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| **Meeting title** | **SCHOOLS FORUM** |  |
| **Date** | Tuesday 17th November 2015 – Community Space, Keynsham. |
| **Forum Members Present** | Annie Smart, Kevin Burnett, Julie Dyer, Claire Hudson, Ed Harker (Chair), Roz Lambert, Jim Crouch, Alun Williams, Colin Cattanach, Susan Robbins, Anne Hewett, |
| **Forum Members Not Present** | Mark Mallett (Chair), Dean Anderson. |
| **Officers Present** |  Ashley Ayre, Richard Morgan, Margaret Simmons-Bird, Sara Willis, Jeannette Viera, Richard Vanstone, Cllr. Michael Evans, Mike Bowden, Alice McColl, Chris Wilford. Mark Christopher (Observer, EFA), Ruth Ferguson (Item 5), Keiran McCarthy (Item 5) Sara Willis |
| **Officers Not Present** | Caroline Howarth, Richard Baldwin, Sally Churchyard, Cllr. Emma Dixon, |
| **Distribution** | As above; Theresa Gale; Colleen Collett; Cllr Charles Gerrish; Cllr. Lisa Brett; Cllr. Tim Warren, Cllr. Emma Dixon, Tim Richens; Jeff Wring; Wendy Jefferies, All Headteachers |
| **Next meeting** | **Tuesday 8th December 2015, 3-5pm , west 1.1 Civic Centre, Keynsham** |

**ACTION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Apologies Received** |  |
|  | Mark Mallett, Dean Anderson. |  |
| **2.** | **Minutes of Last Meeting – 22nd September 2015** |  |
|  | Agreed. Question was asked regarding the price of school meals for 2016/17. RM informed the group that a proposal has been made by catering service and a meeting was being held next Monday (23rd November 2015) for all schools interested in purchasing services from the service. .Item 4. Schools Forum Membership - New academy representatives have been agreed, Alun Williams (Norton Hill), Colin Cattanach (Aspire) and Dean Anderson (Broadlands Academy).Item 6. Shared Behaviour strategy - JV was asked what the response to the Behaviour Strategy Survey had been. JV informed the group that 43% of schools had responded. A draft Strategy for pre-school setting was being written but the process was not yet complete.Item 9. Sensory Impaired Service – CW said that some schools had expressed a wish to take part in the review and a final specification was ready.Item 14. SIMs Contract - AS requested clarification about how the costs of the procurement process are met. RM advised that the procurement costs would be included in the overall charges made to schools who use the system. |  |
| **3.** | **Matters Arising** |  |
|  | Included on Agenda.  |  |
| **4.** | **Schools Forum Membership** |  |
|  | 3 vacancies for Academy representatives have been filled following discussion at the BASCL. Alun Williams (Norton Hill), Colin Cattanach (Aspire) and Dean Anderson (Broadlands Academy) have been appointed.  |  |
|  **5.** | **Nurture Outreach Service** |  |
|  | SW introduced Ruth Ferguson and Keiron McCarthy from Bath Spa University who then presented the findings of the Independent Impact evaluation that had been carried out. The overall impact of the NOS was found to be very positive both in terms of progress, well being and achievement for children and increased confidence and understanding for staff and increased parental interaction. Outcomes compared very well with National levels.SF has currently agreed funding for this service until March 2016. The services has funding agreed via the CYP CAMHS Transformation Plan and propose to use these funds for the staff development side of the NOS. SF is requested to match fund this by allocating £50,000 annually to fund the individual work that the service undertakes with each child identified in each school. It was noted to SF that this is pre-Behaviour and Attendance Panels and therefore not covered by their budgets.EH commented that the Thrive training was very good within his own school and that this was a strong report with clear outcomes. AS agreed that from her experience in school it was having a very positive impact.Decision re funding will be discussed at January budget meeting. |  |
| **6.** | **Behaviour Strategy for BANES** |  |
|  | JV presented headlines of the paper. The purpose of the paper is to outline the emerging findings of the work to develop a Behaviour Strategy. 43% of schools had responded to the Behaviour Strategy Survey. The paper highlights the increasing number of exclusions year on year with 5 already this year. Appendix 1 summarises BESD data and alternative provision arrangements of BANES statistical and geographical neighbours. This showed a clear underinvestment in BANEs compared to neighbours. The key recommendations of the paper would provide a framework for BANES Schools. Framework agreements were common across LAs. MB summarised the 3 options suggested in the paper adding that *C) Passive Development* was a not a very realistic option.SF discussed the paper and options suggested.* Query re cost per place discrepancy. This was probably caused by diseconomies of scale but further work need to be carried out.
* Localities a good idea but needed to understand what this would look like. JV suggested that a number of representatives from the B&A Panels and practitioners could collaborate to agree a process which would then go out to tender but we had not reached that stage yet.

MB was asking for a steer from SF whether to continue down this path. A wider behaviour Strategy was coming later but SF needed to find ways of managing the conversations around this due to conflicts of interest for a number of members. SF agreed that SF representatives with no direct interest should meet and prepare 2-3 potential models for consideration. Forum members who wish to be involved should contact MB.**ACTION; SF members with no direct interest to contact MB to form a group to take this forward.** | ***ALL*** |
| **7.** | **CHiN and CP Case Support** |  |
|  | AA introduced paper. SF agreed in July to seek further information and research on which settings and schools had above average numbers of children with CP/CIN and to make a proposal to agree a funding mechanism for these children. CHiN and CPP children do place and extra workload on schools (particularly senior management teams) and the problem was particularly acute in early years settings and ‘RI’ schools. The proposal was to ask SF to agree a commitment to 1 off funding rolling forward for 3 years to help build capacity in schools (£500 per CPP and £250 per CHiN). This should release some time for senior leaders in schools.AA thanked SW and her colleagues for providing the information.SF discussed the proposal noting that all primary schools would be included. It was noted that some very small senior schools and studio schools should perhaps also be included. This had not been considered but AA agreed that the data could be looked at and felt that the inclusion of these schools would only have a marginal impact on costs. RM added that secondary funding levels were higher than primary and therefore SF might want to consider scaling funding accordingly.**ACTION: Consider inclusion of smaller senior/studio schools and scaling of funding.** SF agreed that this proposal could have a large impact and make a real difference in schools and early years settings.Decision re funding to be considered at Jan budget meeting. | ***AA/RM******RM*** |
| **8.** | **SEND Transition** |  |
|  | CW briefed SF on the impact of the SEND reforms and the increasing burdens on the two main special schools in BANES particularly during the period when schools have to convert statements to EHCP’s. CW expressed concerns about the ability of schools delivery plans and JD added that this was a huge burden that schools were struggling with.The paper proposed SF fund two SEND Practitioners in our special schools for 2 yearsDecision re funding to be carried forward to January budget meeting. | ***RM*** |
| **9.** | **Area SENCO Practitioners** |  |
|  | CW introduced paper requesting SF to consider funding a 24 month pilot to support early years settings in the early identification of children with SEND, implementing the requirements of the SEND code of practice and ensuring smooth transitions to school for children with SEND. The service is currently under a great deal of pressure due to the big increase in the number of children being identified in early years with SEND. The expected outcome of this increased funding is that it would expand the number of settings/individuals that are supported. Starting the planning process in the early years setting would mean that children should arrive at school with their needs already identified therefore reducing the pressures on schools. AH commented that the quality of support in early years settings seems to have been sporadic so it would be good to make this more consistent.SW offered to provide more evidence of impact/outcomes to the next SF meeting.Decision re funding to be carried forward to January budget meeting. | ***SW/CW******RM*** |
| **10.** | **Hospital Education and Reintegration** |  |
|  | CW presented this update paper as agreed following discussion of the previous paper on 9th December 2014.The HERS service is receiving increasing numbers of referrals from all sectors and continues to operate at full capacity and beyond. The service is projected to have an overspend of £65k by the end of the 2015/16 financial year. SF are asked to agree an increase the budget for 2016/17 by this amount. During this period an advisory board will be formed to review the current service and make recommendation to the SF on a future delivery model in December 2016. It was suggested that the advisory board should have at least one secondary head teacher on it.AW agreed that more support from HERS would be appreciated. SF was also asked to note that 1% staff pay rises were funded by schools and not the government.Decision re funding to be carried forward to January budget meeting. | ***RM*** |
| **11.** | **Collaborative Research** |  |
|  | MSB presented the paper focusing on greater collaboration between all schools to optimise outcomes for all children and young people in BANES. The paper has been produced following consultation meetings held with head teachers and chairs of governors of maintained schools within BANES. It proposes that SF allocates £25k (which the LA will seek to match) in order to ask an independent consultant to undertake a research project to produce a range of possible models of collaboration and partnerships for consideration. SF discussed and the following point were raised* Timescales – would expect to be completed by mid March possibly followed by conference. It is key to provide the information before it becomes ‘urgent’.
* Feedback is that schools want this information. Need to ensure that schools have all the information they need to make a decision on how to go forward.
* Discussion at Chairs meeting – context by cluster went down well.
* Are Diocese being included in discussions – Yes and they are broadly in favour. CH added that Church schools may have some sensibilities around this process and these would need to be included. Diocese would be happy to share any information they have.
* What sort of organisation will be asked to carry out the work? AA – spec would be properly commissioned with schools being involved and all stages would be co-worked.
* Need to be clear about the direction of travel by the government and its possible impacts. It is possible this piece of work may be duplicating work being done by the regional schools commissioner and it was suggested that he should be involved to ensure the work is worthwhile.
* Will be difficult to find a person who meets all the needs of the spec. Need to ensure that all options are ones that can be chosen.
* Whatever comes out of this piece of work must be futureproof.
* There is already good collaboration between schools in BANES.

Should the vote be taken in January budget meeting? RM - This is current year money so decision can be taken now.**VOTE – LA to commission a suitable qualified person to undertake this piece of work.****For 6.****Against 3.****Abstentions 1.** |  |
| **12.** | **Budget Planning** |  |
|  | RM summarised position. Further consideration at January budget meeting. |  |
| **13.** | **A.O.B** |  |
|  | None |  |

**Maintained Schools Only**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14.** | **De-delegation of Services** |  |
|  | EH had sent an e-mail to all maintained schools regarding decision and all were in favour of de-delegation as proposed in the paper.Secondary schools were not fully represented at today’s meeting so a vote was taken for primary schools only.**VOTE – Primary schools only – Unanimously agreed** |  |
| **16.** | **Date of next Meeting** |  |
|  | 8th December 2015, West 1.1, Keynsham Civic Centre. |  |