

HILLINGDON SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8 December 2021 at 1pm via Zoom

Voting members

NAME	ORGANISATION	ATTENDANCE	TERM ENDS
Maintained Nursery (1)			
Ludmila Morris	McMillan Early Childhood Centre	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Maintained Primary - Schools (4)			
Rachel Anderson	Dr Triplett's School	PRESENT	Sep 2023
Duncan Greig	Breakspear Primary School	PRESENT	Sep 2021
Kris O'Sullivan	Deanesfield Primary School	APOLOGIES	Sep 2024
Carly Rissen	Colham Manor	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Maintained Primary - Governors (4)			
John Buckingham	Glebe Primary School	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Jim Edgecombe (CHAIR)	Whiteheath Junior School	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Tony Eginton	Minet Nursery & Infant School & Hillside Junior School	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Phil Haigh	Cherry Lane Primary School & Meadow High School	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Maintained Secondary (1)			
Liz Horrigan	Harlington School	PRESENT	Sep 2021
Maintained Special (1)			
John Goddard	Hedgewood School	PRESENT	Sep 2022
Academies (9)			
Aftab Ahmed	Guru Nanak Sikh Academy	ABSENT	Sep 2023
Peter Edgley	Bishopshalt	ABSENT	Sep 2024
Tracey Hemming	Middlesex Learning Partnership	PRESENT	Sep 2024
Nicola Kelly	Charville	APOLOGIES	Sep 2024
Helen Manwaring	Swakeleys School	PRESENT	Sep 2022
Catherine Mosdell	Frays Academy Trust	PRESENT	Sep 2023
David Patterson	Queensmead School	PRESENT	Sep 2023
Colin Tucker	Ryefield	APOLOGIES	Sep 2024
Sandra Voisey	Laurel Lane Primary School	PRESENT	Sep 2023
Special Academies (1)			
Sudhi Pathak	Eden Academy Trust	PRESENT	Sep 2021
Alternative provision (1)			
Laurie Cornwell	The Skills Hub	ABSENT	Sep 2024
Private Voluntary & Independent Early Years Providers (2)			
Elaine Caffary	4 Street Nursery	APOLOGIES	Sep 2024
(vacant)			
14-19 Partnership (1)			
(vacant)			

Other attendees (non-voting)

Independent Non-Maintained Special School			
Debbie Gilder	Pield Heath School		NOT REQUIRED
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Schools)			
Rachel Blake	Bishop Winnington-Ingram		NOT REQUIRED
Eleesa Dowding	Harmondsworth		NOT REQUIRED
Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Governor)			
Jo Palmer	Hillside Infant School and Hillside Junior School		NOT REQUIRED
Graham Wells	Colham Manor Primary School		NOT REQUIRED
Local Authority Officers			
Kate Boulter	Clerk		PRESENT
Vikram Hansrani	Assistant Director, SEND & Inclusion		PRESENT
Dan Kennedy	LA		PRESENT
Graham Young	Lead Finance Business Partner - School		PRESENT
Tony Zaman	LA		PRESENT
Observers			
Councillor Jan Sweeting			PRESENT

		ACTION
1.	<p>INTRODUCTION & APOLOGIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies were accepted and recorded in the attendance list (above). The Chair confirmed the meeting was quorate and could proceed to business. A number of members' terms of office had expired in September 2021 and the nomination/election process had not been completed yet. The Forum AGREED that those members' whose terms had expired (DG, LH and SP) would be voting members for the purposes of this meeting (see also Minute 3b). 	
2.	<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS</p> <p>The meeting held on 20 October 2021 had been inquorate so the minutes of the 22 September 2021 were presented here for ratification. The Forum AGREED the following minutes as correct records of those meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22 September 2021 20 October 2021 23 November 2021 (extraordinary meeting) 	
3.	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>(a) MEMBERSHIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GY would liaise with Democratic Services to arrange an election for the 16-19 representative. Duncan Greig (Primary Maintained), Liz Horrigan (Secondary Maintained) and Sudhi Pathak (Special Academies) had reached the end of their terms of office. Primary Forum and HASH would be asked to nominate representatives for the maintained vacancies. Nominations would be sought for the Special Academies representative. The LA had not yet found a suitable candidate for the PVI Representative vacancy. <p>(b) SCHOOL PROVISION FOR AFGHAN REFUGEES</p> <p>GY advised that the LA had been notified that funding was available to support schools and further information was awaited from government. An update would be provided at the next meeting.</p>	<p>GY</p> <p>GY/KB</p> <p>PR</p> <p>GY</p>
4.	<p>FEEDBACK FROM SUB-GROUPS</p> <p>The DSG Deficit Recovery Working Group had met on 10 and 18 November 2021. The minutes were not yet available however all issues had been discussed at the Extraordinary Schools Forum meeting on 23 November 2021 and the Forum had received the minutes of that meeting.</p>	KB
5.	<p>ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION</p> <p>(a) DSG DEFICIT RECOVERY PLAN SUBMISSION</p> <p>The Forum considered the Safety Valve Submission which the LA had sent to the DfE, and which the LA were asking the Forum to support. The Forum commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final page of the document referred to further slides which the Forum had not been provided with. Officers responded that these slides were on governance, and covered how the LA would take forward oversight and implementation of the Plan. The Forum and other bodies would be involved, however it had been officers' view that the focus now was on the main body of the report – the actions to achieve a balanced budget - rather than detail of the governance arrangements. The Forum was satisfied that it could consider the Plan without the governance pages but asked that this section be provided later. The Forum observed that officers had spoken at a number of meetings of the need to change the relationship with schools and engage more with them, and it would have been helpful for the improved engagement to have progressed more at this critical stage when the Plan was being drafted. Officers acknowledged that it would have been better to engage more with schools, however capacity had been impacted by the 	TZ/GY

	<p>need to produce the Plan within the DfE’s deadline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noting that it was being asked to support the Plan in its current form, the Forum asked whether the Plan would change before the final version was agreed. Officers stated that they did not anticipate any material changes, but would bring the Plan back to the Forum if there were any material changes. • The Forum observed that the average expenditure figures on page 12 of the document (cost of in borough and out of borough placements) appeared to be wrong. The Forum requested officers look closely at the figures to ensure they were accurate. • Members noted that the Plan did not contain much detail on complexity of need, which had increased as well as the number of EHCPs. Officer responded that this was weaved into the Plan. • Members requested more details of proposals around review of the banded funding model. Officers advised that this would be provided in due course. • The Forum had previously agreed to consult schools on proposals around the 3% threshold however no report on this had been brought to the Forum for consideration. Officers advised that this did not require a decision from the Forum and the Plan included the easing out of the 3% threshold model. <p>Having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED to support the Safety Valve Submission and asked to be kept apprised of any material changes to the submission.</p> <p>(b) SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING TRANSFER CONSULTATION The consultation had sought feedback from stakeholders on three proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Schools Block transfer. • The transfer of the allowable 0.5% (approx. £1,269k). <p>In total, 25 responses were received, of which 88% supported no transfer and 12% supported a transfer of 0.5%. The Forum noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the responses were received early in the consultation, before the consultation deadline was extended and schools were provided with more background information about the consequences of not agreeing the transfer. • Some of the comments provided by respondents indicated that the funding should come from government rather than transfer. The Forum observed that it had no control over the funding provided in the DSG and could only act within its remit. • The officer’s report gave the option to defer the decision until January after wider consultation on the Deficit Recovery Plan. <p>Having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED (1) not to defer the decision until the January meeting; and (2) to support a transfer of 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. The Forum noted that the number of consultation responses received was low relative to the number of schools, and that supporting the transfer would assist the LA in achieving the targets set out in the DSG Deficit Recovery Plan, which would be beneficial for all Hillingdon residents.</p> <p>(c) SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA 2022/23 The Forum considered a report on Schools Funding Formula changes 2022/23. The Forum had agreed at its meeting on 20 October 2021 to consult schools on the proposed changes. Only one response was received.</p> <p>Having been put to a vote, the Forum AGREED to retain all core factors at the 2021/22 London Borough of Hillingdon rates and distribute any additional School Block funding by increasing the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) rates.</p>	<p>TZ</p> <p>GY</p> <p>TZ/GY</p>
6.	INFORMATION ITEMS	
	<p>(a) EARLY YEARS FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENT The Forum NOTED a report on the Early Years Funding Announcements 2022/23.</p>	

	<p>(b) DSG BUDGET MONITORING MONTH 7</p> <p>The Forum considered the Month 7 budget monitoring report 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no change overall. • The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) monitoring position was an in-year overspend of £12,657K at Month 7, an increase of £5,329K on the budgeted deficit of £7,328K. • The overspend was due to ongoing pressures in the cost of High Needs placements, where due to a lack of capacity in borough, the number of independent placements had increased since the budget was set. In addition, the LA was increasingly seeing uplift in the funding allocated to SEND placements due to a change in the level of need. The budget for High Needs was increased for 2021/22 to take account of projected growth, but it was projected that the budget would be significantly exceeded. • When the £25,386K deficit brought forward from 2020/21 was taken into account, the cumulative deficit carry forward to 2022/23 was £38,043K. • The High Needs Block projected overspend at Month 7 was £5,176K. • There was £153K overspend on the Schools Block. The Forum had agreed to backdate growth contingency to 2018/19 for one secondary school which it retrospectively decided met the criteria for funding. This had resulted in overspend on the Schools block in 2021/22. • Three maintained schools were unable to set a balanced budget for 2021/22 and the LA had approved licensed deficits. <p>(c) UPDATE ON MAINTAINED SCHOOLS IN DEFICIT</p> <p>The Forum had requested further information on the support being provided to the three schools with licensed deficits, as these posed a risk to the DSG. The Forum NOTED a report which set out the reasons for the deficits, the support by the LA, and actions put in place to help the three schools to achieve balanced budgets.</p>	
7.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>None.</p>	

The meeting closed at 2.15pm.