

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

TUESDAY, 28TH MARCH, 2017

At 1.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - GUILDHALL, WINDSOR.

TO: Head Teacher Representatives: Isabel Cooke, Richard Pilgrim (Chairman), Heidi Swidenbank, Helen McHale, Alison Penny, Nick Stevens (Vice-Chairman), Stuart Muir, Joolz Scarlett, Tony Dickens, Mike Wallace, Chris Tomes, Amanda Hough and Martin Tinsley.

Governor Representatives: Hugh Boulter and Jo Haswell.

Non- School Representatives: Gina Kendall and Anne Entwistle.

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: 20/03/2017

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **David Cook**, david.cook@rbwm.gov.uk

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2017.	7 - 12
4.	<u>HIGH NEEDS BLOCK MONITORING</u> To consider the report.	13 - 16
5.	<u>SCHOOLS BUDGET 2017-18</u> To receive a verbal update.	Verbal Report
6.	<u>WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW FORUM PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES.</u> To consider the Task Group report.	17 - 18

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

SCHOOLS FORUM

TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2017

PRESENT: Head Teacher Representatives: Isabel Cooke, Richard Pilgrim (Chairman), Heidi Swidenbank, Helen McHale, Nick Stevens (Vice-Chairman), Stuart Muir, Joolz Scarlett, Mike Wallace, Chris Tomes and Martin Tinsley.

Governor Representatives: Hugh Boulter and Jo Haswell.

Non- School Representatives: Gillian May.

Also in attendance: Mr J Wilding (Claire's Court) and Mrs Farnden (Forest Bridge).

Officers: Kevin McDaniels, David Cook, Phil Herd, Alan Abrahamson, Geoff King.

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Gina Kendell and Amanda Hough.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting on 11 October 2016 were approved as a true and correct record subject to Gillian May attendance replacing Anne Entwistle.

DSG 2017-18 SETTLEMENT AND STRATEGY FOR MANAGING DSG IN FUTURE YEARS

The Chairman informed the Forum that this item and agenda item 8 were interrelated. It was planned to discuss the DSG then the other agenda items were pertinent to the final decision that would be taken at agenda item 8.

The Head of Education and Schools informed the Forum that the report summarised RBWM's 2017-18 DSG allocation and set out proposals for managing the DSG for the next two years in light of the 2017/18 funding arrangements. The Forum were informed that since they had met as a task group in December 2016 there had been an unexpected addition of £390k into the high needs block.

Although the additional funding was welcome and the report showed the difference between the Forum's December discussion and the current position section 3.5 of the report did highlight future potential pressures. The DFE had now released draft proposals for the redistribution of high needs funding with the indicative figures showing that RBWM could lose £2.3m if this new formula was to be implemented.

The report went on to show, as illustrated in table 4.2, that if we continue on the current direction of travel regarding spending then there would be a £5.8 million overspend. Potential options to manage the pressures within each block were explained in the reports annexes. It was proposed that a task group be established to look at saving proposals and that the Forum would be asked to approve a reduction in AWPU of 0.5% to support high needs pressures.

Alison Penny asked why some schools had not been affected by the proposals shown in the report and was informed that some schools would be protected by the minimum funding guarantee.

The Chairman asked that with regards to agenda page 23 paragraph C what the implications would be if our base line was incorrect. The Forum were informed that the DFE would look to see how much we had borrowed from the school block for high needs and compare our spending with other authorities. LEA's have been told they can no longer keep borrowing from the schools block. The Chairman also mentioned that it was worth noting that out of borough placements was the biggest budget growth regarding high needs.

Gillian May asked if the working group to look at out of borough placements had been established and was informed that the report was proposing setting up a task group that would look at those placements but also other saving opportunities.

The Chairman had agreed that Mr James Wilding, Claire's Court, could address the Forum on this item.

Mr Wilding informed that he had been head teacher since 1981 and the school was very popular and approximately 700 pupils choose the school because of their special needs. The school worked with a number of local authorities and each authority had their own rules regarding placements. At their nursery school approximately 85% of students were PVI's. one of their challenges was not being able to communicate effectively with RBWM. He mentioned that Buckinghamshire had the provision that if urgent action was required then there would be funding made available. He understood that there were funding challenges but as a private institute it was difficult to get support.

Mr Wilding noted that the RBWM consultation submission on the green paper had said that independent schools should not get funding for high needs placements. He had held discussions with the Head of Education and understood that a liaison officer would be appointed and he offered his help to the Schools Forum in their deliberations regarding high needs placements.

The Chairman mentioned that the funding situation was not going to get any better soon so it was important that a working party be established as soon as possible. The vice-chairman mentioned that the terms of reference and timescale needed to be clear and relevant to have an impact.

The Forum had been circulated a list of High Needs Expenditure and Jo Haswell informed that it had been difficult accessing SEN services and a lot of the services on the list had not been known to her.

The Head of Education and schools informed that a link officer was being put in place and would work with local independent schools and that moving to Achieving for Children would enable the LA to have a dedicated officer looking at the local offer.

Martin Tinsley asked if the Forum should also engage with the public health, for example over CAMHS, as part of the review and was informed that this was important especially regarding mental health.

The Chairman had agreed that Elizabeth Farnden, Forest Green School,, could address the Forum on this item.

Elizabeth informed the Forum that Forest Bridge opened four terms ago and had 29 RBWM pupils with the rest being from other LA's. There were temporary accommodation on site and due to challenges with planning they could not get the school to its 96 capacity. Any cut in funding would hit the school hard. The Forum were also informed that the school had children with significant behaviour problems and thus a key priority was keeping children safe. She understood the need to make savings and said that she would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the working group and see how we bring more pupils back into the borough.

The Forum were informed by both secondary and primary head representatives that both sectors were not supportive of the proposed cut in AWPU.

It was noted that a reduction in high needs placements out of borough would help and the Forum were informed that although they did not need to identify savings at this meeting the Forum did need to agree the level of savings required so the DFE could be informed.

The Chairman asked what the consequences would be if a zero balance could not be achieved and was informed that the consequences were not known. The national funding formula would split the high needs and the school block and it was expected that either schools, the LEA or both would have to pay any difference.

The Forum noted the report and the recommendations would be reviewed under agenda item 8.

EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA 2017-18

The Forum considered the report regarding the implications of the Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) and the suggested options for implementing a new local Early Years Funding Formula within the EYNFF framework.

The Forum were informed that the likely implications to RBWM of the EYNFF were covered in October's forum meeting. Since that meeting the response to the Government's consultation had been published and the early years block for 2017-18 was now estimated at £9.666m based upon the latest census data, the components of this was shown in table 2.3.

The Forum were informed that section 4 of the report showed the consultation questions put to local providers. Section 5 showed the final proposals which were:

- There will be one universal base rate for all providers.
- There will be three deprivation tiers.
- The deprivation tier will start at 10%.
- The quality supplement will be based upon staff qualifications.
- The saving from not having a leadership supplement would be put into the staff qualifications supplement. (this could be reviewed for 2018-19 given the lack of clarity over this).
- There will not be a sparsity or flexibility supplement.
- There will not be an EAL supplement for 2017-18 but this will be reviewed for 2018-19.

The proposed hourly rates were shown in section 5.2 of the report.

Resolved unanimously: that the Schools Forum note the implications of the EYNFF as outlined in the DFE's publication dated 2nd December 2016 and summarised in the report. That the recommendations would be reviewed in one year's time and specifically would look at the leadership supplement due to the lack of clarity at the present time.

2017-18 SCHOOLS BUDGET AND CENTRALLY RETAINED BUDGET PROPOSALS

The Chairman informed the Forum that the figures contained within the report were based on the assumption that there was no decrease in AWPU.

The Forum were informed that the report summarises RBWM's proposed schools budget allocation and the schools block central budgets. The Forum were asked to approve the final 2017-18 funding formula as set out in Annex 3 to this report and the indicative individual school budget shares set out in annex 4. Maintained schools were asked to vote by sector on individual centralised services as set out in the report.

Resolved unanimously: that the secondary sector approved the Secondary De-delegated services 2017-18 as set out in 3.7 of the report.

Resolved unanimously: that the primary sector approved the Primary De-delegated services 2017-18 as set out in 3.7 of the report.

With regards to Early Help advisors in schools the Forum raised concern that they had previously agreed to fund the services and after an initial good start the social workers had been re-allocated into the MASH. The Forum were informed that this had now been reversed and the service should be available and officers would check why schools were finding it difficult to access the service.

Resolved unanimously: that the Schools Forum approved the Central schools expenditure 2017-18 as set out in section 4.2 of the report.

Resolved unanimously: that the combined services budgets allocation be deferred until March 2017.

It was noted that in October 2016, Schools Forum gave their approval to retain £315k in 2017-18 to pay for the services that were previously funded by the retained duties element of ESG.

Resolved unanimously: that the final 2017-18 funding formula as set out in Annexe 3 of the report and the individual school budget shares set out in annexe 4 be approved.

NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The Forum considered the report that informed that the Department for Education (DfE) funding strategy had made changes to the way schools were funded. As a result of this the LEA was required to change the way it provides schools (the term schools and colleagues with High Needs funding for children and young people with special educational needs (replaced by EHC Plans).

The Schools Forum had previously agreed in to a period of consultation, leading to a revised process for allocating High Needs Funding to support Children and Young People eligible for an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan or statement of Special educational needs. This consultation had taken place and it was planned that a change in methodology would be implemented from April 2017.

The report detailed the consultation methodology and the findings.

Gillian May reported that she currently had a funding gap and wanted reassurance that the £6k additional funding would be available. The colleague currently had 140 SEN pupils but only received funding for 82. The Forum was informed that the funding was available and there was a line in the handout previously provided that showed funds taken from the DFG. It was not proposed to change the amount of funding provided but how it was divided.

Joolz Scarlett mentioned that it was disappointing that behaviour had not been included in the matrix and was informed that it was not intended to be included as you could not distinguish between the child's behaviour and the environment. There was a disagreement on this statement and it remained a moot point.

The Chairman mentioned that as the report was to note the issues it raised could be considered as part of the working group that was to be established as per agenda item 4.

DSG 2017-18 SETTLEMENT AND STRATEGY FOR MANAGING DSG IN FUTURE YEARS

The Chairman informed that the Forum were asked to make resolutions on the recommendations in agenda item 4, DSG 2017-18 Settlement and Strategy for Managing DSG in Future Years.

Resolved unanimously: That the Schools Forum approves:

- **The retention of headroom to support the high needs block.**
- **The increased early year’s retention to support high needs.**
- **The carry forward of the DSG Deficit be acknowledged.**
- **The Forum did not approve the proposed reduction in AWPU of 0.5% to support high needs pressures.**

The Forum endorsed the establishment of a working group to look at savings for the high needs block.

OUTCOME OF DFE SECOND CONSULTATION ON NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA

The Chairman asked if the Forum would like to hold a separate meeting to respond to the consultation and it was approved that the forum would meet on 2nd March 2017, details to be confirmed.

The Forum were informed that the LEA would make its own submission and individual schools were encouraged to respond to the consultation as well as the Schools Forum.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 2.30 pm, finished at 4.45 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

Date:	28 th March 2017
Title:	High Needs Block Monitoring
Responsible Officer:	Kevin McDaniel, Head of Education and Schools
Contact Officer:	James Norris, Lead Accountant Children's Services
Email:	James.norris@rbwm.gov.uk
Telephone:	07824478100

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper summarises the progress made by the High Needs Block (HNB) working party that was created at the request of the Schools Forum 31st January 2017 to undertake a review of the HNB budgets and agree a proposed Implementation Plan to deliver savings and efficiencies to address the projected budget deficit.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools Forum is asked to note:-

- 2.1 The revised implementation plan as set out in appendix A.
- 2.2 The options identified by the HNB working party will be a standing item for future forum meetings.

Schools Forum is asked to endorse:-

- 2.3 The required HNB implementation plan in principle as set out in appendix A.
- 2.4 Further exploration of the initial areas of investigation identified by the HNB Working Party.

Schools Forum is asked to approve:-

- 2.5 The revised implementation plan as set out in appendix A.
- 2.6 The carry forward of the DSG deficit.

3 HIGH NEEDS BLOCK BUDGETARY PRESSURES

- 3.1 There are a number of significant pressures within the HNB of the DSG which mean that the overall DSG will go into deficit as at March 2017. As proposed at the last Schools Forum a working group including forum members met on the 9th

March 2017 to review the proposed options that could be implemented in order to balance the DSG over the next 2 or 3 financial years.

The working group reviewed all services and budgets included within the HNB.

4 HIGH NEEDS BLOCK 3 YEAR BUDGET PLAN

- 4.1 Following the Forum decision 31st January 2017 not to approve the proposed reduction in AWPU of 0.5% and the decision of the HNB working party not to support the reduction in Mainstream, Special School & RP School Top Ups the revised High Needs Block 3 Year Budget Plan is as below:-

High Needs Block 3 Year Budget Plan

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	£k	£k	£k
Deficit b/f	0	950	946
HNB Overspend	1,250	0	0
One Off Savings	-300	0	0
HNB 16/17 Requirements	0	1,250	1,250
HNB 17/18 Requirements	0	800	800
HNB 18/19 Requirements	0	0	800
HNB Additional Allocation	0	-398	-398
HNB Implementation Plan 17/18	0	-800	-800
HNB Implementation Plan 18/19	0	0	-800
Total HNB Net Pressure	950	852	852
Schools Block Headroom	0	-300	-300
Additional Headroom	0	-247	-247
Total Headroom contribution	0	-547	-547
Early Years Central Retention	0	-309	-309
Early Years Retention 18/19	0	0	-182
Total Early Years	0	-309	-491
TOTAL	950	946	760

The revised 3 year budget plan has a net deficit of £760,000 at the end of 2018/19.

- 4.2 The HNB working group were presented with the initial Implementation Plan and discussed each of the proposed work streams. It was agreed that the reduction in Mainstream, Special School & RP School Top Ups would not be supported.

All other work streams were supported to be explored further. The summary of proposed work for in-year savings is:

- a. Improved Commissioning – contracting an external consultancy firm to review both existing and future arrangements with a view to renegotiating contracts and delivering savings for the long-term. The consultant will work on a fixed cost plus commission basis.
- b. Reorganisation of Alternative Provision – releasing the budget for senior commissioning officer and reducing the funding provided for individual alternative provision outside of the statutory medical and permanent exclusion grounds from 1 April 2017.
- c. Financial review of the borough's two special schools – both schools have agreed to take part in a review during the summer term to establish the value of the funding regime and reach agreement on any changes to top up rates.

4.3 The working group are meeting again to review the impact of outreach services to consider changes which deliver more intensive action over a defined period to make impactful change. This is included in the SEN Support services line of the information in appendix A.

4.4 The revised implementation plan totalling £1,860,000 as set out in appendix A.

5 NEXT STEPS

5.1 The service in conjunction with finance will undertake analysis of the impact of the Children & Families Act 2014 0-25 year old agenda in relation to growth in costs for the 18-25 year old cohort.

5.2 The service in conjunction with finance will undertake a forward projection of future HNB volumes.

5.3 The service will undertake a medium term needs analysis for the HNB provision. Based on outcome consideration for future Capital investment. The Borough has been allocated £750,000 over three years from April 2018.

5.4 Consider options for implementing a charging policy; ensuring a robust process for maximising partner contributions is implemented.

5.5 The service working with Commissioning to review current and potential use of outreach services to deliver more intensive services which deliver tangible outcomes..

High Needs Block Implementation Plan

Year 2017/18	Mainstream School Top Ups	Special School and RP Top Ups	Forest Bridge Top Ups	Indep and NMSS Schools	Sen Support Services	Alternative Provision	Totals
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Reduction in Top Ups	0	0					0
Consultation Review	30	20	20				70
Reorganisation of Alt Provision						200	200
SEN Support Services					100		100
Improved Commissioning		40	50	440			530
Total 2017-18	30	60	70	440	100	200	900
Year 2018/19							
Reduction in Top Ups	0	0					0
Consultation Review	20	20	30				70
Reorganisation of Alt Provision						300	300
SEN Support Services					60		60
Improved Commissioning			30	500			530
Total 2018-19	20	20	60	500	60	300	960
Totals							
Reduction in Top Ups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consultation Review	50	40	50	0	0	0	140
Reorganisation of Alt Provision	0	0	0	0	0	500	500
SEN Support Services	0	0	0	0	160	0	160
Improved Commissioning	0	40	80	940	0	0	1,060
Totals	50	80	130	940	160	500	1,860

To: Schools Forum - Meeting 28th March 2017

From: Hugh Boulter (Governor Representative) Chair of Working Group to review Forum processes and procedures.

Working Group Membership: Heidi Swidenbank, Isabel Cooke, Amanda Hough, Alison Penny, Nick Stevens, Hugh Boulter

Summary

Following Schools Forum representatives agreeing to a Work Group to be established to review Schools Forum governance, processes and procedures at the meeting held 13th December 2016, the above group have had a number of discussions subsequently and have identified the following areas for consideration. The Work Group would therefore request the Forum membership and other stakeholders as appropriate to agree to evaluate the feasibility of making changes to the way the Forum operates as soon as possible. The Work Group requests that all such feasibility work is completed in time for approval at the Schools Forum meeting in May in order for any new or changes to processes can be in place by September 2017.

Background

Continuing funding constraints leading to more complex financial evaluations having to be undertaken and decided upon by the Schools Forum increases the need to ensure the Forum is operating effectively and is able to decide on specific financial proposals that deliver optimised results in a balanced way across the school community within RBWM. It is also felt that the Forum needs to be more inclusive of all schools in its decision making processes regardless of whether they are represented directly or not at the Forum meetings. The Work Group have therefore studied, reviewed and evaluated all aspects of the Forum processes and have identified the following areas which we believe could deliver a significant improvement in the quality of decisions made and also enabling all schools to have a direct input into the way decisions are made.

Proposals for consideration, feasibility assessment and subsequent action:

- **Distribution of pre Schools Forum meeting paperwork** - recommend distribution to all Forum members, invited attendees and all headteachers at the latest 2 weeks prior to the Forum meeting. The work group would request the local authority to decide how best (should they wish to) adopt a similar distribution process for Private/Voluntary attendees.
- **Headteacher Cluster Meetings** - proposal to reschedule these meetings one week prior to the Forum meeting, thus enabling all heads to review and discuss the key agenda items and agree a set of views on critical items which will then be communicated to the Forum by the appointed representatives. All heads should be kept up to date as to who their representatives are.
- **Schools Forum agendas and associated papers** - the local authority representatives are requested to consider how all pre meeting paperwork can be explicit on course of action required at the Forum meeting identifying those items that require a formal vote together with clarity on who is eligible to vote on a particular issue.
- **Schools Forum minutes** - the local authority representatives are requested to consider how to explicitly identify actions required by whom and when, with a follow up process instigated between Forum meetings on critical items. All Forum members and attendees together with all heads should receive a copy of the minutes within 2 weeks of the Forum taking place.

- **Annual report** - the local authority are requested to consider producing an annual report summarising actions undertaken by the Forum over the previous 12 months together with a high level summary of issues likely to be brought before the Forum over the next year (including any emerging budgeting shortfalls). The report should also include where relevant how effective the financial decisions made by the Forum have been in terms of value added and impact on schools and the overall budget.
- **Budgetary processes** - the Work Group feel it is imperative for an improved alignment of RBWM budgeting processes and those that exist across the whole school community, together with a need for any major budgeting shortfalls to be brought to the attention of Forum members earlier in the process. A separate discussion needs to be held between all parties to agree on a precise budgeting timetable. The Work Group would also request that a budgetary summary is presented at each Forum meeting in order for any major issues to be identified as early in the process as possible,
- **School Forum meetings timelines** - the Work Group felt that the current dates when Forum meetings are held are fine, although members are asked to consider cancelling either the January or March meeting. However, in relation to the above item on Budgetary processes, this would only be feasible if draft budget decisions were made at the October meeting and the final budget was approved at the December meeting - if this was to be adopted this would go a long way towards aligning major budgetary work with the timescale schools are committed to adhere to.
- **Decision Making** - the Work Group request that all decisions made at School Forum meetings should be binding until such time Forum members are formally invited to consider changes to original decisions made or make a new decision should the financial position change and/or new information become available. In practice all decision making should be made at planned Forum meetings, in exceptional circumstances extraordinary meetings may need to be set up additionally to review or change decisions. It may be appropriate in certain circumstances for Forum members to be asked to provide a view on specific items via e mail that may result in a revised decision being made.
- **Data/Information** - the local authority representatives are requested to provide at all times to members, relevant data/analysis to support any proposals/actions/decisions that need to be made on a financial issue. Ideally, the Work Group would ask that members are provided with a suite of options to resolve a particular financial issue with high quality financial data supplied thus making the task of members to fully understand the scale of the issue and therefore making it easier to make an informed decision.
- **Voting** - the Work Group is aware that strict governance surrounds voting procedures at School Forums. However, as covered above it is important for all parties to be clear in advance items that require a vote and who is eligible to vote on that issue.
- **Forum Membership** - the Work Group feel the current membership of the Forum meets all needs.

Next Steps - the Schools Forum is asked by the Work Group to consider these proposals and agree as far as possible to adopt them into future Forum working practices with a target date for implementation September 2017.