

The KIRKLEES SCHOOLS FORUM

(Schools Funding Consultative Group)

meeting held on **Friday 9th January 2009 9:00am**
at the Textile Centre of Excellence

Present:

Julie Helm	Nursery School Heads (1)
Graham Altoft, Jenny Chamberlain, Carol Crossland, Gill Goodswen, Michelle Lee (Vice-chair), Diana Wilson	Primary School Heads (6)
Caroline Thompson	Middle School Heads (1)
Jackie Eames, Toby Eastaugh, Christine Spencer (Chair), Janet Tolley	High School Heads (4)
Philip Gibbins	Special School Heads (1)
Jo Bailey-Taylor (NASUWT), Pat Colling (Kirklees Governors Association), Gillian Collins (ATL), Sarah Ellis (pre-School Learning Alliance), Howard Roberts (NUT)	Non-school members (6)
Angela Farmer (Senior Finance Officer (Resources & Support) Warwick Firmin (School Funding Strategy Manager, R&S); Clerk David Gearing (Financial Delegation Manager, R&S); Minute Clerk	Kirklees Children & Young People Service Officers in Support
Kathleen Benetis [KPH], Margaret Cobb (Learning & Skills Council)	Observers

1. Apologies for Absence

Mark Ayres (Resources & Support), Julie Bowdidge (Learning Service), Howard Roberts (NUT) for the morning of the meeting only, Chris Sadler (14-19 Partnership).

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 December

Agreed as a true record.

3. Matters arising from meeting 12 December

3.1 2009-10 DSG Strategy update [minute 4 of the 12 December meeting]

Independent Safeguarding Authority – details of timescales and how the programme will be phased in are still awaited. Given that any activity in 2009-10 will most likely be towards the back end of the year, it is likely that any costs to fall in 2009-10 will be minimal and other strategies will have to be considered to meet the initial costs if they arise next year. The issue will now be removed from the 2009-10 DSG strategy list but will need to be considered again for 2010-11 once implementation details have been clarified.

Advance budget allocation to Madni Girls High – there is still no clarity as to when the transfer to voluntary aided status might be effected and what the advance allocation might need to include. Again this issue will be removed from the 2009-10 DSG strategy list but the position will need to be revisited for 2010-11.

Change Directors – a formal proposal has not been constructed to progress this item. The item will now be removed from the 2009-10 DSG strategy listing.

3.2 Standards Fund update 2009-10 [minute 5 of 12 December]

Further clarification is awaited about the new Making Good Progress grant and about the roles and funding of the National Challenge Advisers and School Improvement Partners (to ensure there is no duplication).

4. Confirm meeting format and agenda

No changes to the agenda and proposed format of the meeting were suggested or made.

5. DSG Overview version 6a

The 2009-10 DSG Budget Strategy version 6 was included amongst the consultation papers sent out to Head Teachers for consideration at this week's constituent group meetings. A slightly amended version of the strategy (new ref 6a) was circulated to the Forum meeting, increasing the identified initial funding gap from £908,100 to £995,400. The difference is due to finalised figures now being available for the ETHOS and the Westfields Pupil Referral Units report and the inclusion of a new part-year cost of £50,000 for the Primary BESD service (see 5.1.1 below).

Elsewhere within the strategy list, the premises funding set aside for Headfield Junior school was questioned – wouldn't it have been cheaper in the long run to purchase the temporary classrooms instead? Headfield's problem is in its annex building which has had to be taken out of use for health and safety reasons. Alternative accommodation needed to be secured quickly. Happily, there were already a number of temporary class units in situ at a nearby primary school whilst fire damage to that school was being made good. These classrooms were available for transfer almost immediately via an extension of the original leasing arrangement. A permanent solution to Headfield's accommodation problem should be in place if all goes to plan for Easter 2010 from funding supplied by the Primary Capital programme, so the temporary units should only be required for a relatively short period of time – hence the decision to rent rather than buy. The 12-month rental costs in 2009-10 are estimated to be about £90k, the remaining £13k is to fund the running costs of the floor area involved.

5.1 New issues for consideration

5.1.1 SEN Review: Improved service and provision for Primary children with Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties (BESD)

The meeting considered a newly-tabled proposal aimed at a realignment of BESD support services for primary children. Both fixed term and permanent exclusion rates amongst primary-age children in Kirklees are above the national averages. There is also a lack of parity between the primary and secondary sectors in terms of support for pupils who become permanently excluded and for those who are at risk of being permanently excluded. The secondary sector has access to intervention programmes available for KS3/4 students at Westfields, ETHOS and alternative KS4 provisions. The primary sector, in comparison, only has the 14-place Turnaround Resourced Provision (which is temporarily located at Nortonthorpe Hall Special School and managed by the school's head teacher) and buy-in access to the Claremont Behavioural Support Service. (The delegation to schools of this service would seem to be at odds with how the other behaviour services are organised as centrally-retained provision).

There are two main strands to the proposal: -

1) The relocation of the Turnaround provision to new premises for September 2009. This would entail not just the establishment of a new base but also would need a new leadership post. It is proposed to appoint a primary head teacher with relevant experience in behaviour management and emotional health strategies to manage the new service on the same salary range as the existing Pupil Referral Unit heads. The new post would also take responsibility for managing the Claremont service and the Primary Exclusion & Reintegration Service (EARS) in addition to the Primary PRU / turnaround programmes. The estimated part-year cost of the proposal during 2009-10 is £50,000 (rising to £85,300 in a full-year before performance increments start to apply).

2) To return the funding for the Claremont Service to the retained DSG budget, thereby formally withdrawing the service from delegation. This would match the approach taken with all the other behaviour support services for schools in Kirklees. It would also bring Claremont's costs more into line with available budget provision thereby reducing some of the pressure within the retained DSG budget. There would be some financial effect upon those primary schools which have hitherto opted not to buy into the Claremont traded service – such schools would lose the financial "benefit" of retaining their funding for Claremont.

The lateness of the proposal to Schools Forum was seen by some to be a problem. The apparent cost of creating a management committee for the proposed Primary PRU was also questioned – it was pointed out that the PRU management committee already exists and its responsibilities could simply be extended to cover the Primary PRU.

As a new proposal the issues need to be referred to the next round of constituent group meetings or for consideration by nominated representatives of same. [See the notes at item 6.5 below regarding the intention to invite the Principal Improvement Manager for Inclusion and the Head of the Pupil Referral Service to the next Forum meeting to quiz them further on issues pertaining to Pupil Referral Unit funding in Kirklees. Questions about this particular proposal could also be raised then].

5.1.2 PPP life cycle costs

The 2009-10 DSG strategy list includes a figure of £31,800 in respect of PPP1 life cycle costs. A breakdown of this figure was circulated to the meeting.

Under the Public/Private Partnership (PPP) contract, the relevant schools have to pay additional charges levied by the contractor whenever a physical change to their premises is effected. The funding formula currently reacts by increasing the floor area funding the school receives whenever the change expands the school's internal floor area. However, under the terms of the contract, the contractor is also allowed to recover "life cycle" costs for the new accommodation provided – effectively an annual instalment towards the eventual repair or replacement costs of the facility at some point in the future. Non-PPP schools are not subject to this type of cost so it has been argued that this additional cost for PPP schools should receive specific support funding via the Formula.

The supporting figures provided to the meeting focus upon additional annual life cycle costs at those schools where the authority has agreed the change in response to an identified basic need, usually linked to capacity issues or inadequacy of current accommodation for a specialist area. Only five schools are listed, with annual life cycle charges ranging from £280 to £16,900. [There are other PPP life cycle costs in existence but these have been generated by changes implemented by schools themselves and not in response to basic need issues]. If the proposal is accepted it is intended that each school affected would receive equivalent funding within the "rents" formula for their annual charge.

The view reported back from KSHS is against the proposal but the further information supplied today will be taken back to the next meeting. KPH and the other groups have not yet had the chance to consider the issue. One contention reported from the KSHS meeting was that extensions are built as a result of increased student numbers so the additional AWPU funding that entails should be used to meet the life cycle costs. The flaw in this argument is that many of the changes listed are linked to dealing with inadequate and outdated facilities rather than expansions to cope with demographic pressures. Two of the schools on the list are incurring charges because of changes to their premises not even to do with school provision – the creation of a Children's Centre and the remodelling of areas used by another organisation / activity within the school in question.

Revisit this issue at the next Forum meeting.

5.2 Confirm issues

5.2.1 DSG Early Retirement

The DSG strategy list contains an amount of £26,000 for the Early Retirement budget to replenish the sum available for new retirements in 2009-10, following the ongoing annual pension commitments taken on during financial year 2008-09. Before agreeing to this figure, Forum wanted to know if the overall funding level of the ER budget had been adequate this year.

Forum set aside a new base budget provision of £101,000 in 2008-09 to meet early retirement pension and lump sum costs (on a mandatory compensation only basis) for school staff outside the Leadership Group. Based on average first-year costs the £101k would normally permit around 30 new cases to be approved each year. However, 2008-09 has proven to be a bit of an exceptional year – all but £9,500 of the budget has currently been committed but on only 12

teachers. A contributory factor to the situation has been the closure of Grylls Middle school which resulted in the need to approve the cases of some teachers who were younger than 55 at the time of retirement – the younger the teacher the more expensive the payment. The underspend at this stage of the year is quite typical – additional charges are often made by the Teachers Pensions Agency in respect of increases to pension costs directly relating to salary increases above an “acceptable” level in the final two years of work. Some cushion is needed to absorb these charges. It is also not a good idea to commit all the funding at the end of August when there could well be other demands for ER which surface in the remainder of the year.

This year’s ER round had seen more expressions of interest and enquiries than happened the previous year, largely as a result of the increased amount of publicity given to the scheme. However, only 12 teacher cases have been approved against the set criteria. There was, however, no waiting list of employees who had met the criteria but the funding had run out. There appears to be no reason to amend the level of budget provision going into 2009-10 so the £26,000 in the strategy list is seen to be an appropriate figure. There will be a need for the decision to be kept under annual review to react to changing circumstances, particularly as the Schools for the Future reorganisations start to impact.

Agreed: to add £26,000 to the DSG (new) Early Retirement base budget provision in 2009-10 to maintain the provision at its 2008-09 level. Should any of the 2008-09 budget remain uncommitted by year end it will be rolled forward into 2009-10 to reduce the £26,000 commitment.

5.2.2 Day 6 Exclusion

It was confirmed that Schools Forum requires no change to the formula method used to distribute the Day 6 Fixed Term Exclusion funding for 2009-10.

6. Review of 2009-10 DSG funding issues

6.1 Nursery Development Budget

All the constituent groups fed back their support for option 1 from the consultation paper “Nursery Development Budget: implications of one point of entry for Autumn Term CSA support”. This would see the current budget provision of £166,700 (at 2008-09 price base) distributed amongst those schools which now qualify for the support funding. The budget would be allocated over the number of pupils in Reception at schools without formal Nursery provision. This change can only happen at the point the admissions system moves to one point of entry at the beginning of September. A decision from the Schools Adjudicator as to whether this will be for September 2009 or a year later is awaited.

Agreed: once the change in admission policy is implemented, to replace the current Autumn Term CSA support funding arrangements with a formula method which distributes the available funding by reference to numbers of pupils in the reception year in those schools without formal nursery provision. [NB. The admission change might not happen for 2009-10].

6.2 Single Status Special Schools Support Staff

Further information on the Single Status issues affecting Special Schools was distributed at the meeting; i) a simple table showing how each of the special schools fares under the three options presented for revision of support assistant funding within the planned place value and ii) to mirror the three approaches taken with the support assistants, a costed analysis of the new upgrading of lunchtime supervisory staff within the special school place value. Based upon the “middle path” option a figure of £44,000 has been included in version 6a of the DSG Budget strategy to deal with the salary change for lunchtime staff in special schools.

There were questions raised about why so much financial help was being directed to special schools when mainstream schools have been expected to cope with the consequences of Single Status revisions themselves. There is a clear difference between mainstream and special in terms of the impact of Single Status. In mainstream the decisions will have affected each school differently – some schools will have increased costs (linked to historic underpayment of certain roles?), for some there will be no changes at all and for others there will be longer term savings if

the valuation of some posts has been downwards. Other than spreading some headroom funding towards the cost of the extension of the paid year it is not possible (nor indeed desirable if extra costs reflect historic undervaluation) to direct further funding support to the mainstream sectors. For special schools, the planned place funding mechanism is built up from assumptions about the salary rates of both support assistants and lunchtime supervisory staff. Upward revision of the grades for these staffs must therefore be matched by a commensurate alteration to the planned place formula mechanism.

The analysis of the three options circulated today clearly shows that option 1, linked to incremental progression up the new grade, significantly underfunds the additional costs involved. Option 2, immediate movement to the maximum of the new grade, significantly overfunds when compared to the additional costs. Option 3, the "middle path" more or less matches the extra costs incurred overall, though, as with any formula allocation, there are winners and losers amongst the schools concerned.

It was also questioned why only some Resourced Provision Units were to receive additional funding in respect of their support assistant grade. Not all the support assistant roles in Resourced Provisions have received an increase in grade. Whether it has happened or not depends upon the work the assistants are expected to do and some roles have not matched the criteria for a revision in grade. It was reported that some head teachers of schools with RP Units were unaware of this. It was officers' understanding that Personnel had been through the detail of RP support assistant roles/grades with the individual head teachers to determine which groups of staff qualified and which did not. The apparent confusion in some quarters will be reported back to the Personnel service.

Agreed : The additions to base budget funding listed in DSG strategy v6a in respect of Single Status uniform cost movements go ahead with the exception of £47,200 set aside for New Approaches in 2009-10. [Because Forum has resolved to change the method for distribution of the New Approaches budget it is no longer necessary to revise the level of provision in the way proposed].

	£
School Meals staff – extension to the paid year	136,300
SEN Statements budget – extension to the paid year	90,400
Special schools support assts regrade – option 3 (middle path)	355,300
Special schools lunchtime staff regrade – option 3 (middle path)	44,000
Resourced Provision support staff regrade (where appropriate)	<u>20,000</u>
	646,000

6.3 Repairs & Maintenance Traded Service

KHSH do not support the proposal to add £61,000 to the structural repair and maintenance delegated budget in order to allow Asset Management to recover the true cost of administering the service on behalf of those schools buying in the service.

KPH took a similar view although any decision was hampered by an apparent lack of understanding amongst their members about the 'one-stop shop' approach referred to in the consultation paper. Different head teachers held differing views about the effectiveness of the approach – problems were reported from some schools with changes being made to assigned contact officers during the year (due to staff turnover and pressures brought to bear by work on the Schools for Future programme) yet other heads were very pleased with the support they receive. Perhaps more information and publicity about the service is needed?

There was general support for the fall-back option contained in the proposal – that the projected shortfall of £44,000 in the recovery of administration costs should be charged against the traded service income collected from purchasing schools.

Agreed: to allow the Asset Management Team to recover the £44k shortfall in the admin costs of providing the service to schools from the traded service income collected from the schools which buy in.

6.4 Head Teacher Well-being

The proposal is to formally extend the funding arrangements to bring secondary schools under the umbrella of the service. To match the funding arrangements already in place for the other schools this would entail the commitment of an additional £30,000 (£15,000 extra deduction from Age-weighted Pupil Unit funding and £15,000 extra input from the teacher absence insurance cover scheme).

KHSH – the view reported back was that there should be no formal increase to the base funding level of the service but those individual high school heads interested can still buy into the service should they wish to do so. With the current economic climate and the expected pressure within school budgets next year heads were worried about being seen to look after their own needs at the expense of other provision.

KPH – There was also no support for the formal extension of the service to high schools. Questions were asked about who has responsibility for monitoring the budget provision. [It is accounted for within the retained DSG budget so any surplus or deficit would be reported to Schools Forum].

KMSH – thought that the service's funding should be increased to pay for the actual hours being put in by the two project managers. Given the major changes to come when the Schools for the Future reorganisations get under way it is even more essential that appropriate support systems are accessible by the head teachers that will be affected.

KSSH – the view is that the funding arrangements should stay as they are.

It was clear that there was little or no support for bringing high schools formally into the funding arrangements. Officers agreed to help the project managers consider whether the current charge level for high schools buying back individually is appropriate to the cost of supporting those schools.

There was support from some quarters for an enhancement to the existing level of funding available to the service in order to provide more hours of support to primary, middle and special schools. Views on this idea are to be gathered from constituent groups. The discussions today would also be reported back to the Head Teacher Support Steering Group.

6.5 Westfields & ETHOS Pupil Referral Units

Two documents had already been made available to Schools Forum members in advance of the meeting – a contextual commentary paper summarising the issues and the work undertaken with the PRUs (circulated to all head teachers as part of the consultation papers) and a copy of the ETHOS PRU report. The Westfields PRU proposal was tabled at today's Forum meeting.

In the process of making final checks of the reports there has had to be an alteration to the total budget figure proposed for the ETHOS PRU – the commitment of additional funds rising from the £161,800 declared in DSG strategy V6 to £173,500 now showing in V6a. There are two reasons for the adjustment - £3,900 of annual pension costs missed from the original version and £8,200 added back in respect of a late reduction in Care to Learn grant income.

The Westfields proposed budget figure has also risen in comparison to the estimate declared in V6 such that the additional commitment now appears as £88,700 in V6a.

The reports lay open in some detail the costs of the two PRUs in terms of staffing, supplies and services, transport and supporting income for each of the fields of PRU activity. They propose to correct any obvious budget omissions (catering at ETHOS, relief cover for both) and under-

provision where identified. The reports also comment upon how each field of activity might be placed on a formula funding basis similar to the formula principles applied in special schools.

The Schools Forum welcomed the in-depth analysis of costs and staffing levels provided by the reports and acknowledged the tremendous amount of work that had taken place to reach this stage. Whilst finance officers involved in the report could answer quite a few of the detailed questions posed by members it was clear that the Schools Forum wanted to dig a little deeper into how the PRUs are organised and what makes them different from mainstream schools. There were questions raised covering staffing/pupil ratios, TLR structures, attendance figures, how many pupils pass through each of the PRU's books each year, the general outcomes for children attending the PRU, monitoring arrangements and consideration of value for money. It was suggested that the best way forward from this point would be to invite to the 23 January Schools Forum meeting both the PRU head teachers, Ritch Barras (ETHOS) and Martin Ridge (Westfields), together with Lynne Nickson, Principal Improvement Manager for Inclusion and Dennis Shields the Pupil Referral Service Manager. W Firmin would try to arrange this. It would be helpful if the questions could largely be known in advance of the meeting so that any requests for further supporting information can be addressed and the meeting prepared for properly. Suggestions for questions to WFirmin as soon as possible please.

6.6 Additional Pupil Needs (APN)

The consultation papers illustrate the financial effects of five different options for alteration of the Additional Pupil Needs funding method. All the options assume a permanent contribution of £0.5m from the Age-Weighted Pupil Unit budget to smooth the path to a funding mechanism which allocates a level of funding to all disadvantaged pupils not just those in excess of a specific threshold. The models illustrated are: -

Model 1: The current APN threshold method is unaltered [£522 to disadvantaged pupils in excess of an average assistance threshold of 30.11%] but the £0.5m top-sliced from AWPU is allocated to disadvantaged pupils below the 30.11% threshold (at approx £40 per pupil).

Model 2A: Retains the 30.11% average threshold. Every disadvantaged pupil is funded at approximately £78 per pupil and extra funding of around £347 per pupil is allocated to those disadvantaged pupils in excess of the threshold. (ie the pupils above the average attract a total of £425 each).

Model 2B: Also retains the 30.11% average threshold. Every disadvantaged pupil is funded at approx £128 per pupil with extra funding of around £172 per pupil allocated to disadvantaged pupils in excess of the threshold. (ie. the pupils above the average attract a total of £300 each).

Model 3A: Raises the threshold level to 40%. The funding value per excess pupil stays at £522 as per the current method. The raising of the threshold allows all disadvantaged pupils below the threshold mark to be funded at around £110 per pupil.

Model 3B: Raises the threshold level to 50%. The funding value per excess pupil stays at £522. The setting of a higher threshold increases the funding for all disadvantaged pupils below the threshold to around £151 per pupil.

With the exception of model 1 (which only results in schools with less than 20% of their pupils classed as disadvantaged losing out financially) the other models redistribute funding from those schools with either low or high rates of deprivation in favour of those schools in between.

KHSH – support the slicing of £0.5m from the AWPU budget to implement the change as it also helps with the authority's deprivation target requirements. The group opted for model 2A as being the most appropriate at the present time but recommend that model 2B is adopted when the system can afford it. Model 3a was not supported because there was seen to be too big a gap between the funding values used of £522 and £110.

KMSH – no middle schools currently receive anything from the APN allocation. KMSH plumped for option 2B as it was seen to be the most effective in redressing the situation for the middle sector.

KPH – there had been a very polarised debate at the KPH meeting but there was a general acceptance that the current method was unfair to some schools and should be changed. By way of a formal vote, option 3A was chosen mainly due to concerns about the destabilising effect of some of the other models. There was an acknowledgement at the meeting that, in principle, all pupils with additional needs should receive some funding support but it was also recognised that there is a ‘critical mass’ of proportions of such children that ramps up the difficulty for certain schools.

KSSH – the proposals are not really an issue for the special sector as the schools fall outside the distribution anyway. The ‘wisdom’ of dragging funding away from those schools in most need of support was questioned though.

The constituent groups have therefore not fallen in behind one particular model. It was pointed out to the KSSH representatives that there is not as wide a difference between the values used in models 2A and 3A as they had presumed. The amounts shown in the spreadsheet relate to funding above the threshold – the total allocation is really £78 to disadvantaged pupils below the threshold and £425 above. It was proposed therefore to seek a compromise position by working up a further option which falls approximately mid-way between 2A and 3A – in rough terms this would mean a threshold raised to 35% disadvantage and funding for pupils above the threshold at around £475, with the remaining budget being spread to all disadvantaged pupils. There was also a suggestion made that the application of a second, much higher, threshold could be explored to protect those schools with the larger proportions of disadvantage.

The compromise model will be worked up for the 23 January Forum meeting and considered by KSSH at their 4 February meeting. The Forum KPH representatives will meet to look at the proposal once the decision from KSSH becomes available. Middle and Special schools will accept the eventual outcome reached. Any decision is likely to be made for one-year only in the first instance and needs to be taken at the 6 February Forum meeting at the latest.

6.7 SEN Funding (New Approaches)

The following models for redistribution of the New Approaches funding went out for further consultation: -

[All the models start from an assumption that the current amount of funding allocated in total to each sector – primary, middle and secondary – remains unaltered. There is no proposed redistribution of funding between the sectors].

Pale Yellow model – the available funding is simply distributed using Tax Credit Indicator (TCI) data.

Salmon pink model - 50% of the available funding is distributed using TCI data with the other 50% referencing prior attainment data.

[The prior attainment data used is different between the Key Stages. In KS1 the numbers of Yr2 children attaining below level 2B in KS1 reading, writing and maths has been used. (This will need to be re-calculated using Early Years Foundation Stage assessment data). KS2 used the numbers of pupils in Yrs 3-6 attaining below level 2B in reading, writing and maths at the end of KS1. KS3 and KS4 now have to use test scores at the end of KS2 as KS3 assessments have recently been withdrawn by the DCSF. The allocation is based on the number of pupils in Yrs 7-11 attaining below average English and maths test scores at the end of KS2. Weightings are applied as follows, Maths at level 3 = 1, Maths at or below level 2 = 2, English at level 3 = 2 and English at or below level 2 = 4].

Mustard model – the same elements as the salmon pink model but losses are capped at a value representing 3% of the school’s last Age-weighted Pupil Unit allocation.

Purple model – the mustard model phased over three financial years. The figures show the change to be implemented in any one year.

KHSH – It was reported that the head teacher of the school most adversely affected by the proposals has accepted the need for the funding method to change. [Their current large New Approaches amount harks back to action supported by the Ed Psych service when the school

had a special measures classification. It was never the intention for this level of funding to be recurrent]. The favoured option is salmon pink but with the changes phased in over three years to give the school most affected time to adjust its spending profile.

KPH - The favoured option was the purple model. The capping and phasing was seen to be essential to protect the schools standing to lose the most funding in comparison to the current New Approaches distribution.

KMSH – also favoured the purple model as it offered most protection for those schools losing funds in comparison to the New Approaches allocation.

KSSH – abstained from the debate as special schools are not affected by the change.

Officers agreed to rework the salmon pink model for a phased approach and re-present the chosen options for consideration at the next Forum meeting. It was confirmed that there is no reason why the secondary sector cannot have a different allocation method to the other school sectors.

6.8 Other issues

There are three other amounts on the DSG strategy list where decisions need to be recorded.....

- A Gr6 admin post, initially for one year, to work on the School Workforce Census return on behalf of schools (£23,000).

Agreed - to add in temporary funding to the Resources & Support Personnel service for 2009-10 to support this post. The position is then to be reviewed for 2010-11.

- The estimated cost of premises changes in the primary sector – two new school premises plus emergency provision for Headfield Junior school. The additional cost is somewhat unavoidable as it relates to formula funding allocations but approval still needs to be recorded.
- Pressure in the SEN statements budget (mitigated by some savings in Resourced Provision funding commitments. The RP Units affected were reported to the meeting). Again the additional cost is largely unavoidable but a decision needs to be recorded.

7. Confirm details of the next stages of consultation and recommendation

7.1 Items requiring further debate – Reserve meeting 23rd January?

The reserve meeting set for 23 January now needs to be activated when the following agenda items will be considered: -

- Pupil Referral Unit funding issues – ETHOS, Westfields, Primary Turnaround. [Questions for the PRU Heads and Inclusion Service managers to W Firmin in advance of the 23 January Forum meeting please].
- The new Additional Pupil Needs funding model: further refinement to the option 2a/3a approaches to be illustrated and considered.
- Replacement method for New Approaches: further refinement to the secondary school option (regarding phasing) to be illustrated.
- School-by-school summary of the funding shifts, presented in deprivation rank order, to look at the cumulative effect of the proposed changes to AWPU, Additional Pupil Need and New Approaches funding.
- Consideration of how to deal with the remaining gap in the 2009-10 DSG strategy. Version 7, reflecting the decisions reached today, will be available for the 23rd.

7.2 Items for reference back to constituent groups during week 2-6 February

This item of business can now be sorted out at the 23 January meeting.

7.3 Agenda: Confirmation meeting Friday 6th February

The agenda for the 6 February 'confirmation' meeting will also now be determined at the 23 January meeting.

8. 2008-09 DSG Budget Monitoring

The retained DSG budget monitoring position declared at week 36 was considered by the meeting. The projection shows an expected year end deficit of £306,500 in total but this relies upon a projected surplus within the 08/09 insurance cover scheme account of –(£300,000). If the view is that the cover scheme surplus should not be used to offset general funding problems (as not all schools are members of the scheme) then the real deficit level should really be regarded as £606,500. Since week 36 was declared there has also been a lot of activity within the LMS Contingency account which has turned the projected wk36 surplus of –(£100,000) into a projected deficit of £170,000. The main pressures now surfacing are to do with demands against the NQT Induction provision, a higher than normal incidence of necessary revisions to individual KS1 Class Size arrangements and the cost of SEN-related Single Status revisions now exceeding the specific provision Forum originally set aside for 2008-09. This would take the underlying problem in the 2008-09 DSG up to £876,500 although there is still time for things to change before the end of the year.

The discussions turned to how to deal with such a position should that be the actual year end outcome. In very general terms there would probably have to be a two-stage approach to redeeming the deficit. Any uncleared DSG deficit (excluding the outturn position within the insurance cover scheme account) would need to be recovered by raising a charge against all schools (pro rata to AWPU and planned place allocations?). Forum will also need to consider whether to return some, or all, of the accumulated surplus within the teacher absence insurance arrangements to those schools which are currently members of the scheme. This would mitigate the impact of the 'recovery' charges in the vast majority of schools.

Further monitoring updates will be supplied over the coming months to keep Forum fully in the picture as the situation develops.

9. Any other business

None was raised.

Date and Time of next meeting

Friday 23rd January 2009, **9:15am** to 11:30am at the Deighton Centre, Huddersfield