

HILLINGDON SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 26 September 2019 at 2pm at the Civic Centre

Voting members

NAME	ORGANISATION	ATTENDANCE
Maintained Nursery (1)		
Ludmila Morris	McMillan Early Childhood Centre	PRESENT
Maintained Primary - Schools (4)		
Rachel Anderson	Dr Triplett's School	PRESENT
Duncan Greig	Breakspear Primary School	PRESENT
Kris O'Sullivan	Deanesfield Primary School	PRESENT
Sophia Shaikh	Grange Park Junior School	ABSENT
Maintained Primary - Governors (4)		
Jim Edgecombe (CHAIR)	Whiteheath Junior School	PRESENT
Tony Eginton	Minet Nursery & Infant School and Hillside Junior School	PRESENT
Phil Haigh	Cherry Lane Primary School and Meadow High School	APOLOGIES
Jo Palmer	Hillside Infant School and Hillside Junior School	APOLOGIES
Maintained Secondary (1)		
Liz Horrigan	Harlington School	PRESENT
Maintained Special (1)		
John Goddard	Hedgewood School	PRESENT
Academies (9)		
Bob Charlton	Charville Primary School	PRESENT
Tracey Hemming	Middlesex Learning Partnership	PRESENT
Robert Jones	Haydon School	APOLOGIES
Helen Manwaring	Swakeleys School	ABSENT
Peter Ryerson	Guru Nanak Sikh Academy	PRESENT
David Patterson	Queensmead School	PRESENT
Sandra Voisey	Laurel Lane Primary School	ABSENT
(two vacancies)		-
Special Academies (1)		
Sudhi Pathak	Eden Academy Trust	APOLOGIES
Alternative provision (1)		
Laurie Cornwell	The Skills Hub	PRESENT
Private Voluntary & Independent Early Years Providers (2)		
Elaine Caffary	4 Street Nursery	APOLOGIES
Lesley Knee	Ruislip Methodist Preschool	APOLOGIES
14-19 Partnership (1)		
(vacant)		

Other attendees (non-voting)

Independent Non-Maintained Special School		
Debbie Gilder	Pield Heath School	PRESENT
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Schools)		
Rachel Blake	Whiteheath Infant School	NOT REQUIRED
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Governor)		
John Buckingham	Glebe Primary School	NOT REQUIRED
Mr Graham Wells	Colham Manor Primary School	NOT REQUIRED
Local Authority Officers		
Kate Boulter	Clerk	PRESENT
Steve Denbeigh	LA Finance	PRESENT
Dan Kennedy	Director Housing Environment Education Performance Health & Wellbeing	PRESENT
Peter Malewicz	Finance Manager - Children and Young People Services	PRESENT
Graham Young	Lead Finance Business Partner - School	APOLOGIES

		ACTION
1.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies were accepted and recorded in the attendance list (above). The Chair confirmed the meeting was quorate and could proceed to business.</p>	
2.	<p>MEMBERSHIP</p> <p>There were two vacancies for Academy Representatives following the resignation of Joan Greening since the last meeting. A number of rounds of nominations over the past two years had failed to fill all vacancies, and the Forum had agreed at its last meeting that the Chair and Vice-Chair would identify candidates for co-option to fill the vacancies.</p>	JE/PH
3.	<p>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE 2019</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2019, and the confidential annex, were agreed as correct records.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE 2019</p> <p><u>Minute 4 – Surcharge for Admissions</u> DK advised that the LA sought to work collaboratively with schools and he would pick up with headteachers the need for forward planning admissions changes to avoid burden on the Admissions team at its busiest periods. The LA would not consider surcharging schools at present.</p> <p><u>Minute 4 – Place planning</u> DK reported that the place planning consultant had met with primary headteachers and a number of them had indicated a desire to reduce or cap their school’s PAN. The LA had identified areas where a reduction in PAN would work whilst mindful of the need for a coordinated approach to ensure sufficient spaces across the Borough. The LA would be discussing proposals to reduce or cap PAN with individual schools. The requirement to consult meant that the earliest a permanent PAN reduction could be implemented was the 2020/21 academic year however a ‘soft’ cap prior to that would be possible.</p> <p>Projecting future place demand was challenging. The previous year had seen growth in secondary demand and a fall in primary demand, and overall net migration into the Borough. This year overall there was net migration out of the Borough. Private rental prices were driving families out of the Borough and parents were applying for selective grammar schools over the border into neighbouring boroughs. There needed to be flexible options for building extra capacity when needed.</p> <p>The Forum requested a further update on place planning at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Minute 4 - Implications of Heathrow expansion</u> DK advised that a report on the Heathrow expansion would be considered by Cabinet that evening. The Council was against the expansion proposals and would be robust in its response to the consultation. The Council recognised the impact on schools in the area.</p> <p><u>Minute 5 – Deficit Recovery Plan (confidential annex)</u> PM reported that the DfE had received an FoI request which required it to provide documents sent to them by LAs as part of the Deficit Recovery Plan evidence, including items which had been submitted to the DfE in confidence and had not been shared publicly by the LA.</p>	DK

5.	<p>FEEDBACK FROM SUB-GROUPS</p> <p>The Forum NOTED the minutes of the DSGWG held on 11 September 2019 and of the HNG held on 18 September 2019.</p>	
6.	<p>INFORMATION REPORTS</p>	
	<p>(a) RENEWAL OF ENERGY CONTRACT</p> <p>The Forum was advised that a proposal to renew the energy contract, which around thirty schools currently bought into, would be considered by the Council. The Council sought to use suppliers that provided good value, however schools had the option to opt out if they did not wish to use the approved supplier.</p>	
7.	<p>DSG BUDGET 2019/20</p>	
	<p>(a) MONTH 4 DSG MONITORING REPORT</p> <p>The Group considered a monitoring report on the DSG budget 2019/20:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall position continued to worsen. There was an in-year overspend of £2,863k at Month 4, an adverse movement of £853k on the Month 2 position. This overspend was due to continuing pressures on the cost of High Needs and alternative provision placements. When the £8,492k deficit brought forward from 2018/19 was taken into account, the cumulative deficit carry forward to 2020/21 was £11,355k • There was £556K overspend in the Central School Services Block as a result of an increase in the number of young people accessing alternative provision, the educational contribution towards placements for looked after children, and a projected overspend in the Admissions team due to additional workload resulting from secondary population growth. • A year end variance of £4m was projected in the High Needs block and it seemed certain that the LA would have reason to submit a disapplication request for transfer of funds from the Schools Block for 2020/21. • The majority of maintained schools had submitted budgets for the 2019/20 financial year with an in-year deficit. Three maintained schools had set a deficit budget for 2019/20. • 31 out of 45 academy schools had an in-year deficit as at 31 August 2018. 6 academies were in deficit. <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authorities nationally were facing large deficits. The Government had not recognised the financial burden on schools' budgets of the changes that came with the Children and Families Act. • Hillingdon was placing a significant number of children in independent and out of borough placement due to a shortage of special provision in the Borough. The HNG had been discussing with the LA for some time plans to create more local provision by expanding current schools and creating satellite hubs, however additional places were unlikely to be available until at least September 2020. • A condition survey of one maintained special school had found temporary classrooms to be at risk and it was possible that capacity could drop by up to 80, which would wipe out any growth in the system planned from the introduction of satellite hubs. • Other actions designed to ease the cost burden were being implemented including the new SEND Pathway and restructuring of the Educational Psychology team. • The Forum recognised that post-19 young people with needs were entitled to educational support, however it remained unclear why this was funded from the schools budget. Under Social Care legislation, people were considered adults at age 18. The pressure from post-19 high needs was significant and a key contributor to the deficit. This point had been made in the Deficit Recovery Plan submitted to the DfE. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a need for a collaborative approach from the LA, schools and ESFA to maximise resources available for the benefit of all users. The Forum was concerned to hear that delays in finalising arrangements for the new build at Harlington School had already caused a year's delay in the facility opening, and there was a risk that the provision could be lost. • The Forum requested that modelling of the current Year 13 rolled on be carried out to help quantify potential future pressure, however, this would not capture people getting their first EHCP post-19. 	PM
8.	DSG BUDGET 2020/21	
	<p>The Group considered two reports which set out the impact of the Spending Review announcements on the Schools Block and the High Needs block:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools across England would receive a significant cash boost, with investment of over £14 billion in primary and secondary education in the three years 2020/21 to 2022/23. • In 2020/21 only, there would be an additional £700 million for children with SEND. If this was distributed based on the current model, it was anticipated that Hillingdon would receive approximately £4.2m. This would go some way to cover the High Needs shortfall in 2020/21 but would not address the historical High Needs deficit. • As part of the Schools Block funding increase, every secondary school would receive a minimum of £5,000 per pupil in 2020/21. Every primary school would receive a minimum of £3,750 per pupil in 2020/21 and a minimum of £4,000 per pupil from 2021/22. Most Hillingdon schools were already above that level. • Implementation of the National Funding Formula would be progressed but no clear date had been set. • Additional funding of £1.5 billion for the next three years would fund additional pension costs for teachers. • There was no mention of additional funding to cover the teachers' pay rise so any funding increase may have to cover higher pay costs. • The announcement seemed geared towards addressing historic underfunding. London schools which already received higher funding were unlikely to receive a significant funding increase. • LAs would be permitted to transfer up to 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High Needs block. Transfer requests for more than 0.5% would require a disapplication request to be approved by the Secretary of State. • The LA had received no feedback from the DfE on its Deficit Recovery Plan. • The full funding model would be available in October. <p>Members of the Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appeared that the additional funding would only cover rising costs, particularly teachers' pay, and so was a 'stand still' budget for Hillingdon. • The additional funding, whilst welcome, did not address the fundamental causes of the deficit and would only ease pressure temporarily. • Local authorities nationally were facing large deficits. The Government had not recognised the financial burden of the changes that came with the Children and Families Act. • There was a perception that schools held large surpluses, however the vast majority of this was held by academies and was exempt from clawback under current rules. • The Council's External Auditors were considering qualifying the Council's accounts as the cumulative DSG deficit looked certain to rise above £10 million. Many councils were in a similar position. • The Deficit Recovery Plan had contained a proposal to re-base the MFG and recalculate going forward, and this seemed imperative to ensure some schools did not receive disproportionate historical funding. • The Forum acknowledged that it would not be possible to set a balanced budget for 2020/21 even with the additional High Needs funding and therefore the LA was likely 	

	<p>to make a disapplication request for transfer in excess of 0.5%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the timescales for submitting a diapplication request, the Forum AGREED that an additional meeting of the DSGWG would be organised for October to consider the budget position and proposals in the Deficit Recovery Plan. 	PM/KB
9.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>None.</p>	
10.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The next meeting of the Schools Forum would be held in the Civic Centre on Thursday 7 November 2019 at 2pm.</p>	

The meeting closed at 3.25pm.