

**ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM
FRIDAY, 30TH NOVEMBER, 2012**

Present:- David Silvester (in the Chair).

Learning Community Representatives: - Paul Blackwell (Dinnington), Roger Burman (Winterhill), Richard Marlowe (Thrybergh), Caroline Keating, David Pridding (Swinton), David Butler (Saint Bernard's), Stuart Wilson (Rawmarsh), Ann Abel (Oakwood), Lynne Pepper (Clifton), Kay Jessop (Wingfield), John Henderson (Brinsworth).

Other School Members: - Alan Richards (Secondary Governors' Rep), David Ashmore (Rotherham Teaching School Alliance), Karen Borthwick (Post-16; Raising Participation), Susan Brooke (NASUWT/ Teaching Trade Unions Rep), Nick Whittaker (Special Schools), Geoff Gilliard (Sheffield Diocese), Margaret Hague (Early Years Rep), Jane Fearnley (Junior School Rep), Sue Malinder (Primary Governors' Rep).

Together with: - Joyce Thacker (Strategic Director – CYPS).

Also in attendance: - Helen Barre and Lorraine Lichfield.

Apologies for absence had been received from: - Dorothy Smith (Joyce Thacker representing), Bev Clubley (Richard Marlowe representing), Councillor Paul Lakin, Councillor Jane Havenhand, Diane Mitchell, Michael Waring and Lee Simpson, Donna Humphries and Joanne Walker.

46. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH OCTOBER, 2012.

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 5th October, 2012, were considered.

In relation to minute 36(3) (Budget Holder Information Where Funding for the Service May be Delegated to Schools from April, 2013), it was noted that the strategic review of the Local Authority's provision for Special Educational Needs was due to be launched shortly. The Rotherham Schools' Forum Special Educational Needs Working Group would receive updates on its progress.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as a correct record.

47. VICE-CHAIR, ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM.

Resolved: - That Mr. R. Burman, Winterhill Learning Community Representative, be appointed to the role of Vice-Chair of the Rotherham Schools' Forum for the 2012/2013 financial year.

48. SCHOOL EXPANSION NEEDS AND PLANS.

Helen Barre, Strategic Lead for School Admissions, Organisation and Special Educational Needs Assessment Service, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services, was welcomed to the meeting. Helen gave a presentation for members of the Rotherham Schools' Forum in relation to the ongoing school expansion requirements across the Borough.

- Waiting lists for places in FS2 and parental preference;
 - Increased school admission appeals.

- Review undertaken into current admissions categories;
- Consultations underway on increasing pupil numbers and/or building space in schools across the Borough;
- Department for Education's Basic Needs funding.

Discussion ensued on the information provided to the Rotherham Schools' Forum.

The Chair thanked Helen for the informative presentation and the way in which it had provided clarity and context to the future decisions to be made by the Forum.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

49. STRUCTURE OF THE ROTHERHAM SCHOOLS' FORUM AND WORKING GROUPS.

David Silvester, Chairman of the Rotherham Schools' Forum, spoke about the recent work of the Forum in relation to Government Consultations on funding proposals and the consultation undertaken by the Forum with individual schools on the principles of the proposed Rotherham formula.

In recognition of the number of decisions that the Forum was due to take, and the need to thoroughly research and consider the options available before confirming decisions, the Chair proposed a structure of Working Groups underneath the Rotherham Schools' Forum to take investigation work forward. It was envisaged that the Working Groups would have specific areas of responsibility whereby they would work with officers and other stakeholders on decisions that were due. The Working Groups would research and consider all of the options available and report their recommendations to the Rotherham Schools' Forum to vote on.

It was proposed that a Working Group would be established to cover each of the following areas: -

- Special Educational Needs;
- Learning Support Service / Autism Communication Team;
- Finance;
- Safeguarding;
- Get Real Team;
- Early Years;
- Outdoor Education;
- Behaviour Support;
- School Effectiveness.

The make-up on the Working Groups would be balanced to ensure that each had representatives from the Primary and Secondary phases, and Local Authority Officers.

The Chairman was grateful of the support to Local Authority had committed to liaising with the individual Working Groups.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That the structure of Working Groups be adopted.

50. BASIS OF SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM DOCUMENT.

David Ashmore, Rotherham Teaching School Alliance representative, presented a paper that outlined school funding reform proposals.

The paper outlined the intentions of the funding reforms, and the ways in which the DSG would be allocated in three blocks (Schools', High Needs' and Early Years'). These blocks would not be ring-fenced, and local authorities had the responsibility to make strategic decisions on how the funding was distributed between the blocks.

- Intention to achieve maximum delegation, only in exceptional circumstances could funding be retained by the local authority for the provision of central education services;
 - Exception 1: - where maintained schools agreed that a service should be provided centrally (although other groups of schools could purchase the service from another provider if they wished to);
 - Exception 2: - historic commitments to use the Schools' budget to fund costs which would normally be met from the general local authority funding (i.e. redundancy);
 - Exception 3: - statutory functions of the local authority that could not be delegated, so must be centrally funded.
- Significant reduction in the number of factors that could be used in the formula;
- October pupil census was proposed, instead of January – leading to different budget setting timetables;
- Different Services were funded by different percentages of DSG funding.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

51. FEEDBACK OF WORKING GROUPS.

Representatives of the Working Groups provided an update to the Rotherham Schools' Forum on the initial work that had been undertaken.

Learning Support Service: -

- Currently operated as a traded service;
- Did the service represent the best long-term capacity building for schools?;
- The Working Group had requested further detailed information;
- Other learning support services sold their services to external customers – could this be achieved in Rotherham whilst meeting TRL and the Rotherham Teaching School Alliance's principles?.

Behaviour Support Service: -

- Working Group had been previously established and was known as 'Alternative Provision review';
- Different collaborative models existed between the primary and secondary phases;

- Future focus would be on early help, and would include ensuring young people remained in schools;
- Staff training;
- Other behaviour support services sold their services to external customers – could this be achieved in Rotherham whilst meeting TRL and the Rotherham Teaching School Alliance's principles?.

Get Real Team: -

- Initial meeting had scoped a number of questions for further investigation;
- Take-up of training offered by the Team was patchy;
- Impact measures – how many children did the Service work with face-to-face? / did some learning communities have more looked after children than others? / Rotherham children who were placed in other local authorities / other local authority children placed in Rotherham – what were the best ways to support them?
- Role of Social Care Services in supporting the Team?
- Was there a moral imperative to support this Service?

Safeguarding: -

- Statutory elements to the Service;
- Role of other partners in contributing to the running costs;
- Liaising with colleagues who had used these services – did it offer good value for money / an effective Service?;
- Is there a moral imperative to support this Service?;
- Preventative role of the Service?.

School Effectiveness Service: -

- High percentage of other funding streams;
- Flexible staff – the Service was not operating as a 'silo';
- Working Group would undertake visits to statistical neighbours to assess best practice;
- Full review likely to take until April, 2014, to be completed.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That further updates on the Working Groups be provided to future meetings of the Rotherham Schools' Forum.

52. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

Nothing was raised under this item.

53. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting take place on Friday 18th January, 2013, to start at 8.30 am at Rockingham Professional Development Centre.