

**HILLINGDON SCHOOLS FORUM MINUTES  
Tuesday 25 January 2011  
Civic Centre, Committee Room 6**

**Present**

Headteacher Members	Mr. Andrew Wilcock, Bishop Ramsey (Chair) (AW) Dr. Philip Rutter (Breakspear Junior) (PR) Mr. Robert Lobatto, Barnhill (RL) Mrs. Ann Breslin-Bowen, Hillingdon Primary (ABB) Ms. Ludmila Morris, McMillan (LM) Mrs. Sue Pryor, Swakeleys School (SP) Mrs. Patsy Crowley, Belmore Primary (PC)
Governor Members	Mr. Phil Haigh, Cherry Lane Primary and Grangewood Special (PH) Mr. Tony Eginton, Minet Nursery and Infant and Hillside Junior (TE) Mrs. Barbara Glen, Breakspear Junior (BG) Mr. Jim Edgecombe, Rosedale College/Mellow Lane, Abbotsfield, Chantry and Willows Special (JRE) Ms. Jo Palmer, Newnham Infant School and Hillside Infant and Junior Schools (JP) Ms. Leonora Smith, Barnhill Community High (LS) Mr. Richard Burton, Meadow, (RB) Ms. Joy Nuthall, Moorcroft School (JN)
Other Members	Ms. Elaine Caffery, 4 Street Nursery, (PVI) (EC) Mr. Peter Ryerson, Guru Nanak Secondary (PRy) (Academies)
Also Present	Ms. Anna Crispin, Deputy Director of Education and Children's Services (AC) Ms. Alison Moore, Senior School Improvement Officer LA (AM) Mr. Chris Spencer, Director of Education and Children's Services, LA (CS) Mr. Ben Lea, LA, (BL) Mr. Don Freeman, LA (DF) Mr. Amar Barot, Senior Finance Manager, LA (ABa) Ms. Kamla Jassall, LA (KJ) Ms. Alison Booth (LA) (A.Bo) Mr. Peter Sale, 14-19 Strategic Group (PS) Mr. Paul Hewitt, Service Mgr for Safeguarding Cluster (PH)
Apologies	None received

**The meeting was quorate**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting with a special mention to Ms. Joy Nuthall, a newly appointed member to Schools Forum representing Special Schools and to Mr. Paul Hewitt, present for matters arising during Schools Budget Consultation 2011/12 (agenda item 7).

## **Constitutional Issues – Membership of Schools Forum**

Following the issue raised at the meeting held on 23 November 2010 in respect of eligibility for membership on Schools Forum, it was confirmed that PRy could no longer hold the office of Vice-Chair as Guru Nanak Secondary school was now an Academy. PRy would now be the representative for Academies, and this would be as an Observer.

It was proposed by Mr. Phil Haigh, seconded by Mr. Tony Egington that Ms. Jo Palmer be elected as Vice-Chair. This proposal was unanimously accepted. Ms Jo Palmer agreed to accept the post.

### **1. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 23 NOVEMBER 2010**

It was noted that an incorrect date had been inserted for the minutes of the previous meeting. The date should read 6 October 2010. It was also noted that the meeting scheduled for 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010 was cancelled. With these amendments noted, the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2010 were accepted and signed by the Chair as a true record.

### **2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

*2.5 Training for Schools Forum* – A suggestion was put forward that as part of the training, members of Hillingdon Schools Forum attend meetings at neighbouring Schools Forum. Suggested areas were Slough, Harrow, Ealing and Brent. Clerk to Schools Forum to investigate when and where meetings were held. **Clerk to investigate**

*2.7 Special Needs Strategy* - HASH were setting time aside to discuss the Special Needs Strategy further with Pauline Nixon.

*9 Future Years Funding to include Pupil Premium and EYSFF Updates* – BL confirmed that a copy of the response made on behalf of Schools Forum has been circulated.

*Membership Issue* – Minuted above.

*5. Update on Schools Funding 2011/12* – It was noted that the meeting of Schools Forum had not taken place on 8<sup>th</sup> December but members had been invited to two subsequent meetings of Resources SAG. Thanks were given to ABa and BL for their efforts in arranging this. The Finance Team were requested to circulate copies of the minutes from these two meetings to all members of Schools Forum.

**Finance Team to circulate minutes of Resources SAG Meetings**

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No declarations were made.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **5. SCHOOLS BUDGET CONSULTATION 2011/12 (Paper 1)**

The Chair explained the intended procedure to cover the process of reviewing the School Budget Consultation paper for 2011/12. It was proposed to work through the summary of responses in the order of the consultation document but leaving the decision as to whether Schools Forum would agree a possible technical breach of the CEL until the end of the process.

Members were reminded that they must use their best judgements when voting on the various proposals.

ABa advised members that the Secretary of State had outlined issues around the MFG and the budget and that some schools, particularly secondary, would not see any change in their allocation if grants were devolved to schools.

A brief explanation was given as to why some schools received MFG. It was also noted that it may be necessary to seek ratification from the Secretary of State for LA to devolve specific grants.

A total of 72 responses to the consultation were received (compared with 24 received last year). The responses included Primary Forum and HASH.

At the meeting, there were 16 members eligible to vote on proposals.

**Stakeholders were asked to give views on the proposal to dis-apply the MFG to Nursery Budgets included in the EYSFF (section 5)**

All 59 responses to this question supported the proposal. Both Primary Forum and HASH gave their support.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

16 members were in favour of dis-applying the MFG to Nursery Budgets included in the EYSFF

0 members opposed the proposal

0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal to dis-apply the MFG to Nursery Budgets included in the EYSFF***

**Stakeholders were asked to give views on whether the MFG should be set at a higher than negative 1.5% in Hillingdon and if so the level at which it should be set (section 5)**

33 responses were received, 18 of which were from the primary sector, who together with Primary Forum supported setting MFG at negative 1.5%. Two of these were special schools who also supported setting MFG at this level. Responses from secondary sector were split with 6 supporting a negative 1.5%, 4 supported a zero level and 2 supported 0.5%.

A discussion took place when the possible losses at various levels were given. The possibility of setting MFG at negative 0.75% was also considered as was the setting of MFG at different levels for primary and secondary sectors. Confirmation was given that MFG could be set at different levels for primary, special and secondary sectors.

**As the Primary and Special Sectors supported setting MFG at negative 1.5%, this was accepted by Schools Forum.**

Various proposals for the secondary sector were put forward:

**It was proposed that MFG be set at negative 1% for secondary schools.**

Voting took place the result of which was :

9 members were in favour of the proposal

1 member opposed the proposal

6 members abstained from voting

**It was proposed that MFG be set at negative 1.5% for secondary schools**

Voting took place the result of which was :  
0 members were in favour of the proposal  
5 members were opposed to the proposal  
11 members abstained from voting

**It was proposed that MFG be set at negative 0.75% for secondary schools**

Voting took place the result of which was :  
2 members were in favour of the proposal  
0 members opposed the proposal  
14 members abstained from voting

**It was proposed that MFG be set at negative 0.5% for secondary schools**

Voting took place, the result of which was:  
0 members were in favour of the proposal  
0 members were opposed to the proposal  
16 members abstained from voting

**It was proposed that MFG be set at 0% for secondary schools**

Voting took place, the result of which was :  
0 members were in favour of the proposal  
5 members opposed the proposal  
11 members abstained from voting

**From the results of the above, it was then proposed that members vote as to whether MFG for secondary schools be set at negative 1% or negative 0.75%**

Voting took place, the result of which was :  
9 members were in favour that MFG should be set at negative 1%  
2 members were in favour that MFG should be set at negative 0.75%  
5 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that MFG be set at negative 1% for secondary schools***

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that MFG be set at negative 1.5% for primary and special schools.***

**Stakeholders were invited to give views on whether to increase the devolved element of the former School Lunch Grant (section 10)**

32 of the 35 respondents were in favour of the increased devolution of funds, with the majority requesting that the whole funding be devolved to schools. There would be an impact on the Food in Schools team if the whole fund was devolved. The grant amounted to £104k.

Voting took place, the result of which was :  
11 members were in favour of Schools Lunch grant being fully devolved to schools  
2 members were opposed to Schools Lunch Grant being fully devolved to schools  
3 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that the former Schools Lunch Grant should be fully devolved to schools***

**It was then proposed by Mr. Robert Lobatto and seconded by Ms. Sue Pryor that the £104k School Lunch Grant be distributed to schools post formula so that all schools would benefit, and the distribution be pupil weighted.**

Voting on this proposal took place, the result of which was :

16 members were in favour of the Schools Lunch grant be distributed post formula  
0 members were opposed to the proposal  
0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that the Schools Lunch Grant be Distributed to schools post formula on AWPU basis***

**Stakeholders were asked to give views on whether the devolved specific grants rolled into DSG should be added in on the basis of current year cash allocations or by reference to unit amounts (section 13)**

The responses received showed that 6 schools supported the addition of specific grants by reference to current year cash allocations, whilst 24, plus Primary Forum and HASH preferred units amounts updated for the January 2011 census count.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

15 members were in favour of unit amounts updated from the January 2011 census  
0 members were opposed to the proposal  
1 member abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that devolved specific grants rolled into DSG should be added in on the based on unit amounts updated from the January 2011 census***

**Schools views were sought as to whether to utilise £259k of Exceptional Circumstances Grant to ensure that the pupils were fully funded in both settings (section 13)**

This related to the shortfall in funding affecting the Pupil Referral Units arising from Government's removal of funding for dual subsidiary registration pupils in 2011/12. 32 responses had been received, of which 26 supported the proposal and 6 were opposed. It was unclear why primary and secondary sectors were dealt with in a different manner. This would be investigated and the outcome would be made known. It was confirmed that HASH would be reviewing this with Pauline Nixon.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

13 members were in favour of utilising £259k Exceptional Circumstances Grant to ensure pupils were fully funded in both settings  
0 members opposed the proposal  
3 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal to utilise £259k of Exceptional Circumstances Grant to ensure that pupils were fully funded in both settings***

***Members to be advised of why primary and secondary sectors are dealt with in a different manner***

**Schools views were sought as to whether to utilise Exceptional Circumstances Grant to allocate an additional £300k to the SEN budget (section 13)**

From the 31 responses to the question, 11 were in favour and 20 opposed the proposal. Schools Forum were advised that the request represented the current level of overspend and if not approved, it might be necessary to topslice DSG in future years. Concerns were expressed that although more money was being made available, there did not seem to be a significant improvement in SEN provision. Schools Forum would like to see a clear strategic policy drawn up.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

4 members were in favour of utilising Exceptional Circumstances Grant to allocate an Additional £300k to the SEN budget  
3 members opposed the proposal

9 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved allocating an additional £300k from the Exceptional Circumstances Grant for SEN***

**Schools views were sought as to whether to utilise £62k of Exceptional Circumstances Grant to fund the Allegations Manager post (section 13)**

PB (a specialist in child safeguarding) outlined the necessity for the funding for this post. It was noted that this was a post requiring specialist knowledge and with the increase and complexity of allegations, an additional post was necessary in order to adequately cover staff and children. It was also noted that in the Serious Case Review to be published shortly, there was a recommendation that a second post was required. If the post was approved, the member appointed would work only within the schools settings. 35 responses had been received, of which 25 were in support of the proposal and 10 opposed.

Voting took place, the result of which was:

- 16 members were in favour of utilising £62k of Exceptional Circumstances Grant to Fund the Allegations Manager post
- 0 members opposed the post
- 0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal of utilising £62k of Exceptional Circumstances Grant to fund the Allegations Manager post***

**Schools views were sought as to whether to hold the balance of the Exceptional Circumstances Grant centrally to offset the impact of the LACSEC adjustment (section 13)**

31 responses had been received for this question, with 4 supporting the proposal and 27 opposed. Neither Primary Forum nor HASH supported the proposal.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

- 0 members were in favour of holding the balance of the Exceptional Circumstances Grant centrally to offset the impact of the LACSEC adjustment
- 8 members were opposed to the proposal
- 8 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum opposed the proposal to hold the balance of the Exceptional Circumstances Grant centrally to offset the impact of the LACSEC Adjustment.***

***Schools Forum requested that the balance available be known at the March meeting.***

**Stakeholders were asked to give views on whether the Balance Control Mechanism should continue (section 15)**

34 responses had been received with 4 supporting the proposal and 30 opposing. Primary Forum and HASH did not support the continuation of BCM.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

- 1 member was in favour of Balance Control Mechanism continuing
- 13 members opposed the proposal
- 2 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum opposed the proposal that Balance Control Mechanism should continue***

**Individual Specific Grants**

Views had been sought on proposed arrangements for former specific grants being rolled into the Dedicated Schools Grant.

### ***Specific Development Grant***

Members felt that insufficient information had been made available to reach an informed decision. Concerns had also been expressed over the implications for Advanced Skills Teachers and HIP funding if full devolution were allowed. ***AC would request more qualitative information be made available. Schools Forum requested that a decision be deferred until the March meeting.***

### ***Schools Standards Grant/School Standards Grant (Personalisation)***

Both grants were currently fully devolved to schools through the funding formula, with the exception of a small retained element attributable to pupils attending Hillingdon Tuition Centre. Of the 18 responses received, 17 were in favour of continuing this devolution and 1 supported the proposal.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

- 16 members were in favour of continuing the current practice
- 0 members opposed the proposal
- 0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the continuation of the current practice for Schools Standards Grant / School Standards Grant (Personalisation)***

### ***Diploma Delivery Grant***

The proposal was that the allocation be retained at the start of the year and then devolved to schools during the year. There were 14 responses, 10 in support and 4 against.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

- 15 members were in favour of the proposal
- 0 members opposed the proposal
- 1 member abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that the allocated Diploma Delivery Grant be retained at the start of the year and devolved to schools during the year***

### ***London Pay Addition Grant***

The vast majority of this grant is currently devolved to schools and it was proposed to continue this practice. Of the 18 respondents, 12 supported the proposal, with 6 opposing.

Voting took place, the result of which was:

- 15 members were in favour of the proposal
- 0 members opposed the proposal
- 1 member abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that the London Pay Additional Grant continue with the current practice***

### ***Ethnic Minority Achievement***

The proposal was to remove the current split between devolved and retained funding and fully delegate funding to schools, reflecting the existing distribution on a unit basis updated from the January 2011 census. 33 of the 35 respondents supported the proposal.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

- 16 members were in favour of fully delegating funding to schools
- 0 members opposed the proposal
- 0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved fully devolving the Ethnic Minority Achievement Funding to schools***

### **1-2-1 Tuition**

The proposal was to retain the allocation at the start of the year and then devolve to schools during the year, as was the practice this year. From the responses received, there had been a significant split between sectors, with 18 out of 19 responses from primary schools and 2 out of 3 responses from special schools in favour of devolution in full at the start of the year whereas 6 out of 10 responses from secondary schools supported the LA proposal. Primary Forum and HASH took opposite views.

It was proposed that the secondary element of 1-2-1 tuition continue with the current LA practice with a decision on the primary element being deferred until the March meeting.

Voting took place, the result of which was

16 members were in favour of this proposal

0 members opposed the proposal

0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that the secondary element of 1-2-1 tuition continue in its present form with the primary element being deferred until the March meeting***

### **Extended Schools – Sustainability/Subsidy**

The proposal was to retain this allocation at the start of the year and then devolve to schools during the year, in line with practice in the current year. 34 of the 35 respondents preferred the funding to be devolved in full at the start of the year. The main area of concern was centred around the way the funding was distributed, with HASH preferring allocation by AWPU and Primary Forum preferring a flat per pupil allocation.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

0 members were in favour of retaining the allocation at the start of the year with funds being devolved during the course of the year

16 members were in opposed to the proposal

0 members abstained from voting

***Schools Forum opposed the proposal of retaining the Extended Schools – Sustainability/Subsidy allocation at the start of the year with funds being devolved during the course of the year.***

### **National Strategies (Secondary)**

The proposal was to retain this allocation at the start of the year and then devolve to schools during the year, in line with practice in the current year. 31 of the 33 respondents did not support the proposal, with a preference that the funds were devolved in full at the start of the year.

***It was agreed that the method of distribution should be AWPU, but outside the formula.***

## **Comments on Other Sections of the Consultation Document**

### **Section 5: Formula Factors**

The proposals for removal all nursery elements of funding from the primary funding formula to allow the introduction of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) and the termly counting of nursery pupils leading to the development of rolling indicative budgets for early years settings under EYSFF were outlined in the consulting document. 26 comments on the first proposal had been received, and 60 comments on the second, including 30 comments



from PVI sector providers. Both proposals received unanimous support from the respondents

**Stakeholders were asked to give views on whether to initially retain centrally funds which are currently delegated during the course of the year and the associated technical breach of the Central Expenditure Limit (section 13)**

In view of the decisions taken as minuted above, Schools Forum were asked their views on whether they would sanction a possible technical breach of Central Expenditure Limit,

Voting took place, the result of which was :

15 members were in favour of allowing a technical breach of CEL

0 members opposed the proposal

1 member abstained from voting

***Schools Forum approved allowing a technical breach of CEL***

**6. EQUAL PAY (Paper 2)**

The paper had been distributed as a pre-read. Schools Forum had previously agreed to allocate £377k DSG central underspend at the end of 2008/09 to offset the cost of settling the claim at 7.5%. Although approximately 95% of claimants had settled at this level, there remained a small number of claimants who were pursuing their claim further. There were 11 claimants taking their claim to an Employment Tribunal with a further 22 potential claims. At a meeting with the unions and ACAS, a proposed settlement had been agreed on these claims. LA was waiting confirmation that the settlement was acceptable. In addition to these claims there were a number of other employees who had not signed the settlement which could potentially lead to further claims.

The estimated additional cost for settling the 11 claims was £121k and for the further 22 claims would be approximately £360k. Additional claims were difficult to quantify as intentions were not known, but could amount to £215k, bringing the total amount to £575k.

LA was challenging certain elements of the claim, which if successful, could reduce the overall amount to £400k.

Schools Forum were assured that "loopholes" to prevent similar action in the future were being closed but also advised that Government states that liabilities of this nature must be met by the department involved.

It appeared that some claimants had received their settlement, although schools had not been made aware of this. It was requested that schools be notified as soon as possible.

Schools Forum were requested to agree the recommendation that funds be set aside to fully fund the cost of claims in schools.

Voting took place, the result of which was :

15 members were in favour of setting aside funds to fully fund the cost of the equal pay settlement

1 member opposed the proposal

0 members abstained from voting.

***Schools Forum approved the proposal that funds be set aside to offset the cost of the equal pay settlement in schools***

**7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of Schools Forum was scheduled to be held in Committee Room 6 on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2011, commencing at 5.00 p.m.

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  
Bishop Ramsey C of E School  
Hume Way  
Ruislip  
Middlesex HA4 8EE  
  
Telephone : 01895 639227  
E-mail: [awilcock@hillingdongrid.org](mailto:awilcock@hillingdongrid.org)

**Vice-Chair** : Jo Palmer  
Hillingdon Governors Executive  
Committee  
  
Telephone : 01895 470884  
E-mail : [joannapalmer44@hotmail.com](mailto:joannapalmer44@hotmail.com)/  
[jpalmer@hillingdongrid.org](mailto:jpalmer@hillingdongrid.org)