

# Bristol Schools' Forum

**Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019**  
**at 18.00 hrs at City Hall**

**Present:**

Simon Eakins	Academy Primary Head Rep, Cathedral Primary
Rob Endley	Non School Member, (NASUWT and NEU).
Peter Evans	Special School Head Rep, KnowleDGE
Simon Holmes	Nursery Head Rep, St Phillips Marsh Nursery
Sarah Lovell	Academy Secondary Headteacher Rep, Bristol Metropolitan Academy
Garry Maher	Diocese of Clifton Rep
Aileen Morrison	Pupil Referral Unit Rep, St Matthias Park
Carew Reynell	Academy Secondary Governor Rep, Henbury
Cedric Sanguignol	Maintained Primary Governor Rep, Bishop Road Primary
Simon Shaw	Maintained Secondary Head Rep, St Mary Redcliffe & Temple
Christine Townsend	Maintained Primary Governor Rep, Whitehall Primary
David Yorath	Academy Secondary Governor Rep, Cotham School

**In attendance from Bristol City Council:**

Corrina Haskins	Clerk to Schools Forum
Sally Jaeckle	Service Manager, Early Years
Cllr Anna Keen	Cabinet Member for Education and Skills
Denise Murray	Director of Finance
Alan Stubbersfield	Interim Director Education Learning & Skills Improvement
Mary Taylor	Business Manager, SEND
David Tully	Interim Finance Business Partner
Travis Young	Corporate Finance

**Observers:**

Alderman Brian Price

	Action
<b>1. Welcome and introductions</b>	
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
<b>2. Forum standing business</b>	
<p><b>a. Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jamie Barry (Academy Primary Head Rep, Parson Street School);</li> <li>- Lorraine Wright (Academy Primary Head Rep, Elmlea Junior School);</li> <li>- Kate Matheson (Maintained Primary Governor Rep, St Barnabas Primary);</li> <li>- Kris Hristakev (Special Schools Governor Rep, Woodway Federation);</li> <li>- Graham Clark (Maintained Primary Governor, Sea Mills Primary);</li> <li>- Chris Pring (Maintained Primary Headteacher Rep, Cabot Primary);</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ruth Pickersgill (Nursery Governor Rep, Rosemary Nursery);</li> <li>- Massimo Bonaddio (Maintained Primary Head, Blaise Primary);</li> <li>- Jez Piper (Diocese of Bristol Board of Education)</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Quorate</b>          The Clerk confirmed the meeting was quorate.</p> <p><b>c. Resignations</b>          There were no resignations to report.</p> <p><b>d. Appointment of New Members</b>          The Clerk confirmed the following appointment:          Kris Hristakev - Special Schools Governor Rep, Woodway Federation</p> <p><b>e. Notification of Vacancies</b>          The Clerk advised of the following Schools Forum Vacancies which would be advertised through the Heads/Governors Bulletins:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two Primary Maintained Heads;</li> <li>• Two Primary Academy Governors;</li> <li>• Two Secondary Academy Heads;</li> <li>• One Secondary Academy Governor;</li> </ul> <p><b>f. Declarations of Interest</b>          There were no declarations of interests.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 May 2019</b></p>	
<p><b>RESOLVED</b> - that the minutes be confirmed as a correct record.</p> <p><b><u>Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p>CR gave the following updates on actions required at the previous meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CR had formally thanked Billy Forsythe for his work as Clerk of the Schools Forum;</li> <li>2. The first meeting of the Finance Sub Group had taken place and a further meeting would be held later this month;</li> <li>3. AS had prepared a response to the other outstanding issues and this would be circulated to members of the Forum. On receipt of the information the Forum would consider whether it was necessary to have a further report on the issue of resource base places;</li> <li>4. Graham Booth would be leading on the review of the scheme for financing schools.</li> </ol> <p>In relation to the Hope School, a question was raised about how Schools Forum could see the impact of the additional funding given to the school as there was no performance data or detail about Governance on the Hope School Website. AS confirmed that Governors did receive performance data and AK further advised that Councillors also received this information through the Corporate Parenting Panel. It was <b>agreed</b> that, as the Hope School received funding from the Schools Block money, it would also be useful for Schools Forum to receive performance data to</p>	<p>CH</p> <p>GB</p> <p>AS</p>

<p>measure the impacts for looked after children.</p>	
<p><b>4. Scrutiny Report SEND</b></p>	
<p>AS gave a presentation on a report prepared for the Council’s Scrutiny Commission Task and Finish Group on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historical background for SEND legislation;</li> <li>• The Impact of SEND reforms;</li> <li>• The High Needs Block pressures and LGA analysis;</li> <li>• Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission;</li> <li>• SEND in Bristol.</li> </ul> <p>The following questions and comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were post-16 SEND students supported to meet the gap between school and post-16 provision? The 2014 Act recognised this and there was a pathway to adult social care with Education and Health Care Plans, although this was not sufficiently backed by funding;</li> <li>• The number of home educated children had increased and there could be a relationship between this and schools off-rolling SEND students;</li> <li>• Local Authorities should be proactive in recognising where students were being off-rolled;</li> <li>• The data showed that 23% of children in Bristol had a Specific Learning Difficulty (SpLD) and so why was this not part of the key conclusions? AS agreed that there were questions that needed further study and a proper analysis of needs;</li> <li>• The LGA refers to a demand-led service, but there should also be a focus on a preventative approach in the case of mental health and wellbeing of students.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Draft Response to Education and Skills Funding Agency (EFSA) call for evidence on SEND and Alternative Provision (AP) Funding</b></p>	
<p>AS gave a presentation on the areas of questioning in response to the EFSA call for evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SEN in Mainstream</b> – notional SEN budgets, better targeting of funding, £6,000 threshold, clarity of information;</li> <li>• <b>Alternative Provision</b> – early intervention, collaboration, best value?</li> <li>• <b>FE</b> – do arrangements secure best outcomes at a reasonable cost?</li> <li>• <b>Early Intervention</b></li> <li>• <b>Partnership</b></li> <li>• <b>Other aspects</b> – Special School arrangements, Early Years / High Needs boundaries, ring-fencing DSG blocks?</li> </ul> <p>He also drew attention to the results of the survey conducted by Primary Heads’ Association of Bristol (PHAB) which asked for the views of primary headteachers in response to the call for evidence.</p> <p>Forum Members raised the following comments/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The £6k notional budget was problematic as provision was varied in different schools;</li> <li>• The £6k notional budget did not cover the real costs of supporting SEND students;</li> <li>• There needed to be a balance between formula allocation and a needs led assessment;</li> <li>• The response needed to evidence the case of what was different/unique in Bristol;</li> <li>• What percentage of SEND students were in AP as the result of permanent exclusion? AM</li> </ul>	

<p>responded that students in AP/PRU were often at risk of exclusion and a high percentage of those either had an Education and Health Care Plan or were awaiting one and should have had their needs identified earlier. Therefore there was an argument for investing in early intervention to prevent future escalation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The progression of SEND students who benefitted from early intervention could be used as evidence;</li> <li>• The response should consider the number of SEND children who had been permanently excluded and also those who had been moved to avoid permanent exclusion;</li> <li>• Was the national formula too rigid, should there be one block or would this disadvantage areas such as AP?;</li> <li>• Concern was expressed about proposals to devolve AP funding to schools and the impact that this would have on the quality of the provision to these already vulnerable students.</li> </ul> <p>DT asked for any further comments by 9<sup>th</sup> July to be included in the response to the EFSA.</p>	
<p><b>6. SEND Staffing (Bristol City Council Cabinet Report)</b></p>	
<p>AK reported that the Bristol City Council Cabinet had met earlier that day and considered a resourcing plan for SEND function. She confirmed that the Council was currently at risk of non-compliance with its statutory duties to SEND children and young people and a package of improvements had been agreed, as set out in the report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED – that the report of Bristol City Council Cabinet in relation to SEND resources and the actions agreed to improve the service be noted.</b></p>	
<p><b>7. SEND Capital Strategy (Bristol City Council Cabinet Report)</b></p>	
<p>AK reported that the Cabinet had also approved the next steps in the education capital programme to progress priority projects that would ensure the provision of adequate and sustainable new places for children with SEND. AS confirmed that the Cabinet had approved 3 priority projects at Kingsweston Special School – The KEEP, KnowleDGE 6<sup>th</sup> Form and Claremont and Elmfield and other priorities included partnership work, Alternative Learning Provision and reviews of projections.</p> <p>The following comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report suggested that Lansdown had provision for KS4 children, but this was not the case. AK undertook to feed this back.</li> <li>• Were these schools at risk of closing due to lack of maintenance by Bristol City Council? AS stated that the schools had been opened in response to a need in the local area and housed in inadequate accommodation. The risk of not investing in these facilities was the risk of closure and children being educated out of area.</li> </ul> <p><b>RESOLVED – that the report and decisions of Bristol City Council Cabinet in relation to SEND Capital Proposals be noted.</b></p>	
<p><b>8. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Overview 2019-20</b></p>	
<p>DT reported on the latest position as at Period 2 in relation to the DSG overview Budget 2019/20 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was early in the financial year, but based on the previous year, the overall forecast was</li> </ul>	

<p>for an overspend of £1.85m with in year variances in the Early Years Block and High Needs Block;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following the decision at the previous meeting to retain £0.390m in the Early Years Block, SJ was working on options and would report back in the Autumn;</li> <li>• In terms of the Early Years Block, the forecast was relying on the pattern of provision in previous year which meant a £1.777m underspend;</li> <li>• In terms of the High Needs Block, the original budget exceeded in-year resources by £2.004m, and further net spending of £30k had been identified at the end of period 2, but this was expected due to the funding shortfall and was being addressed by lobbying government and pursuing the High Needs Transformation Programme.'</li> </ul> <p><b>RESOLVED – that the period 2 DSG overview budget position 2019/20 be noted.</b></p>	
<p><b>9. Composition of the Forum</b></p>	
<p>CR reported that he had drafted a discussion document to address issues raised at the previous meeting in relation to the composition of the Forum. He confirmed that he had used comparative data with other local authorities and advice from DfE.</p> <p>The following comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a discussion about whether 1 representative of 16-19 provision was enough, but it was noted that the only part of the DSG funding which could be directed at this sector was the High Needs Block and that 16-19 provision was also included by some of the Secondary Schools represented on the Forum;</li> <li>• Would reducing the size of the Forum change anything as there would probably be the same people attending meetings?</li> <li>• Heads/Governors could be put off by the size of the Forum and lengthy meetings hence the number of current vacancies. Would a smaller group be more focussed and engaged?</li> <li>• Forum Members represent their group rather than their school and certain groups were currently over-represented e.g. church groups, which may or may not be an issue;</li> <li>• If the size is reduced this could affect Trade Union representation and as De-delegation decisions are made at Schools Forum, this has an impact on Trade Union funding;</li> <li>• There was a need to inform schools about the role of the Forum in terms of consultation and this could encourage more people to fill the vacancies;</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to undertaking a self-evaluation as part of the process of looking at the composition.</li> </ul> <p>CR confirmed that the composition of the Schools Forum was ultimately a matter for Bristol City Council, but it was useful to know the views of Members and he asked for any further comments to be submitted by email.</p>	
<p><b>10. Any Other Business</b></p>	
<p>Forum Members noted that it was Alan Stubbersfield’s last meeting as Acting Director of Education and Skills at Bristol City Council and thanked him for all his help in supporting the Forum.</p>	

The meeting closed at 7.55am

DRAFT