



## GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 14 July 2016 at 10.00 am in the Dryden Centre

---

From the Chief Executive, Jane Robinson

---

Item Business

**1. Apologies**

**2. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 8)

The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 9 June 2016.

**3. Use of Dedicated Schools Grant Reserves** (Pages 9 - 10)

Gillian Dodds, Care Wellbeing and Learning

**4. Contingency Funding Application** (Pages 11 - 14)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**5. Gateshead Scheme for Financing Schools - Consultation Outcome** (Pages 15 - 18)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**6. Special School Funding Review** (Pages 19 - 20)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**7. The Role of Schools Forum - SEND Area Inspection** (Pages 21 - 26)

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**8. DSG Consultations - Possible Verbal Update**

Carole Smith, Corporate Resources

**9. Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 22 September 2016 at 2.00pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

### GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 9 June 2016

#### PRESENT

Ken Childs	Special School Governors
Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
Denise Henry	Nursery Sector Representative
Mustafaa Malik	Primary Headteachers
Andrew Ramanandi	RC Primary Headteachers
Michelle Richards	Special School Headteachers
Allan Symons	Primary Governors
Steve Williamson	Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Clive Wisby	Primary Headteachers
Matthew Younger	Primary Headteachers

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Cllr Chris McHugh	Elected Member
Carole Smith	Corporate Resources
Frank McDermott	Corporate Resources
Alan Foster	Corporate Resources
Jan Batchelor	Care, Wellbeing and Learning
Gillian Dodds	Care, Wellbeing and Learning
John Watson	Communities and Environment
Rosalyn Patterson	Corporate Resources and Governance

#### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Peter Largue, Chris Richardson, Sarah Diggle, Jim Thomson, Ethel Mills, Elaine Pickering and Julie Goodfellow.

#### 2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

#### 3 DSG OUTTURN

The Forum received the final outturn position of DSG for 2015/16. It was reported that the outturn is £94.959m against the budget of £95.333m, therefore an underspend of £0.374m. In addition, there was an additional £155,000 Early Years settlement for 2014/15 which was received in 2015/16, so a total of £529,000 to be added to the DSG reserve. Therefore the balance to be carried forward to 2016/17 is £3.357m.

The areas of underspend were identified as; High Needs Budget, including ARMS provision, and also premature retirement costs.

It was questioned whether the underspend on ARMS was in fact an under fund, as schools are giving them up as they are too costly, therefore the reason there is an underspend is because the provision is underfunded. It was confirmed that the withdrawal of provision has led to this underspend.

It was queried if this is a typical amount of underspend over the last few years. It was confirmed that generally there is an underspend every year and this is the highest reserves so far as there has not been any big calls on reserves recently.

RESOLVED - That the Forum noted the contents of the report.

#### **4 USE OF DSG RESERVES**

The Forum received a report on the use of DSG reserves to fund additional special school places for Gibside early years pupils. The Forum was advised that work would only be undertaken once Ward Councillors had been consulted.

It was noted that a number of Gibside pupils are placed at Blaydon Children's Centre in an early years unit and it is proposed that this be extended to increase pupil numbers by 15. There is a need to increase provision as there is no room on the Gibside site, there is an increasing need to place young children with complex needs and currently there is not sufficient capacity within the borough.

It is proposed that £16,308 from reserves be used for the works at the Children's Centre and Local Environmental Services has agreed to 'match fund' the project and will contribute £18,600.

The point was raised that more thought is needed as to the longer term position as this proposed works is reactive. It was confirmed that an officer group has been established to look at the whole population due to increasing primary numbers, pressure on two and three year old places and increasing SEN, the group will look at pinch points and how to use funding better.

It was queried whether academies could also apply for match funding, it was confirmed that all schools who buy in to the service can apply for a maximum of £40,000.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the proposal to fund £16,308 from DSG reserves for the work to be undertaken at Blaydon Children's Centre for the additional early years children.

#### **5 USE OF EARLY YEARS UNDERSPEND**

A report was presented on the use of the Early Years Block underspend to create additional two year old funded places in Crookhill and Ryton. It was noted that at the meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> March 2016 a further cost breakdown and supply and demand analysis was requested before the Forum could make any decision.

An analysis of demand was undertaken based on the information received from the DWP. In terms of the Ryton, Crookhill and Stella ward, as at February 2016 there were 24 eligible two year olds, 9 of whom had taken up a place and 15 had not. In Crawcrook and Greenside there were 19 eligible children, 9 had taken up a place and 10 had not. Further more recent data from the DWP in April indicated that in September there will be 3 eligible children in Stella, 5 in Crookhill, 8 in Ryton, 8 in Greenside and 8 in Crawcrook who as yet had not taken up a place.

All providers have been consulted around their supply of places. In Ryton, Crookhill and Stella from September there are 10 places available at Care with Cuddles and four at Crookhill Early Years, however there are no places available at Willows Montessori in September. Therefore, as indicated by the demand analysis, a further two places are required for September. In Crawcrook and Greenside there are currently no places available at Bright Sparks and there will be no places in September. Therefore a further 14 places are required.

Neighbouring wards were then looked at to establish whether any places could be accessed there. In terms of Stella, it could reasonably be expected that three children could access provision in Blaydon and there would be places for eight children living in the Ryton area at Care with Cuddles. Therefore there are still three areas with insufficient available places; Crawcrook, Crookhill and Greenside.

Greenside Primary School has been approached but do not want to provide two year old places. Therefore the following options were proposed to the Forum;

- Create places in Emmaville Primary School and Crookhill Early Years
- Create places at Emmaville Primary School only
- Create places at Crookhill Early Years only
- Enhance the learning resources at Care with Cuddles

Following a feasibility study the recommended options were; create places at Emmaville, through a demountable building at a cost of £205,000 and enhance the learning resources at Care with Cuddles, at a cost of £11,000.

It was noted that the funding for resources at Care with Cuddles will help the setting obtain a 'good' Ofsted rating when they are inspected, as places can only be funded in good or outstanding settings.

It was questioned whether any second hand demountable units had been priced. It was confirmed that this had not been looked at and prices were sought through a private company, however if this progresses the tender process will be followed.

It was queried what the £11,000 would be used for at Care with Cuddles. It was confirmed that the provision is ran out of a church hall, there is a lot of communal play areas and the funding will be used to further enhance the provision. It was questioned whether there is any precedent for giving private companies funding. It was confirmed that this has been done previously. It was also noted that Education Gateshead has provided support in terms of enhancing the provision. It was queried whether the profits are used for resources. It was acknowledged that Care with Cuddles only makes a small profit, the £11,000 is a start-up grant and will not be

provided again.

It was acknowledged that in the long term work needs to continue with partners to provide quality provision, which could impact on later school years.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the Schools Forum approved the option to create places at Emmaville Primary School.
  - (ii) That the Schools Forum approved the option to enhance the learning resources at Care with Cuddles.

## **6 SCHOOLS SURPLUS BALANCES REVIEW OF 2015/16 LICENCES**

The Forum received a report on the current schools surplus balances. Forum was advised that last financial year £415,000 was approved, the surplus balance has reduced by £231,000. A list of schools with funding sill to spend was provided to the Forum.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Forum noted that surplus balance licence have reduced by £231,000 during 2015/16.

## **7 SCHOOLS SURPLUS BALANCES 2015/16 LICENCE APPLICATIONS**

A report was presented on the level of schools surplus balances in maintained schools and the amount of licence applications for the use of 2015/16 surplus balances. It was reported that the total amount of surplus balances is £270,000, the surplus is within the nursery and primary sector, the secondary and special sectors have no surplus balance.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Forum noted the surplus balance amounts.

## **8 SCHOOLS SURPLUS BALANCE CHANGE REQUEST**

A report was presented on the decision to alter the surplus balance licence for Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School. The surplus balance was requested for the refurbishment of pupil's toilets, however the charge for the work was put through on the wrong account and was not picked up before the 2015/16 accounts were closed. Therefore the school requested the remaining licence to fund a teaching assistant. The licence would have been fully spent if the charge had been correctly allocated so the request was granted.

St Joseph's Primary School Gateshead had previously been granted use of some of their surplus balance to make improvements to the car park. However due to budget pressures the school requested to change part of the licence to maintain support staff levels for 2016/17. This was granted as the three year projected budget position would benefit from the change in the licence.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Schools Forum noted the change of

surplus balance for Corpus Christi Primary School and St Joseph's Gateshead Primary School.

**9 GROWTH FUND APPLICATION**

A report was presented to inform the Forum of the successful application for Growth Funding. Ravensworth Terrace Primary School applied for funding due to the increased pupil numbers. The school met the conditions set in the growth fund criteria, as its planned admission number increased from 30 to 60, and the school was supported in its expansion due to projected increase in pupil numbers, therefore £35,000 was awarded.

RESOLVED - That the Forum noted the funding awarded to Ravensworth Terrace Primary School for growth in pupil numbers.

**10 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The date and time of the next meeting is Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> July at 10.00am.

This page is intentionally left blank



---

**TITLE OF REPORT: Use of Early Years Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserves.**

---

## **Purpose of the Report**

To request the use of Early Years DSG reserves for the Council's Design and Technical Services to prepare concept designs as requested within the Department for Education (DfE) capital grant application to support the extended free entitlement for working parents of three- and four-year-olds.

## **Background**

The extended free childcare entitlement will be available from September 2017 for working parents of three- and four-year-olds and will provide eligible parents with a total of 30 hours of free childcare per week, over 38 weeks or 1,140 hours across more weeks per year.

Officers from Gateshead Early Years Childcare Service (EYCS) submitted an expressions of interest (EOI) to the Department for Education (DfE) in April 2016 to work with local childcare providers to bid for capital funding to expand childcare provision (including schools that currently offer, or plan to offer, provision for 3- and 4-year-olds).

On 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 officers received information from DfE requesting applications from Local Authorities setting out specific provider capital projects in their area by 31st August 2016.

Notification was also received of our 'Project Limit' ranking of Medium – 4 projects maximum. This is based on the number of 3- and 4-year-old children that DfE estimate are eligible for 30 hours in the local authority. The figure for Gateshead is 1370 eligible children.

## **Application Process**

Expressions of interest from all providers that are interested in building on the existing 15 hour universal entitlement, and require capital to do so, were requested to be submitted to EYCS by 8th July 2016. For the purposes of this bid round DfE define a place as a 30 hour funded place offered over at least 38 weeks per year. The place may either build on an existing 15 hour place to create a 30 hour place or be an entirely new 30 hour place.

An Officer Group consisting of representatives from the Councils Design and Technical Service, Corporate Finance, Legal Services, educationGateshead and EYCS will apply the DfE assessment criteria to ensure that the four most suitable providers/schemes from Gateshead are submitted to DfE for their consideration. The DfE criterion is divided into to a two stage bid assessment process.

- Stage 1 will assess individual projects against a set of pass or fail qualifying tests based on: track record with Ofsted or the Independent Schools Inspectorate; completion date by the end of August 2017; total cost of the project is below £1 million; and a minimum of 25% of the total project cost is funded from alternative sources.
- Stage 2 will assess individual projects that were successful at the initial stage based on the following criteria: evidence of localised sufficiency need, project outcomes, and value for money.

In order to completely fulfil this criterion it is necessary that the Council's Design and Technical Services prepare concept designs, preliminary schemes and estimates of costs. This detail will be completed for the four EOI which the officer group select as the most suitable schemes to go forward to DfE. An allowance of £3,500 for each scheme is needed in order that this work can be carried out.

Successful bids will receive grants awards within financial year 2016-17. Successful bidders will be notified by December 2016.

### **Options**

There are 2 options:

- 1) Not to proceed with the capital applications.
- 2) To proceed with the capital applications. This will involve upfront funding from Early Years DSG Reserves of £3,500 per scheme to prepare concept designs, preliminary schemes and estimates of costs. Four schemes will be submitted for consideration. Should the applications be successful and the grant awarded the upfront outlay from Early Years DSG reserves will be reimbursed.

### **Recommendation**

That schools forum approves the request for £14,000 in order to proceed with option 2 at a total cost of £14,000.

### **For the following reasons:-**

- To submit four capital grant application from Gateshead to the DfE.
- To support the Council to meet its statutory duty to provide sufficient places for working parents of three and four year olds in addition to the free 15 hours universal entitlement for three and four year olds and the places for eligible 2 year olds.

---

CONTACT Gillian Dodds



## REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

14<sup>th</sup> July 2016

### TITLE OF REPORT: Contingency Funding Application

---

#### Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to inform Schools Forum decision to provide contingency funding to a school.

#### Background

##### Winlaton West Lane

The school applied for additional funding under category 4 – Schools Causing Concern Appendix 1). Winlaton West Lane Primary School was first identified as requiring improvement in May 2013 due to the below issues:-

- Pupils' achievement in writing and mathematics in Key Stages 1 and 2, while improving, is not yet good.
- Some disabled pupils or those with special educational needs do not achieve well because the planning for their needs is not sharp enough.
- A small proportion of teaching still requires improvement and there is not enough outstanding teaching.
- The more-able pupils are not always challenged enough.
- The ways in which school leaders measure the success of school improvement plans are sometimes not precise enough. This means that leaders are not always clear about how successful their actions have been.

An action plan was put in place and the school was re-inspected in May 2015.

The school was still judged to be requiring improvement due to the below issues:-

- Over time, pupils' achievement and progress vary across year groups, subjects and between different groups of pupils. Standards at the end of Year 6 are too variable and not consistently high enough. From their starting points, too few pupils make good progress in writing and mathematics.
- By the end of Year 6, the gaps in attainment between disadvantaged pupils and others in the school are not closing fast enough, particularly in writing and mathematics.
- The achievement of other groups, including the most able and boys, is too variable and needs improvement. Too few pupils reach the higher levels at the end of Year 2 and Year 6.
- Teaching over time is not good enough to make sure that the different year groups and groups of pupils achieve as well as they are able. Expectations of some teachers are not high enough.

- The pace of improvement has been too slow since the previous inspection. New leaders have not had sufficient time to develop their skills to enable them to thoroughly monitor the impact of actions upon school improvement.
- The achievements of pupil groups, are not analysed and compared over time by leaders sufficiently well to identify where gaps in achievement are widening and where action is needed.
- Leaders and managers do not analyse the information they have about different groups of pupils and their progress rigorously enough. This makes it difficult for leaders and governors to monitor the school's performance.

The school then had a monitoring visit in December 2015 at which the school was still judged as requiring improvement in the following areas:-

Senior leaders and governors are not taking effective action to tackle the areas requiring improvement identified at the last section 5 inspection in order to become a good school. Leaders should take urgent action to:

- Ensure that the pupil premium is targeted specifically to improve outcomes for eligible pupils
- Ensure that the quality of pupils' writing improves across the school, but particularly in Key Stage 1
- Ensure that more-able pupils are challenged sufficiently so they reach the higher levels of which they are capable, particularly in mathematics
- Update the safeguarding policy and information on the school website
- Make sure the school improvement plan has precise criteria by which success can be measured.

Following the monitoring inspection a number of leadership and governance changes were made and an interim executive head was appointed as well as a new chair of governors.

Following these appointments the staffing structure has been reviewed and the school has a new action plan in place.

The school needs to make at least one compulsory redundancy due to financial issues, however at the time of asking for volunteers 4 candidates put their name forward to take voluntary redundancy.

One redundancy will be funded by the LA under the Redundancy in Maintained Schools Guidance.

The school applied to have the additional redundancy payments of £15,905 met from contingency along £10,000 for addition resources for KS1 pupils and for training to assist the new leadership team and improve teaching and learning across the school.

## **Process**

Colleagues in EducationGateshead had input into the review process of the contingency application, and fully support the application.

**Proposal**

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the amount of funding provided to School.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that School Forum notes the funding provided to the school.

**For the following reasons:**

- To provide funding to assist the school in improve teaching and learning across the school.

---

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**

## Appendix 1

### Updated Contingency Funding Criteria

The LEA will retain centrally contingency funding that **could** provide in-year support to schools for:

1. Cost pressures specifically identified and caused by a relatively large numerical change in pupil numbers, especially if it relates to a single age-group, where the change is outside the control of the governing body and where the timing of the change in circumstances prevents no opportunity to the school to plan accordingly (eg housing demolition or compulsory purchase orders, or reorganisation)
2. The correction of significant errors in the data or in the application of the resource allocation formula.
3. Emergency costs arising from incidents outside the control of the governing body of the school (eg flood or fire damage). The money allocated for these purposes will be earmarked for specific use.
4. The provision of additional resources or other special support, temporarily, in response to a school found to be in need of Special Measures within the meaning of Part V of the Education Act 1993 and in accordance with DFE Circular 17/93.
5. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of pupils with new or revised statements of SEN, or for statemented pupils transferring between schools within the LEA.
6. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of the admission of pupils permanently excluded by other schools. Such allocations will be determined in accordance with Regulations made by the Secretary of State **under Section 47 of the 1998 Act**.
7. Schools that are in financial difficulty, and can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to address financial issues, and that the current financial difficulties are not as a result of financial mismanagement. Schools must apply the LEA's "Model of Reasonableness" before making an application to demonstrate that they meet the criteria.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus balance in excess of 16% for primary and special schools or 10% for secondary schools the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.



REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

14<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**TITLE OF REPORT: Gateshead's Scheme for Financing Schools – Consultation Outcome**

---

**Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum Gateshead's updated Scheme for Financing Schools for approval.

**Background**

This report builds on a report brought to Schools Forum in December 2015.

On the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2015 the DfE published new statutory guidance for local authorities on the Scheme for Financing Schools. The full guidance is available on the below link.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schemes-for-financing-schools>

Under sections 48 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and schedule 14 to the Act, each local authority must publish a Scheme for Financing Schools. The Scheme sets out the financial relationship between the Authority and the maintained schools which it funds, it contains requirements relating to financial management and associated issues, binding on both the Authority and schools.

The directed revisions state that all maintained schools must be consulted on any updates to the Scheme, and receive approval of the members of Schools Forum representing maintained schools. The revised amendments must be published on a website accessible to the general public.

The Scheme covers all Community, Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools and covers all sectors- Nursery, Primary, Secondary, PRU's and Special Schools. Academies and Free Schools are not covered by the Scheme.

A copy of the draft Scheme is electronically available for review.

**Directed Revisions to the Scheme**

The main changes are summarised below:

Removal from the Scheme of the requirement of:

- All references to General Purpose Accounts under banking arrangements

Inclusions to the Scheme of:

2.9 Requirement for maintained schools to publish a register of the business interests of their governors, along with any relationships between staff.

## 9. PFI /PPP

An authority may wish to insert into its scheme other provisions relating to Private Finance Initiative (PFI) / Public Private Partnership (PPP) projects. Amongst other issues these might deal with the reaching of agreements with the governing bodies of schools as to the basis of such charge; and the treatment of monies withheld from contractors due to poor performance.

Among PFI/PPP provisions may be one which formally sets out the power of the authority to charge school's budget share amounts agreed under a PFI/PPP agreement entered into by the governing body of a school.

## Other Revisions

- 3.6.1 School Payment Cards has been included
- The following Schools have been deleted from the Scheme following conversion to Academy Status:
  - o Thomas Hepburn
  - o Charles Thorpe
  - o Sacred Heart
- Other Schools that convert will be deleted from the Scheme as they transfer.
- Post titles and references have been changed to reflect the changes in the Authorities internal structure.
- General updates to reflect any changes in legislation.
- The Scheme and the dates of any amendments have to be published on Gateshead Councils Webpage.

## Process

In December Schools Forum approved the draft Scheme for Financing Schools to enable a consultation with all maintained schools to be undertaken on the proposed changes to the Scheme.

The a covering letter and draft Scheme were e-mailed to all maintained head teachers and chairs of governors on the 16<sup>th</sup> May and the consultation ran from 16<sup>th</sup> May until 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016, with a request for comments or suggestions to be sent to [Carolesmith@gateshead.gov.uk](mailto:Carolesmith@gateshead.gov.uk) by 5pm 24<sup>th</sup> June.

No comments or suggestions were received by the deadline.

## Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes that no comments or suggestions were received by Schools Forum and therefore it is requested that Schools Forum approved the proposed revisions to Gateshead's Scheme for Financing Schools.

Once approved the Scheme will be published on Gateshead Council's website and a link will be sent to all head maintained school teachers and chairs of governors to note.



## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that School Forum approves the revisions to Gateshead's Scheme for Financing Schools.

### **For the following reasons:**

- To comply with the DfE's directed revisions to the Scheme and the other amendments and detailed above.
- To enable the updated Scheme to be published on the Councils website.

---

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**

This page is intentionally left blank

---

**TITLE OF REPORT: Special School Funding Review**

---

**Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum information on the current Special Schools Funding Review.

**Background**

The Special Schools Formula is undergoing a review of the weightings between each specialism following the completion of one full year under the amended formula. The weighting amendments implemented in 2015/16 moved funding from ASD to SEMH which has resulted in large funding swings for some schools, especially Hill Top Special School.

There is also the probability of a National Funding Formula (NNF) for the High Needs Block from 2017/18, however second stage consultation documents with more detailed proposals are expected before the summer break. The outcome of the second stage consultation and the impact on the funding available from the High Needs Block of the DSG are not yet known.

**Process**

The pupil related top ups for special schools was based on how much relative resources each child in each the banding required to meet their needs.

Initial proposals include:-

- Reduce all top up rates by -1.5%
- This will then release some funding re re-allocate
- Look at the differences between the bandings
- Ensure that no school loses more than -1.5% of their overall budget.

The outcome of this work will be discussed on the 11<sup>th</sup> July with all Special Heads.

**Proposal**

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the report and the work that is being undertaken to review the Special Schools Funding Formula.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that School Forum notes the contents of the report.

**For the following reasons:**

- To inform Schools Forum of the current funding review.

This page is intentionally left blank



## REPORT TO SCHOOLS FORUM

14<sup>th</sup> July 2016

### TITLE OF REPORT: Role of Schools Forum – SEND Inspection

---

---

#### **Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum information on a new type of joint inspection carried out by Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission.

#### **Background**

These new inspections, which started in May 2016, “will provide an independent external evaluation of how well a local area carries out its statutory duties in relation to children and young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities in order to support their development.”

They “are designed to hold local areas to account, they also intend to assist local areas in improving and developing their processes and support systems in order that local areas become more effective and deliver better outcomes for children and young people.”

Children and young people with SEN and/or disabilities often receive a variety of services. These could be provided by nurseries, schools or colleges, specialist therapists, and professionals in education, health and social care.

Under the Children and Families Act 2014, the government placed new duties on the local health, social and education services that provide for those with SEN and/or disabilities. The Special Educational Needs Code of Practice was updated to reflect these new duties.

In particular, the local area has to:-

- publish an accessible ‘local offer’ detailing the support and services available in the area
- work with children/young people and parents/carers, to ensure SEN and/or disabilities are identified in a timely manner
- assess the needs of children and young people who may need an education, health and care (EHC) plan in discussion with them and their parents/carers
- work with all relevant agencies, children/young people and their parents/carers to produce an EHC plan
- provide children and young people with the support agreed in their EHC plan, and keep the plans under review.

## **Process**

In order to prepare for the area inspection a number of working groups have been formed to ensure that we have all the information that we may need when the inspection takes place.

One aspect of this information gathering was to look at all groups that have an input into SEND. To gather information on all the different groups a template was devised. A copy of the draft completed template on the role of Schools Forum is provided as Appendix 1.

As part of the inspection process it is possible that the Chair of Schools Forum could be interviewed.

## **Proposal**

It is proposed that Schools Forum review the content of the template, suggest any amendments and agree a final version to be held on record and to note that, as part of an Ofsted area inspection for SEND, the Chair of Schools Forum could be interviewed as part of the inspection process.

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Schools Forum reviews, discusses and agrees any proposed changes to the SEND template and notes that the Chair of Schools Forum could be interviewed as part of the inspection process.

## **For the following reasons:**

- To enable Schools Forum to have reviewed, discussed and agreed the template at Appendix 1
- To inform Schools Forum that the Chair could be interviewed as part of a SEND area inspection.

---

**CONTACT: Carole Smith**

## Appendix 1

### Gateshead SEND Strategy

#### Schools Form working group remit

#### Membership

Chair: Ken Childs

Core Members: With voting rights

<b>Primary Heads</b>	<b>School</b>
Clive Wisby	Caedmon
Joanne Allen	Brighton Ave
Matt Younger	Colegate
Andy Ramanandi	St Joseph's Blaydon
Mustafaa Malik	Wardley
Julie Goodfellow (primary academy)	Riverside Academy
<b>Primary Govs</b>	
Allan Symons	Caedmon
Sarah Diggle	Bede
<b>Secondary Heads</b>	<b>School</b>
Chris Richardson	Heworth Grange
Mark Lovett (academy)	Lord Lawson
Jonathan Parkinson (academy)	St Thomas More
Steve Haigh(secondary academy)	Whickham
<b>Secondary Govs.</b>	
Elaine Pickering	Heworth Grange
<b>Special Heads</b>	
Martin Flowers (academy)	The Cedars
Michelle Richards	Furrowfield
<b>Special Govs</b>	
Ken Childs	Eslington
<b>Nursery Heads</b>	<b>Setting</b>
Denise Henry	Bensham Grove
Ethel Mills	PVI Nursery
<b>PRU</b>	
Steve Williamson	PRU
<b>Non School Members</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Christine Ingle (Corpus Christi)	RC Diocesan
Peter Lague (Vice Chair)	Trade Union
Cllr McHugh	Non exec elected member
Judith Doyle (Gateshead Coll.)	14 to 19 Partnership

It is a statutory duty for all Local Education Authorities to have a Schools Forum that meets at least 4 times a year.

Only specific officers can speak at meetings of the schools forum. These officers are:

- Director of Children's Services or their representative
- Chief Financial Officer or their representative
- Any person invited by the Schools Forum to provide financial or technical advice

- Any person presenting a paper to the Schools Forum but their ability to speak is limited to the paper that they are presenting.

Schools Forums are usually supported by a specific officer. In the course of Schools Forums work, they will be required to consider a whole range of issues and they may consider it appropriate that other officers attend for specific items of business. Where this is the case, the local authority should meet the Schools Forum's requests as far as possible.

### Aim of working group

Schools forums generally have a consultative role on issues that affect school funding. However, there are situations in which they have decision-making powers. The respective roles of schools forums, local authorities and the DfE are summarised in schools forum powers and responsibilities (below).

### Key areas of work

	Function	Local Authority	Forum	DfE Role
1	Formula Change (including redistributions)	Proposes and decides	Must be consulted. [Voting restricted to schools members plus PVI members]	None
2	Contracts	Propose at least one month prior to invitation to tender, the terms of any proposed contract	Gives a view	None
3	Financial Issues relating to: arrangements for pupils with special educational needs; arrangements for use of pupil referral units and the education of children otherwise than at school; arrangements for early years provision; administration arrangements for the allocation of central gov't grants.	Consult annually	Gives a view and informs the governing bodies of all consultations carried out in lines 1, 2 & 3	None
4	Minimum funding guarantee	Proposes any exclusions from MFG for application to DfE	Gives a view	Approval
5	De-delegation for mainstream schools for: contingencies administration of free school meals insurance licences/subscriptions staff costs - supply cover support for minority ethnic pupils/underachieving groups behaviour support services library and museum services	Will propose	Primary and secondary school member representatives will decide for their phase.	Will adjudicate where Forum does not agree LA proposal
6	Central spend on funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth equal pay back-pay places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils early years expenditure	Proposes	Decides	Adjudicates where Forum does not agree LA proposal
7	Central spend on admissions servicing of schools forum carbon reduction commitment capital expenditure funded from revenue contribution to combined budgets schools budget centrally funded termination of employment costs schools budget funded prudential borrowing costs	Proposes up to the value committed in 2012/13 and where expenditure has already been committed	Decides for each line	Adjudicates where Forum does not agree LA proposal
8	Carry forward a deficit on central expenditure to the next year to be funded from the schools budget	Proposes	Decides	Adjudicates where Forum does not agree LA proposal
9	Scheme of financial management changes	Proposes and consults GB and Head of every School	Approves	Adjudicates where Forum does not agree LA proposal
10	Membership : length of office of members	Decides	None (but good practice would suggest that they gave a view)	None
11	Membership: appointment of Schools and Academies Members	Appoints those elected by members of the relevant sub groups. Facilitates election where required and appoints member if there is a tie or the election does not take place by a date set by the LA	None	None
12	Membership: Non Schools Members	Seeks nominations from the relevant bodies then appoints	None (but good practice would suggest that they gave a view)	None
13	Voting Procedures	None	Determine voting procedures	None
14	Chair of Forum	Facilitates	Elects (may not be an elected member of the council or officer)	None



## **Key areas of work and timescales**

Key areas of work that link to the SEND agenda are:-

- Consultation on formula changes for mainstream schools (notional SEN calculation) Special Schools, the PRU and high needs top ups in mainstream schools
- Funding proposals that affect the calculation of mainstream school budgets must be agreed before 20<sup>th</sup> January each year (notional SEN)
- Funding arrangements for Special Schools, the PRU and top up amounts for mainstream schools must be agreed by mid-February
- The number of commissioned high needs places in mainstream schools, special schools and PRU

## **Links to other Groups**

- Special Schools Funding Review Group
- PRU Working Group
- Funding Sub Group of Schools Forum (formed from members as required)
- Care Wellbeing and Learning Portfolio Holders

## **Meeting Frequency**

The group will meet approximately 9 times a year, depending on workload, with a break for summer and Easter.

## **Monitoring**

### **The role of executive elected members**

A schools forum needs to ensure that there are systems in place for executive members of the Council to be aware of its views on specific issues and, in particular, any decisions it takes in relation to the Schools' Budget and individual budget shares.

Executive members with responsibility for education/children's services or resources of the local authority are able to participate in schools forum meetings. By doing so such elected members are able to contribute to the discussion and receive first-hand the views of the schools forum: it is clearly good practice for this to be the case and the regulations provide the right for executive members to attend and speak at schools forum meetings. However, there is no requirement for this to happen so, at the very least, there should be clear channels of communication between the schools forum and executive members. Communication may also be assisted if schools forum members attended relevant Cabinet meetings as members of the public, e.g. when the funding formula is decided.

This page is intentionally left blank