

Birmingham Schools Forum

Thursday 20th January 2022

2pm – 4pm

Remote meeting via MS Teams

Present:	<p>James Hill Mainstream Academy Representative Chair Maxine Charles Maintained Primary HT representative Claire Williams Maintained Primary HT representative Mike White Academies Representative Nicola Redhead Academies Representative (Alternative Provision) Sara Reece PVI representative Denise Fountain Maintained Special HT Chris Wilson Special Academies representative Mike Dunn Maintained Secondary HT David Room Teacher Associations Sally Leese Maintained Nursery HT. Karen Mackenzie Maintained Primary governor Pam Garrington Maintained Primary Governor Mashuq Ally Maintained Secondary Governor Gillian Gregory Maintained Special School Governor Steve Howell PRU Representative City of Birmingham School</p> <p>Tim Boyes CEO BEP</p> <p>Lisa Fraser BCC Assistant Director for Education and Early Years Sue Harrison Director Education and Skills BCC Julie Beattie Education and Skills Fair Funding BCC. Clare Sandland Finance Business Partner BCC. Lindsey Trivett Head of Early Years and Childcare Service Xiao-Ming Hu Finance Manager Education and Skills BCC Lucy Dumbleton Principal Officer - Pupil Place Planning BCC (left the meeting at 3.05pm) Jaspal Maddahar BCC (left the meeting at 3.05pm) Cllr Sharon Thompson.</p> <p>By invitation: Malcolm Green Strategic Finance Manager – Schools Herefordshire Council</p> <p>Observer: Pauline McKenna Director of Support Services Federation of Cherry Oak School, Victoria School & Victoria College.</p> <p>In attendance: Janice Moorhouse (clerk)</p>
-----------------	--

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
1.1	<p>The Chair welcomed members and officers to the meeting.</p> <p><u>Apologies</u>: apologies for absence received from Claire Henebury Maintained Nursery HT, Catriona Savage PVI representative and Jaswinder Didially Head of Service Education Infrastructure BCC</p> <p>Absent: Janet Dugmore Support Staff Union representative and Makeda Jeffers Maintained Primary Governor</p>	
2.	Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 9th December 2021	
2.1	<p>The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Pam Garrington reported meeting papers were issued in an acceptable timeline and thanked officers.</p> <p>Pam Garrington requested the same standard be achieved for the circulation of papers for technical funding meetings.</p> <p>The Chair reported several members did not join the technical funding meeting held on 13th January as no papers/updates were received in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: The Chair requested that, in future, papers be circulated one week in advance of the meeting.</p>	LA/X-M H
3.	Matters arising from the minutes.	
3.1	<p><u>Item 3.1</u>: the Chair to work with Clare Sandland in relation to identified actions regarding DLP and High Needs funding. Chair stated to be reported at the March meeting.</p> <p><u>Item 3.2</u>: academy representation: Lisa Fraser to follow up. Lisa Fraser reported nomination letters had gone out to CEOs/Chairs of Trustees of academies with School Forum members cc'd into the message.</p> <p><u>Item 5.4</u>: Central Schools Services Block: an update related to the Early Years block clawback to be provided for Schools Forum at the January meeting. Julie Beattie reported this was covered in the Central Schools Services Block paper.</p> <p><u>Item 6.7</u>: Growth fund and falling pupil proposals: a report on the 2020/21 spend to be presented at the next meeting. Lucy Dumbleton stated ACTION the 2020/21 spend would be reported at the next meeting. The Chair stated information was needed on incremental growth year on year.</p>	LA/JD/ LD
4.	LA update	

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
4.1	<p>Lisa Fraser reported information and details on how to access the Covid 19 workforce fund for schools was available on School Noticeboard. There were challenges related to supply cover for teachers' absences.</p> <p>Corporate finance was very tight with a £4.2m overspend at year end. Delivering 78% of in year savings (aim of 80%).</p>	
4.2	<p>Sue Harrison thanked members for the responses to the consultation on the School Improvement Grant.</p>	
5.	Growth fund and Falling Pupils fund 2022/23	

5.1	<p><u>Growth Fund:</u> Growth Fund 2022/23 For Decision and Growth Fund 2022/23 changes made by the Department for Education (DFE) to National Growth Fund Allocations to Local Authorities circulated before the meeting.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u> Funding for growth to meet basic need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Forum agree the criteria and rates as set out in the report <p>Funding for growth re transfer of pupil numbers due to school closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools Forum agree to an approach whereby in the exceptional circumstance of a school /phase closure the funding rate for transferred pupils is tailored to individual school and pupil circumstances subject to sufficient funding within the retained School Budget Share from the closing school or closing school phase <p>Funding for new schools or new school phases to meet basic need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Forum agree the criteria and rates as set out in the report and appendix • Implicit growth: £3.669m • Explicit growth: £0.987m <p>Total Growth Fund decisions: £4.656m</p>	
5.2	<p>Lucy Dumbleton reported Local Authorities were permitted to retain funding to support Primary and Secondary schools (including Academies and Free Schools) with significant in-year growth in pupil numbers from Reception to year 11.</p> <p>The growth fund must not be used to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - schools in financial difficulty or general growth due to popularity (managed through lagged funding) <p>None of the Growth Fund was retained or used by the LA for any other purposes</p>	
5.3	<p><u>2022/23 Basic Need Growth Fund Requirement:</u> Lucy Dumbleton reported maintained schools and academies might admit additional pupils' part way through a financial year.</p> <p>Proposal: Growth Fund to provide sufficient school places set at £4.656m for 2022/23 to accommodate ongoing and new expansion projects to address demand during 2022/23.</p> <p><u>Funding for new schools or new school phases to meet Basic Need</u></p> <p>In calculating individual schools' funding formula from DSG, Birmingham City Council proposed to allocate funding from September 2023 through School Budget Share by using forecast pupils in the Fair Funding formula. Growth Fund would be targeted for each new intake and for any additional classes opening across multiple year groups. New schools to be funded at PAN to reflect the agreed new intake.</p>	
5.4	<p>Karen Mckenzie commented that money was accounted for in the budget allocation and a decision made by the LA.</p> <p>Jaspal Madahar stated the schools with in-year explicit growth to be funded from the growth funding pot paid directly to schools.</p> <p>Lucy Dumbleton reported the majority of funding was implicit growth for September maintained sector bulge classes with a higher pupil rate.</p>	
5.5	<p>Mike Dunn, referring to new schools being funded at above PAN, asked if this continued into the second year.</p> <p>Lucy Dumbleton confirmed it would continue. Funding would be adjusted if a new school took over PAN on appeals. If above PAN, the school would be funded on the following year's census through the national funding formula.</p>	
5.6	<p><u>Recommendations</u> Members voted by a show of hands</p>	

	<p>Funding for growth to meet Basic Need; increased births and in-year cohort growth from migration agree the criteria and rates as set out: disagree 0 agree 10</p> <p>Funding for growth in pupil numbers resulting from school closure agree to the approach: disagree 0 agree majority</p> <p>Funding for new schools or new school phases to meet Basic Need agree the criteria and rates as set out disagree 1 agree 10</p> <p><u>Falling pupil fund</u> Falling Pupils Fund 2022/23 For decision circulated before the meeting. <u>Purpose:</u> to seek approval to an allocation for 2022/23 and criteria against which the allocations would be determined. Funding allocated to schools for one-year with no ongoing commitment to fund further surplus places in future years.</p> <p><u>Decisions:</u> Changes to existing criterion: The criterion for 2022/23 had been amended and improved upon to address schools in most need. Decision on whether to fund good or outstanding schools only or allow a request for disapplication of Ofsted criterion Decision to fund the rate at 100% Age Weighted Pupil Unit or 75% AWPU Noted: options required funding between minimum of £0.556 to £1.061</p>	
5.7	<p>Lucy Dumbleton reported LAs able to top slice the DSG to create a small fund to support good schools with falling rolls where local planning data showed that surplus places would be required within the next three financial years. The fund applied to all schools including Academies. For 2021/22, the fund was set at £0.546m.</p>	
5.8	<p><u>Proposed allocation:</u> Following a review of October 2020 and 2021 census and forecast expectations for next year, Lucy Dumbleton requested to increase the allocation to up to £1m for 2022/23, including £0.272m for 5/12 of the funding for existing business cases received in 2021/22.</p> <p>Members noted that forecasts indicated numbers in primary year groups would fall by 2,000 pupils between 2021-22 and 2022-23 and school capacity needed to be retained to ensure sufficiency in areas where there were minimal surplus places or robust expectations around in-year growth (such as in areas of temporary accommodation or local regeneration/housing.)</p>	
5.9	<p>Referring to the criteria for support only being available to a school that did not have a surplus balance in excess of 5% of its school budget share as at 31st March 2021 and 31st March 2022 (or the relevant academic years in the case of academies), Lucy Dumbleton requested approval for the change from the historical 8% for primary schools.</p>	
5.10	<p>Referring to the request to apply to the DfE for the disapplication of the mandatory requirement for support to be available to a school to be judged to be Good or Outstanding at the last Ofsted inspection, Pam Garrington commented that, for some schools, it was some time since the last inspection and asked, regarding a business case for each school, what criteria would be used for assessment.</p>	LA/LD
5.11	<p>Lucy Dumbleton stated the school would be assessed against the rest of the proposed criteria. Modelling had looked at a school that could apply that did not meet the Ofsted criteria. Steve Howells asked if the disapplication was permanent of a year on year decision. ACTION: Lucy Dumbleton to clarify.</p>	

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
5.12	<p>Karen Mckenzie commented the falling rolls funding of £1m was included in the NFF funding and, therefore, had an impact on the NFF decision. The £311k surplus was a proper surplus that could be allocated. If members did not agree that less than good/outstanding schools were included, the £311,000 surplus would be higher.</p> <p><u>Changes to existing criterion</u> The Chair proposed the surplus balance for primary schools should not be changed from 5% to 8%. This would impact on smaller primary schools. On a show of hands, nine members supported the proposal made by the Chair</p> <p>The Chair requested ACTION modelling for 5% and 8% be provided.</p> <p><u>Disapplication of Ofsted criterion</u> Option B(i) 100% AWPU agree 10</p>	LA/LD
6.	National Funding Formula and Minimum Funding Guarantee proposals	

	<p>Mainstream Schools Funding Formula and Minimum Funding Guarantee 2022/23 (circulated before the meeting)</p> <p>For Decision</p> <p>In comparison, Option 1 gives higher value to primary schools, whilst Option 2 and Option 3 requires capping and scaling to be affordable. Option 4 maintains the MFG at 2% and does not apply capping or scaling to schools</p> <p>Member noted the LA recommendation: Option 4.</p>	
6.1	<p>Xiao-Ming Hu requested approval for the allocation of the national funding formula factor values and the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) at 2% as part of the mainstream school funding formula for 2022/23 and agreement to the preferred option for allocating the additional £311,020 available after applying the National Funding Formula.</p>	
6.2	<p>The total allocation as at 16th December 2021 was £1,031,442,395 including £7,909,491 National Non Domestic Rates (more commonly known as Business Rates) within the premises factor, or £1,023,532,904 excluding NNDR.</p> <p>The LA had applied NFF rate in the Authority Proforma Tool and modelled four different options to allocate the £311,020 funding available after applying the NFF.</p>	
6.3	<p>Option 1: An additional £7.78 per pupil added to the primary AWPU to reflect the higher value paid in 2021/22, MFG @2% with no capping or scaling. This option results in total costs of £1,031,442,038 with £357 as a balancing figure.</p> <p>Option 2: An additional £81 per primary AWPU to follow DfE guidance in reducing over-NFF payment by 10% each year. This is only affordable with MFG @1.91% with capping at 1.91% and scaling at 24.06%.</p> <p>Option 3: An additional £45 per primary AWPU as a mid-point between the NFF and last year's primary AWPU. This is only affordable with MFG @1.91% with capping at 1.91% and scaling at 11.41%.</p> <p>Option 4: Share the £311k surplus equally between primary and secondary phase with an additional £4.69 per pupil for primary schools, and £3.53 per pupil for secondary schools, MFG at 2% with no capping or scaling.</p> <p>This option results in total cost of £1,031,442,141, with £254 as a balancing figure.</p>	
6.4	<p>Xiao-Ming Hu reported every school to receive a minimum of £5,525 per-pupil funding for secondary schools and £4,265 for primary schools (KS3: £5,321, KS4: £5,831) and this was reflected in the APT.</p> <p>In addition to applying the rate specified in NFF guidance, the following factors were increased in the APT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - De Delegation: increased by 3% in line with general NFF factor increase rate - Split sites: increased by 3% in line with general NFF factor increase rate - PFI top ups for PPP1 schools: increase by 7.2% in line with Office for National Statistics published RPI(X) rate at November 2021. 	
6.5	<p>With the primary AWPU rate at £3,217 and MFG at 2% with no capping or scaling, the NFF base model had a total cost of £1,031,131,375 with £311,020 to allocate.</p>	
6.6	<p>The Chair stated members accepted the NFF had been adopted /used and no concerns were raised.</p> <p>The Chair reported the LA were recommending option 4.</p> <p>On a show of hands, six members agreed and three members disagreed.</p>	

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
	The Chair stated option 4 agreed on a majority vote.	
7.	De-delegation proposals 2022/23	
	De-delegated Budgets 2022/23(circulated before the meeting) For Approval from Forum members representing LA maintained primary and secondary schools: LA proposal to de-delegate for three areas of commitments unchanged from 2021/22. 2022/23 unit rate increased by 3%. De-delegation not applicable to special schools or the PRU.	
7.1	Xiao-Ming Hu reported the three areas were <u>Contingencies</u> to fund residual costs arising from the opening/closing of schools, deficits of discontinued schools, schools in financial difficulties, and other expenditure where the circumstances were unforeseen. <u>Facilities Time</u> : enabling the costs of releasing city-wide union representatives. Shared between schools so not falling disproportionately on the staffing of a small number of schools with these representatives. <u>Behavioural Support Services</u> : part of helping to sustain inclusion. The budget will allow resourcing of short-term programmes and preventative type work via the City of Birmingham School to continue while alternative models are developed.	
7.2	<u>Recommendations</u> School Forum to agree the allocations for 2022/23 as outlined in Appendix 2 circulated before the meeting. Members noted the actual total figures were subject to change due to academisation.	
7.3	Contingencies: Primary: agreed as proposed. Secondary agreed as proposed. Facilities time: Primary: agreed as proposed. Secondary agreed as proposed. Behavioural Support Services: Primary agreed as proposed.	
8.	Central Schools Services Block proposals 2022/23	

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
8.1	<p>Central School Services Block Allocations 2022-23 circulated before the meeting Report for decision. Information on benchmarking, details of admissions, safeguarding and early help and spend on statutory functions circulated before the meeting</p> <p>Julie Beattie reported the CSSB funded LAs for statutory duties both maintained schools and academies and brought together funding for ongoing responsibilities such as admissions, funding previously allocated through the retained duties element of the education services grant (ESG) and residual agreed funding for historic commitments. the CSSB did not include funding for any central front-line budgets and commitments held in the Early Years and High Needs blocks.</p>	
8.2	<p>Indicative 2022/23 allocation: £8.303m – a reduction of £9.981m from 2021/22. The LA had lost £10.0m relating to Equal Pay commitments (now ceased) and 20% of funding for remaining historical commitments.</p> <p>Historic commitments referred to spend back to 2013/14 and were difficult to track back but seemed to equate to equal pay (manual and non-manual), school improvement, nursery redundancies and early help / brokerage.</p> <p>The LA had gained 4.5% for its other responsibilities.</p>	
8.3	<p>Julie Beattie reported the funding for ongoing commitments within the CSSB allocation had been increased by 4.5% in 2022/23. To fund the remaining historic commitments at the same level as in 2021/22, £0.894m of the funding allocated for ongoing commitments needed to be utilised. There were three options for allocating the remaining budget.</p>	
8.4	<p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>Julie Beattie requested members agreed the allocations for 2022/23 option 2 as outlined in Appendix 1 circulated before the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the £1m against school improvement was the contract with Birmingham Education Partnership.</p> <p>Lisa Fraser confirmed it was the BEP contract and stated the current contract was £1.08m; the LA funding £80k.</p> <p>On a show of hands, ten members agreed the allocations. No members disagreed.</p>	
8.5	<p>Schools Forum request the Local Authority continued discussions with DfE regarding exempting the £0.660m budget (that funds prudential borrowing to cover school equal pay costs for manual staff) from the 20% funding reduction calculations of the CSSB.</p> <p>On a show of hands, members supported the request</p> <p>The Local Authority agreed to review the funding arrangements for historic commitments and will consult with Schools Forum in the Autumn term 2022 regarding plans on how these can be reduced.</p> <p>On a show of hands, members supported the request</p> <p>Clare Sandland reported the autumn term papers to include a breakdown on current school improvement spending and spending over time.</p>	
9.	Early Years Rates review 2022/23	

	<p>Early Years Rate Review 2022-23 (including projection for 23/24 and 24/25) circulated before the meeting For Information/Agreement</p> <p>9.1 Lindsey Trivett stated the report circulated to Schools forum as draft had received the appropriate sign off by Early Years Forum at the meeting held on Wednesday 19th January as was no longer in draft form. ACTION: final report to be sent to the clerk for circulation.</p> <p>9.2 Lindsey Trivett presented the report detailing the findings of the Early Years Rates Review Group and recommending the amendments to be made to the Early Years DSG Funding for the 3-year financial period 2022-2023; 23-24; and 24-25. Lindsey Trivett reported the Task and Finish group confirmed the reported was representative of the groups' discussions. There had been an open invitation to all to join the task and finish group. Members noted the review had been aligned to allocations within the Central Government. Spending Review that covered the period of three years. The review and recommendations were to cover the whole 3-year period with an annual review.</p> <p>9.3 Lindsey Trivett reported HM Treasury had announced a three-year settlement for 2022 – 2025 that included a commitment to additional Early Years funding over each of the next three years through the national formula. Nationally the additional investment in early years education had been confirmed as £160m in 2022/23; £180m in 2023/24; and £170m in 2024/25. This would mean an increase on the hourly per child rate in the national formula paid to the LA for two, three- and four-year olds.</p> <p>9.4 <u>Recommendations</u> That Early Years Forum supported the recommendations for Schools Forum to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that the current level (£2.95m) of funding will be retained centrally to support the Councils delivery of the Statutory Duties for early years, incrementally increasing over the next 3 years to the 5% the LA is able to retain. <p>Lindsey Trivett reported a slight increase to retained funding in 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain the current level of Deprivation and FSM supplements as set out in section 5.1. of the report <p>Lindsey Trivett reported an increased rate for all children would benefit those living in deprived areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase the amount allocated to ISEY over the next 3 years, maintaining the current level of £1m (noting that £0.25m is held within the centrally retained element), increasing to £1.5m in 23/24 and 1.75m in 24/25 as set out in section 5.2 of the report. To also note the request for the increase to be matched over the 3-year period from the High Needs Block. £500k to be set aside in the 22/23 financial year. ▪ Agree the funding rates to be applied to providers as set out for the next year in sections 5.3 and 5.4. of the report ▪ Note the requirement for all rates to be confirmed as part of an annual review in line with the Early Years block allocation <p>On a show of hands, nine members supported all the recommendations.</p> <p>9.5 The Chair thanked Lindsey Trivett for her excellent presentation and the members of Early Years Forum. Sara Reece reported the task and finish group completed a cohesive, challenging and constructive piece of work and thanked the LA, Lindsey Trivett and her team. Lindsey Trivett thanked Sara Reece and the Chair for their comments.</p>	<p>LT/clerk</p>
--	--	-----------------

1.	Welcome and apologies for absence.	
10.	High Needs update	
10.1	Proposal: High Needs update to be brought to the March meeting. Pauline Maddison had been in contact with special schools regarding setting up a technical group meeting for the High Needs block in February with papers circulated well in advance of the meeting date.	
10.2	The findings from the audit by CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) should be ready for presentation at the next meeting.	
10.3	Denise Fountain stated that it would be good for schools to know what they would be receiving as High Needs funding for 2022/23 and where money had gone over the previous two years. A co-production on High Needs funding would be welcomed. Denise Fountain stated she had questions related to budget proposals and hoped to get answers at the technical funding meeting.	
11.	Any Other Business	
11.1	Malcolm Green, referring to the Falling Pupil fund, stated an immediate decision was required regarding the changing the criteria to 8% as this would increase expenditure above the available funding of £1.06m.	
11.2	The Chair asked members to vote on confirming the allocation at the available £1.06m for 2022/23, including £0.272m for 5/12 of the funding for existing business cases received in 2021/22 On a show of hands, ten members agreed.	
10.3	ACTION: to be taken back to a Technical Funding meeting to discuss how to ensure spending remains within the £1.06m funding envelope agreed by Forum. Clare Sandland proposed that, at the next meeting, the plan/activities for each Schools Forum and Technical Funding meeting were discussed. The Chair thanked members for their patience regarding the circulation of meeting papers and the LA for responding to requests and circulating papers on time.	Chair/LA
	The meeting closed at 4pm	