#  MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

**Wednesday, 27 November 2024 at 8.30am**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TYPE | MEMBERSHIP |
| GOVERNORS | Tracy Edwards, Johnson Brock\*, Alan Morton\*; Robin Precey\*, Srividya Srivathsan\*, Laura Worsley\* |
| HEADTEACHERS | Veronica Armson\*; Sarah Bowmer\*, Dee Bleach\*; Hodo Dirir\*; Becky Dolamore; Zobaidha Elmi, Tom Foster\*, Brenda Landers\* (Chair); Nicholas Langham\*; Danny Lye\*; Jon Ryder\*, Astrid Schon; Shoshannah Thompson\*, Jessica Williams\*;  |
| Non-School Members | Jemima Reilly\* -THEP , Natasha Chaudhury\* – NEU,  |
| OBSERVERS |  |
| Officers in Attendance | Lisa Fraser (Director of Education); Terry Shaw (Head of Schools Finance), Steve Reddy (Corporate Director of Children’s Services), Pauline Maddison (Education Consultant, Catherine Grace (Head of Pupil Access and School Sufficiency), Sara Walsingham (Accountant) |

*\*Denotes attendance*

*The meeting started at 08:33 and was quorate.*

**AGENDA ITEM 1: Welcome and apologies**

PRESENTING: Chair

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received and accepted from Zobaidha Elmi.

**AGENDA ITEM 2: Minutes of the last meeting - 9 October 2024**

PRESENTING: Chair

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed to be an accurate record subject to the following correction:

Action point ‘*Discuss and propose ideas for how the 2023-2024 Contingency Fund can be spent’* should say *‘Discuss and propose ideas for how the 2024-2025 Contingency Fund can be spent’.*

Matters arising

* There was some confusion over which group David Waller had been added to. It was agreed that the LA would check that David had been added to the School Business Managers (SBM) Working Group. Terry Shaw
* It was suggested that the dates of the SBM meetings be added to the work plan. Salma Siddiqua
* The following update on the action points was provided by Terry Shaw:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** | **Responsible** | **Response from Interim Head of Schools Finance** |
| 4 | Report which areas within the HNB were contributing most to the overspend. | Terry Shaw | There is a projected overspend of £5.2 million on the High Needs Block.  The overspend is due to advisory and therapeutic services, specialist places, out of borough placements and alternative education provision. |
| 6 | Benchmarking of trade union charges at other LAs. | Terry Shaw | This is not something that the Schools Finance Team would find extremely difficult to undertake as Schools Finance don’t manage the trade union charges at other LA’s.  This is always the role of HR and is using excessive time of the Schools Finance Team to attempt to facilitate the management of the TUFA fund in collaboration with the TU Forum, with no resolution in sight. |
| 6 | Look at DfE guidelines for calculating the special schools contributions to TUFA. | Terry Shaw | The only guidelines I can locate around de-delegation to Special Schools is at the following link: [Schools operational guide: 2024 to 2025 - GOV.UK](https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.gov.uk%2Fgovernment%2Fpublications%2Fpre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2024-to-2025%2Fschools-operational-guide-2024-to-2025&data=05%7C02%7CSalma.Siddiqua%40towerhamlets.gov.uk%7C3753ffa1ec334c9f72ae08dcfe82d6d6%7C3c0aec87f983418fb3dcd35db83fb5d2%7C0%7C0%7C638665085105340425%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=WOGC5ani8CFdLi5G0KQBQYCndR%2BxsroEdvHbwR7QeXU%3D&reserved=0) which states *‘De-delegation does not apply to special schools, nursery schools, or PRUs. Where de-delegation has been agreed for maintained primary and secondary schools, the department’s presumption is that the local authority will offer the service on a buyback basis to those schools and academies in their area which are not covered by the de-delegation.’*  However, I do know that rather than offer a buyback service, the City of Wolverhampton Council charges special schools x3 the rate per pupil for the de-delegated items, which doesn’t include a Contingency Fund. |
| 7 | Look at if the post -16 review should be funded by the de-delegation fund | Terry Shaw | The post-16 review shouldn’t be funded by the de-delegation fund.  It was never agreed that the cost allocated there in 2024-2025 when reviewing previous email trails, so it isn’t known why it was coded there.  It has now been removed in all reports and will be coded elsewhere.  |
| 7 | Draft mechanism for how the de-delegation budget should be spent. | Terry Shaw | The de-delegation budgets for Behaviour Support, FSM Eligibility and Additional School Improvement are passported to the relevant departments within the LA to manage.  However, the de-delegation budgets for Trade Union Facilities Time and the Contingency Fund have been left to the Schools Finance Team to manage and it has become apparent from the meetings I have attended that these two de-delegation items have caused much discomfort and no clear proposals or resolutions in how these funds should be managed.  It is optional to propose to de-delegate these two items in 2025-2026, although not de-delegating a Contingency Fund in any guise would leave budget pressures in the DSG High Needs Block and the funding the external consultancy costs of schools in financial difficulty and the LA would have to consider over options to fund those.  |
| 8 | Annual cost of early retirement fees for school staff. | Terry Shaw | These are the pension strain costs for St Elizabeth £20,124 and English Martyrs £120 in 2024-2025.  The costs were £49,612 in 2023-2024, £0 in 2022-2023 and £261,110 in 2021-2022, although no description of the schools are included in these figures the pre 2024-2025 costs. |
| 8 | What are the Schools Sustainability Group external consultancy fees  | Terry Shaw | External consultancy is the costs of Helen Jenner and Jay Patel to support schools in deficit.  The costs were £59,545 in 2021-2022, £35,000 in 2022-2023, £0 in 2023-2024 and projected to be £35,750 in 2024-2025. |

**AGENDA ITEM 3: Review of Schools forum Terms of Reference**

PRESENTING: Chair

The Forum reviewed the Terms of Reference, and the following points were discussed:

* Creation, criteria and size of a Falling Rolls Fund: Tower Hamlets does not have a Falling Rolls Fund but does have programs which deal with falling rolls. It may be necessary to formalise this and introduce parameters.
* Centrally retained budgets: this responsibility could be discharged more effectively. The Forum does receive some reports on this however they could be better scrutinised.
* Funding for central early years expenditure: Forum does not currently scrutinise this but does approve it.
* A reduction in the schools’ budget in order to fund a deficit arising in central expenditure: Forum has not been required to do this.
* Scheme for financing schools: Forum currently agreed this annually.

The Chair summarised that the Schools Forum (SF) needed to carry out more scrutiny of de-delegated budgets, especially the Contingency Fund. More clarity was needed about the role of the Schools Forum and the LA in falling rolls. The centrally retained budget also needed greater scrutiny.

The Forum proposed that the Chair, the Chairs of the Primary, Secondary and Special Consultative and the Head of Schools Finance and a governor representative member of the Schools Forum meet and discuss when and what information the SF receives and how these are discussed and decided. The group will also review the current workplan and how it is formatted. Action.

Srividya Srivathsan, volunteered to be the governor representative on the above committee.

Natasha Chaudhury stated that the NEU had a campaign around falling rolls and she would be happy to contribute. The Chair clarified that the SF’s remit in falling rolls was to ensure adequate budget was allocated to support any work around this. Any actual strategies to address falling rolls was not within the remit of the SF.

Sara Walsingham commented that the DSG allocations will be released in mid-December. This means that the report on the Schools Block, APT and Growth Fund will not be completed until early January.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: DSG Monitoring**

PRESENTING: Terry Shaw

The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) report with the projected forecast for 2024-2025 was shared prior to the meeting.

The final position of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) at the end of 2023-24 is an overspend of £2.8 million from the budget position. The outturn position reported in June was a cumulative deficit of £15.8 million.

The DSG Budget, actuals to date, projected forecast and projected variances for the financial year 2024-2025 were shared in the report. There is a projected underspend of £2.8million in the Schools Block. The Central Schools and Services Block is projected to spend to budget. There is a projected overspend of £5.2 million on the High Needs Block, a detailed analysis of this was provided in the report.

High Needs Block expenditure has grown by 20% in Tower Hamlets since the 2020-21 financial year. 37% of spend is on maintained special schools, 34% on maintained mainstream schools, and 9% on independent settings (Delivering Better Value Report January 2024). Continuous increase in the number of children and young people with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) has led to the significant overspend in the High Needs Block.

There are steps are in place to reduce the steep trajectory of requests for statutory assessment and resulting EHCPs including:

* supporting early years settings and schools to manage without triggering the statutory process.
* developing an early intervention programme in pre-school, which will support stakeholders to meet need without an EHCP when they attend school.
* introducing a Tower Hamlets inclusion framework to guide schools on what is expected as ordinarily available provision and SEN support.

11 out of 32 London LAs were in the DfE Safety Valve Programme. Tower Hamlets was in the Delivering Better Value (DBV) Programme which was an intermediate programme.

A Member expressed their concern regarding the HNB budgetary pressures and commented that without adequate funding it will not be possible to deliver the early interventions which have been discussed. Pauline Maddison (PM) agreed and stated that the available resources would be used to support early intervention and Early Years Support. The funding from the DBV is £1 million and it was very clear that the area of focus would be Early Years. The view was that appropriate EY interventions in place would result in fewer referrals in later years. The focus from other teams such as Health was also on EY.

A Member asked for further clarity on how these would be achieved. PM replied that 2 part time consultant specialist in High Needs have been appointed to support this. They will review how funding is spent and why. They will also be delivering training for school leaders. A training may be organised for the Schools Forum and may cover what the HNB is, and what the limitations are and what strategies have been identified.

A Member asked what happens to the Schools Block surplus. PM replied that as the LA has a deficit, there was no obligation to ringfence the budget. SW added that the LA maximised all funding through the National Funding Formula (NFF) and the Authority Proforma Tool (APT) directly to schools.  After this any headroom (unallocated) is available for growth only.

A Member commented that parents are informed that schools will sort out Speech and Language Therapy for children, however schools were paying for this out of their own budgets. Many children needed intervention before they start school. PM replied that the focus will be to provide early intervention to reduce statutory intervention later on and ensure children are ready to start school.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: Contingency Fund Update**

Presenting: Terry Shaw

The Chair introduced the item and commented that the Contingency Fund had not been monitored effectively by the Schools Forum previously. There has been a lack of clarity in previous years on what the Contingency Fund is specifically meant to fund, with Schools Finance, Schools Forum and Schools not in agreement on what the fund was meant to cover

A report setting out the Contingency Fund income and expenditure from 2021-2022 to 2023-2024 and the income and year to date expenditure for the current financial year was circulated to all. The Chair thanked Terry Shaw for the report and the clarity it provided.

Terry Shaw explained that the Department for Education Scheme for Financing Schools states ‘The local authority can retain a central budget within the schools’ budgets to fund the costs of new early retirements or redundancies by a deduction from maintained school budgets, excluding nursery schools, only where the relevant maintained school members of the Schools Forum agree.

On that basis, the LA and Schools Forum have previously agreed that relevant expenditure would include:

* Exceptional unforeseen costs which it would be unreasonable to expect governing bodies to meet
* Schools in financial difficulty
* Additional costs relating to reorganised or closing schools
* Funding for Schools HR project

Overspends or underspend within the three years from 2021-2022 to 2023-2024 have been treated in the same manner as overspends or underspends in other areas of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in that they have been consolidated at financial year end due to the Dedicated Schools Grant carrying an ongoing cumulative deficit.

A Member suggested that the Contingency Fund be used to support schools making a Licensed Deficit Application (LDA), by paying for the cost of the SLA (£7,000) these schools were required to take out. The Chair proposed that the Contingency Fund be used to cover this cost for the 2024-2025 academic year only.

SW informed the Forum that only primary, secondary and special schools contributed to the Contingency Fund, and this would only be applicable to them. This would exclude nurseries. The Chair asked if nurseries could be included as an exception. SW replied that this would be the decision of the SF, however, they had previously chosen to exclude post-16 provisions.

The Chair stated that this proposal to support those schools making a LDA cover the cost of the Schools Finance SLA, would be considered for the 2024-25 financial year only. As all schools have already de-delegated this budget, this will mean no loss to schools. Going forward a discussion will need to be had about where school sustainability will fit in.

The Schools Forum agreed to pay the £7,000 SLA cost, to support schools with a LDA, from the Contingency Fund.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: Trade Union Facility Time Update**

PRESENTING: Chair

Staff costs supply cover (for trade union and public duties) ensures that representatives are available to enable schools to participate in collective bargaining and consultation processes. By accompanying staff to formal meetings enables schools to progress formal actions under HR Procedures.

The current Trade Union Facilities Time funding does not reflect the full cost of releasing staff from school. The daily cost to schools does not reflect the actual cost to schools. An agreement needs to be reached about how the budget is allocated to the trade unions. In July, the SF was asked if the Contingency Fund could be used to cover the shortfall until the issue was resolved. The Chair clarified that this was not a decision for the SF, whose only responsibility is to allocate the budget.

The Chair proposed that a HR Consultant be appointed to verify the membership of TUs, benchmark across other LAs and draft a proposal for how the Trade Union Facilities Time budget is allocated between the trade unions. The Chair recommended that the Contingency Fund be used to fund this piece of work. Trade unions would also have to agree that they will follow the recommendations in the report produced by the Consultant as the SF needs to know that this money will lead to a decision that will be followed, and the situation will be resolved.

A Governor Member commented that their school was impacted by this at a cost of approximately £11,000 paid from the school’s own budget. The school also has an LDA, and this was impacting the school greatly. The Member proposed that the Contingency Fund is also used to top up the difference for schools affected by this for the 2024-25 year. The Chair stated that more detailed figures would be needed, and this could be discussed at the January Schools Forum Meeting.

A Member asked if Special Schools had agreed to contribute. Veronica Armson replied that Special Schools had agreed to the de-delegation and will contribute by a multiplier of three of the mainstream rate for TU Facilities Time.

Natasha Chaudhury (NC), TU representative to the Schools Forum, commented that the management of the funding issues had damaged the reputation of TUs and how they supported members and managed their workload. TUs were keen to resolve this. NC added that the uncertainty of the funding has impacted the commitments she was able to make in January in relation to TU work.

A Member asked what would happen if some unions did not agree to the recommendations in the report. The Chair replied that if some unions did not agree to follow the recommendations, then there would be no point in appointing a consultant. Prior agreement from the unions will be required before appointing a consultant.

The Schools Forum agreed to fund the appointment of a HR Consultant from the Contingency Fund subject to agreement from the trade unions that they will honour the recommendations made by the Consultant.

SW clarified that the recommendations would be implemented for the 2025-26 year and asked what the plan for this year was. The Chair replied that further information on this was required. This will be reviewed in January.

NC asked if funding for the NEU rep was confirmed for January-April 2025. Lisa Fraser confirmed that the funding was confirmed and had been related to the HT of the relevant school.

**AGENDA ITEM 7:** De-delegation of Behaviour support

PRESENTING: Kerri Marriner

Behaviour support services are offered to schools dealing with challenging behaviour; mental health and parental conflict; and increase in complexity due to lack of specialist advice. The team also providing training and support for attendance issues. The funding is both statutory, via bought-in service level agreement (SLA), and the de-delegated budget supporting the provision. The de delegation total will meet the cost of the SLA.

Schools Forum will be asked to vote on two options:

Option 1 - to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7%. This would increase the per pupil rate as shown in the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **De-delegated Item** | **2024-2025 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Primary Schools** | **2024-2025 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Secondary Schools** | **2024-2025****Per Pupil Rate Special Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Primary Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Special Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Special Schools** |
| Behaviour Support Services | £4.48 | £7.71 | £0.00 | £4.55 | £7.84 | £0.00 |

Option 2 - to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by an exceptional increase of 19.03% to cover the increase in the salaries and on-costs of the two Inclusion Support Teachers. This would increase the per pupil rate as shown in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **De-delegated Item** | **2024-2025 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Primary Schools** | **2024-2025 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Secondary Schools** | **2024-2025****Per Pupil Rate Special Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Primary Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Maintained Special Schools** | **2025-2026 Per Pupil Rate Special Schools** |
| Behaviour Support Services | £4.48 | £7.71 | £0.00 | £5.42 | £9.33 | £0.00 |

The de-delegated services for Behaviour Support Services are applicable to maintained primary and secondary schools only as this service is not accessed by special schools.

**AGENDA ITEM 8: De-delegation Consultation Proposals 2025-26**

PRESENTING: Terry Shaw

Terry Shaw (TS) presented the de-delegated services for the financial year 2024-25.

Special Schools Contribution to de-delegation

TS explained that Schools block “de-delegation” does not apply to special schools or PRUs funded from the High Needs block, but the DfE have an expectation that similar services should be offered to special schools on a chargeable basis. Not having done this in the past has led to confusion in the central support offer, therefore the LA is proposing to extend the same services to special schools excluding behaviour support - which is accounted for in the place funding / top-up funding of the high needs base.

In 2025-2026 the charge for special schools would use the mainstream rate multiplied by the number of places (weighted x 3) rather than pupil numbers for Trade Union Facilities Time and Contingency Fund and the number of places for Free School Meals (FSM) Eligibility Assessment. The weighting is less than the overall funding differential between mainstream & special phases and more in the region of DfE grant funding differential.

A Member asked if special schools at other LAs de-delegated for services. TS replied that no other LAs de-delegated for the Contingency Fund.

TS informed the SF that special schools had agreed the following:

* **Free School Meals (FSM) Eligibility Assessment** to be charged at a multiplier of one as this is based on pupil numbers.
* **Trade Union Facilities Agreement (TUFA) Time** to be charged at a multiplier of three to reflect the higher staffing ratios in special schools.
* Special schools should not be included for **Additional School Improvement** and **Behaviour Support** as these services are not accessed by special schools.

The special schools were not opposed to being charged three times for the Contingency Fund. However, schools wanted further information of the costs relating to each element of expenditure to ensure that these related to all schools and not only to mainstream schools.

The Chair proposed that the Contingency Fund be charged at a multiplier of one for special schools.

Schools Forum agreed that special schools be charged at a multiplier of one for the Contingency Fund.

Free School Meal (FSM) Eligibility

The Education Service has a service level agreement (SLA) with the Housing Benefit service, who manage the eligibility assessment/checking of pupils for free school meals and notifies individual schools on a regular basis of their pupils’ eligibility. Providing this service centrally means that efficiencies can be gained. Administration at individual school level would be burdensome as entitlement checking would have to be done manually. The service also conducts campaigns on behalf of schools, resulting in increased take up. The de delegation total will meet the cost of the SLA.

The Local Authority is proposing to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7%, from £4.18 to £4.25 per pupil.

A Member asked how many families had discovered that they were eligible for FSM through this scheme. What was the impact of this? A HT replied that their school received information on eligible families even though they thought that their checks within the schools were thorough.

A Member asked why the work from the ‘auto-enrolment’ had not continued. LF replied that auto-enrolment had been a piece of work which took place when universal FSM was rolled out and generated an additional £1.8million for school. The FSM Eligibility SLA was separate to the auto-enrolment.

Additional School Improvement Services

School improvement services are provided for schools following the phasing out of the Schools Moderation and Brokering grant. This allows the local authority to monitor and support performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision and provide intervention to raise standards and is to be fully passported to an Education Partnership.

The local authority is proposing to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7%. This would increase the per pupil rate from £6.20 to £6.31.

Trade Union Facilities Time

The local authority’s proposal to Schools Forum for 2025-2026 is to uplift the 2023-2024 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7%, from £5.33 to £5.42 for maintained schools, and £15.99 to £ 16.26 for special schools.

Contingency Fund

Terry Shaw clarified that it was identified that there was some post 16 review expenditure incorrectly coded to the Contingency Fund, and this has now been coded elsewhere.

The Contingency Fund has underspent in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 in excess of £300k and is projected to do so in 2024-2025. At year end in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, the underspend has been offset against the DSG Deficit, which has helped the Local Authority and its settings to reduce the financial pressure it is facing under the DfE’s Delivering Better Value (DBV) Programme.

The report set out detail of the projected expenditure expected in 2025-2026. Three options were provided for the Schools Forum to consider:

* Option 1 - to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7% and redistribute any underspend to the de-delegated schools on a pro-rata per pupil basis. This would increase the per pupil rate from £16.19 to £16.47.
* Option 2 - to uplift the 2024-2025 per pupil rate by the current Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation rate of 1.7% and use any underspend to offset the DSG Deficit at year end. This would increase the per pupil rate as shown in the table below with the same rates as Option 1.
* Option 3 – to reduce the per pupil rate to provide funding only for the £126k projected to be spent from the Contingency Fund. Based on the 2024-2025 pupil numbers of 17,879 for primary maintained schools, 9,274 for secondary maintained schools and 985 for special schools, this would reduce the per pupil rate to £4.20 for maintained primary and secondary schools and to £12.60 for special schools

The decision on these proposed de-delegated rates has to be made in January 2025.

Kerri Marriner informed the Schools Forum that two BASS team members had resigned, however the current funding rates did not allow the staff members to be replaced. This will mean that the service will have to shrink, or the de-delegation rate will need to increase. This was against the context of a 25% increase in referrals made to the team. The Chair agreed to discuss this with headteachers at the next Consultative Meetings and requested an outline of the support which will be available to schools with each option.

Action: an outline of the BASS support which will be available to schools with each de-delegation option.

A Member asked if the team would experience reduced capacity even with an uplift in the de-delegation. KM confirmed that this would be the case.

A Member commented that there was an underspend in the Contingency Fund and asked why schools were contributing more to that fund and not to Behaviour Support.

**AGENDA ITEM 9: School Roll Projections and School Sustainability Reviews**

PRESENTING: Catherine Grace

Catherine Grace gave an update on the support provided to schools at risk in terms of finances and schools with an LDA.

The School Organisation Strategy Group (SOSG) was born out of the School Organisation and Capital Investment Strategy (SOCIS), in response to volatility in pupil numbers.

Schools at potential risk are identified annually based on a number of identifiers and risk indicators. Identified schools are then contacted and discussions about support for risk mitigation and sustainability planning take place.

Last year 18 schools were identified, this was reduced to 9 schools based on budget outturns and 3-year budget plans. Consultants were engaged to support schools with the application for Licensed Deficit Agreements, and support with financial planning. This support will continue for 3 years.

Conversations are also taking place with some schools on organisational change such as partnerships, teaching and staffing models, and potential new income streams for schools.

This year a further 17 schools were identified, this included academies.

A Member commented that PFI contracts are road blockers for income generation, and wondered if the affected schools included schools with PFI contracts.

The Chair asked how the school sufficiency support, expected to continue for 3 years, would be funded going forward, and if a Falling Rolls Fund could be used to fund this. SW replied that the Falling Rolls Fund was only for short-term drop in pupil numbers, not for long term planning.

**AGENDA ITEM 10: Update from working groups**

PRESENTING: Chair

There were no updates from working groups.

 **AGENDA ITEM 12: Date of Next Meeting**

Laura Worsley requested name cards for all members.

The date of the next meeting was the 15 January 2025.

*The meeting ended at 10:20*

Summary of action points

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** | **Responsible** |
| 2 | Check that David Waller has been added to the School Business Managers (SBM) Working Group. | Terry Shaw/Sara Walsingham |
| 2 | Add the dates of the SBM meeting dates to the Work Plan. | Salma Siddiqua |
| 3 | Propose what information the SF receives and when in order to discharge its responsibilities fully. Review the current workplan.  | Chair |
| 6 | Provide more detail of schools affected by the Trade Union Facilities Time budget shortfall. | Pauline Maddison |
| 8 | Provide a detailed outline of the BASS support which will be available with each de-delegation option. outline of the BASS support which will be available to schools with each de-delegation option. | Kerri Marriner |