

Birmingham Schools Forum

Thursday 10th March 2022

2pm – 4pm

Remote meeting via MS Teams

Present:	<p>Claire Henebury Maintained nursery school Head Teacher representative Maxine Charles Maintained Primary school Headteacher representative Claire Williams Maintained Primary school Headteacher representative Vicky Nussey Maintained primary school Head Teacher representative (joined the meeting at 2.40pm) Mike Dunn Maintained secondary school Head Teacher representative Denise Fountain Maintained special school Head Teacher representative James Hill Mainstream Academies Representative Chair Mike White Mainstream Academies Representative Chris Wilson Special Academies representative (joined the meeting at 2.40pm) Nicola Redhead Alternative provision academies representative (joined the meeting at 2.39pm) Karen Mackenzie Maintained Primary governor representative Pam Garrington Maintained Primary Governor representative Mashuq Ally Maintained Secondary Governor representative Gillian Gregory Maintained Special School Governor representative David Room Non-school representative (nominated by Teacher Associations) Janet Dugmore Non-school representative (Associations representing support staff working within schools) Jackie Howse Non-school representative (nominated by the PVI Early Years providers) Jyoti Jaspal Non-school representative (nominated by the PVI Early Years providers {substitute for Sara Reece})</p> <p>Tim Boyes CEO Birmingham Education Partnership Technical Observer</p> <p>Lisa Fraser BCC Assistant Director for Education and Early Years Pauline Maddison Interim Assistant Director for SEND, Inclusion and Wellbeing Julie Beattie Children and Families Directorate Fair Funding BCC. Clare Sandland Finance Business Partner BCC. Xiao-Ming Hu Finance Manager Children and Families Directorate BCC Jaspal Madahar Resources and Finance Manager Education Infrastructure BCC (joined the meeting at 2.42pm) Jaswinder Didiially Head of Service Education Infrastructure Birmingham City Council (joined the meeting at 2.42pm)</p> <p>By invitation: Malcolm Green Strategic Finance Manager – Schools Herefordshire Council Daniel Dawson Senior Commissioning and Finance Officer SEN Assessment and Review (SENAR)</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 Steve Howell Pupil Referral Unit representative, Makeda Jeffers Maintained Primary Governor representative, Sara Reece Non-school representative (nominated by the PVI Early Years providers), Sue Harrison Director Children and Families Directorate, Dave Worledge Mainstream Academies Representative, Colin Townsend Mainstream Academies Representative and Les Lawrence Mainstream Academies Representative</p> <p>Absent: Cllr Jayne Francis Non-school representative (nominated by Cabinet member with primary responsibility for education)</p>	
2.	Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 20th January 2022	
2.1	The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
3.	Matters arising from the minutes.	
3.1	<p><u>Item 2.1</u>: The Chair requested that, in future, papers be circulated one week in advance of the meetings.</p> <p>The Chair stated that papers and reports were received in advance of meeting but not the full seven days before. It was agreed that ACTION papers, reports etc should be emailed to the clerk by 2pm on the Thursday before the meeting.</p> <p>Growth fund and falling pupil proposals: a report on the 2020/21 spend to be presented at the next meeting. See item 5: actions update</p> <p><u>Item 5.11</u> 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.</p> <p>Steve Howells asked if the disapplication was permanent of a year on year decision.</p> <p>See item 5: actions update</p> <p><u>Item 5.12</u>: The Chair proposed the surplus balance for primary schools should not be changed from 5% to 8% and requested modelling on the impact of reducing the primary schools' surplus balance availability from 8% to 5% be presented.</p> <p>See item 5: actions update</p> <p>Item 9.1 Early Years Rates review 2022/23</p> <p>Final report to be sent to the clerk for circulation. Action not completed. ACTION: Clerk to follow up with Lindsey Trivett.</p> <p>The Chair reported that, apart from the one held for the High Needs block, a technical funding meeting had not been held.</p>	<p>LA</p> <p>clerk</p>
4.	LA update	

4.1	<p><u>Support staff pay rise update</u> Lisa Fraser reported the support staff NJC pay award had been agreed, would be processed through the payroll in March 2022 and back dated to April 21. The award was for an increase of 1.75% except for point 1 which would receive an increase of 2.75%. This applied only to all BCC maintained schools where BCC was the employer.</p>	
4.2	<p>For schools where BCC was not the employer, the increase would only be applicable if the school had adopted the NJC pay framework. The school would need to confirm with HR and Payroll/ or the external payroll provider regarding when the backpay element would be paid. Lisa Fraser reported that any further pay award for April 2022 onwards would be covered by separate negotiations.</p>	
4.3	<p><u>Teachers' Pay document</u> Lisa Fraser reported the document published on Friday 4th March included potential scenarios for pay for September 2022 and September 2023. 2022 pay award: Government evidence to the STRB (publishing.service.gov.uk) The document set out the intention regarding starting pay and for staff on MPS1 – MPS6 and provided an indication of the potential increase for all other teaching staff including UPS and Leadership. Members noted the document had not been agreed but did provide schools with the potential costings to provide stability for budget planning purposes.</p>	
4.4	<p><u>National Insurance Increase from April 2022.</u> Lisa Fraser reported the increase would impact on both the employers and the employees National Insurance contributions. The Employers costs would increase by 1.25% from April 2022.</p>	
4.5	<p><u>Supplementary Grant</u> Covid Related Supply Costs claim form Lisa Fraser reported school level allocations had not been published for 2022/2023. Schools would be notified via Schools Noticeboard once available (indicated as May 22)</p>	
4.6	<p><u>Covid Related Supply Costs claim form</u> Coronavirus (COVID-19) workforce fund for schools - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) The date for claiming funding to support schools facing significant staff absences and financial pressures with the costs of staff cover had recently been extended to 8th April 2022. The claim form to be available in April.</p>	
4.7	<p><u>Individual School Budget Share notifications.</u> Lisa Fraser reported Section 251 for maintained Primary and Secondary schools had been publicised on the BCC webpage. The budget briefing document would be publicised shortly. Maintained Early Years and Special schools allocations were still awaiting publication as these settings had a later publication date each year.</p> <p><u>Three year Budget plan.</u> The deadline for the submission of the signed budget plan from maintained schools to Schools Financial Services was 31st May 2022.</p>	

5.	Growth fund and Falling rolls	
5.1	<p>Jaswinder Didi ally presented an 'Actions Update' shown on screen at the meeting Primary Surplus Budget.</p> <p>Jaswinder Didi ally reported currently in the process of modelling the impact of reducing the primary schools' surplus balance availability from 8% to 5%.</p> <p>ACTION: work on modelling to be presented at the next technical group meeting.</p>	LA/JD
5.2	<p>OfSTED ratings</p> <p>Jaswinder Didi ally reported the query had been raised with the DfE. No response to date.</p>	
5.3	<p>Update on 2021/22 Growth Funding and Falling Pupil Budget</p> <p>Jaspal Madahar reported the budget agreed by School Forum was a total of £5,067,000. £2,672,395 was implicit growth for 29 schools at various stages of permanent expansions. This was built into the School Budget Share as year on year growth.</p> <p>£2,389,826 was paid out as explicit growth (in year growth) to cover ten bulge expansions, five permanent expansions either for the first year of expansion or if it was not captured in implicit growth, 27 business cases (seven growth and 20 falling pupils).</p>	
5.4	<p>There were two sets of applications – one set from 2020/21 that were agreed but not paid and one from 2021/22 where the AWPU was reduced to 75% to ensure the available budget was not exceeded.</p> <p>The total spend against the budget was £5,059,879, leaving a surplus of £7,121.</p>	
5.5	<p>The Chair queried the availability of the previously requested report on surplus places/sufficiency planning.</p> <p>Jaswinder Didi ally stated the report would be available in mid-April.</p> <p>Mike Dunn reported that he had requested information/data on falling roles in secondary schools. The data received did not give cross city or ward information.</p> <p>On 18th February, he requested information on the anticipated number of surplus places available in Year 7 and had not received a reply to his query.</p> <p>ACTION: Jaswinder Didi ally to follow up. Detail on capacity to be provided.</p> <p>Jaswinder Didi ally reported planning areas were previously based on political wards. This was changed to align with the new super output areas.</p>	LA/JD
6.	2022/23 High Needs budget proposals	

	<p>2022-23 HIGH NEEDS ALLOCATION PROPOSALS circulated before the meeting.</p>	
6.1	<p><u>High Needs Block Allocation 2022-23 from DfE</u></p> <p>Julie Beattie reported a 2022/23 High Needs block allocation as at 21st December 2021 of £201,899,795.</p> <p>Supplementary funding as at December 2021 of £8,730,410.</p> <p>Total High Needs block allocation 2022/23 of £210, 630,205. A variance of £ 26,129,543</p> <p>Members noted the 2022/23 High Needs allocation was £234.7m before recoupment and £201.9m after recoupment – an increase of £21.8m gross or £17.4m net.</p> <p>In addition, supplementary funding amounting to £8.7m had been provided in 2022/23 as recognition of the additional costs local authorities and schools faced in the coming year.</p> <p>After recoupment, the total additional funding available in 2022/23 was £26.1m</p>	
6.2	<p><u>How the High Needs Block is used in Birmingham</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core funding <p>The annual allocation an institution receives either directly from the provider local authority (based on the financial year) or from ESFA (based on the academic year)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Top-up funding <p>The funding required, over and above the core funding, to enable a pupil or student with high needs to participate in education and training in a variety of institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding under a service level agreement <p>Where a service relating to SEND or Alternative Provision has been commissioned by a local authority and is delivered by an institution, the local authority can pay for that service from its high needs budget.</p>	
6.3	<p><u>High Needs Block allocation proposals for 2022/23</u></p> <p>Julie Beattie reported the proposal were to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase special school places and mainstream resource bases to meet need <p>Additional Places - £5.4m.</p> <p>Julie Beattie stated the proposed increases were not nearly enough to cover the demand, but all the LA was able to commit to in 2022/23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop the local provision model with schools working in partnership with other schools to support SEN <p>Julie Beattie reported funding for the DLP model remained at £7m for 2022/23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase resources for Speech and Language and Occupational Therapy in conjunction with Health <p>Speech and Language Therapy £2.2m and Occupational Therapy £0.2m</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase resources for children in early years settings with SEND <p>Increase in ISEY Funding £0.5m</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in services which had maximum impact and represent value for money 	
6.4	<p>Julie Beattie stated costs offset by reductions of £4.1m associated with the fall out of £3m for schools in financial difficulty and £1.1m SENAR staffing not chargeable to DSG.</p> <p>This left approximately £2.4m which would be needed for individual pupils and school places; project work to support the outcome of the national SEND review and the accelerated progress plan, particularly related to inclusion.</p>	
6.5	<p>Pam Garrington, referring to the statement that ‘the proposed increases were not nearly enough to cover the demand but all the LA was able to commit to in 2022/23’ asked the LA to quantify the statement in terms of the number of children without a school place or not in the right school place.</p>	

6.6	<p>Pam Garrington, referring to the remaining £2.4m, asked if all pupils would be catered for in an appropriate way.</p>	
6.7	<p>Pauline Maddison stated that it was difficult to be precise about the number of children involved as the numbers changed daily. Week beginning 28th February, there were 130 children without a school placed and 300 not in the right school place.</p> <p>There was a need for a more inclusive approach, to talk to school governors on what was and what was meant by inclusion and to look with Birmingham Children’s Trust and Health colleagues at the funding mechanism for funding mainstream.</p> <p>The Chair requested ACTION a rationale to the statement ‘the proposed increases were not nearly enough....’ to be added.</p>	LA
6.8	<p>Pauline Maddison stated the LA recognised that more special school places were needed and would be bidding for new schools under the Chancellor’s budget announcement along with looking at opportunities to expand existing schools.</p> <p>The resources going into mainstream for top up were insufficient and the LA recognised the need for the amounts to increase.</p>	
6.9	<p>Pam Garrington commented she understood this was a national problem. The current school staffing budgets meant that schools had to rely on their own resources to meet the needs of pupils who were struggling.</p> <p>Pauline Maddison stated that no child should be out of education and home education, although not adequate, was provided for those without a school place.</p>	
6.10	<p>Pauline Maddison stated the national review on SEND would major on mainstream taking more children and coming up with more arrangements to manage this requirement.</p> <p>Pam Garrington queried the arrangements for greater coordination between schools and those responsible for provision planning and how this would be monitored.</p> <p>Pauline Maddison stated DLP resources, teaching services resources, early help and psychology would be included as part of the inclusive approach to synchronise impact.</p>	
6.11	<p>Mike White commented on the lack of information in the papers on the allocation of the whole pot of money. There has been increases in funding over the previous three years of £25m, £25m and £31m.</p> <p>Mike White asked how the £212m allocated for the current financial year had been spent. There was pressure on mainstream. Unless funding followed individual need, schools would not cope with the pressure.</p>	
6.12	<p>Pauline Maddison stated the SEN system was broken nationally due to the Code of Practice and financial mechanisms. As the LA did not have a recovery plan, it did not qualify for extra resources. Apart from pushing up inclusion, there was nowhere to go.</p> <p>Spending in special schools for the next financial year could be shown in blocks.</p> <p>Mike White stated that, if schools were expected to help, providing information on where current funding was going would be a good starting point. A breakdown on the unallocated High Needs budget had not been included in the presentation.</p>	LA
6.13	<p>Mike White recommended ACTION a breakdown on the unallocated High Needs budget to be brought to School Forum.</p> <p>The Chair requested ACTION previous and proposed allocations of High Needs funding to be shared with School Forum.</p> <p>Pauline Maddison stated funding could be shared by blocks.</p>	LA

<p>6.14</p> <p>6.15</p>	<p>Denise Fountain stated the changes made to the top up rate to 6% were welcomed and asked how top up rates were decided.</p> <p>Dan Dawson reported decision based on autumn top up fund. Banding rates increased as more pupils were now in mainstream.</p> <p>Chris Wilson asked when schools would be notified of the increase and asked what aspect of High Needs top up was included if the rate was based on banding plus ESM plus environmental factored funding.</p> <p>Dan Dawson reported the rate was based on banding.</p> <p>ACTION: The banding rates plus 6% to be sent out to the relevant sector.</p> <p>Xiao-Ming Hu reported the notification was a part of the budget notification by 31st March.</p> <p>The Chair, referring to the High Needs Technical Group, suggested all School Forum members to be invited to future meetings.</p> <p>Pauline Maddison stated ACTION all School Forum members would be invited to future meetings of the High Needs Technical Group.</p> <p>Mike Dunn reported that, when moving to an EHCP request, professional involvement not procured by the LA was not recognised and asked if this still applied.</p> <p>Pauline Maddison stated a LA procured Educational Psychologist was statutory provision. Psychology was the most statutory piece of advice.</p> <p>The demand on certain support services including educational psychologists and therapists would be reviewed.</p> <p>The Chair queried if a school were not allocated enough Educational Psychologist provision to meet the statutory needs could the school procure further Educational Psychologist provision?</p> <p>Pauline Maddison replied locum Educational Psychologist support can be purchased</p>	<p>LA/PM DD</p> <p>PM</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>2022/23 Authority Proforma Tool – National Funding Formula final after DfE approval</p>	

7.1	<p>Mainstream Schools NFF Funding Formula 2022/23 circulated before the meeting for information.</p> <p>Report to update Schools Forum on Schools Block budget 2022-23 following full council approval on 22nd February 2022 and approval by DFE on 23rd February 2022 after validation process.</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>Xiao-Ming Hu reported Schools Forum had approved the LA proposal and recommendation on Schools' block budget allocation for mainstream schools from Reception to Year 11 that included an estimate for Growth Fund.</p> <p>The total allocation as at 16th December 2021 for Birmingham was £1,031,442,395. This included £7,909,491 national non-domestic rates (NNDR) within the premises factor or £1,023,532,904 excluding NNDR.</p>	
7.2	<p><u>Minor Adjustment after DFE validation</u></p> <p>Xiao-Ming Hu reported the DFE advised on adjustments regarding a couple of schools' NOR (for example growth already completed for a school, treatment for new school etc.) which resulted in additional funding to be shared across all schools. To ensure equal distribution, the AWPU (Age Weighted Pupil Unit) was increased equally for all primary and secondary schools by an extra £3.66 (secondary schools are higher by £0.01 due to rounding).</p> <p>There were no changes to other unit rate.</p> <p>Final AWPU rates</p> <p>Primary (Years R-6) £3,225.35</p> <p>Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9) £4,543.20</p> <p>Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11) £5,119.20</p>	
7.3	<p>Members noted the content of the table: School Block 2022-23 APT Total summary.</p> <p>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MPPF and MFG Funding Total): £1,008,451,567</p> <p>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total: £1,012,687,965</p> <p>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula: £1,029,394,188</p> <p>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding): £1,031,442,260</p> <p>Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding NNDR): £1,023,532,769</p>	
8.	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
8.1	<p>The Chair reported, during the pre-meeting, members had considered continuing to meet on MS Teams with meeting face to face. Most members had expressed a preference to continue meeting virtually with, perhaps, one face to face meeting a year.</p> <p>Lisa Fraser commented the LA would be guided by forum on the decision.</p>	
8.2	<p>The Chair reported this was the last meeting Mike White would be attending.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mike White for all his work related to School Forum and wished him well for the future.</p> <p>Through the MS Chat facility, members added their thanks and good wishes to those of the Chair.</p> <p>Mike White thanked the chair and the members.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 3.35pm</p>	