

GAPH Executive Committee Meeting
23.09.22 at 8.30am
Holiday Inn, Barnwood, Gloucester



Present:

CLP: Katie James (KJ), Jon Millin (JM)

GSP: Kerry Cunningham (KC), Helena Armstrong (HA), Steph Matthews (SM), Su Broadhurst (SB)

SAS: Jane Rushton (JR), Dirk van den Broek (DB), Rebecca Gore (RG)

TDP: Mark Bacon (MB), Karen Lewis (KL)

NCSP: Rachel Bradley-McKay (RBM), Kirsty Williams (KW)

SCSP: Julie Fellows (JF), Gordon Soutar (GS)

WGSP: none

1.0	Phil Haslett, Head of Education Strategy and Development	Action
	<i>KC and JF welcomed PH to the meeting of the GAPH Executive Committee, to share details of GCC's Banded Funding Model.</i> PH shared a slide deck on Banded Funding, with a view to getting engagement from HTs in Gloucestershire, with three key strands: ▪ 1 Pilot for Banded Funding ▪ 2 Implementation of Non-Statutory Funding ▪ 3 The 1 in 40 model 1. The Banded Funding Model: PH shared that Cabinet had agreed in January that there would be one banded funding system to provide a single, structured approach to replace 6 or 7 systems that have not, to date, provided equity. The Government's Green Paper says that there will be a national system around this, so this will put Gloucestershire in good stead. The pilot has mapped 300 EHCPs against new descriptors, in readiness for the new system. There has generally been positive feedback. Alongside the descriptors there will be a provision map for the child, as part of the EHCP. Where good examples of provision evolve from this, they can be shared and replicated, with an ambition within GCC to move away from heavy reliance on TAs. Funding is complex for mainstream. In Special Schools, it is a case of mapping a banding system against another banding system. Gary Tricke oversees the provision of funding and has been looking at how each EHCP maps into the bands. The ambition is to get a decision at Schools Forum in November. PH would like a group to work with, HTs with a number of children to whom this system will apply. There is no intent to increase or decrease funding, so it is important schools are comfortable with it. 2. Non-Statutory Funding: PH explained that GCC has been talking about providing Non-Statutory Funding for a while, but the structures have not been in place to action this. If there are children with a need, who could benefit from the non-statutory system, they don't necessarily need the statutory process. PH was clear that this would not be lowering thresholds, but explained that this would potentially relieve some of the pressure on the statutory system. The current thinking is that alongside the Banded Funding System, there would be an opportunity to apply for Non-Statutory Funding, where there is a short-term need against the descriptors i.e. 18 months-2 years. PH asked for feedback on this, including the timescales, for situations where, even if the need was complex, it was viewed that short-term support could be beneficial to a child. PH shared that if GCC does this - if NSF is in place - they will not fund the statutory process. PH reiterated the LA's deficit of £7m.	

KC: GCC would be challenged on this as parents would not see this as a fair system. Schools are under massive constraints, already funding provision for children without EHCPs. There are high levels of children with complex and high-additional needs; needs that will not 'go away' in 18 months. SM: What about in cases where NSF is given and as a result, the EHCP awarded is ultimately less, because of the impact it has made? PH: If it was felt that NSF was making an impact, it could potentially be extended. MB: What value of funding is involved? There are high numbers of children across Gloucestershire. PH confirmed that there are high numbers – and growing - of EHCP applications in Gloucestershire. GCC is very aware that if an EHCP is refused, it is appealed and it is overturned, which carries its own cost. JM: If it is not extra, as schools use the EHCP funding for TAs, a lot of schools would still go for EHCP. GS: If you are not moving the threshold, there would still be the same amount of paperwork involved. PH confirmed that they would expect to see that the child has a MyPlan+ at minimum and be clear where they are on the Graduated Pathway. SM: Some of the children may have not been on the Graduated Pathway as they are just joining infant school. KJ reiterated this, stating that too often, by the time EHCPs are in place, the child is going to Junior school. Schools are funding the interim before Statutory Funding is in place. Having being part of the NSF pilot, KJ shared that it was a clear process, but some children do not fit. PH agreed that this is a very complex issue and shared that this is why it has taken a long time to agree the strategy. PH restated the aim to have the NSF conversation alongside the Banded Funding conversation with a working group, to get sign-off at November Schools Forum to put in place in January. SB: You mentioned moving away from TAs. What does that mean? PH: Around county we see a blend of therapeutic provision – including some TA support – with a clear provision map. KJ: It has been useful to share experience with other schools in the pilot. Therapy such as play therapy is promising. KW: Had an EHCP refused and just one child with the need, we are a small school, so no opportunity to form a 'group' of children. PH: The variation in numbers within different schools is great; parents often look at schools with a CNI centre, for example, so these are chosen more. KC: Schools that have done well by SEND children, are then put under a lot of pressure. KC emphasised that GAPH had given a very strong message that GCC admissions and ATS they they should not be referring to schools on this basis. KJ: This is also a result of parental choice and sharing between parent groups. 3. 1 in 40 formula: PH explained the formula. If you have 400 children on role, there is a threshold of 10 to receive £6k funding. It was 1 in 75, when the High Needs spend was £3.2 m. When that moved to 1 in 40, it went down to £1.3m, but is now up at £2.3m. This has been raised at Schools Forum. PH does not want to get rid of the 1 in 40 formula, as the NFF does not work. One of the issues is the spread of the EHCPs, and how many children don't go to their local school. PH is modelling what it would look like if children with EHCP went to their local school, rather than a 'hotspot'. An EHCP provides parental preference between mainstream and special schools, but there should not necessarily be parental choice around which school. It needs to be a message that every school is equipped to meet your children's needs, to avoid those hotspots. PH said that they will be taking a tougher line on schools that are stating that they cannot meet need. PH shared that schools should have had contact from caseworkers and system is being digitised. Dialogue is essential between schools and casework to ensure there is a relationship and a genuine understanding. KC: Agree with PH, but to play devil's advocate, in a contextual situation, there are some mitigating circumstances. It needs to be a clearer structure to the defined need, so that schools have to confirm each part of that need and whether they can or can't specifically meet it. KL: Schools are being directed to take a child and not listened to.	
--	--

	KW: If there was additional funding to create a nurture space, for example, a school could take a child, but not without that investment. KJ: The 1 in 40 model doesn't work as the Statutory process takes so long, that by the time you tip into the 1 in 40 formula, the children are leaving the Infant School. GS: There is a potential danger that at every transition point, schools might be inclined to go for the NSF instead. PH: Caseworkers have very high caseloads, in the region of 240 per person. Casework has been very process driven in the past, but there are now more touch points between child and family, and Caseworkers will have a better understanding of SEND. KC: The scale of that is unbelievable, 240 per Caseworker is almost one case per day for every day of the academic year. KL: Could there be more funding at EYFS level? PH: If there was a part of the Education System poorly funded, it is the Early Years system. There is work going on. Schools Forum will put PH under pressure to potentially drop the formula. PH ended the presentation by asking for a group of people who will sit on a working group, that can meet and review the three main points that he had made. It will need people with a financial brain and representation across small schools, infant schools, junior schools, primaries, large schools. Doesn't matter how big the group is, as it would be on Teams. ACTION: KC confirmed that PH would like a mixed representation and that the Clerk would send out a form, which captures the different criteria and will accept first come first served for each category. PH confirmed that the meetings will be in October; two or three virtual meetings in total. PH to send summary and dates to GB. PH also shared that there was an engagement exercise open at present, which came out on 8th September and asked HTs to please complete that. ACTION: PH to send to GB for re-circulation. KC stressed that it is important that schools respond. It will ensure that, for example, there will be APS spaces that don't put high SEMH needs children with children who are school-phobic, across five sites, to meet real needs. <i>The co-Chairs thanked PH for taking the time to attend the meeting of GAPH Executive. PH left the meeting.</i>	PH/Clerk PH/Clerk
2.0	Gareth Vine, Head of Service for Commissioning for Learning Stephen Chandler, Place Planning Manager	
	<i>The co-Chairs welcomed both GV and SC to GAPH.</i> GV explained his role as Head of Service for Commissioning for Learning and the people involved. GV shares the role with Clare Medland, overseeing school place planning. A link was shared to the School Projects and School Place Planning. In his role, he is also responsible for capital projects. Links were also shared to Mainstream transport and FSM, Coordinated Admissions, SEN Transport and Enablement and Post-16 Support. <i>GV introduced SC, Place Planning Manager.</i> SC shared that he works on forecasting pupil numbers, including working with housing developers and town planners. The priority areas include S106 and community levy. Across the next 4 years, he explained that there will be 45,000 houses, increasing by 1,400, but by 2026, there will be 27 less reception pupils. He shared that it is hard to predict, which is why they are only forecasting to 2026. With large urban extensions, including Gloucester, Cheltenham, Uckington and along A38 towards Tewkesbury, plus 10,000 houses in a new Garden town outside of Tewkesbury, there is an anticipated need for new secondary and primary school places. Stroud has seen growth but is now levelling out. New schools are being built: Oldbury, Bishops Cleeve, Lydney (expanded Severnside) New housing includes Hunts Grove and Perrybrook, where some completion dates have slipped back. If existing Gloucestershire schools are hearing of new children coming into schools, please let SC know.	

SB reported that many schools are having to manage the admissions process, which comes with an overhead, but they cannot access S106 funding to cover this.

SC shared that in Twynning, they are planning to put another classroom onto the school, but then there can be no more expansion after that. SC also shared that there are 17 villages that have no capacity for further expansion and often the newer housing is closer to the schools than the original village housing. There need to be 400-500 houses to go in to an area to warrant a new school. GV shared that they are working with planning to be firm that small housing developments are having a negative impact on school places.

In year admissions, where families move into the area, families from Ukraine, Hong Kong etc. accounted for 2400 in-year admissions last year.

▪ **Developers' contributions:**

Much harder to get S106 contributions from at present. Developers saying that they cannot afford to contribute to school places, but the LA needs to meet housing targets. The system is such that GCC is having to transport children to existing schools, rather than giving them access to new schools. GV shared that this has a huge cost bearing as well as harming the environmental sustainability. Planners are concerned with meeting their new housing quotas regardless of financial impact on schools.

JF: What are the projects in North Cots, as these have not been mentioned?

SC: There is new housing in Cirencester and new school in Steadings.

GS knew of a plan around Lechlade and asked at what point will schools be contacted.

GV: Need to be careful that provision is not brought on too soon, as that would have a detrimental in roll numbers

Northleach shared that there is a catastrophic lack of take up of school places; the housing stock is not bringing in young families and initiatives such as Airbnb are harmful.

KC: Is there a map of Gloucester with the details of new developments?

SC: Discussions with developers can last for 5-10 years, before the building commences, which means that the resulting children, may not be in the primary system for 20-30 years. Two thirds of development discussions do not come to fruition. If there is a big development, planning would approach several schools in an area, but there may be a long lead time. Only when the houses are in place, can capacity really be gauged. Warden Hill is an example where a planned school was pulled, because of the impact that it would have had on the surrounding schools.

▪ **Community Infrastructure Levy (Roof Tax):**

This was introduced to replace S106, but there is no CIL money coming forward.

MB: There are 420 new homes in Churchdown and had heard that would equate to 42 (10%) families.

SC: Survey brought back that 42/100 primary places should be considered the ratio, but it is now 38.5/100, based on home education and private school preferences. This is part of a consultation and that may change next year.

Following a GV thanked SC and following questions raised in advance of the meeting, went on to explain the different types of funding available to schools.

▪ **Capital Funding:**

- *Basic Needs Grant:* Essentially comes through DfE based on capacity and forecasts, for new places.
- *Specific DfE grants:* Very much focused on Higher Needs Provision.
- *School condition funding:* Maintenance of school premises, informed by surveys. There is roughly £4m in county-wide budget for this.
- *Developer contributions:* Increasingly this is difficult to secure, as was discussed earlier.
- *Suitability funding:* Used to be in place to make adaptations. This is no longer available.

GV reported increase in building materials of more than 40%.

GV asked what HTs experience of the asset management property service is?

SM: Asked around the table if there is still a consistent expectation around schools' expected contributions?

GV: If schools are in deficit, but the work is required, it needs to be looked at. KC: The state of the estate is not good. When schools come to academise, there are funds given to the academy trust, before they will take them on, so the maintained schools' budget leaves the maintained schools' system. KC shared the example that her own schools' toilets are in an appalling state and have been high priority for 5 years and there doesn't appear to be a strategy for making those kinds of decisions across the estate. KL: Communication is poor. A surveyor comes out to schools, but nothing is shared beyond that. KC: What happens with high priority issues? What is the process? Is the academisation money part of the £4m? GV confirmed that it was and shared that schools should be getting the annual visits from the Asset Management. SB: With energy costs, ongoing maintenance will not be possible in the next few years. Andoversford: Often the LA works are more like sticking plasters, rather than repairs. HA: The list of approved contractors needs to be addressed. Some schools have access to suppliers which provide much better value for money from the public purse. GV agreed that this needs to be addressed. HA reported that her school had windows and paid 25%. The next phase of windows has been proposed at 50% contribution. KC: What is the next step for GAPH? GV: It would be good to know what the scale of this is. GS: There should be a system which collates the state of maintenance across the LA estate, so there is transparency. GV: Surveyors are now taking into account the needs of the school. KC: There is disparity between surveyors view and the contractors' view. SM: Projects have been agreed because it is a priority. This has then been moved into the next financial year, and it has then been shelved. KC: What action can GAPH take to move things forwards? GV: Listing concerns that are in existence at present? What are the priorities that have been agreed between GCC and yourselves? KL shared that she is paying for Gold service because she is not a surveyor and is paying for their expertise and peace of mind. The belief is that the 'Gold' service will look after the school, but it does not. KC: Proposed that a survey will be put together: - Which package are you on? - Highest priority 1 - Other priority 1s ACTION: Clerk to draft a survey, based on the above and share with each Partnership. GV: Are you getting the right level of service? There used to be a system of feedback and there is an opportunity to put forwards a business case. <i>It was agreed that this would form part of the survey.</i> ▪ Energy Costs: KL shared that there is nothing available in terms of quantification of energy costs based on Government announcements. GV shared that there is nothing coming across corporately at present and stated that he is pushing for the 'green' plan across the estate, as part of the Net Zero ambition. HA: It would be good if there was a county wide Solar offer available to schools, where Solar companies won't touch schools. <i>The co-Chairs thanked GV and SC for taking the time to attend the meeting of GAPH Executive. GV and SC left the meeting.</i>	Clerk
---	-------

3.0	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	
	KC welcomed everyone to the meeting and initiated introductions around the table. Apologies had been received and were accepted from: DH (CLP), AF (CLP), KM (SAS), MD (WGSP), KB (WGSP), CJ (WGSP), HM (WGSP), JF (TDP), JM (NCSP), JW (SCSP)	
4.0	Committee Business:	
4.1	LInCs: KC asked for a representative to assume the role of Chair for LInCs. ACTION: Clerk put out request to LInCs Committee. KJ shared that she is prepared to co-Chair if there is someone else who can do this.	Clerk
4.2	Continuous Improvement: KC has joined the Continuous Improvement Board under Ann James, following the last GAPH Executive. In order for the recruitment and training to be sustainable through the Social Care academy, CS is pushing for Social Workers employees to have to reapply for accreditation, if they have been out of the service i.e. working within agency, for more than a certain time. KC shared that the importance of having partners' feedback in advance of LA SEND inspection was discussed, giving a voice on how to implement the SEND strategy. ACTION: This is to be added to GAPH Executive as a Standing Agenda Item. Clerk to add this to Agenda Items, together with any other Standing Agenda Items. It was agreed that Child Friendly Gloucestershire would also be a Standing Agenda Item. SB shared that there is potentially an opportunity to have discussions within the Curriculum Committee around Careers Development, something that's less tightly aligned with Ofsted, but still valuable.	Clerk
5.0	AOB	
	<i>There were no submissions of AOB.</i>	
6.0	Approval of previous minutes from 06.05.22:	
	All agreed that the Minutes were a true and accurate record of the meeting. The Minutes were accepted.	
7.0	Matters arising:	
	CPD opportunities for single-day CPD sessions: Jamie Pembroke, from Sig+ was scheduled to deliver a half day of CPD entitled 'An update on primary assessment and accountability'. This will be repeated twice, with a morning and an afternoon session. KC asked if there is other CPD that Partnerships would be interested in? KC confirmed that as well as GAPH being a conduit between LA, there is also an opportunity to put in place a programme of CPD.	
8.0	Supporting new Headteachers:	
	JF shared that this was a discussion at GAPH Cabinet and asked if Partnerships are seeing any needs in this area in terms of wellbeing and networking. JM shared that new HTs are often concerned that they are too busy to join Partnership meetings, not understanding the value and importance of these networks and support. SB shared that within the GSP, new Headteachers are given a link Headteacher to meet. KC shared that Integra had shared the fact that they are running a network for Heads of School and Exec Heads. Could GAPH also run these? JF: Some Headteachers will not have seen any other Headteachers if they joined during the pandemic. KL: How do we know where there are HT changes? GS: There needs to be commitment at Partnership level to identify new HTs and make contact, backed up by a series of 'signposting' events, where new HTs can bring a list of questions for experienced HTs and meet other new HTs. GAPH could cover the costs for Teaching HTs to attend these. SM: There is often an inherent guilt about leaving their schools. KC: Proposed that each Partnership ask for new HTs to come forwards WGSP: Has had Teams catch-ups and this has encouraged new HTs to come forwards. RBM: Why is Reflective Supervision so hard to buy? JM and KC confirmed that this is available to agree as a package from Nick Wood's team at GCC Occupational Health.	
9.0	LInCs:	

	Governance: JM raised that he had not received a call as Chair around the Governance, which was an action from the last Cabinet Meeting. ACTION: Clerk to check and issue contact information for each project. <i>KC left the meeting.</i>	Clerk
10.0	Schools Forum:	
	There is a vacancy for a Primary Headteacher (Maintained school), which has been shared by Democratic Services and in Heads Up. It was agreed that it would be beneficial to have someone from GAPH Executive on the Schools Forum board, to be able to provide updates and be a voice for GAPH. KL shared that she was happy to stand, but if someone else stands, she is happy to withdraw.	
11.0	GAPH Conferences:	
11.1	JF confirmed that the focus of the GAPH Conference on 09.06.23 will be Oracy. Further details will follow. ACTION: Clerk to send out a 'save the date' reminder.	
11.2	Look Who's Talking competition: JF shared an overview of this initiative with the GAPH Executive Board. All children in Gloucestershire schools will be given the opportunity to speak for 3 minutes, on any subject at all, with the winner from each class being taken forwards to a competition within each school, then at a Partnership level, so ultimately there would be seven competitors across KS1 and KS2. The children would deliver the same speech, but would have schools' input to hone it, at each stage. JF proposed to GAPH Executive that GAPH would fund the costs of hosting the final and prizes. All agreed that this would be a good use of funds.	
12.0	Finance update:	
12.1	Accounts: Clerk shared the accounts on the screen and agreed to send these around electronically. LC (GAPH Finance) had confirmed that these are with an Accountant for auditing.	
12.2	Signatory for GAPH payments: LC had raised a request for another signatory on the GAPH account, to act as an approver for transactions on the account. When LC makes a payment from the account, the information would go to that person to authorise, by logging on to the Lloyds Bank account within a certain timeframe. JF agreed to be registered as approver, as she has an existing Lloyds school account, which simplifies the process.	
13.0	Date for the next meeting:	
	GAPH Executive: 20th January 2023, Holiday Inn Barnwood Dates for the remainder of the year: GAPH Cabinet: 18 th November 2022 GAPH Executive: 20th January 2023 GAPH Cabinet: 31 st March 2023 GAPH Executive: 5 th May 2023 GAPH Conference: 9 th June 2023 GAPH Cabinet: 23rd June 2023 GAPH Executive: 7 th July 2023	