

## Hillingdon Schools Forum

### Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 24 January 2012

Commencing at 17.00

Civic Centre, Committee Room 6

#### Present:

Headteacher Members	Mr. Andrew Wilcock (AW) <b>Chair</b> Dr. Philip Rutter (PR) Mrs. Ann Bowen- Breslin (ABB) Ms. Ludmila Morris (LM)  Mr. Robert Lobatto (RL) Miss Vicki Williams (VW) Mrs. Sue Pryor (SP) Ms. Joy Nuthall (JN)	Bishop Ramsey School Breakspears Junior School Hillingdon Primary School McMillan Early Childhood Centre Barnhill School Harefield Junior School (& HIP) Swakeleys School Moorcroft School
Governor Members Primary School,	Mr. Phil Haigh (PH)	Cherry Lane  Moorcroft, and Grangewood Special School Breakspears Federation Rosedale College and Hewen's College, Abbotsfield School, Chantry Special School and Willows Special School Newnham Infant School and Hillside Infant School Barnhill Community High School (arrived during item 2.2) Guru Nanak Sikh Academy Grangewood School Minet Nursery & Infant  and Hillside Junior School
Also Present Education	Mrs. Barbara Glen (BG) Mr. Jim Edgecombe (JE)  Ms. Jo Palmer (JP) <b>Vice-Chair</b> Ms. Leonora Smith (LS) Mr. Peter Ryerson (PRy) Mr. Mark Lemon (ML) Mr. Tony Eginton (TE) School	Group Finance Manager -  and Schools LA Schools Funding Accountant London Borough of Hillingdon Head of Access & Inclusion London Borough of Hillingdon
<b>Apologies:</b>	Ms. Anna Crispin (AC)	Chief Education Officer London Borough of Hillingdon

**Did not attend:**

Mr. Peter Sale (PS)

14-19 Strategic Group

**The meeting was quorate**

**Item 1 Welcome & Apologies**

17.00 AW welcomed members to the meeting especially Mark Lemon who joins as a new Governor Member. Apologies were received from AC and PS did not attend; Pauline Nixon (PN) attended in place of Anna Crispin.

5

**Item2 Minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 January 2012 – Appendix 1**2.1 Accuracy

Amendments were made as follows:

<b>p1 Apologies</b>	Apologies were received from TE and JN	10
<b>p4 item 3 Free School Meals (L96)</b>	Should read: Members noted that the consultation document recommends no change but they would like to receive some further clarification on the current School Meals grant status.	15

**Item 3 Matters Arising which are not covered by the agenda:**

<b>p2 Item 2.2(1) Previous Clerk</b>	AW asked if the flowers had been sent to Pat Campbell, previous clerk. In the absence of AC – PN agreed to do this.	PN 20
<b>p2 Item 2.2(2) Exceptional Circumstances</b>	Queensmead school are chasing a response to their letter on this matter. PM informed members that they are still waiting for a response from legal and will report back to Forum as soon as they can. Forum asked PM to send Queensmead a copy of previous minutes relating to this matter.	PM 25
<b>p2 Item 2.2(3) July meeting</b>	PM will confirm the venue once booked.	PM 30
<b>p3 Item 2.2(4) SEN provision</b>	AW asked if Moorcroft has been re-assessed yet. PH confirmed that it had but the findings had yet to be discussed by the school's Governing Body. PH will keep Forum informed. PN informed members that the Cabinet Leader	PN 35 40

	<p>has asked for more evidence about the current, and future, SEN need in considering the need for any additional provision.</p> <p>Members asked for a response to their resolution which was passed at the previous meeting (L 61-66) PN agreed to supply this.</p> <p>PN also agreed to prepare a report for the next meeting of Forum to provide details of the provision in similar schools in other authorities and the different costs of the various types of provision, both within and outside of the borough including the private sector.</p>	PN	45
<b>P3 Item 3 14-19 Provision</b>	PM informed members that funding for the 14-19 officer comes from the LA budget and not from DSG	LBH	55
<b>p4 Item 3 Retained Budget &amp; School Expansion (from L103)</b>	<p>PRy reminded members that they have previously asked the LA to provide figures about the actual number of children entering the borough during the year. The figures previously provided included children who moved school within the borough. Members would also like to better understand where the pressures are. LBH were asked to provide this information, as a matter of priority, for the next meeting.</p>		60
<b>p4 Item 3 Factors excluded from MFG</b>	<p>DF reported back that the DfE had approved three factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air Conditioning;</li> <li>• Split Site factor; and</li> <li>• Expanding School factor.</li> </ul> <p>They would not approve the removal of the fixed factor and have requested more information on the Small School factor. DF has amended the formula accordingly.</p>	LBH	70
			75

\*\* AW thanked the finance team for their diligence and thorough work with the Schools Forum, however, members expressed their extreme disappointment that the current Directors, especially the Director, with responsibility for Education, have not attended any of the Schools Forum meetings. The previous Director of Education attended regularly to answer questions raised by the Forum and this was, members stressed, really helpful; it was expected that the current Director would continue this practice. **Members unanimously approved a request, proposed by the chair of the Schools' Forum and seconded by the vice-chair, that the Director with responsibility for Education attends these meetings.**

#### Item 4 Issues arising from January 2012 Consultation Meetings (Appendix 2)

17.20 PM spoke to this item and explained to members that they had had to cancel the evening meeting because only 3 people wanted to attend at that time. The finance team liaised with these three people directly. PM went through the matters raised during these meetings which the Schools Forum should consider (Appendix 2):

1	<b>Achievement Funding</b>	Members discussed how support for pupils with no historical KS1 or KS2 data would be recognised. Members discussed this at some length but agreed that this matter needed even more thought and discussion, so it will be added to the Work Programme for Schools Forum/Resources SAG (see item 7). For this year students where no Key Stage data is available, will not be included for this factor. During the discussion it was also noted that the secondary funding should be based on students achieving Level 3 or below.	85
			<b>Work Programme</b>
			90
			95
2	<b>Special Resource Provision</b>	Consideration was given to increasing the rate of funding because it is not keeping pace with the actual cost of delivery. Members discussed various options; for example, changing the rate annually in line with changes in the GUF or rises in salaries. PH asked if funding is based on pupils or places – it is funded on places. It was finally agreed that, there will be no increase this year and once again, this matter will be discussed in more detail, and will be added to the Work Programme.	100
			<b>Work Programme</b>
			105
			110
			<b>Work Programme</b>
3	<b>Per pupil funding differential</b>	Some schools have questioned the range and whether Schools Forum should be trying to reduce this. PM explained that there will always be some differences but changes can be made to reduce the range. AW suggested that this be moved to the Work Programme for further debate.	115
			120
4	<b>Special Schools &amp;</b>	PM informed members that Meadow High School had responded to the	

	<b>Special Needs funding</b>	consultation and said that they were disappointed that there had been no review of the Special Schools funding formula and that they strongly disagreed with the change to the banding last year. The school has also raised these matters by way of a member's enquiry. PM thought that these matters should be addressed by Resources SAG. AW asked for a copy of the letter. It was agreed that the distribution of Special Schools' funding should be considered as part of the forthcoming work programme	PM  125 <b>Work Programme</b>  130  135
5	<b>Impact</b>	PM explained that all schools expressed their concern about the true impact of the changes. PM explained that his department hopes to have indicative budgets available for schools by 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2012. The January census data should be available for the finance department by 1 <sup>st</sup> or 2 <sup>nd</sup> February and once this has been received DF can produce the indicative budgets and circulate them to Schools Forum that week. An <b>additional meeting of Schools Forum</b> was pencilled in for <b>Monday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2012 from 14.30</b> to discuss any areas of major impact arising from the calculations.	DF

**Item 5 Consideration of school consultation responses (Appendices 3)**

140

16.10 PM introduced this item and went through each question in turn. Questions 1 and 2 relate to the Funding Formula package and its transitional arrangements. The remaining questions relate to proposed changes to the existing Scheme for Financing Schools

Q1	<b>Funding Formula package</b>	A significant number of schools, 84% of those who commented on this question, agreed with the proposal and only 10% disagreed. Members unanimously approved the recommendation that <b>the revised funding factor should be put to Cabinet</b> , proposed by PH and seconded by PRy.	145 150 To Cabinet
Q2	<b>Rate of the transitional factor</b>	PM explained that whilst half of the responses received were in favour of the proposal, some schools wanted the time increased and others shortened. On balance members unanimously approved the recommendation that it should be <b>put to Cabinet that the rate of the transitional factor should be set at +/- 1.5% over 2 years, using a linear reduction over the same period;</b> proposed by JE and seconded by PRy.	155 160 To Cabinet
Q3	<b>Central Funds and Earmarking</b>	Members noted that this question did not apply to academies. And the majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b>Central Funds and Earmarking – to be revised to account for the changes in the funding of Children's Centres.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	170 175
Q4	<b>Newly Qualified Teachers</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b>provision should be made for loans to Newly Qualified Teachers.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	180 185
Q5	<b>Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS)</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b>the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) should be a mandatory requirement for all schools to complete each financial year.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	



Q6	<b>Budget Plans</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b><i>in accordance with the SFVS Schools will be required to submit a three year budget plan even where a financial forecast for a multi-year period is not provided.</i></b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	190 195
Q7	<b>Budget Plans</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b><i>in accordance with the SFVS Schools will be required to submit a three year budget plan even where a financial forecast for a multi-year period is not provided.</i></b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	200 205
Q8	<b>Interest clawback</b>	The majority of respondents who commented agreed with the proposal that <b><i>there should be a change of rate at which interest is charged on loans taken out by schools from LIBID to LIBOR effective for the term of the loan prevailing at the date the loan is taken out. This brings it in line with the rates paid by the LA to access the funds from banks for loans to schools.</i></b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	210 215 220
Q9	<b>Bank &amp; Building Societies</b>	It had been proposed that LA should have access to schools bank accounts in cases where the delegated budget is suspended by the authority and when a maintained school ceases to exist. Most schools did not agree with this recommendation and the proposal, as it stands, and it was agreed that <b><i>the LA should be asked to re-word the proposal and circulate it to schools for further consultation.</i></b> This was proposed by JP and seconded by PR.	PM 230 235
Q1	<b>Reporting on</b>	It had been proposed that the Governing	240

0	<b>surplus balances</b>	Body of schools should report to the LA on the intended use of surplus balances, where balances are above the thresholds for Primary and Secondary schools, as set out in the Schools Financial Value Standard. There was no significant majority response for this question and PM clarified that it was not intended that schools should provide detailed information. Members agreed that schools forum should know why any significant under spend of budget is to be carried forward.
---	-----------------------------	--

		Members agreed <b>that the LA should be asked to re-word the proposal and circulate it to schools for further consultation.</b> This was proposed by JE and seconded by PR; 15 members were in favour and there was one abstention.	PM 245
Q1 1	<b>Planning for deficit balances</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal to <b>add a requirement for schools to formally apply for a licence from the LA to operate in deficit.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	250 255
Q1 2	<b>Licensed Deficits</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal to <b>change requirement for all deficits to be licensed instead of just those above 2% of the school's budget share.</b> It was noted that some members wondered if this figure was too low. However, members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	260 265
Q1 3	<b>Loan Schemes</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal <b>to discourage schools from holding on to loans beyond the required period.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	270
Q1 4	<b>Recovery of monies owing to the LA when a school converts to become an Academy</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal that <b>the circumstances in which charges can be made to allow recovery of monies owing to the LA when it converts to become an Academy should include item 6.2.22 of the document.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	275 280
Q1 5	<b>Responsibility for repairs and maintenance</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal <b>to allow schools to spend their Devolved Capital Funding, which is in many cases lower than £10,000 the deminimus for capital expenditure.</b> Members unanimously approved this recommendation which was proposed by PRy and seconded by TE.	285 290
Q1 6	<b>Removal of section 6.3</b>	The majority of respondents agreed with the proposal to <b>remove section 6.3 due to the abolishment of the General</b>	

## Item 6 DSG Budget Monitoring (Appendices 4)

18.30	PM referred members to the Month 9 Monitoring Report (Appendix 4a). PM highlighted:	300
	➤ a more favourable DSG position with the projected final outturn position on the retained DSG of £317k;	
	➤ at 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2011, only one school carried forward a deficit balance and this is a licensed deficit;	
	➤ £747k reserves were brought forward and School Specific Contingencies show an overspend of £302k;	305
	➤ SEN shows increased pressures and indicate that the DSG budget for SEN, next year, will need to be increased;	
	➤ The DSG balance will be known by the end of May 2012.	
	RL asked about possible cuts in behaviour support spending. LBH was asked to clarify the position and include in the report what is happening, why the situation has changed and why this support is under budget when the need is still there for the service. LBH to report back to the School Forum meeting on 29 <sup>th</sup> February 2012. It was further agreed that the Education provision for children who are out of School; Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and Behaviour Support should be looked at as a group of related matters and proposals discussed as part of the Work Programme.	310 PM 315
	<b>Schools Forum noted the month 9 monitoring position.</b>	
	PM also circulated an updated report on the Abbotsfield deficit which members read and then discussed. JE, as Chair of the Shadow Governing Body at Abbotsfield highlighted that the school is in a good financial position to pay back some of the deficit ahead of schedule, however, this might not be as much as hoped for because there is some unexpected urgent repair work needed to the roof. The school are also looking into the possibility of selling the former caretaker house provided the money raised can be used against the deficit. AW thanked PM & JE for their reports.	320 325

## Item 7 Draft Work Programme 2012/2013 (Appendix 5)

18.50	The schedule was discussed and will include:	
	1. To review the impact of the new Primary and Secondary Schools funding formula and identify any areas requiring further work	330
	2. To review Special Needs Funding to clarify and assess the fairness of Special Needs funding inc a review of funding for children with SEN but with no statement	335
	3. To determine if Special Schools Funding needs to be reviewed in order to establish clarity and fairness	

- |  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. To review the differentials in AWPU especially the range</li> <li>5. To consider the minimum baseline of funding that a school cannot go below</li> <li>6. To review the Key Stage 1 Class Size Factor</li> <li>7. To review SRP (Special Resource Provision) funding</li> <li>8. To review the achievement funding for children with no Key Stage data</li> <li>9. To review the Education provision for children who are out of School; Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and Behaviour Support</li> <li>10. To look at the funding differential both in terms of benchmarking and review (This will form a substantive agenda item on the February 29<sup>th</sup> agenda)</li> </ol> | <p>340</p> <p>345</p> |
|--|-----------------------|

**Item 8 Future Meetings**

10.1 Items for future Agendas:

- Funding Formula Impact – 6 February 2012
- New in year admissions - 29 February 2012
- Funding differential – 29 February 2012
- DSG Central Reserve Decision – 18 July 2012
- Review of the Class Size Factor in the Funding Formula

Dates for Future Meetings:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>10.2 Monday 6 February 2012 at 14.30<br/>(if required)</p> <p>Wednesday 29 February 2012 at 16.15</p> <p>Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> May at 19.15</p> <p>Wednesday 18 July 2012 at 17.00</p> | <p>venue TBC</p> <p>Committee Room 6</p> <p>venue TBC</p> <p>Committee Room 6</p> |
|---|---|

The meeting closed at 19.15

**Signed:** ..... **Date:** .....

If you have any issues to refer to the Schools Forum you should contact one of the representatives. You may contact the Chair and Vice-Chair as follows:

**Chair :** Andrew Wilcock  
 Headteacher  
 Committee  
 Bishop Ramsey C of E School  
 Hume Way  
 Ruislip  
 Middlesex HA4 8EE  
 Telephone : 01895 470884

**Vice-Chair :** Jo Palmer  
 Hillingdon Governors Executive

Telephone : 01895 639227  
E-mail: [awilcock@hillingdongrid.org](mailto:awilcock@hillingdongrid.org)

E-mail : [joannapalmer44@hotmail.com](mailto:joannapalmer44@hotmail.com) or  
[jpalmer@hillingdongrid.org](mailto:jpalmer@hillingdongrid.org)