

**Schools Forum  
4 December 2013**

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Agenda – 57<sup>th</sup> Schools Forum

**Wednesday – 4<sup>th</sup> December 2013 at 6.00 – 8.00 p.m.**

**Venue: Room Q309 - Queen's Park Community School  
Aylestone Avenue  
London NW6 7BQ**

**(Refreshments from 5.30 p.m.)**

### AGENDA

#### Items:

- |   |   |                                   |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Apologies for Absence   |                                   |
| 2 | Minutes of the Meeting of 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2013                   |                                   |
| 3 | 2014/15 Early Years Funding – Consultation with Schools and PVI's Sectors | Sue Gates                         |
| 4 | SEN Update – <b>(To follow)</b>   | Carmen Coffey/<br>Sara Williams   |
| 5 | 2012/13 Schools Budget Outturn and DSG Settlement for 2013/14             | Norwena Thomas                    |
| 6 | De-delegation - Trade Union Facilities                                    | Barbara Cleary/<br>Norwena Thomas |
| 7 | AOB   |                                   |

#### Next Meetings

Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2014  
Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2014

**This page is intentionally left blank**



## Brent Schools Forum

### **Minutes of the 56<sup>th</sup> Schools Forum held on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2013 at the Village School**

#### **Attended by:**

#### **Members of the Forum**

<b>Governors</b>	Mike Heiser - Chair (MH) Martin Beard (MB) Titilola McDowell (TMcD) Umesh Raichada (UR) Alan Carter (AC) Herman Martyn (HM) Cllr Helga Gladbaum (Cllr HG) Cllr Lesley Jones (Cllr LJ)
<b>Head Teachers</b>	Sylvie Libson – Vice Chair (SL) Gill Bal (GB) Lesley Benson (LB) Matthew Lantos (ML) Rose Ashton (RA) Terry Molloy (TM) Sabina Netty (SN) Rabbi Yitzchak Freeman (YF)
<b>PRU</b>	Terry Hoad (TH)
<b>PVI Sector</b>	Paul Russell (PR)
<b>Trade Unions</b>	Lesley Gouldbourne (LG)
<b>Others</b>	Sue Knowler (SK)
<b>Officers</b>	Sara Williams (SW) Norwena Thomas (NT) John Voytal (JV) Devbai Patel (DP) Rebecca Matthews(RM)

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
1.1	Cllr Michael Pavey (Cllr MP) Janice Alexander (JA) Andy Prindiville (AP) Kay Johnson (KJ) Maggie Barth(MB) Elizabeth Jones (EJ)	
<b>2.0.</b>	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2013 and Matters Arising</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Accuracy</b>	
2.1.1	Item 5.6 - AC said that he did not say that the running costs should be included but what he said was that they are ridiculously high.	
2.1.2	GB and Cllr LJ were present at the last meeting.	
2.1.3	The above amendments were noted and the minutes were approved as accurate record.	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Matters Arising – (From the Action Log)</b>	
2.2.1	<b>Schools Forum Governor Representation at Brent Schools Partnership</b> - MH said he put himself forward and so did UR and Cllr HG. It has been agreed by BSP that MH would attend and UR and Cllr HG would cover his absence.	
2.2.2	<b>Confirm if Schools in Financial Difficulty or Schools in Difficulty</b> – This is as the historic holdback for Schools Causing Concern. This budget funds support for schools with particular challenges, either having failed or with risk of failing Ofsted.	
2.2.3	<b>Report on adequacy of growth funding in 2013/14 to inform provision for 2014/15</b> – This report is to be brought to the December's Forum	Carmen Coffey
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Schools Funding Reforms – 2014/15 Update</b>	
3.1.1	JV introduced the report. He apologised for not being able to attend the last Schools Forum. He provided an update on the	



consultation sent out to schools. In total six schools responded and the schools will be responded to the points raised. There were no overall objections to the proposed change in the primary and secondary ratios but some observations regarding the loss of funding in 2014/15.

- 3.1.2 A couple of responses were around schools losing even more money if they have had an increase in pupils in their ARP units. DP explained that this is because the ARP unit pupil numbers are deducted from the total pupil number but in reality this is also an increase to the total number on roll but increasing total pupil number was not possible. In the final budgets, this won't be an issue as it will be based on the actual pupil numbers.
- 3.1.3 JV reported that one school has responded saying it receives the lowest per pupil amount and is an outlier in 2013/14 and remains so in 2014/15. This is due to the fact that they have low number of pupils that attract the Additional Educational Needs funding. The officers have been helping them and supporting them in clarifying their funding position. Under the new funding reforms this situation is outside of the LA's control and reflects the workings of the pupil led factors in the formula created by the DfE.
- 3.1.4 YR said he would have liked to see the budgets presented earlier but due to the religious day he couldn't attend the last Forum. He thanked the Chair and officers for acknowledging and noting not to arrange Schools Forums on religious days for the future. He recognises that LA's proposal to move towards the right direction but is concerned that the move is in one year. The move is affecting around 30 schools in losing funding. He is aware that the intention to move in one year is if the MFG was removed but felt that it should happen over two years.
- 3.1.5 JV said that this was discussed at the Schools Funding Sub Group (SFSG). ML said the sub group looked at two models and which ever model was being used, there were winners and losers. SL said there was not a better way where it was benefitting all schools.
- 3.1.6 LB said it seems that whatever the direction the move takes place, different schools will lose funding. It is best to go with principles. There is always going to be a problem for some schools.
- 3.1.7 AC said no schools will lose more than 1.5 %. A clarification was raised regarding whether 2014/15 will be cash flat and if the funding has been calculated on this basis. MH said it's not likely to increase next year. DP explained that it is the same total as the



actual amount used in 2013/14. However, there is an unallocated amount of £647K which we reported at the last schools forum that £500k was to increase the growth funding and a small balance was left unallocated. SW said that the paper on Growth funding is to be brought to the next schools forum in order that the actual growth amount can be agreed.

3.1.8 HM said that Sinai School is facing total loss of around 6% and this is significant to the school. In total this equates to over £160k. ML said he was present when Sinai School's budget position was being reviewed by the SFSG. His school is also losing money under the new funding formula but Sinai's problem is a result of the national rules. The secondary schools are facing a reduction in 6<sup>th</sup> form funding.

3.1.9 MH asked if members concerned agreed that their issues have been considered and this was accepted.

### **3.2 Request to fund Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre Facilities Centrally**

3.2.1 SW said that the centre operates on a trading basis which covers its costs apart from a small subsidy. If the DSG subsidy was not there, it would possibly be necessary to establish a trust to run the centre or transfer it to an appropriate charitable organisation as other LAs have done with their outdoor centres.

3.2.2 TM said it would be useful to have sight of the more detailed business plan information. We can give a decision this year but in future Schools Forum should be provided with more detailed figures. It was suggested that other options should also be explored e.g. charities. UR said that a change of status could assist in raising funds.

Angela  
Chiswell

3.2.3 Cllr HG said she is a governor at a primary school where if not for the GBC, children would not get to see goats and chickens and other animals. She was fully committed to support funding the centre. She said £50k is a small amount for the benefit generated. The children get experience of outdoors which they do not get anywhere else and pleaded that this service was supported with DSG allocation.

3.2.4 RA said that we have parents who cannot afford to take their children abroad and this centre is incredibly valuable. Many children in Brent do not get to go Spain or other countries or even out of London and by going to this centre it allows them to go away





out of London.

3.2.5 LB asked if Early Years can use the service within this cost. DP said this is a historical funded DSG service for which approval is required every year therefore the funding covers all phases.

3.2.6 It was clarified that all can vote for this service as it is funded from DSG held centrally.

**Recommendations:**

- Note the consultation responses received to date – **Noted**
- Continue to fund Gordon Brown Centre at the current rate – **Approved**

**4.0 De-delegation Request – Free School Meals Eligibility Assessments**

4.1 There were no maintained secondary schools representatives at this meeting. ML said that DP has agreed for him to report decisions on all de-delegation requests on behalf of AP for secondary schools. DP confirmed that this was correct. There continues to be a vacancy for the maintained secondary schools governor.

4.2 SW presented this report and explained that the service is provided by Customer Services on the basis of them doing all checks including liaising with DfE and DWP. This makes it easier for schools and lessens the burden of schools having to do these checks individually. They also do the electronic checks.

4.3 SL was in agreement to de-delegate and SN supported her. ML said he would have liked to see the rates for the academies which each paper should indicate. TM said his school is receiving this service free of charge. LB asked if the parents are claiming on line, how are the charges separated between maintained and academies. SW said we will check and respond back. TM said it's DP not the value of FSM that matters to schools but it triggers Pupil Premium allocations making a significant difference to the schools budget.

4.4 Cllr LJ asked what happens when all infant school children receive free school meals. The whole incentive to apply for FSM changes. MH said we will have to wait until we are guided by the DfE on this. They will probably introduce another factor.



4.5 The Early Years meeting was to take place on the same day as this schools forum, 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2013. The meeting couldn't take place as it was inquorate. It was suggested that may be the membership needs to be increased. LB said that it was arranged at short notice and members could not attend. Members were concerned about this.

4.6 MD said can we agree that there is a general support to de-delegate this service and asked for votes:

Primary -     - Agreement – 8  
                  - Disagreement – 0  
                  - Abstained – 0  
Secondary - Agreement – 1 (as per paragraph 4.1 above)

## **5.0 Schools Causing Concern**

5.1 JV apologised for not removing draft on the reports.

5.2 RM presented the report. RM said the appropriate heading for this budget is Schools Causing Concern and asked if it could be called that. The report provides details of changing the methodology in the way this funding will be allocated to schools. The funding will be made as described in the new Core School Improvement offer. For the current academic year, all schools causing concern will have a Rapid Improvement Group (RIG) established, and that group will produce an action plan. The action plan will be costed and the school will receive funding for the improvements that the school cannot fund from its own resources. RM said that they are creating a risk assessment to ensure that the School Improvement Service is able to address the greatest need and to create greater transparency. Once the school's profile improves, so that there are fewer schools causing concern, there will be less call on this funding but until that happens, the request for the same level of funding is being made.

5.3 MB asked why the budget in 2012/13 was £185k but £254k was used. RM said that the call on the budget was greater than the funds available, but that the School Improvement service had found the surplus from its own resources. But for the current year, because of service cuts, the service is determined to keep within the allocated budget.

5.4 It was questioned as to how many headteacher consultants are engaged. RM said she could not answer for the past but last year when she arrived there were 2 people but these are no longer



being used. TM asked if this budget wasn't available, how would we support schools? RM said there is no other budget available.

5.5 A clarification was sought for de-delegations for nursery schools with reception children. This is a historic holdback so covers all sectors.

5.6 MH invited appropriate members to vote.

Primary -     - Agreement – 7  
                  - Disagreement – 0  
                  - Abstained – 0

Secondary - Agreement – 1 (as per paragraph 4.1 above)

## **6.0 The Learning Zone at Wembley Stadium**

6.1 The programme is funded partly by Wembley Stadium, Traded Service income and from the DSG contribution. The literacy and numeracy programmes continue to be provided by Wembley Stadium as part of its programme of support for the local community since its funding ceased to exist in March 2011 under the DfE's programme 'Playing for Success'. The whole programme delivers six week courses as well as one day experiences to primary school children. The DSG funding supplements assistance-in-kind funding from Wembley Stadium for the use of the stadium facilities. The programmes have a positive impact on the children's confidence, self-esteem and learning through projects and activities developed with schools. The programme also gives a link to special events such as the NFL, rugby world cup and football which without the DSG may not be supported and the access to stadium is at risk.

6.2 The DSG element funds a full time and a part time post. The funding has had a positive impact on young people in terms of their confidence. UR commented that the ability for local children to use the stadium was brilliant!

6.3 RA asked why this is only supporting primary schools as Copland is also using it. SW said that primary may have voted last year but if it is used by both sectors then both sectors can vote this time. DP said this is another service historically funded centrally and both primary and secondary schools could vote.

Primary and Secondary - Agreement – 9

## **7.1.0 Maternity Grant, Trade Union Facilities and Licences Budgets**

- 7.1.1 **Maternity Grant** – the allocation is based on £4,206 for teachers and £3,179 for non-teachers at a rate of £8.48 per pupil. It excludes SMSA's. The overall amount that is required for de-delegation is £223,143. It's a reduction of £116,524 from 2013/14 due to more schools converting to academies
- 7.1.2 The view was that this is insurance and not a disproportionate way of funding maternity cover. TM asked how much was it before academy conversions and NT referred him to paragraph 2.2.4 of the report which provides the details of 2014/15 provisional amounts to be divided with October 2013 pupil number.
- 7.1.3 LB motioned that the maintained nursery schools have had access to the benefits offered by this cover but had no funding via the EYSFF. NT clarified that the nursery and special schools would have to access this cover on a buy-back basis at £8.48 per pupil.

**Recommendation** - MH asked the Forum for a vote with the following outcome :

- Primary -     - Agreement – 9  
                   - Disagreement – 0  
                   - Abstained – 0  
 Secondary - Agreement – 1 (as per paragraph 4.1 above)

- 7.2.1 **Trade Union** – This covers schools with staffing involved on Trade Union duties. The funding is reimbursed to schools on an average cost of an M6 teacher salary cost. The proposed budget is £140,000 and is a reduction of £20,000 from 2013/14 to reflect the value of the academy buy-back. With the academy buy back this will support the current 3.52 FTE staff cost. Nursery and Special Schools would have to buy-back into this service.
- 7.2.2 As the funding was meant to reflect reasonable time off to deal with trade union activities SN wondered what was, in the view of the funding requested, reasonable time off to arrive at an appropriate cost.
- 7.2.3 TM then raised a point of order regarding the presence of LG as a Trade Union representative as this could create a conflict of interest. LG said she was happy to leave the room if the Chair wanted her to. On this point of order the Chair MH did ask her to leave the room. LG left the room for this item. She said before leaving, in reply to SN's point, that it was difficult to quantify time for



example if a school is having a restructure this involves a significant level of Trade Union representative time.

- 7.2.4 SW said it's a matter of judgement in deciding what constitutes 'reasonable' time off.
- 7.2.5 ML said he would still prefer the figures to be presented on a per-pupil amount rather than on posts. ML also offered the view that the Forum should not be doing the government's 'dirty work' in ending or greatly reducing the level of TU representation in schools.
- 7.2.6 It was suggested by secondary headteachers that borough trade union representatives should be required to be serving teacher with a timetable in school who spent part of their time on trade union duties and that we should not have full time representatives or representatives who did not teach as this risked diluting their representative role.
- 7.2.7 An academy headteacher who has not seen any value in buying into this service took the view that the LA has allowed the money to be used inappropriately and it was not a good use of public funds.
- 7.2.8 A primary headteacher stated that in her experience, particularly for schools in difficulty, they have benefited greatly from this funding and the Trade Union support has been invaluable. They have supported schools in addressing issues around unsatisfactory staff performance. SW added that as part of any changes, it was vital to develop a formal TU facilities agreement in consultation with schools since this was not currently in place.
- 7.2.9 TH said it should be noted that the issues which TUs get involved in are time consuming. It involves meetings and attending disciplinaries etc so it would be difficult to calculate reasonable time off. We have to recognise that Trade Union membership and representation is a 'right' and needs to be paid for by schools.
- 7.2.10 TM asked how our budget compares with other LA's. SW said that the HR undertook some benchmarking recently which showed a range between £50k to £140k. There is no particular accepted rate around how staff should be represented.
- 7.2.11 SW said that the proposed de-delegation amount will be included in the provisional budget and the LA will report back with a report that sets out what schools will be looking for from facilities time and

some benchmarking.

- 7.2.12 AC said this de-delegation relates to next year so we do have time to review and come back. We can look at benchmarking it against other authorities. It was agreed to include it in the provisional budget and if the decision is made to reduce it later or to delegate it, adjustment to the final budget can be made accordingly.
- 7.2.13 **Recommendation** - It was agreed to defer decision on this request for de-delegation until funding level from other comparative authorities is received and schools' views could be taken into account.
- 7.2.14 LG was invited back in the room and was informed of the decision that the item is deferred for decision to the next schools forum when the other comparative local authorities' data is available. HR
- 7.3.1 **Licenses** – A request for de-delegation to fund a number of licenses on behalf of maintained schools was made. The total funding required is £44,418 and is subject to confirmation based on the October 2013 actual pupil numbers. The de-delegation offers maintained schools a more efficient method of acquiring these licences removing the need for each school to purchase on an individual basis.
- 7.3.2 The DfE purchases a blanket license for CLA and MPA and invoices Local Authorities for these two licences. The academies are also covered under these licenses. The funding of £75,000 for these two licenses is to be top-sliced from the ISB and is currently not an option for de-delegation.
- 7.3.3 LB was concerned that they will not have access to the funds for de-delegated services when it has been provided to nursery schools previously. SW said that officers will look to see how the nursery and special schools can continue to be supported without additional impact on their delegated budget. NT highlighted that the guidance says that the funding for the special schools is included in the top-ups. SW said that we will need to review this. NT/DP
- 7.3.4 **Recommendation** to de-delegated licenses funding was approved by all primary and secondary school members. For secondary schools paragraph 4.1 above refers.

## 8.0 Any Other Business

- 8.1 Terry Hoad, a representative for PRU's was introduced to all. MH



apologised for not having introductions at the start of the meeting mainly due to having table name plates.


8.2 The meeting ended at 7.50pm.



## Action Log

No	Action	Completion Date	Owner
1	Find out if parents apply on-line for FSM eligibility assessment, how they are identified if they attend maintained school or academy.	4 <sup>th</sup> December 2014 Schools Forum (Matters Arising)	Paula Buckley/DP
2	Benchmarking of End to End process and cost per pupil in processing admissions application	December 2013 Forum (Matters Arising from Sept 2013)	Paula Buckley/ Margaret Read
3	Benchmarking on funding for Trade Union activities with our comparative authorities	December 2013 Forum (Matters Arising from Sept 13)	HR/SW
4	Report on adequacy of Growth Funding in 2013/14 to inform provision for 2014/15	4 <sup>th</sup> December 2013 Forum	Carmen Coffey/ SW
5	Review of Early Intervention Team – to be presented to EY Sub Group prior to being presented to Schools Forum	December 2013 Forum	Sue Gates
7	Strategy for Full-Time Nursery Places - to be presented to EY Sub Group prior to being presented to Schools Forum	December 2013 Forum	Sue Gates
8	If the funding for de-delegations can be funded centrally or additional funding provided to nursery and special schools	January/February 2013	NT/DP
<b>2014/15 Action Points</b>			
9	Budget Review of Alternative Education Service – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To present partnership model that oversees devolved funds</li> <li>Develop further proposals to introduce a rewards and incentives funding framework</li> </ul>	February 2014	Sara Kulay
10	Schools Forum Membership to be recalculated if any more schools convert to academy. Otherwise refresh for the start of the year using the latest (January) census	As and when required / March	NT/DP
11	Low Carbon Schools Programme Update Report	September 2014	Emily Ashton
12	Provide details of what service is covered by DSG allocation at GBOEC	September 2014	Angela Chiswell



 <b>Brent</b>	<p align="center"><b>Schools Forum</b></p> <p align="center"><b>4th December 2013</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Report from the Director of Children &amp; Families</b></p>
For Information	
<b>2014/15 Early Years Funding – Consultation with Schools and PVI Sectors</b>	

## 1. Background

- 1.1 It was not possible to hold the Early Years Funding Sub Group (the Sub Group) meeting scheduled for October due to a large number of absences rendering the meeting inquorate. A November meeting has also proved impossible in diaries. The council was consulting the sub group on the following items impacting on 2014/15:
- Increase in the base rate of 3% to be funded from savings arising from the over funding of FT places during 2013/14
  - Funding a post for the early years inclusion team to support children with emerging SEN in school nursery classes and PVIs from the additional £500,000 approved for early years in 2013/ 14 with the residual sum being allocated using the IDACI criteria within the deprivation supplement
  - To retain the current FSM eligibility requirement and process for funding FT places.
- 1.2 In the absence of the Sub Group meeting and to facilitate the development of the 2014/15 budget and guidance to schools continuing to offer FT nursery places for the September 2014 intake it was decided to consult Sub Group members via email.

## 2 Detail

### *3% Increase in the Base Rate*

- 2.1 The Forum was consulted last year for the 2013/14 early years funding on a proposal to increase the base rate by 5% if affordable. However, it was only possible to fund a 2% increase. Savings will arise in 2013/14 from the over funding of schools offering FT places due to the operation

of the clawback mechanism. This is where the actual number of eligible FSM children was less than the number estimated for the school's budget share. The savings will be sufficient to fund a 3% increase in the base rate.

*Additional Early Intervention (SEN) Post*

- 2.2 The Forum approved additional funding of £500,000 for the 2013/14 early Years to support children with emerging SEN in school nursery classes and PVI providers. There is now a need to use this funding in a more targeted way that will provide additional staffing resources within the early Intervention Team to assist providers in managing the needs of SEN children.

*Funding Full Time School Nursery Places for FSM Pupils*

- 2.3 Following an earlier review of the provision of FT places Schools Forum asked that work was done to review the feasibility of offering funded FT places to all schools and PVI providers. The proviso was that it had to be funded from within the existing cost of provision and it had to include additional local eligibility criteria.
- 2.4 Initial work undertaken by officers during the summer indicated that the current funding would only support around two places per setting in all primary, nursery and PVI settings. In addition the administration of any new scheme could be prohibitively complex if additional local eligibility criteria were introduced over and above the current FSM criterion.

### **3 Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 3.1 The email responses from the schools and PVI Sub Group representatives supported the three proposals.
- 3.2 Schools Forum is asked to:
- a. Note the responses from the Sub Group representatives
  - b. Note the proposals outlined in paragraph 1.1 of this report.

#### **Contact Officer:**

Sue Gates – Head of Early Years and Family Support  
Sue.gates@brent.gov.uk

**Sara Williams**  
**Interim Director of Children and Families**



# Brent

## Schools Forum 4<sup>th</sup> December 2013

Report from the Director of Children & Families

For Information

### Schools Budget Outturn 2012/13 and Final DSG Settlement for 2013/14

## 1.0 Background

- 1.1 This report sets out the Schools Budget outturn for 2012/13. The outturn relates both to the Individual Schools Budget (delegated budgets) and the central items expenditure elements of the Schools Budget.
- 1.2 The final part of this report sets out the latest position for the Schools Budget 2013/14 following the announcement of the final DSG settlement figure for 2013/14 by the DfE. This announcement was made in September 2013 and although it is described as the final figure this is subject to further change as it does not yet fully account for all academy conversions.

## 2.0 Schools Budget Outturn 2012/13

- 2.1 The Schools Delegated Balances at the end of 2011/12 and 2012/13 are shown in the table below, by sector. These are the cumulative surpluses and deficits reported for each individual school as at the end of the financial periods. Overall these balances have increased by £1.1m from the previous year. The 2011/12 balances exclude those of schools which converted to academy status during the 2012/13 financial year. Further details for individual schools are shown in Appendix A.

SECTOR	2011/12 CLOSING BALANCES	2012/13 CLOSING BALANCES	IN YEAR MOVEMENT Surplus +ve/ Deficit -ve
NURSERY	539,261	429,342	-109,918
PRIMARY	15,249,709	16,550,488	1,300,779
SECONDARY	-908,707	-1,381,925	-473,218
SPECIAL	1,560,284	1,951,933	391,649
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16,440,547</b>	<b>17,549,839</b>	<b>1,109,291</b>

- 2.2 The table below shows the Capital balances held by schools. At the end of 2011/12 the capital funds total was in deficit as schools at overspent on their capital allocations. Where schools had more spent more on capital expenditure than was received via devolved capital funding, the remaining expenditure should have been funded via revenue contributions to capital. This has been rectified in 2012/13 and the capital balances are now in surplus.

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>2011/12 CLOSING BALANCES</b>	<b>2012/13 CLOSING BALANCES</b>	<b>IN YEAR MOVEMENT</b> Surplus +ve/ Deficit -ve
NURSERY	189,536	127,948	-61,588
PRIMARY	-903,389	131,829	1,035,218
SECONDARY	222,180	186,453	-35,727
SPECIAL	-10,390	-11,020	-630
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-502,064</b>	<b>435,209</b>	<b>937,273</b>

- 2.3 Final expenditure on central elements of the Schools Budget was more favourable than had been forecast earlier in the year. The final outturn report at the end of 2012/13 was an underspend of £1,073,886 which has been put towards the current DSG Deficit Recovery plan.
- 2.4 The improvement is due to the following:
- Continued reduction in SEN expenditure due to the SEN One Council Project which has now concluded;
  - More favourable DSG adjustments for academy recoupment than had been anticipated.
- 2.5 It is important to note that the cumulative deficit now stands at £4.66m as a result of the improved outturn position on central expenditure. The Deficit recovery plan that was agreed for the Schools Budget by the Schools Forum in September 2011 was expected to produce a cumulative deficit of £6.5m at the end of 2012/13. The deficit recovery plan is therefore ahead of plan by £1.8m.
- 2.6 The need to reduce overall spend on the Schools Budget in accordance with the deficit recovery plan has been and continues to be of paramount importance. SEN continues to show a reduction in expenditure, and this has been further improved by the new funding reforms where schools now have to fund the first £6k of each statement.
- 2.7 However although the plan is currently progressing ahead of schedule, please note that there are current pressures which may negate this improvement. In particular, there is currently a consultation taking place on the proposed transfer of Copland Community School to become a sponsored academy. If this goes ahead on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014, any revenue deficits will remain with the local authority and will impact on the DSG Deficit Recovery Plan. The work to bring the school within budget is also inevitably generating redundancy costs.

### **3.0 Final DSG Settlement and Schools Budget for 2013/14**

- 3.1 The DfE have announced the DSG settlement figure for all local authorities. The figure for Brent has been set at £203.512m after recoupment deductions for Academy conversions and transfers. This figure is subject to further change as it does not reflect conversions and transfers that take place during the 2013/14 financial year, such as Kensal Rise which transferred to ARK to become ARK Franklin on 1<sup>st</sup> September.
- 3.2 Reconciling the DfE's DSG figures has become increasing more difficult over the past couple of years due to the number of academy conversions. The increase in conversions means that the DSG figure is subject to continuous change. As there may be more schools converting throughout the year, Officers will reconcile as required, but it is not anticipated that there will be any further material impact on the Schools Budget for 2013/14.
- 3.3 Based on the DSG settlement figure above, Appendix B sets out the Schools Budget for 2013/14.

### **4.0 Recommendations and Consultation points**

- 4.1 The Schools Forum is requested to:
- a. Note the schools budget outturn for 2012/13;
  - b. Note the final DSG and Schools Budget for 2013/14.

### **Appendices**

- A. Schools Balances 2012/13
- B. Schools Budgets 2013/14

### **Contact Officer**

Norwena Thomas  
Schools Finance Manager

**This page is intentionally left blank**

ITEM 5 - APPENDIX A  
SCHOOLS BALANCES 2012/13

SCHOOL	COST CENTRE	2011/12 CARRY FORWARD	2012/13 CARRY FORWARD	2012/13 CARRY FORWARD AS % OF BUDGET SHARE	MOVEMENT
Granville Plus	EA01	6,171	75,803	12.72%	69,633
Curzon Crescent	EA02	55,965	100,433	12.65%	44,468
College Green	EA03	169,947	47,970	11.27%	-121,977
Fawood	EA04	307,178	205,136	26.95%	-102,042
<b>Nursery Schools</b>		<b>539,261</b>	<b>429,342</b>		<b>-109,918</b>
Anson	EB01	306,219	403,045	20.38%	96,826
Barham	EB02	691,853	545,755	17.87%	-146,099
Braintcroft	EB04	212,721	418,746	12.60%	206,025
Brentfield	EB05	737,892	666,021	27.19%	-71,871
Byron Court	EB09	140,383	226,526	8.95%	86,142
Carlton Vale Inf	EB10	100,977	155,358	12.40%	54,381
Chalkhill	EB11	1,121,753	566,058	24.47%	-555,695
Christchurch	EB08	102,336	175,088	14.46%	72,752
Convent of J&M Inf	EB14	177,691	144,986	10.22%	-32,705
Donnington	EB15	128,297	161,671	12.31%	33,374
Elsley	EB16	111,572	45,271	2.20%	-66,301
Fryent	EB17	569,784	425,437	19.41%	-144,346
Furness	EB20	276,826	648,021	25.84%	371,195
Gladstone Park	EB21	263,884	110,052	3.62%	-153,831
Harlesden	EB23	203,042	135,163	10.50%	-67,879
Islamia	EB73	484,075	510,241	27.30%	26,166
John Keble CE	EB24	511,557	711,732	35.12%	200,175
Kensal Rise	EB25	109,656	553,531	17.44%	443,875
Kilburn Park Jnr	EB32	-65,703	20,997	1.79%	86,700
Kingsbury Green	EB26	336,702	208,689	6.81%	-128,012
Leopold	EB27	129,061	257,652	11.67%	128,591
Lyon Park Inf	EB28	-92,609	-91,498	-5.00%	1,111
Lyon Park Jnr	EB29	-36,010	-57,744	-2.64%	-21,734
Malorees Inf	EB30	38,825	-37,758	-3.31%	-76,583
Malorees Jnr	EB31	-52,468	-20,401	-1.65%	32,067
Michael Sobell Sinai	EB63	250,672	65,794	2.55%	-184,878
Mitchell Brook	EB06	320,659	371,916	15.41%	51,257
Mora	EB33	514,699	381,879	16.71%	-132,821
Mount Stewart Inf	EB35	142,645	37,338	2.92%	-105,307
Mount Stewart Jnr	EB36	237,766	147,198	9.09%	-90,568
Newfield	EB37	215,077	226,187	11.97%	11,110
Northview	EB38	162,216	186,793	15.61%	24,577
NW London Jewish	EB39	108,509	95,363	7.90%	-13,146
Oakington Manor	EB40	1,157,744	1,576,827	45.99%	419,084
Oliver Goldsmith	EB42	402,328	492,770	24.82%	90,442
Our Lady of Grace Inf	EB43	107,625	134,537	13.19%	26,912
Our Lady of Grace Jnr	EB44	122,167	133,399	12.13%	11,233
Our Lady of Lourdes	EB45	139,914	121,342	9.36%	-18,572
Park Lane	EB46	315,945	333,343	17.88%	17,398
Preston Park	EB47	364,014	501,884	15.35%	137,870
Princess Frederica	EB48	71,626	181,508	9.76%	109,882
Roe Green Inf	EB49	474,865	211,316	11.76%	-263,549
Roe Green Jnr	EB50	593,092	871,943	40.55%	278,851
Salisbury	EB62	-19,436	-75,394	-2.54%	-55,958
St Andrew & St Francis	EB51	210,669	161,524	7.56%	-49,145
St Joseph's Inf (Waverley Ave)	EB54	406,205	409,249	35.76%	3,044
St Joseph's Jnr (Chats Ave)	EB52	368,979	588,244	44.89%	219,265
St Joseph's (Goodson Rd)	EB53	181,302	103,753	4.54%	-77,550
St Margaret Clitherow	EB55	124,254	139,804	11.24%	15,549
St Mary Magdalen's	EB56	100,519	72,693	4.63%	-27,826
St Marys CE	EB59	175,881	125,939	7.57%	-49,942
St Marys RC	EB57	228,586	28,681	1.47%	-199,905
St Robert Southwell	EB60	81,830	141,186	8.10%	59,357
Stonebridge	EB64	224,173	414,067	20.42%	189,894
Torah Temimah	EB74	46,933	49,734	5.13%	2,801
Uxendon Manor	EB68	171,517	252,478	12.20%	80,961
Wembley	EB76		584,146	15.97%	161,568


## ITEM 5 - APPENDIX A

SCHOOL	COST CENTRE	2011/12 CARRY FORWARD	2012/13 CARRY FORWARD	2012/13 CARRY FORWARD AS % OF BUDGET SHARE	MOVEMENT
Wykeham	EB72	315,838	600,407	23.63%	284,568
<b>Total Primary Schools</b>		<b>15,249,709</b>	<b>16,550,488</b>		<b>1,300,779</b>
Copland	EC05	-1,126,947	-1,551,008	-16.14%	-424,061
JFS	EC12	304,183	308,195	2.90%	4,012
Newman Catholic	EC02	-1,189,222	-494,133	-11.82%	695,089
St. Gregory's	EC11	1,103,279	355,021	5.47%	-748,258
<b>Total Secondary Schools</b>		<b>-908,707</b>	<b>-1,381,925</b>		<b>-473,218</b>
The Village	EE04	750,276	911,712	15.59%	161,437
Manor Day	EE05	96,874	132,474	4.32%	35,601
Woodfield	EE06	472,937	540,780	19.10%	67,843
Phoenix Arch	EE07	240,198	366,966	36.53%	126,768
<b>Total Special Schools</b>		<b>1,560,284</b>	<b>1,951,933</b>		<b>391,649</b>
<b>TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS</b>		<b>16,440,547</b>	<b>17,549,839</b>		<b>1,109,291</b>



<b>SCHOOLS BUDGET 2013-14</b>	
<b>BUDGET DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>2013-14 BUDGET £</b>
Dedicated Schools Grant	(203,512,000)
Sixth Form Funding	(6,949,332)
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>(210,461,332)</b>
<b>DEVOLVED RESOURCES</b>	
Schools ISB (Including 6th Form)	159,449,990
<b>TOTAL DEVOLVED RESOURCES</b>	<b>159,449,990</b>
<b>CENTRAL EXPENDITURE</b>	
SEN Developments	188,119
Educational Psychology	252,850
SEN Assessment Service	159,130
Integrated Teams	182,759
Recoupment & Other SEN Placements	11,166,236
Statemented Pupils in IB Mainstream	3,050,252
Medical Needs	177,512
Early Years - SEND	167,444
SEN Transport	500,376
Academies Statementing Support	3,209,118
NMSS (Non Maintained Special Schools)	579,000
Schools Causing Concern	184,800
BDHIS Brent Deaf and Hearing Impaired	320,880
BEDOS Brent Education Disabilities of	349,780
BOAT Brent Outreach Autism Team	232,560
School Improvement - Core	635,107
Wembley Learning Zone	81,000
Behaviour	150,000
SEN Advisory	162,959
EMTAS	14,051
Education Welfare Service	51,348
Alternative Education	4,885,233
Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre	50,000
Crisis Intervention and Support Team	60,000
CIN Service Management Team	88,245
Commissioning & Access to Resources T	93,564
FSS LAC Education Team	365,249
CLA P & V Residential Care Children's	698,610
YOT Service Unit	114,000
Speech & Language Therapy	346,116
Early Years Payments - NEG 2, 3 &4	10,731,910
DSG - Early Years Service	1,758,085
Early Intervention Services	400,000

<b>SCHOOLS BUDGET 2013-14</b>	
<b>BUDGET DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>2013-14 BUDGET £</b>
PRC	603,580
Maternity & Jury Service	508,728
Schools Forum	33,696
Subscriptions	140,340
Rising Rolls Contingency etc	1,129,952
Support Services	69,615
Carbon Reduction	235,000
CERA (Capital Expenditure from Revenue)	1,240,000
Communication & Support Services	459,553
Out of School - Pupils Without a Place	3,757,512
School Admissions	23,068
FCS School Staff Salary Recharge To D	416,920
Home to School Travel	10,699
Other Sixth Form Expenditure	976,387
<b>TOTAL CENTRAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>51,011,342</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>210,461,332</b>
	0

 <b>Brent</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Schools Forum</b>  <b>4<sup>th</sup> December 2013</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Director of Children &amp; Families</b></p>
For Information	
De-Delegation: Trade Union Funding	

## 1.0 Background

- 1.1 A report was submitted to the Schools Forum on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2013 regarding de-delegated budgets. In response to teacher trade union facilities the Schools Forum requested a further report be presented with recommendations for managing trade union facilities in the future. The Schools Forum asked for more detailed information to be prepared including benchmarking with other local authorities and the need to establish operational arrangements for the management of facilities time.
- 1.2 This report reviews the time off facilities for teacher trade unions for 2013/14 and makes proposals for 2014/15. Currently the facilities arrangements are provided to all maintained schools within the Borough and are managed centrally by the Children and Families Department. Academies have the option to 'buy in' to the facilities provision. Nurseries and special schools are currently included in the de-delegation funding arrangement. However, in the future this will no longer be allowed and it will be necessary to establish a similar arrangement for them to buy in to the trade union facilities provision. This will also apply to PRUs who now have delegated budgets.

## 2.0 Legal Requirements

- 2.1 The purpose of the statutory provisions is to aid and improve the effectiveness of relationships between employers and trade unions. Employers and unions have a joint responsibility to ensure that agreed arrangements work to mutual advantage by specifying how reasonable time off for union duties and activities and for training will work.
- 2.2 Trade unions recognised by employers for collective bargaining purposes have a statutory right to reasonable paid time off from employment to carry out trade union duties and undertake trade union related training. This requirement is set out in the Trade Union and Labour Relations Consolidation Act 1992 and the ACAS Code of Practice for Time Off for Trade Union Duties and Activities. Additionally an

employee who is a member of an independent trade union recognised by the employer should be permitted reasonable time off during working hours to take part in any trade union activity.

- 2.3 Where a trade union is not recognised by an employer, employees have no statutory right to time off to undertake any duties, except that of accompanying a worker at a disciplinary or grievance hearing.
- 2.4 A union representative is an employee who has been elected or appointed in accordance with the rules of the independent union to be a representative of all or some of the union's members in the particular company or workplace, or agreed group of workplaces where the union is recognised for collective bargaining purposes.

### **3.0 Current Arrangements**

- 3.1 The current facilities arrangements for time off for teacher trade union representatives have evolved over time. The arrangements cover the need for trade unions to be involved and consulted on overarching school issues as well duties across all maintained schools. The current facilities time equates to 3.52 FTE. This arrangement is managed by the Council on behalf of schools. In addition to the full time equivalent there are local trade union representatives and health and safety representatives in schools dealing with local issues.
- 3.2 The trade union facilities arrangement is allocated across the teacher unions proportional to their membership. Currently there are 2908 teachers in schools within the borough, of which there are 1944 teachers within Council maintained schools. Information regarding trade union membership is not held within the Council. The trade unions have indicated there are 3336 members within the teacher unions which includes teaching assistants and technicians (ATL members) as well members in academies. In the past the allocation of the facilities time has been allocated by the Teachers Panel in consultation with the trade unions using trade union membership data. The trade unions covered by this arrangement are NASUWT, NUT, NAHT and ATL.
- 3.3 The trade union facilities arrangements do not cover academies. In respect of academies there is a buy back service. Currently nurseries and special schools are included in the trade union time off arrangements. However this will change in 2014/15. This is discussed in the section on funding below. It is proposed to develop a new buy back service for nurseries, special schools and PRU's for 2014/15.
- 3.4 In addition to the teacher trade union time off arrangements the Council recognises GMB and UNISON for staff employed across the council's services and they also cover support staff in schools. There are separate facilities arrangements in place which are managed corporately by the Council.

## 4.0 Trade Union Facilities Funding

- 4.1 The funding required to provide supply cover for the time off is managed by the Council. The funding for trade union facilities is currently de-delegated. This means that a proportion of the schools budget is held centrally to cover the cost of trade union facilities. The Teachers Panel submit an annual claim each year detailing the FTE time spent on trade union duties which is converted into a salary cost for an M6 grade and paid to those schools where staff were absent on trade union duties. Set out in the table below is a summary of the actual amount spent on trade union facilities for 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14. The actual spend for 2013/14 is not available at this stage.

Year	Allocated FTE	Allocated Budget	Cost per pupil	Actual FTE	Actual Cost	Cost per pupil
2011/12	3.52	£153,000	£3.52	2.99	£132,832	£3.05
2012/13	3.52	£155,000	£3.50	2.80	£124,260	£2.80
2013/14	3.52	£159,457	£3.59	tbc	tbc	tbc

Based on previous year's claims it is evident from the claims submitted that the actual facility time claimed is less than the full allowance of 3.52.

- 4.2 The Education Funding Agency 2014/15 Revenue Funding Arrangements amend the de-delegation arrangements. In future a local authority can only de-delegate for maintained primary and secondary schools. This means that nurseries and special schools that are currently included in the time off trade union facilities arrangements in future will have to buy back trade union facilities support if they wish to continue to be part of this arrangement. This will be a decision for the school/nursery. Additionally PRUs now also have delegated budgets and will need to decide whether they wish to buy in to the facilities arrangement.
- 4.3 Academies currently have the option to buy into the trade union facility arrangements. The fee is currently £3.50 per pupil. Currently 3 academies out of 13 buy into the trade union facilities arrangement.
- 4.4 The 3.52 FTE trade union facilities time has remained the same for the last 4 years. However, there has been an increase in the number of schools becoming academies which as discussed above are outside the scope of the trade union facilities arrangements. The relationship between the trade union facilities funding and the number of schools establishments eligible to participate has not decreased to reflect this change in the number of maintained schools. Going forward it will be necessary to reduce the de-delegated trade union funding to reflect the reduction in the number of maintained schools. Currently the 3.52 FTE is based on all schools, including academies, nurseries, special schools and PRU's. If an adjustment is not made then there is a disproportionate burden on the remaining maintained schools. Any additional buy in can supplement the facilities allocation.

## 5.0 Benefits of De-Delegation

- 5.1 If the trade union facilities arrangements were not to be managed by the local authority it would mean that schools would need to make local plans to cover the cost of trade union facilities directly from their budgets. There are strong arguments in favour of maintaining a central facilities arrangement. Schools are able to pool the resources to cover the cost in a way that avoids costs falling unpredictably or unevenly across the schools. For example, schools undergoing change and expansion programmes are likely to place greater demands on trade union facilities. Overall the current approach is a more efficient and cost effective way of managing facilities time.
- 5.2 The benefits of this arrangement include:
- Enabling the school to plan for the absence of the teacher from the class room;
  - Schools are aware of representatives' availability;
  - Greater flexibility and capacity to respond to issues;
  - More effective way of responding to local authority wide school issues;
  - Provides a fair system in respect of both time and costs for all school.
- 5.3 It is therefore proposed that the Schools Forum agree to continue the de-delegation arrangement in 2014/15 and that this arrangement is reviewed annually in light of changes in the number of maintained schools and schools outside the scope of the agreement buying into the facilities arrangement.

## 6.0 Benchmarking

- 6.1 To enable the Schools Forum to consider what would be reasonable facilities time off for the teacher trade unions in the future a survey of London boroughs has been undertaken. The survey information has been difficult to compile as authorities contacted hold the information in a number of different forms.
- 6.2 The information is set out in the table below:

London Borough	No of Teachers/ Teacher union members if data available	Facilities Time FTE	Allocated Budget
Brent	1944 (teachers in maintained schools) * 3336 (members in teaching unions) **	3.52	£159,457
Camden	1099 (teachers in maintained schools) 1000 (members in teaching unions –estimated)	1.40	£65,800
Ealing	2350 (teachers)	2.40 (teaching & support staff)	£150,000 (approximately)
Greenwich	2116 (members in teaching unions)	2.00	£90,124
Harrow	unknown	1.08	unknown
Havering	2200 (teachers) 2600 (members in teaching unions)	3.0	£175,000
Hillingdon	3132 (members in teaching unions)	1.82	£63,720

\* from annual staffing return to Teachers' Pensions on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

\*\* from Lesley Gouldbourne's report on facilities time.

## **7.0 Analysis and Options**

- 7.1 It is evident from the information on schools trade union facilities that the current allocation no longer reflects the actual time needed to provide trade union support in schools.
- 7.2 The actual time spent on trade union duties in 2011/12 and 2012/13 was less than the allocated 3.52 FTE, at 2.99 and 2.80 respectively.
- 7.3 The allocated 3.52 was based on all the schools in the borough with the exception of non-recoupment academies. This is therefore 80 schools. Given the changes that have occurred in the status of schools the formula for calculating time off should have taken this into account and reflected that a number of schools had become academies. Going forward the formula should also take account of nurseries, special schools and PRUs which also now have delegated budgets. Currently there are 61 maintained schools (excluding academies, nurseries, special schools and PRUs) which should be used as the basis for calculating the allocation of time off for teacher trade unions.
- 7.4 The trade unions in their submission have suggested a 10% reduction in trade union facilities time reflecting a change in circumstances from their perspective. Their request is for 3.16 FTE. The teacher trades unions have engaged with the local authority in a positive debate on this issue and have submitted a range of papers which are attached as Appendix A.
- 7.5 There is a financial requirement to allocate budget provision to schools on the basis of the pupil head count. However it is suggested to use the teacher headcount to determine the time off facility is more appropriate. It is therefore suggested that, in future, teacher headcount is used for calculating the facility time and the cost can then be converted to pupil head count for purposes of allocating the budget to schools in accordance with the financial guidelines.
- 7.6 In the past not all trade union representatives have been serving teachers who spend part of their time on borough-wide union duties and the remainder teaching in school. It is acknowledged that there has been a reasonable explanation for this situation. However, as raised by head teachers at the last meeting of the Schools Forum, in the future it is proposed that it be made clear in the facilities agreement that borough-wide trade union representatives should be serving teachers who are practising in local schools and are familiar with current local circumstances to inform consultation and negotiations. It would also distinguish them from regional level full-time union officials. It is usual practice for trade union representatives to be serving teachers.
- 7.7 Based on the foregoing, a number of options are set out below for the Schools Forum consideration.
- 7.7.1 Option 1**  
Reduce the time off facility to 3.16, which would be consistent with the trade union proposal. This translates to a de-delegated budget of £142,600 (£5.45 per pupil), and would give a small reduction on the facility time compared to previous years. However, this does not reflect the actual reduction in the

number of maintained schools, as the trade union proposal is based on all schools they represent not just the maintained schools. This option does not fully address the issue of there being a disproportionate burden on the remaining maintained schools and should be dependent on an element of those schools out of scope buying into the facilities arrangement. Steps should be taken to agree to enable nurseries, special schools, PRUs as well as academies to access the facilities on a fee paying basis. It is proposed that this arrangement would be reviewed on an annual basis.

#### **7.7.2 Option 2**

Calculate the facilities time using the number of teachers in maintained schools and reviewing the arrangement on an annual basis. Using the current maintained school's teacher head count of 1944 this would equate to 2.35 FTE facilities time, and translates to a de-delegated budget of £106,100 (£4.05 per pupil). This approach recognises the actual number of maintained schools within the borough and any buy back would be used to supplement the amount of time off. As in option 1 above, steps would be taken to agree to enable nurseries, special schools, PRUs, as well as academies, to access the facilities on a fee paying basis at £4 per pupil.

#### **7.7.3 Option 3**

From benchmarking data it can be seen that other London boroughs are not as generous with the time given for trade union facilities. The Schools Forum may wish to consider a more significant reduction, in light of these findings, to 2.0 FTE. This would translate to a de-delegated budget of £90,300 (£3.45 per pupil). As in option 1 and 2 above, steps would be taken to agree to enable nurseries, special schools, PRUs, as well as academies, to access the facilities on a fee paying basis at £3.50 per pupil. This is a more accessible option for buy-in from academies than options 1 or 2. It would also be reasonable to review any arrangement concluded under this option on an annual basis.

#### **7.7.4 Option 4**

Decide not to de-delegate the budget and leave schools to make their own arrangements for trade union representation. The report sets out disadvantages that would come with this approach.

### **8.0 Conclusion**

- 8.1 In considering each of the options and all of the factors that are impacting on the time off facilities for teacher trade unions the Council is minded to recommend Option 2 on the basis that it reflects the current numbers of teachers and schools. It provides a fair way to manage the arrangement on behalf of schools, whilst at the same time allowing for the time off to be supplemented dependent on the number of schools that buy into the arrangement. The Council would approach schools at the end of each year to determine the level of buy in for the following year in order to calculate any additional facilities time resulting from the buy back.
- 8.2 Whichever of the options are decided the Council would, in consultation with the trade unions and schools, seek to develop a formal trade union facilities agreement



to support the agreed time off facilities, including the allocation of the time between the teacher unions.

## **9.0 Recommendations and Consultation points**

9.1 The Schools Forum is requested:

- a. To decide whether to de-delegate for the trade union facilities budget for 2014/15;
- b. To agree on an option from paragraph 7.7 in the report for the provision of trade union facilities time off in the future – the LA is recommending Option 2;
- c. To agree to enable nurseries, special schools and PRUs, as well as academies, to have access to the facilities arrangements on a fee paying basis;
- d. To agree to review the arrangements annually and adjust the time off arrangements to reflect any changes in the status of schools;
- e. That officers, in consultation with the trade unions and schools, should develop a formal trade union facilities agreement to support the agreed time off facilities, including the allocation of the time between the teacher unions
- f. To agree that the facilities arrangements would require representatives funded through this route to be serving teachers in Brent schools.

## **Appendix**

A. Trade Union Facilities report

### **Contact Officers**

Sara Williams  
Acting Director of Children & Families

Barbara Cleary  
Strategic HR Manager

Alison Bell  
Principle Employee Relations Officer – Schools'

Norwena Thomas  
Schools Finance Manager

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Report on Facilities Time for Schools Forum

### 1. What is “reasonable” paid time assigned to the execution of Trade Union duties and training?

There are 3336 teachers in the teachers’ Unions in Brent. The current Trade Union Facilities Agreement is funded according to an allocation of 3.52 full-time equivalent teachers. Using directed time as a reasonable basis for time available, this gives a Brent total of ,

$$(1265 \text{ hours} \times 3.52) = 4452.8 \text{ hours of paid Trade Unions officers' time.}$$

For 3336 teachers this equates to 1.33 hours per teacher ( $4452.8 \div 3336$ ).

When dealing with casework, it can easily take over one hour to arrange and conduct one meeting with a member, and become acquainted with the facts of the case, research any other information required, and then arrange any further meetings. A case may then require further meetings, in which HR and/or management are involved.

Of course, not all 3336 teachers will need their Union in any given year, but this figure of 1.33 hours per member per annum does not take into account the other work routinely done by Trades Union officers. These will include meetings such as Schools Forum, Teachers Panel, Overview and Scrutiny, Policy Committees, school visits to meet membership groups and Members reps, attending Officer training sessions, Health and Safety meetings and training, Divisional meetings, as well as consultations with head teachers, governing bodies and HR officers. Nor does it take into account the time required in travelling to such meetings, and reading and preparing documents.

As an example, one Brent Teacher officer generated the following workload for September-October 2013:-

- 15 schools visited, and meetings held
- 25 individual members contacted/meetings held, for casework
- 2 Alternative Education Re-structuring meetings attended
- 1 SEN sub-group meeting
- 1 New Brent Teachers Induction meeting
- 1 Schools Policy Review group meeting
- 2 Teachers Panel meetings
- 1 School Reps training session
- 2 consultation meetings with Councillors Butt and Pavey
- 2 Schools Forum
- 3 (days) NUT Divisional Secretaries meetings

No officer of any teacher Union is released from a school full time in Brent. In fact, it would be impossible to cope with the regular workload generated in Brent schools, without the unpaid time given by various retired teachers, fulfilling roles as Trades Union officers.

### 2. Benchmarking Data.

This is some information gathered from other Divisions within the London area, for work done by Trades Union officers. It might help to see what appears to be the situation on Facilities time, in other London Boroughs.

<b>London Borough</b>	<b>No.of Union Members</b>	<b>Facilities Time (full time equivalents)</b>	<b>Brent Equivalent (see notes below)</b>
Brent	3336	3.52	3.52
Barking and Dagenham	1472	1.80	3.80
Bexley	1288	0.85	2.20
Camden	1678	1.50	3.00
Ealing	2120	1.50	2.4
Hackney	1724	2.30	4.45
Hammersmith and Fulham	1008	1.0	3.3
Haringey	2146	2.0	3.1
Lambeth	1609	1.4	2.9
Newham	2643	2.0	2.5
Southwark	1923	1.7	2.9
Waltham Forest	2051	2.0	3.2
Westminster	1012	1.0	3.2
Average			3.11

Notes;

- Brent equivalent is derived by calculating the proportion of fte, should the stated Borough have the same number of members as Brent.
- Data (where available) from 2012.
- In London, only Bexley and Waltham Forest have delegated funding.

In recognition of the financial difficulties facing schools, and Education services, the teacher Unions suggest that, as a gesture of goodwill and good faith, a cut in the facilities time of 10%, bringing the Brent fte from 3.52 to 3.16 would be acceptable. This would bring Brent closer to what would seem to be a London- wide average.

In return, and in order to try to manage the increased workload resulting from this consideration, officers of the Trades Unions trust that Head teachers/HR officers/Governors will continue to work with us, to enhance harmonious industrial relations.

### **3. What do we do about Academies, Nurseries and PRUs?**

These institutions cannot de-delegate their Trades Union funding, but can continue to receive an element for it in their funding. The easiest, and cheapest, way for them to sustain their Trades Union responsibilities, would be to “buy in” to the Brent funding pot that has been created by the other (included) institutions de-delegating their funding. This fund is not managed by the Trades Unions, but by the Brent Local Authority.

Where institutions decide not to “buy in” the service, and involvement of Trades Union involvement, at a Divisional (or higher) level, would be charged for, and schools would be invoiced accordingly. In two Divisions where this happens, the rate is charged at consultancy rates, and consequently, is a much more expensive option.