



City of Westminster

Westminster Schools Forum Meeting - Minutes

Date and time of meeting: Monday 15th October 2018 at 4.45pm

Location: 5 The Strand, London, WC2N 5HR

Representing	Name	Organisation	Attendance
Primary Schools	6 Members		
Primary Head	Sandra Tyrrell (ST)	Christchurch Bentinck Primary	Present
Primary Head	Darren Guttridge (DG)	St Peters' Eaton Square Primary	Present
Primary Head	Mary Wilson (MW)	St Mary of the Angels Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Vacancy		
Primary Governor	Andrew Garwood-Watkins (AGW) (Chair)	St Stephens CE Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Vacancy		
Secondary schools	1 Member		
Secondary Head	Eugene Moriarty (EM)	St Augustine's High School	Apologies
Secondary Head	Kathryn Pugh	The St Marylebone CofE School	Present
Academies	5 Members		
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	TBAP	Present
Primary Recoupment Academy Head	Louisa Lochner (LL)	Gateway Academy	Present
Maintained Nursery Schools	1 member		
Nursery Head	Liz Hillyard (LH)	Tachbrook Nursery	Present
Special Schools	1 member		
Special Schools Head	Andy Balmer (AB)	Westminster Special Schools	Absent
Early Years (PVI)	1 member		
	John Trow-Smith (JTS)	LEYF	Absent
14-19 Representative	1 member		
	Vacant		Apologies
Officers in Attendance			
Director, Children's Service	Melissa Caslake (MC)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
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 SEND	Julie Ely (JE)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Apologies
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	Bi-Borough Strategic Finance Education	Present
Head of School Governor Services/Clerk	Jackie Saddington (JS)	Bi-Borough Children's Services	Present
Observers			

Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Young People	Cllr David Harvey (DH)	Councillor	Present
Deputy Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Young People	Karen Scarborough (KS)	Councillor	Apologies
Observer	Mr Miles Ridley	St Peters' Eaton Square Primary	Present
Observer	Sara Bagnall (SB)	Marylebone Boys' School	Present
Observer	John McDonald (JM)	St Marylebone CofE School	Present

Item		Action
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr Karen Scarborough, Mr Eugene Moriarty, Mrs Julie Ely</p>	
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p>MEMBERSHIP</p> <p>The Clerk reminded members of the vacancies on the School's Forum.</p> <p>Alternative Provision Academy – Mr Krishna Purbhoo (Executive Headteacher TBAP West) was appointed to represent the Alternative Provision Academy.</p> <p>Primary Headteacher – Mr Darren Gutteridge (Edward Wilson Primary School) was appointed in place of Mr Miles Ridley.</p> <p>Primary Governors – The clerk advised she was liaising with Democratic Services to try to fill the positions.</p> <p>Secondary headteacher – Mrs Kathryn Pugh (The Marylebone CofE School) was appointed as the Secondary Headteacher representative.</p> <p>14-19 Representative – The vacancy was noted.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION: Clerk to continue to follow up on the vacancies as above.</p>	Clerk
4.	<p>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 12 JUNE 2018</p> <p><u>Minutes of meeting held on 12 June 2018</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2018 were agreed.</p> <p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>➔ To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2018 as a true record of the meeting.</p>	

5.	<p>HIGH NEEDS REVIEW</p> <p>AT reported that the working party had met on 8 October 2018 to consider the challenges related to the allocated funding of £23m.</p> <p>The group had considered the need to identify the priority areas and it had been agreed a detailed review of every budget line needed to be carried out, along with a detailed review of how the spending works.</p> <p>IH explained that how the funding allocation could be used differently also needed to be considered. He also recommended a Headteacher should chair the working party.</p> <p>The Chair said he was encouraged to see the LA taking the issues forward and in a transparent way which would provide more certainty to schools.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ To request from the Headteacher meetings a Headteacher to Chair the Working Group meeting. ➔ AT to provide a detailed review of the budget and how the budget is used for the next meeting. 	<p>AT</p> <p>AT</p>
6.	<p>DSG 2018/2019 BUDGET MONITORING</p> <p>AS highlighted a £2.3m reduction in Early Years funding and referred members to table 2 of the report under item 3.1. She explained that the figure of +1475 at the bottom of the table takes into account the £565k transferred to the High Needs Block. The figure of +1011 under the Total High Needs Block was in line with the 2017-2018 figure of £1.5m.</p> <p>Members asked whether a smaller amount could be retained for central services. AT informed members the configuration of the Early Years team was being reviewed, although the LA hold 5% of funding. He said the LA was aware that the requirements would always be in excess of what the LA predicted was required. Whilst parents need to be encouraged to register, the LA is also engaging with Childcare Works and the DfE.</p> <p>AT pointed out retrospective funding for RBKC place funding from September 2018-March 2019 would be required.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Noted. 	
7.	<p>PROVISIONAL DSG FUNDING SETTLEMENT, NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA AND LOCAL FUNDING FORMULA 2019/2020.</p> <p>AS explained that decisions of the Schools Forum were key for the next two years. She highlighted table 2 at paragraph 2.2. She was asked why schools had only received an increase of 0.3% when the LA had received more funding and why the PUF and SUF increases had been at the levels shown. She explained the requirements of the MFG and referenced the 2017-2018 baseline.</p>	

The Chair questioned whether the correct increase should be 0.5%. AS informed him that the calculations were made nationally but were 0.3% for WCC. AT advised the forum he would not recommend challenging on the figures, but it would be better to lobby for increased funding overall.

In response to questions from members the forum was advised the lump sum was included in the per pupil funding in the options along with the area cost adjustment which was applied to every factor in the NFF options.

AT referred members to the table at paragraph 3.2. He pointed out the figures could change as two amounts had been taken out for 2018-2019. He also informed members the total shown was £3.5m more than the LA had received. The LA had modelled the figures but the DfE model still showed £1m more. AS said the LA was trying to obtain an explanation from the DfE as to why the figures could be so different.

Options 1-4 were discussed, with the forum noting that the figures shown were not the final figures. Twenty schools had been represented at a consultation meeting, with 8 responses received. Option 3 was most favoured from the responses received, with option 4, the least favoured.

AS informed members no decision had been made on the MFG. The DfE intended on using a funding floor which was their version of protection for schools and WCC Schools Block will not receive anything under the funding floor, which will be the same for all the other London LA's. AT explained that the original intention had been to use a funding floor for 2017-2018 and then 0.5% the following year and 1% for the second year but the DfE changed this and introduced the MFG. Ultimately WCC would lose 4% but the MFG will take schools through the transition. AS said she was happy to clarify with the DfE that the MFG must be used as opposed to the funding floor, as WCC had received no allocation for the funding floor.

The Chair expressed frustration that there was still no certainty for schools, as it means they can't plan on how their schools will be resourced going forward. He asked if it would be possible to invite someone from the ESFA to attend the next meeting. IH explained that would be possible and the ESFA are also entitled to attend the meetings anyway.

Cllr Harvey suggested organising a meeting with the ESFA, the LA and a representative from the Schools Forum.

Members were informed ESFA will give no assurances, but funding must be fair, transparent and equitable which is why MFG is used.

Primary heads expressed concern that there had been a short consultation period and timeframe to respond and they had abstained rather than make a decision as they felt they did not have sufficient information available at the time, such as the per pupil figures. Generally, it was felt Option 3 was the least polarising for primary schools.

Members also felt there was an unfair allocation across schools, local factors were unclear, more schools would lose out under options 1 and 3 and the needs of pupil premium children were not being met. It was also highlighted that there was insufficient funding available and the teacher's pay award was not being completely

	<p>funded by the DfE, which was an added pressure on schools.</p> <p>AT reminded members the meeting on 10 October 2018 was not a consultation. It was an information sharing meeting to enable a greater understanding of the issues.</p> <p>The Chair reminded everyone their decisions should reflect what was best for every single pupil, not their own settings. The APT Tool needed to be submitted to the DfE by the LA by 19 January 2019. He suggested organising a presentation by the ESFA to schools with a decision following the presentation.</p> <p>Cllr Harvey stated representations should be made to the DfE asap. IH agreed and also supported inviting the ESFA to a meeting. They agreed they wanted to achieve the best settlement to enable schools to be run effectively.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Officers to provide a timeline to the Chair to engage the ESFA presentation. ➔ To review updated figures after information has been received from the ESFA, but before the 21st January 2019 statutory deadline for APT submission. 	<p>AT/AS</p> <p>AT/AS</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>UPDATE ON DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG) BALANCE PROPOSALS AND SCHOOL BALANCES INCLUDING RAG RATING</p> <p>Members were referred to Table 2, Paragraph 3.1.</p> <p>IH reminded members of the Schools Forum that they did not have to commit to everything at this meeting, but the LA was recommending some funding was transferred to the High Needs Block. Better value was required from the health providers and as the CCG is the main provider, the LA wants to press for changes for 2019-2020. He said the LA wants to provide an extra therapist at extra cost, to support the schools and enable more staff to be trained. Members questioned whether SALT had capacity, noted that the Heads Executive was unanimous that they did not want this extra provision and would rather have a trained therapist to work one to one with pupils and wanted more transparency and clarity.</p> <p>Members discussed whether there was a necessity to provide funding for one off school restructuring costs, pointing out many schools had already restructured and would receive no benefit. AT said this suggestion was due to the LA receiving a large number of requests as a result of falling rolls.</p> <p>Members questioned how much had already been spent on restructuring, observing that there is too much provision in schools, which will mean schools will be forced to restructure. They were informed primary school surpluses are down, there is a need to allocate some balances and the LA had to consider what was affordable, which was why £300k had been set aside to partially fund a minimum funding level whilst ensuring a small</p>	

	<p>amount was left for the DSG in 2020-2021, which is likely to be needed for high needs pressures.</p> <p>The Chair noted there were no figures shown for 2020-2021 and wanted assurance about the funding for 2020-2021 as he did not want to see further hardship for schools in 2020-2021.</p> <p>IH stated a review was currently underway by the LA, with all areas being looked at. He was asked to guarantee that there would be no reduction in provision. MC stated that it would not be possible to give any guarantees at this meeting. IH reminded members that statutory provision has to be funded and the LA was looking at the top up rates.</p> <p>The Chair pointed out to Members that they must be clear on the consequences of using the £300k. He was also reminded that £300k equates to 10% of the budget and will support a lot of pupils. AS also asked if there would be a decision before the transfer of funds to the High Needs Block.</p> <p>MC left at 6.27pm.</p> <p>The Chair expressed concern that the £300k was to be taken from balances. He questioned whether it should go back in the formula or go to the top up funds. Additionally, he asked whether members felt a decision should be taken at the meeting or be put to schools for transparency.</p> <p>IH informed the Chair that AS needed clarity. AT said they could go back to the baseline and hold a workshop. Funding could be allocated proportionately, through a 50/50 allocation, or on pupil numbers.</p> <p>Members voted by a majority to allocate funding proportionately by sector. Subsequently, some Members disagreed with the outcome, and it was agreed that the vote of the Schools Forum would be reported to the Cabinet Member, along with the views of the Chair for a final decision.</p> <p>The Chair reminded AT that he was going to provide the Schools Forum with a paper on the criteria for funding, which he said he was happy to do. IH said it needed to contain clear criteria like that for School Rolls. In the meantime, he recommended deferring any decisions.</p>	
	<p><u>RESOLUTION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ To note the RAG rating. ➔ To note the proposed use of DSG balances. ➔ To reject the proposal for the Development of the Local Offer – speech language and Communication Support: Targeted Offer for WCC Primary Schools. ➔ To defer a decision on one off school restructuring costs to support viability. ➔ To agree to allocate a one-off allocation of £300k to partially address the minimum funding level. 	

	<p>→ To note the High Needs growth, hospital schools' education & post 16 unfunded growth.</p>	
9.	<p>SCHOOL PLACE PLANNING INCLUDING MINERVA CLOSURE AND MOVEMENT OF FUNDS TO RECEIVING WESTMINSTER SCHOOLS UNDER GROWTH FUNDS</p> <p>Members were asked to send any comments to Wendy Anthony or Alan Wharton by the end of the first week after half term.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>→ Members to send any comments to Wendy Anthony or Alan Wharton by the end of the first week after half term.</p>	ALL
10.	<p>SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS PROPOSED CHANGES</p> <p>Members were asked to provide feedback to Anita Stokes within 7 days.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>→ Members to send feedback to Anita Stokes within seven days.</p>	ALL
11.	<p>DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL OFFER -SPEECH AND LANGUAGES</p> <p>This was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>→ To defer to the next meeting.</p>	
12.	<p>OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS</p> <p>All actions had been completed.</p>	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>→ Noted.</p>	
13.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	
14.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The dates of the next meetings are as follows:</p> <p>Monday 21 January 2019 – 4.45pm – 5 The Strand</p> <p>Clerk's note: [Monday 3 December 2018 - 4.45pm – 5 The Strand (EGM)]</p>	

Meeting closed at 7.00pm