

Minutes of the Schools Forum Meeting

Meeting title:	Schools Forum Meeting	
Date/time:	10 November 2021, 17.30-19.00	
Members:	<p><u>School Members</u> Kevin McDonnell (Special School Headteacher rep) Asarena Simon (Maintained Pri Headteacher rep) Caroline Tyson (Maintained Pri Headteacher rep) Sian Davies (Maintained Pri Headteacher rep) Lee Laudat-Scott (Maintained Pri Governor rep) Lisa Neidich (Maintained Pri Governor rep) Jane Heffernan (Maintained Sec Headteacher rep) Wendy Mason (Maintained Sec Governor rep) Lisa Clarke (Nursery School Headteacher rep) Richard Brown (PRU rep, Headteacher)</p>	<p><u>Academy Members</u> Claire Syms (Academy Principal rep) Phoebe Clapham (Governor rep)</p> <p><u>Alternative Provision</u> Anna Cain (Special Academy rep)</p> <p><u>Special School Members</u> Jo Clare (Special School rep)</p> <p><u>Non School Members</u> Cathy Murphy (EY/PVI rep) Adrian Cottrel (16-19 rep) David Davies (Staff rep)</p>
Additional attendees:	Annie Gammon (DoE, Hackney Education) Donna Thomas (Head of Early Years, Early Help & Wellbeing) Fran Cox (Head of High Needs and School Places) Jo Larkin (Head of Human Resources, Hackney Education) Mizanaur Rahman (Head of Finance, Children & Education) Ophelia Carter (Head of Schools Finance) Monica Imbert (Head of Education Operations, Hackney Education) Chenelle Blake (Clerk to the Forum)	
Apologies:	Caroline Tyson (Maintained Pri Headteacher rep),	
Absent:	Lee Laudat-Scott (Maintained Pri Governor rep), Jo Clare (Special School rep)	

	Item
1.	<p>Welcome and introductions</p> <p>Monica Imbert, newly appointed Head of Education Operations at Hackney Education, welcomed attendees to the first Schools Forum meeting of the academic year 2021/22.</p> <p>Monica reiterated the meeting etiquette for participating in a virtual meeting and clarified that only Schools Forum members and relevant local authority officers were allowed to participate in the meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that members were asked to submit questions in advance of the meeting; 7 questions were received and will be answered by the lead officer under the corresponding agenda item.</p> <p>1.1 Update on local authority roles: Monica Imbert highlighted the following changes to personnel at the Local Authority since the last meeting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monica Imbert, replaced Tracey Caldwell as Head of Education Operations - Mizanur Rahman, replaced Yusuf Erol as Head of Education Finance <p>Monica also clarified the following structural changes at the local authority since April 2021:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jacquie Burke, replaced Anne Canning as Group Director for Children’s and Education in August 2021. - Mark Carroll, replaced Ian Williams as Chief Executive in October 2021.
<p>2.</p>	<p>Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair</p> <p>The clerk chaired the meeting for this item.</p> <p>The clerk received one nomination for the role of Chair from Sian Davies, Executive Headteacher of Primary Advantage Federation, and Primary Headteacher representative on the Forum. Sian Davies left the meeting for the voting process. Forum members were advised that voting would be carried out using a show of hands to indicate ‘in agreement to appoint’ and the clerk clarified that only Forum members were able to vote for the Chair.</p> <p>Sian Davies was appointed the Chair of Schools Forum (2021-22) with 9 votes (based on members in attendance at the time of voting).</p> <p>The clerk received one nomination for the role of Vice Chair from Lisa Neidich, Primary Governor representative on the Forum. Lisa Neidich left the meeting for the voting process. Forum members were advised that voting would be carried out using a show of hands to indicate ‘in agreement to appoint’ and the clerk clarified that only Forum members were able to vote for the Vice Chair.</p> <p>Lisa Neidich was appointed as the Vice Chair of the Forum (2021-22) with 9 votes (based on members in attendance at the time of voting).</p> <p>Sian Davies assumed chairing duties from this point onwards.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>3.1. Minutes of the last meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed as an accurate record of the meeting held 23 June 2021, subject to the following corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was requested to insert page numbering. <p>The minutes were agreed.</p> <p>3.2. Action log - It was noted that actions recorded in the action log were complete and addressed on the agenda.</p> <p>3.3. Matters arising;</p> <p>Annie Gammon advised of the discussion at the last meeting and written representations received, regarding funding of redundancy payments and how Hackney funds schools in financial difficulty, particularly around falling rolls. Detailed responses will be provided by the Head of Schools Finance and Head of HR under item 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. However, there are a number of issues arising from the detailed responses, which would benefit from a working group meeting to look at these issues and make recommendations on the options available to Schools Forum.</p> <p>The Chair noted the proposal for the Schools Forum to convene a working group to review the issues relating to the funding of redundancy enhancements and recommend a number of options for Schools Forum to consider and formally agree. School Forum Members indicated their agreement for this working group to be formed.</p> <p>Annie emphasised the point that there is no additional money available, as the funds sit within the DSG budget; Schools Forum members were advised that there is no external source of funding .</p>

Summary report

A summary report was prepared by Ophelia Carter, Head of Schools Finance to provide Schools Forum Members with clarification, following requests at the last meeting.

Ophelia highlighted that the report prepared identifies the various funding pots, which Schools Forum Members can decide whether to top slice or de-delegate. These funds are as follows:

- **Falling Rolls Fund** - this is top sliced from the schools block with the agreement of Schools Forum Members. The DfE has provided recommendations on the criteria to be applied to this pot of money, one of which includes the school being judged as 'Good' or 'Outstanding' following the last Ofsted inspection. Officers are required to report any balance remaining from this fund at the end of the financial year, which may be carried forward to the following funding period; it is the decision of Schools Forum how to utilise this surplus.
- **Surplus Growth Fund** - this is top sliced from the schools block with the agreement of Schools Forum Members and is ring fenced to support schools that are required to provide extra places, to meet the basic need within the borough. Officers are required to report all payments made against this fund on an annual basis to Schools Forum; it is the decision of Schools Forum how to utilise this surplus.
- **School Contingency** - this is de-delegated from the schools block, to assist schools in financial difficulty, meet the deficit of a closing school, reorganisation involving new, amalgamating or closing schools or any other unforeseen expenditure. Officers are required to report any unspent funds on an annual basis to Schools Forum and may be carried forward to the following funding period; it is the decision of Schools Forum how to utilise this surplus. This fund is not available to support special, academy or free schools, as they do not contribute to the pooled funds.

It was noted that at the Schools Forum meeting held in June 2020, it was reported that in recent years the surplus growth fund had been used to offset the cost pressures in the high needs block and the schools contingency balance was carried forward to financial year 2021/22; therefore, the schools contingency fund did not offset the cost pressures in the high needs block.

The Chair brought School Members attention to 2 questions submitted in advance regarding this report; a response was provided for both questions:

Member question: Does the Falling Rolls Fund also apply to academies?

Ophelia Carter responded - *Yes, there is some eligibility for academies if we top slice; however, it will not apply to academies if we opt to de-delegate.*

Member question: The summary report notes the following condition: 'The school's roll includes at least 80% of the pupils that live within its area' - how is 'area' defined? Surely with Hackney schools so close to each other it would be impossible to satisfy this?

Ophelia Carter responded - *It is not a mandatory requirement to apply this criteria, however the DfE would like to see a number of the recommended criteria points considered. Hackney does not operate 'catchment areas' (an area around a school covering a number of roads or parts of roads); admissions are based on distance from school to home address. For the majority of schools in Hackney (bar those on the border), it is reasonable to say that the majority are admitted from the areas in the immediate vicinity of the school. This would be assessed on a case by case basis for schools being considered for falling rolls funding.*

Member question: In relation to paragraph 5.4 of the summary report, what are the options around the decisions for contingency underspend to be used to offset cost pressures in the

high needs block and do we need to make a conscious decision on a regular basis, rather than accepting it as a part of the annual report?

Ophelia Carter responded - *School Forum Members are given the opportunity to consider this and it will be a formal vote under agenda item 7.*

Position paper on financial liability for redundancies

A position paper was prepared by Jo Larkin, Head of HR following a question raised at the last meeting regarding redundancy payments being made from the central schools block; Jo highlighted that the paper prepared establishes the legal basis for when schools are required to make such payments.

Schools Forum Members were advised of section 37 of the Education Act 2002, which stipulates:

- costs incurred by the local education authority in respect of any premature retirement of a member of the staff of a maintained school shall be met from the school's budget share for one or more financial years except in so far as the authority agree with the governing body in writing (whether before or after the retirement occurs) that they shall not be so met.
- costs incurred by the local education authority in respect of the dismissal, or for the purpose of securing the resignation, of any member of the staff of a maintained school shall not be met from the school's budget share for any financial year except in so far as the authority have *good reason* for deducting those costs, or any part of those costs, from that share.

It was noted that it is ultimately the court's decision as to what constitutes a 'good reason'; however, the position paper provides a number of examples for charge of dismissal or resignation costs to delegated school budget and charge of premature retirement costs to local authority non-schools budget or central schools budget.

The following examples were brought to the attention of Schools Forum:

Charge of dismissal or resignation costs to delegated school budget where:

- staffing reductions arise from a deficit caused by factors within the school's control
- the school has excess surplus balances and no agreed plan to use these

Charge of premature retirement costs to local authority non-schools budget or central schools budget where:

- a school has a long-term reduction in pupil numbers and charging such costs to their budget would impact on standards
- charging such costs to the school's budget would prevent the school from complying with a requirement to recover a licensed deficit within the agreed timescale

Jo Larkin highlighted the following from the position paper:

- Paragraph 2.9: '*Costs of early retirements or redundancies may be charged to the central school services block of the schools budget*' - **this is a historical area, based on issues agreed prior to 1 April 2013.**
- Paragraph 2.10: '*The local authority can retain a central budget within the schools budget to fund the costs of new early retirements or redundancies by a deduction from maintained school budgets*' - **the local authority can only retain a central budget upon agreement from Schools Forum.**
- Paragraph 2.11: '*local authority discusses changes to the schemes for schools finance with the schools forum. Although each case should be considered on its merits, this should be within an agreed framework*'. - **this would require an application process and an agreed framework, so could be an area for the proposed working group to consider and put forward recommendations to Schools Forum.**
- Paragraph 2.12: '*A de-delegated contingency could be provided, if schools forum agree, to support individual schools where a governing body has incurred expenditure which it would be*

unreasonable to expect them to meet from the school's budget share': - this would need to be presented to Schools Forum for agreement.

- Paragraph 2.13: *'For staff employed under the community facilities power, the default position is that any costs must be met by the governing body, and can be funded from the school's delegated budget' - this links to the responsibility of the school Full Governing Board and is an unusual scenario; however, it forms an important part of the legal basis.*

It was noted that there are a variety of examples in other boroughs and what Hackney has in its position paper is comparable with neighbouring authorities; these authorities have been approached for benchmarking intelligence.

Member question: What are 'community facility powers'?

Jo Larkin responded - *this is in relation to schools that have the power to provide work, resources and services in the form of a charity, providing services to children and residents of the local area; this is very unusual, however is a decision made by the Full Governing Body, for staff to be taken on for that particular function. This is not based on classroom based staff and is for the purpose of outreach work.*

The Chair summarised that there are essentially 2 ways in which Schools Forum could support schools with redundancy costs; however, a decision must be made by Schools Forum. These two areas to consider are:

1. Delegated schools budget
2. De-delegation

The Chair brought School Forum Members attention to the 4 questions submitted in advance regarding this position paper; a response was response to the questions:

1. **Are school redundancy enhancements supported by Schools Forum as policy, as there appears to be no evidence of this being agreed? If so, can this be funded by the Local Authority, rather than the individual school budget?**

Jo Larkin responded - *The redundancy enhancement of 70% is a Hackney Council policy. It has been a policy since at least 2007; although it is accepted that there is no formal written agreement, Hackney Legal has confirmed that it is custom and practice, as it has been used as a part of the process, and therefore, forms part of an agreed policy.*

The local authority is not in a position to fund the enhancement for schools; Schools Forum would need to agree to de-delegate funding from the schools block for this purpose.

Jane Heffernan noted that as a consequence of the above, more redundancies have been created due the requirement to pay the enhancement; she expressed that this is not legitimate or fair, as staff members have lost their jobs based on a policy which Hackney is unable to evidence. As a result, it is appropriate for Hackney to be responsible for enhancement costs or remove the requirement on schools.

The Chair noted Schools Forum agreement with no objections for the following 3 proposals to be explored further by the working group:

1. Could Hackney Council take responsibility for the funding of the 70% school redundancy enhancement costs?
2. Could Hackney Council remove the requirement for schools to make 70% redundancy enhancements?
3. Could Hackney Council agree for the extra uplift for redundancy enhancements to be funded through the contingency fund or de-delegated funds?

The Chair requested that formal legal advice be provided at the next meeting, to address the formal decision making process, in relation to the 3 redundancy enhancement proposals listed above. This written guidance from legal will provide Schools Forum with the required assurance for funding of the enhancements going forward.

Action 1: Jo Larkin to obtain advice from Hackney Legal on the formal decision making process to implement any of the redundancy enhancement proposals. This to be available to the working group.

Member question: Are there any proposals coming from the local authority?

Mizanur Rahman responded - *With the exception of the local authority's proposal to convene a working group to address the comments in the position paper about the de-delegation from the central schools services block or the schools budget, there are currently no other proposals and no other source of funding available.*

Jo Larkin provided a further response- *The process for voluntary aided schools is slightly different; these schools follow the Hackney policy in relation to the enhancement, however due to the Governing Bodies being the employer, consultations can commence with staff/unions now, should those particular schools wish to opt out of the required enhancement.*

Annie Gammon echoed the point that the local authority does not have any other sources of funding, however options can be considered to address this. There are some schools which are more financially comfortable than others and some that have experienced acute change; therefore, given the circumstances, this is an appropriate time to consider a number of options to be presented to Schools Forum for agreement. It is not possible for these options to make a significant impact, however, they could cushion the change in circumstances.

Jane Heffernan noted the importance for the local authority to come to a view, as there are a number of schools falling into a deficit and required to make changes to school structures due to falling rolls.

It was suggested that the working group consider the scope within the powers of Schools Forum and any relevant funds available, to address reductions in funding for schools experiencing falling rolls.

Action 2: Schools Forum Working Group to be convened and present recommendations on the approach to redundancy enhancement costs and any funding available to support schools experiencing falling rolls; this will be presented at the next meeting scheduled on 9 February 2022.

The Chair noted that the issue with falling rolls is likely to be largely attributable to the schools with deficits; therefore, this raises a concern around the protection of provision for pupils still attending these schools, as a lack of funds can affect their educational experience and support available.

2. Do School Forum Members agree to continue to support the 70% enhancement of redundancy payments?

Jo Larkin responded - *The enhanced 70% payment is part of Hackney Council's redundancy policy. Community schools cannot opt out of this payment/policy as staff are ultimately employees of the Council. However, as voluntary aided schools are the employer, they can decide to opt out through local consultation with their staff and trade unions. In light of discussions, this matter will be considered by the working group.*

3. Are redundancy payments to Hackney Education (HE) staff paid out of the HE budget or are they funded through central funding?

Mizanur Rahman responded - *Redundancy payments for Hackney Education staff are paid*

from the service budgets, unless they are a result of corporate initiative, i.e. contributing to the council savings targets; in this case they would be funded centrally. The most recent redundancy exercise was for voluntary redundancies which resulted in council savings. School budgets were not top sliced or de-delegated to fund this exercise.

4. How many posts have been deleted over the last 3 years from HE and what has been the redundancy cost?

Jo Larkin responded - *A request has been submitted for this detail, however it will take at least one week for this information to be provided.*

Jane Heffernan requested written responses to questions 3 and 4. It was further requested that Mizanur Rahman, Head of Education Finance include a written response providing more detail on the various sources of funding.

Action 3: Mizanur Rahman to provide a written response detailing the various sources of funding available to accommodate HE redundancy payments.

Action 4: Jo Larkin to provide a written response to confirm whether HE redundancy payments are funded from a HE budget or central funding and how many HE posts have been deleted in the past 3 years and the redundancy costs associated.

4. Membership and Terms of Reference (ToR) Update 2021/22 including roles and remit of the Forum members

The Clerk to Schools Forum provided the annual report highlighting the changes to the membership of the Forum and recommended that Forum members agree to the ToR which had been slightly amended to reflect changes to local authority personnel.

It was noted that there are 2 vacancies on the Forum for a Primary Governor representative and an Academy /Free School Governor representative. The clerk confirmed that efforts will be made to recruit to these vacancies.

School Forum members were also presented with meeting attendance information from the last academic year 2020/21.

School Forum Members noted the changes to membership and unanimously voted (by a show of hands) to agree to the ToR.

5. Consultation on High Needs funding arrangements

The report prepared by Fran Cox, Head of High Needs and School Places addresses the high needs funding arrangements for pupils with SEND 2022/23. It was noted that this paper was prepared for School Forum to note, as it does not propose changes to the current arrangements for this financial year.

Fran highlighted the following areas which are overseen through High Needs funding:

- Post 16 students
- Local Special Schools
- SEND pupils in local maintained schools
- Pupils in independent schools (*one of the larger areas of overspend*)

School Forum Members were advised of the draft Education Estates Strategy which proposes a significant number of local places to be delivered for SEND pupils; this will be presented to Hackney

Cabinet for agreement in January 2022; this will result in a reduction in the number of children placed out of the borough.

Fran noted that Hackney schools, both special and maintained, have been asked to submit expressions of interest to be involved in the delivery of more Alternative Resource Provisions (ARP's); this is a key area of focus for the independent schools funding allocation.

Fran highlighted a reference in the report to Pupil Referral Unit's (PRUs) and brought Schools Forum attention to a clarification under paragraph 5.2; it was noted that top-up funding is provided on a pro rata basis; therefore, the full top up entitlement is not received for the entire academic year if the pupils are not in attendance for the year.

Fran acknowledged that the High Needs Budget is a significant area of overspend and emphasised the need to review the high needs budget and how it is utilised.

The Chair brought Schools Forum attention to 1 question submitted in advance regarding this report:

Member question: 'Hackney Education continues to seek ways to reduce its reliance on out of borough/independent provision.' This was discussed last year but has any progress been made? It was noted that this question was answered through Fran Cox's update.

Cathy Murphy requested an invitation to be involved in any high needs conversations outside the Schools Forum meeting; Small settings and providers are concerned that although the rolls have fallen, the percentage of children with SEND is increasing. Additionally, during the assessment process, particularly in Early Years, there is little or no support leading to a delay in the receipt of funding.

Dave Davies suggested a presentation on the Education Estates Strategy; it was agreed that this be presented at the April meeting, which is usually set aside for training or workshops.

Action 5: Fran Cox to present an overview of the Education Estates Strategy at the meeting scheduled in April 2022.

Schools Forum members noted the arrangements for SEND pupils and PRU set out in the report which were largely unchanged from the current academic year. There were no further comments from the Forum.

6. Approval of Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) 2022/23

The report prepared by Ophelia Carter, Head of Schools Finance seeks approval of Schools Forum for use of the Central Schools Services Block estimated at £1.89m.

It was noted that table 1 within the report illustrates the increase of on-going responsibilities (capped at 5.5%), which includes school admissions, servicing of Schools Forum, statutory/regulatory duties (including DoE and officers), asset management and education welfare. It was further noted that there are a number of historical commitments which are reducing by 20% year on year, in line with DfE guidance.

Member question: There appears to be a forced reduction of 20%; does the allocation for historic payments bear any relation to money spent?

Ophelia Carter responded - *There is a reduction on the activities; the DfE took a baseline in 2013/2014 and at this time Hackney was being funded up to a given point; however, in recent years we have been required to make a 20% reduction year on year.*

Member question: Paragraph 4.3 relates to 'asset management and landlord duties'; it appears that there is a disproportionate use of consultants in this role which carries a significant cost. When will there be a substantive permanent appointment?

Annie Gammon responded - a report on the asset management (how it is funded and cost) to be addressed at the next meeting.

Member question: There was a sum of money which Hackney Education was entitled to receive from the DfE, which was not received due to a consultant's failure to make the correct returns to the DfE. Is this correct? Was it something that was a short term blip which has been remedied? Or Has Hackney lost money as a result of the failure to make the correct returns?

Annie Gammon responded - there are no details to hand to provide a response, however this can be addressed at the next meeting.

Action 6: Mizinur Rahman with Ophelia Carter to provide a short report to Schools Forum, addressing member questions relating to funding/costs associated with consultant asset management role and a query about a DfE return.

Schools Forum members resolved (with 10 votes) to agree and approve the LA's proposals outlined in paragraph 4, for the use of the CSSB.

7. Annual Report School Funding Formula and Schools Block funding arrangement 2022/23

Ophelia Carter highlighted the purpose of the report, to seek the Forum's approval on the LA's proposals, relating to the DSG Schools Block and De-delegation for 2022-23. This report also seeks to consult Schools Forum on the LA's proposals relating to the schools' 2022-23 funding formula.

Recommendations are:

- Approve the Local Authority proposal to transfer 0.5% of funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to support provision for children with SEND given the continuing exceptional cost pressures in this area
- Note the estimated School Growth commitment to be funded from the Schools Block.
- Approve the Local Authority proposals for de-delegation from maintained primary & secondary schools as appropriate to maintain specific services provided to them
- Give a view on proposals for the local funding formula

Ophelia noted the importance for Members to understand that the national funding formula growth referred to in table 1 (para 3.1), is estimated based on the expected numbers based on the October 2020-21 census. The total allocation is £548,000; however this should not be confused with any growth within the local authority, as there are falling rolls across the borough.

It was further noted that there is no explicit growth set aside for 2022-23, evidenced in table 6 (para 5.3).

Schools Block and Funding Formula Consultation

The outcome of the consultation sent to all school leaders in October 2021 has been recorded in Appendix B. A total of 8 responses were received from schools, 3 of which rejected the 0.5% top slice and the remaining 5 schools agreed with the top slice.

7 schools voted for model A for the local funding formula and 1 (secondary) school had no opinion.

All 8 schools agreed to retain the minimum funding guarantee at 1.6%; 6 schools agreed to maintain the de-delegation and the remaining 2 (secondary schools) had no opinion.

Model A is the preferred option, which moves the basic entitlement 25% closer to the NFF values and FSMe6 is increased to the full NFF values, with a minimum funding guarantee of 1.6%.

Model B would require more MFG, although the DfE has stated that as we approach the implementation of the hard NFF it will protect the MFG. Ophelia expressed the risk of continuing with a formula that has high MFG, therefore there are efforts to keep this at a minimum.

It was noted that Hackney has been moving closer to the NFF on a gradual basis, to minimise the turbulence for schools individually and collectively across the borough; it is unknown when the DfE will implement the hard formula, however it is hoped that Hackney will be close to the values at the point of implementation.

Member question: There was a previous protected discussion about contributions to the trade unions facilities, which was followed up with a concerted attempt to get the academies and free schools to contribute; this would reduce contributions overall. Has there been any progress since this discussion?

Jo Larkin responded - *there has been progress, as 3 academies have agreed to contribute, with a potential 4th school willing to contribute.*

It was requested that once all schools confirm contribution, the academies and free schools be named at Schools Forum, as they should be congratulated for joining the Hackney Family of Schools.

Action 7: Clerk to ensure the Hackney Academies and Free Schools confirmed to contribute to the Trade Unions facilities are named at the summer term meeting; to be congratulated for joining the Hackney Family of Schools.

It was noted that the academies and free schools who have not taken up the opportunity to contribute have been made aware of consequences to staff, which results in less representation rights than members of staff in community schools.

The Schools Forum resolved to make the following decision;

No.	Decision Item	Votes	Outcome
1.	To transfer 0.5% from the schools block to the high needs block	For - 6 Against - 1 Abstention - 1	Agreed
De-delegation decision (primary school representatives voted for primary de-delegation and secondary school representatives voted for secondary de-delegation)			
2.	School contingencies @ £12.50 per pupil	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 2 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri and Sec
3.	To support for UPEG & bilingual learners	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 2 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri and Sec
4.	FSM eligibility service @ £3.38 per pupil (Primary only)	For - Pri - 3 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri
5.	Licenses / subscriptions @ £3.02 per pupil;	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 1 Against - 1	Agreed for Pri and Sec

		Abstention - 0	
6.	For Trade Union Supply Cover @ £8.80 per pupil	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 2 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri and Sec
7.	For School Improvement (SRAS) @ £26.62 per pupil	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 2 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri and Sec
8.	For underspend or overspend from de-delegated budgets to be carried forward for use in the following year's de-delegated budgets.	For - Pri - 3, Sec - 2 Against - 0 Abstention - 0	Agreed for Pri and Sec
8.	<p>Agreement of Final DSG Budget for 2021/22 (current year update)</p> <p>Ophelia Carter highlighted the purpose of the report for Schools Forum to note the total DSG for 2020/21 was £225 million; the academies share was £79.5 million.</p> <p>It was noted that the DGS was overspent by £4.1 million; this was initially a larger overspend, however the local authority found reserves to offset this total.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the final DSG budget update with no questions.</p>		
9.	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>There was no other business raised.</p>		
10.	<p>Dates of forthcoming meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 9 February 2022 ● 20 April 2022 (<i>held for training</i>) ● 22 June 2022 		
11.	<p>Summary of actions agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Action 1: Jo Larkin to obtain advice from Hackney Legal on the formal decision making process to implement any of the redundancy enhancement proposals. ● Action 2: Schools Forum Working Group to be convened and present recommendations on the approach to redundancy enhancement costs and any funding available to support schools experiencing falling rolls; this will be presented at the next meeting scheduled on 9 February 2022. ● Action 3: Mizanur Rahman to provide a written response detailing the various sources of funding available to accommodate HE redundancy payments. ● Action 4: Jo Larkin to provide a written response to confirm whether HE redundancy payments are funded from a HE budget or central funding and how many HE posts have been deleted in the past 3 years and the redundancy costs associated. 		

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Action 5: Fran Cox to present an overview of the Education Estates Strategy at the meeting scheduled in April 2022.● Action 6: Mizanur Rahman, with Ophelia Carter, to provide a short report to Schools Forum, addressing member questions relating to funding/costs associated with consultant asset management role and query re DfE return.● Action 7: Clerk to ensure the Hackney Academies and Free Schools confirmed to contribute to the Trade Unions facilities are named at the summer term meeting; to be congratulated for joining the Hackney Family of Schools. |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|