

# HILLINGDON SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 20 October 2021 at 1pm in the Council Chamber

## Voting members

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

## Other attendees (non-voting)

<b>Independent Non-Maintained Special School</b>			
Debbie Gilder	Pield Heath School		PRESENT
<b>Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Schools)</b>			
Rachel Blake	Bishop Winnington-Ingram		NOT REQUIRED
Eleesa Dowding	Harmondsworth		NOT REQUIRED
<b>Shadow Representative (Maintained Primary - Governor)</b>			
Jo Palmer	Hillside Infant School and Hillside Junior School		PRESENT
Graham Wells	Colham Manor Primary School		PRESENT
<b>Local Authority Officers</b>			
Kate Boulter	Clerk		PRESENT
Vikram Hansrani	Assistant Director, SEND & Inclusion		PRESENT
Dan Kennedy	LA		PRESENT
Graham Young	Lead Finance Business Partner - School		PRESENT
<b>Observers</b>			
None.			

		ACTION
1.	<p><b>INTRODUCTION &amp; APOLOGIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apologies were accepted and recorded in the attendance list (above). The meeting was inquorate and any decisions would need to be deferred to the next meeting for agreement.</li> <li>The Chair observed that this was the first Forum meeting held in person since January 2020, and attendance was poor. Some members had informed the Clerk that they could not leave their school due to staff absence, but they could have attended by videoconferencing. Consideration would need to be given to holding meetings remotely to maximise attendance if meeting in person was problematic.</li> <li>It was further observed that reports for the meeting had been circulated very late which impacted members' ability to prepare for the meeting. The Forum recognised that officers were particularly busy at the current time, but requested that they endeavour to produce reports earlier for future meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>KB</p> <p>GY/VH</p>
2.	<p><b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2021</b></p> <p>The minutes were considered by those present to be a correct record but formal approval would be deferred to the next quorate meeting.</p>	KB
3.	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2021</b></p> <p><b>(a) SOCIAL CARE STRUCTURE</b> DK would circulate the Social Care structure to members.</p> <p><b>(b) MEMBERSHIP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GY would liaise with Democratic Services to arrange an election for the 16-19 representative.</li> <li>Duncan Greig (Primary Maintained), Liz Horrigan (Secondary Maintained) and Sudhi Pathak (Special Academies) had reached the end of their current 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.</li> <li>A prospective second PVI Representative had attended a previous meeting as an observer. The LA had been due to confirm a nomination, but no more had been heard. PR to be asked what had come of this.</li> </ul> <p><b>(c) TRAINING FOR SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS</b> There had been a good response to the offer to provide training. This would be arranged for the new year when new members were in place.</p>	<p>DK</p> <p>GY</p> <p>GY/KB</p> <p>PR</p>
4.	<p><b>FEEDBACK FROM SUB-GROUPS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There had been no meetings of the DSG/EY Group or High Needs Group since the last meeting.</li> <li>The Forum <b>NOTED</b> the minutes of the DSG Deficit Recovery Working Group held on 4 October 2021. These were discussed under Minute 6b.</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b>ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION</b></p>	
5.1	<p><b>(a) SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA 2022/23 CONSULTATION</b> The Forum <b>AGREED</b> the draft consultation paper for Schools Funding Formula 2022/23. The consultation would take place in November.</p> <p><b>(b) SCHOOL PROVISION FOR AFGHAN REFUGEES</b> At the last meeting, DK had reported that some schools were being disproportionately impacted by admissions applications from asylum seeker children, many of whom were resident temporarily and never took up the school place or left after a short time. This was having a financial impact on the affected schools, and the Forum had asked officers to produce a proposal for compensating those schools. This would be brought to the next meeting. A member advised that some of the children had experienced traumatic events or were living in unsatisfactory conditions in temporary accommodation. They required</p>	GY

	immediate support from Social Care.	
6.	<b>INFORMATION ITEMS</b>	
	<p><b>(a) SCHOOLS BLOCK TRANSFER &amp; 3% MECHANISM CONSULTATIONS</b></p> <p>The DSG Recovery Working Group had recommended that the consultation deadline for the Schools Block Transfer and the 3% Mechanism be extended from 8 October 2021 to enable wider engagement with stakeholder. The responses would be considered at the meeting on 8 December 2021.</p> <p>The Forum considered a report which set out which schools would be affected by the proposed change to the 3% threshold. It was observed that this could have a greater financial impact on some schools than the proposed 0.5% transfer.</p> <p><b>(b) DSG RECOVERY PLAN UPDATE</b></p> <p>The Forum had received the minutes of the DSG Recovery Working Group meeting held on 7 October 2021 and the slides that officers presented at that meeting. The Forum discussed progress with delivering the Recovery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair reported that it had become increasingly clear to members of the Working Group that until now the situation had not been clearly explained to Schools Forum.</li> <li>• If agreed, an in-year balanced DSG budget would need to be achieved within five years. 2021/22 was the first year, so this would be required by the end of 2025/26.</li> <li>• It was the DfE's expectation that the LA would work with Schools Forum to ensure the Plan had the support of the Forum.</li> <li>• The Working Group minutes referred to a new 15 place autism unit not having been signed off by the LA yet, which had caused a delay in the provision of places. For the Forum to be able to support the Recovery Plan, the Forum needed to be confident that the LA was committed to delivering the actions set out in the Plan. Delays such as this caused the Forum to question whether the LA was sufficiently committed and able to deliver on its plans.</li> <li>• The Council did not have sufficient reserves to cover the deficit and there would be serious implications for the Council if the safety valve agreement was not accepted by the DfE/ESFA. The Forum recognised this and was keen to support the Plan but observed that school colleagues, including those from academies, would need to be persuaded that supporting the Plan was in their interests, and that the actions set out in the Plan could be achieved.</li> <li>• The Forum would wish to monitor progress on key projects through RAG-rated reports.</li> <li>• It was noted that the LA could implement the 3% Mechanism change without the agreement of the Forum, but wished to hear schools' views. If the Forum did not agree the 0.5% transfer, the LA could request that the DfE overturn the decision.</li> <li>• Officers reported that the draft plan submitted by the LA needed to be refined. Officers had been working on modelling to ensure data was accurate and assumptions were realistic. The LA had met with the DfE/ESFA on 29 September and a further meeting was planned for 25 October. There was further work to do and then the draft Plan would be shared with the Forum.</li> </ul> <p><b>(c) DSG BUDGET MONITORING MONTH 5</b></p> <p>The Forum considered the Month 5 budget monitoring report 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no change overall from Month 4.</li> <li>• The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) monitoring position had an in-year overspend of £12,657K at Month 5, an increase of £5,329K on the budgeted deficit of £7,328K.</li> <li>• 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 an uplift in the funding allocated to SEN 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 £25,385k deficit brought forward from 2020/21 was taken into account, the</li> </ul>	VH/GY

	<p>cumulative deficit carry forward to 2022/23 was £38,04K.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The High Needs Block projected overspend at Month 5 was £5,176K.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Three maintained schools ended 2020/21 in deficit. This was an improved position from the start of the year when the LA approved licensed deficits for five schools.</li> <li>• Two maintained schools had converted to academy status in September 2021.</li> </ul> <p>The Forum commented that it would be helpful to have more details of the support being provided to schools with large deficits, as this was a risk to the DSG.</p> <p><b>(c) NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA 2022/23 CONSULTATION</b> The Forum <b>NOTED</b> the LA's response to the consultation.</p>	<b>GY</b>
7.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b> None.</p>	

The meeting closed at 2.20pm.