

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

TUESDAY, 11TH JULY, 2017

At 2.30 pm

in the

ASCOT AND BRAY - TOWN HALL,

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

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: 03/07/2017

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

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. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and 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 of 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 previous meeting.	7 - 10
4.	<u>SEND UPDATE</u> To consider the verbal update.	Verbal Report
5.	<u>TERMS OF REFERENCE</u> To consider the report.	To Follow

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they 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' means a discussion by the members of meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, Members should move to the public area or leave the room once they have made any representations. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) 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 licence 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.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

SCHOOLS FORUM

TUESDAY, 28 MARCH 2017

PRESENT: Head Teacher Representatives: Richard Pilgrim (Chairman), Nick Stevens (Vice-Chairman), Alison Penny, Stuart Muir, Mike Wallace, Chris Tomes and Martin Tinsley.

Governor Representatives: Jo Haswell.

Non- School Representatives: None.

Also in attendance: Councillor Natasha Airey

Officers: Kevin McDaniel and James Norris and David Cook

APOLOGIES

Apologies for the inability to attend the meeting were received from Isabel Cooke, Heidi Swidenbank, Joolz Scarlett, Amanda Hough, Hugh Boulter, Gina Kendall, Anne Entwistle and Helen McHale.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 31st January 2017 were approved as a true and correct record subject to Alison Penny being in attendance and that on page 8 Forest Green School be amended to Forest Bridge School.

Matters arising. The Forum were informed that the timescale for children's services joining Achieving for Children had changed to 1st August 2017 due to the democratic process of the two existing authorities. RBWM were still committed to becoming a partner.

With regards to the New Assessment Criteria the Chairman asked if the new criteria had been signed off as at the last meeting concern had been raised about behaviour not being included. The Head of Education and Schools informed the Forum that the matrix had been approved. There had been a focus on cases rather than behaviour; there were behaviour services in place. When behaviour needs were not addressed managed behaviour would be used.

In response to a question about existing funding the Forum were informed that the matrix would be used for new arrangements and reviews, the aim of the change was to make the process more transparent and fair. It was noted that parents and professionals had been included in the consultation process.

HIGH NEEDS BLOCK MONITORING

The Forum were informed that at their meeting on the 31st January 2017 they considered the need to make savings to the High Needs Block (HNB) and requested that a working party be established to look at potential ways of delivering the required savings.

At the working group meeting on 9th March 2017 group members looked at saving options and a breakdown of all services and budgets included in the HNB. There was a vacant post that it was proposed not to fill. When reviewing the initial implementation plan it was agreed that the

reduction in Mainstream, Special School and PR School top ups was not supported. The table on agenda page 16 showed the current HNB Implementation Plan.

The Forum were informed that there would be a conversation with the two borough special schools during the summer term to analyse costs. Part of the review would also look if a child would be better served in a special school or a mainstream setting.

As part of the in year savings it was also proposed that there be a reorganisation of alternative provision and that the Council takes a more challenging stance on permanent exclusions.

In response to questions it was noted that since September 2016 there had been 16 RBWM pupils excluded from schools, that there had been an increase in exclusions from the previous year due to the change in legislation regarding persistence and disruptive behaviour and that this year had seen an increase in exclusions due to one off events. There were reasons when it was appropriate to exclude a pupil and when excluded the LEA had a duty to provide an education setting after 6 days which was paid for from the HNB.

There were lessons to be learnt from behaviour patterns from all schools with some schools having a more challenging setting where exclusion may be more appropriate.

The Forum felt that consistency in funding from the HNB was required and this again raised the question about behaviour and the newly introduced funding matrix.

It was noted that it was expected that exclusions would increase as there were already pupils within the system without exclusion plans that were being funded and schools have also indicated that without additional support more pupils would be at risk of exclusion. The LEA wanted to be open and clear with schools; it was about being transparent and clear that there was no wish to see children out of mainstream education.

The LEA had a statutory duty to provide a PRU and therefore there was a demand lead budget. It was noted that the Fair Access Protocol was binding on all where a child could not find a placement and it was felt that there could be better use of managed moves.

The Forum were informed that whilst attending a meeting the previous week the Head of Education had been surprised to find out that RBWM was one of a few smaller councils that did take funds from the school block to support high needs pressures.

With regards to proposed implementation plan the Forum were informed that there was about £100k of savings from SEN support services and that there was expected savings from improved commissioning. Over the last few years the CYPDS team had focused on finding placements more than the costs. Following the model used by Adult Services officers would be looking at existing placements to see if they could be commissioned better, they would look at economy of scale and the quality of service provision.

Officers were asked if the value for money exercise was being applied to other areas and the Forum were informed that it was with end user surveys also being used. The outreach service would also be reviewed by the task group to assess if it is making a difference.

The Forum were informed that if the short term cash savings were successful then this would allow time to review service delivery. The task group gave the message that that they wanted provision to be provided locally as much as possible.

The Chairman mentioned that the long term view was to support the HNB and asked if we knew the timeframe for the National Funding Formula. The Forum were informed that it may be delayed for a further 12 months but if it was not we would need to be informed by the end of the summer term.

Resolved unanimously: that the Forum noted the report and endorsed:

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

SCHOOLS BUDGET 2017-18

The Forum were informed that at its January 2017 meeting concern was raised regarding Early Help Advisors working in the MASH rather than providing support to schools. Service leads had been contacted and the service was now fully staffed and the support could be booked as usual. Officers were working with schools on a case by case basis and could still make referrals. There had been a short gap when they had been placed in the MASH but this had been corrected.

The Chairman mentioned that the Forum had supported the advisors so they could give advice and not undertake case work. It was agreed that a further update would be brought back to the Forum in October 2017.

WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW FORUM PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES.

The Forum considered the findings of the Forum Processes and Procedures Working Group which was introduced by Nick Stevens.

The Forum were informed that the working group had been established to examine ways that the Forum could be more open and inclusive of the sectors they represented and thus they looked at governance, process and procedures. The recommendations were contained within the report and the following areas were highlighted; distributing Forum paperwork earlier in conjunction with cluster meetings being a week before Forum meetings, that Forum reports are explicit on what decisions are being made and by which sectors and that decisions are clear with a better process being introduced if decisions are changed. It was proposed that if approved a target date of September 2017 was introduced.

The Chairman agreed that it was important that different sector views were heard and that for future meeting there would be a standing item on the High Needs Block. The Chairman suggested re-arranging Forum meetings and the possibility of having 2 fewer meetings as the December meeting was often cancelled; it was noted that it was easier to cancel a meeting them to add an additional one into the diary.

Cllr Airey, Lead Member for Children Services, mentioned that when looking at meeting dates and agenda management consideration should be given to adding appropriate Cabinet reports to the Forum agenda so schools were aware of any implications. Cllr Airey also mentioned that there was a vacancy for a primary co-opted member of the Children’s O&S Panel and asked if volunteers could be forwarded to the Kevin McDaniel.

Resolved unanimously that: officers considered the recommendations of the Task Group, that meeting dates be reviewed and that the Forum was the responsible body for distributing reports and decisions to the sectors they represent.

The meeting, which began at 1.00 pm, finished at 2.25 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank