

AGENDA

Herefordshire Schools Forum

Date: **Friday 5 June 2015**

Time: **9.30 am**

Place: **Chamber, The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford
HR1 2HX**

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Tim Brown, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Tim Brown, Governance Services on 01432 260239 or e-mail tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the Herefordshire Schools Forum

Membership

Chairman
Vice-Chairman

Mrs D Strutt
Mrs J Rees

Mrs S Bailey
Mr P Barns
Mr P Box
Mrs L Brazewell

Mr P Burbidge
Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins
Mr J A Chapman
Mr J Docherty
Mr T Edwards

Mr M Farmer
Mr J Godfrey
Mr NPJ Griffiths
Mr G House
Ms A Jackson
Ms T Kneale

Mr R Leece
Mr C Lewandowski
Mr M Lewis
Mrs R Lloyd
Mrs S Woodrow
Mrs C Woods
Mr K Wright

(3 vacancies)

Academies

Local Authority Maintained Primary School

Special Schools

Pupil Referral Unit

Academies

Local Authority Maintained Primary School Governor

Roman Catholic Church

14-19 Partnership

Church of England

Academies

Local Authority Maintained Secondary School Governor

Academies

16-19 provider representative

Academies

Academies

Early Years Representative

Locally Maintained Primary School (Nursery)

Trade Union Representative

Trade Union Representative

Local Authority Maintained Primary School

Early Years Representative

Locally Maintained Secondary Schools

Local Authority Maintained Primary School

Local Authority Maintained Primary School

AGENDA

	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.	
2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY) To receive any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Forum.	
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
4. MINUTES To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2015.	5 - 10
5. PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT FUNDING - FINAL PROPOSALS To seek Schools Forum's agreement on the final proposals for Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) funding effective from 1 September 2015 following consultation with Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers.	11 - 14
6. MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOLS FORUM To review the membership of Schools Forum and the Budget Working Group.	15 - 20
7. BUDGET PLANNING FOR THE NEXT THREE YEARS To receive and consider a presentation on a range of information to inform the development of a financial approach for schools in Herefordshire for the next three years.	21 - 24
8. WORK PROGRAMME To consider the Forum's work programme.	25 - 26
9. MEETING DATES The following meeting dates have been scheduled: 10 July 2015 – 9.30 am 23 October 2015– 9.30 am 4 December 2015 – 9.30 am 15 January 2016 – 9.30 am 11 March 2016 – 9.30 am	

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Herefordshire Schools Forum held at The Shire Hall, St Peter's Square, Hereford HR1 2HX on Friday 13 March 2015 at 9.30 am

Present: Mrs D Strutt (Academies) (Chairman)

Mrs S Bailey	Special Schools
Mr P Barns	Pupil Referral Unit
Mr P Burbidge	Roman Catholic Church
Mr J Docherty	Academies
Mr T E Edwards	Local Authority Maintained Secondary School Governor
Mr NPJ Griffiths	Academies
Mr G House	Academies
Ms T Kneale	Locally Maintained Primary School (Nursery)
Mr R Leece	Trade Union Representative
Mr C Lewandowski	Trade Union Representative
Mr M Lewis	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mrs R Lloyd	Early Years Representative
Mrs A Pritchard	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mr S Robertson	14-19 Partnership
Mrs S Woodrow	Locally Maintained Secondary Schools
Mrs C Woods	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Mr K Wright	Local Authority Maintained Primary School

In attendance: Councillors WLS Bowen and JW Millar (Cabinet Member Young People and Children's Wellbeing)

194. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr P Box, Mrs L Brazewell, Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins, Mr J Chapman, Mr J Godfrey, Ms A Jackson, and Mrs J Rees.

195. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Mrs A Pritchard substituted for Mrs J Rees and Mr S Robertson substituted for Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins.

196. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 8: Whitecross PFI Scheme

Mrs A Pritchard declared an interest as a Governor of Whitecross High School and Specialist Sports College.

Mrs D Strutt declared an interest as Head Teacher of Whitecross High School and Specialist Sports College.

197. MINUTES

The Chairman reported a correction to Minute 191 on page 6 of the agenda papers paragraph 7 to read: *“He outlined the balances held by schools as a percentage of the annual budget in bands of 5% up to 50% noting that the average balance percentage was 10% with the highest being 52%.”*

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2015, as amended, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

198. PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT FUNDING PROPOSALS

The Forum received an update on proposed changes in pupil referral unit (PRU) funding to be effective from 1 September 2015 with a view to considering final proposals in June 2015.

The School Finance Manager presented the report. He reported that changes were necessary because the Department for Education was standardising the place payment at £10,000 for PRUs in line with special schools and special provision.

He outlined the consideration of options that had taken place and the rationale for the proposals being put forward. He noted that these had been discussed with the PRU Management Committee and the Budget Working Group. It was proposed to undertake formal consultation with Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers.

It was asked whether if the cost of PRU places increased this would make schools reluctant to place pupils in the PRUs, both to the disbenefit of pupils and to the efficiency of the PRU. In response it was stated that it was always the case that a decision on where a pupil was placed was a matter for individual schools, and PRU charges had to reflect the true cost of the PRU provision whilst leaving the placement decision with schools.

RESOLVED:

That (a) formal consultation on the Herefordshire PRU funding proposals with the Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers (HASH) be approved; and

(b) final proposals be presented for agreement at the Forum’s next meeting in June 2015.

199. PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SAFEGUARDING EDUCATION IN THE MULTI-AGENCY SAFEGUARDING HUB

The Forum received an update on the role of the Education Safeguarding Officer in the Multi – Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH); and was invited to approve a means of seeking sustainable funding to make the function permanent and to increase the capacity within the MASH.

It was noted that a number of schools considered the Education Safeguarding Officer role to be a valuable one. The contribution the post made to the work of special school headteachers was highlighted.

In relation to funding, the Assistant Director explained that the preferred option was to secure approval from the Secretary of State to vary the base Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget to fund the post. In case approval was not forthcoming, in parallel with

contacting the Secretary of State, it was also proposed to develop a service level agreement as an alternative option. The Council remained under Government intervention in relation to Children's Safeguarding and the case for a budget variation may therefore be viewed favourably.

The School Finance Manager commented that the post had to date been funded from an underspend from the 2011/12 DSG but funding would run out in the summer term. The proposal was for £75,420 to be made available from the DSG on an annual basis. This was equivalent to approximately £4 per pupil.

RESOLVED:

- That:**
- (a) the proposal to apply to the secretary of state for approval to use the dedicated schools grant (DSG) to fund the education support function in the MASH be supported;**
 - (b) the development of a service level agreement as a fall back position be supported; and**
 - (c) a report for decision be considered in June 2015.**

200. SCHOOL BALANCES - CLAWBACK PROPOSALS

The Forum was informed of the outcome of the consultation with schools regarding the reintroduction of a balance clawback mechanism and considered whether such a mechanism should be introduced.

The School Finance Manager presented the report. He acknowledged that this was a difficult matter for the Forum because it did not affect all schools equally. He reminded the Forum that the issue had been brought before the Forum by the Budget Working Group (BWG) which had been concerned at the level of balances held. The Forum had approved a consultation with schools.

He emphasised that the purpose of a clawback scheme was not simply to remove excess balances from schools but to encourage schools to spend their annual budget on their current pupils. The introduction of a clawback scheme would require the Forum to approve the amendment of the Scheme of Financial Management.

He noted that advice had been received from the Department for Education (DfE) that only maintained schools should vote on the proposed amendment of the Scheme of Financial Management. The implication of legal advice provided on this point set out in the report was that the Forum should take a decision confirming that it would adopt this approach.

The report set out the following options for consideration:

A – introduction of a clawback mechanism for the 2015/16 financial year;

B – phasing in of a clawback mechanism over 3 years; and

C – inclusion of academies in a clawback mechanism on a voluntary basis – *(with the additional option if academies chose not to join the scheme of proceeding with a scheme for local authority schools only or not proceeding with the proposals unless all academies participated.)*

The Schools Finance Manager (SFM) reported the outcome of the consultation exercise, a copy of which had previously been circulated to the members of the Forum.

In summary only about a quarter of schools had responded. The response was heavily against the introduction of the full clawback scheme from 1 April 2015, moderately in favour of a phased introduction over 3 years, in favour of the inclusion of academies within the scheme and strongly of the view that the clawback scheme should not proceed unless all academies were included.

He also referred the Forum to paragraph 8 of the report which set out the action the local authority proposed to take if the Forum declined to adopt a clawback mechanism.

In discussion the following principal points were made:

- There were a number of reasons why schools chose to hold balances and the Authority should seek clarification from schools of those reasons before a decision on the introduction of a balance clawback scheme was taken.
- The phased approach offered by Option B was preferable to the implementation of Option A.
- A number of schools were holding excessive balances and that was not acceptable when representations continued to be made to the BWG that schools had insufficient funding.
- The level of school balances held within the County as a whole did not assist the County's case for extra school funding from Government.
- The SFM confirmed that no funds had ever been clawed back from schools within the County. However, one of the objectives of the clawback scheme was to encourage schools to spend annual budgets on current pupils.
- The issue of a common approach to all schools in the County including academies was raised. It was noted that academies' accounts were audited and the expectation was that they would hold balances equivalent to one month's expenditure. The SFM noted that this would be close to the average balance held by maintained schools of 10%.
- It was asked if there was any evidence that schools holding high balances were failing to meet educational standards. The Assistant Director commented that there was no simple link and that the Authority considered a range of information on schools performance and worked with school leaders and school governors to address standards issues. Balances and budget management could be a factor in this.
- The proposal to claw back balances in excess of 8% would affect more than half of the locally maintained schools in the County and this was surely unacceptable.
- More respondents to the consultation had been opposed to clawback at all than had favoured any of the proposed options.
- The response rate to the consultation had been low.
- One view expressed was that introduction of a clawback scheme risked precipitating inappropriate, unnecessary expenditure. An opposing view was that such an approach to a scheme's introduction would represent poor management.
- There might be merit in checking that schools were allocating balances correctly between revenue and capital budgets, noting the need to save for capital schemes.

The Chairman of the BWG invited any headteacher with a high balance to attend the BWG to justify their approach.

A number of proposals were put forward including deferral; a variation of option B (the phased introduction of a clawback mechanism); and the version of Option C that involved not proceeding with the proposals unless all academies participated.

A motion that the Scheme of Financial Management be amended and a balance clawback scheme be introduced for 2015/16 on the basis of a clawback of any balance in excess of 25% of a school's annual budget, subject to an annual review of the percentage of any further balance clawback, was carried.

A motion that as a matter of principle the Forum as a whole should agree that it was not acceptable for a school to hold excessive balances and that a school's annual budget should be spent on children currently in school was carried, requesting that the Director of Children's Services should advise Headteachers and Chairmen of Governors of all Schools in the County, including academies and free schools, of the Forum's view and invite them to confirm their agreement with this principle.

RESOLVED:

- That**
- (a) the results of the consultation with schools on the introduction of a balance clawback mechanism be noted;**
 - (b) the Director of Children's Wellbeing be requested to write to Headteachers and the Chairmen of Governors of all Schools, including academies and free schools, in the County holding a balance of more than 10% of their annual budget asking them to provide reasons for holding such a balance;**
 - (c) as a matter of principle the Forum unanimously considers that it is not acceptable for a school to hold excessive balances and is of the view that a school's annual budget should be spent on children currently in school; and the Director of Children's Services be requested to advise Headteachers and Chairmen of Governors of all Schools in the County, including academies and free schools, of the Forum's view and invite them to confirm their agreement with this principle;**
 - (d) the Scheme of Financial Management be amended and a balance clawback scheme be introduced for 2015/16 on the basis of a clawback of any balance in excess of 25% of a school's annual budget, subject to an annual review of the percentage of any further balance clawback, (noting that participation in the mechanism by non-maintained schools would be voluntary).**

(Note: The Forum agreed, taking note of the advice from the Department of Education, that only maintained schools should vote on the proposed amendment of the Scheme of Financial Management (resolution d).)

201. WHITECROSS PFI SCHEME

The Forum received an update on the progress in securing cost reductions for the Whitecross Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract.

The Schools Finance Manager reported on the savings that had been secured, subject to the contract variations being signed by all parties. He commented that the action taken had put in place a plan to address the £3.5m deficit that had been projected for 2032 with a small surplus now being forecast depending on inflation rates.

RESOLVED:

- That**
- (a) the progress made in securing cost reductions for the PFI contract be noted and a progress review be established, once every three years, commencing in January 2018, to establish a process for routine review of the contract; and**
 - (b) reports outside of this timescale be on an urgent needs basis.**

202. WORK PROGRAMME

The Forum noted its work programme with the following additions:

June 2015

Permanent Funding for Safeguarding Education in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub.
Pupil Referral Unit Funding Proposals
Entitlement determination in relation to the pupil premium (provisional)

203. MEETING DATES

Noted.

The meeting ended at 10.40 am

CHAIRMAN



MEETING:	Schools Forum
MEETING DATE:	5 June 2015
TITLE OF REPORT:	Pupil Referral Unit Funding – Final Proposals
REPORT BY:	School Finance Manager

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards Affected

County-wide.

Purpose

To seek Schools Forum's agreement on the final proposals for Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) funding effective from 1 September 2015 following consultation with Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers.

Recommendation(s)

THAT: the final proposals as agreed with the Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers are approved for implementation from 1st September 2015 as follows:

- (a) the local authority fully funds vacant, second and third year key stage 4 places at £10,000 per place;
- (b) funding for first year places (key stage 4) is shared by the secondary school seeking the place (both permanent exclusions and placed for other reasons) and the local authority on a sliding scale per academic year as set out below
 - (i) Academic year 2015/16 school £4,000 local authority £6,000
 - (ii) Academic year 2016/17 school £5,000 local authority £5,000
 - (iii) Academic year 2017/18 school £6,000 local authority £4,000;
- (c) high needs top-up payments as determined by the assessment matrix, and expected to be on average £5,000 per pupil, to be paid by the local authority to the PRU for key stage 3 and 4 pupil pro-rata

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green, school finance manager, on Tel (01432) 260818

to occupancy; and

- (d) **Key stage 3 places are funded per half term at £1,666.67, irrespective of the number of days occupied, payable by the school requiring placement.**

Alternative Options

- 1 A range of options have been explored with School Forum's Budget Working Group (BWG) and following further consultation with Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers (HASH), a minor adjustment is proposed to the draft proposals considered by the Forum in March.

Reasons for Recommendations

2. To approve new PRU funding arrangements effective from 1 September 2015

Key Considerations

Background

3. The DfE have increased the funding for each PRU place to £10,000 from September 2015 and Schools Forum considered draft proposals for a revised PRU funding scheme at the meeting in March 2015 and approved formal consultation with HASH. The proposed new funding arrangements bring PRU funding into line with special schools and other specialist provision. HASH suggested a minor amendment for the funding of Key Stage 3 places which has been accepted.

Final Proposals

- 4 The following table provides summary of the original funding model discussed with School Forum in March 2015

Basic information collected for pupils entering PRUs between Sept 2009 and August 2012	St Davids	Aconbury
	56 places 75% occupancy rate 14 vacant places 22 1st year places 20 2nd year places	24 places 75% occupancy rate 6 vacant places 9 1st year places re intervention 9 2nd/3rd year (6+3)
New High Needs Top Up Model from 1st September 2015 Local authority commissions vacant & 2 nd /3 rd year places New 1 st year placements "Pay as you Go" LA/school contribution on sliding scale of £10,000	£340,000 i.e. 44%	£150,000 i.e. 46%
High needs top-up at £5k average	£220,000 i.e. 29%	£90,000 i.e. 27% (on a half termly basis)
School funded		
2015/16 school £4,000		
2016/17 school £5,000	£88,000 i.e.12%	£36,000 i.e. 11%

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green, school finance manager, on Tel (01432) 260818

2017/18 school £6,000	£110,000 i.e. 15%	£45,000 i.e. 14%
	£132,000 i.e. 18%	£54,000 i.e. 17%

5. The original proposals also sought to make the KS3 provision more cost effective by charging a termly place fee (based on the £10,000 place cost) which takes account of the short term nature of key stage 3 intervention places and the difficulties in immediately filling a vacant place. The original termly fee was proposed as £3,333 for the autumn term, £2,500 for the spring term and £4,167 for the summer term, any intervention placement in the term will incur the full termly cost instead of the strict pro-rata charge as now. HASH considered that the charge of a full termly fee was unduly harsh and considered a scheme based on a half termly fee would be much fairer, as such the local authority is willing to moderate the KS3 placement fees so that £1,666.67 is payable per half term, irrespective of whether summer, autumn or spring half terms.
6. Additionally, the local authority is concerned that increasing numbers of pupils are staying on for second and third year placements and included in the original proposal was an increase in the schools place contribution on a sliding scale as follows;
- 2015/16 local authority £6,000 school £4,000 (which is a savings on the current £4,325 charge)
 - 2016/17 local authority £5,000 school £5,000
 - 2017/18 local authority £4,000 school £6,000

Community Impact

7. There is no community impact as the proposals simply seek to rebalance how schools and DSG fund the PRU. Only if schools, as a result of these proposals, modify their usage of PRU places will there be a community impact as it is possible that the number of places on offer will have to be reduced.

Equality and Human Rights

8. There are no implications for the public sector equality duty.

Financial Implications

9. The costs of the PRU funding proposals are met in full by Dedicated Schools Grant and the proposals seek to provide a fair balance between schools and the high needs block of DSG in light of DfE mandatory funding changes. The financial changes are necessary due to the DfE increasing the commissioned place cost by £2,000 to £10,000 from September 2015. Schools Forum agreed delegation of £150,000 additional funding for high schools in 2015/16 from the high needs block to assist schools in meeting the PRU charges.

Legal Implications

- 10 The purpose of this report is to seek the Schools Forum's agreement on final PRU funding proposals. As such there are no specific legal implications.
- 11 Section 10 of the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 sets out the local authority's duties to consult with the Schools Forum on school funding issues.

Risk Management

- 12 The consultation process with HASH and the BWG ensures that risks are identified and minimised prior to a final decision by Schools Forum in June 2015. There is a risk that the funding model does not provide a sustainable budget for the PRU and in which case Schools Forum will be asked to consider revised charges.

Consultees

- 13 None.

Appendices

- None

Background Papers

- None identified.



Meeting:	Schools Forum
Meeting date:	5 June 2015
Title of report:	Membership of Schools Forum
Report by:	Governance Services

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Purpose

To review the membership of the Schools Forum and the Budget Working Group.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) it be noted that no amendment to the membership of the Forum is required, as set out at Appendix 1; and
- (b) It be noted that no amendment to the membership of the Budget Working Group is required, as set out in appendix 1.

Alternative options

- 1 The Forum could recommend a change to the Forum's composition amending the number of representatives.

Reasons for recommendations

- 2 The Regulations contain a requirement that primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on the Forum. The recommendations address this requirement.

Key considerations

- 3 The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 contain a requirement that primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on the Forum.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services Officer, on Tel (01432) 260239

- 4 The Forum's Constitution provides that the term of office of representatives is three years, running from 1 September to 31 August. In the event that a member of the Forum ceases to hold the office, the term of office ceases and another appointment must be made. The replacement will serve the remainder of the term. The terms for all current members are taken to have commenced on 1 September 2012 and will end on 31 August 2015.
- 5 It was, however, decided that the membership of the Forum would be kept under annual review to provide flexibility to ensure that broad proportionality of primary schools, secondary schools and academies was maintained. The three year term of office would be subject to this annual review. This is consistent with the Department for Education Guidance that, "The term of office should not be of a length that would hinder the requirement for the structure of Schools Forum to mirror the type of provision in light of the pace of academy conversions."
- 6 The relevant Regulation makes no distinction between primary phase and secondary phase academies. The guidance states that Free Schools are classed as academies for the purpose of this exercise. The calculations of proportionality set out below have been made on that basis. The figures are taken from the January 2015 census. A table showing numbers in different school sectors is attached at appendix 2.
- 7 Based on the proportionate number of registered pupils (as at the January 2015 census), the numbers of member places (to the nearest whole number) to be filled by primary schools, secondary schools and academies, are:

Maintained Primary $9,767/22,582 = 43.3\% \times 16 = 7$

Maintained Secondary $3,348/22,582 = 14.8\% \times 16 = 2$

Academies $9,467/22,855 = 41.9\% \times 16 = 7$

(The proportionate split between primary and secondary academies, if applied at the discretion of the Academies, is 2 primary and 5 secondary seats.)

- 8 As reported to the Forum in the previous annual reviews for May 2013 and April 2014 applying strict proportionality meant that the Forum had one too many secondary academy representatives and one too few maintained secondary school representatives (either a Headteacher or a Governor). The Forum exercised discretion and proceeded with that membership there being a consensus that the membership was sufficiently broadly proportionate.
- 10 The calculation above confirms that the membership now accords with strict proportionality
- 11 It is therefore proposed that no change is made to the current, proportionate schools representation, as shown at Appendix 1.

Membership of the Budget Working Group

- 12 Regulations prescribe how the Forum itself is to be constituted. These provisions do not apply to the composition of the Budget Working Group. That is a matter for the Forum itself. The Forum agreed in October 2012 that representative bodies be invited to submit nominations to serve on the Budget Working Group on the basis that

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services Officer, on Tel (01432) 260239

the Group will consist of 14 Members with the 11 places available to primary schools, secondary schools and academies, (taking account of the 2 early years places and 1 special schools place) to be allocated on a broadly proportionate basis based on pupil numbers in each category. The Forum also agreed that there should be a minimum of one maintained school representative from the secondary sector and one academy representative from the primary school sector.

- 13 Using the figures from the January 2015 census produces an allocation of places as follows:

Maintained Primary $9,767/22,582 = 43.3\% \times 11 = 5$

Maintained Secondary $3,348/22,582 = 14.8\% \times 11 = 1.63$

Academies $9,467/22,582 = 41.9\% \times 11 = 4.61$

- 14 Technically, by a very narrow margin, on a strict calculation this means that the current balance of 2 maintained secondary representatives and 4 academies representatives can be maintained as shown at appendix 1. It is reiterated, however, that proportionality is not required to apply to the BWG.

Next Steps

- 15 The Schools Forum operational and good practice guide contains guidance on the membership of Schools Forums. In relation to the election and nomination of Schools Members it states: "The relevant group or sub-group is probably best placed to determine how their schools members should be elected." "The purpose of ensuring that each group or sub-group is responsible for their election process is to guarantee that there is a transparent and representative process by which members of schools forums are nominated to represent their constituents." "Academies members must be elected by the proprietor bodies of the academies in the local authority's area."
- 16 In terms of non-schools membership representative groups will be invited to make nominations. The local authority must appoint at least one person to represent early years providers.
- 17 Relevant groups will be written to confirm their representation.

Community impact

- 18 None

Equality duty

- 19 There are no implications.

Financial implications

- 20 None.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services Officer, on Tel (01432) 260239

Legal implications

- 21 The Department for Education publication: Schools Forums: Operational and Good Practice Guidance - October 2013 indicates that the responsibility for establishing Schools Forums rests with the Local Authority. This reflects the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 and the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 (the Regulations).
- 22 The proposals comply with provisions in the Regulations and guidance governing membership.

Risk management

- 23 Failure to comply with the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 in terms of membership, minimum statutory requirements and broadly proportional representation could leave the Local Authority open to legal challenge. This report makes recommendations to mitigate that risk.

Consultees

- 24 None

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Membership of the Schools Forum and the Budget Working Group

Appendix 2 - Table showing numbers in different school sectors

Background papers

- None identified.

Schools Forum Membership

Schools Members

- 5 maintained primary schools' headteacher representatives
- 1 Local Authority maintained schools' with a maintained nursery class representative
- 1 maintained primary schools' governor representative
- 1 maintained secondary schools' headteacher representative
- 1 maintained secondary schools' governor representative
- 1 Local Authority maintained special schools' headteacher representative
- 1 special schools' governor representative
- 1 Pupil Referral Units' (PRUs) management committee representative
- 7 academies' representatives (headteacher/governor/schools business manager)

Non Schools Members

- 1 16-19 provider representative
 - 2 Early Years representatives
 - 1 14-19 Partnership representatives
 - 2 Diocesan/faith representatives
 - 2 Trade Union representatives, 1 primary school and 1 secondary school
- Total Forum members: 27

Budget Working Group

- 5 Maintained Primary Schools
- 2 Maintained Secondary Schools
- 4 Academies (1 primary 3 secondary)
- 2 Early Years Representatives
- 1 Special school Representative

Appendix 2

	LA Maintained		Academies		Free Schools		Total	
	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils
Primary Schools	60	9,767	17	3,168	1	50	78	12,985
Secondary Schools	5	3,348	9	5,875	1	47	15	9,270
All through Schools			1	327			1	327
Special Schools	2	116	2	191			4	307
Pupil Referral Units	1	63					1	63
	68	13,294	29	9,561	2	97	99	22,952

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services Officer, on Tel (01432) 260239



MEETING:	Schools Forum
MEETING DATE:	5 June 2015
TITLE OF REPORT:	Budget Planning for the next Three Years
REPORT BY:	Assistant Director, Education And Commissioning

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To receive and consider a presentation on a range of information to inform the development of a financial approach for schools in Herefordshire for the next three years.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) the Schools Forum receive a presentation on the financial context that may come into place over the next three years; and**
- (b) establish a planning approach to develop a three year budget strategy.**

Alternative options

- 1 No alternatives are presented as it has been agreed that a presentation and workshop should take place. Schools Forum could adopt an approach to plan budgets on an annual basis but this would not enable the Forum to take a strategic approach and establish longer term pieces of work to alter spending and enable the dedicated schools budget to be managed effectively

Reasons for recommendations

- 2 It is prudent for the Schools Forum, schools representatives and Herefordshire Council officers to consider how to plan for possible financial scenarios over the next three years to enable resources to be effectively managed.

Key considerations

- 3 A presentation will be given at the meeting. This will contain a range of schools and council budget information, particular factors to consider and proposals on how to take the work forward.

Community impact

- 4 None at this stage.

Equality and human rights

- 5 Any resulting proposals will have to pay due regard to Section 149, the "General Duty" on public authorities as set out:

"A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct ... prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it."

Equality impact assessments will be carried out as any proposals are developed.

Financial implications

- 6 No implications at this stage.

Legal implications

- 7 The purpose of this report is to confirm arrangements to update the Schools Forum on future financial issues and to hold a planning workshop.
- 8 Section 10 of the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 sets out the local authority's duties to consult with the Schools Forum on school funding issues.
- 9 This is not a consultation and as such there are no specific legal implications.

Risk management

- 10 No risks are associated with debating a presentation.

Consultees

- 11 The chair and vice chair of the Schools Forum, and the chair of the budget working group have all agreed to this approach as a positive way of engaging school leaders.

Appendices

- None

Background papers

- None identified.

MEETING:	Schools Forum
DATE:	5 June 2015
TITLE OF REPORT:	Work Programme
REPORT BY:	Governance Services

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider the Forum's work programme.

Recommendation

THAT: the Work Programme be noted, subject to any comments the Forum wishes to make.

Herefordshire Schools Forum – Work Programme 2014/15

Friday 10 July 2015 – 9.30 am
(Date to be retained in diary in case of urgent business)
Friday 23 October 2015– 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election of Chairman/Vice-Chairman of Forum • Election of Chairman of Budget Working Group • Report of Budget Working Group (outcome of School budget 2016/17 consultation - approval of provisional National Funding Formula values) • Capital Investment 2015/16 Update • Review of High Needs Tariffs Implementation • Workplan • Dates of Meetings

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Governance Services on (01432) 260239

Friday 4 December 2015 – 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Friday 15 January 2016 – 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated Schools Grant settlement and proposed schools budget 2016/17 • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Friday 11 March 2016 – 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan • Dates of Meetings

Background Papers

- None identified.