

Hillingdon Schools Forum

Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 23 October 2012

Commencing at 17.00

Council Committee Room 5

Present:

Maintained Primary Headteacher Members:	Mrs. Ann Bowen- Breslin (ABB) Ms. Jane Ellis (JME) Ms. Kris O'Sullivan (KO) Dr. Philip Rutter (PR)	Hillingdon Primary School Highfield Primary School Deanesfield Primary School Breakspears Junior School
Maintained Secondary Headteacher Members:	Mr. Mark Bland (MB)	Abbotsfield School
Academy Headteacher High Members:	Mr. Robert Lobatto (RL) Chair Mr. Martin Rainsford (MR) Ms. Wendy Bhad (WB)	Barnhill Community The Douay Martyrs Academy Bishop Ramsey CofE School
Maintained Primary School Governor Members:	Mr. Tony Eginton (TE) Mrs. Barbara Glen (BG) Mr. Phil Haigh (PH)	Minet Nursery & Infant and Hillside Junior School Breakspears Federation Cherry Lane Primary School, Moorcroft, and Grangewood Special School
Maintained Secondary Governor Members:	Mr. Jim Edgecombe (JE) Special	Abbotsfield School, Chantry School
Academy Secondary Governors:	Mr. Peter Ryerson (PRy)	Guru Nanak Sikh Academy
Other Members:	Ms. Elaine Caffery (EC) Nursery Ms. Ludmila Morris (LM)	Nursery Manger - 4 Street McMillan Early Childhood Centre
<u>In attendance from:</u>		
London Borough of Hillingdon Education	Mr. Peter Malewicz (PM) Ms. Pauline Nixon (PN) Ms. Kamla Jassal (KJ)	Group Finance Manager - Head of Access & Inclusion Principle
Accountant - Schools Funding Clerk	Ms. Sue Illsley (SI)	Independent Clerk
<u>Apologies:</u>	Mr. Robert Dixon (RD)	Uxbridge High

Mr. Julien Kramer (JK)
Officer

Ms. Jo Palmer (JP)

Ms. Alison Moore (AM)
Ms. Laurie Cornwell (LC)

Interim Chief Education

Newnham Infant School and
Hillside
Infant School

14-19 Manager
The Hillingdon Tuition Centre Pupil
Referral Unit

The meeting was quorate

Item 1 Welcome & Apologies

17.00 RL welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Item 2 Minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2012

The minutes were approved as an accurate record and signed by the chair, after a couple of typing errors were corrected.

Item 3 Matters Arising from the meeting held on 27 September 2012

17.05 Matters Arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda: 5

p2 Item 3(1) Membership of Forum	PM is still trying to find another representative from the maintained special schools. JE offered his help with this task and arranged to discuss this further with PM, after the meeting	PM/JE
p2 Item 3(3) Leader's Update	Now that Anna Crispin has left JK/PM agreed to follow this up with Cllr. Puddifoot. Forum would like confirmation, from him, that the minute relating to his comments at forum are correct. This is with JK	PM/JK
P3 Item 4 Funding Formula	The funding formula in terms of child need discussion will be tabled for the next meeting	PM

10
15

Item 4 Consultation Response

17.10 RL asked PM to speak to this item and members were referred to his 'Consideration of school consultation responses' paper and the spread sheet (**Appendices 1**). 20

The report provided an analysis of all of the responses received as part of the consultation on Schools, Early Years & High Needs Special Educational Needs (SEN) Funding Arrangements for 2013/14, which took place between 1 October 2012 and 16 October 2012. 25

The paper put forward four **proposals** which were:

4.1 Accepts the proposed changes to the Primary and Secondary Schools' funding formula.

4.2 Accepts the proposed changes to Special Schools and Special Resource Provision funding. 30

4.3 Accepts the proposed changes to the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

4.4 Agrees that Officers of the Council submit the draft funding pro-forma to the DfE by 31 October 2012.

Members noted that 38 responses had been received and of these 22 were from Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Nursery and Local Authority Nursery providers, 6 primary schools, 6 secondary schools, 3 special schools and 1 from the Hillingdon Association of Secondary 35

Headteachers. Only a few of the responses provided detailed comment and these are contained, verbatim, on the spreadsheet.

40

- 4.1 Members considered the responses to the consultation questions individually and voted on whether to change the formula in response to the comments received.

45

Questions - Primary and Secondary Schools Formula Review

Proposal 1: *The rate of the cluster factor for SEN pupils should be set at 2.0% of the schools number on roll.*

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 72.2% agreed and 27.8% disagreed (excluding no comments).

50

Members discussed the comments; most of which suggested that the percentage should be reduced. Members were particularly mindful that if the percentage is reduced more schools would qualify for cluster funding and consequently the retained pot would be significantly reduced. Members agreed that the arguments made had been well voiced in the working group and consequently were not mindful to change the proposal. Members also confirmed that any decision now would change with the introduction of a National Funding Formula.

55

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 14 Against: 0 Abstained: 0

**Proposal
carried**

60

Proposal 2: *AWPU ratios should be broadly in line with the national average, the Deprivation and Attainment ratios should be 1: 1.5 between Primary and Secondary sectors and the Fixed Factor should be set at £140,000.*

65

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 77.8% agreed; 11.1% disagreed and 11.1% did not know (excluding no comments).

Members discussed the comments and were reminded by PM that the way the calculation works is guided by the DfE tool. Members agreed that the working group could have looked at another modelling option related to the 2011/12 damping factor but concluded that it would not have changed the outcome. However, this was now not possible in the timescale.

70

75

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 13 Against: 0 Abstained: 1

**Proposal
carried**

80

- 4.2 **Proposal 3: *the Capping Factor for schools that gain from the proposed changes should be set at 0% (i.e. no cap)***

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 72.2% agreed; 11.1% disagreed and 16.7% did not know (excluding no comments).

Members discussed the comments and noted that if a cap was applied the schools receiving a reduction in funding would not benefit from it. Members, therefore, decided not to change the proposal.

85

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 14 Against: 0 Abstained: 0 **Proposal carried**

90

Questions – Special Schools and Special Resource Provision Funding

4.3

Proposal 4: *the rate of the cluster factor for SEN pupils should be set at 2.0% of the schools number on roll.*

95

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 70.6% agreed and 29.4% did not know (excluding no comments). (The appendix report needs correcting on this response).

Members discussed the comments and noted that none of the respondents disagreed with the proposal but 5 said that they did not know. Members decided not to change the proposal.

100

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 14 Against: 0 Abstained: 0 **Proposal carried**

105

Questions – Early Years Single Funding Formula Review

Proposal 5: *8% of the total EYSFF should be distributed using IDACI factors*

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 82.8% agreed; 2.9% disagreed and 14.3% said that they did not know (excluding no comments).

110

Members discussed the comments and noted that as over 80% of respondents agreed with the proposal they were not mindful to change it.

115

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 14 Against: 0 Abstained: 0 **Proposal carried**

Proposal 6: *the distribution of Quality funding should be based on the ratings of each early years setting and that this should only be allocated where the rating is 3 or more based on a flat rate per hour*

120

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 77.2% agreed; 11.4% disagreed and 11.4% did not know (excluding no comments).

Members discussed the comments at length and a number were concerned about the 'Quality' factor and how it will be judged. Members were mindful that nursery provision, which is based in schools, does not have a separate Ofsted from the school and may well function differently. Members also wanted assurances that if the proposal is successful, resources and support will be available to help nurseries, which 'require improvement'. Members went on to discuss the support currently available from the Early Years team and confirmed that Liz Marsh, and her team, are funded from DSG, however, they are managed and resourced by the Local Authority. **Members asked for more information on how nurseries will be supported if they do not receive funding under this factor.**

125

130

135

PM informed members that Liz Marsh was a member of the working group which explored this factor and she has said that her team will

assess school based nurseries so that all nurseries will have their individual judgement separate from the school. Members were concerned that the Early Years team will be over stretched and adequate support will not be available.

140

Members asked PM if a decision had to be made on this question or whether it could be deferred whilst the level of available support was explored further. PM suggested that there were two options – 1) to approve the proposal or 2) to keep with the status quo and not include a 'Quality' factor.

145

4.4 PRy suggested that Schools' Forum could decide to increase the money for Early Years Support but members were reminded that the team's management is currently with the LA so it is for them to decide how the service is resourced and managed.

150

Members asked again if they could defer this decision until the next meeting in December when they would invite Liz Marsh to the next meeting to provide forum with more information on available support. PM thought that this was possible but asked members to take a vote in case he finds the DfE require a decision before December 2012. Members were asked to vote between accepting the proposal, as it stands, or rejecting it and keeping the status quo.

PM

Vote on the proposal should it not be possible to defer a decision until December:

In favour: 0 Against: 8 Abstained: 6 **Proposal to be rejected if it cannot be deferred to December 2012**

Proposal 7: That 4% of the total EYSFF is a reasonable rate to use to distribute resources based on a quality factor

Response & Forum Discussion: Of the respondents 58.8% agreed; 11.8% disagreed and 29.4% did not know (excluding no comments).

Members discussed the comments and were mindful that any change in the percentage would affect the modelling calculations. Members, therefore, decided not to change the proposal.

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 12 Against: 0 Abstained: 2 **Proposal carried**

Members agreed that Officers of the Council should submit the draft funding pro-forma to the DfE by 31 October 2012.

Item 5 Split Site Factor – Douay Martyrs School

18.05 MR declared an interest in this item and did not vote.

Members received a request from Father Timothy Hutton, Chair of Governors at Douay Martyrs School, (**Appendix 2**) to increase the Split Site Factor to a sum nearer to the actual cost of maintaining their split site.

155

PM reminded members that Douay Martyrs is the only school in Hillingdon operating on a split site and, therefore, eligible to the split site factor funding. The present factor is set at £100k and Douay Martyrs

160

School has calculated the actual cost, for them, at £307,512.42 per annum.

PM has benchmarked this factor with other schools, at a recent DfE meeting attended by many London Boroughs, and they range from £3k to £30k. 165

MR explained some of the financial implications facing the school as a direct consequence of the split site which members acknowledged, however, they also noted that many other schools currently share teaching, and pupils have to move sites for various reasons. 170

Members asked about the possibility of having a bridge constructed over the road to increase safety and reduce costs but they were told that the local residents have fought against the planning application.

PM confirmed that a decision on this factor could not be deferred and RL brought the proposal to a vote. 175

Proposal – *that there is an uplift in the value of the Split Site Factor*

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 2 Against: 8 Abstained: 3 ***Proposal not carried***

The factor remains at £100k

Item 6 Growth Contingency Fund Policy

6
18.15

The proposed policy was submitted for discussion by PM (**Appendix 3**) 180

PM explained that the policy details the arrangements for managing the Growth Contingency Fund whose purpose will be to provide resources to schools (both Maintained and Academy) to support growth in pupil numbers to meet basic needs. In order to ensure that no unfair advantage is taken from the fund, PM has included a number of caveats to protect the fund. 185

PM took members through the policy and highlighted that the purpose of the Growth Contingency Fund will be to provide financial recompense to schools throughout the relevant financial year (1 April to 31 March) to cover the cost of agreed and planned growth because the school has expanded; taken on children above the 30 place class size definition for primary schools; is a new school or schools have decided to amalgamate (eg Rosedale). 190

Expanding Schools – The proposed policy states that expanding schools will have been identified by the LA, before the beginning of the financial year and any school which takes a later decision to expand will only receive funding once confirmation has been received from the LA. 195

Members discussed the definition of 'Expanding Schools' and agreed that this should relate to the PAN (not the number on roll). Members also discussed whether it should be the LA who approves school expansion or Schools Forum and concluded that it should be Schools' Forum; they, therefore, asked for the ***3rd bullet point under Section 5 – Expanding Schools to be reworded to read Schools' Forum rather than Local Authority.*** PM 200

The rate of the expanding schools funding was also considered and it was agreed that there should be just ***one flat rate based on the average*** PM 205

AWPU

PM

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 13 Against: 0 Abstained: 1 **Proposal carried**

210

KS1 Class Size Funding – Members debated whether this should be set at 30 or 26 because the required ratio of staff to pupils in Reception is 1:13. It was agreed that this discussion requires additional time and was deferred to the December meeting. For now **Reception will be removed from the first bullet point under this section.**

PM

Amalgamating Schools – Members agreed that the additional funding is intended to ease the transition and, therefore, should reduce year on year to £0 by year 4.

During the discussion members touched on the funding arrangements for Rosedale Primary School and **RL asked PM to provide forum with more details at the next meeting.**

Item 7 Hedgewood Special School – Capital Funding

215

18.45 *PH declared an interest in this item*

PM brought this item back to Schools' Forum with a paper detailing developments since it was first raised at Schools' Forum on 18 July 2012 (**Appendix 4**)

The recommendation then was for HLA to explore options for funding with the council and return to Schools' Forum if the council did not agree to fund the classroom.

220

PM reported that the Leader had made it clear that he believes this work should be funded from DSG as the investment will directly benefit DSG. PM reminded members that under the current School Finance Regulations, it would be legitimate to fund any capital investment from the DSG where it can be proven that it provides value for money. He, therefore, proposed that Schools' Forum should approve the funding for the additional classroom at a cost of £282,000.

225

Members were disappointed by the council decision and felt that they had effectively been given no choice. They believed that the council could have legitimately funded the additional classroom out of the Section 106 funding which has been set aside for the expansion of the primary sector.

230

Members reluctantly agreed to **fund the additional classroom at a cost of £282,000 from DSG to be paid in a one off payment on the basis that the council had reneged on its responsibilities.**

235

Vote on the proposal:

In favour: 12 Against: 0 Abstained: 2 **Proposal to fund the additional classroom carried**

240

In favour: 13 Against: 0 Abstained: 1 **Proposal for a single one off payment carried**

Members also discussed the offer made by the school to pay £20,000 towards the cost, this being the end of year carry forward balance at the end of March 2012 and decided that this was not necessary.

Item DSG Monitoring Report

8

19.00 Members agreed a working group to look at this before the next meeting of Forum and report back to it. The meeting to be arranged by PM for late November. Members of the **group will be JE, PH, PM, TE, PRy and ABB**. It was further agreed that the group can co-opt additional members. PM will produce a detailed breakdown for the group. **PM**

245

Item School Deficit Report

9

19.10 Noted

Item School Admissions

10

Deferred to the December meeting

AOB Members recognised that **Don Freeman** (Previous LA Principle Accountant - Schools Funding) has now left HLA and they expressed their most sincere thanks and appreciation for all the work he has done with Schools' Forum.

Future Meetings

Monday 10 December 2012 at 16.30 – venue TBC

Thursday 10 January 2013 at 17.00– venue TBC

The meeting closed at 19.10

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 as follows:

Robert Lobatto c/o Barnhill Community High, Yeading Lane, Hayes, Middlesex UB4 9LE or by e-mail to rlobatto.312@lgflmail.org