

Primary Headteachers	Primary School Governors
Richard Thomas (Pevensey & Westham Primary) Debbie Gilbert (Burwash CE Primary) Apologies Richard Blakeley (Parkside Primary) Kate Owbridge (Ashdown Primary) DID NOT ATTEND Lizzie Field (Park Mead Primary)	Jane Johnson (Newick CE Primary) Geoffry Lucas (Etchingham CE Primary) Vicky Richards (St Mark's CE Primary)
Secondary Headteachers	Secondary School Governors
Hugh Hennebry (UCTC) Chair Helen Key (Chailey) Emily Beer (Willingdon Community) Apologies	Monica Whitehead (Claverham Community College)
Special School Headteacher	Special School Governor
Sophie Gurney (Hazel Court School) Apologies	Vacancy
Pupil Referral Unit	
Frank Stanford – (Sabden Multi Academy Trust)	
Academy Representatives	Non School Members
John Greenwood (Aurora Academies Trust) (Chair) James Freeston (King Offa Primary Academy) Apologies Anna Robinson (Beacon Academy) Apologies Richard Preece (Saxon Mount and Torfield) Phil Matthews (Hailsham Community College) Sarah Pringle (Seahaven Academy) Vacancy	Lesley Brown (Early Years) Did not attend Phil Clarke (Trade Union Representative) Apologies Joanna Sanchez (Diocese of Arundel and Brighton) Apologies Mandy Watson (Diocese of Chichester) Apologies Mike Hopkins (16-19 representative) Apologies
Officers	Observer
Fiona Wright (Assistant Director Education & ISEND)	Cllr Bob Standley (Lead Member for Education and Inclusion, Special Educational Needs and Disability) - Apologies
Nathan Caine (Head of ISEND)	Stuart Gallimore (Director Children's Services) - Apologies
Edward Beale (Schools Funding Manager)	
Mark Whiffin (Head of Finance)	
Sarah Rice (Finance Manager – Schools)	
Martin Kelly (Strategy Manager, Apprenticeship Levy)	
Kirsten Coe (BSD Finance)	
Beth Armstrong (Deputy Head of ISEND & Strategic Lead for Education)	
Amanda Altenhoven (Clerk)	

No.	ITEM	ACTIONS
1.0	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
	Chair welcomed all and thanked Hugh for chairing the last meeting in John's absence.	
1.1	Apologies received from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbie Gilbert • Emily Beer • James Freeston • Anna Robinson • Joanna Sanchez • Mandy Watson • Mike Hopkins • Cllr Bob Standley • Stuart Gallimore • Phil Clarke • Sophie Gurney 	
2.0	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 11 May.	
2.1	Hugh asked with regards to page 3 the independent review of the music service. FW explained that there have been a range of activities surrounding this, looking to see other solutions and possibilities. Cllr Standley is centrally involved and the review is progressing.	
	The Minutes for 11 May were signed off by the Chair as a true record. AOB from last minutes: Signed as a true record	
3.0	MATTERS ARISING AND DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
3.1	<p>Hugh asked when the figures of schools balances would be presented to elected members. The clarity of presentation of balances was discussed as to how this could be changed to take into account ring fenced amounts such as capital amounts and unspent grants. Due to the difficulties in obtaining detailed breakdown individually from all schools retrospectively, Ed explained that this is not straightforward to extract specific reasons for balances to add clarity to the reporting. It was agreed it would be beneficial to look at how this information could be effectively collected from schools as part of the 2018/19 yearend closedown procedures.</p> <p>Action Schools Finance will review the collection of data from school regarding year end balances as part of preparation for 2018/19 year end. -SR</p>	SR
4.0	High Needs Block	
	<p>Nathan Caine (NC) gave an update on the High Needs Block and begun with an update on expenditure. Since 2016, the ISEND service has undertaken dedicated work with schools and colleges to address the pressures which were evident within the High Needs Block. The LA has reduced the number of EHCPs in the last 2 years, bringing East Sussex more in line with the national averages. East Sussex is one of only 2 Local Authorities in the country to reduce the total number of new EHCPs issued two years running. Furthermore, we have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced some of the escalating costs in the FE sector; 	

No.	ITEM	ACTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased the number of places in special schools. Increased occupancy rates in specialist facilities; Reduced the number of placements in Independent and Non-Maintained Schools (INMS) <p>As a result of all of these, the projected spend for 2018/19 is within agreed budget. However, this is predicated on continuing the trajectory of reducing demand and shifting the balance from high to lower cost placements.</p> <p>Costs for SEND provision in East Sussex are higher than national averages and we currently place more children with EHCPs in special schools or INMS than our statistical neighbours, and less in mainstream.</p> <p>Earlier this year, we worked with the ISOS Partnership to analyse our spending. The outcome of this work was confirmation that we are doing all the right things compared to other LAs and are actually doing more in comparison to most.</p> <p>For 2018/19, East Sussex received a small uplift in HNB of 0.5%. Despite this only being a small uplift, we are projecting spend for 18/19 within budget. By comparison, other LAs in the South East have a projected overspend for 18/19 from £0.2m right up to £30m (after interblock transfers from the DSG) with some projecting overspends representing 25% of their total budget.</p> <p>In order to ensure that we continue to manage spend within the High Needs Budget, we need to continue to reduce costs by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Driving down demand – ensure that more children are in lower cost placements (ISOS predict that in order to bring our spend in line with national averages, we need to reduce the number of pupils in INMS by 50 and reduce the number of pupils in special schools by 100 and educate more pupils with SEND in mainstream schools); Create more cost-effective provision Consistently and robustly defend appeals – Mainstream and special schools need to support tribunal appeals. Independent schools support parents in appealing and we are unlikely to win an appeal if we do not have a mainstream school in attendance. Look to cease EHCPs where they are no longer required. <p>Jane Johnson asked how many of the 50 children would need to move in to mainstream schooling and what support would a maintained school have would they receive funding for a special placement? NC advised that maintained schools receive funding in their budget and top-up if required to manage the EHCP.</p> <p>John Greenwood asked is there work to do with the schools with regards to placements and why are the schools not supporting at tribunal stage. NC advised that work is continuing using resources efficiently and effectively so that the school has confidence in supporting the child. NC explained that some schools are very supportive with placements and at tribunals. Where individual schools do not support ISEND in appeals, our chances of success are greatly diminished and then the costs will be borne by all Pupils and schools.</p> <p>Hugh stated that he would like to thank Nathan and the ISEND team for their good work.</p>	

No.	ITEM	ACTIONS
	<p>Hugh referenced page 7 from Nathan's briefing and asked for the figures to be shared, NC advised that he would share the figures.</p> <p>NC explained where the special schools were in terms of placements and budgets. Discussion ensued with regard to the appeal process; NC went on to explain this process. Richard Preece commented that the quality of provision of mainstream schools is not under as much scrutiny as special schools.</p> <p>Sarah Pringle commented that there is a missing link where parents push for private special school placement. There should be more of a discussion with the Headteacher if a child leaves mainstream to attend a special school rather than via SENCo and ISEND. More discussion as to what could be done to address costs. FW explained that ISEND have been looking at this with groups of schools and how they manage individual pupils who should be mainstream educated but present different type of challenge. Reverse strategy - if we can move a special child back in to mainstream, is there enough of a resource that can go with them.</p> <p>Lizzie Field asked what is the responsibility of the council for a child moving from an academy in to mainstream. She has had 3 appeals over 9 months and does not have the resources to support. NC explained that this is the same across the board and asked Lizzie to forward the details of the children she was concerned about to him so that he can look into them.</p> <p>Richard Thomas backed up the point that schools should be present at tribunals to support the process.</p> <p>John echoed Hugh's thanks to Nathan and ISEND</p>	
5.0	EALs and Behavioural Support	
	<p>Beth Armstrong (BA) leading on this item. FW introduced the item and explained that we were presenting it now (as well) to help members to consider all aspects before the September meeting. BA advised that the full financial breakdowns would be present in September's paper; today she had been asked by schools forum to provide an indication of the wider impact of the decision to cease de-delegation. Each member was presented with a hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation; this has been attached to the minutes.</p> <p>BA talked through the slides regarding EALS and explained each point. Key points of note were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that refugees are placed in any area where there are school places, and for unaccompanied asylum seekers they are placed in any area where there are foster carers. A school may not have had need for the EALS service in the past but could need the EALS service at any point in the future, and at very short notice. • EAL is not a special educational need; children with EAL are often high achievers if they are well supported at an early stage • Feedback from schools and attainment data shows EALS to be a valued and effective service, providing vital support for individual children and families as they settle, enabling mother tongue exams to take place, and supporting children to make outstanding progress. • If de-delegation ceases EALS would not be financially viable and would have to close; the service is not available in the private sector. There are some translation services available but they are more expensive than EALS. This would have a significant impact on the schools who currently receive a high level of support. There would also be a significant rise in the numbers of children requiring support in the secondary phase as this support will not have been provided in the primaries. EALS would not be available 	

No.	ITEM	ACTIONS
	<p>to provide this support.</p> <p>Lizzie: thanked BA for explaining this really clearly and said that she did not need to use EALS but the forum had a moral imperative to support services supported through de-delegated budgets. Hugh and Helen commented that they had received an excellent service from EALS supporting with refugees. Sarah shared with colleagues that it wasn't possible to conduct a mother tongue exam anymore without support from EALS as the exams had changed so much. Jane asked how the money is going to be top sliced from schools? Ed explained that it was done on a per pupil basis for 17/18, and took into consideration the number of EALS pupils in the school in the previous 3 years. Jane said that she supported de-delegation but schools that do not need EALS need to understand the figures to know that they are fair. Jane suggested that the funding formula group could look at this.</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Finance to review how the charges to schools for the EALS and Behaviour Support Service de-delegation items are calculated. Information will then be presented to the Funding Formula Working Group for discussion in September.</p> <p>Sarah Pringle asked if the cost structure is the same for academies and mainstream schools. Ed advised that it is.</p> <p>BA continued to present the paper moving on to the ESBAS topic. Key points of note were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If de-delegation ceases ESBAS would be significantly reduced and only be focused on statutory work, no longer providing any early intervention services; this would impact the attendance offer from ESBAS as well as the behaviour offer. The Local Authority will need to lower the threshold for core attendance support, and may not be able to provide it at all, meaning all attendance intervention would be on a traded basis and may need to be sourced privately. • There would be a significant rise in the numbers of pupils requiring support in the secondary phase as this support will not have been provided in the primaries. • Significant reductions in ESBAS will result in permanent exclusions and breakdown of placements of pupils with EHCPs, which will impact High Needs Block funding leading to reduced funding to schools. <p>The question of the academy view around de-delegation was raised. John Greenwood commented that it was 'some and some'. Sarah commented that it wasn't a question of maintained compared to academies but about levels of need. Schools with a higher level of need, such as Seahaven, used ESBAS extensively and need to be able to draw on higher levels of support; de-delegation provides this.</p> <p>Jane Johnson commented that there are changing factors to the funding formula for this year and we need to look at how it should be top sliced make it fair for all.</p> <p>Hugh thanked BA for her update and commented that schools are under huge funding pressure so it is important that schools with a higher level of need can access support when they need it. Hugh stressed the importance of consulting with other headteachers to gain their views. It was asked for the presentation to be circulated electronically to all schools forum members asap as time is limited before the September vote. Amanda shall action this today 06.07.2018</p>	<p>EB</p>

No.	ITEM	ACTIONS
6.0	Apprenticeship Levy Update	
	<p>Martin Kelly provided a verbal update; the paper regarding the apprenticeship levy update is attached.</p> <p>Update as to where we are as a levy. He has engaged with as many schools as possible. Numbers are good, 2.3% public sector target of all staff should be undergoing some kind of training, target set by DfE. 0.874% achieved. National average 0.253%.</p> <p>Martin explained the courses that staff are enrolled on. He is working closely with Brighton College.</p> <p>Schools currently have a £185K budget per year for apprenticeships, £8K average per school.</p> <p>Martin went on to explain that there are no issues with learners or provides and they have received positive feedback across the board.</p> <p>The training is mainly completed online, which is distant learning.</p> <p>John asked how confident are you in what happens to the funding pot? Martin explained that any unspent money drops out April '19. The more the money goes up on monthly basis the more training that happens and learners join.</p>	
7.0	Funding Formula Working Group	
	<p>Ed provided a verbal update on the Funding Formula.</p> <p>The working group to reconvene in September; looking to go to consultation in November. The working group shall also meet after today's meeting.</p>	
8.0	AOB	
	<p>John announced his retirement. Advised that Hugh has volunteered to step up to Chair.</p> <p>Need a Vice Chair nomination from a Primary Headteacher. Positions will be elected and confirmed in the September meeting.</p> <p>FW – thanked John for his service and contribution to schools forum. Recognised John's achievements as Headteacher and throughout his career supporting schools and staff in East Sussex.</p>	
	<p>Meeting concluded at 10.15 am</p> <p>Next meeting - Friday, 28 September 2018, at 0830 hours at Wellshurst Golf Club</p>	

Draft items for next meeting

- Election of Chair and Vice Chair
- ESCC Funding Formula Proposals for Consultation
- De-delegation Proposals