

**MINUTES OF THE OF THE SCHOOLS' FORUM
HELD ON 18 JANUARY 2022
VIRTUAL TEAMS MEETING
(10:00am to 12:00pm)**

Present:	Maintained Primary Representatives	
	Scott Halliwell (SH) (Joint Chair)	HT, Southwood Primary School
	Julie Philips (JP)	HT, Godwin Primary School
	Martin Nicholson (MN)	HT, Grafton Primary School
	Gill Massar (GM)	HT, William Bellamy Primary School
	Richard November (RN)	HT, Valence Primary School
	Simon Abeledo (SA)	HT, Rush Green Primary School
	Junaida Bana (JB)	HT, Furze Infant School
	Maintained Secondary Representatives	
	Tony Roe (TR)	HT, Barking Abbey School
	Vacant	
	Maintained All-through (A/T)	
	Vacant	
	Governor Representatives (1 pri & 1 sec)	
	Vacant	
	Vacant	
	Academy & Free Primary	
	Lisa Shepherd (LS)	HT, Eastbury Primary School
	Academy & Free Secondary	
	Andy Roberts	HT, Riverside School
	Academy & Free Schools (A/T)	
	Vacant	
	Academy Special School Representative	
	Roger Leighton (RL) (Joint Chair)	Chief Executive, Partnership Learning
	Maintained Special Schools Representative	
	Susan Ball (SB)	HT, Trinity School
	Maintained PRU Representative	
	Cathy Stygal (CS)	HT, Mayesbrook Park School
	Early Years Representative	
	John Trow Smith (JTS)	Early Years, Local Authority
	Trade Union Representatives (shared role)	
	Dominic Byrne (DB)	NUT
	John McGill (JMc)	NASUWT
	Church of England Representative	
	David Huntingford (DH)	HT, William Ford C of E Junior School

Catholic Representative

Clare Cantle (CC)

HT, All Saints Catholic School

Also present: Jane Hargreaves (JH), Commissioning Director – Education; Councillor Evelyn Carpenter (CC) – Cabinet Member for Education and Schools; Patricia Harvey (PH) – Senior Professional, High Needs Block; Katherine Heffernan (KH) – Group Manager, Local Authority Finance and Investment; Shaj Sivadasan (SS) – Principal Accountant, Schools - Local Authority Finance; Kofi Adu (KA) – Group Accountant – Local Authority Finance; Caroline Connolly (CC) – Finance Business Partner; Simon Abeledo (SA) – HT, Rush Green Primary School Mairead Pryor (MP) – Warren Junior School; Janet Cassford (JC) – HT, Aspire Virtual School; Holly Pottle – Thomas Arnold Primary School; Grant Krog (GK) – HT, The Leys Primary School; Gurmit Kaur GK, Group Accountant – Local Authority Finance; Davina Nwaizu (DN) – Rush Green School; Elizabeth Bailey (EB) – HT, Erkenwald School; Jamie Bell (JB) – HT, Warren Junior School; Charlotte Mortimer (CM) – Local Authority Finance; Emmanuel Baidoo (EB), Business Partner – Local Authority Finance; Mike Abbot (MA) – LEYF; Mike McKeaveney (MM) – Head of School Performance and Partnerships; Jacqui Dunmow (JD) – Roding Primary School; Jagrutee Jani (JJ) – The Leys Primary School; Sharon White (SW) – Head of Inclusion; Clare Scott (CS), HT – St Peter’s Catholic Primary School, Joy Barter (JB) – Early Years Manager; Davina Nwaizu (DN) – Rush Green Primary School; Chris Harrison (CH), HT George Carey Primary School; Gurmit Kaur (GK), Accountant – Local Authority Finance; Natalie Holden (NH), HT – Marsh Green Primary School and Nichola Young (NY) – Local Authority Minute Clerk.

Mr Roger Leighton chaired the meeting, Mr Scott Halliwell to chair the June 2022 meeting.

1.0	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u>				
	Apologies were received from Andy Roberts, Ronan Fox and John Trow Smith.				
2.0	<u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</u>				
	A declaration was made by RL and MN for the Trade Union duties item.				
3.0	<u>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING</u>				
	3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2021 were confirmed as an accurate record.				
	3.2 Update on actions from <u>previous</u> meetings.				
	No.	Date of Meeting	Item No	Action	Owner
	1	19/10/2021	3.1	<u>National Funding Formula</u> A note about the National Funding Formula to be added into the spring edition of the Director’s report to governors. Ongoing – this will occur in the Spring term.	KH/KA
4.0	<u>REPORT FROM THE GROUP ACCOUNTANT – FINANCE</u>				
	1. <u>Constitution</u>				
	1.1 A minor change was proposed around the reduction of primary representatives by one and the increase of all through representatives by one. The overall number of school representatives will be maintained with a slight change to the makeup.				
	1.2 As there are no primary vacancies, KA to check the membership threshold to see whether it is possible to increase the existing school representatives to 14. Colleagues discussed the possibility of making a conscious agreement to move towards the adjustment rather than altering the constitution which has worked up until now. It was agreed that the number of primary HT representatives will remain as it is,				

	<p>with a move towards 6 next year. KA will check whether 14 is allowed and update at the next meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action</p> <p>Recommendation (i): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note the updated constitution, based on the October 2021 census. (b) Approve consultation with key members for the election of representatives in respect of vacancies</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted and approved</p>	KA
	<p>2. <u>Revised DSG funding for 2021/22, including HNB</u></p> <p>2.1 For noting, no changes on funding allocation reported in December.</p> <p>Recommendation (ii): Schools' Forum are requested to note the:</p> <p>a. Updated DSG allocations for 2021/22</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>3. <u>DSG Outturn Forecast for 2021/22</u></p> <p>3.1 The forecast deficit within the HNB has increased to £2.3m. There is a reduced spend within the Schools Block mainly due revised forecasts on growth fund requirements. There is a planned underspend of £7.5m. see table by 3.2.</p> <p>3.2 There is an underspend within Falling Rolls allocations of £32k. It is recommended that this be carried forward to 2022/23.</p> <p>3.3 The net DSG reserve forecast is £5.6m</p> <p>Recommendation (iii): Schools' Forum is requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note the projected 2021/22 DSG outturn position</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>4. <u>HNB Outturn Forecast for 2021/22</u></p> <p>4.1 There is a significant overspend within the HNB due to the planned use of resources in order to make one off payments for band F/G/H pupils that exceed 1% of the total school population, as agreed at the December forum and the HN Working Group.</p> <p>4.2 There are pressures within post 16 top-ups, SEN panel top-ups, special school funding and OOB schools.</p> <p>4.3 The forecasted deficit within the HNB is just over £2.3m.</p> <p>Recommendation (iv): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note and comment on the 2021/22 High Needs outturn forecast position</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>5. <u>2022/23 Early Years Central Costs</u></p> <p>5.1 Funding allocations were discussed in December where a query was raised around the centrally retained Early Years budget and what the money is used for. This is outlined in section 5 of the Schools' Forum report.</p>	

EY central Costs	2020/21 Central Costs Budgets	2021/22 Central Costs Budgets	No of FTE Staff	Notes
Childminding Development Officers	69,345	73,548	1.6	i
Early Years Teachers Service	522,480	554,134	8.7	ii
Home Portage Scheme	179,293	190,155	7.9	iii
Targeted Support Central Costs DSG	108,630	115,211	0.6	iv
Total	879,748	933,047	18.8	

Recommendation (v): Schools' Forum are requested to note:

- (a) Details of the Early Years central spend budget for 2022/23

Noted

6. DSG Block Allocations for 2022/23

- 6.1 The Schools Block is expecting minimal additional funding. High Needs is benefiting from previous underfunding. Central Services funding is tied to pupil numbers and has increased slightly.
- 6.2 There is a reduction of £148k in the historic element of the central block.
- 6.3 Growth element has decreased by £516k, this is below what was expected and what is felt is needed for next year.

Block	2021/22 Final Allocations	2022/23 Final Allocations	Movement + Fav / (unfav.)
	£000s	£000s	£000s
Schools Block	232,350	238,080	5,730
Premises (historic)	9,992	9,462	(530)
Growth Fund	1,939	1,423	(516)
Total Schools Block	244,281	248,965	4,684
<i>Pupil No</i>	<i>39,847</i>	<i>39,882</i>	<i>35</i>

Block	2021/22 Final Allocations	2022/22 Final Allocations	Movement + Fav / (unfav.)	% change
Schools Block	244,281	248,965	4,684	2%
High Needs	42,557	46,917	4,360	10%
CSSB - On-going	1,620	1,632	12	1%
CSSB - Historic	740	592	(148)	(20%)
Early Years (Prov.)	21,619	21,619	0	
Total DSG Funding	310,817	319,725	8,908	0

Recommendation (vi): Schools' Forum are requested to:

- (a) Note the final 2022/23 DSG allocations
(b) Note the reduction of £516k in growth fund allocation from the DfE
(c) Note the reduction of £148k in historic element of central block

Noted

7. Growth Funding for 2022/23

- 7.1 The total cost of funding growth for September 2023 is provisionally £1,871k, this includes £420k of pupil-led premium uplift. The DfE growth fund allocation is £1,423k, leaving a shortfall of £448k to be met by the schools block. If growth does not

materialize, then the funding will go back into reserves and be carried forward for use in future years.

Recommendation (vii): Schools' Forum are requested to:

- (a) Note the expected shortfall in growth funding allocation for 2022/23
- (b) Agree the centrally held growth fund budget of £1,871m for 2022/23

Noted and approved

8. Falling Rolls Fund for 2022/23

Please refer to Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

- 8.1 Appendix 1 demonstrates a reduction of falling rolls within the primary phase and increases within the secondary phase.
- 8.2 Noted, a significant number of primary schools are seeing a reduction of numbers on roll.
- 8.3 There is a proposal to create a falling rolls fund as done in previous years, using reserves. The current in-year underspend is not going to meet the expected gap. Schools will still need to make planned reductions in budgets.
- 8.4 It was questioned whether support may be available for schools with multiple years of falling rolls.

	£000s
2021/2 b/f (growth fund)	641
In-year underspend (growth fund)	543
Total expected c/f growth fund balance at end of 2021/22	1,184
Of which:	
To retain centrally for future use	500
Falling Rolls in 2022/23	468
2022/23 schools funding formula (22/23 growth)	216
Total	1,184

	£000s
From 2021/22 Growth Fund underspend	468
From 2021/22 Falling Rolls underspend	32
Total	500

Recommendation (viii): Schools' Forum are requested to:

- (a) Approve the proposed use of growth fund underspend (£500k retained centrally for future use), £468k for 2022/23 falling rolls and, £216k for 2022/23 schools' formula
- (b) Approve the creation of the falling rolls budget of £500k for 2022/23 (£468k from growth fund and £32k from falling rolls underspend).

Approved

9. Local Funding Formula for 2022/23

- 9.1 National funding is being moved slightly towards secondary phase. Local policy is to move it back. All pupil led formula factors have remained the same as the national factor apart from AWPUP which has been tweaked to 1:1.35 with a slightly lower secondary factor and higher primary.

- 9.2 Split site allocations are more generous than the national lump sum allocation. When the funding formula comes in full, schools will lose a significant portion of funding.
- 9.3 The proposal is for MFG to be 2%, in line with national policy, with no capping or scaling. Budgets may reduce with falling rolls. Noted, the 2% MFG will not cover the increase in national insurance contributions.

Please refer to appendix 2 which outlines provisional budgets for next year.

- 9.4 Some schools are expected to face a difficult year. FMG activity is expected to increase.

- 9.5 There was a high level of consultation responses. Please refer to Appendix 4.

Recommendation (ix): In respect of 2022/23 formula funding, Schools' Forum are requested approve:

- (a) The primary secondary ratio of 1:1.35 in the final funding model
- (b) The proposed AWPU and pupil led unit factor rates
- (c) No capping and scaling
- (d) The maximum MFG for +2%
- (e) Schools' Forum are requested to note the consultation responses

Schools' Forum formally approve the overall formula and the funding rates - **Approved and noted.**

10. De-delegation

- 10.1 Schools' Forum maintained mainstream school representatives are required to vote and approve delegation rates and amounts phase by phase. There will be votes for Primary Schools and Secondary schools, all through schools will be required to vote twice. Trinity will contribute via the HNB rather than the schools block.

- 10.2 The below table demonstrates lines within de-delegation. There is a proposal to add a new delegation for School Improvement to offset the anticipated reduction of £84k in grant income. If approved, the overall delegation will increase by £50k. There are no proposals to increase the budget in any areas apart from School Improvement.

	2021/22 Primary De-delegations			2022/23 Primary De-delegation			
	Primary Pupil Nos	Unit Rate	Total Amount	Primary Pupil Nos	Unit Rate	Total Amount	Movt
Contingencies	19,981	3.64	72,790	19,737	2.51	49,540	(23,250)
LSCB	19,981	1.39	27,800	19,737	1.39	27,434	(366)
Trade Union	19,981	8.38	167,014	19,737	8.37	165,199	(1,815)
FSM Eligibility	19,981	0.84	16,765	19,737	0.84	16,579	(186)
Sch. Improve.				19,737	2.81	55,461	55,461
Primary Total:		14.23	284,369	98,885	15.92	314,155	29,844

	2021/22 Secondary De-deleg.			2022/23 Secondary De-dele.			
	Secondary Pupil Nos	Unit Rate	Total Amount	Secondary Pupil Nos	Unit Rate	Total Amount	Movt.
Contingencies	9,830	3.64	35,810	10,044	2.51	25,210	(10,600)
LSCB Board	9,830	1.39	13,677	10,044	1.39	13,961	284
Trade Union	9,830	8.36	82,166	10,044	8.37	84,068	1,902
FSM Eligibility	9,830	0.84	8,248	10,044	0.84	8,437	189
Sch. Improve.				10,044	2.81	28,224	28,224
Sec. Total:		14.23	139,901		15.92	159,900	19,999

2022/23 Academy Charges (to be invoiced)									
	Total 2021/22	Primary NOR	Unit Rate	Primary Total:	Sec. NOR	Unit Rates	Sec. Total	TOTAL 2022/23	Movt
LCSB	13,563	4,757	1.39	6,612	5,355	1.39	7,443	14,056	493
Trade Union	81,431	4,757	8.37	39,816	5,355	8.37	44,821	84,637	3,206
	94,994			46,428			52,265	98,693	3,699

	21/22 De-del.	22/23 Total De-del.	21/22 Acad Invoiced	22/23 Acade Invoiced
Contingencies	108,600	74,750	0	0
LSCB	41,477	41,398	13,563	14,056
Trade Union	249,180	249,267	81,431	84,637
FSM Elig.	25,013	25,016	0	0
Sch. Improv	0	83,685	0	0
Total	424,270	474,114	94,994	98,693

10.3 Academies contribute towards Trade union and LSGB (Local Safeguarding Board) and are invoiced at the same rate.

Recommendation (x): Schools' Forum are requested to:

- (a) Approve by phase (maintained schools only), the delegation rates and amounts
- **Maintained primary and all through schools – all lines approved**
 - **Maintained secondary and all through schools – all lines approved.**
- (b) Note rates to be used for billing academies
- **Noted. Academies will be charged the same rate. They are able to opt out of trade unions but will then need to make their own arrangements if needed.**

11. Trade Union Duties

Two HT associations declared an interest in this item.

11.1 The model of funding not been looked at for a number of years, there is a proposal to conduct a review of the current arrangements. This will take some time and will be via a proper process of consultation and engagement. The proposal is to maintain the funding in 2022-23 with schools receiving the current level of funding, and to amend in 2023-24.

11.2 Academies pay a contribution; the rest comes from de-delegation.

11.3 The chair recommended that in-depth discussions should be avoided at this meeting and should take place at the review where historical facts can be considered.

11.4 The consultation needs to have been completed for the Autumn 2022 Schools' Forum. The consultation is being handed over to HR and the school professionals

	<p>associations. At the HT pre-meet, it was agreed that the review is best organised by an independent chair/facilitator. The LA are seeking advice from Gail Clark and agreed that it would be beneficial to seek external advice and support.</p> <p>11.5 DB requested that the current agreement around facility time in place between the council and all recognised trade unions, feature as part of the review to ensure all trade unions are treated equally.</p> <p>11.6 Schools Forum members agreed that consideration needs to be given to how special schools make a contribution where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation (xi): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note the proposed review of funding for trade union duties</p>	
	<p>12. <u>School Improvement and Brokerage</u></p> <p>12.1 There is a proposal to remove the School Improvement (SI) budget and make it a de-delegation. The government have proposed to remove the SI brokerage grant. SI was kept outside of the DSG and received a separate grant for it for services that LAs have to carry out. This has now been removed in line with their intention to reduce the role of the LA, suggesting this should be replaced with approval of local schools with de-delegation.</p> <p>12.2 Half of the SI brokerage grant (maintained schools only) will be lost this year. £2.81 per pupil delegation is being proposed to account for the loss of £85k which is half of the SI grant to carry out services listed in appendix 5.</p> <p>12.3 Double funding issues were raised by HTs in the pre-meet who felt that Appendix 5 did not provide enough information as to what the money goes towards. HTs requested more information on which services cover all schools and which cover maintained schools as the proposal is for maintained schools only. HTs expressed reservations about signing off this item due to concerns around schools paying for services twice. The LA confirmed that no one is paying twice, and that analysis will be provided to show that the £168k is used to support maintained schools only, HTs agreed to this proposal following the LA's assurance. The key elements and costings of the BDSIP specification to be provided.</p> <p>Recommendation (xii): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note the update on funding arrangements for school improvement function for 2022/23</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Action MM</p> <p>Noted</p>
	<p>13. <u>High Needs Budget for 2022/23</u></p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 6</p> <p>13.1 The High Needs Budget has received one of the largest uplifts.</p> <p>13.2 There are ongoing pressures within post 16. The budget has been redistributed to support inflation and payroll costs, provisional allocations in terms of pressures have been examined, post 16 has been increased, special schools have been looked at, and commissioned places are being considered due to lag funding.</p> <p>13.3 The DfE have commissioned a big piece of work in terms of SEN pressures due to LA overspend within the HNB.</p>	

	<p>13.4 Due to the budget increase and the restriction on ARP expansion, the LA are looking at providing funding to support ISPs (In School Provisions) in schools which have rooms that support SEN children in mainstream schools with complex needs which cannot be met in the mainstream classroom. This is to avoid schools having to apply repeatedly for Top Up and to support access to a qualified teacher. The criteria around support for ISPs have not yet been finalised. Around £1m has been earmarked within the HNB to support this initiative.</p> <p>13.5 The HNB working group are working with health around joint commissioning with SALT and occupational therapists</p> <p>13.6 JH advised SF that the LA are seeing an uplift in the number of independent non-maintained places being issued to children due to special schools being full. The LA policy is to place children locally and as close to mainstream as is appropriate. We recognise the pressure on specialist places locally at the moment and are working to create more. However, increases in placements in the independent sector will impact on the overall HNWB and potentially make a demand on the contingency.</p> <p>13.7 HTs are grateful for the additional funding allocated to schools to support high needs children and the work undertaken by Nadia and Mike around staff training. They advised that questions need to be asked around the appropriateness of placements for some children and whether needs are being met. The point was made that schools are at crisis point and reported that the high number of children with complex needs is impacting the rest of the school community.</p> <p>13.8 The budget does not technically need to be approved, please refer to Appendix 6– for comment and noting.</p> <p>Recommendation (xiii): Schools' Forum are requested to note:</p> <p>(a) The update on High Needs budgets for 2022/23</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>14. <u>Update on Funding for Schools</u></p> <p>14.1 Funding for the National Insurance increase will come separately, will be funded via a formula linked to NoR and pupil premium, Allocation will be received some time in Spring.</p> <p>Recommendation (xiv): Schools' Forum are requested to note:</p> <p>(a) The supplementary grant for 2022/23</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>15. <u>Replacement of Council's Oracle General Ledger and HR/Payroll System</u></p> <p>15.1 The change of the council's financial system will occur at the same time at the same as year-end. Schools are urged to be aware of information sent out about the new HR and Finance systems. It is important that schools close in advance of year end and meet the time table which will shortly be provided by Finance.</p> <p>Recommendation (xv): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Note the update on replacement for Oracle and HR/Payroll systems (b) Note the timescales for maintained schools' closure of account</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Noted</p>	
	<p>16. <u>AOB</u></p>	

	<p>16.1 A high proportion of underspend from previous years has been related to Early Years. The LA are aware of gaps in provision and attainment between the most disadvantaged children and others. Some of the most disadvantaged children do not receive the full 30 hours of education when they turn 3. A proposal was received from the London EY Foundation to use some of the accumulated underspend in an initial targeted pilot to provide an additional 15 hours of education.</p> <p>16.2 The pilot will be targeted towards children from disadvantaged backgrounds. The proposed indicators, which can be amended, are those known to social care, children with EHC plans or those with older siblings who are causing concern which may indicate that the family is under stress and strain. This will be implemented by increasing attendance at the current setting with the view of starting in the summer term if SF are in agreement.</p> <p>16.3 The cost for 50 children is approximately 50k per term. This scheme is being proposed as a pilot to evaluate how much difference it makes. Early Years will work with providers to help identify these children.</p> <p>16.4 CH advised that whilst in support of the scheme, colleagues should be mindful that vulnerable children cost significantly more in terms of the support required and that additional support staff may be required. JB noted this comment and advised that there is capacity for additional support for SEN children.</p> <p>16.5 An evaluation of the impact to be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation (xvi): Schools' Forum are requested to:</p> <p>(a) Approve a pilot of 50 children, to start between February half term and Easter until the end of the summer term, targeted at 3 & 4 year olds using the criteria discussed, to be funded by drawing down on the reserves. The cost will be between £50 to £75k.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Approved</p> <p>Cllr Carpenter is not proposing to stand in the May elections and expressed her thanks to Schools' Forum and HTs for allowing the attendance and observation of meetings and providing papers which gave an understanding and insight into school funding. RL expressed thanks and gratitude on behalf of SF and HTs for CC's hard work and support with Education and finance matters.</p>													
<p>5.0</p>	<p><u>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</u></p> <p>Tuesday 21 June 2022, virtual Teams meeting from 10:00am to 12:00pm. SH to chair the June meeting.</p> <p>Head teachers' pre-meeting will be arranged by NY and will commence at <u>9.15am.</u></p>													
<p>6.0</p>	<p><u>ACTION LOG</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="224 1640 1451 1976"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="224 1640 412 1719">Date of meeting</th> <th data-bbox="412 1640 574 1719">Item No</th> <th data-bbox="574 1640 1235 1719">Action</th> <th data-bbox="1235 1640 1451 1719">Owner</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="224 1719 412 1898">18 January 2022</td> <td data-bbox="412 1719 574 1898">Item 1.2</td> <td data-bbox="574 1719 1235 1898"> <p><u>Constitution</u></p> <p>KA to check the membership threshold to see whether it is possible to increase the existing school representatives to 14 and update at the next meeting.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1719 1451 1898">Kofi Adu</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="224 1898 412 1976">18 January 2022</td> <td data-bbox="412 1898 574 1976"></td> <td data-bbox="574 1898 1235 1976"> <p><u>School Improvement Budget</u></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1235 1898 1451 1976">Mike McKeaveney</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date of meeting	Item No	Action	Owner	18 January 2022	Item 1.2	<p><u>Constitution</u></p> <p>KA to check the membership threshold to see whether it is possible to increase the existing school representatives to 14 and update at the next meeting.</p>	Kofi Adu	18 January 2022		<p><u>School Improvement Budget</u></p>	Mike McKeaveney	
Date of meeting	Item No	Action	Owner											
18 January 2022	Item 1.2	<p><u>Constitution</u></p> <p>KA to check the membership threshold to see whether it is possible to increase the existing school representatives to 14 and update at the next meeting.</p>	Kofi Adu											
18 January 2022		<p><u>School Improvement Budget</u></p>	Mike McKeaveney											

			An analysis to be provided on the key elements and costings of the BDSIP specification to ensure that the £168k supports maintained schools only.		
--	--	--	---	--	--