

Meeting title	SCHOOLS FORUM
Date	Tuesday 6 th December 2022 – via Teams
Forum Members Present	Jo Marsh (Chair), Jo Stoaling, Kevin Burnett, Louise Malik, Steven Mackay, Louise Malik, Mary Cox
Forum Members Not Present	Alan Williams, Clare Crowther, Roz Lambert,
Observers	Patrick Grant (DFE)
Officers Present	Christopher Wilford, Richard Morgan, Mary Kearney-Knowles, Mandy Bishop, Becky Biddlecombe (notes), Phillip Frankland Olwyn Donnelly, Rosie Cullis
Officers Not Present	Rosemary Collard, Cllr Dine Romero
Distribution	As above plus Ed Gregory Education Director, Diocese of Bath & Wells Cllr. Richard Samuel: Cabinet Member Resources Cllr. Kevin Guy: Leader of the Council Cllr. Vic Pritchard: Chair of PDS Panel Mandy Bishop, Wendy Jefferies, Andy Rothery, Jeff Wring, Paul Hiscott, Olwyn Donnelly
Next meeting	31st January 2023

1.	Apologies Received	ACTION
	JM: Welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.	
2.	Declarations of Interest	
	Members were reminded to complete the declaration of interest forms once per year and to declare anything pertaining to the papers being presented. Declarations were made as follows. Kevin Burnett – Governor of Farrington Gurney school Jo Marsh – Governor with Bath and Wells trust at St Stevens school.	
3.	Minutes of the last meeting (27th September 2022)	
	Changes to minutes – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillip Frankland present in previous minutes • Kevin Burnett – Page 2 to be clarified – CW confirming • Kevin Burnett - Page 3 – Jo marsh clarification • Kevin Burnett - Page 6 – check wording bottom of page 6, SEND B&NES commitment. • KB - Matter arising on page 2 – kept open 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KB – Matter arising on page 8 – Can anything be done about 0.5% MFG schools e.g. Does DfE know of problem? <p>Forum minutes accepted.</p>	
4.	Budget Update 2023-24	
	<p>RM – The autumn statement is basically telling us that there would be an extra 2.3 billion available for schools but the DfE haven't yet specified exactly what the mechanics are of how that money gets into schools. We have been advised (because we're in the safety valve planning process), that the high needs block will get an increase of £1.3 million for Bath & North East Somerset next year over and above what we have already been advised. Which, if you were to extrapolate that out onto a national basis, means that approximately 360 million would be allocated to high needs block out of that 2.3 billion.</p> <p>The remainder, assuming all of the £1.94bn goes into the school's block, would equate to a round about 3.8%. So, if the DfE were to put all of that resource into the NFF factor values, then you could see all the factor values increasing by 3.8%. However, I'm not sure that the DfE are going to do it, because quite simply, if they were to do that, then any school on the minimum funding guarantee would still only be guaranteed half a percent. That could be quite disastrous - not for so many schools in Bath & North East Somerset - but around the country, (particularly in the London boroughs), which would suffer a significant hit.</p> <p>So, it is possible that the DfE may do what they did last year, which was to create a supplementary funding grant. This would allocate that additional new money and then build that into the baseline for each individual school. At this point, we have not been advised of anything, so we don't know. But if I was going to put money on it, I would say they would do a supplementary grant rather than add it to the national funding formula for 23/24.</p> <p>SM – It came through on Governor Hub, that they are also announcing additional capital funding for schools to do with making schools more efficient. Around 40,000 on average for secondary schools, to improve their energy efficiency. But they are not going to support the energy cap anymore for schools.</p> <p>RM – They have indicated that the energy cap may not be supported beyond the Easter time frame</p> <p>SM – I think I probably agree with you <i>on the supplementary grant</i> Richard, because they've also got to find a mechanism for academies to be funded for that period from April to September as well in our current academic year.</p>	

RM – That is correct. So, if they were to build it into the NFF, then you effectively wouldn't get the resource until September. But if they do a supplementary grant, that feeds it in from April if that's what they do.

LM – I always seemed to be the bearer of bad news with these things, but a bit of a dampener on the additional money because although it is welcome (and as Steve said I wasn't expecting it either)- there are so many cost pressures that if they're not funded in addition, it will completely wipe out that money. So, for example the teachers' pension scheme is due to be revalued from April 24, last time it went up by 7.2%. I think we're expecting it to be at least the same and my worry is they'll say, well, we just gave you an extra £2 billion. You don't need anymore.

LM - Also lots of schools and trusts when they set their budgets at the start or before the start of 22/23, we're assuming sort of 3% pay awards and it's been obviously a lot higher this year. But given where inflation is and what the economy is doing, they could be much higher again next year. So, there are a whole load of things that mean that additional funding was very welcome but is probably not actually going to make that much difference to the pressures they're facing.

RM – Yes, it's good news but it just stems off the problem for another year.

LM –As far as I understand it, there's no increase in early years or post 16 funding out of that 2.3 billion either.

RM – None of it will end up in the early years sector or the post 16 sector, but we haven't seen any notification and early years have had less notification than Mainstreams schools. I think it is possible that the DfE may divert some of it, but we haven't had any notification of that at all.

PF – Yes, that's why I popped along today was just to augment what Richard was saying. Obviously, since my update at the last meeting about the draft of the funding consultation nothing's been published since. I think we've had another two, if not 3 early years, ministers in that intervening period; so, need to get the latest one up to speed. Obviously the two things that we're waiting to hear about are funding and any response to the consultation, (that was about increasing the ratio for staff who will look after 2-year-olds) and whether those will be intertwined is another matter. We keep hearing from the government that they're looking to reduce the cost of childcare for parents, but we see no obvious signs of it coming forward at this stage. So, we have worked on the basis that what was in the consultation is likely to be, what the sector might expect; but we are not anticipating anything will come from the budget update statement.

	<p>PF - It was interesting to note last year we found out about how much money we're going to have to fund of the sector on the 25th of November, and it is now the 6th of December, and we are a week away from going into the holidays. For many of our providers it is time to chat to the sector, tell them what's likely to happen. Time is going to be very limited before we come back to set the budget for next year.</p> <p>JM - Thank you for that. We've committed as a forum that we are really concerned about the early years particularly and one we are all very interested in as it feeds through the sector, If we get it right or better at early years, then we're playing less catch up across the system. So, I think you know we can continue to make that commitment and get that message out. If there's anything particularly you think we can assist with at School's Forum please can you have a chat with me in terms of what else, we might do to raise the voice of the concerns?</p> <p>PF - Thanks, I mean in the last week I've had one meeting with the DFE and two with the Local Government Association. So, we are trying to push it hard, but we know I think it's pretty much all been written out. It's just the whole decision process that seems to take a very long time.</p> <p>JM - Thank you, we thank you for that update and we will hold the space for early years.</p> <p>KB – Just as you'd expect from the Union perspective, just to reinforce what Louise was saying. We're looking for 10% plus a 5% restoration of pay as a starting point for discussions just to stand still and try to restore some of the 24% loss of income since 2010. So, the DFE have got a lot of thinking to do with the government on how to move things forward. It should be seen as an investment to recruit and retain quality staff, which is probably the same argument as nursing. And the fact that people are not going to choose the stress and the level of responsibilities when there are other employment opportunities available. I hope the observer takes that back with him.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>DSG – Safety Valve Programme</p>	
	<p>RM – Well, this is more of just an update as to where we are in the process. The DFE have had a couple of meetings with us over the last couple of months, interrogating us in terms of our plan to recover the DSG deficit as best we can, and it must have been about two weeks ago we received the letter to say that we would be getting £1.3 million extra for the high needs budget next year. Therefore, we have revisited our assumptions as part of that process and we have a meeting with the finance advisors next Thursday.</p>	

Our strategy is the same strategy that we have explained in the past that is 2 strands of looking to reduce or limit the growth in the number of EHCPs and to increase local specialist provision in order to reduce the need for independent specialist placements. The two strands have been discussed with the DFE. They seem to accept them as part of our process. There has been some discussion around some of the assumptions as to what targets we should be setting as part of a strategy, and I think that's where we will now be going back to them next week with a revised set of targets and hopefully that will be acceptable to them.

We would be looking for the DFE to contribute around 15-16 million to recover deficit position, which is down quite significantly from when we first discussed this. And that's primarily because the additional resource as part of the high needs block will feed its way through and reduce our need for a contribution from the DFE. So hopefully we'll make an agreement next week and then from that point we will move to formally, enter into a legal agreement during the January, February time.

LM – Whilst the government have put in an extra 2 million pound, and you have anticipated 365 million of that will go into the high needs block, I wonder how much is just for reducing their Safety Valve allocations rather than providing any extra allocation into education. Second point I'd like to ask is just about whether you've been put under or given any indication from the DFE about whether they are looking for you to increase the transfer from schools to the high needs block as part of the Safety Valve programme.

RM – I agree that it will reduce the need for the DFE safety valve pot of funding. On the transfer from school's block one of the financial advisors talked about it loosely early on in discussions, but they have not mentioned it at all since. We have not suggested anything other than the half percent that we've had agreement from the forum in the past.

LM - I understand that this is happening in some other local authorities.

RM - Yes, we understand that this is happening in some authorities, yes, but we have not suggested that anywhere as part of our discussions.

CW – I just wanted to speak on behalf of B&NES and to say that the LA has received great support from the local education community. We've got some really good links with the send education leads across B&NES. I think this is an exciting piece of work around SEND support

and I think we've got a real opportunity to do something really good actually for schools and for the children, young people in B&NES. It's got some very ambitious targets around. The growth of the EHCP's attached to that. But I think the product of what we're doing is really good and I think we're going to take the opportunity to think about how we deliver that work hand in hand with Mary's Social care teams and other services that work across the Authority supporting children in B&NES. Just to record to the forum so that you know, there's been some good support there.

OD –It was only just to say that we have started the hard work and meetings and we've had great commitment from all of the CEO's, their Inclusion leads and key personnel across the schools. We have a tight schedule, so we want to keep the energy and commitment around because we want to have it designed by April. I think it gives the project momentum. So, I just want to note my thanks for the support and that I will be looking for it to continue all the way up until April.

CW – Thanks Olwyn and just a couple of updates on the resource base programme which Rosemary is overseeing, we have some good solid plans coming up - both primary and secondary. Some of the primary ones may not materialise, so Rosemary will be writing to all heads again. So just keep an eye out with your Trust's, MAT's and schools.

JM – So Chris, is that a targeted contact from Rosemary to the areas where there's identified need or a broader request for anybody who wants to step forward?

CW – We will be revisiting conversations from the past.

JM – An assist from forum members would be helpful, to go back and push out. Just check those messages are getting through because sometimes things get a bit lost.

LM – Thank you again. And I just wanted to ask for an opportunity to have some further discussions with the appropriate people within the local authority. It would be interesting to see whether other schools and trusts are facing the same thing but with all of the financial pressures around SEND and more generally within the whole of the education sector, we're having to make some considerable changes to the way that we structure the provision within our schools and that will have a knock-on implication in terms of how we deliver support for children with special educational needs.

I think it's important that we can have an open and honest discussion

about that, because what I don't want to happen is for the local authority and the schools to end up sort of butting up against each other and for parents and carers to be able to get different messages that contradict each other from both the local authority and schools. So, I think it's important that while we understand what you're doing in terms of the safety valve programme and all the exciting plans that you've got for increased provision, I think it's also really important that you hear what we're doing today, so that we can make sure that we're working really effectively together in the best interests of the children. So, I'd welcome an opportunity to be able to do that.

JM – Thank you, Louise. I would echo that massively. I was thinking a similar sort of thing, and you've expressed that clearly.

OD – I think you are right, Louise. And one of the key strands is that described rather clunkily as *ordinarily available provision* that we're going to call the B&NES send commitment. That is a statement of intent that is agreed across all settings, so that it is a document that will be supportive of schools and give very clear information to parents as well. So, what is on offer can be expected on both sides and is made very clear and that document is a living document. It doesn't just become something that you put in a folder on your shelf but is something that is a launchpad for discussions, something to focus on as a community in B&NES for our schools, so that there isn't any post code lottery and parents don't feel that they can sort of shop around. It is clear what the offer is and the expectation on both sides - and where local authorities have co-produced that together with their MAT's, with their families, it's been incredibly effective. So that is a key strand. I'm hoping that will have a positive outcome.

LM – Are there arrangements already in place to enable that Co-production to happen, or is that yet to be put in place?

OD – It is happening, Debbie Cocker is your inclusion lead. She is involved in the key steering group, so she should be able to feedback.

CW – Echo that. Working in B&NES and working across a lot of different leaders, (and?) organisations we can't do this without working at the ground level. Olwyn does have a different representative from each MAT, standalones and maintained.

The people who have been nominated by the MAT's and the Trusts so far have come with real enthusiasm and with some really good ideas which will shape this. There is a significant line of funding in our Safety Valve programme to invest in this as well. So yes, just to reassure you

	<p>Louise it shouldn't end up being something where we're going to impose on you.</p> <p>JM – It remains a key agenda item for us. We will at our next meeting hopefully know some more but again we have committed to that being on our agenda. It's one of our key development pieces along with School Standards Board. So, we shall look forward to the update at the next meeting please. And please do take those actions back to pick up some of that activity around resource base interest and that Co-design piece with Olwyn's team.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>National Funding Formula Consultation</p>	
	<p>RM - Sent out consultation paper on 28th September - responses in attached appendix in the report. The DFE are intending to try and narrow the position so that local authorities follow the national funding formula (rather than) what they now call the local national funding formula and effectively they've required us to make a few technical changes to the formula base and therefore, we consulted on the various options and the responses came through as part of the order shown in the appendix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are looking to set the minimum funding guarantee at 0.5% percent, which is within our remit, which is at the upper limit of what the DFE would allow. We are looking to reduce all factors if the resources available, do not allow us to match the national funding formula factor values rather than have any form of CAP on gains. So, we would pro rata down every factor equivalent. We would limit the resources going out to every school rather than just those schools that are gaining the most. • We will inflate local factors (split site etc) in line with the overall NFF inflationary values (3.4%) • We are not suggesting that we would put forward a change to the notional SEND until the DFE produce their green paper and we can do some national benchmarking, because there's a lot of change coming in that part of the system and it would be foolish to change now when we don't know what the outcome of the Green Paper would be. • We are not looking to introduce a falling rolls policy at this point in time, but we will be monitoring to see what the impact on individual schools is like with falling roles. But we're not anticipating any specific difficulties across any of our schools at this point. But things can change relatively quickly within a year or so we will keep that under review. • The final question that we asked in the consultation was to transfer half a percent to the schools block, as we have done over the past eight years now, I think it is 7 or 8 years and the 	

response for that was 100% in favour of all those who responded, which is good and we want to thank schools in the multi Academy trusts for that response because I think that is an important part of the relationship between the local authority and the individual schools.

- Additionally, a separate paper about our own specific premises factors. The exceptional premises factor applies to schools that have specific requirements in primary to hire church and village halls in order to meet curriculum need. According to the DFE planning, it looks as if they have to apply for that as part of the process. So, because we had 100% backing for that, we have made the application to the DFE to apply a local exceptional premises factor. We are hopeful that the schools that do have that factor will continue to have that in 23/24 and onwards.
- As part of this process, we will now be writing a paper for Dine Romero to make a formal local authority decision on the funding formula and effectively we will be putting in that paper what I've just explained, providing the Forum's recommendation is to follow the responses from the consultation. So, what we're now looking from you is effectively the formal response or recommendation to Dine to follow the responses of the consultation and have a minimum funding guarantee at half a percent, not to introduce a cap on gains, but to have reduced factors for all if- if resources require it, not to change the SEND consultation notional factor values, not to introduce the falling role factor and to transfer half a percent of the school's block. Sorry just to be clear, the transfer to the school's block is a schools forum decision so we will need to formally make that decision as part of this paper.

JM - I just want to check before we move to vote or recommend those two separate elements. Is everybody happy? There's been enough information, you've had good sight of the consultation and you're happy that the process is secure around what we have just been told.

KB - Around the notional SEND budget, which I know you're not touching at the moment, was that just a paper exercise or was it something that will signal, if you like, a greater need for high needs within schools' budgets and that the DFE will use later as a signal to say well all schools in B&NES need £50,000 for their high needs?

RM – The notional SEND budget is one of the most complex areas of funding within schools. It tries to explain how much of the resource that is allocated to individual schools should be utilised for SEND purposes and it takes a view that a share of the age-weighted pupil unit, a share of all the deprivation factors, and a share of the lump sum, are part of the notional SEND budget of the school, and the schools should use that for SEND purposes as part of its arrangements for meeting the

<p>needs of individual children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual authorities have been allowed to set up their own notional SEND budget, there's a range of percentages from as low as about two or three percent, I think is the lowest one I've seen to up to about 20-24, I think is the highest one I've seen. We are in B&NES somewhere around about 11% on the secondary sector. • What the DFE are planning is they're looking for almost like a standardization on a national basis. So they would end up with a percentage that is the same across all local authorities. It would create an overall position that everybody would have the same notional SEN budget. That's what the DFE I think are moving towards and what this - should we say technical change to the national funding formula - it allows local authorities to review their SEND notional budget and fall in line with the national trend. • At this point in time, we haven't had the outcomes of the Green Paper and when we do get that, I think we probably should look to review our position of what our notional SEND budget is, because that is the first point of conflict between the local authority and the school, because we would be saying, you've got money in your main budget to meet the needs of your SEND children because you've got a notional SEND budget of £50,000. So, you can use some of that for SEND purposes and the school would be quite rightly arguing back to us. <p>KB - I suppose I just want to register that it's really important as to what the purpose is of the notional SEND budget and what it's going to be used for, because that's going to make the discussion change a lot. I think, we need somehow one day to separate if we are having a separate high needs block then it needs to be a separate high needs block. And if they're going to fund schools for a certain amount for SEND as a notional budget then that funding should be very clear and it also should be over and above what schools get so it's going to be quite a discussion with the DFE.</p> <p>JM - We'll capture your question there and keep it in the pot for when we get that Green Paper response, this is about the forum members consultation. So, if we pull it back to that for this piece and we'll note your question Kevin and thank you for that. So, in terms of the process, our members happy, we've had a good secure process around our consultation.</p> <p>Formal recommendation to Dine Romero to follow the outcome of the consultation</p> <p>Formal vote to approve the ability to transfer the 0.5% to the high needs block.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>
---	---

7.	Split Site Factor	
	<p>RM – The split site factor is quite an interesting change. The DFE are preparing, as I've said before, for a national funding formula and as part of that process, they are anticipating changing the split site factor which was a local factor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently we have 4 primary schools and one secondary school that attract resources and there is a local policy for split sites. But if you look at the DFE planned approach for a national split site process, there is a change in so much as the four primary schools would no longer be eligible for split site funding. • So really, this paper is about informing Forum of the change that is coming and effectively that the four primary schools who currently receive between one thousand to three thousand will no longer be eligible for that funding in 24/25, But for 23/24 it will still form part of their overall funding value. • For 24/25 it is anticipated that the DFE will effectively restrict the split site formula and the primaries will no longer be eligible, whereas the secondary school, Hayesfield, that currently gets a split site factor under our policy would still be eligible under the national policy and it is likely that they would get an increase from roughly £63,000 they get now, to about £72,000. That's what we think is likely to happen. So, it's beneficial for Hayesfield secondary school but negatively impacting on the four primary schools and this is primarily down to the fact that the four primary schools have effectively a detached playing field and that detached playing field is no longer deemed to be a split site as per the DFE's planned process. <p>JM – It is a small number of our schools, but I can see that would have a bigger impact probably in primary schools than it would the secondary and obviously the secondaries are beneficial.</p> <p>KB - Colleagues have commented that possibly there could be unintended consequences if this is applied both in B&NES and further afield in terms of use of playing fields. And maybe that's something the DFE don't want to happen anyway.</p> <p>RM - We have as part of our papers, provided copies of the papers specifically to those five schools and drawn their attention to it specifically with specific direct emails. So just so that they are all aware of what is likely to happen.</p> <p>Part of the way that the DFE plan to do it is of course because the funding will be there in 23/24, it'll form part of their baseline and therefore to some extent they will be protected for it as part of the minimum funding guarantee the following year. Though it will effectively disappear over time.</p>	

8.	New Alternative Provision Free School Bid	
	<p>OD – This is the paper because as you know, Rosemary Collard already came to speak to you about the application for a special school and the free school wave. We are also putting in an application for a free school AP and we've been looking at this for some time before the wave even opened because in B&NES we commission our AP or alternative provision, and we don't have a registered school here in B&NES. There be many advantages to having an all through registered AP provision. Having all the teaching and support staff and having in one site to allowing greater support and work with the leadership across a single site also increased access to specialist subjects and facilities also just the ability to work to economies of scale and any ancillary benefits that would go with that around providing a hub for our CPD and support for our schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The wave opened in September whilst our current provider, which is Lansdown Park, part of learn@ MAT is commissioned and was due to be recommissioned from next year. It was decided to pause the recommission and to put in an application for a free school wave instead. So, the pre application was successful and now the final application has been completed with the deadline of the 17th of February.• In B&NES we are quite confident that we're able to demonstrate several indicators of success. So, we have identified a viable site we'd be looking at the Culverhay site in Rush Hill, we don't have an existing AP school and have a general commitment around the delivery of high-quality AP provision - as is outlined in the Green Paper.• The process is different to the special school free school bid as the local authority has to identify the strongest partner with whom to put the bid forward with and create schools which were funded by the DfE to support local authorities. In doing this, I had a number of meetings with the DfE, and we looked at the range of partners that were available and spoke with a number and landed on Midsomer Norton Partnership as a partner who was very keen to do this piece of work with us. So I am working at the moment with Midsomer Norton Partnership to complete this bid and you'll know that, a key part of the bid is a being able to say that my schools forum support this as a concept and are fully behind the application. So that's why I'm here today. We need to hope that you would support this bid and I am very hopeful that we will be successful, and I think it will be a positive for the students. <p>KB - Great news in many ways and thank you to MSNP for partnering with you on this bid. I'm sure you've said this before, but this is obviously an enhancement to what's the provision we already have, and</p>	

will it eventually be one of those cost saving measures that would be part of our SEND strand?

OD - We haven't badged specific savings against this Kevin, but we do feel that as part of the overall philosophy around particularly early support upstream that we would anticipate that a school and all through school that is registered that is ours in B&NES would be able to provide that solid support out to our schools. That is a requirement and as you know the Green Paper is very keen on far more outreach into our mainstream schools to provide support before any threat of exclusions and the current provider is certainly making great steps in that direction.

SM - What sort of scale is that likely to be in terms of the size of the provision?

OD – In our application we have put in 55. We have gone for eight in key stage one and in key stage two and then the remaining in key stage three and four with a slightly larger increase in key stage four compared to key stage 3.

It's a little bit more than we have currently and I will need to go out to other neighbouring authorities to see if they have any interest in commissioning, also I will be approaching colleagues in multi academy trusts and B&A panels because one of the things we will need to be able to demonstrate that by having this provision we will reduce the need for schools having bespoke packages with other AP providers. So there needs to be some sort of cost benefits if you like. It's slightly different to us because we don't have a school already. That's really designed for those who are adding additional resource when they already have an AP registered provision, and they want assurance that they're not sort of overstuffing the market.

SM - So I suppose the question I have is what's determined whether we feel that's the size that's required?

OD - I will be influenced by conversations that I have with neighbouring authorities about places that they would like to Commission, you'll know because of the letters that have gone out to schools that our current AP is full.

SM - My feeling is, and I don't know what the sense from the schools and secondary schools is, that is having the capacity to have more, and if there's overcapacity then commissioning out to other local authorities to fill places, makes sense. But my feeling is if we're going for a bid for capital funding that we go for a bid where we go for as many places as we feel is realistic.

OD - This is helpful feedback. What would be your thoughts when you

	<p>heard that figure? SM – Not enough. It's also that those children who are finding out that they're being placed on a respite placement or on a temporary placement and then find that for example they're going through an EHCP and that they're there for a longer term. Having more places - as many places as we can to get the capital funding for - and then going from that point kind of makes sense.</p> <p>OD - You're completely right and I can feed back with Midsomer Norton partnership, and the bid writing is I think that there is that balance. We have had a very strong model in B&NES where it has not been a sort of cul-de-sac institution where young people go, and they stay, and they don't move on. And we have had that clear you know we wanted that 12 weeks and then to go on, but I do also appreciate and myself and Rosie and Chris have already been having discussions around that cohort that go on to have plans and that sort of where they become slightly stuck. You're right to raise it. So, thank you.</p> <p>JM - Thank you and our secondary schools would also really support that in terms of our Trust. I know that the size issue, but also with our concerns about the plans for early years, that the challenges around funding are saying we want to put more services into the early age pupils. There's a period for that to bring around rewards. So, I think and where we have concern for provision with Early years funding being tight, it's something we talk about a lot.</p> <p>JM – School forum vote – all in favour to support.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>HERS commissioning update</p>	
	<p>OD – You will know that HERS, the hospital education reintegration service went through a recommissioning and the new provider is the Partnership trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new specification was designed very much more with an emphasis on supporting home schools to meet the needs of pupils with medical needs and also working in partnership with schools to support reintegration as the data is very clear that where pupils are not reintegrated back into their home schools, attainment falls off significantly, and So the funding mechanism agreed in school's forum, would have a scaled block payment from B&NES depending on occupancy, and then we would do a recharge to the home school or Academy at the weekly age rated pupil unit rate for each week that the pupil was in HERS. During the mobilisation period in the summer, we had a number of 	

	<p>conversations with the regional director, formerly the RSC, around, the changeover and the significant change, and it was agreed that the HERS pupils will be dual registered. Pupils will also be registered on role with the Mendip School as this was identified as the most suitable school within the partnership trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HERS will have a number of pupils who are not registered at a home school, and this is usually because they're electively home educated at the point of referral. Now all of those pupils who are EHE, are able to access HERs while in hospital. But beyond this, the pupils and their families have to be committed to returning to education if they want to continue to access HERS. • So, without a home school with whom they've dual registered, the plan for future reintegration is compromised, and there is also a financial implication as the provider is without the AWPU element, as the Mendip School is a specialist provision. Patrick our observer, may be interested to know that Richard and I had lengthy and interesting discussions with the EFSA around this a couple of weeks ago. • They were looking at this issue as well and what we felt was a positive move, would be where a pupil is not registered at a home school and these parents are committed and the family are committed to them re-joining a school, they apply for a mainstream school subject to the usual application requirements and have dual registration for the period that they are in HERS. • So this is only applied to those pupils currently solely registered at the MENDIP and it would allow facilitation for reintegration and allow the admitting school to claim the appropriate funding allocation at the earliest opportunity and thus allow the pupils to be supported like all the other pupils using HERS. This is absolutely in line with the feedback I've had from the providers who feel that where students don't have a named home school for them to go on to, this limits and compromises the reintegration plan. So that this would be extremely helpful for the students who wanted to reintegrate back into mainstream. • So, my proposal is that those students, as I said, where they are committed to going back into mainstream school, would make an in-year application assuming that they've missed the deadline for their local school and I'm hoping school forum will approve too. <p>JM – School forum vote – all in favour to support.</p> <p>OD - Just to say, I should have said earlier on when we're talking about this system of SEND support that the colleague who is leading this with me is Julie Dyer. Just so that you know, and for those colleagues that don't know, this is proving extremely positive.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>10. AOB:</p>		

	None	
11.	Date of next meeting: 31st January 2023	

DRAFT