



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Islington Schools Forum, held at the Laycock Centre, Laycock Street, Islington N1 1TH on Thursday 29 November 2018 at 2pm.**

**PRESENT**

**Forum Members**

Abi Misselbrook-Lovejoy (AM-L)	Headteacher, Newington Green Primary School
Lisa Horton (LH)	Headteacher, Hargrave Park Primary School
Fiona Godfrey (FG)	Headteacher, Kate Greenaway Nursery School
Jo Dibb (JD)	Vice-chair and Chair of meeting, Headteacher Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School

Andrew Bosi (AB)	Governor, Rotherfield Primary School
Vicky Linsley (VL)	Headteacher, St Mary Magdalene Academy
Cllr Rakhia Ismail (RI)	Islington Council – non-Executive Member
Anita Grant (AG)	CEO Islington Play Association (voluntary sector)

**Other Attendees**

Tim Partington (TP)	Head of Children’s Services, Finance
Debbie Stevenson (DS)	Schools Funding Manager
Mark Taylor (MT)	Director of Learning and Schools
Marnie Caton (MC)	Data consultant
Jane Wright (JW)	Manager Schools and EY Governance and Clerk

	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>The following apologies were accepted: Nigel Smith, Barrie O’Shea, Penny Barratt , David Barry, Maggie Elliott, Tanya Watson, Peter Murray.</p> <p>It was <b>AGREED to highlight the importance of the next meeting on 17 January</b> in these minutes to remind Forum members of their responsibilities with regards to attendance and decision making, given there were a large number of apologies/absences on this occasion.</p> <p>The January Forum meeting will be of particular importance as decisions will need to be made of the Schools Block Funding Formula and Central Retention of services.</p> <p>At a future meeting, to discuss timings of meetings.</p>	<b>All Forum Members</b>
2.	<p><b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 MAY 2018</b> (A M-B took the chair for the Accuracy part of the agenda, then JD resumed chairing)</p> <p><b>a. Accuracy</b> p.6 (541) – delete ‘MORE HERE’</p>	

	<p><b>OTHERWISE AGREED AS ACCURATE</b></p> <p>b. <b>Matter Arising</b>  p.2(537) – AB asked about redundancy expenditure as there was no paper on the agenda. DS clarified that schools were to fund 50% of redundancy costs and full cost of pension capital strains. Currently no overspend on this budget was projected. JD said HR advice to schools would be to continue with restructure despite short term budgetary difficulties for the longer term benefit to the school.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>SCHOOLS FORUM COMPOSITION</b></p> <p>The clerk reported there were six current vacancies.</p> <p>The clerk had contacted head teachers from the relevant phases (primary – 2 vacancies; secondary – one vacancy; special – one vacancy) asking for nominations by 30 November. One primary nomination received to date.</p> <p>The clerk had also contacted chairs of secondary governors asking for secondary governor nominations for the one vacancy by 30 November. One secondary governor nomination received to date.</p> <p>The clerk had emailed the principals and vice-principals of secondary academies asking them to appoint to their vacancy.</p> <p>The meeting noted that the terms of office of several Forum members, including the chair and vice-chair, were due to end in spring 2019. It was also noted that terms of office could (and have been) extended by a year to avoid large scale churn/vacancies all at once. Current members could also be re-elected or appointed.</p> <p><b>AGREED: the clerk was to seek clarification on processes for extending membership.</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>2018-19 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG) PROJECTED OUTTURN</b></p> <p>TP outlined the presented paper.</p> <p>Early Years (EY) subgroup to discuss the <b>EY Block</b> of DSG at subgroup on 6 December as they need to wait for outcome of October 2018 Census.</p> <p>The meeting discussed the significant issue of low take up of 30 hours' places for 3 and 4 year olds of working parents – many families not eligible, also in some settings these places have to be held as vacancies for children in nursery not yet aged 3 and a term. FG highlighted the importance of protecting nursery schools in autumn when numbers are at their lowest.</p> <p>It was noted that Camden have removed all subsidy for childcare under 2 so they can offer 30 hours' places for all children aged 3 and a term - a political decision.</p>	

	<p>The balance of trajectory funding for 2YOs (£478K) was not expected to be spent this year and will be carried forward.</p> <p>Operational guidance has just been received and the LA will again be applying for disapplication of Early Years National Funding Formula.</p> <p><b>Schools Block</b> – projected underspend of £143K from top slice for growth and falling rolls. Could be carried forward to next year or reallocated to High Needs. This will be a decision for the Schools Forum at the end of the year.</p> <p><b>High Needs</b> – most pressure on this block. Despite an in year funding adjustment (£72K) and one-off contingency payment (£384K), the projected overspend is still £110K. This reflects the national picture.</p> <p>MT and DS commented that the DfE is for the first time acknowledging this underfunding issue, but not indicating action to mitigate this for the moment - awaiting spending review. The Forum urged the LA to keep up the pressure on the DfE.</p> <p>Growth of £0.5m in 2019/20 will not be sufficient.</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	
5.	<p><b>2018-19 GROWTH/FALLING ROLLS</b></p> <p>DS presented the paper. The Forum had previously agreed the budget for 2018/19 to be £400K for explicit growth (for permanent expansions in school roll and bulge classes).</p> <p>DS explained that growth in 2018/19 is looked at now due to the need to look at the difference between the October 2018 and October 2017 Census.</p> <p>An underspend of £42,804 was presented to Forum where the underspend was largely because City of London, Highbury Grove’s expansion had been delayed by a year and a reduced funding allocation to Winton; where protection rules applied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – to note explicit growth allocations and to agree that AMSI be funded through Schools in Financial Difficulty as, although their PAN had increased to 180, actual pupil numbers were less than 150 yet the costs of teaching staff remained the same. This would increase the Growth Funding underspend to about £108K. The LA has considered reducing places at AMSI in future years. - <b>AGREED</b></p> <p>DS clarified that this funding could not be used for EY settings as it came from maintained primary and secondary schools de-delegated funding and could only be used to support children in years Reception to 11.</p> <p>FG pointed out in Appendix A the criterion for extra funding, ‘additional support where a school extended its age range’. DS clarified that this did not apply to schools taking 2 year olds – this is for children reception to 11.</p>	

	<p>The Forum queried why the calculated growth in pupil numbers had not materialised. DS explained that projections of pupil numbers had been incorrect due to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) projecting too high figures. Greater London Authority (GLA) used ONS data which the LA had used – see Item 9 Place Planning.</p> <p><b>AGREED</b></p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>2019-20 DSG FUNDING ALLOCATIONS</b></p> <p>DS spoke to the report. Final allocations will be published in December 2018 following the October 18 census. In July 18, according to DfE illustrative allocations, LBI was due to be the only LA losing funding. This was because of an error by DfE in calculating funding in 2018/19. After much work with DfE, the DfE has provisionally agreed to honour the complete loss of £1.2, subject to Ministers’ approval. There will be no change to the Primary and Secondary Unit Funds (PUFs and SUFs) as these are now correct. But the funding will come through the Growth Funding as a one off – DS recommended the phased use of these funds.</p> <p><b>The meeting thanked DS, TP and the Finance Team for their hard work and tenacity in pursuing and liaising with the DfE to achieve this.</b></p> <p>Provisional Schools Block DSG allocations indicate a reduction of £280K – this is due to a reduction in the number of pupils, not in funding per pupil. 182 fewer primary pupils with loss of £744K, while small growth (42) in secondary.</p> <p>A reduction of £26K is anticipated for the Central School Services Block. The DfE allows for ongoing duties such as Admissions to retain the same funding. But it expects LAs to reduce historic commitments in relation to ongoing contracts (eg Building Schools for the Future – BSF) by 2021.</p> <p>A M-L asked if the council was maximising funding it was holding through investments. TP and MT replied that there is a constant movement of funding in and out of the council, with allocations not being paid in one amount, so there is no growth from investment but the funding is secure.</p> <p>The £1.2m additional funds will come in 12 instalments.</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>2019-20 ISLINGTON SCHOOL FUNDING CONSULTATION</b></p> <p>DS introduced the paper that had been circulated. Last year there was a significant consultation around moving towards the National Funding Formula (NFF). As there had been so much movement towards the NFF, there was a shorter consultation this year, 11 to 22 November, which had</p>	

	<p>resulted in only 10 responses. JD felt it was important for schools to participate in such consultations.</p> <p>The meeting discussed the recommendations in the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To continue to move towards the NFF as far as is possible</li> <li>• To phase in the reduction in lump sum; because of the circumstances outlined in para 1.5, this will only be possible if a portion of one-off cash payment is directed to the lump sum</li> <li>• Continue to use the mobility factor in 2019-20</li> <li>• Continue to retain Growth Funding</li> <li>• Continue to retain Falling Rolls Funding</li> <li>• To continue to retain funding for services through the Central School Services Block as previously agreed with Schools Forum</li> <li>• To continue de-delegated services at the current rate</li> <li>• To not offer any additional de-delegated services</li> </ul> <p>After discussion, all recommendations were <b>AGREED</b></p> <p>It was acknowledged how useful the mobility factor was in Islington – the meeting urged the LA to continue to lobby the DfE to include mobility as a factor in the NFF and to relax the threshold of 10%.</p> <p>LH asked for a picture of how different schools were impacted by mobility. DS will report on this at the January Forum</p>	<p><b>DS</b></p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>2019-20 GROWTH / FALLING ROLLS PROPOSAL</b></p> <p>DS presented the report. <b>Growth funding</b> supports implicit growth (for those schools yet to be full), explicit growth (as discussed under Item 5) and falling rolls. Due to a new allocation methodology by DfE, LBI is anticipating reduced funds circa £390K, as the new formula will be based on lagged growth data.</p> <p>Some growth underspend from 2018/19, as discussed in Item 5, could be used to mitigate this.</p> <p>Table 1.11 set out anticipated funding needed for explicit growth - £417K. DS pointed out that some funding for Tufnell Park (only school with building works expanding its provision) may be phased.</p> <p>Part 2 of the report focused on <b>Falling Rolls Funding</b>. Five schools currently qualify under the criteria and about £127K was expected to be needed (budget £300K). DS pointed out that some academies may become qualified for explicit growth under the criteria if they achieved a good or better Ofsted judgement – this would put additional pressure on the budget.</p> <p>There was some discussion about the fact that, on the one hand, the LA was using funding to support places that were not in the end needed while, on the other, funding provisions with too few pupils. DS explained that it is a</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b></p>

	<p>matter of timing – for example at the time of agreeing Growth funding, the additional places had been needed.</p> <p>Falling rolls were not about the miscalculation by the ONS of population projections but about children not materialising in schools.</p> <p>DS clarified that Falling Rolls funding is usually limited to two to three years – during that time schools are expected to make great efforts to recruit more pupils or reduce workforce.</p> <p>A M-L asked what the LA is doing strategically to support schools with falling rolls. Actions included setting up priority support groups and working with schools to make the best of their estate, given there is no further capital funding for building works.</p> <p><b>Recommendation to continue funding schools with falling roll and note the potential allocations.</b></p> <p>The forum acknowledged the complexity of these issues and <b>AGREED THE RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p>	
9.	<p><b>PLACE PLANNING REPORT</b></p> <p>MC presented the report. Population figures have changed enormously in the last three years. MC referred to the overestimate of population growth by ONS – they had overestimated the number of children immigrating to the country. There is plenty of capacity for the foreseeable future in school places in all school places planning areas. It is difficult to predict the impact of Brexit – eg large French population in Islington may move.</p> <p>Looking for a reduction in Pupil Admission Numbers (PANs) for a couple secondary and primary schools – Schools Adjudicator will have to agree.</p> <p>A M-L – parents may not understand quality of teaching when they visit, but they do appreciate good premises and facilities.</p> <p>AB asked if MC had looked at Boundary Commission data – indicated 30% growth in over 18s in one ward. <b>MC said she would check that data.</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	<b>MC</b>
10.	<p><b>CAPITAL SUB GROUP UPDATE</b></p> <p>DS reported on behalf of ME - everything going as planned, with no issues to raise at this meeting.</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	
11.		

	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Thursday 17 January, 2-4pm, Laycock Centre</b>	
--	--	--