



City of Westminster

Westminster Schools Forum – Extraordinary Meeting - Minutes

Date and time of meeting: Monday 26th March 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	Apologies
Primary Head	Miles Ridley (MR)	St Peters Eaton Square Primary	Present
Primary Head	Mary Wilson (MW)	St Mary of the Angels Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Vacant		
Primary Governor	Andrew Garwood-Watkins (AGW) (Chair)	St James & St John C E Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Vacant		
Secondary schools	1 Member		
Secondary Head	Eugene Moriarty (EM)	St Augustine's High	Apologies
Secondary Head	Sian Maddrell (SM)	The Grey Coat Hospital	Present
Academies	5 Members		
Secondary Non-Recoupment Academy Principal	Richard Ardron (RA)	Marylebone Boys School	Apologies
Secondary Recoupment Academy Head	Vacancy Ms Penny Collins (PC) attended as representative	Westminster Academy	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy	Michael Bithell (MB) (Vice Chair)	United Westminster Schools Foundation	Present
Alternative Provision Academy	Nathan Crawley-Lyons (NCL)	TBAP	Absent
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	Apologies
Early Years (PVI)	1 member		
	John Trow-Smith (JTS)	LEYF	Present
14-19 Representative	1 member		
	Vacant		
Officers in Attendance			
Director of Education	Ian Heggs (IH)	Tri-Borough Children's Services	Present
Director of Resources	Andrew Tagg (AT)	Tri-Borough Children's Services	Present
Finance	Feroza Begum (FB)	Tri-Borough Children's Services	Present
Finance	Anthony Lineker (AL)	Tri-Borough Children's Services	Absent
Clerk	Jackie Saddington (JS)	Tri-Borough Children's Services	Present
Observers			
Assistant Finance Manager	Nicholas Grey (NG)	Children's Finance	Present
Assistant City Treasurer	Steve Muldoon (SM)	Commercial and Financial Management	Apologies
Deputy Cabinet Member for Children,	Karen Scarborough (KS)	Councillor	Apologies

Families and Young People			
Observer	Peter Broughton (PB)	Westminster City School	Present
Observer	John McDonald (JM)	St Marylebone School	Present

Item		Action
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Ms Tyrell, Cllr Scarborough, Mr Moriarty, Mr Ardron, Mr Balmer and Mr Muldoon.</p>	
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p>MEMBERSHIP</p> <p><u>Primary Governor</u></p> <p>Members were informed Mr Ti Chen's term of office at Christchurch Bentinck Primary School ended on 10 February 2018. Therefore, he is no longer eligible to serve as a member on the School's Forum and the vacancy will need to be filled.</p>	
4.	<p>MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 29 JANUARY 2018</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2018 were agreed.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p> <p>RESOLUTION: To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2018 as a true record of the meeting.</p>	
5.	<p>NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA – COMPARISON BETWEEN NFF & LOCAL FUNDING FORMULA 18/19</p> <p>AT explained it was difficult and complex to compare the old formula against the new formula. He had liaised with the Chair and Vice Chair and an analysis had been carried out to see what the budget position would have looked like with no changes. The next step was to look at how it was transferred to APT. Local Authorities have been instructed to use the baseline and then add 0.5% for 18/19 and a further 0.5% for 19/20.</p> <p>AT explained the legislation doesn't account for the MFG and therefore funding will be taken back to the 17/18 funding levels and include the historical discrepancies. The LA is trying to address historic issues to move to the NFF, allow for the MFG and replicate the £130k lump sum.</p> <p>SM asked how the issues could be resolved. AT informed members all the issues had been raised with the DfE and the LA wanted to provide schools with 3 to 5-year</p>	

	<p>projections but the current changes gave variations in allocations of between -3% to +1%, giving an overall difference of 4%.</p> <p>The Vice Chair asked AT if the Schools Forum will have to escalate their concerns. AT explained that clarity was needed for schools receiving the MFG and the concerns had been raised with the DfE, but changes were needed in legislation or statutory guidance to resolve the problems.</p> <p>LL asked if use of the 18/19 baseline would give schools protection they required. AT said it would and cited an example to members.</p> <p>The Chair said his understanding was there could be a situation where funding was never level and may need a local adjustment, but it was not clear whether there was any to be made? AT informed members there would be a 0.5% increase per pupil and the LA was seeking a two-year transition. However, to date it had not been possible to get a clear answer from the DfE. The only advice from the DfE is to add 0.5% for 18/19 and 0.5% for 19/20.</p> <p>LL asked if the situation was unique to schools in the borough of Westminster. AT said it wasn't but not many Boroughs will lose 16% of funding. The answer is for additional funding to be provided in the system.</p> <p>The Chair suggested AT approached the DfE for their latest thoughts and then if there was no answer in four weeks the issues should be escalated. AT asked if the School's Forum were happy for the LA to share Appendix A with the DfE. MB pointed out the information was already in the public domain and the Chair requested that AT highlighted schools who were to receive the least amount of funding.</p> <p>JM said he was not sure Appendix A gave the right comparisons as it didn't reflect the funding floor. Schools need to be clear they won't be exposed to reductions of 1% of the funding floor above the 17/18 funding. AT pointed out that went against why the MFG was in place for the next two years. He said there is flux at the moment with two different funding mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transition funding - Reverting to 17/18 funding floor. 	
	<p>RESOLUTION:</p> <p>➔ AT to contact the DfE and escalate the concerns if there is no answer in four weeks.</p>	
6.	<p>EARLY YEARS FUNDING 2018/19</p> <p>NG referred members to Table 1 and Appendix A of the reports. He highlighted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hourly rate remains at £6.40 for the first 15 hours - The total figure of £8,733,312 shown under Base Rates per hour, per provider is significantly less than will be received. - A consistent deprivation factor has to be set (10%). - There is a discrepancy in the contingency figure between the amount the DfE have notified the LA and the amount derived from the local formula. - The number of 15 hours pupils is decreasing 	

	<p>- Two-year-old funding remains the same.</p> <p>JTS asked why the deprivation factor was only used for the first 15 hours of funding. NG explained that funding for deprivation cannot be considered under the criteria if extra hours are received. JTS asked for confirmation that a person could qualify for 30 hours funding and be in the most deprived area. NG confirmed this was correct. JTS pointed out it is only known if there will be additional funding retrospectively. He asked if there could be more than 10% who receive the supplement with all hours in scope. NG said it was possible based on the January dataset.</p> <p>AT explained it is possible to go over 10% and cap funding at 15 hours based on the universal offer. However, there could be challenges from either parents or a setting if a pupil was eligible for funding and the funds were not passed on. JTS pointed out there would be no impact as the funding is retrospective. LL also pointed that benefits can bring a minority up.</p> <p><u>Maintained nurseries Supplement</u></p> <p>JTS offered congratulations to the LA on winning the case for extra funding until April 2019. AT thanked him and informed members there were currently 484 standalone nurseries throughout the country who had asked the DfE if they can be given lump sums. Lobbying is taking place, but no answer had been forthcoming to date.</p> <p>MW noted that additional hours were funded at £3.70 per hour and asked if settings had been underfunded. AT said the LA only receive funding for 15 hours and the extra hours were subsidised.</p> <p>LL asked how the figure of £400k for SEN was arrived at. NG said no additional funding for SEN inclusion was provided for 0-5 years or 19-25 years. AT informed members the LA was trying to provide sufficient funding whilst expanding provision at the same time. LL asked if this only applied to nursery schools. AT confirmed that was correct, except for those children with an EHC plan.</p> <p>IH reminded members it was possible to apply for contingency funding for 0-5 years. AT agreed but pointed out demand was growing.</p> <p>LL informed members that some children who required NHS support had still to be seen and in order to access an EHC Plan, children already have to be receiving some support. IH agreed and said it was recognised that Early Years settings require assessments. AT reminded members it had been agreed previously by the Schools Forum that funding could be used from the balances budget.</p> <p>The Chair asked when the basis for distribution of the SEN inclusion funding would need to be agreed. He was informed it needs to be approved by June, but the implementation date would be backdated to April.</p> <p>JTS reminded AT that the School's Forum had asked to see the difference between different Early Year Lines. AT agreed to distribute this information with the minutes.</p> <p><u>RESOLUTION:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ To agree the hourly rates of £6.40 and £6.50 ➔ To note the contents of Appendix A 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ AT to circulate the parameters for the SEN inclusion fund via a letter to schools. ➔ To agree the deprivation calculation is set at £0.64 and is applied to the most deprived 10% of all pupils for the first 15 hours across nurseries, primaries, academies and PVI's. AT to investigate whether this can go above 10%. ➔ To agree the funding of the last term of full time places at £0.360m from DSG balances. ➔ AT to provide information on the difference between different Early Years lines, for circulation with the minutes. 	
7.	<p>FALLING ROLLS FUNDING 2018/19 – ITEM 8 ON THE AGENDA</p> <p>AT referred members to point 3.2 in the paper, pointing out that the criteria was laid down and all schools that receive funding were required to submit a final business case by 9th March 2018, to show the reasons for supporting funding in the following year.</p> <p><u>Hallfield Primary School</u> AT informed members that Hallfield Primary had reduced from a 3FE school to a 2FE school as part of a planned reduction and structural change.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the LA had given any assistance to the school. IH said there had been no assistance provided, although a criterion of 8% on balances for primary schools and 5% for secondary schools should have been included in the criteria. AT stated Hallfield had a balance of 13%. The Chair noted that if the planned loss of pupils was taken out Hallfield would not qualify. Members also noted that some schools choose to cap numbers and if they received funding another criterion would have to be added in. It was agreed that Hallfield did not qualify for funding on more than one criteria.</p> <p><u>Christ Church Bentinck</u> Members noted that Christ Church Bentinck did not have a falling roll. Therefore, Christ Church Bentinck did not meet the criterion for funding.</p> <p><u>ARK Paddington</u> Members heard a reduction in numbers was planned at ARK Paddington. Therefore, they did not meet the criteria.</p> <p>AT explained that it is possible to recycle funding, but the LA needed clarity from the DfE and he needed to reconsider the funding formula.</p> <p>The Chair said he was not entirely comfortable with the Schools Forum funding schools that had falling rolls but had an unspent budget, as they could use their reserves. He felt the options appeared to be distribution of funding via use of a formula or for schools to use their balances. LL reminded members that in the past the School's Forum had tried to protect small schools or those with falling rolls. AT agreed and said the LA will try to support schools where possible.</p> <p>RESOLUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ To note Appendix A ➔ To decline funding for Hallfield Primary school 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → To decline funding for Christ Church Bentinck Primary school → To decline funding for ARK Primary School. → AT to seek clarity from the DfE on the regulations for recycling funding → To approve funding for Burdett-Coutts and Townshend Foundation CofE Primary School and Our Lady of Dolours RC Primary School → To defer consideration of funding for St Edward’s Catholic Primary School to the June meeting. 	
8.	<p>HIGN NEEDS FUNDING 2018/19 – ITEM 7 ON THE AGENDA</p> <p>Members were informed that there are significant high needs pressures in many local authorities and demand continues to increase. The LA is working with other councils to lobby for additional funding.</p> <p>AT reminded members they had agreed to transfer £562k to the High Needs Block, giving the high Needs block funding of just under £23m.</p> <p>The situation in London was very complex with a total overspend across London of £110m, an increase from £20m two years ago. The independent sector needs a 6.5% increase to deal just with cost pressures. From 2021 the LA will only have responsibility for the High Needs Block. Overall LA’s have seen income reduced by 45% and with the overspends amongst councils the future is uncertain. IH agreed and informed members Mr Edward Timpson MP, had been informed that LA’s have insufficient funds.</p> <p>AT reminded members that schools have to pay for the first £6k of SEN funding for each pupil out of their overall budget. A decision needed to be made on the allocation of £1.1m in the High Needs block.</p> <p>The Chair asked when Purdah would finish. He was informed this concluded on 4 June and a cabinet then had to be formed.</p> <p>JTS asked if there was any information on the use of voluntary council tax donations. IH said a consultation would take place on how to spend this income. AT explained there was challenges for the LA with funding, but school funds will be protected.</p> <p>MB agreed the demands on balances were still there and asked if it was possible to lobby National Government. IH and AT said the DfE do seem to be recognising the problem but a high level of funding would be required across the country. The MFG is a decision to be taken locally but this can only be done once the LA is clear on the challenges and balances available. IH explained a briefing would also need to be prepared for the Cabinet Leader after the May elections.</p> <p>RESOLUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → AT to bring paper on criteria for distribution of the £1.1m High Needs balances to the next meeting. 	
9.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>New Agresso and Payroll provider</p>	

	AT informed members the LA was moving from BT to Hampshire SHP from October 2018.	
10.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING 11 June 2018 – 4.45pm – Venue to be confirmed.	