

**LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM  
8 OCTOBER 2014**

**PRESENT: TERL BRYANT (CHAIRMAN)**

David Bennett (Governor, Horncastle Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School), Graham Burks (Headteacher, Kesteven and Grantham Girls School), Professor Ken Durrands CBE (Governor, The Kings School, Grantham), Roger Hale (Headteacher, Caistor Grammar School), Jonathan Maddox (Headteacher, Bourne Grammar School), Richard Thomson (Headteacher, Rauceby Church of England Primary Academy), Joanne Noble (Headteacher, Gainsborough Nursery School), Roger Hewins (Governor, Corringham Church of England Primary School), Mr Craig Vincent Miller (Governor, All Saints Church of England Primary School, North Hykeham), Patricia Ruff (Headteacher, Dunholme St Chads Church of England Primary School), Bridget Starling (Business Manager, Church of England, Diocesan Education Centre), Dave Thompson (Pupil Referral Unit), Linda Houtby (Principal and Chief Executive, Grantham College), Christine Horrocks (Headteacher, Walton Girls' High School and Sixth Form), Jeremy Newnham (Headteacher, Caistor Yarborough Academy), Michael Pichel-Juan (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School), Scott Healey (Assistant Headteacher De Aston School, Market Rasen), Allan Lacey (Headteacher, St Christopher's School) and Richard Linnel (NUT).

Keith Howkins (Funding Reform Team, Education Funding Agency) attended the meeting as an observer.

Officers in attendance:-

Debbie Barnes (Executive Director of Children's Services), Elizabeth Bowes (Team Leader, Schools Finance Team), Katrina Cope (Team Leader Democratic and Civic Services), Jonas Gibson (Commissioning and Development Manager), Mark Popplewell (Assistant Head of Finance Children's & Specialist Services), Catherine Southcott (Commissioning Officer), Tony Warnock (Operations and Financial Advice Manager) and Paula Whitehead (Manager, Team Around the Child).

15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS/NEW MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Michael Follows MBE (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School, Boston), Bridget Robson, (Headteacher, Fortuna Primary School, Lincoln), Vicky Cook (Headteacher Welbourn C of E Primary School, Welbourn), Ian Wilkinson (Headteacher, Deeping St James Community Primary School), Ellenor Beighton (Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) and John Beswick (Governor, Stickney C of E Primary School).

Members were advised that Michael Pichel-Juan (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School), Allan Lacey (St Christopher's School, Lincoln), Scott

## 2

### **LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM 8 OCTOBER 2014**

Healey (Assistant Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) had attended the meeting on behalf of Michael Follows MBE (Governor, John Fielding Community Special School, Boston), Bridget Robson (Headteacher, Fortuna Primary School, Lincoln) and Ellenor Beighton (Headteacher, De Aston School, Market Rasen) respectively, for this meeting only.

The Schools Forum were advised that a resignation letter had been received from Sharron Close (Tall Oaks Academy Trust).

Following the election held during August/September 2014, the Forum were advised that two Academy members had been elected they were Jeremy Newnham (Headteacher, Caistor Yarborough Academy) and Christine Horrocks (Headteacher, Walton Girls' High School and Sixth Form).

It was reported that the Schools Forum was still carrying some vacancies and that they were in the following groups:-

- Primary Head Teachers – one vacancy
- Secondary Head Teacher – one vacancy
- Primary Academies – two vacancies

It was highlighted that there had been a poor response overall during the election period, and that the nominations received had only received a small number of votes.

#### 16 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2014

Confirmation was given that with regard to minute item 10 Pupil Premium for Looked After Children (LAC), the termly allocation of £300 related to 1/3 of a year.

Also, with regard to Looked After Children, the Operations and Financial Advice Manager advised that he would find out further information relating to the issue of free school meals in readiness for the next meeting.

It was also highlighted that there was some disappointment from officers a National Fair Funding formula had not yet been introduced.

#### RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Lincolnshire Schools Forum from the 25 June 2014 be agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 17 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Note: Mr Terl Bryant wished it to be recorded that he had an interest in agenda item 4, as a Governor of Stamford Queen Eleanor Community School who had pupils from within Peterborough where funding had been retained.

#### 18 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SEN FUNDING 2015/16

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which outlined to the Schools Forum the Local Authority's (LA) proposals to change the schools funding for primary and secondary schools from 2015/16, to ensure compliance with the DfE's regulations.

In guiding the Forum through the report, particular reference was made to the steps the LA had taken to arrive at the proposals in the report which were set out at Appendix 1. Paragraphs 1 to 8 on pages 18/19 of the report summarised the position taken. It was noted that the LA would have to reduce funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. The DfE's Regulations assumed that schools already had £6,000 available within their budgets to meet the initial costs of pupils with statements, including those at Bands 6 to 8. Officers had reviewed the formula and the results had shown that the LA was able to demonstrate that primary and secondary schools had, respectively, only £3,233 and £2,450 of notional SEN within their current budgets. This was clearly short of the £6,000 that schools were expected to have to meet the initial costs of Band 6 to 8 pupils. The shortfall equated to £1.136m for primary schools and £1.264m for secondary schools giving a total of £2.400m. And as a result of the difference, the LA had come up with a 'best fit' remodelling formulaic approach which would minimise the losses to individual schools.

It was reported that from September 2014, government regulations required statements of special educational needs to be replaced by Education, Health and Care Plans where appropriate. It was noted that Band 6 to 8 statements would disappear and would be replaced by new plans. That under the new system the funding assigned to each child would be to meet their specific needs. Schools would need to demonstrate that they had used £6,000 of their budget to meet the initial costs. It was highlighted that the £6,000 threshold was lower than the LA had been operating since the delegation of funding for Bands 1 to 5 in 2010/11. It was highlighted further that there was a risk that over time this would increase the demands upon the Higher Needs block, and to safeguard this it was proposed that £2m was set aside within the Higher Needs block from 2015/16 to meet any such potential costs. This amount equated to approximately one sixth of the current funding for Band 6 to 8 pupils.

The report also provided information relating to implications for schools where pupils belonged to other LAs, as some LAs had contested the Band 6 to 8 funding rates that Lincolnshire currently applied and had argued that under DfE rules, £6,000 should be deducted because schools were required to meet the first £6,000 from their notional SEN budget, which had led to the non-payment of some schools' invoices. It was noted that the proposal presented in Appendix 1 should help to resolve the issues.

The next steps were that the views expressed by the Schools Forum would be considered and that the final decisions would be reflected in the Authority Proforma Tool that had to be submitted to the Education Funding Agency by 31 October 2014. All schools would then be notified of the detail and the proposed changes and the likely impact upon their budgets for 2015/16 and beyond.

**4**  
**LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM**  
**8 OCTOBER 2014**

In conclusion, the Forum were advised that the LA was required to comply with the DfE's regulations, which included ensuring that Band 6 to 8 statements were correctly funded, and that there will be no impact upon individual pupils with SEN.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- How the proposed remodelling as detailed on page 19, at 5a and 5b would work. The Forum were advised that the proposals ensured that the LA complied with the DfE regulations, that schools were funded fairly; and that the proposals minimised the immediate and long term impact upon individual schools budgets;
- The effect of the gains and losses on primary and secondary schools. Officers advised that paragraph 5 on page 25 provided figures as to the review of projected gains and losses and that at the bottom of page 25 and, top of page 26 were details of the targeted funding which would reduce both the number of schools that would otherwise suffer significant losses and the value of those losses;
- If the LA knew who the students were, could it not be done by on a pupil by pupil basis? Officers advised that it could be done separately, but the LA was trying to make sure that a status quo was maintained; and
- Concern was expressed as to using the £2m underspend from the DSG and a question was asked as to how long the allocation was going to run for. The Forum were advised that it would be for a temporary basis of two years and then released back into the system if it was not required. It was noted further that Headteachers were aware of the proposals and that they were happy with the £6,000.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the report presented be noted.
2. That support be given to the proposals set out in the report including:
  - a. The net reduction in funding for Band 6 to 8 pupils;
  - b. The redistribution of those funds through the factors described in the report;
  - c. The provision of targeted support; and
  - d. The introduction of transitional protection for one year.

**19**     **REVISED SCHOOLS BUDGET 2014/15**

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which advised the Schools Forum of the revised Schools Budget for 2014/15 and sought support for the proposed use of the underspending from 2013/14.

The Assistant Head of Finance, Children's and Specialist Services guided the Forum through the report making reference to:

- The carry forwards for 2012/13, which included the total underspending on the DSG as at 31 March 2013 totalling £16.688m; the commitments against the sum totalling £9.550m; the setting aside of £3m to cover uncertainties; and the recommendation that the £4m balance of the underspending was to be distributed to all county schools. It was noted that this was completed on 1 April 2014;
- It was reported that the underspending carried forward at 31 March 2014 was £15.454m. An explanation of the movement between the opening and closing carry forwards were as follows:- funds earmarked as being commitments payable in 2013/14 £3.565m; the centrally held DSG budgets underspent in 2013/14 of £5.844m (A full explanation of these were detailed in Appendix 1 to the report); and the DfE's adjustment to the 2013/14 Early Years' block increased the DSG by £0.487m;
- The Forum was advised that the current commitments total was £6.846m. Full details were contained within Appendix 2 to the report;
- Appendix 3 provided the Forum with details of proposed developments to use some of the DSG underspending from 2013/14. These totalled £2.055m; and
- It was noted that the uncommitted sum, after the existing commitments and proposed developments had been deducted, was £6.553m. An explanation as to the proposed use of the uncommitted sum was detailed on page 31 of the report. The Forum were advised that it was proposed that c.£2.5m of the DSG underspending for the last year were to be set aside to finance any pressures that emerge as a result of uncertainties relating to the centrally held Dedicated School Budgets. It was the intention of the LA to repeat the approach of the last two years and distribute the remaining balance (£4m) to schools in a way that mirrors as far as possible the DfE's Devolved Formula Capital distribution mechanism.

A discussion ensued, from which the following issues were raised:-

- Some concern was expressed as to the amount of money put aside for sector led development and what that development might look like going forward. It was noted that school improvement needed to change. The current contract was due to end in 2017. The LA had a statutory duty to account for performance across the county. At the moment the LA was working with Headteachers to develop ideas and plans for new imaginative ways of securing school improvement in the medium term. The Forum were advised that by 2015 the LA would need to be clear of what it wanted to do with regard to school improvement;
- Cost of using consultants;
- The cost of the carbon management projects. Some concern was expressed as to whether this represented good value for money, as there had been little evidence as to how much money had been saved. It was suggested that funding needed to be targeted to those schools that needed it most. However, it was noted that the DSG was for the benefit of all schools as was the carbon management initiative;
- The underspend relating to the birth to five staffing;

## 6

### LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM

8 OCTOBER 2014

- School re-organisation, including new schools and closures, the effect of section 106 and CIL; and
- Support was given to the amount of uncommitted funding to be distributed to schools being increased from £4 million to £5 million.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the report be noted.
2. That support be given to:
  - a. the developments, as set out in Appendix 3; and
  - b. the use of the uncommitted sum, as outlined in paragraphs 9 and 10 above, but that the amount distributed to schools being increased from £4m to £5m.

## 20 FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING FOR 2015/16

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided an update on the DfE's latest announcement on Local Authority (LA) funding for schools from April 2015, and set out the LA's proposal for the use of the additional funding that would be provided.

The report highlighted the background behind the 'Fairer Schools Funding in 2015/16' consultation, and the implications for Lincolnshire, and that on 17 July 2014, the DfE had announced its response to the consultation exercise. The key points to note from the consultation were detailed on pages 39 and 40 of the report presented.

It was highlighted that it was implicit in the DfE's consultation and its calculations that the additional funding was intended for the primary and secondary sectors. However, this matter could not be considered in isolation as there were wider issues affecting the DSG, which had been captured in the earlier report 'Revised School Budget 2014/15'. There were also issues arising from the requirement for the LA to comply with the DfE's regulations relating to SEN funding, which were also captured in the earlier report 'Proposed Changes to SEN funding in 2015/16, which had been considered by the Forum earlier in the agenda.

Having considered all the issues the LA proposed to:

- Transfer £2m in to the Higher Needs block to cover the potential growth in the base budget for SEN, as a result of the DfE's requirement for the LA to delegate some of the funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. This requirement reduced to £6,000 the current threshold at which additional special educational needs funding is provided; and
- Allocate the remaining £2.5m equally between primary and secondary schools (all schools) by uplifting the awpus by the same percentage.

The Forum noted that the final decision on the use of the £4.5m funding needed to be reflected in the LA's Authority Proforma Tool submission to the DfE on 31 October 2014.

During discussion, the following points were raised:

- That for the Schools Block element of the DSG, Lincolnshire had the 40<sup>th</sup> lowest per pupil funding rate of the 152 LA's in 2015/16;
- There was concern raised that the nursery school budget was not going to increase, but the nursery schools still had the same budgetary needs. It was reported that there was an Early Years Premium coming in and that the LA had the discretion to move the money between blocks;
- Concern was expressed that Appendix 1 to the report which highlighted that Lincolnshire was below the minimum awpu rates and that Lincolnshire had been given £4.5m, but was only planning to spend £2.5m; and
- It was highlighted that it was regrettable that there had been a cap on the lump sum, and that the sparsity factor in Lincolnshire did not work. The Forum was advised that the lump sum would remain, but further support would not be given to smaller schools.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the report be noted.
2. That support be given to the Local Authority's proposals for use of the £4.5m increase in DSG from 2015/16, as set out in paragraph 7 of the report and detailed below:-
  - a. Transfer £2m in to the Higher Needs block to cover potential growth in the base budget for SEN as a result of the DfE' requirement for the LA to delegate some of the funding for Band 6 to 8 statements. This DfE requirement reduces to £6,000 the current threshold at which additional special educational needs funding is provided. The LA will be monitoring the response of schools to this change in funding arrangements, and to the introduction of Education, Health and Care plans from September 2014. However, this could create a significant risk to the DSG given school practices in the decade prior to the delegation of Band 1 to 5 statements in 2010/11. If such pressures do not materialise over the next two years as these new systems bed in, this funding would be released.
  - b. Allocate the remaining £2.5m equally between primary and secondary schools by uplifting the awpus by the same percentage.

#### 21 DE-DELEGATION OF MAINTAINED PRIMARY SCHOOLS BUDGETS 2015/16 & 2016/17

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which sought the maintained primary school representatives' approval to the Local Authority's proposal for the de-delegation of the budgets in 2015/16 and 2016/17.

The report provided information as to the background to the proposal; the current financial position; and the proposals the LA intended to implement, these were shown in paragraphs 1 to 5 on pages 44 and 45 of the report presented.

It was reported that the impact of the proposal was to reduce the total budget requirement for all of the services mentioned in the report from £1.439m in 2014/15 to £1.115m p.a. in 2015/16 and 2016/17. That would then create a budget requirement for the two years of £2.230m. After the projected underspending (£1.080m) is deducted, the sum to be de-delegated would be £0.575m for each of the two years. This amount was a significant reduction in the proposed charges to the current year.

Appendix 1 to the report provided details of the current service provision.

#### RESOLVED

That the maintained primary schools representatives supported the proposals for the de-delegation of the budgets for the period 2015/16 and 2016/17 as set out in the report and detailed below:-

1. The services for which funds are de-delegated are primarily staffing based and so for planning purposes, it would be helpful to have more advanced notice of the maintained schools' plans for future de-delegation. Maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum are therefore asked not only to support de-delegation, but to do so for two years commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. The LA proposes that a similar report to this one is produced each year, not only to report on progress and to seek feedback, but also to seek agreement to extend the existing agreement by a further year. This would mean that providing mainstream school representatives are content with the services being provided, the relevant services would always be able to plan with the certainty of two years' further funding.
2. As indicated earlier in this report, it is possible that the budgets de-delegated each year may underspend and it is important that this is earmarked for the benefit of the schools that contribute to those. Unfortunately, recent government regulations prevent certain in-year payments being made to schools by the LA. Furthermore, it could become very confusing for schools, and complicated to administer, if partial refunds are issued to schools on the 1<sup>st</sup> April each year. The LA therefore proposes to adjust the sum that it proposes to de-delegate each year, to take account of the previous underspendings. This way, maintained schools will benefit from any underspendings on their de-delegated budgets by paying reduced amounts in the following financial year. A consequence of this approach, however, will be that the per pupil amounts de-delegated for each service will vary from year to year, but the sums involved should be relatively modest.
3. In light of the 2013/14 actual and 2014/15 projected underspend on the Termination of Employment budget, it is proposed to reduce the budget

requirement from £0.467m to £0.250m p.a. for the next two years. This will be kept under review.

4. It is proposed that the budget requirement for Interim Headteachers is reduced from £0.401m to £0.291m p.a.
5. It is proposed that the funding level for Inclusion and Attendance (Ethnic Minority and Traveller Education Team (EMTET)) is set at £0.188m. A modest increase in budget (c.£0.005m) would therefore be needed to offset the modest reduction in funding that would have arisen from recent academy conversions.

## 22 TEAM AROUND THE CHILD (TAC) IN LINCOLNSHIRE

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Manager, Team Around the Child, which provided an update on Team Around the Child in Lincolnshire, in particular the use of Schools Forum funding; and sought to obtain approval for continuation of the existing funding arrangements.

In guiding the Forum through the report, particular reference was made to multi agency approach to provide Early Help for the young people in Lincolnshire.

The report highlighted that there was an increase in the number of initiations, and open TACs in Lincolnshire. Full details on the Early Help consultant Activity from April to July 2014 were contained in the report, which clearly indicated that there was an increase in activity. In addition the consultants had continued to provide briefing sessions on a single and multi-agency basis, and had also attended Health Team and Schools Cluster meeting on request.

The feedback received from the support provided had been very positive. A snapshot of opinions received following the first four months of the service were detailed in the report presented, but overall, 72% had been positive and 22% had not used the service yet. It was however highlighted that the take up of the offer of Administrative support had been very low. Only 27 requests had been received and dealt with, and these were all requesting invites to be posted out for initial TAC's.

The report detailed the original funding breakdown for the developments. It was noted that the project timescales had been met, and as a result the funding would be used by the year end according to the profile. As a result of the actual usage of the service, and the feedback received, a suggested funding profile was detailed in the report on page 62 to take to service forward.

In conclusion, although the team had only been in place for six months, feedback and evidence had suggested that the team was providing the support that schools and academies required from Early Help Consultants. As a result additional capacity was required in this area and a request was made for the funding to be realigned to enable the number of consultants to double, two per locality and that the that the funding was provided on a permanent basis; and that regular updates were received by the Schools Forum on the impact and needs of the team.

**10**  
**LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM**  
**8 OCTOBER 2014**

Some concern was expressed as to the wording of the fourth bullet point at the top of page 60, as it implied that the LA was failing 75% of children. Clarification was given that this was meant as a positive statement which identified that the service was improving as a result of the work of the team.

Work was also ongoing with regard to the provision of health visitors and school nurses and that provision would be commissioned in April 2015.

Some concern was expressed as to the costs and what part of the educational budget the funding would be taken from. Officers explained that the funding would come from the Higher Needs block in the DSG.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the update report be accepted.
2. That agreement be given to the continued funding of the team on a permanent basis.
3. That the revised allocation of funding to better meet the need, as detailed below be agreed.

<b><u>Full Year Costs 2015/16</u></b>	<b><u>LCC Costs</u></b>	<b><u>Schools Forum Costs</u></b>	<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>
Team Manager/Practice Supervisor	£59,467*	0	<b>£59,467</b>
TAC Administrators	£125,484	0	<b>£125,484</b>
Early Help Consultants	£97,373	£154,285	<b>£251,658**</b>
Non-staffing costs	0	£18,670	<b>£18,670</b>
Schools Administration	0	£46,692	<b>£46,692</b>
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>£282,324</u></b>	<b><u>£219,647</u></b>	<b><u>£501,971</u></b>

**23**      **OUTREACH SUPPORT SERVICE**

The Schools Forum gave consideration to a report from the Commissioning Officer, which provided an update on the Outreach Service and provided a Final Report and Recommended Model for the delivery of Outreach Services.

The report identified schools receiving Outreach support; sources of the review held during April and August 2014. It was highlighted that the review had shown that there was a clear demand for the service and that stakeholders on the whole were very positive about accessing the service and the outcomes available as service users.

Full benefits and risks of all the five models considered were contained within Appendix 1 to the report presented.

Considering the key findings, benchmarking and stakeholder engagement, the recommended model to deliver Outreach Services was for a Multi-disciplinary approach (excluding physical disabilities) with single providers covering each of the Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries to deliver the service countywide.

Some concern was expressed that there was a need for special schools to analyse the document and come up with some responses to the proposal. Officers advised that a considerable amount of time had been given to this proposal, at the request of the Forum. The outreach service had been looked at in great detail, and on behalf of the schools had presented this report as providing the best value for outreach services in Lincolnshire. It was noted that the expectations of the model would be streamlined management costs, consistency of approach across the county, improved tracking and measuring of outcomes and greater accountability.

The Special School representatives felt that accepting the recommendation would mean adopting a model that could not provide what was required. Others member felt that delaying the vote on the recommendations as detailed in the report would have an impact on delivery for September 2015.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the contents of the final report and the proposed model in Appendix 1 be noted.
2. That the Multi-disciplinary approach model be agreed and that the next steps be as follows:
  - a. Developing a timetable for the procurement process
  - b. Invoking the extension agreed at Schools Forum in June 2014 until the end of the academic year to allow for an implementation period
  - c. providing updates to key stakeholders
  - d. Begin consulting with the market place

#### 24 SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which sought approval from the maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum to make an amendment to the Scheme for Financing Schools, i.e. to increase the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% of budget share.

The Assistant Head of Finance Children's and Specialist Services presented the report and made reference to the background to the report and that the Local Authority believed that there was a strong case for increasing the carry forward limit for nursery schools from 8% to 10% budget share, as a result of the introduction of the Early Years Single Funding Formula and that the increase would retain the core aims of the carry forward policy as detailed in the report.

It was noted that as part of this exercise the LA had considered whether carry forward limits for other sectors should be changed and has concluded that there was no compelling reasons to alter the limits for other sectors, which had been in place since 2004/05.

If the proposal was agreed the LA would be required to consult all maintained schools on the planned changes to the Scheme, and if the proposal was to be widely supported, the change would be applied to nursery school carry forwards from 31 March 2015.

**RESOLVED**

That the maintained school representatives:

- a note the content of the report; and
- b that in advance of a consultation with all maintained schools, approve the LA's proposal for the carry forward limit for nursery schools to be increased from 8% to 10% budget share with effect from 31 March 2015.

**25 SCHOOL CARRY FORWARDS 2013/14**

The Schools Forum gave consideration to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided information regarding Lincolnshire maintained schools' carry forwards at 31 March 2014.

The Team Leader, Schools Finance Team guided the Forum through the report highlighting the School Carry Forwards for 2013/14; the Carry Forwards as a % of the Budget Share; School Deficits; and the Local Authority's perspective in relation to carry forwards, all of which was detailed in the report presented.

Detailed at Appendix 1 to the report was a list of School Carry Forwards as at 31 March 2014.

A short discussion ensued, from which the following issues were raised:-

- An explanation relating to figures shown for Boston Pilgrim School and South Ash Villa School. The reasoning behind the figures was that these were hospital schools with low fluctuating pupil numbers. Boston St Nicholas and Boston St Thomas C E Primary Schools were under the same umbrella; and
- Expenditure on staffing costs, i.e. performance related pay and how that would affect costs.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

**26 SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD (SFVS)**

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which provided an update on the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS).

The Team Leader, Schools Finance Team, in guiding the Forum through the report made reference to the introduction of SFVS. It was noted that Academies and Free Schools were not required to complete the SFVS as it would duplicate their financial monitoring and assurance requirements. It was noted that the current position was that four primary schools and one special school had failed to submit the completed form by the due date.

It was reported that the schools' SFVS returns had provided the LA with little information to make sound and reliable judgement as to the effectiveness of school financial management, and as a result, the LA would not be placing significant reliance on them. Instead the LA would continue to review schools' budget returns and medium term finance plans at the start of the year. Also the LA would perform high level monitoring of school finances throughout the year; and work closely with those that had overspent to help recover their position; and provide advice on a day-to-day basis. It was also highlighted that from April 2015, the finance service to schools would be provided by the LA, and not Mouchel.

Concerns raised were that Academies were not reporting to the County. The Forum was advised that it was not the LA responsibility to monitor Academies. Also, that maintained schools had plenty of checks and balances to avoid schools going into deficit. It was reiterated that it was up to the LA to work with governors to help achieve good financial management in schools.

#### RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

#### 27 DFE CONSULTATION ON THE SCHOOLS AND EARLY YEARS FINANCE REGULATIONS 2014

The Operations and Financial Advice Manager presented a report which advised the Schools Forum of the DfE's consultation on proposed changes to the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014.

A summary of the proposed changes to the regulations was detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

It was reported that the proposed changes would come into effect from 1 January 2015 and would be applied to the 2015/16 financial year.

It was noted that Officers planned to present a report on the final regulations to the Schools Forum at their January 2015 meeting.

**14  
LINCOLNSHIRE SCHOOLS' FORUM  
8 OCTOBER 2014**

During consideration of the Appendix 1, particular reference was made to Regulation 3, in light of the difficulties highlighted with recruitment to the Schools Forum to Regulation 14, the removal of the transitional provision with regard to special school sixth form; Schedule 2, Paragraph 14 that early year's expenditure held centrally had been extended and cannot relate to an excluded provider, and that the wording of the paragraph seem to be confusing.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

**28     EARLY YEARS PUPIL PREMIUM AND FUNDING FOR TWO YEAR OLDS**

Consideration was given to a report from the Operations and Financial Advice Manager, which advised the Schools Forum of the recent announcement by the government regarding the introduction of the Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP) and changes to the funding for two year olds.

The report detailed the two key proposals for consultation.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

**29     SCHOOL COLLABORATION ON RESOURCE EFFICIENCY (SCORE)  
UPDATE**

The Forum gave consideration to a report from the Sustainability and Climate Change Team Leader, which provided an update on recent activity relating to School Collaboration on Resource Efficiency.

Early on in the agenda the Forum had expressed their concerns as to the whether investment in this area represented good value for money. Also, the Forum requested more detailed analysis to ascertain how much money had so far been saved.

RESOLVED

1. That the report presented be noted.
2. That a further report be presented to the January 2015 meeting.

**30     ACADEMIES UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report from the Head of Service, Education Services, which provided information on the latest number of academies and pupils in academies.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

31     INFORMATION PACK

RESOLVED

That the contents of the information pack be noted.

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm