

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham



Schools Forum

Minutes

Tuesday 21 March 2017

Representing	Name	Organisation	Attendance
Primary Schools	5 Members		
Primary Head	Claire Fletcher (CF)	St Paul's CE Primary School	Present
Primary Head	Wayne Leeming (WL)	Melcombe Primary School	Present
Primary Head	Kathleen Williams (KW)	Holy Cross RC Primary School	Present
Primary Governor	Daisy Armstrong (DA)	Avonmore Primary School	Present
Primary Governor	Sharon Robinson (SR)	John Betts Primary School	Present
Secondary schools	1 Member		
Secondary Head	Vacancy		
Academies	5 members		
Secondary Non Recoupment Academy Principal	Gary Kynaston (GK)	Hammersmith Academy	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy Head			
Secondary Recoupment Academy	Vacancy		
Secondary Recoupment Academy (Observer)	Peter Haylock (PH)	Fulham College Trust	Present
Primary Academy	Vacancy		
Maintained Nursery Schools	1 member		
Nursery Head	Michelle Barratt (MB)	Vanessa/Randolph Beresford Early Years Centre School	Apologies
Special Schools	1 member		
Special Schools Head	Cathy Welsh (CW)	Jack Tizard	Present
Alternative Provision	1 member		
Alternative Provision Rep	Nathan Crawley-Lyons (NCL)	TBAP	Present
Early Years (PVI)	1 member		
	Jane Gleasure (JG)	Little People	Present
14-19 Representative	1 member		
	Vacant		
School Business Manager	2 observers		
Primary (Maintained)	Tara McLaughlin (TM)	The Good Shepherd Primary School	Present
Secondary (Academy)	Tim Scott (TS)	Fulham College Trust	Present
Trade Union	1 observer		
	Katie Brown (KB)	NUT	Present
Officers in Attendance			
Tri Borough Director of Finance & Resources	Dave McNamara (DM)	Tri Borough Children's Services	Present
Tri Borough Head of Resources	Andrew Tagg (AT)	Tri Borough Children's Services	Present
Tri-Borough Head of Admissions and School Place Planning	Wendy Anthony (WA)	Tri Borough Children's Services	Present
Tri Borough Commissioning	Rupa Parmar (RP)	Tri Borough Children's Services	Present
3BM Managing Director	Andy Rennison (AR)	3BM	Present
3BM Schools Finance Director	Remi Oladupo (RO)	3BM	Present

Observers			
Headteacher	Julie James (JJ)	Wormholt Primary School	Present
School Business Manager	Caroline Plummer (CB)	Wormholt Primary School	Present
	Robert Jones		
Clerk	Jackie Saddington (JS)	Tri Borough Children's Services	Present

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

As set out above.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 January 2017 were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting.

3. **NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA UPDATE**

Members were informed that briefings had taken place at the School's Forum, schools have had access to workshops and Councillors had held a public meeting at Hammersmith Town Hall at the end of February. A consultation response from the LA had been late going out and AT apologised for that. He reminded everyone the deadline for responses to the consultation was 22 March. It is not known how long it will take the DfE to assess the responses but the outcome could be known by the end of May.

Members outlined the actions their individual schools had taken to galvanise support for the consultation. The Chair asked that everyone continued campaigning beyond the deadline.

IH reported the LA would respond to the High Needs Block consultation too. Schools may also want to respond to the High Needs Block consultation as this will also impact on mainstream schools. AT reported this consultation has had a lower profile due to the National Funding Formula consultation taking the focus away.

CF asked if it was any coincidence that both consultations were running simultaneously. She was informed that the High Needs consultation was being led separately by Edward Timpson and there was not a lot of funding available.

CW pointed out that Special Schools deliver Education, Social Services and Health Care but the DfE did not seem to understand the complexity of what was required as the review was being led by accountants. AT agreed and informed members 70% of Local Authorities were forecasting overspends.

IH reported there was an active Parent Forum in LBHF and he would like to see them consulted too.

RESOLVED: AT to organise for the High Needs Consultation to be circulated.

4. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT MONITORING 2016/17

AT reported there was pressure in all blocks and highlighted the areas with overspend. He explained the projected carry forward was forecast as a deficit of £4.28m, down from £1.01m brought forward on 1 April 2016. The areas affected are redundancies and schools in difficulty.

The Chair asked AT what action he recommended the School's Forum should take. AT said he was not recommending anything currently but wanted members to be aware of the position at the moment and that work will be carried out in 2017-2018 to review the position.

DM said the LA will lobby for additional funds. A meeting had already taken place with the EFA but an extra meeting may be needed.

The Chair asked where meetings with the minister take place as it may be beneficial to hold meetings in schools, particularly a Special School. DM said meetings usually took place at the DfE or Palace of Westminster but he suggested Jack Tizard or Queensmill schools would also be appropriate. He agreed to discuss with HF Cabinet members whether they would want to contact the minister directly to request a meeting but informed members of the forum that they needed to understand the level of overspend cannot be maintained. CW expressed concern that if the levels of funding were not maintained the result could be part-time support for pupils. IH reminded members Peter Grey would be reporting back with a detailed analysis in the summer term.

JJ asked what level of additional funding would be received. DM said about £2m in total but it could be scaled back, although this only goes half way to addressing the issue. Post 19 costs will increase and if additional funding is not provided other options would need to be considered. AT reminded everyone that the current need is not driven by accountants and that demand pressures are not being anticipated by the Government in funding settlements.

IH informed members the communications director is reviewing funding decisions from Health and the SEN working group has discussed implementing higher rates for non-borough residents using provision. CW pointed out that more parents of pupils with complex needs are also electing to send their children to mainstream schools.

DM explained he was not sure how health funding would be transferable to maintained schools. The LA has to fund AP and all services whilst AP can mask spending on High Needs and a separation needs to be shown.

AT explained the intention from June was to lobby for new funds, review the provision and top up rates and look at how the notional SEN block is spent.

The Chair stated it was imperative that a full report was received well in advance of the next meeting so that members had plenty of time to read it. DM agreed and said all actions will be brought to the next meeting. GK commented SEN provision in the borough was so good it worked against the LA. He asked for a long-term plan to be presented with examples of changes from April. AT said it was hoped additional funding would be received of £720k from the Central block to the High Needs block and £500k from the EFA to the High Needs Block.

DA asked where the impact would be felt, with pupils or staff. DM said the first priority was to balance the budget, which included schools balancing their own budgets.

CF asked how much was spent on funding the Independent sector and tribunals. DM said that analysis had still to be done and would be brought to the next meeting.

IH said it was a statutory requirement to publish and review the Local Offer. At the moment, some provision in the LA was full whilst in other areas there were vacancies. There is a need to look at the actual requirements and then commission or de-commission provision accordingly. DM said the LA will not do anything without consultation. It is premature to think of having to decommission provision whilst the review is underway. Increases are being driven by need and it is the responsibility of the EFA to fund need.

JG asked if the aim was to start with 2-3 year olds onwards. DM said it was and PVI settings and maintained nurseries would be consulted.

RESOLVED:

- i) To note the total DSG allocation and current financial position.**
- ii) To note that the projected carry forward is forecast as a deficit of £4.28m, down from £1.01m brought forward on 1st April 2016.**

5. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT AND LOCAL SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA 2017/18

DM reminded members that budgets are not released until they are approved by the Schools Forum. Historically, individual schools' indicative budgets have not been released in advance of the School's Forum meeting. This may be reviewed for future years as it is appreciated schools need to know their budgets, even if this was a provisional figure. CF agreed this would help schools and asked what other Local Authorities do. AT said the date the EFA require information is 1 March. RP said the deadline was 20 January 2017.

KW asked what was meant by de-delegation and how this was agreed. AT explained this referred to areas that schools could be in as a block, such as Licences and Union Contributions. A full list could be provided going forward. KW asked when this was last agreed and was told January 2017. DM explained In Hammersmith and Fulham some money has been used to fund

capital programmes, such as the windows programme. The slice of schools block is historically higher and been locked in. He said he was mindful the LA had to share the funding pressure with schools. With the curtailing of the role of the LA it is important that the funds go to the schools. KW pointed out this was a significant part of the budget in comparison to what other LA's do. DM said there were different models in each LA and historic practices. KW asked to be sent a full breakdown of de-delegation funding and it was agreed this would be useful to all schools. A de-delegation breakdown of spend to be brought to the next meeting.

DM informed members Pupil Premium numbers were variable across the Borough. The Pupil Premium figure initially sent to schools is an indicative figure and the final figure is confirmed in July. CF asked if that could be communicated to schools and asked whether there would be claw back after a year. DM said there would not be a claw-back if there was an error by the LA. AT explained historically adjustments had been made the following year but will now be done in year.

RESOLVED:

- i) To approve the School's budgets for 2017/18.**
- ii) To provide a breakdown of De-Delegation funding to the next meeting.**

6. EARLY YEARS NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA 2017/18

A report by the Head of Resources had been circulated.

AT explained there had been a significant change since the January report. In January, a proposed structure had been put forward and this had been updated. There would now be a universal rate for all settings from April 2017. This would protect maintained nurseries, safeguard full time places for 2017/18, mean no primary school would lose funding, increase the hourly rate to PVI's and encourage settings to provide full time provision. The current and proposed universal base rates for Hammersmith and Fulham providers shown at 3.1 and 3.2 were highlighted.

AT explained a drawdown of £450k from the reserves would be required which is offset by children in nurseries now who will receive funding. Financial viability from April 2019 had not yet been addressed for maintained schools and workshops will take place from April to September. The LA is now compliant with EFA requirements.

CF asked when there would be an early indication of funding finishing. AT said 2017/18 had been completed and there will be no full-time places until September 2018. Further challenges will start to come in 2018/2019.

JG expressed the view that the outcome was overwhelmingly positive and asked how the full-time places for deprivation was audited. AT said it was based on a trust model; checking with schools and reviewing deprivation

indices. JG said children with high needs requirements are not getting places and are not eligible for full time places. This is creating difficulties for families.

DM explained that before the proposed changes came in the LA wanted to support families. There is now distorted provision which the LA would like to restore in future. There are more full time funded places in LBHF and that gives some flexibility. No school will lose funding from this model but the impact will not be known until September. The LA still wants to target families in need, although some nurseries are under threat. It is hoped the EFA will release additional funding as this is the first year of significant change. The LA are asking that schools do not pre-empt changes and wait to see what will happen. The Council wants to support, and increase, the level of affordable childcare through nurseries and schools.

CF expressed concern that some schools/nurseries were not offering full time places and therefore families were not benefitting.

KW asked how the 15 and 30 hours were charged for. DM said it was through historic allocations and choice. CF asked if there was a top up for full-time places and was informed there was. DM explained maintained schools can buffer costs for nursery classes whereas stand-alone nurseries don't have that support. JJ agreed and said the schools were subsidising nurseries at the moment.

DA asked what the strategy would be where nurseries/schools are not sustainable? DM said he expected to see some changes in maintained nurseries but the impact and implications on schools running nurseries with full-time places would not be known until September. This could then be analysed.

IH explained the nurseries in LBHF were already in Federations with an Executive Headteacher and sharing some back-office functions. Some LA's are closing maintained nurseries but Councils want parents to have choice. JG said she would like a mechanism put in place to signpost parents and was informed this would be addressed through the workshops.

RESOLVED:

- i) To approve the funding rates for the 2017/18 financial year.**
- ii) To approve the arrangements outlined and continue funding of full time places.**
- iii) Budgets to be sent to schools by 24 March 2017.**

7. SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS

The scheme for financing schools had previously been circulated.

- RESOLVED:**
- i) To note the consultation responses**
 - ii) To approve the Scheme for Financing Schools.**

8. SCHOOL ORGANISATION AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY

WA informed members the strategy was the first draft. She outlined the shortfall in projections for Primary and Secondary schools and reminded everyone that the LA worked on an expected number of vacancies of between 5-10% for each sector. Demand is reviewed annually and takes into account trends.

Primary Schools

Primary projections, as shown on Page 6 of the report, were discussed. Ms Anthony informed members the demand was expected to be consistent over the next ten years, although housing development will impact on demand.

The north of the borough will have a significant surplus of places in the region of 15%. The south of the borough will have a significant surplus in the region of 11%. Work is currently being undertaken with primary schools to address any issues with a view to agreeing to cap places in the short term.

IH recommended that schools should not change their admissions numbers and criteria as it was possible to cope with the ebbs and flows of admissions requirements. He gave examples of where the LA had supported schools with admissions and where schools had made decisions themselves that then impacted on nearby schools. JJ asked if the LA had any knowledge that Burlington Danes Primary was going to open as a 2FE school. IH said the LA was aware that they had been allocated funding for a 2FE school but the school chose to implement the 2FE immediately, which the LA was not aware was going to happen. This had a significant impact on Old Oak Primary School.

Secondary Schools

WA reported there was currently a surplus in the secondary sector and the LA was monitoring the position but no decisions had been taken on next steps yet. It is projected that by 2021-2022 there will be an increase in demand. It is expected there will be more import than export to LBHF schools, due to the number of good schools in the Borough.

GK pointed out that there were three brand new schools, expansions and changing demographics impacting on schools as well as Ofsted judgments impacting on demand for schools. WA said this was why the LA monitored and reviewed provision annually. IH reminded everyone the LA had the highest EBACC score in the country which attracts parents although the LA can't prioritise places for residents.

WL asked if there were any plans for the primary schools in the south of the borough who were seeing falling rolls. He was told parents are encouraged to choose local schools although some parents will choose independent schools.

CF thanked WA for a comprehensive report.

RESOLVED: To note the draft School Organisation and Investment strategy.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

RESOLVED: Noted.

10. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

13 June 2017 – 2pm

Meeting started: 2.10pm

Meeting ended: 3.34pm

Chairman