|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Members: | Position | Voting | Attendance |
| Vacancy | Primary Maintained Headteacher | Voting |  |
| Karen Joy | Special Maintained Headteacher | Voting | Absent |
| Karen Bennett | PRU Maintained Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Vacancy | Primary Academy Headteacher | Voting |  |
| Cathy Reid | Secondary Academy Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Paul Jackson | Special/PRU Academy Headteacher | Voting | Present |
| Stephen Avis | CFO Multi Academy Trust | Voting | Present |
| Richard Warnham | Governor Primary Maintained | Voting | Present |
| Barbara Fincham | Governor Primary Academy | Voting | Present |
| Clive Mailing -Vice Chair | Governor Secondary Maintained | Voting | Apologies |
| Peter Martin – Chair | Governor Secondary Academy | Voting | Present |
| Vacancy | Governor Special and PRU | Voting |  |
| Hannah Cartwright | Early Years Representative | Non-voting | Present |
| Simon Cook | 16-19 Provider Representative | Non-voting | Absent |
| Kirstin Barker | C of E Diocese Representative | Voting | Present |
| Clare Redmond | RC Diocese Representative | Voting | Present |
| Vacancy | Teaching Unions Representative | Non-voting |  |
| Stuart Gardiner | CFO Multi Academy Trust | Voting | Apologies |
| In attendance: |  |  |  |
| Celia Buxton | Assistant Director of Education and SEND LA. |  |  |
| Maria Beaney | Finance Business Partner LA. |  |  |
| Wendy Vincent | Head of Integrated 0-25. Disability Services LA |  |  |
| Sarah Phillipson | Clerk. |  |  |
| Martin Daniels | Finance LA. |  |  |
| Alex Moir | Parkwood Primary school. HT |  |  |
| Carmel Park | Parkwood Primary school. Business Manager. |  |  |
| Steve Pollard. | Parkwood Primary school. Vice-Chair |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No. | Discussion. |
| **1.** | **Apologies and attendance.**  As noted above.  Stuart Gardiner gave apologies; these were accepted.  Clive Mailing gave his apologies retrospectively due to misunderstanding with the start time.  The meeting was quorate. |
| 2 | **Declarations of Interest.**  No Changes to the previously shared declarations. |
| 4 | **Minutes from the previous meetings on 22nd September and 15th November 2021.**  Accuracy: The Minutes were agreed as an accurate representation of the meeting.  Matters arising:  *Action – MB to ensure that the detailed information request is considered when providing data during the consultation – COMPLETED.*  *Action – MB to ensure that the percentage of the DSG and the comparative figures be provided in the consultation information – COMPLETED.*  *Action - MB to check with Strood Academy if the meeting rooms are available and if they have the option for members to access the meeting virtually - COMPLETED.*  *Action - The proposal for funding support for additional Year 8 pupils and future plans to come to the next Schools forum meeting. MB and PC – COMPLETED.*  No outstanding actions.  **Q - What process has been made regarding the year 8 bulge class situation?**  A – Year 8 Boys will be placed in the Howard, some pupils before Christmas some now. Walderslade girls' school will be taking the Girls. |
| 5 | **SEN strategy and place planning – Wendy Vincent**  WV referred to her previously shared report noting that the High Needs SEND Budget is allocated annually by the Education Service Funding Agency.  The High Needs Budget is intended to be used to provide the most appropriate support package for a child or young person aged between 0 and 25 years old who has special educational needs and or disabilities (SEND). These students can be supported in various settings, taking account of parental and student choice, including nurseries, mainstream schools, special schools, colleges, and training centres. It is also intended to support good quality alternative provision for pupils who cannot receive their education in schools, i.e., those who have been permanently excluded in preparation for their return to mainstream education.  The High Needs Budget is administered in accordance with The Children and Families Act 2014, which sets out local authorities and education providers statutory duties.  High Needs Place Planning  The current strategy aimed to work with schools to ensure that children and young people meet their needs in the most appropriate setting. The LA work with mainstream schools to assist them to support a higher number of children with Education, Health and Care Plans. In 2019, 36% of children who have an EHCP in Medway attended mainstream school, which was significantly lower than the national figure of 39.2%. In April 2021, this had |
|  | risen to 42% compared with 40% nationally.  As the number of children who have an EHCP grows, the need for more children to be supported in mainstream schools also grows. There is also an increased need for resourced provision and special school places. Most of the current resource provision and special schools in Medway are full, resulting in an increased reliance on Independent Schools.  An additional 317 special school places and 185 resourced provision places have been identified and will open between September 2021 and September 2025. This should ensure that the LA has enough new SEN places for the medium term and further reduces reliance on Independent Schools.  **Current Commissioned SEN Places.**  WV report advised that Local Authorities are obliged to complete a "high needs change notification return" to the ESFA in November of each year. Medway Council SEN Team have worked with all schools that have resourced provisions, special schools and colleges to agree on the number and type of places required for 2022-23. This work determines the number of places required to meet the predicted needs of pupils who have EHCP's. See the full report for details.  WV noted that due to the pressure on the High Needs Budget, it is important that the Local Authority commissions enough places but limits the potential number of funded vacant places. The schools have taken conversations to assure them they will get the right funding, and the LA is not reducing places.  Abbey Court is in addition to the shown places. The LA has commissioned an additional 56 places at Abbey Court to reflect the increase as well as the building on the secondary provision at Bradfields, will provide a number of new places.  WV ran through the detailed report on placement numbers noting the key points:   * 30 extra places at Bradfields – a total of 366 next year * Brompton is back up to 100 for next year * Danecourt – 233 spaces for next year * No date for the new school inspire – waiting for the Free school team at the ESFA to confirm will give 60 spaces for next year * Rivermead Community school 197 places and Hospital school places 30   **Q – The Rowans have 65 spaces. Is this including the primary places?**  A- They normally have 65 in their secondary, including 15 funded places for their outreach provision.  A member noted a potential reduction of 25 places in alternative provision for next year. WV agreed that this was the case, as it was difficult as the provisions started empty but then filled up. The member added that if the LA are taking 15 places from the secondary part of the Rowans and 10 places out of Will Adams provision, then this is 25 fewer placements available. WV clarified that the 65 places at the Rowan are funded, and then, in addition to this, they also have 15 primary funded placements. |
|  | **Q - Have you now got the resource provision you need in the secondary schools?**  A – There is room for more, and the LA is in discussions with two more secondary schools. There is the risk that the places will fill quickly.  **Q - What specialisms do the LA require?**  A – ASD and SEMH places.  **Q - If there is a movement to reduce alternative provisions for secondary, how will this support the need to reduce permanent exclusions, and how will HTs access places at the right time?**  A – The numbers have been reviewed over the last five years, and it is important that the funding is used in the right places at the right time. The LA is being very careful around having too many vacant spaces.  A member noted that secondary heads are currently crying out for alternative provisions, and the funding is not channeled directly into schools. There is a concern that this provision is being reduced.  CB explained that it is the LA plan to look at this issue and be transparent by having conversations with the schools about what is needed and how the LA uses the money, whether that be in the provision or devolving it to schools to put in that pre-emptive work. The LA will be having conversations about how that works moving forward and going back to the schools.  **Q – Are all local children, or are they out of the area with the special units?**  A – The vast majority of funded places are for Medway places – however, if another area asks an academy to take the child, they can; if it is maintained, the LA will review this. The HTs are good at keeping the places open for Medway children. The LA also placed outside of Medway into Kent, and it is not legal to reserve spaces for just Medway children.  MB noted that there is an import and export adjustment, and which accounts for the funding. Last year Medway was an exporter.  A Schools forum member stated that an HT had confirmed that only yesterday they had tried to find a child placement at an alternative provision and was told that there were no places left in Medway.  WV added that the report figures are as they are today and have been sent to the EFSA as the LA commissioning intention; they will review them around January time and can make adjustments, in consultation with schools, so the figures may change as the schools move through next year. However, at the moment, these are the figures currently. |
| 6 | **Outreach Report – Celia Buxton**  PM declaration of interest was noted – PM did not vote or input into the discussion.  CB referred to her previously shared report explaining the report sets out the current provision made by the Fortis Trust (Bradfields) and the Marlborough Centre outreach services, which is currently funded by the local authority (LA), using the high needs block (HNB) and makes suggestions for how this funding is used moving forward. |
|  | CB outlined that currently, two services are commissioned in relation to children and young people with learning difficulties and SEMH:   1. *To provide direct outreach support to Medway state-funded mainstream nursery, private, voluntary and independent (PVI) providers and Medway state-funded mainstream primary and secondary schools/academies (hereby referred to as educational provisions) to support the education of children and young people with moderate or complex learning difficulties and enable them to access learning successfully in a fully inclusive environment within Medway mainstream settings.* 2. *Support educational providers in building capacity and expertise to include children and young people with moderate or complex learning difficulties in their home mainstream educational provision.*   A further provision is commissioned from The Marlborough Trust concerning children and young people with Autistic Spectrum Disorder/Speech Language and Communication Difficulties, which, in addition to the above, aims to:   1. *To support staff and pupils to work collaboratively to facilitate pupil progress and attainment so pupils achieve the best possible educational outcomes.* 2. *The outreach work contributes to a reduction in the rate and proportion of excluded pupils with ASD/SLCN.* 3. *Reduce the number of referrals for education, health and care assessment for children's young people with ASD/SLCN in educational provisions through skilling up staff and providing strategies for support and learning so that educational provisions are able to make good support for pupils through School SEN Support.* 4. *To improve parental confidence that mainstream educational providers can meet their children's SEN.*   CB further explained that a specific issue was raised at the Schools forum meeting about the offer of behaviour support through the Fortis Trust. The trust has clarified that its offer is in two distinct parts:   * A SEND service, which works with pupils and staff to enable learners with special educational needs to access teaching and learning within mainstream settings from nurseries to the sixth form; * A service for pupils who have social, emotional, mental health needs and where the behaviour are a result of an underlying SEND need, anxiety, trauma or difficulties with regulating their emotions.   The current contractual arrangements total £405,000 and have not been revised or uplifted since they were brokered in 2017, despite increased pupil numbers and staffing costs. There is a requirement in terms of transparent commissioning of services, and while it may not have been the case in the past, the forum agreed in principle last Jan to continue the contractual agreement for all services that expired in July 2020.   * The school forum was asked to take the following considerations: * The contractual arrangements for all services expired in July 2020; contracts have subsequently been rolled forward. |
|  | * The priorities, strengths and challenges in relation to inclusive education, particularly for children and young people with SEND has changed significantly since the arrangements were put in place in 2017; not only due to the ongoing pandemic but given the considerable improvement journey the education system has been engaged in since the local area SEND inspection. * Evidence of impact and a transparent commissioning process is required to ensure all available options have been considered and the best value for money is achieved. * The Schools forum provisionally agreed in January 2021 that the cost of these services should be funded by a 'top-slice' in the current (2021/22) financial year. * Annual funding arrangements make it difficult for providers to recruit and retain staff. * The current commissioned provision is the only provision free at the point of use to schools; therefore, any changes to this will need to be transitioned not to have a detrimental effect on the support for children and young people.   CB report outlined the future options, and the Schools forum members discussed the details.   * Agree on the top slice and continue current arrangements * Agree on the top slice and review current arrangements over a transition period * Cease agreement to the top slice, and the service continues through a traded model with options around subscription or pay as you go. (It is noted that the decision to 'trade' would be that of the providers) * Cease agreement to the top slice and discontinue the services moving forward   A member noted that EYFS 2-year-olds could not apply for High Needs support but are still expected to deliver the care and put the measures in place. WV noted that the disability act is only for 3 and 4-year-olds, so funding is restricted. Within Medway, the only nursery available is Abbey Court, a specialised nursery. Out of the 5% of children who receive the DLA. Only 1% of them qualify for a place to Abbey Court; the other options are Snapdragon, but they are assessment only. In Thanet, four nurseries specialise for children with SEN; even though they don't have the two-year-old high needs support funding, their local authority is making provision for those children to have that quality provision and be supported. CB responded by explaining that in Kent the additional funding is not from the Schools Block; they make additional payments out of their general funds for EYFS. LA does not have this funding currently.  **Q -How much of the early year's money was top sliced, and how much goes back into the early years?**  A – CB will take this conversation outside of the Schools forum**.**  It was questioned that the EYFS providers do not have a mechanism to have a voice to discuss these concerns and that they are not considered part of the education sector and don't have a vote in this meeting. Would it be possible to have their own forum and budgets? CB agreed to consider the issue and write to respond to the HC the EYFS representative. |
|  | CB recommended that Members of the School forum support the LA's proposal to top slice 0.25 per cent of delegated budgets to fund outreach services in the financial year 2020/2021, with the agreed timescale to review the current arrangements and transition over the period detailed.  A Schools forum member expressed his disappointment that the forum was being asked to again agree on a top slice until the current arrangements could be reviewed. The forum had expected these arrangements to have been completed last year.  The Schools forum members deliberated the recommendation.  **Decision- The Schools forum members voted and agreed to support only for another year the LA recommendation to - support the LA's proposal to top slice 0.25 per cent of delegated budgets to fund outreach services in the financial year 2020/2021, with the agreed timescale to review the current arrangements and transition into transition any changes over the period detailed. (Voting 1/9)**  Action – CB to write to the affected provisions to make them aware of the process regarding the funding going forward. |
| 7 | **2021-22 Round 2 Monitoring SB Centrally Retained Services – Maria Beaney**  MB presented her previously shared report explaining that on an annual basis, the Schools forum is required to approve the centrally retained budgets and the CSSB funding and is required to receive updated reports on how funding is being spent. At their meeting on 13th January 2021, the Schools forum members approved the centrally retained and the CSSB funding as explained below:    Service 2021-22 2021-22 Variance £  Budget Forecast (Sept 2021) £  C&A Directorate Management Team 176,884 176,884 0  Education Management Team 242,323 242,323 0  Schools’ forum Administration 5,000 1,000 (4,000)  SACRE 15,094 15,094 0  Achieve Officer 18,691 18,691 0  Admissions and Medway Test –  Excluding Appeals. 414,557 414,557 0  Governor Services 19,990 19,990 0  Total **892,539 888,539 (4,000)**  **De-delegated Services**  The de-delegated services funding is intended to provide funding for LA's to continue to operate their statutory functions for maintained schools only and is agreed as a top slice. Any underspends at the year-end will be carried forward to in 2022-2023. |
|  | Responsibilities for 2021-22 2021-22 Variance £  maintained schools Budget £ Forecast (Sept 2021) £  Functions relating to LA pensions: 273,913 273,913 0  General Landlord Duties 26,383 26,383 0  National curriculum assessments  and virtual head teacher. 100,000 100,000 0  Monitoring of school improvement. 173,937 173,937 0  Total **£574,233 £574,233 0**  **Growth Fund**  The approved 2021-22 growth fund budget is £511,400 compared and is expected to be fully spent by the end of this financial year.  Responsibilities for 2021-22 2021-22 Variance £  maintained schools Budget £ Forecast (Sept 2021) £  Bulge Classes 161,400 161,400 0  SIFD due to PAN management 350,000 350,000 0  Total **£511,400 £511,400 0**  The Schools forum **noted** the above report details. |
| 8 | **Consultation Outcome – Martin Daniels**.  MD outlined that the Schools forum members agreed as part of the 2022-23 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 included in Medway schools and academies funding formula consultation. * To set a lump sum factor of £97,500, flexed to make the formula affordable. * To de-delegate the trade union duties and the central services' budgets per pupil for both primary and secondary maintained schools.   These decisions were provisional and subject to consultation with Medway Schools and Academies.  **Consultation for 2022-23**  The consultation was open from Monday 1st November 2021 to Sunday 21st November 2021.    MD further explained that emails were sent to Headteachers, Finance Officers, and office/finance addresses both maintained schools and academies using the Council's online contact system. Some schools contacted the LA to obtain copies of this consultation as they did not receive the emails. Copies of the consultation were uploaded to SLA online and on the Council Website. |
|  | The consultation asked schools and academies to submit their views on eighteen questions. All questions applied to maintained schools, and all but two questions applied to academies and free schools.  Forty-five responses were received from the ninety-four eligible schools, not all responders answered all questions, and some academies answered the non-academy questions. This compares to the thirty-six responses received last year and the twenty-seven responses the year before. This year 64% of the responses were received from academies compared to the 58% received last year.  DM then ran through the questions asked, sharing the responses. (Details found in the full document).  **Q – Did the Trusts respond for each school or as a whole Trust?**  A – The Trusts responded for all their schools.  All Schools forum members noted the consultation findings. |
| 9 | **Provisional Schools & Academies Funding Formula 2022-23 – Maria Beaney**  MB presented her previously shared report, explaining that the LA are opting to suggest a Local formula and the LA have consulted the schools as noted above.  **2022-23 Schools Block Dedicated Schools Grant (SB DSG)**  The Funding Formula is used to distribute the Schools Block element of the DSG to all mainstream schools and academies fairly and transparently. Table 1 below shows a breakdown of Medway estimated provisional 2022-23 Schools Block DSG allocation of £219,461,771 (21/22 estimate was £206,651,940), equating to a 6.2% increase.  Description £  2022-23 Provisional Pupil-led Funding (Estimate) 214,119,094  2022-23 Growth Funding (Estimate) 1,791,745  2022-23 New Pupils (ESTIMATE) **3,550,932**  2021-22 Provisional SB DSG Total Funding **219,461,771**    Number of Pupils (2019-20 Allocations) 41,786  2020-21 Provisional Funding per Pupil 5,252    Medway proposes to transfer 0.5% (estimated as £1,097,000) from the SB to the High Needs Block for 2022-23. This is the same process as last year.  **Q – This is not in the repayment schedule to pay off the High Need's deficit, and last year it was agreed on the grounds that this would not need to happen again unless something exceptional happened; why are we seeing it again?**  A- There have been changes in the High Needs block recovery plan. The plan assumed that the LA would receive £5million from the EFSA for High Needs; this is now looking like it will be £3.5million. If the LA does not transfer 0.5% from the school's block to the High Needs block, it will add a £1.5 million additional cost of the recovery year on year. The LA would then need to relook at the recovery plan to make greater savings to deliver it. |
|  | A member noted that this transfer is not shown in the current High Need recovery plan for this year. The member proposed that the forum reject and give the LA time to review the recovery plan. This will not affect the number of ECHPs etc. The forum is being asked to change something without a reason to do so.  The chair noted that the Schools forum promised something, which has not happened. CB has not had time to investigate why this has happened; in this situation, the forum should not agree to the transfer. It was noted that LA will come back in January with the final funding formula.  **Decision – The School Forum members voted NOT to approve transfer up to 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High needs block. All PRU and EYFS representatives were not eligible to vote. (Voting was 3 for, 6 against)**  Medway proposes to transfer a further 0.23% (estimated as £505,000) from the SB to the High Needs Block for 2022-23 to run the outreach programme on behalf of schools.  **Decision: School Forum members voted to AGREE to transfer up to 0.23% from the Schools Block to the High Needs block. All PRU and EYFS representatives were not eligible to vote. (Voting was 8 for, 1 against)**  **2022-23 De-delegated Services**  Funding for de-delegated services must be allocated via the funding formula for maintained mainstream schools with the Schools' Forum approval. De-delegation is not applicable for special schools, academies and PRUs, but they can purchase the service via SLA online as a buy-back service.  The LA must request/renew the de-delegated services each year as they can't be rolled forward. The LA consulted with schools on services 2021-22:  A) Central Services - £66.00 per pupil (stays the same)  This image shows responsibilities for maintained schools and the amount per pupil.   Functions relating to LA pensions and redundancy £31.  General landlord duties £3 National curriculum assessments and virtual head teacher £12 Monitoring of school improvement £20 for a total of £66 per pupil.  B) Trade Union Support - £1.50 per pupil (8p decrease)  **DECISION: Maintained Primary School Forum members voted to AGREE on de-delegated services as noted. Central Services - £66.00 per pupil (stays the same)**  **DECISION: Maintained Secondary School Forum members remotely voted (after the meeting via email as agreed by the Schools forum) to AGREE on de-delegated services as noted. Central Services - £66.00 per pupil (stays the same)** |
|  | **DECISION: Maintained Primary School Forum members voted to AGREE on Trade union support figure as noted. £1.50 per pupil (8p decrease)**  **DECISION: Maintained Secondary School Forum members remotely voted (after the meeting via email as agreed by the Schools forum) to AGREE on Trade union support figure as noted. Central Services - £1.50 per pupil (8p decrease)**  **Pupil Variation Numbers – Growth Fund**  The funding formula for each school or academy is based on the characteristics from the October census. LA's can request approval to vary the pupil numbers for a specific school(s) where:   1. There has been/will be a reorganization. 2. A school has changed/will be changing its age range either by adding or losing year groups. 3. A temporary shortage of pupils. 4. New Schools/academies.   These are known as PAN increases.  In January, a report will be presented to the Schools' Forum requesting the PAN increases required for 2022-23.  **The proposed new 2022-23 Formula**  The LA consulted with its schools, academies, and free schools before introducing changes to its local funding formula.  Appendix 1 of the full report contains an explanation of the ten funding factors used in Medway's Local Schools and Academies Funding Formula.  The LA proposed to move all funding factor unit costs except for the lump sum to the new 2022-23 national funding formula rates.  The government has built a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) into the funding formula on a per-pupil level. No school will receive a decrease of more than 0.5% per pupil when compared to last year. If a school loses funding or falls below this percentage, its budget will be protected up to the MFG level, and it does not protect against a sudden fall or drop in numbers.  Medway does not propose continuing to cap school gains in line with the national formula but reserves the right to reintroduce as part of the final formula.  A member noted that the Schools forum would need to review the detailed data if it was required to introduce a 6% school gains cap. This was agreed.  **DECISION: School Forum members voted and agreed that there might be a need to potentially introduce a 6% school gains cap under the local funding formula. If so, they would bring the cases to the January Schools forum meeting. All PRU and EYFS representatives were not eligible to vote.**  Clare Redmond left the meeting at 15.30. |
|  | The maximum sparsity funding a school can be awarded is £55,000 for Primary and £80,000 for Secondary. In September 2014, and every year since the Schools' Forum have approved the use of the tapering lump method, and this approach must be each year. The Schools' Forum must decide again what approach and the value of the Sparsity funding in 2022-23.  **DECISION: School Forum members voted and agreed Medway proposes to use the same lump method and sum as 2022-23. All PRU and EYFS representatives were not eligible to vote.**  Medway propose to use an initial allocation of £93,000 (reduced by £4,500 from the consultation due to the extra year 8 budge class), which is higher than last year but is subject to change, if the final funding formula is unaffordable after the October 2021 school census is published, Medway propose to increase/reduce the lump sum so it is affordable. This is the same processes agreed in previous years.  Other Key information the formula must provide/allow for:   * Primary minimum funding of £4,265 per pupil * Secondary minimum funding of £5,525 (KS3 £5,321 and KS4 £5,831) per pupil * The all through minimum funding per pupil will by the same percentage depending on the pupil number from the census   If all the above proposals are approved, the new funding formula in appendix 2 will:   * Increase the Primary Basic entitlement to £3,217 (An increase of £94 per pupil) * Increase the Secondary KS3 Basic to £4,536 (An increase of £132 per pupil) * Increase the Secondary KS4 Basic to £5,112 (An increase of £149 per pupil) * Increase the FSM to £470 (An increase of £10 per pupil) * Increase the Primary FSME6 to £590 (An increase of £15 per pupil) * Increase the IDACI banding rates to match national * Increase both mobility funding unit costs to match national * Increase the Primary low prior attainment to match national (An increase of £35 per pupil) * Increase the Secondary low prior attainment to match national (An increase of £50 per pupil) * Increase the lump sum to £93,000 (an increase of £18,000) although the national is currently £121,300   A member noted that the national funding formula is not fully funded. MB explained the process around the setting of the funding.  A member noted that this formula is extremely detrimental to the small schools because a percentage of their budget is massive. It is understood why this is done and the complexity of doing it any other way. MB added that this is considered, and the method of less impact is used.  **DECISION: School Forum members voted and agreed on the Medway proposes to use the same lump method and sum as 2022-23. All PRU and EYFS representatives were not eligible to vote.** |
|  | MB explained that the final local formula is based on a revised allocation, setting everything (with the exception of the lump sum) as at the national level that will now go on to cabinet and Council for approval. In January, this will come back to the Schools forum for the final funding formula when the final allocations are known. |
| 10 | **Funding support business cases – standard item – Maria Beaney**  **Confidential Minutes.** |
| 11 | **AOB –**  Membership Proposal that additional position to be made on the Schools forum for SPI over 19 years provisions to be added to the Schools forum membership. As proposed by Marie Sweetlove.  **Decision- The Schools forum members voted and agreed to add to its membership – a representative for SPI over 19 provisions.**  Victoria Richmond of Oasis Skinner Street was nominated as the Academy's Primary HT representative.  **Decision- The Schools forum members voted and agreed to add to its membership – Victoria Richmond as the Academy's Primary HT representative.**  Heidi Barton Burnt Oak Primary was nominated for Maintained Primary HT representative  **Decision- The Schools forum members voted and agreed to add to its membership – Heidi Barton as the Maintained Primary HT representative**  Justin Stuart – Rivermead Inclusive Trust – was nominated as Governor Special and PRU representative  **Decision- The Schools forum members voted and agreed to add to its membership – Justin Stuart as Governor Special and PRU representative** |
| 13 | **Date of the next meeting**  12th January 2021 – virtual unless altered. 2pm. |

Meeting ended at 15.37

Signed by Vice-Chair ……………………………………………………………………….……. Date: ………………………………