#### LANCASHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT 10:00 A.M. ON THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER 2019 AT THE EXCHANGE, COUNTY HALL, PRESTON

Present:

#### **Schools Members:**

## Primary School Governors

Ian Ball Stephen Booth (Vice-chair) Gerard Collins Eleanor Hick Lesley Millard Laurence Upton Robert Waring

#### **Primary School Headteachers**

Daniel Ballard Sarah Barton Jenny Birkin Neil Gurman Brendan Hassett Deanne Marsh Lucy Sutton

#### **Secondary School Governors**

John Davey Brian Rollo Lorimer Russell-Hayes

#### **Secondary School Headteachers**

Ivan Catlow Mark Jackson Jan Marshall

#### Academy Governor Chris McConnachie Helen Dicker Louise Shaw

Academy Principal/Headteacher Gaynor Gorman Alan Porteous

#### **Alternative Provision Academy**

#### **Special School Academy**

Special School Governor Laura Brennan

**Special School Headteacher** Peter Higham Shaun Jukes (Chair)

## Short Stay Governor

Sandra Thornberry

#### Short Stay Headteacher Anne Kyle

#### **Nursery School Headteacher**

#### **Nursery School Governor**

#### Members:

Other Voting Members Sam Johnson

**Observers - Members of the Public** Kathleen Cooper

Early Years - PVI Peter Hindle

#### **Observers**

David Fann (NAHT) Eric Harrison (NASUWT) Liz Laverty (ASCL) Sam Ud-din (LASGB) Ian Watkinson (NEU) CC Jayne Rear

In attendance:	Helen Belden	For Item	
	Paul Bonser		
	Andrew Good	6	Paul Duckworth, Head of Service –
	Christine Hurford		Education, Quality and Performance
	Stephen Martin		(Acting) and Lynsey Austen, South
	Robert Rimmer		Primary Area Team Leader,
	Kevin Smith		Education, Quality & Performance
		7	Sally Richardson, Head of Inclusion
Observing:	Sam Parker Democratic Services		Service
-	Neil Smith Schools Finance	9	Hannah Regan, Nat West Bank

As agreed at the last meeting, Shaun Jukes took the Forum Chair for the 2019/20 and 2020/21 academic years.

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from: Cathryn Antwis, Janice Astley, Chris Bagguley, Sandra Blight, Steve Campbell, CC Anne Cheetham, Thelma Cullen, CC David Foxcroft, Katrina Gale, Julie Gordon, Jan Holmes, Michelle Howard, Angela Johnstone, Louise Martin, CC Jennifer Mein, Michelle O'Neill, Ken Wales, Tim Warren, CC Phillippa Williamson and Jill Wright.

## 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Forum agreed the minutes of the last meeting held on 4 July 2019 as a correct record.

## 3. FORUM MEMBERSHIP

A report was presented setting out the Forum membership changes since the last meeting.

New members joining the Forum at the start of the new academic year were welcomed:

- Ian Ball, a governor from Euxton CE Primary School;
- Michelle O'Neill, a governor at Lytham CE Primary School.
- Cathryn Antwis, headteacher at Frenchwood Primary School;
- Jenny Birkin, headteacher at Adlington Primary School;
- Katrina Gale, headteacher at Yealand CE Primary School;
- Neil Gurman, headteacher at St Mary's CE Primary School, Rawtenstall;
- Deanne Marsh, headteacher at Bacup St Saviour's Primary School;
- Lorimer Russell-Hayes, a governor from Penwortham Girls High School;
- Laura Brennan, a governor at Wennington Hall School;
- Peter Higham, headteacher of Great Arley School;
- Jan Holmes, Headteacher of Walton Lane Nursery School;
- Gaynor Gorman, Principal at Lostock Hall Academy;
- Helen Dicker, Chair of Trustees at Endeavour Learning Trust.

It was also noted that Patricia Eastham had resigned from the Forum. Arrangements were in being made to find a replacement and an election process is currently taking place.

## The Forum:

a) Noted the report;

b) Thanked Patricia Eastham for her contribution to the Forum;

c) Welcomed Ian Ball, Michelle O'Neill, Cathryn Antwis, Jenny Birkin, Katrina Gale, Neil Gurman, Deanne Marsh, Laura Brennan, Peter Higham, Jan Holmes, Gaynor Gorman and Helen Dicker to their first Forum meeting; d) Welcomed Lorimer Russell-Haves back to the Forum

d) Welcomed Lorimer Russell-Hayes back to the Forum

## 4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting held on 4 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record

## 5. MATTERS ARISING

## • Apprenticeship Levy

Forum members who had raised specific questions/queries about the apprenticeship levy had received direct contact from the Apprenticeship Levy team in response their queries.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SCHOOLS BLOCK WORKING GROUP

A report was presented setting out the recommendations from the Schools Block Working Group held on 24 September 2019.

## *i.* Update to Bank Account Guidance

The County Council has been reviewing the Guidance Notes for the Operation of Schools Local Bank Accounts, which included a proposal to introduce a Cash Flow Advance Loan proforma, and sought Forum views about revised charges for 2020/21.

• Set up a new school bank account – Proposed 2020/21 Charge £1,000

A charge of £1,000 will be made prior to 31 March in the year of application. In addition to the existing training and support, schools will receive extra support from a nominated schools finance officer in operating a new bank account. This support will include:

- Onsite training prior to 31 March;
- First two months reconciliation to Oracle and submission of month end files to the Authority.

This enhanced service, which includes additional on-site support from SFS, should enable schools to transition more smoothly into the operation of their new bank account without placing considerable unscheduled demands on the service.

• Annual maintenance charge for operating a school bank account. – Proposed 2020/21 Charge £500

An annual maintenance charge of £500 will be made via invoice in May each year.

Members sought clarification of the services provided, which included reconciling local bank records into the county council's accounts, investigation and correction of errors, reconciling payroll, ensuring completion of statutory VAT returns, offering support and guidance etc.

The Working Group

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Supported the proposed bank account charges from April 2020.

A copy of the updated bank account guidance was provided for members.

## *ii.Schools Block Funding 2020/21*

This report provided information on Government announcements about an additional £14b of funding between 2020/21 and 2022/23, 'for 5-16 schools' and some DfE consultations.

Key Headlines were:

Future minimum pupil funding (MPF) levels for primary and secondary schools:

- For secondary schools, the MPF level will be £5,000 per pupil from 2020/21 (compared to £4,800 per pupil in 2019/20);
- The primary school MPF level will rise to £3,750 per pupil in 2020/21 and to £4,000 per pupil in 2021/22 (compared to £3,500 per pupil in 2019/20).
- Schools Block funding factors are expected to increase by 4% over 2019/20 levels, with the exception of:
  - The free school meals factor, which will be increased at inflation as it is intended to broadly reflect actual costs;
  - Premises funding will continue to be allocated at local authority level on the basis of actual spend in the 2019/20, with an RPIX increase for the PFI factor only.
- The funding floor will be set at 1.84% per pupil,
- LAs will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee in local formulae, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%;
- LAs can transfer up to 0.5% of their School Block to other blocks of the DSG, with schools forum approval. To transfer more than this, or any amount without schools forum approval will require DfE approval.

The Government are consulting on 'Extending the Academies Risk Protection Arrangement (RPA) to Local Authority Maintained Schools (LAMS)'.

#### Future Developments

Some brief information about other funding developments in future years has been suggested, which includes:

- Teachers Pay and Teachers Pensions Grants to be included in the NFF from 2021/22;
- Proposals are being considered to pay school rates centrally in future years.

Final Dedicated Schools Grant Allocations for 2020/21 are expected in December 2019.

## The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Encouraged individual members to respond to the RPA consultation if appropriate;
- c) Awaited further information and modelling about the 2020/21 funding arrangements.

Subsequent to the meeting, information was provided about the RPA claims process from an academy that had used the function for different claims types and this feedback had been provided to the LCC insurance team.

## Supplementary Paper on DfE Announcements of 11 October 2019

A supplementary paper was provided for the Forum setting out information on further Government announcements from 11 October 2019. This included provisional Schools Block, High Needs Block and Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) allocations for 2020/21. The Schools Block data was accompanied by 'notional' individual school level allocations for 2020/21 for primary and secondary schools.

The report included comparisons with the 2019/20 DSG budget allocations for the provisional allocations that were available. It was noted that the Lancashire per pupil increase is ranked 75<sup>th</sup> out of 149 LAs nationally.

From the individual school primary and secondary school data, 185 schools are forecast to receive the minimum NFF increase available at 1.84%. The highest per pupil increase for a Lancashire School is 12.6%.

All these allocations must be treated with caution as they are based on October 2018 pupil data.

The accompanying guidance did confirm some final National Funding Formula (NFF) figures for 2020/21, including actual units of funding:

- Actual primary unit of funding (PUF) £4,233
- Actual secondary unit of funding (SUF) £5,276

The DFE have also confirmed the actual NFF values for 2020/21.

We have also received information on the formulaic methodology that will be used from 2020/21 to allocate mobility funding. This formula will be applied to Lancashire school data and it is estimated that it will generate allocations to circa 158 schools.

Modelling will need to be undertaken to assess the impact of the changes around the Lancashire Schools Block allocations for 2020/21, based on the NFF methodology and the additional HNB allocations factoring in the increased cost and demand led pressures.

However, initial analysis suggests that we may be able to issue a formula consultation shortly after half term. This will include:

#### MFG

The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) level in the local formula must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. Our intention is to set a value at 1.84% as this is the level operating in the NFF model.

#### Possible transfer from the Schools Block

Initial estimates suggest that Lancashire will be able to implement the NFF methodology, including the new minimum pupil funding (MPF) levels, no cap on funding gains and the maximum allowable MFG level of + 1.84% in 2020/21.

This may also generate a small amount of Schools Block headroom.

Provisional allocations also provide a significant increase in the level of High Needs Block funding in 2020/21. However, this may only cover the forecast increase in the cost and demand led pressures facing this block.

It is possible that a transfer of headroom only from Schools Block to HNB may allow a funding increase to be provided to special schools and PRUs. The aim of this transfer would be to increase top up funding for these school, by at least 1.84% using the school specific factors in each formulae. This would offer a level of equity with mainstream schools.

Members suggested that any headroom may also assist with pressures in the Early Years Block.

#### Notional SEN calculation

The consultation on the notional SEN calculation previously agreed with Forum will take place as part of the formula consultation.

It was emphasised that a conclusive position can only be modelled after receipt of final DSG allocations in mid December 2019. If the final modelling outcomes were vastly different from those based on provisional data it may be necessary for an additional consultation to take place during a short window in early January 2020.

The Lancashire central school services block (CSSB) allocation will reduce in 2020/21. There is an increase, up to 1.94%, in the formulaic 'Ongoing responsibilities' element of the budget, but the DfE are reducing the funding level for 'historic commitments' by 20%.

## Consultation on changing the dedicated schools grant

The government funding announcements also included a consultation about DSG conditions of grant.

The DfE proposals are that from the end of the 2019/20 financial year, LAs will no longer be able to fund DSG deficits from general funding. This is because the Government are concerned that LAs may make further spending cuts on already pressured LA services to cover DSG overspends. Therefore, in future DSG overspends will be expected to be carried forward and repaid over time through the recovery arrangements recently introduced by DfE for larger DSG deficits. The LA is considering a possible response.

## The Forum:

- a) Noted the supplementary information:
- b) Supported the proposed consultation local formula issues, including a possible headroom transfer from Schools Block to support High Needs and Early Years budget pressures.

#### iii.2020/21 De-Delegation Proposals

Following reports to the Forum in the summer term 2019, the 2020/21 de-delegation consultation had been issued to schools. This report provided more details for the Working Group about the proposals and highlighted the main changes from 2019/20.

## The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report and the interim information provided on the consultation responses to date;
- b) Noted that primary and secondary school members of the Forum would need to formally vote on each of the relevant de-delegation proposals, by phase, at the Forum meeting on 17 October 2019;
- c) Requested that further information be provided around the take up and impact of the Inclusion Hub proposals across all district;
- d) Encouraged individual members to respond to the consultation.

## Supplementary Information

Further information was presented to the Forum in connection with de-delegation considerations for 2020/21, including:

- A final position of the consultation analysis (a copy of this information is attached as Appendix A to the minutes);
- A copy of anonymised consultation comments received to date.
- Additional Primary Inclusion Hubs information

Paul Duckworth, Head of Service – Education, Quality and Performance (Acting) and Lynsey Austen, South Primary Area Team Leader, Education, Quality & Performance attended the meeting to additional Primary Inclusion Hubs information that had been circulated with the Forum papers, setting out feedback on developments in each district, together with some County wide data pupil number and exclusion data.

Members entered into considerable discussion around the de-delegation service offers, analysis of school responses and the supplementary information provided. It was confirmed that the additional funding in the Schools in Financial Difficulty de-delegation for school financial health checks was subject to confirmation and would only be taken if the LA intended to proceed with proposals set out in the consultation document.

## The Forum:

- a) Noted the report, the responses and comments received from schools on possible de-delegation options and the supplementary information provided at the meeting;
- b) Primary school members voted on each of the possible de-delegations affecting primary schools and secondary school members voted on each of the possible de-delegations affecting secondary schools, as set out below. :

i.	Primary school members voted to de-delegate Staff costs – Public
	<b>Duties/Suspensions</b> for primary schools in 2020/21:
	14 Votes for de-delegation
	0 Votes against de-delegation
	1 Abstentions
ii.	Secondary school members voted to de-delegate Staff costs – Public
	Duties/Suspensions for secondary schools in 2020/21:
	O Vetes for de dels ration
	6 Votes for de-delegation
	O Votes against de-delegation
iii.	O Abstentions
	Primary and secondary school members voted on the service level for the <b>Staff costs – Public Duties/Suspensions</b> de-delegation in
	2020/21:
	2020/21.
	<ul> <li>13 Votes to continue with 2019/20 policy;</li> </ul>
	1 Vote to continue but with a reduce Trade Union Facilities Time
	contribution;
	0 Votes to continue but with no Trade Union Facilities Time
	contribution;
	O Abstentions

iv.	Primary school members voted to de-delegate the <b>Museum Service</b> for primary schools in 2020/21:
	14 Votes for de-delegation
	<ul> <li>0 Votes against de-delegation</li> </ul>
	0 Abstentions
v.	Primary school members voted to de-delegate <b>Schools In Financial</b> <b>Difficulty,</b> including the financial health check proposals, for schools for primary schools in 2020/21:
	14 Votes for de-delegation
	0 Votes against de-delegation
	O Abstentions
vi.	Secondary school members voted to de-delegate <b>Schools In Financial</b> <b>Difficulty,</b> including the financial health check proposals. for secondary schools in 2020/21:
	6 Votes for de-delegation
	<ul> <li>0 Votes against de-delegation</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>O Abstentions</li> </ul>
vii.	Primary school members voted to de-delegate the <b>Primary Inclusion</b> <b>Hubs</b> for primary schools in 2020/21:
	13Votes for de-delegation
	<ul> <li>1 Vote against de-delegation</li> </ul>
	O Abstentions

c) Requested a further update around Primary Inclusion Hubs in summer term 2020, including any secondary school developments.

## iv.Split Site Policy Update

Following a review of the Lancashire split site criteria, a revised criteria for the allocation of split site funding was agreed by the Forum at the January 2019 meeting. Information was provided to the Working Group about the eligibility of schools against the revised policy and the application of the 2020/21 transitional protection criteria.

## The Working Group

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Supported the application of the revised split site arrangements.

# v.DfE Consultation Financial transparency of local authority maintained schools and academy trusts

The DfE issued a consultation on 'Financial transparency of LA maintained schools and academy trusts'. The County Council shared a draft response with the Working Group.

## The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Supported the content of the draft LCC consultation response.

The LA response to the consultation has now been submitted.

## vi.High Needs Block Provision Task and Finish Group Report

Members were informed that a report from the LCC High Needs Block Provision Task and Finish Group had been produced and had been agreed by the Cabinet. It was originally intended to share the document with the Forum at this round of meetings, but the report now required revaluation in light of the recent Government funding announcements.

## The Working Group:

a) Noted the report.

## The Forum ratified the Working Group's recommendations.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE HIGH NEEDS BLOCK WORKING GROUP

A report was presented setting out the recommendations from the High Needs Block Working Group from 26 September 2019.

## i. Election of a Chair for the High Needs Block Working Group

Peter Higham, headteacher at Great Arley School, was elected as the new Chair of the High Needs Block Working Group.

## ii. High Needs/Central Schools Services Block Budget Monitoring 2019/20

Summer term 2019/20 data was used to provide monitoring and analysis for the High Needs Block, Central Schools Services Block and Central items. The forecast High Needs Block budget position at 31 March 2020 predicts an overspend of some £2.6m.

It was noted that when considering the 2019/20 Schools Budget, the Forum recommended that a proposal to devalue the Weighted Pupil Number (WPN) rate from the academic year 2019/20 was not taken forward, and it was agreed that the shortfall in funding should be met by the use of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserves. In budget monitoring terms this decision accounts for circa £1.3m of the forecast year end overspend.

The remainder of the forecast overspend related to increased demand and cost pressures across the High Needs Budget. An element of growth was built into the 2019/20 budget and this has been supplemented by savings elsewhere in the original budget. However, the growth figure was always considered to be a conservative estimate of the likely increased demand and was constrained in the original budget setting process by the pressures on the HNB budget envelope.

## The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report and the latest budget monitoring position;
- b) Noted the comments provided around the forecast overspend and that further information would be provided at the Schools Forum in response to certain queries.

As requested by the Working Group further information was provided in the report to the Forum, in connection.

## Out County Expenditure

Information was provided comparing increases in Lancashire Out County expenditure to national trends. It was noted that local and national rises were around the same level.

## Alternative Provision Budget Monitoring

The budget monitoring report presented to the Working Group specified that intervention capping had been introduced in the autumn term at 21 pupils and this has subsequently been updated. The number of intervention places has been capped at 154 funded places. The capping was introduced as a temporary measure, in response to a circa £2m overspend on the PRU budget in 2018/19, until the outcomes from the ongoing AP reviews are published and put into practice.

## iii. High Needs Block Funding 2020/21

Funding announcements from the Prime Minister about school funding included a commitment for £700m extra for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in 2020/21. This report provided initial information about the implications for Lancashire and about a Major Review into Support for Children with Special Educational Needs.

#### The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Noted that more detailed information about the Lancashire implications around funding announcements and government reviews would be provided in due course.

## iv. High Needs Block Provision Task and Finish Group Report

A verbal update on the High Needs Block Provision Task and Finish Group Report was provided for the Working Group, including proposals to develop project plans for each of the options set out in the report agreed by the LCC Cabinet.

The report also made reference to a recent National Audit Office Report: Support for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities in England.

It was noted that the report had been agreed by the LCC cabinet/management team, at it had been intended to provide a copy to this cycle of Forum meetings. However, the proposals now needed to be re-evaluated in light of the recent Government funding announcements.

Further explanation about the implementation of the report recommendations going forward. It was proposed that each of the recommendations would be taken forward as a specific project. Each project would be subject to a project plan, and would have a project lead, a finance contact and a school(s) representative from across phases/sectors. The current recommendation around broadening inclusion hub proposals was highlighted.

By way of further background information, a recent National Audit Office Report: Support for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities in England was provided for members. Comment was made that many of the contributor factors to the financial pressures nationally are similar to those that have been identified in Lancashire.

The Forum Chair also made reference to a recent cabinet report 'Developing the Approach and Provision for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities', which had agreed a '12 point plan'.

The Working Group: a) Noted the report; b) Noted that more detailed information would be provided in due course.

A copy of the 12 recommendations arising from the LCC Cabinet Developing the Approach and Provision for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities report was provided for the Forum.

## The Forum ratified the Working Group's recommendations.

#### **Supplementary Presentation Ensuring Sufficient SEND Provision**

Sally Richardson Head of Inclusion Service attended the Forum for this item

Sally provided information about the review od SEND places in Lancashire, which had been undertaken using principles agreed by the LCC cabinet in August 2019 and a forecast of place need over the next 5 years. This suggested a number of additional places were required, estimated as follows:

- 75% increase in the south (c144 places)
- 20% increase in the east (c45 places)
- 10% increase in the north (20 places)

These figures also factored in a desire to reduce the percentage of pupils that were educated in special schools, so that they were more in line with national averages. Current special school placements in Lancashire are circa 9% above the national average,

Priorities for provision included

- Autistic Spectrum Disorders
- Social Emotional and Mental Health
- Deprivation
- Suitability of provision

This information had been used to develop proposals around the utilisation of some £3.5m of capital funding made available by DfE for Lancashire for SEND provision. Formal proposals had now been developed for submission to DfE as follows

- a) South
  - adapt Sir Tom Finney School
  - circa £1.4 m
- b) East
  - move Broadfield school to Hameldon site
  - circa £3.0 m

It was noted that the additional £0.9m needed above the Lancashire allocation was proposed to be taken from the Lancashire basis need capital allocation.

Members asked a number of questions about the proposals.

#### The Forum:

- a) Noted the information provided;
- b) Expressed support for the proposals.

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EARLY YEARS BLOCK WORKING GROUP

A report was presented setting out the recommendations from the Early Years Block Working Group from 1 October 2019.

## *i.* SEN Inclusion Fund

Information was provided to the Group to indicate that PVI and maintained providers should now have received details of the SEN Inclusion Fund. Members fed back that they did not recall receiving the communications and asked if this information could be checked.

The Working Group:

a) Noted the information provided, but asked if the distribution of the Inclusion Fund information could be checked.

## ii. Early Years Block Budget Pressures

Reports had been presented to previous working group meetings about the financial pressures facing the sector and this report provided an update.

It was noted that the Government had announced an increase early years spending by £66million in 2020/21, but at this stage, we have no further details about how this funding will be allocated or the share that Lancashire may receive.

It was noted that officers intended to continue to raise Lancashire early years finance issues with DfE early years funding officials at national conferences on school funding later in the term. It was also understood that previous evidence submitted to DfE will still be considered as part of future spending reviews. In addition, Lancashire continued to feed into national funding groups through our designated regional representatives.

It was confirmed that the Council continued to monitor the impact of funding pressures on the sufficiency of early years places in the County, which was now being undertaken on a monthly basis. The latest monitoring revealed a small net increase in the number of FEE providers.

#### The Working Group:

- a) Noted the report;
- b) Noted that further information on Early Years Block funding would be provided in due course.

#### *iii.Consultation on Discretionary Payments in the Lancashire Early Education Formula 2 Year Old Funding Arrangements*

The Working Group were provided with a new an update on the consultation on Discretionary Payments in the Lancashire Early Education Formula 2 Year Old Funding Arrangements, together with an interim analysis of the consultation responses and comments, as at 30 September 2019.

#### The Working Group

- a) Noted the report and the consultation responses to date;
- b) Recommended that the Forum support the continuation of the existing criteria in the 2 year old offer that aids discretionary groups.

At the Forum meeting, final analysis of the consultation responses were considered, along with comments. The final analysis is provided below:

a) Continue the existing criteria in the 2 year old offer that supports discretionary groups	40	60.6%
b) Cease support for all the discretionary groups in the 2 year old offer from April 2020	23	34.8%
No response entered	3	4.5%
Total responses	66	

# The Forum supported the Working Group's recommendation to continue the existing criteria in the 2 year old offer that aids discretionary groups.

## iv.Payments for Social Services Supported Children

The Working Group Chair provided a verbal update for members in connection with the payments to providers for Social Services Supported Children.

It was noted that a backlog of payments have now been processed and work is continuing to further improve the procedures and that there was an ongoing review of this process.

#### The Working Group:

- a) Noted the information provided;
- b) Supported the ongoing systems issues being subject to further review.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Chair submitted a list of system issues together with a draft proforma that could possibly be used to provide clarity about relevant payment arrangements that were agreed.

#### The Forum ratified the Working Groups Recommendations.

#### 9. FRAUD AND CYBERCRIME PRESENTATION

Hannah Regan, from NatWest Bank, attended the meeting and provided information on Fraud Prevention and Cybercrime.

#### The Forum

- a) Thanked Hannah for her presentation;
- b) Requested that the Detect and Protect Fraud and Cybercrime document referred to in the presentation be circulated to all Forum members.

#### **10. SCHOOLS FORUM URGENT BUSINESS PROCEDURE**

No decisions had been taken using the Forum urgent business procedure since the last meeting.

#### **11.FORUM CORRESPONDENCE**

There has been no Forum related correspondence since the last meeting.

## **12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

a) Payments for expenses to be done once per cycle not after each meeting It was noted that, in future, members expenses will be made as one payment per Forum cycle.

## b) Advertising on LCC Vacancy Site

Brendan Hassett reported that confirmation had been provided at the BTLS User Group that schools and academies that do not buy into the BTLS payroll service would be allowed access to the LCC vacancy site.

#### c) Neil Smith

Neil is known to many members through attendance at the Forum but also for his work with Schools Financial Services. He is retiring from the authority in December 2019 after 37 years.

Neil worked in the original finance team formed to develop Local Management of School in Lancashire, and has been helping schools with their finances ever since.

#### The Forum

#### a) Noted the AOB;

b) Thanked Neil for his substantial contribution to school funding in Lancashire and wished him well for his retirement.

## **13. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was noted that the next scheduled Forum meeting will be held at 10.00am on 14 January 2019 at County Hall, Preston.

## Appendix A

Question 1: What is your preferre	d de-deleas					
acouon n. what is your preferre	a ac-aciega		Continue but			
			reduce Trade	Continue but		
			Union Facilities	no Trade Union		
	Total	Continue at the	Time	<b>Facilities</b> Time	Completely	
	Responses	2019/20 levels	contribution	contribution	discontinue	Not su
All schools	153	122	19	2	4	
		80%	12%	1%	3%	4
Primary	128	104	14	1	3	
		81%	11%	1%	2%	5
Secondary	14	10	3	0	1	
		71%	21%	0%	7%	0
Other	11	8	2	1	0	
		73%	18%	9%	0%	0
Question 2: Do you support the de	-delegation	n of the Museum	Service in 2020	/212 (Primary sol	hools only)	
desition 2. Do you support the ut						
	Total					
	Responses		No	Not sure		
Primary	128		21	17		
		70%	16%	13%		
Question 3. Do you support the de	e-delegation	n of Support for S	Schools in Finan	cial Difficulty in 2	2020/21?	
Question 3. Do you support the de			Schools in Finan No	cial Difficulty in 2 Not sure	2020/21?	
Question 3. Do you support the de All schools	Total	Yes 110	No 28	Not sure	2020/21?	
	Total Responses 153	Yes 110 <b>72%</b>	No 28 18%	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b>	2020/21?	
	Total Responses	Yes 110 <b>72%</b> 92	No 28 18% 23	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b> 13	2020/21?	
All schools	Total Responses 153	Yes 110 <b>72%</b>	No 28 18%	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b>	2020/21?	
All schools	Total Responses 153	Yes 110 <b>72%</b> 92 <b>72%</b>	No 28 18% 23	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b> 13	2020/21?	
All schools Primary	Total Responses 153 128	Yes 110 <b>72%</b> 92 <b>72%</b>	No 28 18% 23 18%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10%	2020/21?	
All schools Primary	Total Responses 153 128	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b> 13 <b>10%</b> 1	2020/21?	
All schools Primary Secondary	Total Responses 153 128 14	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 7%	2020/21?	
All schools Primary Secondary	Total Responses 153 128 14	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5	Not sure 15 <b>10%</b> 13 <b>10%</b> 1 <b>7%</b> 1	2020/21?	
All schools Primary Secondary Other	Total Responses 153 128 14 14	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 7% 1 9%		
All schools Primary Secondary Other	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 7% 1 9%		
All schools Primary Secondary Other	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9%		
All schools Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the de	Total Responses 153 128 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 'rimary Inclusion No	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21		
All schools Primary Secondary Other	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 7 rimary Inclusion No 38	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 7% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29		
All schools Primary Secondary Other tuestion 4. Do you support the de All schools	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses 153	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45% 45% Yes 86 56%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 45%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 7% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19%	?	
All schools Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the de	Total Responses 153 128 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 5 45% 5 45% 86 86 56% 76	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 45% 7 imary Inclusion No 38 25% 36	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19% 16	?	
All schools Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the de All schools Primary	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses 153 128	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 6 45% 76 59%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 45% 7 imary Inclusion No 38 25% 36 28%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19% 16 13%	?	
All schools Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the de All schools	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses 153	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45% 5 45% 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 7 5 45% 7 5 45% 25% 38 25% 36 28% 1	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19% 16 16 13% 8	?	
All schools Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the de All schools Primary Secondary	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses 153 128 14	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45% 45% 86 55 86 56% 76 59% 5 36%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 45% 7 imary Inclusion No 38 25% 36 28%	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% 1 Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19% 16 13% 8 57%	?	
Primary Secondary Other Question 4. Do you support the do All schools Primary	Total Responses 153 128 14 14 11 e-delegation Total Responses 153 128	Yes 110 72% 92 72% 13 93% 5 45% 45% 45% 86 55 86 56% 76 59% 5 36%	No 28 18% 23 18% 0 0 0% 5 45% 7 5 45% 7 5 45% 25% 38 25% 36 28% 1	Not sure 15 10% 13 10% 1 1 7% 1 9% 1 9% Hubs in 2020/21 Not sure 29 19% 16 16 13% 8	?	