

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

Westminster Schools Forum

Date and time of meeting: Monday 9th March 2015, 4.45 – 6:00pm

Location: Quintin Kynaston School

Representing	Name	Organisation	Attendance
Primary Schools	6 Members		
Primary Head	Sandra Tyrrell (ST)	Christchurch Bentinck Primary	Present
Primary Head	Ann Townshend(AnnT)	St Barnabas Primary	Present
Primary Head	Mary Wilson (MW)	St Mary of the Angels Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Aslam Merchant (AM)	Hallfield Primary	Present
Primary Governor	Andrew Garwood-Watkins (AGW)	St Stephens	Apologies
Primary Governor	Vacant	Vacant	
Secondary schools	1 Member		
Secondary Head	Eugene Moriarty (EM)	St Augustine's High	Present
Academies	5 members		
Secondary Non Recoupment Academy Principal	Smita Bora (SB)	Westminster Academy	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy Head	Kat Pugh (KP)	St Marylebone	Present
Secondary Recoupment Academy	Jo Saxton (JS)	Future Academies	Apologies
Alternative Provision Academy	Nathan Crawley-Lyons (NCL)	TBAP	Apologies
Primary Recoupment Academy Head	Louisa Lochner (LL)	Gateway Academy	Present
	Lucian Boyd-Harte	Quintin Kynaston Academy	Observer
Maintained Nursery Schools	1 member		
Nursery Head	Sylvie Gambell (SG)	Mary Paterson Nursery School	Present
Special Schools	1 member		
Special Schools Head	Olivia Meyrick (OM)	Westminster Special Schools	Present
Early Years (PVI)	1 member		

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

	John Trow-Smith	LEYF	Present
14-19 Representative	1 member		
	Vacant		
Officers in Attendance			
Tri Borough Director of Finance & Resources	Dave McNamara (DMc)	Tri Borough Children Services	Apologies
Tri Borough Director of Resources	Andrew Tagg (AT)	Tri Borough Children Services	Present
Tri Borough Director of Schools	Ian Heggs (IH)	Tri Borough Children Services	Apologies
Tri Borough Assistant Director Special Educational Needs & Vulnerable Children	Alison Farmer (AF)	Tri Borough Children Services	Present
Tri Borough Interim Schools Finance Manager	Mala Dadlani (MD)	Tri Borough Children Services	Present
Tri Borough Clerking Service Manager and Clerk to WSF	Owen Rees (OR)	Tri Borough Children Services	Present

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

Item		Action
1	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>As set out above.</p>	
2	<p>DSG 2015-16 SETTLEMENT AND DEPLOYMENT THEREOF</p> <p>MD introduced the paper. She said that the general crux of the paper is that the settlement was still incomplete, as the Council was yet to receive the non-recoupment academy and High Needs Block, or Early Years (the settlement of which is made in arrears); when this information was received, the Council confirmed the final position in terms of each of these blocks. She said that Appendix A provided the detail, and that it represented a healthy position though there were caveats. She said that funds left over from the 2 year old offer helped to support the overall position of the fund fortuitous, recoupment funding looks like there is income there. She said that the data had included an overstated invoice on RBKC payments, which had reflected expenditure as higher than it was. She said that a balanced position was expected, and that officers would bring a further report to the next meeting of the Forum.</p> <p>AT said that officers would monitor termly and do a report on the provisions on a termly basis, allocating on an agreed formula back to schools. He said that, given the risks, the current settlement was the best that could be currently offered.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the anticipated size of variation in the Early Years settlement, MD clarified that payment was based on the January count, and officers could only make an estimate of what it will be in January 2016. AT said that the Council would pass any additional funding as funding for part-time places. He said that funding for all FT places was funded, and that it was very unlikely that schools would fall significantly below the figure they had been notified. He said there had been an issue with the IDACCI profiles which had meant that there would be a slight change. The data had been put through the model, but was currently funding the richest schools the most. He said that a sheet would come out to schools.</p> <p>In response to questions from LL, AT confirmed that nursery funding was in place to April, and that full time funding covered until July</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the level of the Early Years Pupil Premium, AT confirmed that this was £353 per pupil, and that the amount allowed for this within the DSG was £315000, based on the January pupil count.</p>	AT
	RESOLVED	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) That the DSG allocation from the EFA for 2014/15 be noted, and; (ii) That the allocations of the DSG funding the three blocks be agreed as reflected in paragraph 3 above. 	
3	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 19th JANUARY 2015	
	RESOLVED	

**THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM**

	<p>The Schools Forum agreed the minutes of its meeting on the 19th January 2015 as true and accurate. There were no matters arising not considered elsewhere on the agenda.</p>	
4	HIGH NEEDS BLOCK	
	<p>AT said that an e-mail had been sent to schools had gone to chasing outstanding claims. He said that he would recirculate this to all schools. He said that if schools believed they were owed recoupment funding or outstanding payments, they should submit their claim as soon as possible, as this needed to go into the accounts before 31st March.</p> <p>He said that, in the new financial year in April, each school would get a schedule of children. The school would verify this list, return it to the Council who would then make the payment. He said that schools should only receive 3 payments, and all parties should be clear which children are being paid. He said that this should address the anxiety of schools in relation to cash flow, though it was reliant on schools bringing the data back. He said that there would be a deadline on each return, and that a timetable for the year would go around in April.</p> <p>LBH asked who the contact for schools was. AT said that Michael Hallick was the Finance contact and that the SEN Key Worker was the SEN contact. He said that the financial information would come with a clear narrative.</p> <p>LL said that she would welcome a briefing on SEN funding. AT said that the Council was happy to run these. The Forum suggested that twilight sessions for Heads and Finance/Business managers to attend together, as twilight sessions might be suitable, especially if these could be matched to school type.</p> <p>AF said that 2 papers had been submitted to the HNB and EYHNB reference groups, and which had not been forwarded to the Forum. She apologised that these had not been circulated with the papers. She said that the former had worked to agree place funding, and an approach to distributing the plus 3 blocks. She said that the group had been concerned to continue to support the availability of provisions with appropriate skill-bases, which could retain the necessary staff.</p> <p>She said that, in reference to the Early Years sector, the group had sought to address the issue of pre-assessment children with the creation of an Early Years contingency budget, and she sought the Forum's approval for that measure. She said that bids would be invited for short term contingency funding. She said that she would circulate the revised format for application and the agreed criteria. The reference group would determine bids, with a Head Teacher rep included on the panel.</p> <p>In relation to the HNB as it applied to schools, the group had looked at the way in which schools were paid, as previously discussed. It had also looked at AP provision, and commissioned from TBAP a 12 place AP provision for primary, in addition to existing provision. It was considered that this met a need in the sector. AF said that the funding in the HNB for this measure was slightly short; the funding for the primary AP therefore came from special projects, and would cover the PRU but not outreach activity. AF agreed to circulate the reports to Forum Members.</p> <p>In response to a question, it was confirmed that the group had continued to commission 10 places at Marlborough Family School; KP said that longer was needed to assess impact, so the group had agreed a further year, and agreed a referral approach.</p>	<p>AT/AF</p> <p>AF</p>

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

	RESOLVED	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To Agree the approach to Short Term Contingency funding for Early Years settings, which builds on and develops the existing arrangements for contingency funding, and; (ii) To agree continuation of the current arrangements for High Needs Top-Up Funding arrangements for children with a Statement of SEN/EHCP in the Early Years Sector over the financial year 2015/16 , and; (iii) To agree the approach for Block Request (3 applications per academic year up to a maximum of 40k per request) for Early Years Sector over the financial year 2015/2016. 	
5	2 YEAR OLD FUNDING	

**THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM**

	<p>AT said that the two year old offer been in place for two years, and had been expanded to cover the 40% most deprived children in the borough. He said that it should be a seamless offer. He said that the local authority had previously been funded on a formula on the number of eligible pupils- 801- but would now be funded according to take-up- 367. He said that some of the funding had been used for full time places, will now be closed and funded on take up. Flexibility.</p> <p>He said that the report contained a proposal that £150000 would be used for promotion of the offer, and £100000 for transitional support for providers, to allow facilities to be adapted. He said that the local authority proposed to increase the rates paid for 3 year olds, to support the continuity of provision.</p> <p>The Forum agreed that the proposals regarding a parent portal to lead promotion of the offer were not appropriate to the target group, and asked for an alternative to be brought forward to the next meeting.</p> <p>LL asked whether the assessment of the number of eligible children had been accurate. MD said that the local authority did not gather the data, and that it did not have the resources to check what proportion of the targeted parents did not want to take the offer up. She said that the formula work was showing a reduction in eligible children. JTS asked if the DfE had mined the child benefit data. MD said that they had, cross comparing with DWP data. JTS agreed that outreach was needed for the two year old offer, and suggested this might be delivered through children’s centres.</p> <p>In response to a question from Forum members, AT explained the rationale for the funding the first term after the child’s 3rd birthday at the 2 year old rate of £6.07. Currently 3 year olds were funded at £3.09 per hour plus supplements. He said that this would give providers an incentive to deliver the continuity of provision which was sought. JTS asked how long the funding was for. AT said that will need yearly review.</p>	
	<p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) To agree to apply £150,000 of DSG brought forward to improving engagement of disadvantaged families with children who qualify for the two year old programme, and;</p> <p>(ii) That officers be requested to seek alternative uses for the £50,000 to be used on a Parent Portal.</p>	AT
6	<p>UPDATED DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2014/15 ALLOCATION AND UPDATE ON PROJECTED 2014/15 EXPENDITURE</p> <p>MD said that this report contained the same information as the previous, in relation to the 14-15 expenditure. She said that the figures showed DSG 14-15 May position compared to December, gave updates on the EY, HNB and Academy recruitment adjustments. She also set out the timetable for adjustments.</p> <p>JTS asked what date could EY providers expect notification of changes in factors. AT said that these should have gone out. It was confirmed that these had not been received by special schools and by at least some PVI. AT would check what had been sent out and ensure that these were sent out before the 1st April.</p> <p>The Forum thanked officers for having sent out budget information prior to April, which had never happened before.</p> <p>JTS asked if there was a risk on recruitment clawback. AT said that the</p>	AT

**THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM**

	<p>local authority needed to make sure that provisions are backed up on the balance sheet, and that termly payments were designed to resolve that issue.</p>	
	<p>RESOLVED</p> <p>(i) That the updated DSG funding allocation for 2014/15 (and the fact that this is still likely to change further) be noted by the Schools Forum.</p> <p>(ii) That the projected outturn for 2014/15 and the uncertainties around some of these projections be noted.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>REPORT OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM WORKING GROUP</p> <p>AT introduced the report. He said that the report's brevity did not reflect the work and effort put in by the working group. He said that it was difficult to allocate funding on a one-off basis. He said that a lot of work put in to each model, and there were pitfalls in every model. He said that the recommendation was to allocate to Primary Schools on the basis of minimum funding level and to Secondary Schools on the basis of pupil numbers. The funding was split £700,000 to primaries, £300,000 to secondaries. The approach taken served to close the gaps between schools. He said that it had taken four meetings to agree and that the work to revise the formula for the full DSG would now begin. He noted that the proposal was the working group's, rather than the local authority's.</p> <p>MW asked if there was any work being done on changes to Pupil Premium uptake and the use of the EY Pupil Premium. AT said the work was being done on a London level. He said that some schools were subsidising the cost of full-time Nursery places for children, and the local authority was trying to argue for using EY Pupil Premium for that purpose. He said that he would circulate a note on what the local authority was doing in relation to the EY PP.</p> <p>ST asked when budgets would change to reflect the changes to nursery funding. AT said that this was loaded onto schools' budget share. They would get sum and payment notification.</p> <p>LBH agreed to join the working group which would look at the formula for the following year.</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>MD</p>
	<p>RESOLVED</p>	
	<p>(i) Agrees the proposed funding methodology for the allocation of the additional funding for the 2015/16 financial year only.</p> <p>(ii) To carry a full review of the current funding formula for implementation in 2016/17.</p>	

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

	DATE OF NEXT MEETING Monday 9 th June 2015 at QE2	
--	--	--

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM

THESE MINUTES ARE DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT AT THE NEXT MEETING
OF SCHOOLS FORUM