|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Members: | **Position** | **Voting** | **Attendance** |
| Jane Shields | Primary Maintained Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Karen Joy | Special Maintained Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Karen Bennett | PRU Maintained Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Tim Williams | Primary Academy Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Cathy Reid | Secondary Academy Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Paul Jackson | Special/PRU Academy Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Stephen Avis | CFO Multi Academy Trust | Voting | Apologies were given and accepted. |
| Richard Warnham | Governor Primary Maintained | Voting | Present |
| Barbara Fincham | Governor Primary Academy | Voting | Present |
| Clive Mailing | Governor Secondary Maintained | Voting | Present |
| Peter Martin – Chair. | Governor Secondary Academy | Voting | Present |
| Ian Chappell - Vice-Chair. | Governor Secondary, Special and PRU | Voting | Present |
| Vacancy | Early Years Representative | Non-voting | N/A |
| Vacancy | 16-19 Provider Representative | Non-voting | N/A |
| Kirstin Barker | C of E Diocese Representative | Voting | Present |
| Clare Redmond | RC Diocese Representative | Voting | Present |
| Julia Harris | Teaching Unions Representative | Non-voting | Absent |
| Vacancy | CFO Multi Academy Trust | Voting |  |
| In attendance: |  |  |  |
| Chris Kiernan | Assistant Director of Education and SEND LA. |  | Present |
| Maria Beaney | Finance Business partner LA. |  | Present |
| Paul Clarke |  |  | Present |
| Sarah Phillipson | Clerk. |  | Present |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Agenda Point.** | **Discussion.** |
| 1. | **Apologies and attendance** | Attendance noted above.  Stephen Avis gave apologies, and these were accepted. |
| 2. | **Declarations of Interest** | No changes.  Members below noted a conflict of interest with;  Item 11:  Clive Mailings – Chair of governors at one of the schools.  Richard Warnham – Oaklands school  Kirsten Baker – St Johns Infants schools.  Item 9:  Ian Chappell – Chair of the Trust noted. |
| 3. | **Minutes from the previous meeting.** | 30th September 2020 |
|  | **3.1** | **Accuracy.**  The minutes were agreed as an accurate representation of the meeting. |
|  | **3.2** | **Matters Arising.**  Action carried over– MB to send out to eligible voting members the above proposals and request an agreement. Carried forward  Action carried over – MB/WV to contact all providers of 16-19 sectors and EYFS sectors. Carried forward  Action –Add the Scheme for Financing Schools consultation findings to the Schools forum December meeting. COMPLETED within the agenda  Action – MD to update the final draft and send out to all members of the Schools forum. Completed within agenda.  Action CK to provide trend information at the December meeting around the use of the outreach services. COMPLETED within agenda.  Action – Add to the December agenda the proposal meeting that Schools forum to discuss and vote on top-slicing mainstream schools' budgets to fund the outreach services. COMPLETED within agenda. |
| 4 | **Verbal update from the High Needs Sub Group**  **Chris Kiernan** | CK updated the members regarding the High Needs subgroup meeting held on the 5th November 2020. The minutes were previously shared with all members.  Main points covered:   * £14 million overspend projected. * Fourteen-point recovery savings plan was shared in detail with the HN subgroup. This outlined the action points needed to bring the budget out of deficit. * There are seven savings lines within the recovery action plan. Each action has lead officer allocated. * Kim Gunn is supporting one of the actions via the Educational people. * Substantial progress has been made within in the decommissioned and commissioned services action points. 515 special school spaces are required within the LA. Capital funding has been agreed for schools to provide the places, and the formal agreements are in place to build what is required. * Six hundred new places will be available over the next 5-6 years. This will be the major contributor to the savings. This will allow a surplus at the end of 2027/28. * The banding system will be fairer and will be in place by 2021. (Cost neutral). * The outreach service is now out to tender to ensure value for money. * All independent schools will be audited to ensure that costs also value for money. Lead by GM. * Stop top-up funding in all but exceptional circumstances. * Top slicing 0.5 % of the DSG for one year.   The chair noted the amount of work which has been put into this project. The savings will be considerate. CK pointed out that this has been achievable by the support from HT and schools.  The chair of the HN subgroup stated that he had briefed the Medway Secondary heads group, and the feedback was overall positive. Some elements raised concerns as it directly affected individuals schools. Discomfort around working with the EHCP process to make it more robust, this suggests there will be less awarded, and the offset of this is reduced top-up funding for those schools that ware trying not to apply for EHCPs.  CK reiterated that EHCPs do need to be reduced to come into line with the rest of the country. There is no reason for Medway to be applying for 17% more EHCPs. The majority seem to be in years 9, 10 and 11. The lower years have reduced significantly. LA will provide EHCPs for those who need them. The reduction will come from those children moving out of the system post 19. |
| 5 | **Place Planning and Growth Strategy**  **Paul Clarke** | PC presented the Place Planning and Growth Strategy, which had been taken to cabinet noting the following key points:  **Primary:**   * Overall capacity is good and should be sufficient for the next five years. However, Peninsula West is forecasted to have a localised shortfall, which may be met through excess capacity in neighbouring Strood and Peninsula East. Forecasts will continue to be monitored and updated twice each year, and compared with weekly birth numbers, to identify any variations from this position. * Hoo and its surrounds are expected to be the main area for housing growth in the local plan, and so the demand for school places will inevitably increase. The number of additional places required, and when and how they are provided will depend on the rate of house building. When developments come forward, the LA will work with the developers and planning department to ensure that appropriate school places are provided in the right place and at the right time. * Local schools have already been identified for expansion in the future and some feasibility studies undertaken in readiness.   **Q – 3 Business cases coming from Primary schools not full and seeking additional funding, this has been due in most cases to not being allowed to reduce PAN sizes. Do we have places in the right areas?**  A – There is a need for flexibility to support inward migration. The report notes in the section – 5.3 graph outlines this. The is a fluctuating number of children arriving at the LA throughout the year. The is a need for a 5 – 8 % flexibility. Popularity, perception of the schools affects this, and the LA is working with individual schools to manage the trends.  Secondary:   * The pressure on places has begun to increase in year seven as the larger numbers of primary cohorts feed into secondary education. This will extend through all year groups over time. This is also impacted by a combination of new families coming to live in Medway, and also pupils coming from outside of Medway to attend Medway secondary schools.   Non-Selective   * Demand for year seven non-selective places has been rising steeply from 2016 and is forecasted to continue until at least 2023. Sufficient capacity in year seven intakes has been available up to 2019 due to spare capacity in older year groups. Year group rolls were lower in the past, and so current older year groups are smaller. However, this leaves a shortfall in the future, and schools cannot be expected to continue to meet demand within the current capacity.   Non-selective Year 7   * This shortfall is planned to be met through the provision of the two new Free Schools; Leigh Academy Rainham and The Maritime Academy in Strood. These will be delivered and funded through the Government's Free School programme. Free schools are new academies, rather than academies which have converted from an existing school.   Initially, the target date for opening the free schools was 2020; however, delays in the programme have meant that the targeted opening dates are now 2021 and 2022, resulting in the number of pupils forecast to exceed current capacity before the free schools open. As an intermediate solution, in 2020 ten existing secondary schools have agreed to admit bulge classes to varying degrees.  In 2021, even with the free school in Rainham opening, demand will exceed supply, and further bulge classes will be required. Thomas Aveling and Robert Napier will take a second bulge class of 30 pupils each, and the new Leigh Academy Rainham will take an additional 60 pupils. The extra capacity from these bulge classes, and the free schools, are shown on the graph as the proposed Published Admission Number (PAN) dashed line.   * The capacity provided by the new free schools is forecasted to be sufficient for the total non-selective rolls. As further housing developments are approved, there is likely to be an increase in secondary numbers.   Selective   * Secondary selective schools are also facing pressure on places (Figure 11). Schools have been admitting over their PAN, using surplus capacity from older year groups. Three projects were carried out to provide additional capacity, at Sir Joseph Williamson's Mathematical School, Rainham Mark Grammar School, and Holcombe Grammar School. This is reflected in the increasing selective PAN between 2015 and 2018. * This expansion programme will provide places for the next few years. Current forecasts expect that selective Year 7 rolls will continue growing, above the additional capacity provided. In 2020 the shortfall is forecasted to be 63 places, growing to 179 places in 2023.   Special Needs and Disabilities (SEND)   * In 2015/16 expansions at Danecourt for 40 primary pupils with ASD and some SLD and the primary expansion at Abbey Court for 68 pupils with SLD/PMLD were undertaken. * The Department for Education launched a SEN capital programme in 2018, which allocated £2.3m to Medway over three years to provide additional places and facilities for pupils with Education Health and Care Plans. Following a series of consultations, the following projects were selected, and created an additional 164 places and contribute towards a further 160. * A further £2.5m has been made available by the council to create up to 250 additional resourced unit places within mainstream schools. This will provide the opportunity for pupils with SEND to remain within a mainstream environment where that is appropriate. A programme to deliver this need is currently under development. * The council has worked in partnership with the DfE, to acquire in-principal agreement for a Free School to be built on Council land at Cornwallis Avenue, Gillingham. This will provide 160 specialist places for secondary aged pupils with SEMH and ASD with challenging behaviour. It is expected that the school, which will result in the expansion and relocation of the Inspire Free School currently located in Walderslade, will be ready to occupy by 2023. * In August 2020 Cabinet approved expansions at Abbey Court and Bradfields (decisions 96/2020 and 97/2020 refer) to provide additional secondary SEND places. Abbey Court's primary provision was relocated in 2016 to new purpose-built accommodation. The site included sufficient space so that additional accommodation could be built there at a later date and the secondary provision transferred there. This project will provide for 56 additional places for vulnerable pupils with the most severe needs. The project at Bradfields will provide for 100 additional pupils mostly with ASD. * The targeted opening for both projects is September 2022. * The local plan sees that 20k plus houses are likely to be built in the local area. Plans are in place with the planning and regeneration team to ensure there are sufficient numbers of spaces for the schools.   PC left the meeting. |
| 6 | **Round 2 Centrally Retained Forecasts**  **Maria Beaney** | MB presented the report which updated the Schools Forum members on the latest forecast position on the Council school's forum approved budget for 2020-21 as at the end of October 2020.    **Centrally Retained Budget Forecasts**  The Schools' Forum approved centrally retained budgets of £1,363,500 from the schools' block of the DSG which can be grouped into three categories; Growth Funding New Classes old policy commitments, Growth Funding New Classes commitments, Schools in Financial difficulty.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Service** | **Budget** | **Forecast** | **Variance** | | Growth Funding New Classes old policy commitments | £660,000 | £1,110,000 | £450,000 | | Growth Funding New Classes commitments | £208,500 | £208,500 | £0 | | Schools in Financial difficulty | £495,000 | £495,000 | £0 | | **Total** | **£1,363,500** | **£1,813,500** | **£450,000** |   There is a £450,000 projected overspend due to the three schools who were incorrectly badged as budge classes rather than ongoing commitments in the 2019-20 growth able. At a special meeting earlier this year, forum members agreed to recover this overspend from the 2021-22 DSG allocation rather than the following year as is the usual process.  **Central Services Schools Blocks Forecasts**:    The Central Schools Services Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant funds the statutory duties the local authority holds for both maintained schools and academies:     * Funding for ongoing responsibilities, such as admissions. * Funding previously allocated through the retained duties element of the Education Services Grant (ESG). * Residual funding for historic commitments     At their January 2020, Schools Forum meeting members approved, the LA's request to allocate the CSSB block of the DSG to run the following services:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Total  Budget  2020-21  £ | 2020-21  SB retained Services  £ | 2020-21  SB **forecast**  £ | | **Total** | **£1,274,188** | **£768,337** | **£768,337** |   Whilst some of the schemes are overspending, there is no plan currently to ask for an increased contribution from the schools' forum. There is no change to the planned spending on these schemes.    Members are asked to allow the LA to use the underspend within one service to offset as much as possible the overspends of another service. Any underspends at the year-end will be carried forward to fund the statutory functions of the LA in 2021-2022.  **Q – What is the Schools Forum Administration budget of £5,000 been spent on?**  A – Clerking services and printing costs, along with Hall hire.  **Q – Can members of the school forum claim for printing costs for ink etc.?**  A- We have investigated this, and there is not a policy currently in place, so this will be drafted and brought to the next meeting. CK agreed that it is commonplace to have this in place and it will be fast-tracked for agreement.  **Decision - The Schools' Forum members noted and commented on this report.** |
| 7 | **Scheme for Financing Schools Consultation Feedback**  **Maria Beaney** | JS left the meeting at 2.50 pm.  MB presented the report on the Scheme for Financing Schools Consultation Feedback. She explained that at the meeting in September 2020, Schools Forum was briefed on the requirement for the local authority to consult with its maintained schools on some changes it would like to make to the Medway Scheme for Financing Schools in line with guidance published by The Secretary of State in August 2020. These changes mainly covered.     * Planning for Deficit Budgets * Insurance * Submission of Financial Forecasts * Financial information on school websites     The consultation was open from Monday 2nd November 2020 to Sunday 22nd November 2020 and ran in parallel to the schools and academy funding formula consultation.  Using the council's online contact system, emails were sent to Headteachers, Finance Officers and office/finance at email addresses of maintained schools. Copies of the consultation were uploaded to SLA online and on the Council Website.  The consultation asked the maintained schools to submit their views on five questions around key changes. 11 responses were received from the 27 eligible schools, which equates to 40.7%. Copies of the consultation were uploaded to SLA online and on the Council Website.  Appendix A is the revised policy with changes highlighted in yellow. Section 6.2.4 has a slight change it currently states £10,000, and it should state £1,000.  Schools forum members noted the contents of this report.  **Q – Items which are lower than £1000 should be added to the Asset Register?**  A – Yes if they are electrical. There is not a lowest price, but it is recommended as £50.  **Decision - JS proposed the agreement. CM seconded this proposal. Maintained school forum members voted to agree on the amendments to the Medway Scheme for Financing Schools as per appendix 1.** |
| 8 | **Funding Formula Consultation Feedback**  **Maria Beaney** | MB presented the 2021-22 Schools and Academies Funding Formula Consultation Responses report. The Schools' Forum members agreed as part of the 2021-22 Funding Formula that the basic principles for future Schools and Academies Funding Formula should wherever possible and financially mirror the national funding formula and the following recommendation match this apart for the lump sum;  * To provisionally set/agree on the funding factors and unit costs which were included in Medway schools and academies funding formula consultation? * To set a lump sum factor of £75,000, flexed to make the formula affordable. * To de-delegate the trade union duties, free school meals eligibility service and the central services budgets per pupil for both primary and secondary maintained schools.   These decisions were provisional and subject to consultation with Medway s  schools and Academies.  The consultation was open from Monday 2nd November 2020 to Sunday, 22nd November 2020. Using the council's online contact system, emails were sent to Headteachers, Finance Officers and office/finance at addresses of both maintained schools and academies. Copies of the consultation were uploaded to SLA online and on the Council Website. Some schools contacted the LA to obtain copies of this consultation as they did not receive the emails.  The consultation asked for schools and academies to submit their views on 16 questions. All questions were applicable to maintained schools, and all but three questions were applicable to academies and free schools.  36 (34%) responses were received from the 95 eligible schools, not all responders answered all questions, and some academies answered the non-academy questions. This compares to the 27 responses received last year and the 32 response the year before.  There has been a small improvement with the number of academy responses received. This year 58% (21/36). However, out of these, 36 were responses from Multi-academy trusts that had 5 schools within their trust, so this is recorded as 5 responses. If only the MATs were considered then 15 out of 94 schools responded to consultation questions.  **Q – What can we do to increase the response rate with our schools?**  A - Several schools who are academies did not believe that they received their funding from the LA, and so they didn't respond.  **Q – Can something be added to the secondary headteacher meeting?**  A – It has been before. People will respond based on what it means for their school, and it becomes too complicated for them to understand this.  A member noted that the LA should feedback the impact of the consultation to the schools as they will then feel it is worthwhile completing.  **Q – Has anything ever been changed following a consultation?**  A – It would depend on the final agreements.  The majority of responses were in agreement except for question 12 - *Do you support the methodology of applying a gains cap to the funding formula to make the formula affordable?* This was also considered the 4th most important question.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **No of Schools** | **Percentage** | | Yes | 15 | 15.79% | | No | 21 | 22.11% | | N/A | 0 | 0.00% | | No Response | 59 | 62.11% | | **Total** | **95** | **100.00%** |   The Schools forum members noted **the** contents of this report and consider these responses when setting the 2021-22 funding formula. |
| 9. | **LA commissioned outreach services**  **Chris Kiernan** | IC declared an interest and abstained from the discussion. CK presented the Provisional Schools and Academies Funding formula 2021-22 report, noting the following items:This document sets out the provision made by the Fortis Trust and the Marlborough Centre outreach services. Both services focus on assisting schools to meet the needs of pupils with additional needs who attend state-funded schools in Medway. It shows the number of schools and trusts receiving support from outreach services currently funded by the local authority (LA), using the high needs block (HNB) of the dedicated school's grant (DSG). The charge to the HNB is £505,000 in total for the two services.**Current service provision and funding.** Both trusts provide outreach services that are in high demand.  The Fortis Trust outreach service has increased the number of schools from 11 in 2014 to 79 in 2018/19 (the 2019/20 year is not used in the comparisons due to the effect of the pandemic on outreach work).  The centre has increased significantly the schools serviced by its service – between 2014/15 and 2018/19 the number of schools using its outreach service increased by over 600 per cent.  The Marlborough outreach service. By 2018/19, it served the same number of settings and schools as The Fortis Trust.  As noted in the report to the September school's forum meeting, of the 76 primary schools in Medway (41 academy schools and 37 maintained), the overwhelming majority receive a service from one of the provider trusts. Of the 17-academy secondary and one maintained secondary school, most receive a service, although few of the grammar schools.  Overall, in 2018/19, 86 of the 94 mainstream schools in Medway asked for and received outreach support from one of the two centres – 93 per cent of such schools.  Again, as noted in the September report, a large number of pupils are supported by the outreach services – in 2018/19, The Fortis trust supported 434 pupils and The Marlborough centre 402 – almost two per cent of the total school population. **Future options.** While the outreach services are valued greatly by the LA, as well as the staff, parents and pupils of mainstream schools whom all benefit from them, the way they are funded is not sustainable; and neither is it right in terms of the way school funding is allocated.  CK outlined the best way to supply this service in a way that causes schools the least difficulty and if possible' insures' schools against sudden spikes in need to support pupils. Offering in detail two suggestions;  **Option 1** - Implementing an 'insurance' based system.  **Option 2** - A 'traded' model, under which schools pay for the support they need.  A member noted that schools have commented that if they were to fund these services directly, they wouldn't be as keen, they believe that LA will continue to pay and they do not understand the cost for this will come out of their budgets via the top-slicing. The only to do this would be as an SLA which would ensure fairness. The schools feel the services are good but only as it is free. The numbers have increased due to external services directing schools to use these two provisions. There is limited competition.  CK noted that this is a very specialist market and it was unlikely that others would offer similar services. There is a risk that if schools with restricted budgets would not fund this themselves.  The LA recommendation is that school's forum agrees to fund the service through a top-slice at its November meeting and that it agrees to consider funding the outreach services in this way annually, subject to a report that considers the value for money (considering the services' costs and their impact) in the previous school year, every September.  **Q – Medway secondary head noted that there are a couple of other schools interested in offering outreach services. However, they were disappointed that they had not been** **able to propose this to the council. Therefore we are giving £500,000 to only two providers and why only these two?**  A – The budget is fixed and will not increase with inflation. The LA does not have time to procure services for the 2021/22 financial year. Open-minded to do this in future. We need certainly in the market to do this.  **Q –If it is top sliced, how do you choose the schools to support? If the service is good enough, it will continue as an SLA.**  A – The providers would prioritise the requests; they usually meet most requests. By top-slicing we may increase those numbers, then it would have to be done on a selection process. The budget remains the same.  A member noted that he would agree to this for one year but would review this going forward. |
| 10 | **Provisional Funding Formula 2021-22**  **Maria Beaney** | **Provisional Funding Formula 2021-22**  Members were requested to NOTE and COMMENT on this report.  **Decision - All members noted.**  **APPROVE the 0.5% transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for 2021-22 as per section 3.3.**  Eligible members voted:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappel – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible.  Karen Joy \_ no vote not eligible.  Kirsten barker – yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham – Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE the top slice of the schools' block to repay the 2020-21** overspend as per section 3.5.  Eligible members voted:  Eligible members voted:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappel – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy \_ no vote not eligible  Kirsten barker – yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE the top slice of the school's block by £505,000 to pay for the outreach service in 2021-22 as per section 3.7.**  Eligible members voted:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – abstained due to conflict.  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy \_ no vote not eligible  Kirsten barker – No.  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – No.  Peter Martin – yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE The de-delegation service for 2021-22 as per section 4.2.**  Eligible to vote:  Only maintained Trade union s points  **Secondary:**  Clive Mailings– Yes  **Primary:**  Richard Warnham - Yes  Clare Redmond - Yes.  Free school meals – no vote needed.  Central services top slice to stay the same  Secondary:  Clive Mailings– Yes  Primary:  Richard Warnham - Yes  Clare Redmond - Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE the provisional removal of the 6% school gains cap from the local funding formula as per section 6.6.**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy \_ no vote not eligible  Kirsten barker – Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE School Forum members are asked to approve the provisional removal of the 6% school gains cap from the local funding formula.**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy - no vote not eligible  Kirsten Barker – Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **APPROVE Medway propose to use the same lump method and sum as 2021-22.**  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy \_ no vote not eligible  Kirsten Barker – Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **NOTE the 2021-22 Provisional SB DSG allocation.**  **Decision - ALL NOTED**  **RECOMMEND to the cabinet to approve the changes to the Provisional Schools and Academies Funding Formula 2021-22 as outlined above.**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Clive Mailing – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett -no vote not eligible  Karen Joy - no vote not eligible  Kirsten Barker – Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Richard Warnham– Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.** |
| 11 | **Funding Support Business Cases**  **Maria Beaney** | Clive declared an interest. Left the meeting 15:47  Kirsten Barker declared an interest. Left the meeting 15:47  Richard Warnham declared an interest. Left the meeting 15:47  **Q - How do the schools know to apply for this funding?**  A – The LA have made all schools/academy aware that we have this policy in place. These are schools who have applied. School are also contacted directly by MB if she feels they could be eligible.  MB outlined each case to the members. The SF deliberated each case individually and came to the following decisions:  **St john CoE infant school:**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett - Yes  Karen Joy - Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **Oaklands:**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett - Yes  Karen Joy - Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.**  **St Augustine:**  Eligible to vote:  Cathy Reid – Yes  Clare Redmond – Yes  Barbara Fincham – Yes  Ian Chappell – Yes  Karen Bennett - Yes  Karen Joy - Yes  Paul Jackson – Yes  Tim Williams – Yes  Peter Martin – Yes.  **Decision - Voted Yes approve.** |
| 12. | **Date, time, and venue of the next meeting.** | 13th January 2021 @ 2 pm – Virtual Meeting.  Added to this will be governors policy for expenses will be added to the agenda along with the high need provision report moved from this meeting. |
| 13. | **AOB** | Vacancy within the SF membership CEO representative had come forward as the only nomination. This person is working for trust, who already have a member on the forum as a governor role. The SF discussed if this was allowed and agreed that there was to be a maximum of only two for any one trust.  **Decision – Stuart Gardener to be appointed as the SF CEO representative.** |
|  | **Meeting Ended 16.00** |  |

Signed by Chair ……………………………………………………………………….……. Date: ………………………………

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ACTIONS** | **RESP** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |