

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 14 April 2016

PRESENT

Ken Childs (Chair)	Special School Governors
Cllr Malcolm Brain	Elected member representative
Sarah Diggle	Primary Governors
Julie Goodfellow	Primary Academy Headteachers
Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
Peter Largue	Trade Union Representative
Mustafaa Malik	Primary Haedteachers
Andrew Ramanandi	Primary Headteachers
Chris Richardson	Secondary Headteachers
Michelle Richards	Special School Headteachers
Allan Symons	Primary Governors
Matthew Younger	Primary Headteachers

IN ATTENDANCE:

Carole Smith	Corporate Resources
Alan Foster	Corporate Resources
Rosalyn Patterson	Corporate Services and Governance

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Elaine Pickering, Ethel Mills and Denise Henry.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record subject to it being noted that Andy Ramanandi is representing Primary Headteachers and not the Diocese.

3 HIGH NEEDS FUNDING AND OTHER REFORMS CONSULTATION

The Forum received the draft response to the High Needs Funding Consultation. The closing date for responses is Sunday and all schools were emailed on 23 March for comments on the response before finalisation. The Forum was advised that a separate submission can be made by the Schools Forum.

Since the response was drafted an officer meeting was held which resulted in some answers changing once their impact was better known.

Each question was looked at by the Forum and responses agreed, with the following comments being noted to be included in the Forum's response;

Q1 – Forum agreed with the response and noted that, in terms of paragraph three of the response, this needs to be reviewed when further information is known.

Q3 – Forum agreed the high needs formula should be based on actual assessed need, however it was noted that it is on an individual basis as to whether proxy or assessed measures are best. This will not be clear until further information is known at the next phase. The Forum agreed that a comment be made under this question about autism and hearing impairment as deprivation measures.

Q10 – Forum agreed that its response should include a comment that there are differences in the phases and that one size does not fit all because of how ARMS function differently.

RESOLVED -

That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report and reviewed the draft consultation response to submit on behalf of Gateshead Schools Forum.

4 NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA CONSULTATION

The Forum received the draft response to the National Funding Formula Consultation and the group made comments on the answers, which would be used as the Forum's formal response to the consultation.

Each question was looked at by the Forum and responses agreed as follows;

Q1 – The Forum did not agree with the proposed principles for the funding system. It was noted that the system may be efficient but not necessarily effective nor fit for purpose or fair.

Q2 – The Forum did not agree with the proposal to move to a school-level national funding formula. It was noted that if this was done at a national level there would be no feel for schools in Gateshead. The Forum felt that one size does not fit all.

Q3 – The Forum felt that the funding for each pupil should be different for all key stages and that primary should not be one block. Therefore it was agreed that the response should say 'yes' with the comment that primary should be split into key stages one and two.

Q4a – The Forum agreed that a deprivation factor should be included.

Q4b – The Forum supported all three measures for the deprivation factor, but weighted to more FSM numbers.

Q5 – The Forum agreed that low prior attainment factor should be included and noted that a comment be included around the possibility of including a high attainment factor for gifted and talented pupils.

Q6a – The Forum agreed a factor for English as an additional language should be

included.

Q6b – The Forum agreed that EAL3 be used as it takes EAL pupils three years to take part in the curriculum.

Q7 – The Forum agreed that a lump sum factor should be included as this is important for small schools to remain viable.

Q8 – The Forum agreed that a sparsity factor should be included as this can affect schools in rural communities.

Q9 – The Forum agreed that a business rates factor should be included, but not on a historic cost basis as rates can vary year on year and will increase in future years.

Q10 – The Forum agreed that split sites factor should be included.

Q11 – The Forum agreed that a private finance initiative factor should be included but not on historic cost basis.

Q12 – The Forum agreed that an exceptional premises circumstances factor should be included criteria should be developed to be applied on a national basis.

Q13 – The Forum did not agree that funding for rates, PFI, exceptional circumstances and growth funding in 2017-18 and 2018-19 should be allocated based on historic basis.

Q14 – The Forum agreed a growth factor should be included but not on a historic basis.

Q15 – The Forum did not agree that funding for growth be allocated based on historic spend as past growth is no indication of current growth.

Q16a – The Forum did not agree that an area cost adjustment should be included.

Q16b – The Forum agreed that if an area cost adjustment were to be included it should be a hybrid methodology.

Q17 – The Forum did not agree that targeted support for looked after children should be through pupil premium plus, rather than including a looked after children factor in the formula. The Forum agreed that this does not support the school, it supports the child and therefore should not come out of the formula.

Q18 – The Forum did not agree that a factor for mobility should be removed from the formula.

Q19 – The Forum agreed that the post-16 factor from 2017-18 should be removed.

Q20 – The Forum agreed with the proposal to require local authorities to distribute all of their schools block allocation to schools from 2017-18.

Q21 – The Forum did not agree that it would be helpful for local areas to have flexibility to set a local minimum funding guarantee. The Forum agreed that it would not be fair and consistent if there was different MFG in schools in different LA's.

Q22 – The Forum did not agreed that local authorities' ongoing responsibilities should be funded according to a per-pupil formula.

Q23 – The Forum agreed that local authorities' ongoing historic commitments should be funded based on case-specific information, to be collected from local authorities.

Q24 – Forum agreed with the comments but that it should state; Any funding reductions should not be considered to be reduced until very clear guidance has been issued to both LA's and schools on what schools and LA's responsibilities will be and the impact on schools budgets is known.

Q25 – The Forum did not agree with allowing local authorities to retain some of their maintained schools' DSG centrally to fund the duties they carry out for maintained schools.

RESOLVED -

That the Schools Forum noted the content of the report and the draft consultation response and agreed that a consultation response should be submitted in the name of Gateshead Schools Forum.

5 EDUCATION EXCELLENCE EVERYWHERE - EDUCATION WHITE PAPER SUMMARY

The Forum received a summary of the Education White Paper – Educational Excellence Everywhere. It was noted that there is a significant reduction in autonomy.

RESOLVED -

That the Schools Forum noted the contents of the report.

6 SURPLUS BALANCE LICENCE CHANGE

The Forum received a report following a request from Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School to extend its surplus balance licence. The licence was for refurbishment of toilets, however the work was not finished in time as could only be carried out over the holidays.

RESOLVED -

That the Schools Forum ratified the decision to extend Corpus Christi's surplus balance licence due to the start of the refurbishment of the toilets.

7 CONSULTATION - CHILDCARE FREE ENTITLEMENT DELIVERY MODEL

Forum was advised that the closing date for this consultation is 6 June, this is before the next meeting so it was agreed that a response would be emailed round for consideration.

RESOLVED - That the information be noted.

8 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The date and time of the next meeting is Thursday 9 June at 10.00am.