

Public Document Pack




Meeting: Schools Forum
Date: Thursday 16th December 2021
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: Remote Meeting via Zoom

To members of the North Northamptonshire Schools Forum.

*Vote required

Agenda			
Item	Subject	Presenting Officer	Page no.
01	Apologies for non-attendance, Forum membership changes and declarations of interest	Raj Sohal	--
02	Minutes of meeting held on 4 November 2021 and points arising/officer feedback	Chair	3 - 8
03	DSG Finance Update (Verbal Update)	Yoke O'Brien	--
04	Feedback on Consultation Process	Chair	--
05	Feedback from Consultation – Votes	Ann Marie Dodds	9 – 18
06	Funding Formula*		9
07	Methodology to bring the budget into balance*		9-10
08	Funding of Outreach Services*		10
09	Split Site Funding Policy*		10
010	Pupil Growth Fund*		10
011	Permanent Exclusion Clawback Policy*		10
012	Central School Services Block*		10-11
013	De-delegation for Trade Union Facility Time*		11
014	De-delegation for School Effectiveness*		11
015	De-delegation for Redundancy Costs*		11
016	Schools Forum Plan	Raj Sohal	19 - 26
017	Urgent Business	All	--

Adele Wylie, Monitoring Officer
North Northamptonshire Council



Proper Officer
10th December 2021

This agenda has been published by Democratic Services.

Committee Administrator: Raj Sohal

☎ 07500 607949

✉ rajvir.sohal@northnorthants.gov.uk

Future Meeting Dates:

- 20th January 2022
- 17th March 2022

Information on voting

Every item which requires a decision to be made at a meeting of the Forum will be determined by a majority of the votes of members present and voting on the issue. In the case of an equality of votes the Chair will have a second or casting vote.

School and non school members are eligible to vote on all matters requiring authorisation or approval except:

- a) de-delegation is limited to the specific primary and secondary phase of maintained schools members;
- b) amendments to the school funding formula, for which the voting is restricted by the exclusion of non-schools members, except for PVI representatives; and
- c) retaining funding for statutory duties relating to maintained schools only is limited to maintained primary, secondary, special and PRU members.

It is the responsibility of the forum member to declare their 'disclosable pecuniary interest'. The forum member can make a short presentation at the start of the agenda item and then not participate in the discussions or vote on the item to which their interest is relevant.



Minutes of a meeting of the Schools Forum

Held as a Remote Meeting via Zoom at 2.00pm on Thursday 4th November, 2021

Present:-

Members

James Birkett (Chair)
Sandra Appleby
Rob Hardcastle
Pat Kelly
Angela Prodger

Paul Wheeler (Vice Chair)
Peter Cantley
Siobhan Hearne
Nikki Lamond
Ron Whittaker

Officers

Ann Marie Dodds
Cathi Hadley
Helen Hudson
Jo Hutchinson
Yoke O'Brien
Raj Sohal
Chris Wickens

Also in attendance –

Councillor Scott Edwards
Richard Kempa
Richard Poole
Rachelle Wilkins

1 Apologies for non-attendance, Forum membership changes and declarations of interest

No apologies for non-attendance were received.

2 Minutes of meeting held on 22 July 2021 and points arising/officer feedback

RESOLVED that:

The minutes of the meeting held on 22nd July 2021 were approved as a correct record.

3 2022-23 National Funding Formula for Schools and High Needs

The Forum considered a report by Yoke O'Brien (Strategic Finance Business Partner), which presented updates on the national funding formula.

RESOLVED that:

The report be noted.

4 2022-23 NNC Schools Funding Consultation

The Forum considered a report by Ann Marie Dodds (Assistant Director for Education), which provided an update regarding the provisional Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding settlement for 2022/23 and the schools funding consultation.

The Forum would vote on approval for the consultation document. The options would follow in the December meeting, once all the outcomes from the consultation had been received.

During discussion the principal points were noted:

- Members expressed concern that the High Needs Block deficit could increase, if imminent action was not taken by the authority – schools questioned whether a clear outline could be provided of such key actions to ensure that this would not occur.
- Members also expressed reluctance to continue transferring funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, to mitigate this deficit.

In response, the Assistant Director for Education clarified that:

- The authority was in a position where it faced a number of challenges in tackling the High Needs deficit and that this complex issue would require systemic reform rather than a handful of actions.
- Measures that had already been taken by the authority included the establishment of a Special Educational Needs (SEND) accountability board, which had brought key partners and stakeholders together to assess all SEND services across North Northamptonshire.
- Financial officers had also begun the process of closely examining all High Needs spending, to gain a clear view of the deficit.
- This work would take time and if the deficit was to increase, the authority would be required to submit a deficit recovery plan, regarding High Needs spending, to the Secretary of State.
- Nevertheless, the Assistant Director assured the Forum that all options would be exhausted to ensure that this would not occur.

The Chairman of the Forum suggested including information regarding systemic reform on the consultation document, to provide a recognition of the issue concerning High Needs and state the authority's intention to overcome it.

RESOLVED that:

The report be noted.

5 LA Commissioned Outreach Services

The Forum considered a report by the Assistant Director for Education, which set out the provision made by North Northamptonshire Council specialist services.

The Assistant Director explained that if the authority was to follow DfE guidance, it would ask for contributions from schools directly for the provision of specialist services. Historically these discussions hadn't taken place however, the authority would present three options, for consultation, regarding contribution towards the maintenance of these services. There was no option to continue with the existing arrangement due to financial pressures.

During discussion the principal points were noted:

- Members expressed concern that if the authority was to take contributions directly from schools that were already under severe financial strain, the consequences could adversely affect vulnerable students, dependent on specialist services.
- Regarding costs, Members questioned how much of the £2.4M High Needs deficit would be funded through the Council's general fund and how much would be funded by the High Needs Block of the DSG.

In response, the Assistant Director for Education clarified that:

- North Northamptonshire Council had not yet made a final decision regarding whether specialist services would continue to receive local authority funds. The options for future arrangements would be put to schools through the consultation and if none of these were supported, the authority would further explore alternative arrangements.
- The authority could not use High Needs funding to deliver specialist services.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

6 Split Site Funding Policy

The Forum considered a report by the Assistant Director for Education, which set out the proposed split site policy, funded by the Schools Block of the DSG. No proposed changes to this policy were recommended.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

7 Pupil Growth Fund

The Forum considered a report by Chris Wickens (Capital Programme Manager), which outlined the authority's intention to consult on the establishment of a Pupil Growth Fund.

The Capital Programme Manager explained that a Pupil Growth Fund was the mechanism by which any local authority would provide revenue funding to schools, to employ the necessary staff to allow for the provision of new school places. A Pupil Growth Fund would be key in ensuring that North Northamptonshire Council could fulfil its statutory obligation to provide a sufficiency of school places. The Fund would be established through the Schools Block of the DSG.

During discussion the principal points were noted:

- Members questioned what proportion of the Pupil Growth Fund would be attached to providing a pre-opening grant to support the work being done leading up to the opening of a new school.
- Members also questioned what proportion of the funding the local authority would reasonably expect to recoup from the DfE, at a later date.

In response the, Capital Programme Manager clarified that:

- It was made clear in the specification for the new school opening that the pre-opening grant would amount to £90k, which would cover the cost of a head teacher, a business manager, certain other key members of staff and wider infrastructure. This grant would cover the period of the 1st April to the 31st August, prior to the school opening. If costs were to increase, the authority could explore at increasing this amount provided, as the Schools Forum had not previously set a figure for pre-opening costs of new schools.
- The authority would not be able to recoup pre-opening costs from the DfE.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

8 Permanent Exclusion Clawback Policy

The Forum considered a report by the Assistant Director for Education, which outlined the new exclusion clawback policy, to replace the previous Council's policy position.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

9 Central School Services Block

The Forum considered a report by the Assistant Director for Education, which explained that the Central Schools Services Block of the DSG had been decreasing every year and that the authority would therefore, need to review the activity funded through this block.

The Assistant Director explained that the purpose of the report was to present the local authority's proposals for central expenditure on education functions for 2022/23.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

10 De-delegation for Trade Union Facility Time

The Forum considered a report by Helen Hudson (HR Policy and Projects Advisor), which outlined the recommendation for trade union facility time and a pooled arrangement within schools.

The HR Policy and Projects Advisor explained that the alternative to the pooled arrangement was for individual schools to arrange their own trade union facility time. Past arrangements were set out in the report.

Richard Poole, Richard Kempa and Rachelle Wilkins were also in attendance as trade union representatives, who maintained that keeping the existing arrangement was reasonable and supported the work being done in schools.

The Forum would vote on this at the next meeting, once responses had been received from the schools consultation.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

11 De-delegation for School Effectiveness

The Forum considered a report by Jo Hutchinson (Senior School Improvement Manager), which set out the future priorities of the School Effectiveness team, which was funded from the Central Schools Services Block of the DSG.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

12 De-delegation for Redundancy Costs

The Forum considered a report by the Assistant Director for Education, which explained that the authority maintained a central fund, which supported schools to make redundancies. The proposal set out that schools could access up to 25% of redundancy costs and use the fund where they could not afford these costs themselves. The redundancy costs for maintained schools de-delegation enabled maintained schools to collectively manage redundancy situations that were unaffordable for individual schools.

The Strategic Finance Business Partner explained that for 2021/22, the Schools Forum had previously agreed that de-delegated redundancy costs would be reduced from £5 to £1.50. This was due to unused carry-forwards from previous years. The cost contributions were therefore decreased. Going forward, this would need to be brought back to its original level, to meet the imminent amalgamation of redundancy costs.

During discussion the principal points were noted:

- Members questioned which type of establishment would anticipate future redundancies (e.g. primary schools/secondary schools).
- Members expressed concern that even at the rate of £1.50, there was still significant carry-forward and that an increase would not be required.

In response, the Strategic Finance Business Partner clarified that:

- De-delegated redundancy costs only applied to maintained primary schools. In the decisions that were taken, the secondary sector did not participate. The authority anticipated a draw on the redundancy fund due to likely upcoming redundancies in the primary sector.
- The consultation would be the start of the conversation regarding these rates and the authority would be open to feedback from schools, to determine whether such an increase would be necessary.

The Chairman of the Forum also explained that maintained secondary schools did not participate in the scheme due to the low number of maintained secondary schools across North Northamptonshire.

RESOLVED that:

The Forum approve the document for consultation.

13 Remote Meetings

The Forum considered whether it would continue with virtual meetings via Zoom, or return to in-person meetings.

Members agreed that the Forum should continue to monitor the circumstances regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and re-assess the situation at future meetings. In the meantime, the Forum would continue with virtual meetings.

RESOLVED that:

The report be noted.

14 Schools Forum Plan

The next meeting of the North Northamptonshire Schools Forum would be held on 16th December 2021.

At this meeting, the consultation responses would be brought back to Forum and final votes would be taken.

RESOLVED that:

The report be noted.

15 Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

Chair

Date

Agenda Item 5

North Northamptonshire Schools Forum

16 December 2021

School Forum Consultation Overview Report

AnnMarie Dodds annmarie.dodds@northnorthants.gov.uk

OVERVIEW

- 1) Following the conclusion of the school forum consultation running until the 3rd of December 2021 it is now necessary for the schools' forum to take a vote on a number of items.
- 2) The full details of the consultation responses can be found in Appendix A. The original papers presented to the schools' forum can be found [Agenda for Schools Forum on Thursday 4th November, 2021, 2.00 pm - North Northamptonshire Council \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#)

A. Issues to be voted upon

- i. The preferred funding formula option
- ii. The methodology to be used to bring into balance the overall cost
- iii. The options for the continuation of the local authority commissioned outreach services
- iv. The split site policy and the rate of funding of this split site policy
- v. The growth fund policy and the rate of funding this growth fund policy
- vi. The proposed changes to the permanent exclusion claw back policy
- vii. The continuation of the central services partly funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant
- viii. The de-delegation for trade union facility time
- ix. The de-delegation for school effectiveness
- x. The de-delegation for redundancy costs

THE FUNDING FORMULA

- 3) Most respondents to the consultation supported option A, a transfer of 0.5% from the schools' block to the high needs block.
- 4) Given the minimal support to the transfer of 1.3% there is no proposal from the LA to take a vote on the transfer of 1.3%.
- 5) Comments received related to a breakdown of the spend of high needs funding including allocations in different areas. A full review of SEN and associated spend on high needs block is underway and is scheduled for a forthcoming schools forum meeting. A financial breakdown will be presented in detail for discussion at that time.

Bringing the funding formula into balance

- 6) None of the respondents to the consultation supported a reduction of the floor. The majority of respondents opted for 'another' option (i.e. other than those presented.)
- 7) Each of the options previously presented ensured that all schools received the minimum funding guarantee. There were no proposed changes to the AWPU.
- 8) Some comments related to moving closer to the national funding formula this would allow equality of funding across all schools.

- 9) Based upon the outcome of the consultation schools' forum will be asked to vote upon two options.
- 10) The **first option** would be the running of the national funding formula with the minimum funding guarantee or
- 11) The **second option** would be a cap on per pupil increase with the minimum funding guarantee.

Local Authority commissioned outreach services

- 12) Most respondents wished to move to a traded model of outreach services from the local authority. Comments included North Northamptonshire Council fully funding these services, or schools being able to go to the open market to secure the services that they required.
- 13) The cost of fully funding the services would be £970,000 for the sensory impairment service and £778,000 for the specialist support service. Work on the viability of service delivery through a traded model will need to be progressed early in 2022. The risk is that services may not maintain their current offer and/or operation.
- 14) Based upon the consultation schools' forum members will be asked to vote upon the options as originally presented in the paper to schools forum on 4 November 2021.

Split site policy

- 15) Most respondents to the consultation supported a continuation of the split site policy transferring from Northamptonshire County Council. They also agreed to the level of proposed funding for the split site rates.
- 16) Therefore, the schools forum will be asked to vote on acceptance of the formula.
- 17) They will also be asked to vote on acceptance of the rate.

Growth fund policy

- 18) Most respondents to the consultation opted to support the growth fund policy they also agreed to support the level of the proposed policy.
- 19) Therefore, the schools forum will be asked to vote on acceptance of the policy they will also be asked to vote on the acceptance of the rate.

Permanent permanent exclusion claw back policy

- 20) All respondents to the consultation agreed with the changes to the new claw-back policy for North Northamptonshire Council.
- 21) As a result, the schools forum will be asked to vote on the acceptance of the claw back policy.

The continuation of central support services

- 22) There were no respondents in opposition to the continuation of the central services as funded by the dedicated school's grant.
- 23) In the commentary schools wanted to understand the historic commitments that were attached to the central services grant. Historical commitments are linked to pre 2013 pensions which constitute ongoing historical commitments and are permissible in line with the dedicated schools grant guidance as published by the Department for Education.

- 24) The combined services to be delivered through this funding stream for 2022-2023 are school effectiveness, moderation, the safeguarding Children Board, the education contribution to the multi agency safeguarding hub and the education entitlement service (see paper from previous Schools Forum).
- 25) There are a few services that are currently (2021 – 2022) funded from the central support block that will no longer be funded as a result of the 20% reduction of budget allocation to this block year on year. These services were not included in the consultation for the 2022-2023 provision.
- 26) As a result of the consultation the schools forum members will be asked to vote in support of or against the continuation of the services funded from the central support block.
- 27) It is useful to note that this block of funding is not available to be transferred to schools. The funds will remain with the LA.

The following options apply only to the maintained schools

Trade Union facility time

- 28) All respondents to the consultation were in favour of the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate proposed.
- 29) Therefore, schools forum will be asked to vote on the acceptance of the de-delegation at the proposed rate.

School effectiveness

- 30) There was a split vote relating to school effectiveness. There was agreement for the de-delegation but there is a question regarding the rate per pupil.
- 31) A review was requested of the effectiveness of the service should the service increase it's funding level. Benchmarking data from a number of LA's was carried out. The range of spend per pupil ranges from £2 through to £38. This places NNC at a mid-range value.
- 32) Schools forum will be asked to vote on the rate of the school effectiveness contribution as previously advised.

The de-delegation of redundancy costs

- 33) Respondents to the consultation were split on the continuation of this de-delegation at the proposed rate.
- 34) Having considered comments made regarding the rate schools forum will be asked to vote on the acceptance of redundancy cost at the proposed rate.

Next Steps

- 35) Once decisions have been confirmed during the Schools Forum on 16 December North Northamptonshire Finance Officers will model all of the decisions when the final finance award is confirmed for NNC. These allocations will then be shared at the January School Forum meeting.
- 36) In line with the views expressed through the consultation Officers in NNC will write to the Department of Education and confirm that NNC will not be seeking authority from the secretary of state to transfer 1.3% of funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block.

- 37) A school funding sub-group is to be established lead by Strategic finance business partner. This sub-group will review and scrutinise the models of funding that will be brought forward to the January Schools Forum. Volunteers as part of this group do not need to be members of the Schools Forum. The meeting will take place in early January. Volunteers should contact Yoke.o'Brien@northnorthants.gov.uk
- 38) It has already been requested by Schools Forum and scheduled for January to review SEN. The detailed breakdown of spend from High Needs Block will be shared as part of this presentation.
- 39) An options appraisal will be completed during the early part of 2022 that seeks to explore options for the continuation of the outreach services currently provided by NNC.
- 40) An overview of School Effectiveness will be scheduled to be brought back to School Forum later in 2022.

APPENDIX A

Overview

- 1) There were a total of 33 responses to the schools forum consultation. Two of the responses were sent either to the incorrect mailbox or were received after the 3rd of December deadline. These responses have been included within the consultation document as they were retrieved on Monday the 6th of December before 10am at the point from which the consultation responses were pulled together.

Consultation Questions

Question one

Option A transfer 0.5% from schools block to high needs block

??

Option B transfer 1.31% from schools block to high needs block

???

Comments

- 2) I am pleased to see the way high needs funding allocation is being reviewed.
- 3) Before anymore money is designated to the high needs block though I would like to see a comprehensive review of spending. In particular, costs of CEOs and SLT in special schools. The salaries advertised for some senior posts have been phenomenally high. I understand the way they are funded and that is related to secondary schools but when special schools with less than 300 children have CEOs heads of schools' deputies and assistant heads on secondary school salaries, I would question whether this money is being spent effectively to support the children.
- 4) I would also like to see a higher benefit for mainstream schools from the funding of special schools. Some do provide outreach which is valuable but some charge for this when they are already effectively being funded through schools' money. I think this should be an expectation and higher accountability of special schools providing specialist support where schools are in need.
- 5) Until we see better value for money on the high needs block, I do not think it's appropriate to put more money in when all schools are struggling financially. There is a desperate need in mainstream schools for high needs funding and I hope the review will make this much more accessible and transparent.
- 6) I believe option B is the best option for school funding moving forward as it enables more money to be put into higher needs funding retaining some of its services.
- 7) Prefer to enable current services to continue until full review of high needs funding is undertaken.
- 8) X 2 - Schools continue to be under pressure from rising costs and although 22-23 will see an increase in funding. One increase is not enough to relieve the commutative funding pressure faced on schools over the last five years.
- 9) Each year transfers have been approved. If it is structural in nature, why hasn't an effective SEND review been carried out before. There is also a significant increase in the proposed funding for NFF this year. If still insufficient, should ongoing representations be happening at

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

government level. Is the LA unique or are other LA’s experiencing the same? What or how is this being addressed by the local authority at a national level.

- 10) We would prefer no additional transfer to the high needs block. We would instead welcome a more imaginative response to the issues in high needs funding with the virement of funds from other pots including non educational held by North Northamptonshire Council in line with the precedent set in previous years by other local authorities in this position. Further lobbying of government for high needs allocation in line with the need is also needed. The schools block funding should not be used to spend about problems elsewhere without treating the cause of the issue.
- 11) As we have a significant number of high needs students and students in unit provision, we would however need to be reassured that the funding for these students is not affected by this. We would like to be involved in any consultations around high needs block and wait in anticipation for the outcomes of the government review on high needs funding. In particular we would welcome further discussions on the methodology used to calculate the funding allocated to students in unit provision against those in special schools. In particular RAS funding.

Question 2 if the funding formula needs to be brought into balance the overall cost which methodology would you prefer an NC to use

A reduction of the floor

A cap on per pupil increases

??

Other

??

Comments

- 12) No preference
- 13) Mechanism preferred is through a reduction in AWPU only.
- 14) Prefer a cap to a reduction on the MFG which could have severe implications on budget setting.
- 15) The fairest approach would be to reduce the AWPU for all schools so that the cost of any schools’ block transfer is funded fairly and equitably by all schools in north Northamptonshire.
- 16) North Northamptonshire Council should keep its funding allocation as close to the national funding formula as possible. Deviating from this leads to further inequalities in funding.

Question 3 with regards to the local authority commissioned outreach services paper which option do you support

Option 1

?

Option 2

??

Option 3

????????????????

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Other

????

Comments

- 17) See comments relating to transfer of high needs fund in answer one above.
- 18) As in question one I would prefer to enable current services to continue until full review of high needs funding is complete.
- 19) We would look to Commission these services as the work on offer has in the past been limited, time constrained, and there has been a long waiting list.
- 20) North Northamptonshire Council should continue to support this from the general fund as it has done in the past.

Question 4 splits site policy do you agree with rolling forward the split site policy for NCC

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

?

Other

??

Comment

- 21) The policy should be reviewed to bring it in line with the national funding formula.

Question 5 do you agree with using the 2021 2022 split site rates

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

?

Other

??

Comments

- 22) The rates should be tapered to bring in line with the national funding formula next year.

Question 6 growth fund policy do you agree with rolling forward the growth fund policy

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Other

??

Comments

23) The growth fund policy should be updated to allow North Northamptonshire Council to fund growth fund pupils at a rate closer to the per pupil national funding formula rate.

Question 7 growth funding rates do you agree with using the 2021- 2022 growth fund rates

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

Other

??

Comments

24) The growth fund rates should be in line with the per pupil national funding formula rate.

Question 8 permanent exclusion claw back policy do you agree with the change from previous Northamptonshire County Council claw back policy to bring North Northamptonshire Council onto the claw back as set out in the legislation

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

Other

Comments

25) Need to be in line with legislation.

26) X 2 - Figures shown on table one page 116 don't reflect the weighted adjustment which will impact on the max claw back revising figures to around £6680 - £7240 significantly lower than shown.

Question 9 are you in favour of the continuation of the central services that are partly funded by the dedicated schools' grant

Yes

????????

No

Other

????????????????????????????

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Comments

- 27) No response.
- 28) This element needs to be revisited as there are a number of elements within this that should be funded by the North Northamptonshire Council core funding not the schools' block. Also, no details provided on the historical commitments. This should be provided for transparency as we could be funding legacy costs not linked to schools or for which other schools are funding themselves from their reduced budgets.

Question 10 the delegation for trade union facility time - do you support the proposed continuation of this delegation and the rate proposed

Yes

????????

No

Other

Comments

Question 11 the delegation for school effectiveness do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate proposed

Yes

??

No

??

Other

Comments

- 29) I agree with the DEA delegation for services but not doubling the rate to 15 pound per pupil. That is too high.
- 30) School effectiveness in agreement but not the increase in rate proposed. If the service is working why is the additional resource required. Does a review of the service its aims and outcomes need to be taken out?

Question 12 de-delegation for redundancy costs do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation on the rate proposed

Yes

??

No

??

Other

Comments

- 31) Support continuation of this delegation but not at the proposed rate. Believe this is too high and is a massive leap from the current rate. A lower rate of below £5 per pupil would be acceptable.
- 32) Redundancy costs in agreement but not the increase what guarantees are there that school deficits have not been allowed to continue and have not been actively managed and appropriate actions taken centrally in the local authority.



North
Northamptonshire
Council

Item 16: Forum Forward Plan



Background

- ▶ This plan sets out an outline for Forum meetings over the next 12 months.
- ▶ Some items will be covered at the majority of meetings so these are listed separately.
- ▶ In some areas discussions and votes are required so these are included against the relevant meetings although there may be discussions at previous meetings.
- ▶ The listing will not be exhaustive but hopefully provides a useful planning tool for Forum.



Standing Forum Agenda items (if required)

- ▶ DSG Monitoring
- ▶ DfE/ESFA Funding announcements
- ▶ School Budgets
- ▶ High Needs
- ▶ Early Years
- ▶ National Funding formula



2021

Meeting date	Agenda items
22 July 2021	Scheme for Financing Schools Schools Outturn Grant and DSG Funding Update Schools Apprentice Levy Update Hospital Outreach in North Northamptonshire Remote Meetings
Note - * - Forum vote	



2021

Meeting date	Agenda items
04 November 2021	Schools block Combined Services Reports Schools block 2022-23 central expenditure * Primary and Secondary maintained schools de-delegation 2022-23* (SIG, Trade union and school redundancies) School budgets 2022-23 - weighted numbers for new schools/year groups School budgets 2022-23 - PFI utility subsidy Early Years Update Pupil Growth 2022-23 - projections and 2022-23 rates Schools funding formula 2022-23 - consultation feedback
Note - * - Forum vote	



2021

Meeting date	Agenda items
16 December 2021	DSG Finance Update School Budgets 2022-23 - outcome of consultation and final proposals * High Needs update including HN panel, SEN Units RAS, special schools - split site, and draft 21-22 HN budgets, HN place numbers 22-23 academic year
Note - * - Forum vote	



2021

Meeting date	Agenda items
20 January 2022	<p>NNC Draft Budget proposals 2022-23 EYSFF 2022-23 High Needs budgets 2022-23 Final School budgets 2022-23* (vote - if required) Early years central expenditure 2022-23* - outcome of consultation and consideration of proposals, including vote on central expenditure. DSG Finance Risk register</p>
17 March 2022	<p>DSG Monitoring High Needs Update and 2022-23 Planning Early Years 2022-23 Scheme for Financing Schools DSG Finance Risk register</p>
Note - * - Forum vote	

This page is intentionally left blank