bristol Schools' Forum

**Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 16th January 2019
at 17.00 hrs at City Hall**

Present:

Karen Brown	Maintained Secondary Governor Rep, St Mary Redcliffe & Temple
Jamie Barry	Academy Primary Headteacher Rep, Parson Street Primary
Jane Carter	Support Staff Rep
Steve Davies	Support Staff Rep
Patricia Dodds	Academy Primary Governor Rep,
Simon Eakins	Academy Primary Headteacher Rep, Cathedral Primary
Peter Evans	Special School Headteacher Rep, Knowle DGE
Simon Holmes	Nursery Head Rep, St Phillips Marsh Nursery
Tracey Jones	Academy Primary Headteacher Rep, Bannerman Road Academy
Gary Maher	Diocese of Clifton Rep
Aileen Morrison	PRU Rep, St Matthias Park
Chris Pring	Maintained Primary Headteacher Rep, Cabot Primary
Carew Reynell	Academy Secondary Governor Rep, Henbury School
Cedric Sanguignol	Maintained Primary Governor Rep, Bishop Road Primary
Simon Shaw	Maintained Secondary Headteacher Rep, St Mary Redcliffe & Temple
Christine Townsend	Maintained Primary Governor Rep, Whitehall Primary
David Yorath	Academy Secondary Governor Rep, Cotham School

In attendance:

Becky Wilkins	Clerk to Schools Forum
Sally Jaeckle	Service Manager, Early Years
Cllr Anna Keen	Councillor
Denise Murray	Service Director Finance
Alan Stubbersfield	Interim Director Education Learning & Skills Improvement
Mary Taylor	Business Manager SEND
David Tully	Interim Finance Business Partner
Emilie Williams Jones	Head of Special Education, Autism & Travel
Travis Young	Corporate Finance

Observers:

Anne Sheridan
Alderman Brian Price
Kevin Jay

	Action
1. Welcome and introductions	
The Chair opened the meeting at 17:00.	
2. Forum standing business	
Apologies Emma Cave, Graham Clark, Cllr Ruth Pickersgill, Jez Piper, Will Shield, Sarah Lovell Clerk confirmed meeting was quorate.	
New members Jamie Barry – Primary Academy Head	

<p>Vacancies: Maintained Primary Head – requested applications</p> <p>Garry Maher – Diocese of Clifton Rep. Head of St Bedes, declared an interest under item 10, growth fund</p>	
<p>3. Minutes of the meeting held on 27th November 2018</p>	
<p>Minutes were accepted as correct:</p> <p>Matters Arising</p> <p>CP gave name of Business Manager – actioned. Item 9 – not yet actioned. Consultation paper foot of page 6. The report had been subject to comment in the meeting. This was referred to the procurement team and they confirmed the contract was completed, therefore this was not a contractual matter.</p> <p>CT asked if this was a change in practice. DM advised this was not a change in procurement practice.</p> <p>CT asked what would stop this from happening again. AS confirmed due process.</p> <p>CT asked if the process was followed as an update has not been received on whether the report was value for money. DM advised due process was followed in terms of the relevant thresholds and the procurement process met.</p> <p>CT asked if the Council could be in a position where the same thing happens again. AS indicated that you can't guarantee the quality of future work other than by due process and management.</p> <p>DM added that it is for the commissioning officer to decide whether the report was acceptable. The report was accepted and the consultant paid. The commissioning officer is no longer here so we are unsure if the quality of the report was challenged at the time. We now understand the report was not as complete as might have been subsequently preferred, however no procedural changes need to be made but we need to understand why the commissioner accepted the report, as they are no longer here we can't deal with this retrospectively. We don't feel it warrants an external investigation is carried out.</p> <p>CT asked the cost of the report. AS advised it was slightly below £9,000.</p>	
<p>4. Correspondence</p>	
<p>CR confirmed a letter was received from SENCOS regarding pressure on the high needs block, which has been forwarded to AS.</p>	

<p>5. DSG Overview</p>	
<p>DT presented the report and clarified the financial position for 2018/19 and 2019/20.</p> <p>After analysing the Oct 2018 pupil census and working on the basis that we will have the same level of participation in Jan 19 as Jan 18, we think the Early Years underspend will be £1m, with sensitivity of £0.1m either way for a 1% change in participation levels.</p> <p>It was noted that the DfE acknowledge that there was a cost pressure to the high needs block nationally and allocated £350m across all LA's and £1m to Bristol in 2018/19 and also 2019/20.</p> <p>Proposed budgets for 2019/20. The schools block settlement was agreed in December based on an additional 1,010 pupils.</p> <p>DT gave an explanation of table 2, proposing to use DSG High Needs Block funding from 2020/21 in advance so we can include in the returns to government an account of what we expect to spend, as the DfE and ESFA have had discussions regarding a possible re-baselining the high needs budget . If we include the level of spend we expect to be incurring that places us in a good place and we may benefit from this. There are, however, no guarantees that this will happen.</p> <p>Proposing to use £0.517m of early years underspend to maintain the nursery school supplement.</p> <p>It was noted the report was included in cabinet papers. Looking to Schools Forum for feedback to inform their decision.</p> <p>£2.5m in-year deficit for 2019/20 if we spend in line with proposals.</p> <p>Decision: Forum noted the information about current year and overview and context for next year.</p>	
<p>6. Schools Block</p>	
<p>DT explained the report to the forum, confirming that the principles on which the formula had been based arose from the work of the Schools Forum sub-group, the consultation with all schools and the decisions of Schools Forum in September and November 2018. All schools were funded at the same per pupil rates as in 2018/19 and any funding beyond that was distributed through the National Funding Formula values (as far as the arithmetic would allow) for deprivation, English as an Additional Language and Prior Attainment.</p> <p>With 1,010 additional pupils, the expectation was that the additional funding would be neutral in effect, as the additional funding would be included in formula budgets to schools. The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) pupil unit values, however, were</p>	

higher in the schools where increased pupil numbers were recorded. This increased the cost of a standstill budget and reduced the amount of headroom, compared to that estimated in November 2018 (0.4%), to 0.23%.

An extra free school commences in September 2019, which had been budgeted for in the Growth Fund, but this new school will be funded through the formula itself, so £0.4m from the Growth Fund has been transferred to the formula, leaving the Growth Fund budget at £1.6m, rather than £2.0m.

It was noted that, with the proposed minimum funding guarantee, every school is guaranteed to receive the same per head as in 2018/19.

The impact of this is that the £0.6m available beyond a standstill budget (ie the headroom) only goes to 32 schools out of 128, because of the MFG. Schools get the higher of their formula allocation or the MFG. Putting more money through the formula does not produce a formula allocation higher than the MFG for around three-quarters of schools; they continue to be entitled to their MFG driven budget. For around one quarter of schools, (ie those benefiting from more funding through National Funding Formula values for deprivation, English as an Additional Language or prior attainment, or indeed, those whose formula was already close to the MFG level) the extra money does produce a formula allocation that is higher than the MFG.

SE asked if only 32 schools have a budget allocation that is higher than the standstill position.

DT confirmed this was correct, however all schools are guaranteed to receive the same as 2018/19.

CT advised that she expected the funding to go to schools with higher Pupil Premium numbers, Free School Meals Ever Six and SEND and this is not how the funding is being distributed. Therefore, she was not happy to agree to something that she does not fully understand.

CR confirmed that the individual position is based upon need. The effect of the change in the formula will reduce the MFG..

CT explained that she thought the money would go to the schools that have the children with the greatest need but the report doesn't seem to reflect this.

DT confirmed that what was expected to happen has.

CT asked why City Academy not receiving the ever 6 funding.

DT confirmed that they are within the local formula.

CT asked who decided last year's formula.

DT confirmed it was Schools forum.

CT asked why schools with the highest deprivation have not received any additional funding.

SE confirmed it is because there are a number of other factors that have to be considered.

DT confirmed finance have applied the principles that Schools Forum agreed in November.

CT asked for an explanation as to why there is a school on the list that hasn't opened but will receive more money.

DT confirmed it is a growing school and the estimated numbers are used, which is why they have received additional funding as if they were actual. They have no MFG because they have no prior budget, so if there is more formula funding, they will receive a share.

CT asked why a school with no children and no impact of the demographics can receive more money.

SE confirmed that the ESAF have to work on estimated numbers. If a new school then doesn't achieve those numbers the funding is clawed back. .

DT commented that the funding for growing schools is funded from the £3.9m DSG allocation for growth within the Schools Block.

It was noted that the formula is already agreed.

CT asked for training to be provided on the formula and how it is calculated for schools forum members.

CR noted that the forum looked at the outcome of the consultation and received a presentation previously.

DM confirmed finance would be happy to provide a separate session to go through the formula with any member of the forum who would like to understand in greater detail.

CR advised that the timing of any session would need to be considered to fit in with budget planning.

PE asked for the figures to be presented alongside demographic information.

PE indicated confusion regarding funding for a new free school.

SE confirmed there are different rules for mainstream and special schools in terms of how the funding is allocating.

Decision: Schools Forum endorsed the arrangements for the mainstream schools formula and the Growth Fund budget for 2019/20

For – 7 (including chair's casting vote because of a tie)

Against – 6

Schools Forum also agreed to two items of feedback to pass on to Cabinet.

- CR. This will be a difficult year for schools, allocations for most of the schools reflect a MFG at a cash stand still, so in real terms a reduction. Forum may feel it appropriate to indicate that this is not going to be easy.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CR. Figures include transfer between blocks, school block to higher needs. Growth fund funding has increased and we had more money than we needed so that has helped to finance the transfer to the higher needs block. This may not happen in the future so sustaining this sort of transfer would be difficult and medium term planning will need to take place. <p>Discussion then took place with regard to the funding formula and the forum better understanding this.</p> <p>It was noted that Schools Forum is still concerned about the operation of the formula and will be looking at opportunities to address this.</p> <p>AM confirmed the forum had conversations before about allocating additional funding to high needs and deprivation. The principle that we have agreed we trusted would be implemented. It's frustrating and disappointing as we do not understand why this isn't happening. We do need more training as it isn't coming out with results we expected.</p> <p>CP, indicated that the result was surprising and it would be helpful to understand the ingredients of the formula so the forum can understand why these schools have received additional funding.</p> <p>SE, confirmed that the history needs to be factored in. Five to six years ago there was a significant change to funding, moving out of deprivation into AWPU. This resulted in an increase in MFG for some schools.</p> <p>SE. Asked that the funding models and weighting for individual schools is shared. DM. Yes. This information will be shared</p> <p>DT explained how the funding was allocated, including the MFG and confirmed that the principles directed by the forum have been implemented, however the MFG has to be taken into consideration and has an impact on the amounts allocated to each individual school.</p> <p>CT Asked how long it would take for this to change in terms of funding. DT Confirmed if the percentage rate stays at zero this could take a very long time.</p> <p>Forum agreed to feedback the following to cabinet:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That a standstill in funding means a real terms reduction. • Future planning should not be based on continuing assumption of transfer from schools block to higher needs. <p>DM – Build training around detailed modelling and scenarios for funding into the schedule for the sub group.</p>	DM/DT
<p>7. Central Services Report</p>	
<p>AS – gave an overview of the central services report.</p>	

Approval of 18/19 and 19/20 budgets required.

3.1 Talks about central services block, rearranging factors so money is moved into DSG from ESG and top slicing arrangements for historical arrangements are now in CSB. There will not be a budget for prudential borrowing.

Appendices detail the totals.

Section 5 gives a wider context about Trading with Schools, the principles of why it was established and aspirational comments. How the system operates for schools and also the LA. The point is made in 5.4, that the LA took the decision to underwrite the cost of redundancies etc. as it's in effect a commercial entity.

It was noted that Trading with Schools is now part of Commercialisation and Communities Directorate.

AS confirmed he is happy for TwS to sit in commercialisation and equally strong in the view that he will retain the relationship as a professional manager, in a matrix management arrangement, especially for those services such as EWS and Inclusion.

CP confirmed it was good to have the report as this has been requested for eighteen months. TwS was set up as a not for profit organisation, so concerned it's making a profit/surplus. It also doesn't seem to sit with their values around children. It also states about the modest surpluses, which was approx. £800k last year and if this was redistributed to schools it would have reduced any overspend. It's hard to take when it's funding central teams.

AS noted there is a difference between surplus and profit and central departments of the authority have to support council teams, including TwS and that also has to be sustainable as well.

CR Also noted that the surplus for 19/20 is far lower than previous years.

KB asked if the TwS surplus can be challenged.

DM confirmed the position was justified as there is an overspend on Education spending, and the TwS surplus has been used to reduce this.

This forum noted this.

PE noted that consultation costs are almost doubling, which is a concern.

PE asked why these are doubling, is this related to the judicial review.

AS confirmed it is likely that we may not spend all of this money, however we have to ensure it is there following the judicial review, to ensure we have provision for consultation on SEND services.

PE asked if the LA can review the home to school transport budget to ensure this is managed effectively.

EWJ and PE agreed to discuss individual cases outside of the forum.

<p>AS confirmed home to school transport is another area being looked at by consultants, with a view to ensuring the appropriate decisions are being made. AS has also had a discussion with audit regarding prioritising home to school transport and making decisions in the correct way.</p> <p>PE Asked why Hope school is funded from the High Needs Block and not general fund. DT confirmed this was correct and the decision was taken previously before AS was in post. JB asked if the decision can be challenged. AS indicated that to make new proposals at this stage is not a helpful process due to the tight timescale to submit to DfE. We can take on-board all these points for future reference. JB asked when the forum could exercise their powers to ask for this to be changed. CR noted that it would be helpful to ask for officer advice through the budget monitoring process to understand the impact of the change.</p> <p>Decisions: Forum approved the proposed use of the central services block. Forum noted the point regarding licences. Forum noted the position about core funding in the current year. Forum noted the wider context regarding general fund spending in education.</p>	
<p>8. High Needs Update</p>	
<p>Report presented by EWJ and MT to schools forum on period 7. 2.1-3.3 to be considered.</p> <p>SEND Services are expected to have a deficit of £3.3m by March 2020. It is proposed that we will use funding from 2020/21 DSG to cover this.</p> <p>Table 1 details this information.</p> <p>Additional funding is coming to Bristol from central government, which means that our lobbying has worked.</p> <p>High needs transformation project has begun, looking at four specific areas to help improve outcomes for children and secure more effective processes and support.</p> <p>Officers will look at further opportunities to transfer funding from different blocks. The above will be used to mitigate historical funding pressures.</p> <p>Table 2 – sets out the budget monitoring position. Table 3 – details special school place numbers, year on year.</p> <p>Reduced expenditure on SEN top up. The back log is being cleared on 18th January.</p> <p>Figures are indicative of the shortage of specialist provision places in Bristol. Post 16 numbers have decreased.</p>	

Perm exclusions in Bristol of children with EHCP is zero in Bristol 16/17.
Requests for statutory assessment have increased, which is indicative of need.
New SEND data dashboard is currently being developed.

SEND survey went live on 30th November, extended to 13th January. Currently analysing info and will share with schools forum in January. We had 352 responses, plus additional comments.

Four key points from consultees:-

It is perceived that the current top up process could be improved as to fairness and transparency.

Two panels per year are not enough.

Panel days could be more effective.

Parents responding do not feel included in the support that is being provided to their child or young person, they do not know what is put in place.

Stakeholder engagement events took place on 14th and 15th January with regard to how top up will be managed going forward.

All of the transformation projects are following due process. We will also have a period of review post implementation.

Number of 1-5 year olds, 1092. Of those 497 are supported by SEN and 30 have EHCP.

Funding from DfE to train SENCO's to level 3. This will commence next month.

PE Thanked Emily for her very detailed and informative paper and noted his concern regarding EHCP not being fairly delivered in health and social care and asked that the forum keep a close eye on support services as special schools are then under pressure to fund.

JB Noted that whilst he understands that SEN is going through a period of change, better communication regarding top up would be appreciated as the engagement events on 14th and 15th January were only communicated prior to the Christmas holiday. More notice is required.

EWJ indicated that the top up panel is an interim measure put in place whilst in a difficult position. If not enough reps from schools have volunteered we can't go ahead with the panels. An email was subsequently sent to schools and Richard Hanks has helped talking to schools regarding this.

SE Asked for additional information in the reports.

EWJ to implement this.

CR Indicated that the Implication for 2020/21, due to cumulative pressures, is a potentially very substantial overspending. Needs to be an area of very serious concern and suggest that regular reports are given on the transformation and higher needs spending so we can see the scale of the problem.

CT Asked for the rationale behind accessing the future year's funding.

DT Clarified that the LA are proposing to use funding for high needs from 2020/21 in

EWJ

<p>advance. The reason why we support this move in budgeting for a deficit is that we will thus more fairly account for estimated spend, and be able to report this to the DfE to inform any future rebaselining review .</p> <p>CT Indicated that she was concerned about using future money, leaving a deficit for people that come behind us.</p> <p>DT Confirmed that whether we bring forward the money or not we will still be in a £3.3m deficit position.</p> <p>EWJ Also confirmed that work undertaken for the LGA indicates that the majority of LA's across the country are propping up the higher needs block and this has been happening for a long time.</p> <p>KB Noted that there has to be correlation between the reduction in school funding and the increase in top up requests being granted.</p> <p>SH Asked if the Schools forum can receive information regarding the national picture and whether there is a better model anywhere else.</p> <p>AS Confirmed that locally we are doing everything that can be done and we have benchmarked against good practice in the lobbying report. The local system is under control, national system is not.</p> <p>PE indicated that he was not aware of the stakeholder events and unsure if any of his colleagues were.</p> <p>MT Confirmed that these will be rescheduled by six weeks to increase engagement.</p> <p>Decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum notes the budget position of current year. • Forum notes the 2019/20 budget. • Forum notes the progress of the transformational project and that a further report will be brought to the April meeting. • Forum expresses great concern about medium term position. 	
<p>9. Early Years</p> <p>SJ confirmed the purpose of report to update forum of current financial position and consultation that took place.</p> <p>Consultation took place over Christmas period, 79 responses. All proposals endorsed.</p> <p>Some very useful suggestions made which can be used to lobby the government.</p> <p>Early years funding formula includes funding for emerging SEND and more complex needs should be funded by the higher needs block. We are engaged with the transformation project.</p> <p>Risks that the Nursery School supplement could be under pressure if the underspend is not realised.</p> <p>SH Asked when is the national review going to happen as this has been pushed back a</p>	

<p>number of times. SJ Confirmed it will happen and there is a national campaign. It has been raised in parliament and an active debate is currently taking place. We have been informed by the MP for early years that we shouldn't make a decision at present on maintained nursery schools.</p> <p>SH Indicated that nurseries are trying to set their budgets at present and it is very difficult with no indication of funding. SJ Understood the point and confirmed that the supplement from central government has reduced year on year and confirmed the LA is trying to maintain the status quo.</p> <p>Decisions: Forum noted the arrangements for 2018/19 and 2019/20 for the Early Years block; Forum agreed the use of the £1.504m for centrally retained spend; Forum endorsed the proposed formula values including supplement for maintained nursery schools; and Forum noted the support for changes to the rates for Early Years SEN, a matter which will be referred to the High Needs Transformation project on top-ups.</p>	
<p>10. Growth Fund</p>	
<p>Clarified that the member of the public in attendance has asked to record the item relating to the growth fund.</p> <p>It was noted that as this is a public meeting you can make a resolution to have a private session, prior to discussing the paper, however the paper must be discussed in public and the decision made in public and the public can record if they choose to.</p> <p>Decision: Forum voted on whether to agree a move to make a resolution to go into a confidential session for the initial conversation for this section.</p> <p>Those in favour 2. Against 6.</p> <p>The forum voted against, therefore a private session was not convened.</p> <p>Report presented by AS who confirmed it had been checked by an LA solicitor. Following a challenge it has also been checked by the head of Legal Services.</p> <p>AS Confirmed that in summary he is satisfied that the LA's stance is lawful and is common practice, and a practice routinely approved by the secretary of state, therefore the LA is not minded to change its current policy and sees a change as unnecessary.</p> <p>AS indicated that the LA and the schools forum have to agree to the policy and if an agreement is not made, this would go to the secretary of state. It can't be implemented without the agreement of both parties.</p> <p>AS Advised on the point of legitimacy applying to popularity rather than need. The</p>	

interpretation of the scope of the growth fund is fundamental to this. Existing growth fund policy is lawful, in simple terms that relates to common practice approved by the secretary of state and we do not know of any other LA with a policy reflecting the change proposed previously.

AS also advised part of the thinking behind that is to do with how catchment areas cross LA borders. The question arises how to you deal with this situation with regard to growth fund. Correspondence from Wiltshire was read out, illustrating they deal with this and do not discriminate against external demand, which is covered by the LA's growth fund in the example given. The precedent is well established.

AS indicated that the proposed change is not unlawful either. If a change were sought there are comments from our solicitors regarding the consultation and due process we would have to be undertaken to ensure the outcome is resistant to challenge.

CT – AS has outlined that solicitors have looked at this now, however in a previous meeting he was wrong with regards to governance process. It is important to point out the forum's responsibilities in terms of making decisions. So the legal advice that was communicated is corrected in the advice that is in the paper?

CT Asked what the possibility of discrimination is based on if we change the growth fund policy.

AS Confirmed it would be the uneven impact of the change on schools and mainly in the roman catholic sector.

CT Indicated that Colston girl's schools have 31.5% of their cohort from out of area and St Bedes is 40% since expansion and that number has increased for both schools. The number of Bristol school pupils has reduced at St Bedes, despite the increase in places. AS Indicated that the LA does not agree with those figures.

CT – I am going to suggest that there is wording in the way that it is presented so that governing bodies and officers can't make decision on what the policy looks like. Growth fund has not impacted on how schools chose to allocate their places. Growth funding is for Bristol children, those schools that have increased in size are not taking Bristol children.

CT noted that the figures in the report are incorrect because they relate to one school, and challenged the idea that there are no other policies that do the same as proposed in this change. EFSA produced a report and Solihull was used as guidance 'growth funding cannot be used for schools that admit school pupils that have a reasonable alternative school place'. Any child coming into the city has a reasonable alternative school place as their authority has to provide that for them. The LA's paper does not include the Solihull example despite its being sent to officers. Cambridgeshire policy also states, any growth or expansion due to parental preference will not be eligible for growth fund. CT also noted that Cathedral are looking to remove post codes from their admissions criteria.

TD Noted that it is common practice that children cross borders to go to school. There are Bristol children that are going out of Bristol because of parental choice.

CT Asked if they are they filling already existing places in schools outside of Bristol.

KB Indicated that it's interesting seeing what other authorities have in terms of their policies and that we could end up disadvantaged if we change our policies and neighbouring authorities do the same, as more children are going to school outside of Bristol, rather than coming in.

JB Warned that we have to be careful if it's parental choice. We could lose schools because we are expanding in certain areas.

SH Indicated that he was struggling to understand what the issue is.

PE Advised that after reading the growth fund policy he agrees with the majority of it.

PE Asked if the LA can hold the school to account for providing places for Bristol children ad infinitum, so they couldn't change their admissions policy after they have received their three years growth fund.

AS Noted it would not be possible to do that.

CT Indicated that the figures she sent show that hasn't been the case.

SE Bristol desperately needs places and changing the policy could put the LA at risk. The majority of growth places still go to Bristol children.

GM Indicated that the decision to expand the school that he represents was initiated from the LA. He had made an assumption that growth fund would be there and to suddenly have this decision changed is very frightening. The deficit that the school would go into would not be manageable if the money was removed. Bristol students have increased by 21 from Sept 2017. Catholic parents will choose a catholic based education for their children and St Bedes is their closest school. Any change would be setting a very worrying precedent.

CT asserted that children do not have the right to a faith based education, if this was the case we would have other faith based schools. The legal reason is that faith schools may allocate their places on the basis of faith if they are oversubscribed. All children have the right to education in a reasonable place. It is within the gift of the school that they can make changes that catholic applications from Bristol children are given preference if they are oversubscribed, or they may do nothing at all. It didn't sit well with her that schools are choosing to use growth fund to fund pupils from outside of Bristol.

AS advised in response to questions that:

- The head of St Bede's school had clarified an increase of Bristol pupils at that school.
- We have been through a process to ratify all budgets in Schools Forum and this is no different from the growth fund and other public sector budgets which are relied on for planning.
- BCC accepts that Roman Catholic schools and other schools that have catchments may go beyond the Bristol border. This happens in other LA's and where relevant those places are funded by growth fund. Immigration and emigration of pupils is taken into account in school place planning, so LAs don't give places to all home pupils. Collaboration between neighbouring authorities is how the system works.

- The LA does not agree the relevance of the Solihull and Cambridgeshire examples. Examples of catchment areas included in growth fund policies have been given, but not of LA borders.

He believed that the LA may continue with the existing approved growth fund policy and it could also go on with the alternative, but it chooses not to.

AS Indicated that the question then was - should we continue the existing policy and the recommendation is that we should as we do not want to be a test case that isn't proven. AS also did not believe that the secretary of state would be likely to approve the change.

AS also indicated that BCC works closely with neighbouring authorities and would be wary of any changes and how the impact on these would be taken by others. We also need to be able to persuade schools to expand and we need to be able to offer them a growth fund that is predictable.

AS requested that the forum agree to this.

JB Asked if we indicated we were not sure could it go to the secretary of state to ok. AS Confirmed the secretary of state can have arbitration. As demonstrated, his own and others' interpretations are different, however it needs to be a yes or no decision at present.

JB Asked that if we vote no, would that take St Bedes funding away to places that they have already committed to.

It was confirmed that it would.

GM Indicated that they have lobbied the government for real time funding.

SH Indicated there are many complex factors in deciding school places for families, it is not in the interest of anyone to draw boundaries.

Decision: Schools Forum agreed to the LA's proposal that the Growth Fund be unchanged for 2019/20 financial year. 12 votes in favour, 3 against.

It was noted that GM was not allowed to vote and did not vote.

11. Forum Composition

AS discussed.

Review of the forum, along with observations.

It seems sensible to look at who is represented in terms of phases and types of schools. Alternative providers are not represented.

We have an opportunity to take account of AP issues via Chris Davis, as he co-ordinates the work of those providers. He can attend as an officer rather than a member when there is an appropriate agenda item.

<p>If this is felt to be effective it can be reviewed further next year.</p> <p>Post 16 representation, proposing to leave as it is at present.</p> <p>The third point was Diocese representation. Again the LA policy is a standard one, and AS wouldn't advise changing this.</p> <p>PE – Can I be clear on alternative provision, AM provides excellent representation. I would agree with an additional officer rather than a member. AS – I would agree.</p> <p>No decision for forum to make.</p> <p>CT - The constitution indicates an equal voice and there isn't. CT stated her view that the constitution needs to be changed.</p>	
<p>12. Non Teaching Pay 2019/20</p>	
<p>James Brereton updated the forum on changes to the pay structure.</p> <p>It was noted the council follows a national agreement, which was for a two year settlement; the first year was last year, second year commences April 2019.</p> <p>The current draft of new pay points was shared with members and subject to agreement with TU's, it was hoped to agree in coming weeks. Will communicate when this has been reached.</p> <p>We will look at managing compression at the lower end of the scale in the future.</p> <p>Further work to be carried out and consultation with the forum.</p> <p>CP Asked when the increases will be applied. JB Confirmed in the April salaries.</p> <p>Decision: Forum noted the report.</p>	
<p>13. AOB</p>	
<p>None</p>	

The meeting closed at 20.45hrs