

# Bristol Schools' Forum

## Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2018 at 18.15 hrs at City Hall

**Present:**

Massimo Bonaddio	Headteacher Rep, Blaise Primary
Victoria Boomer	Headteacher Rep, Oasis Academy John Williams
Karen Brown	Governor Rep, St Mary Redcliffe & Temple
Emma Cave	Governor Rep, Claremont
Graham Clark	Governor Rep, Sea Mills Primary
Graham Diles	Headteacher Rep, St Mary Redcliffe & Temple
Patricia Dodds	Governor Rep, Fishponds Academy
Simon Holmes	Nursery Head Rep, St Phillips Marsh Nursery
Tracey Jones	Headteacher Rep, Bannerman Rd
Sarah Lovell	Headteacher Rep, Cabot Learning Federation
Gary Maher	Diocese of Clifton Dept for Schools & Colleges Rep
Aileen Morrison	Headteacher Rep, St Matthias Park
Sam Packer	PVI EY Rep
Cllr Ruth Pickersgill	Governor Rep, Rosemary Nursery
Chris Pring	Headteacher Rep, Cabot Primary
Cedric Sanguinol	Governor Rep, Bishop Road Primary
Christine Townsend (Chair)	Governor Rep, Whitehall Primary
Wendy Weston	Support Staff Rep
Michelle Wills	Recognised Teach Professional Association Rep

**In attendance:**

Billy Forsythe	Clerk to Schools Forum
Denise Murray	Service Director Finance
Sue Rogers	Director of Education, Learning & Skills Improvement
Mary Taylor	Senior Inclusion Manager
David Tully	Interim Finance Business Partner

**Observers:**

Simon Eakins

	Action
<b>1. Welcome and introductions</b>	
The Chair opened the meeting at 18:15	
<b>2. Forum standing business</b>	
<b>Apologies</b> Jo Butler, Sally Jaeckle, Tracey Jones, Jez Piper, Carew Reynell, Anne Rutherford, Sue Wilson & Travis Young	
Clerk confirmed meeting was quorate.	

<p>New members                  Jez Piper from Diocese of Bristol                  Massimo Bonaddio – Maintained Primary Head Blaise Primary.                  Graham Clark –Maintained Primary Governor – Sea Mills                  Gary Maher – Diocese of Clifton                  Simon Holmes – Nursery Head – St Phillips Marsh</p> <p>Vacancies:                  Academy Primary Head – election underway with 2 candidates,                  Academy Primary Governor – election underway with 2 candidates.                  Secondary Academy Governor – no applications.</p> <p>No declarations of interest were expressed.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018</b></p> <p>Minutes were accepted as correct with the following corrections:</p> <p>Item 3 final para – TwS report should read TwS report 16/17.</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>Item 6 – officers to meet with individual Academies re core place funding – DY asked if any news SR will check and report back.</p> <p>Item 8 – DY asked how he had raised a question as he wasn't at the meeting. CR had received an email from DY and asked the question on his behalf.</p>	<p>SR</p>
<p><b>4. Correspondence</b></p> <p>No Correspondence.</p> <p>CT reported that the Finance sub group had met re National Funding Formula. Next meeting is on 28<sup>th</sup> June to look at split site funding as it is thought that this will be part of the formula at a local level.</p> <p>It is likely that there will be more money for pupil led factors.</p>	
<p><b>5. DSG Overview</b></p> <p>DT presented the report which identifies Year End balances and proposes what to do with them.</p> <p>Section 4 Table 1 shows a previous forecast of £5.2m overspend, but improvements have reduced this to a net overspend of £1m.</p> <p>The High Needs budget has overspent significantly – there is an improvement on forecast but still £5.7m overspend.</p> <p>£4.7m of underspend in other budgets in DSG.</p>	

RP raised that it was challenging to find out we have an underspend when so many EY settings are in deficit and especially Nurseries with high levels of deprivation who have lost funding. Can we have the full underspend of £2m? Cuts in CCs have a major impact on Nurseries and we need to be clear that Nurseries play a huge role in raising achievement.

SH added that Nursery schools have been a part of Bristol for a very long time and mostly in areas of high deprivation where there are not many private facilities as there is little profit to be made.

SR advised that she was very passionate about EY education and the value of the 12 Nurseries & 22 CCs. Unlike many LAs Bristol has maintained our 22 CCs where other LAs have closed them. We have got to work together to find a sustainable model for Nurseries. A Government commission is looking at Nursery provision. Within the DSG we are overspending overall – so we have to bring that budget back in line. A fine balance between resourcing and financially prudent.

KB asked how did we get more money?

DT replied that it was a result of how DfE EY funding works. They provide income based on previous years data. We have funded every setting correctly but we can't work out precisely how many will be there in a year in future.

SH asked if we are planning ahead.

DM reported that place planning is being taken into consideration looking at 10 or 20 years ahead with planning and aspirations. Not just schools but health, EY etc.

SR added that a report would come back to Forum re projections & hot spots.

SR

RP asked for clarification – are we consulting the Nurseries on how to use the £0.5m or just to give them the money they used to have in 16/17 levels.

DT replied that this was a straightforward way to have a locally maintained nursery supplement based on 16/17 funding and the 12 Nursery schools will be invited to comment.

DY asked if the underspends in de-delegated will be carried forward to help in 18/19 budgets.

SR advised that discussions had started with the Nursery heads & Sally Jaeckle Significant financial challenges for some Nurseries but some are in surplus. We need a better sustainable picture. The £0.5 is an interim measure but in the long term we need more discussion.

DT added that we did consider if we should have more than £0.5m but we are bound by the NFF and if we go above that level we would have to increase universal rates that apply to all settings.

SP reported that in the PVI sector there were settings with diverse needs – it is a shame

that one solution fits all – relocation is a big issue in Bristol

**Forum agreed :**

2.1 a noted

2.1 b £1m overspend can be carried forward – 17 in favour, 1 against

DT reported that Section 6 Table 4 shows budgets following the decision above and Section 7 shows the Outturns for individual schools with 20 schools in deficit. Individual Governing Bodies have to submit budgets. The LA has refreshed guidance and we will be ensuring we are systematic in our approach with every school having a budget plan the LA can support. We expect quite a few meetings over the next few weeks with Heads & Chairs.

Section 8 TWS for 17/18

CP added that the Forum did not have a report for 16/17. SR will check.

SR

DY asked who paid for setting up of TwS and who picks up any surplus. Should schools get a dividend from the surpluses if schools paid for setting up?

DM advised that she was not aware of the history. Many of the services TwS provides are commissioned and the costs are not fully transparent as many of the corporate support services for TWS are not clear. A fully traded model would look different and would show true surpluses.

SR added that the planned review is part of an activity of re-baselining the whole service to make sure we are offering statutory services and also what a new model of operation would look like. Many LAs are configuring their traded service in a different way with more accountability and responsibility. A report will come back to Forum in September with a view of what a traded service might look like.

SR

DM added that it was key to have fully transparent prices and costs and to include the below line items that don't make it into the accounts.

CP added that it was very difficult when TWS have made a surplus and costs have gone up 10%.

DM replied that it needed to be clear that the Council is spending millions on upgrading systems that TwS use. DM added that TWS was not achieving its financial target - £885k is a shortfall and this has been a shortfall for the last three years.

AM added that if there is a profit that should come back to schools and not into general fund – that should be the principal.

SR replied that it could be argued that money from TWS does come back into schools.

DM reported that the general fund does contribute to Education – this includes contribution to PFI, core statutory functions and Children Centres.

GC asked if schools kept the £800K would we not end up with more.

<p>DM replied that if we take money out we would have to reduce budgets. Fees have increased as TWS are not making their targets. We need a review and a quarterly report from TwS.</p> <p>EC added that TWS started 5 years ago and no one knows how much it costs or if it is operating with a deficit. Schools pay in and get nothing back.</p> <p>SR replied that the Officers were not here at the start and there is a loss of operational memory.</p> <p>CP asked if TwS was a not for profit service why are there targets?</p> <p>DM replied that it is not profit. There are a whole range of areas not accounted for in the figures so it doesn't show the full picture of costs.</p> <p>CP added that schools have no mechanism for adding 10% on services unlike TwS.</p> <p><b>Forum agreed :</b>          2.1 c &amp; d – noted</p>	
<p><b>6. High Needs Update</b></p>	
<p>SR advised that Annette would normally have presented the report. Emily Williams-Jones is leading on SEND casework team and Mary Taylor is leading on SEND business team.</p> <p>MT presented the report to explain end of financial year and update on High Needs block</p> <p>Table 1 shows period 9 forecast overspend but this has reduced to £5.6m.</p> <p>Table 2 shows the updated figures with an underspend of £1.4m with an underlying current spend forecast of overspend of £3.7m</p> <p>EC asked about the revised budget template for Special Schools.</p> <p>SR replied that work was on-going work with special schools to find the most appropriate model. We are in the planning stage and will co-construct a model. We set out a potential model and this caused a real difference in understanding between a model and what special school heads thought was the profile of their schools.</p> <p>SR has arranged for a consultant to visit each school with a set of questions to agree how do we create a model we can share and go forward with. Fixed Term Exclusions in Bristol are the highest in the country in both Secondary &amp; Primary. Alternative provision is full. We need to figure out how we keep children in a mainstream setting fully supported. Too many children with a EHCP are in a special school and should be in mainstream. If Bristol had the best SEND outcomes we would think money was well spent but the outcomes for our children with SEND is poor.</p> <p><b>Forum agreed:</b>          2.1 2.2 noted</p>	

<p>SR thanked MT for her report.</p>	
<p><b>7. Growth Fund</b></p>	
<p>SR advised that the Forum is being asked to confirm the change of wording on the policy as agreed at last Forum. Note A &amp; Note B need to change.</p> <p>GM asked for clarification as CR has said that this is only for schools growth from the next year but the paper suggest otherwise.</p> <p>DT replied that the report had been written on the basis that the change takes effect in 2019/2020 and does not matter if growth started earlier.</p> <p>GM thought this was unfair as goal posts are being moved.</p> <p>CT advised that the policy is entirely a Forum issue and the policy is agreed every year by the Forum so is subject to change. The discussion at the last meeting agreed to extended it for a further year as schools had put their budgets in place. Schools can now budget appropriately.</p> <p>GM added that as a Catholic diocese, schools in N Somerset are choosing to send their children to St Bedes as nearest school so this does seem unfair.</p> <p>SR advised that she would meet with St Bedes to look at cost implications</p> <p>DY asked if earmark was the best word.to introduce into the text.</p> <p>Forum agreed to use” oversubscription criteria” and check this wording with Legal.</p> <p>GM asked for clarification re class 8 and growth percentages. DT advised that the growth fund uses Yr7 census figures.</p> <p>Forum agreed to accept the changes subject to Legal confirmation of us of oversubscription criteria.</p> <p>It was also agreed that any subsequent discussion with St Bedes will be in the minutes.</p>	<p>SR</p> <p>SR</p>
<p><b>8. AOB</b></p>	
<p>None</p> <p>Post Meeting. A paper on changing the start time of the Forum for next year from 6.15 to 5.00 will come to the July Forum and it was intended to raise this as an early alert under AOB to give maximum time for schools and governors to consider.</p>	

The meeting closed at 20.10hrs