

# EXTRAORDINARY SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

8<sup>th</sup> January 2019

10.30 to 12.30 Deanesfield Primary School

**Membership:** Jim Edgecombe (Chair), Phil Haigh (Chair of Sub Groups), Ludmila Morris, Duncan Greig, Kris O’Sullivan, Bernie Lloyd, Lisa Corrigan, Tony Eginton, Jo Palmer, Liz Horrigan, Ross Macdonald, Bob Charlton, Joan Greening, Tracey Hemming, Robert Jones, Jacqueline Lack, Peter Ryerson, Sudhi Pathak, Laurie Cornwell, Elaine Caffary, Lesley Knee, Alison Moore, Helen Manwaring.

**Shadow Reps/Observers:** Debbie Gilder, Darrell Butler, Julia Moss, Sophia Shaikh, Sandra Voisey, Graham Wells.

**Officers:** Peter Malewicz, Graham Young, Dan Kennedy, Tom Murphy, Kate Boulter (Clerk)

## AGENDA

	Item	Time	Lead	Update
1.	Apologies	10.30 – 10.35		
2.	Outcomes of Consultations (a) Schools Block transfer (b) De-delegation	10.35 – 11.00	<b>GY</b> <b>GY</b>	Report Report
3.	Schools Budget Modelling 2019-20	11.00 – 12.30	<b>GY</b>	Report
4.	AOB			

## Schools Forum and Sub Group Planned Meetings 2018/2019

	School's Forum Meetings 2018-19	
Meeting	Date & Time	Venue
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 16th January 2019 at 10:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 13th March 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 4
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 16th May 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Wednesday 26th June 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Thursday 26th September 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Thursday 31st October 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6
Schools' Forum	Thursday 12th December 2019 at 14:00	Civic- Committee Room 6

## 1. Introduction

This paper provides a summary of the responses received from stakeholders in response to the consultation on the transfer of funds from the Schools Block in 2019/20 which took place in December 2018.

## 2. Recommendations

Note the contents of the report and consider the responses when determining the Schools Block budget for 2019/20 at the Schools Forum meeting on 16 January 2019.

## 3. Consultation Feedback

In total, 65 responses were received. The number of responses by sector are detailed in the table below;

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Nursery	1
Primary	50
Secondary	11
Special	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>

The consultation was seeking feedback from stakeholders on two proposals. Firstly whether to transfer 0.5% of schools block funding to address High Needs pressures, as was agreed in 2018/19. The second proposal was seeking views on the transfer of an additional 1.45% from the schools block to cover the projected high needs deficit in 2019/20. It should be noted that the following the announcement of additional high needs funding for 2019/20, the high needs funding shortfall has reduced by £775k which has resulted in a reduction in the additional percentage transfer required to 1.1%. Following previous consultations, School Forum members have requested that weightings are applied to the summary of responses to reflect the proportion of pupils in each sector. The weightings applied have been determined based on the most recent pupil data supplied by the DfE as follows;

<b>Sector</b>	<b>No. of Pupils</b>
Nursery	5,500
Primary	28,067
Secondary	16,426
Special	883
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,876</b>

The responses to each of the proposals are summarised in the tables below;

### *Proposal 1 – transfer of 0.5%*

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Nursery</b>	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	3	47	<b>50</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	1	10	<b>11</b>
<b>Special</b>	2	1	<b>3</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Yes (weighted)</b>	<b>No (weighted)</b>	<b>Total (weighted)</b>
<b>Nursery</b>	5.1	0	<b>5.1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	3	47	<b>50</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	1.7	17.1	<b>18.8</b>
<b>Special</b>	63.6	31.8	<b>95.4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>73.4</b>	<b>95.9</b>	<b>169.3</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	

*Proposal 2 – transfer of a further 1.45%*

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Nursery</b>	1	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	2	48	<b>50</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	0	11	<b>11</b>
<b>Special</b>	2	1	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>92.3%</b>	

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Yes (weighted)</b>	<b>No (weighted)</b>	<b>Total (weighted)</b>
<b>Nursery</b>	5.1	0	<b>5.1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	2	48	<b>50</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	0	18.8	<b>18.8</b>
<b>Special</b>	63.6	31.8	<b>95.4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>98.6</b>	<b>169.3</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>58.2%</b>	

#### *Alternative Proposals*

Many of the respondents offered alternative proposals, with the common themes as follows;

- Lobby Central Government for additional funding
- Use council reserves
- Implement claw back facility from schools with high carry forward balances
- Raise council tax

#### **4. Summary**

It can be concluded that the majority of respondents are not in favour of either proposal to transfer funds from the Schools Block to address the projected deficit in high needs. However, when a weighting is applied based on the number of pupils in each sector, the view is not so clear cut.

If a transfer of funds is not agreed by Schools Forum then the local authority will be unable to set a balanced High Needs budget. It should be noted that the local authority is awaiting on a decision from the DfE regarding the disapplication request submitted seeking authority to transfer funds from the Schools block.

## De-delegation 2019/20 – Outcome of Consultation

### 5. Introduction

The Department for Education (DfE) requires local authorities to consult with primary and secondary LA maintained schools every year about the de-delegation of a number of central budgets. De-delegated funds are a deduction from a school's budget share and are held centrally to fund relevant services and can only apply to maintained primary and secondary school budgets. This paper provides a summary of the responses received from stakeholders in response to the consultation on the de-delegation for 2019/20 which took place in December 2018.

### 6. Recommendations

Note the contents of the report and consider the responses when voting on whether to de-delegate for the following services at the Schools Forum meeting on 16 January 2018;

- (i) Trade Union Duties staff cover
- (ii) Teachers Pensions Administration

### 7. Consultation Feedback

In total, 48 responses were received. The number of responses by sector are detailed in the table below;

Sector	Number of responses
Nursery	1
Primary	45
Secondary	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>

The responses to each of the proposals are summarised in the tables below;

#### *Proposal 1 – de-delegation of Trade Union Duties staff cover (£2.19 per pupil)*

Sector	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
<b>Nursery</b>	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	18	22	5	<b>45</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	2	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>48</b>

	<b>43.8%</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	
--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--

*Proposal 2 – de-delegation of Teachers Pensions administration (£1.22 per pupil)*

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Nursery</b>	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Primary</b>	39	5	1	<b>45</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	2	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	

## **8. Summary**

Decisions on de-delegation have to be taken by Schools Forum and will be taken separately in respect of maintained primary and maintained secondary schools and in each case the decision requires the agreement of a majority of the maintained representatives for the relevant phase on the Schools Forum. The analysis of the responses to the consultation should be considered by maintained school representatives when voting on de-delegation.

If the trade union facilities arrangements are not managed through de-delegation then schools would need to make local plans to cover the costs of trade union facilities directly from their budgets. The benefits of de-delegation is that it is a more efficient and cost effective way of managing facilities time with schools able to pool resources to cover the cost in a way that avoids costs falling unpredictably or unevenly across schools.

Should the proposal to de-delegate for Teacher Pensions administration not be agreed by Schools Forum, schools will be required to deal with any queries that the Council receives from Teachers' Pensions, as the Council will no longer be able to liaise directly with the Payroll provider.

## **Schools Budget Modelling 2019-20**

### **1. Introduction**

At the Schools Forum meeting on 12 December 2018, it was requested that some modelling be carried out in order for Schools Forum members to consider schools block budget options prior to the Schools Forum meeting on 16 January when the DSG budget will be presented.

## 2. Recommendation

Schools Forum are asked to consider the modelling presented and advise which model should be used when finalising the Schools Block Budget to be presented at to Schools Forum at the meeting on 18 January 2019

## 3. Background

### *Modelling*

Initially models were to be produced to illustrate the impact on the Individual Schools Budgets of transferring different levels of funding out of the Schools block, as per the consultation (0%, 0.5% and 1.95%). However following the DfE announcement of additional High Needs block funding, resulting in an additional £775k for Hillingdon in 2019/20, the estimated High Needs funding requirement has reduced and therefore the models that have been produced are for the following levels of funding transfer;

- (a) 0% transfer,
- (b) 0.5% transfer,
- (c) 1.6% transfer

### *AWPU*

As in previous years AWPU is used as a balancing figure and the rates are determined once funds have been distributed through all other factors.

### *Deprivation*

As in previous years Deprivation funding is retained at 7.87% of total Schools Block formula funding for each of the scenarios modelled.

### *Prior Attainment*

Following receipt of the final Schools Block data, it became clear that there would also be a requirement to model changes to the Prior Attainment rates. In previous years it has been possible to apply a weighting to the primary prior attainment data to reflect the fact that higher numbers of pupils are failing to meet the good level of development under the new EYFSP. Applying this weighting ensured that the change resulted in minimal impact to the funding formula.

However in 2019/20 there is no longer a primary weighting factor as all primary pupils will have been assessed under the new EFSP. The result of no weighting is an approximate increase of £5.6m through the primary Prior Attainment factor when compared with 2018/19, leading to a reduction in all AWPU rates and a change to the primary to secondary ratio to 1:1.24. It is therefore considered that this needs to be fixed and the following options have been modelled for consideration;

1. No change to the prior attainment rates
2. Changes to the primary and secondary rates (this would retain Primary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19 and would also keep the differential between the primary and secondary rates).

3. Change the primary rate (this would retain Primary and Secondary Prior Attainment funding at a similar level to 2018/19)