

## Notes of Peterborough Schools Forum held on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022

**Present:** Jonathan Lewis; Rachel Davies; Pete Edgley (on behalf of Darren Ayling); Helen Price; Jude MacDonald; Mark Woods; Andy Lyons; Kate Pereira; Stuart Mansell; Cllr Lynne Ayres; Debbie Hayes; Mohammed Younis; Susannah Connell Sarah Burling (notes)

**Apologies:** Darren Ayling; Scott Hudson; Roz Mercuri; Lynne Blythe; John Gilligan; Jo Cook;

Item		Action
1	<b>Welcome, Apologies &amp; Declarations of Interest</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mark welcomed those present to the meeting and apologies were given as noted.</li> </ul>	
2	<b>Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper on Growth Fund to share later on the agenda</li> </ul>	
3	<b>Schools Financial Health/ Balance Control</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper to accompany this item provides an analysis of maintained schools revenue accounts and academy balances. Balances in 2020-21 were higher than usual due to there being no balance control mechanism in place as a result of the uncertainty of Covid and the closure/ partial closure of schools.</li> <li>Detailed breakdown of academy balances can be found in Appendix B. It is hard to report academy balances as more schools are starting to pool their balances.</li> <li>Learning Resource and energy costs per pupil increased in 2021-22. Teacher funding per pupil increased in 2021-22.</li> <li>Section 5 includes details of school's capital balance by phase and funding source.</li> <li>Balance Control mechanism has been in place for several years now. Balances cannot exceed 8% of their Individual Schools Budget for Primary and Special schools and 5% for Secondary Schools. Two schools have exceeded that this year (included in Appendix A) and we are working with them to understand these surplus balances.</li> <li>Schools Forum are asked to consider the proposals to maintain the current BCM of 8% for 2022/23. Schools Forum agreed.</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Schools Funding Consultation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DfE published a consultation in the spring on the next stage of the move towards a national funding formula. Peterborough already follows this.</li> <li>A lot of interaction between national funding formula and high needs. There will be clear mechanism to continue to transfer funding to high</li> </ul>	

	<p>needs block.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local authorities will retain the ability transfer 0.5% of the schools block and there will be a mechanism for multi-year transfers.</li> <li>• Current notional SEN is set at a local level. The proposal is to calculate at a national level as part of the direct national funding formula. Talking to move towards a percentage of EHCPs. Will have to decide if start to move notional SEN budget towards the national average. Something to consider in the autumn when we have more information.</li> <li>• Growth Funding will continue but want to try and align the system – Approach 1 – retain some local flexibility and Approach 2 – national standardised system. Approach 1 is the DfE’s preferred approach.</li> <li>• Funding for new schools is getting more expensive. Our current arrangements are not sufficient to fund new schools.</li> <li>• Where there are changes going on around falling rolls, can use that money to repurpose.</li> <li>• Approach two is a tariffed based approach.</li> <li>• Popular Growth – should we apply the same principles in the maintained sector.</li> <li>• Premises funding – quite significant for Peterborough. Have used split sites to fund alternative arrangements around growth. Proposal is to base funding on basic eligibility + distance eligibility. The four schools on split sites carry balances of £6.2 million between them. They wouldn’t need the £100,000. Helen Price declared an interest in this item. Hampton College is financially disadvantaged by per institution funding mechanisms as the Primary and Secondary schools are under the same DfE number. Probably need to check again across all schools if there are other schools that need to be included on the split site list as don’t want them to miss out. Think that it is important that the schools on split sites respond to this consultation. We will be drafting local authority response to this Consultation. Schools can do their own individual responses. Can draft a Schools Forum response if the group would like to. There is nothing to stop all through schools asking for another DfE number. Helen will take the issue to the CST Group in the autumn.</li> <li>• Don’t think that we will need to amalgamate any schools.</li> <li>• Proposing to simplify the Minimum Funding Guarantee. Looking at a per pupil arrangement around year groups.</li> <li>• Proposing to continue to publish the national funding formula in July each year. In order for schools to understand what the formula will mean for them in practice, there are two proposed options:</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Continue to publish notional allocations as we do now</li> <li>○ Publishing a calculator tool which allows schools to plug in their own pupil numbers and characteristics to see what their funding would be</li> <li>● Under the direct national funding formula, the October Census will form the basis of most school and pupil data used to calculate allocations. Local authorities will no longer need to complete and APT but will still need to provide some additional information.</li> <li>● The local authority will need to inform the ESFA of any planned reorganisations and changes in pupil numbers related to any such organisations. Academy Trusts will supply information on forecast pupil numbers in respect of academies funded on estimates. Local authorities will provide information on forecast pupil number changes relating to structural changes of basic need. Information will need to be collected earlier than under the current system. Two options under the direct national funding formula for GAG funding received for mid-year academy converters.</li> <li>● Forward Timeline – will continue for least two years allocation of budgets against national funding formula. Will be at least 2027-28 before direct funding is implemented.</li> <li>● The Schools Bill supports the move towards a direct national funding formula. This measure means that local authorities will have a local education budget. This includes providing any supplementary funding provided to schools and includes spending on and other local education expenditure covering high needs, early years and central school service. Local authorities will be able to continue with de-delegation. This will mean that Schools Forums will retain their responsibilities around local education spending but will no longer advise on setting local funding formula for core schools funding.</li> <li>● The Consultation closes on 9<sup>th</sup> September. Will come back to Forum when the response has been published with a clearer idea of role.</li> </ul>	
5	<p><b>Growth Fund</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Growth fund can only be used to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need.</li> <li>○ support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size legislation</li> <li>○ to meet the cost of new schools opening or growing to meet demand or legacy agreements in place</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The paper accompanying the item updates on allocations agreed chargeable to this financial year. An allocation has been set aside for the new maintained school, Sir John Henry Newman, due to open in September 2022. This is the balance of the pre-opening funding and dis-economies funding to allow the school to put in place the required</li> </ul>	

	<p>management structures and to meet the resourcing costs of new year groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Growth Fund is currently in surplus. If not spent this will be put back into the bottom line of DSG and carried forward. Two new Free Schools are not funded through this as funding comes straight from the government.</li> </ul>	
6	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 251 – statutory return that lays out where we spend our money year on year. Submitted on time. Have come back with queries. As soon as Jon has responded to these, he will circulate final statement. Will put on next agenda.</li> <li>Jon acknowledged colleagues leaving the Fourm. Amanda Dowd, Darren Ayling and Rhys Throwers. Jon thanked them for their contribution. This opens up opportunities for the CEO group. If there are colleagues that you can think of that we should be asking to join, please let Mark/ Jon know.</li> <li>Future Meeting Dates – will align with Cambridgeshire dates when they are published.</li> </ul>	JL