

**Schools Forum Schools Funding Working Group and SEN Working Group
Joint Meeting**

Minutes – 30th September 2011

Present: Liz Williams, Martin Watson, Phil Cooch, John Hawkins, Neil Baker, Julia Cramp, John Kimberley, Judith Finney, Jane Nicholls, Sarah O'Donnell, Karina Kulawik, Arianne Crampton (for the item on the Carbon Reduction Commitment)

Apologies: Carol Grant, Tim Gilson (J Nicholls substituting), Tristan Williams, Phil Beaumont, Bruce Douglas

		Action
1	<p>Minutes from Previous Meeting The note of the meeting of 24th January had been discussed at Schools Forum</p> <p>The letter to schools regarding the funding of KIT days had not yet been sent to schools as EW still needed to check the information given in the letter against the guidance on HR Direct.</p>	EW
2	<p>SEN Support Services Activity Analysis KK outlined the work that had been done to analyse the activity of SEN Support Services across the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statutory 2. Critical 3. Essential/Capacity Building 4. Traded activity <p>Explaining that the analysis had been carried out by individual teams but then moderated across the service to ensure consistency of approach. The analysis had been discussed with PHF but had not yet been considered by WASSH.</p> <p>The purpose of the paper was to get a steer from Schools Forum on those services that should be delivered and funded centrally and which services, if any, could be delegated and traded.</p> <p>NB fed back that the paper had been well received at PHF but that it was difficult to get all schools to agree on approach as views would depend on how much use they currently made of services and what their experience had been.</p> <p>There was some discussion on the DSG funded services in particular and whether funding could be delegated or should be held centrally.</p> <p>The group agreed that cluster groups should be asked to consider the DSG funded services plus those that are in scope for the LACSEG adjustment and look at what should be provided centrally and what could be traded.</p> <p>The group requested that the statutory elements of each service be costed and these figures included in the paper.</p>	EW

3	<p>Carbon Reduction Commitment for Schools</p> <p>Arianne Crampton introduced the Carbon Reduction Scheme and updated the group on the current position. The report highlighted that the schools' share of emissions in Wiltshire (including academies) was around 60% of the total for the Council. Guidance from the government now indicates that the schools share of a Local Authorities CRC emissions should be charged to the schools budget. based on an estimated charge of £16 per tonne CO₂ this would represent an overall cost of £371,258</p> <p>Within the paper 3 options were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Top slice to the overall schools budget 2. Charge to individual schools based on emissions 3. Combination of options 1 and 2 <p>AC noted that the favoured option of the Cabinet Members responsible for the environment and for schools was to charge individual schools in order to incentivise schools to reduce consumption.</p> <p>The group recommended that Option 2 in the report, charging individual schools, be agreed by Schools Forum.</p> <p>It was agreed that the LA will provide data to schools on expected carbon usage.</p>	
3	<p>DSG Update</p> <p>EW circulated a summary of the final DSG settlement for 2011/12. The final DSG allocation was £140,000 lower than the initial estimate and it was agreed that this would be funded from the underspend carried forward from 2010/11, as proposed to Schools Forum at the June meeting.</p> <p>EW also updated the group on initial proposals for savings to be achieved from the 2012/13 budget. £1.9 million savings need to be identified in order to adjust for the one off funding in the 2011/12 budget. Initial proposals included a proposal to apply negative inflation to the overall delegated budget in the expectation of a -1.5% MFG for schools next year.</p>	
4	<p>Pupil Premium 2011/12</p> <p>PC updated the group on the final allocation of Pupil Premium Grant for 2011/12. The final allocation is £2,818,559 compared with a provisional estimate of £2,881,990. PC explained that the DfE had not provided a school by school breakdown of the final allocation but that if the finalised data on FSM and service pupils was applied then the final allocations total £2,810,640.</p> <p>The final LA data gives a total PPG allocation that is £71,350 less than the provisional allocation notified to schools in March 2011 with their budgets. The group agreed it is necessary to adjust the allocation to avoid a shortfall against the grant and noted that if this caused budget issues for any individual school then the</p>	PC

	Accounting & Budget Support Team would work with that school to look at recovery actions.	
5	<p>Schools Revenue Balances 2010/11</p> <p>PC circulated a paper outlining the position in relation to schools revenue balances for 2010/11. 41 schools had exceeded the permissible threshold, 38 of which were considered to have properly assigned balances in accordance with the scheme. It was agreed that the 3 remaining schools appear to have balances not correctly assigned and therefore should be subject to clawback. It was agreed that these schools be notified and invited to appeal.</p>	PC
6	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>It was agreed that the papers on the Schools Value Statement and the PFI Affordability Gap would go straight to Schools Forum</p>	
5	<p>Date & Time of Next Meeting</p> <p>Date of Next Meeting to be confirmed</p>	

DRAFT