



# City of Westminster

## Westminster Schools Forum Meeting - Minutes

Date and time of meeting: Monday 21st January 2019 at 4.45pm

Location: 5 The Strand, London, WC2N 5HR

Representing	Name	Organisation	Attendance
<b>Primary Schools</b>	<b>6 Members</b>		
Primary Head	Sandra Tyrrell (ST)	Christchurch Bentinck Primary	Present
Primary Head	Darren Guttridge (DG)	Edward Wilson CE Primary	Present
Primary Head	Miles Ridley (MR)	St Peters' Eaton Square CE Primary	Apologies
Primary Governor	<b>Vacancy</b>		
Primary Governor	Andrew Garwood-Watkins (AGW) (Chair)	St Stephens CE Primary	Present
Primary Governor	<b>Vacancy</b>		
<b>Secondary schools</b>	<b>1 Member</b>		
Secondary Head	Eugene Moriarty (EM) <i>Penny Collins (PC) represented Mr Moriarty</i>	St Augustine's High School	Apologies
Secondary Head	Kathryn Pugh (KPUG)	The St Marylebone CofE School	Present
<b>Academies</b>	<b>5 Members</b>		
Secondary Non-Recoupment Academy Principal	Richard Ardron (RA)	Marylebone Boys School	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy Head	Sian Maddrell (SMA)	The Grey Coat Hospital	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy	Michael Bithell (MB) (Vice Chair)	United Westminster Schools Foundation	Present
Alternative Provision Academy	Krishna Purbhoo (KPUR)	TBAP	Present
Primary Recoupment Academy Head	Louisa Lochner (LL)	Gateway Academy	Present
<b>Maintained Nursery Schools</b>	<b>1 member</b>		
Nursery Head	Liz Hillyard (LH)	Tachbrook Nursery	Present
<b>Special Schools</b>	<b>1 member</b>		
Special Schools Head	Andy Balmer (AB)	Westminster Special Schools	Present
<b>Early Years (PVI)</b>	<b>1 member</b>		
	John Trow-Smith (JTS)	LEYF	Present
<b>14-19 Representative</b>	<b>1 member</b>		
	<b>Vacant</b>		
<b>Officers in Attendance</b>			
Director of Education	Ian Heggs (IH)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
Director of Operations and Programmes	Andrew Tagg (AT)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
Assistant Director SEN, Education	Julie Ely (JE)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
Lead Strategic Finance Manager	Anita Stokes (AS)	Bi-Borough Strategic Finance Education	Present
Finance Manager	Nicholas Grey (NG)	Bi-Borough Strategic Finance Education	Present
Senior Finance Manager	Amanda Anerville (AA)	Bi-Borough Strategic Finance Education	Present
Head of School Governor Services/Clerk	Jackie Saddington (JS)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
<b>Observers</b>			

Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Young People	Cllr David Harvey (DH)	Councillor	Present
Primary Headteacher	Mary Wilson (MW)	St Mary of the Angels	Present
Director of Finance and Administration	John McDonald (JM)	St Marylebone CofE School	Present

Item		Action
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Mr Moriarty, Mr Ridley and Cllr Wilkinson.</p>	
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p><b>MEMBERSHIP</b></p> <p>There were no changes to the Membership.</p>	
	<b>RESOLUTION: Clerk to continue to follow up on vacancies.</b>	<b>Clerk</b>
4. a)	<p><b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 15 OCTOBER 2018 AND 3 DECEMBER 2018</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2018 were agreed to be a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2018 were agreed subject to the following addition:</p> <p>“KG confirmed that any transfers made in a baseline year from the Schools Block, such as to High Needs or Falling Rolls funds, will reduce the funding floor baselines at school level when the NFF is introduced. Members noted that this will reduce the protection offered for individual schools indefinitely when the hard NFF is introduced at school level”.</p> <p><b>b) Matters Arising from minutes of 15 October 2018 not included elsewhere on the agenda:</b></p> <p><b>i) High Needs Review - Minute 5</b> A Working Group had been set up and was Chaired by Mr Garwood-Watkins. A paper will be produced for the March 2019 meeting.</p> <p><b>c) Matters Arising from minutes of 3 December 2018 not included elsewhere on the agenda:</b></p> <p>There were no matters arising not covered elsewhere.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: i) To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2018.</b> <b>ii) To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2018 subject to the above amendment.</b></p>	

	iii)To note the matters arising.	
5.	<p><b>SCHOOLS ORGANISATION STRATEGY</b></p> <p>AW informed Members that there was a significant surplus of places in the primary sector and a significant deficit of places in the secondary sector. The housing build for the future was being monitored along with the regeneration plans in the Borough.</p> <p>AW was asked if there was spare capacity of places London wide and if a further drop was expected from the October census. He was also asked if this was mirrored in other Boroughs. WA responded and explained there was spare capacity London wide in both the primary sector and the secondary sector. She informed Members that take up of places in the Borough in the primary sector was 90% of eligible residents. However, in the secondary sector there is a 50% import from other Boroughs with no change in the trend and WCC schools are popular due to the admissions criteria in schools and the location. There has been a moderate expansion of secondary schools in the Borough rather than full new builds. AW reiterated that regeneration can change demand and this is being monitored.</p> <p>AW was questioned about the regeneration programmes near the Gateway Academy and Church Street. AW reported the Church Street regeneration was a twenty-year programme and had already commenced. Cllr Harvey agreed and confirmed the first phase, a five-year period, had started but the impact on school numbers will need to be considered and modelling will need to be undertaken. The Chair pointed out the changes in the availability of affordable housing may also affect travel distances to schools. He asked if there was any more up to date data available. AS said the October census data in Appendix C, Paper A5 contained the most recent data.</p> <p>IH reported there had been a reduction of 4FE in WCC, resulting in a reduction of spare capacity from 15% to 12% in primary places. The LA is monitoring the trends and working with schools to reduce capacity. LBHF has cut admissions by 8FE and Tower Hamlets is also down by 11%. WA informed members that schools in WCC were popular and that would help with demand.</p> <p>Members asked if anything else could be done. IH reported there was less capacity available now and the LA was working with the LDBS to reduce the PAN in schools, where possible, as well as encouraging schools to use their budget allocations differently. The Council was committed to maintaining school places but there was a concern about the impact on standards in schools.</p> <p>The Chair stated the LA needed to take action over falling rolls and surplus school places, citing an example of 95% of properties of Berkeley's homes being sold to overseas buyers, which would have a negative impact on school places. Cllr Harvey informed Members that this was the theme he was addressing this month. He said it was anticipated that the population of the Church Street regeneration programme would return to the area and a Boundaries Commission review was due. It was essential schools worked together but in order to maintain standards hard decisions will need to be made. The Chair informed him that lots of schools were at a tipping point, stating bolder conversations needed to be had.</p> <p>IH informed Members he had written to schools offering training with AS and JS. He would also share information at the Chairs Forum and Governor's Conference. He highlighted Hallfield Primary school as an example of a school that had been pro-</p>	

	<p>active, as intakes were falling, by reducing the PAN from 3FE to 2FE. He advised there would also need to be a review of the allocation of the falling rolls fund. A Member expressed concern that any funds allocated to the falling rolls fund affects all schools.</p> <p>The Chair expressed the view that the Council had an opportunity to take out 1FE at Paddington Green and save capital at the same time, but IH reminded him that the DfE has responsibility for Academies, although the expectation was that Paddington Green and King Solomon will reduce admission numbers over time.</p> <p>A Member asked what criteria is used to determine when a school is no longer viable, whilst another asked if the LA will wait until a school fails. IH stated the final decision is based on whether a school can provide a good quality of education. The DfE and LA already meet regularly as do the LA and Diocese. The Chair pointed out this was not a decision for the Schools Forum, although where there are falling outcomes and/or a deficit the LA and DfE would investigate.</p> <p>AW and WA left the meeting at 5.20pm.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: i) To note the School's Organisation Strategy ii) Cllr Harvey, Chair and AT to meet to discuss falling rolls and capacity in WCC.</b></p>	Chair/AT
6.	<p><b>EARLY YEARS REVIEW</b></p> <p>AT informed Members that a consultation on combining the WCC Early Years team with RBKC to form the Bi-Borough Early Years team had commenced on 8 January 2019 and would finish on 8 February 2019. The LA can only retain 5% of funds centrally, as opposed to 10% previously, and the administrative side of Early Years needed reviewing. The highest number of nurseries is now in the PVI sector, with four maintained nurseries. The aim is to strengthen the Early Years provision and support. He was asked where the consultation had been advertised. AT said it had been advertised on the website and to all partners on the Early Years SEN group on 18 December 2018.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the consultation period could be extended as it was clear some Members had not been aware of it. Another Member asked if details of the consultation period had been put in the Bulletin to schools. AT confirmed it had been put in the bulletin, plus IH's letter and all normal communication channels except direct email.</p> <p>A member said he was hoping to receive information on the rates at this meeting. AS reported the LA was waiting on information from the ESFA and this information would be brought to the next meeting. It was pointed out the indicative funding had been released and it was not helpful to keep PVI settings waiting, just because the maintained nursery information was not yet available. AS said she understood, whilst explaining that the January 2019 EY census data had not been published yet.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: AT to re-circulate the Early Years consultation document</b></p>	

7.	<p><b>DSG 2018-2019 BUDGET MONITORING</b></p> <p>AS reported there had been an additional sum of £481k received from the DfE, which was Westminster’s share of the additional allocation for SEND funding, announced by the SoS for Education. The LA had also received a rebate of £390k following the closure of Minerva. Therefore, overall there is an underspend of £588k forecast.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: Noted.</b></p>	
8.	<p><b>HIGH NEEDS: TARGETED SUPPORT FUNDING OPTIONS AND POSITION REGARDING TRANSFER TO HIGH NEEDS BLOCK</b></p> <p>AS reported that there would be an underlying overspend of £702k after the £481k funding from the SoS for Education if there was no transfer of funds from the Schools Block.</p> <p>The methodology for the high needs funding protection, now known as targeted support funding was agreed at the Schools Forum on 27 January 2014. However, the way funding was allocated during 2018-2019 did not tie in with the decisions agreed in 2014.</p> <p>AS said she was unable to explain the methodology used in 2018-2019 as neither she, nor most staff employed in Finance, were employed at the LA at that time. She could trace the payments but not why payments were made. The allocations for 2018-2019 did need to be adjusted though. She said it was not proposed to take funding away from schools but to address the situation for schools that had not received sufficient allocations.</p> <p>The Chair reported the High Needs working party had considered a suggestion that funds could be clawed back from schools, noting for some schools this would be a significant amount and they would already have spent the funds. Therefore, it was recommended that schools that had been underpaid should now be paid the correct amount as the current year’s allocations were incorrect.</p> <p>A Member expressed the view that it was important to identify how the error had occurred and for an explanation to be provided to the Schools Forum, as it was a significant amount of money. AT said this occurred at a time when there was a high turnover of staff and a lot of temporary staff were employed. It would be possible to recoup the funds from schools over several years, although some Members expressed concern about such an action.</p> <p>AT explained that going forward there will be complete transparency and staff will follow the ESFA requirements and the APT Tool but this can’t be changed retrospectively.</p> <p><u>2019-2020 Funding</u></p>	

	<p>AS reported that the Finance and SEN teams had worked together to put forward the information presented to the High Needs Reference Group. She stated the Reference Group was recommending Option 4 with the schools at the top of the appendix receiving funding from the revised methodology and no school would lose out by more than £40k from the High Needs Block in 2019-20. The Chair stated that the working party also recommended that there should be a one-year transition from the High Needs Block to give schools time to adjust to the changes and they had discussed clawing back funds. The Vice Chair pointed out that schools may also receive income from other LA's. AT explained that the element 2 funding was already included in the budget allocation, therefore schools can't claw back funds from LA's, as it is not additional money but notional SEN.</p> <p><u>High Needs Block and transfer from the Schools Block</u></p> <p>AS referenced 5.1 on the paper. She advised that there would be an overspend of £1.183m before the allocation of £481k from the SOS and if there was no transfer from the Schools Block. However, with the changes made under Option 4 there would be no transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2019-2020.</p> <p>AT reported many LA's were transferring funds from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, thanked everyone for all their hard work and said this would leave WCC in a strong position. It was agreed to continue with the High Needs Review Group to ensure there is a continuous move towards "balancing the books" whilst increasing provision and maintaining quality.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: i) Paper to be provided on the methodology for the High Needs Funding allocations in 2018-19 with an explanation and recommendation.</b></p> <p><b>ii) To agree Option 4 as the preferred option for targeted support.</b></p> <p><b>iii) To pay schools that have been underpaid.</b></p> <p><b>iv) To continue with the High Needs review group.</b></p> <p><b>Members to send a representative if they are unable to attend group meetings.</b></p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>UPDATE ON PROVISIONAL DSG FUNDING 2019-2020, SCHOOLS REVENUE FUNDING SETTLEMENT, AUTHORITY PROFORMA TOOL AND SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING</b></p> <p>The Chair reminded Members it had been agreed that pupils would be funded to the highest amount possible with maximum funds going to the formula. This would enable everyone to strive to narrow the gap between the top and bottom students. The Principles that had been established were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Continue to support schools with restructuring costs</li> <li>➤ Continue to support schools with falling rolls</li> </ul>	

AS reported, it was expected that there would be a carry forward of £2.9m going into 2019-2020 and the Forum would need to consider growth. She was therefore recommending that the balance should not go below £2m, which would leave £900k for allocation.

The Chair suggested the LA should keep £2m, leaving £900k for allocation. The Forum should then consider the projected position of falling rolls and restructuring costs.

AS explained if funding was allocated to all schools with falling rolls above 5% this would account for £600k. IH asked if that was based on an 80% ratio and it was confirmed it was, although AWPU may change. AS further explained that reorganisation costs of £350k could be charged to balances. The LA need the Forum to set criteria to ensure schools are not double-funded. A Member asked of the impact if numbers were down. AS confirmed it wouldn't affect funding for 19/20 but it may for 20/21.

The Chair asked if Wilberforce Academy would qualify as planned, even though they were capped, and was told Wilberforce would qualify. The Chair queried even though they were capped. IH confirmed this was correct as they had been trying to resolve issues themselves. A Member expressed concern that some schools have received funding for falling rolls for four years and it was not equitable if repeated year on year. IH pointed out with a new criteria this could change.

The Vice Chair asked if the allocation of £597k was for restructuring or falling rolls. AS said it could be for falling rolls depending on the methodology used. He said there was no mention of restructuring in the paper. AS agreed, explained the criteria needed tightening, and stated a paper for decision would be brought to the meeting in March.

Members considered options for allocating funding, such as capping falling rolls funds and instructing more schools to restructure, whilst considering all the issues affecting schools and reviewing trends. The Chair said it was essential there was funding allocated for falling rolls. A Member questioned who is responsible for any deficit when a school is closed. AS explained the LA is responsible for maintained schools and if an Academy is closed with a deficit this can be charged to the LA. AT reminded Members the LA can withdraw delegation for maintained schools if necessary. IH said the expectation was that if an Academy closes the EFSA would be expected to deal with any deficit.

Members also considered MFL and Falling Rolls allocations. AT informed Members that the EFSA would be surprised and may question the LA if no allocation was made for falling rolls. He recommended protecting MFL funding at £300k, allocating £347k for falling rolls with the remainder being allocated for restructuring costs.

The Chair suggested alternatively falling rolls funding could be capped, leaving £600k remaining. A Member asked if schools with falling rolls should be

	<p>restructuring. AT confirmed this was already happening. He also pointed out when LA's lobby the DfE for additional funding the response is that school balances haven't changed nationally and therefore, there are enough funds in the system. In WCC, between 2012 and 2017 there has not been much change in school balances.</p> <p>IH advised that the Schools Forum should agree figures and reconvene the working group. The Chair said he would prefer the Schools Forum received papers from officers for transparency. IH said he would prefer to test any paper with a working group before bringing the final version to the Schools Forum. He anticipated one meeting would be required.</p> <p><u>Funding Methodology</u></p> <p>AS outlined the rationale for Option 1 and 2. Members noted the Headteachers meeting had asked for equity for all Members, whilst Option 2 would mean more schools would have a reduction and it required a higher level of MFG, although was more equitable. Consideration was also given to moving to the NFF or allowing more funding for deprivation. The Chair reminded everyone the Schools Forum should be looking at the least worst outcome for all pupils and how to prepare the maximum number of pupils for the NFF. The Schools Forum resolved to agree Option 1.</p> <p><u>De-Delegation</u></p> <p>Members were reminded of the statutory funding regulations in order to fund cover for a trade union post. It was agreed to continue de-delegation. Funding.</p>	
	<p><b>RESOLUTION: i) To reconvene the high needs review group ii) To agree Option 1. iv) To approve the de-delegation to fund cover for trade union support.</b></p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>The date of the next meeting is as follows:</p> <p>Monday 25 March 2019 – 4.45pm – Westminster City Hall</p>	

Meeting closed at 7pm

**ACTIONS**

Item 5	Meeting to take place to discuss falling rolls and capacity in WCC.	Cllr Harvey/Chair/AT
Item 6	To re-circulate the Early Years consultation document	AT
Item 8	To provide a paper on the 2018-19 methodology for the High Needs funding with an explanation and recommendation for the next meeting.	AT/AS
Item 8	To pay schools that have been underpaid.	AT/AS