Schools Forum

Minutes of Meeting held on Monday 2nd December

Members Present:	Jolyon Roberts Dean Brewer Gill Larocque Tyrone Myton Markie Hayden Chris Andrew Theresa Staunton Clare Cranham	Dan Bowden Sue Lenihan Dave Harvey Kate Lanning Maryssa Dako Jenny Aarons Keran Currie		
Observers Present:	Jeni Murphy Stuart Collins Shelley Davies David Rabjohns Karen Steele Stephen Hehir	Cllr Maria Gatland Charles Quaye Jenny Bartlett Abioye Asimolowo Cllr Joseph Lee		
Apologies:	Fiona Robinson, Julie Evans, Cllr Amy Foster, Dermot Mooney, Priya Perera, Sharon Hemley and Alaina Packer-Searle			
Elected Chair: Elected Vice Chair:	Jolyon Roberts Gill Larocque			
Clerk:	Mori Bates			

ltem	Detail	Lead/ Action
1.	Welcome & Apologies	JR
	Apologies received by MB from FR, JE, CllrAF, DM, PP, SHem & APS	
2.	Minutes & Actions – Meeting 10 th June 2024	JR
	Minutes, actions, and matters arising from last meeting 7 th October 2024	
	Summary of comments made in reference to the previous minutes:	
	2.1 Feb'24 minutes: Under Q3/A3, relating to children under the category of Support for Inclusion/Home Education, PP will circulate information requested around this – ACTION PP	PP
	2.2 Jun'24 minutes: Under 4.18, SP will circulate the questionnaire feedback on SALT within authority – ACTION SHem	SHem

	 Clerk also amended other errors with formatting, phrasing and SPAG. 					
	2.3 Oct'24: Regarding an updated on the Maintained Nursery School Balances & Deficit Recovery, the paper has been deferred until January. When questioned about the current status of the MNSs, SD confirmed that the Executive Mayor in Cabinet approved the MNS model in order to sustain the MNS ACTION – MNS Paper added to Jan'25 agenda					
	2.4 Addition #1: It was noted that the grouping of the clusters in connection to the therapies proposal have been readjusted to reflect the clusters of the CLSS.					
	2.5 Addition #2: SD is in the process of arranging a meeting with health colleagues and forum members, so all interested parties should email SD directly if they would like to attend. The meeting itself will benefit from clear steering from both schools and support from the current contract.					
3.	Sufficiency Paper	JM				
	3.1 JM presented a Sufficiency Paper for informational purposes and points to note in connection to the distribution of the Early Years Budget Grant.					
	3.2 The take up of funding is going well and the places are being provided for those children. At present, take up is higher than the DfE predictions, with the exceptions of the 3&4 YOs.					
	3.3 Money from the EYBG will have been paid on the 29 th November. Croydon received £167,094 for all providers and an additional £58,188 for the MNS. Table 1 showed the grant distribution using figures from the Autumn headcount. The aim is to maintain the MNS distribution showing a rate per child. JM confirmed that they are currently working on ways to support the expansion of the wards shown in Table 3.					
	 Q1: DH: Is the money from the EYBG likely to make a difference to the MNS? A1: JM: The MNS will then get two lots of funding – one from Universal and the other from the MNS supplementary grant. 					
	Q2: CC: What are the reasons for the differences in the figures shown in Table 3?					
	 A2a: JM: It could be the number of providers operating within each ward, or the DfE calculations relating to the number of children. A2b: SD: Croydon also has different types of Early Years providers which 					
	allows parents to select the most appropriate provision for their child.					
	3.4 CC noted that there are impacts of the dataset shown in Table 3 on primary school places of which JM confirmed it is possible to overlap the data and map it out for reference in terms of place distribution across the age ranges.					
	3.5 Recommendation C was noted by members of Forum and the proposed					

	distribution method agreed upon as to money being distributed on a per child basis.						
4.	DSG 25/26 & Formula Factors						
	v v L c	4.1 CQ presented the paper on Formula Factors, adding that for the factors where it had been previously voted to move to the NFF we are then unable to move out of this as the DfE does not allow this. Therefore, votes were being taking on the non NFF decisions e.g. IDACI Band A, Lump Sum, PFI, MFG, Growth, Split Site and LAC, with the disapplication request to support the High Needs Block safety valve also to be discussed at the meeting.					
	r			and the Schools' Bl			
	 4.3 CQ drew the attention of Forum to 2.2 of the paper, explaining that the variation shown in column 4 may change as figures are confirmed and grants are being rolled in. 4.4 The Chair commented that upon analysis of column C and D of Appendix C that the primary schools are not benefitting from the uplift as much as secondary schools, when any uplift should have been standard and across all educational settings. He noted that on the very small £3M uplift last year 100% went to secondary. Highlighted sections here indicate the recommendations from the Schools' Block Working Group. 						
	No.	Formula Factor	Approval type 24/25	Options	Voting Result		
	3.1	Minimum per pupil funding	To note	Compulsory factor	N/A – Forum noted		
	3.2	Age weighted pupil unit (Basic Entitlement)	To note	Compulsory factor	N/A – Forum noted		
	3.3	Deprivation – IDACI	BAND B-F – NFF was applied last year (NFF). No change required BAND A – Above NFF rate was applied	 A) Keeping to the IDACI "A" above the NFF rates as last year B) Move IDACI "A" to NFF 	15 votes in favour of option A. Option A is carried.		
	3.4	Deprivation – FSM & FSM6	Moved to NFF last year. No change required				
	3.5	Low Prior Attainment	Moved to NFF last year. No change				
			required. Moved to NFF last				

3.7	Lump Sum	Above NFF rate was applied last	A)	Stay at above NFF rate per	15 votes in favour of option A.
		year	B)	<mark>school</mark> Move to the NFF	Option A is carried.
3.8	Mobility	Moved to NFF last year. No change required.			
(f £ r r t	Group that there factor are not bein equally. A recom 2500K. In the ev nave to complete money is required to undertake thein	PFI factor, it was n is a slight issue wh ng shared to ensur mendation was giv ent that the school the DfE Affordabil d. This would ensu r role with better in ncern for the impa-	iere re th req ity r ure (form	by information re lat all schools and to reduce the ag uire further fund nodel and explai greater transpare nation.	elating to this e being treated reed amount to ing, they would n why additional ency for Forum
c a s k	of the school. Fo a decision that we school. Various r know whether this	llowing on from thi ould not disadvanta members gave the s will disadvantage elling exercise wou	s, S age ir op the	D said that Foru the children atte pinion that we sir school and a co	m should make nding this nply do not ompleted
 4.7 It is also important to know how the money is being spent. T M added that we do not know how much is needed. If a conversation were to start up with the involved parties, then the Forum would have a clearer understanding of how much money the PFI school needs. 3.9 Private Finance Last year £573K A) Inflationary 1 vote in favour of 					
t s	that we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K	eed en t the	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need	tion were to have a clearer
t s	hat we do not kn start up with the i understanding of	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money	eed en t the	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate Stay the same as	tion were to have a clearer ls.
t s	that we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance Initiative – base	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K	eedo en t the A) B)	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate	tion were to have a clearer s. 1 vote in favour of A 14 votes in favour of C, to adjust the
t s	that we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance Initiative – base	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K was agreed To agree part of the DfE model – limits reduced to between	 eedden t en t the A) B) C) A) B) 	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate Stay the same as last year's rate Adjust the figure	tion were to have a clearer ls. 1 vote in favour of A 14 votes in favour of C, to adjust the figure to £500K. Option C is carried. 15 votes for 0% Option B is
t s J 3.9	that we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance Initiative – base rate increase Minimum Funding Guarantee Growth (Primary Growth Factor Value*) New DfE minimum	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K was agreed To agree part of the DfE model – limits	 eedden t en t the A) B) C) A) B) 	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate Stay the same as last year's rate Adjust the figure in question -0.5% 0% 0.5% Agree to keep the same criteria and methodology 24/25 Request a	tion were to have a clearer ls. 1 vote in favour of A 14 votes in favour of C, to adjust the figure to £500K. Option C is carried. 15 votes for 0% Option B is carried. 15 votes to keep using the same criteria and methodology
t s u 3.9 3.10 3.11	hat we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance Initiative – base rate increase Minimum Funding Guarantee Growth (Primary Growth Factor Value*) New DfE minimum funding level/value payable per pupil to schools	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K was agreed To agree part of the DfE model – limits reduced to between -0.5% and 0.5% No changes in the Criteria for growth 25/26 Primary growth factor value* (£1,550 x number of pupils x ACA)	 eedden t the A) B) C) A) B) C) A) B) B) 	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate Stay the same as last year's rate Adjust the figure in question -0.5% 0% 0.5% Agree to keep the same criteria and methodology 24/25 Request a meeting to review last year's criteria and methodology	tion were to have a clearer ls. 1 vote in favour of A 14 votes in favour of C, to adjust the figure to £500K. Option C is carried. 15 votes for 0% Option B is carried. 15 votes to keep using the same criteria and methodology Option A is carried.
t s u 3.9 3.10	hat we do not kn start up with the i understanding of Private Finance Initiative – base rate increase Minimum Funding Guarantee Growth (Primary Growth Factor Value*) New DfE minimum funding level/value payable per	ow how much is ne nvolved parties, the how much money Last year £573K was agreed To agree part of the DfE model – limits reduced to between -0.5% and 0.5% No changes in the Criteria for growth 25/26 Primary growth factor value* (£1,550 x number	 eedden t the A) B) C) A) B) C) A) B) A) 	ed. If a conversa he Forum would PFI school need Inflationary increase of 2.3% (DfE rate) to be applied to last year's rate Stay the same as last year's rate Adjust the figure in question -0.5% 0% 0.5% Agree to keep the same criteria and methodology 24/25 Request a meeting to review last year's criteria	tion were to have a clearer ls. 1 vote in favour of A 14 votes in favour of C, to adjust the figure to £500K. Option C is carried. 15 votes for 0% Option B is carried. 15 votes to keep using the same criteria and methodology Option A is

			Croydon				
	3.14 Looked After Children	DfE has removed this factor. Schools' Forum agreed to fund these services last year – the LA distributed £167K through this factor in previous years.	Please note: Schools' Forum last year agree to fund the £167K LAC through de- delegation process from the growth budget which forms part of the Schools' Block.	Schools' Forum agreed to continue to fund virtual schools via a de-delegation amount equal to last year.			
	4.8 <u>Disapplication Request:</u> A vote is required to carry out a £1.2m block transfer from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block as part of the Safety Valve agreement. This transfer will enable the LA to receive the next instalment of the safety valve payments that will help to continue reducing the High Need Block overspend.						
	 4.9 The Schools' Block recommendation – majority of members of this working group were in favour of the transfer. 4.10 SD explained that the £1.2m goes into the High Needs Block where it can go towards various projects and elements of High Needs support for children and young people. This budget helps to support the needs of the children across all settings, including ELPs and mainstream schools. 						
	 4.11 The Vote: 13 members voted in favour of the transfer, with two members abstaining from the vote. Forum Agreed on the disapplication request to transfer £1.2m from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block. 						
5.	Working Group U	odates			TS/FR/ TM		
	up in 2025 b) Schools Block	ctions pending fron - Meeting centred a	ting Groups n the working group around Formula Fac vith a finance paper	tors			
6.	Any Other Busines	S			All		
		s service, knowledg	orum showed appre ge and numerous pa well.				

Meeting Adjourned: 11:40am Date of next meeting: Monday 27th January F10, Town Hall