



SCHOOLS FORUM

The Village School

Wednesday 21st September 2016 18:00 – 20:00

(Refreshments from 17:30)

AGENDA

| NO. | ITEM. | OFFICER | TIME |
|------------|--|----------------|-------------|
| | Introductions (if appropriate) | | |
| | Apologies for Absence and Membership | | 18.00 |
| 1 | Declarations of Interests | | 18:05 |
| 2 | Minutes of Previous Meeting – 15 June 2016 | | 18:10 |
| 3 | Action Log and Matters Arising | | 18.15 |
| 4 | Wembley Learning Zone | Sandra Bingham | 18:25 |
| 5 | The Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre | John Galligan | 18.45 |
| 6 | Brent Council Response to Early Years Consultation – verbal update | Phil Herd | 19:00 |
| 7 | Split Site Factor Funding | Phil Herd | 19.15 |
| 8 | Schools Funding Arrangements 2017-18 | John Holden | 19:35 |
| 9 | AOB | | 19:40 |

Dates of Remaining 2016-17 Forums

| DATE | VENUE |
|---|------------------------------|
| Wednesday 26 th October 2016 | Queens Park Community School |
| Wednesday 7 th December 2016 | The Village School |
| Wednesday 8 th February 2017 | Queens Park Community School |

BRENT SCHOOLS FORUM

**Minutes of the Schools Forum held on
Wednesday 15 June 2016 at Queens Park Community School**

Attended by Members of the Forum:**Governors:**

Martin Beard (MB)
Helga Gladbaum (HG)
Mike Heiser (MH) - Chair
Jo Jhally (JJ)
Sue Knowler (SK)
Titilola McDowell (TM)
Narinder Nathan (NN)

Head Teachers:

Rose Ashton (RA)
Lesley Benson (LB)
Martine Clark (MC)
Kay Charles (KC)
Danny Coyle (DC)
Desi Lodge Patch (DLP)
Andy Prindiville (AP)
Troy Sharpe (TS)

PRU:

Terry Hoad (TH)

PVI Sector:

Paul Russell (PR)

Trade Unions:**14-19 Partnership:**

Lead Member (C&YP): Cllr Wilhelmina Mitchell Murray (WM)

Officers:

Gail Tolley (GT)
Cate Duffy (CD)
Norwena Thomas (NT)
John Holden (JH)
Devbai Patel (DP)
Sue Gates (SG)
Sasi Srinivasan (SS)

Others:

Raphael Moss (RM) - Observer

ITEM DISCUSSION**i. Introductions**

The Forum commenced at 6.05pm.

MH asked the new Lead Member to introduce herself followed by all others present.

ii. Apologies

Rabbi Yitzchak Freeman
Lesley Gouldbourne
Herman Martyn
Melissa Loosemore
Umesh Raichada
Troy Sharp – for arriving late

iii. Membership

Five vacancies remain which are two Secondary Academy Heads, Nursery School Governor, Early Years PVI and 14-19 Partnership. MH asked if these are being filled and it was confirmed that invitation for nominations are sent out frequently.

1 Declarations of Interests

1.1 None

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 24th February 2016 and Matters Arising

2.1 Paragraph 9.1 – the second sentence was corrected to state that MH said that when a school changes its status the members' category change. It would not be compliant if members were moved into categories that they did not fit into.

2.2 The above was noted. There were no other corrections to the minutes therefore they were approved as an accurate record.

3.0 Action Log and Matters Arising

3.1 With regards to 2017-18 funding phase 2 of the consultation is awaited. MH thanked officers for very detailed responses.

4.0 Election of Vice Chair

4.1 DP reported that nominations were received for two members but RA had the majority number. DP had obtained RA's approval and she had

agreed to take on this position (RA had not arrived at this point). RA was therefore appointed as vice-chair. MH congratulated her.

5.0 Update on Early Years Funding – 30 Hours

[This report was for information.](#)

- 5.1 SG presented this report. She said the report is being brought to Schools Forum for information sharing. The report provides an update on extending new Nursery Education Grant to 3 and 4 year olds to 30 hours for working families and is required to be implemented from September 2017. The current 3 and 4 year olds free 15 hour places continue to be statutory.
- 5.2 The meetings and consultations have taken place so far with parents, child minders and Children's Centres through focus groups in the preparation for implementation. Parents were also consulted through PVI sector providers. A reasonable response has been received.
- 5.3 Section 5 of the report provided a projection on demand estimated to be around 1870 new places based on Brent's Childcare Sufficiency Assessment. Local Authorities will be measured against sufficiency rather than take up. Places are already becoming available and it is likely that therefore a number of places required are going to be fewer than initially planned. Statutory guidance is still to be issued. Early Years providers are mostly positive. Providers are concerned about rates. DfE are planning a consultation on rates which is likely to be in autumn. Parents have understandably been positive. No provider has signalled that they didn't want to take up the free 30 hours. The next step was to set up a pilot to see how it would work.
- 5.4 LB said that Brent need to decide on what was needed to be done next. Also a decision needed to be made about current Full Time places. Two year old hourly rate costs are higher than what is funded. She said it was concerning that the government allows slippage on quality. Providers face a potential cashflow issue.
- 5.5 SG said that a message has gone out to providers. Local Authority has a flexibility around notice period. It used to be at half term of child losing place. There can be a flexibility with full time places. There aren't currently many full time places. Officers are in discussion with the DfE around full time places and will get a steer from them. Quality will have same flexibility with full time places. Most settings are getting good or above and a focus is on settings that are on borderline. In regards to rates, we will have to wait for DfE announcement.
- 5.6 PR said that ratio used to be 13:1 and does keep the cost down. Some of the nurseries charge in more affluent area £1,500 per month but PVI's are trapped and it is concerning for them. They don't own their property and face significant rent increases.

- 5.7 SG agreed with PR and agreed to put a case forward to DfE but still think the rates will not be high enough. Currently there can strictly be no top up of rates but this may change with future guidance.
- 5.8 PR said Brent is good at monitoring top up attempts and prohibiting it whereas other boroughs tend to ignore it.
- 5.9 Recommendation, to note the contents of the report as initial information sharing. This was noted. The Schools Forum would be updated as and when more information from DfE is received and when consultations are completed.
- 6.0 Dedicated Schools Grant – Outturn 2015-16 and Budget 2016-17**
[This report was for information and decision.](#)
- 6.1 NT presented this report. The report provided details of DSG outturn for 2015-16 including Individual Schools Budget (ISB) balances and central items along with the latest position on 2016-17 DSG.
- 6.2 The 2015-16 ISB balances continue to increase. There was one school in deficit by the end of 2015-16 opposed to six 2-3 years ago. There was underspend on DSG of £669k making a cumulative balance of £1.02m which was proposed to be kept as a contingency. The grant is ring-fenced and is therefore carried forward to 2016-17.
- 6.3 The allocation for 2016-17 is £195m after recoupment. This is subject to change due to adjustments to Early Years actual census data and if further schools convert to academy.
- 6.4 An increase of £2m has been applied in 2016-17 to Early Years due to ongoing pressures on this block. There has been a restructure in the council so the total £2m is not with Early Years. Of this £577k is with Schools Effectiveness Service because some of the Early Years' service is transferred to this area.
- 6.5 MH said the budget needs to correctly reflect the Section 251 statement to ensure that central expenditure is not showing high. Some LA's do have a high central expenditure budget.
- 6.6 KC asked if a detailed breakdown could be provided to be able to identify services i.e. how much of it is going to alternative provision and special schools. Without this level of information, members are not in a position to scrutinise. They would like to support but do not know where to start. MH asked if this can be provided for 2015-16 and GT said that there is no resources to complete it this year but can be provided in the future years.
- 6.7 SK asked if the budget for Trade Unions was correct as it had overspent. NT thought it was swapped with maternity grant as she

was confident that the Trade Union budget was underspent. She would check and confirm.

Post meeting notes: The Trade Union budget was £86,473 and the Maternity budget was £220,067. The actual spend was £41,878 and £240,144 respectively.

6.8 The following recommendations were noted:

- a. Outturn for delegated (ISB) schools revenue balances for 2015-16
- b. The outturn for central expenditure elements of the DSG for 2015-16
- c. The revised DSG allocations for 2016-17

Members were invited to vote to agree the DSG budget for 2016-17. This was agreed unanimously.

7.0 Updated Scheme for Financing Schools and Schools Financial Regulations 2016-17

This report was for consultation and information.

7.1 NT presented this report. The Scheme for Financing Schools was updated and the summary of changes were included as an appendix. NT went through the changes. The main change is the increase in threshold for high value contract from £250k to £500k. Schools Financial Regulations sits alongside Scheme for Financing Schools and again a summary of changes was attached as a separate appendix. LB said a lot of work went into Scheme for Financing Schools last year where a group was set up to look at it in detail. Therefore there were not many changes this year. GT thanked those involved.

The Chair asked Members to consider the following Recommendations:

- a. Scheme for Financing Schools. Maintained schools Members were invited to vote to approve the Scheme for Financing Schools 2016-17. This was agreed unanimously.
- b. Schools Financial Regulations – Members were consulted on this and had no further comments.

8. Review of Criteria for Split-Site Factor, Falling Rolls and Growth Fund

This report was for consultation and information.

8.1 NT presented this report. The report reviews the split site factor, falling rolls and growth funding. The split site factor funding has not been reviewed since it was introduced several years ago. It became apparent through discussions with other London Boroughs and

through benchmarking that Brent pays the second highest and fourth highest in percentage of total school block of funding. The criteria being proposed meets the DfE guidelines.

- 8.2 Three options were presented and the one recommended was a phased implementation over 4 years. This was on the basis that it would be necessary to support schools that are going through an expansion on two or more sites until the school is fully occupied. Once the school is full, the pupil-led funding and site specific factor funding should cover the costs. It would be necessary to support the schools in the first couple of years. If this option was approved, out of five schools that currently receive funding three would cease to receive it as they would no longer be eligible.
- 8.3 The Falling Rolls criteria was being introduced for the first time in Brent. In the first instance only good and outstanding schools qualify for funding under this criteria. The full criteria was explained under paragraph 4.5. (b) of the report. This is to protect schools that are currently undersubscribed but due to growth, the places will be required in the near future. In 2016-17 two schools would have been eligible for funding under this criteria. It was recommended that £500k was top sliced from DSG to fund eligible number of places equivalent to AWPU. It may be necessary to scale AWPU value down to remain within the budget of £500k.
- 8.4 The Growth funding is split between additional classrooms and rising rolls. This is top sliced from DSG to create places in meeting the basic needs demand. The DfE's criteria is specific that this funding is used towards basic needs and not due to popularity.
- 8.5 It was to be noted that the bulge and additional class funding is guaranteed for 5 terms for each class from the time they start. If these then become permanent then the funding is guaranteed for 5 terms from the term they become permanent.
- 8.6 HG reported on behalf of a primary school in receipt of split site funding the concerns that the school has if the split site criteria was approved by the Schools Forum. She read out a submission from the school. They felt that they were not consulted directly to understand the impact and will cause an enormous pressure on their school. NT responded that schools were contacted a week before the Schools Forum. The primary schools should have less movement between sites other than the leadership. Some of the contracts could be negotiated for joint sites and would reduce cost i.e. cleaning and catering. It is likely that a similar change may be imposed in the new national fair funding formula so this is preparing schools in advance.
- 8.7 AP read out a statement he had received from a secondary school which requested that a decision on this paper was deferred until they

are in a position to analyse the impact. He read out a list of duties and staff that are required at both sites i.e. receptionists, libraries and additional student facilities.

- 8.8 MC said Strathcona will not be financially viable to manage without this additional funding. The school also felt that they were not given sufficient time to review the impact.
- 8.9 MH spoke not as a chair but as a governor for a secondary school and shared his view with AP. The school with two sites do have additional costs i.e. cleaning and catering. It is something that has been in place for a long time and it was implemented with a clear formula. He asked if someone could find a formula from the time it was approved by the Schools Forum.
- 8.10 CD said she understood the concerns of schools and not wanting this change to happen. The schools do have legitimate cases and good arguments. She agreed that more discussions would be required over a longer period. Schools however need to understand that over a £1m is allocated to 5 schools which is more than what they would receive in other boroughs. This funding which would in other boroughs go into the pot for distribution to all schools.
- 8.11 GT added that Newham receives £40k and how they do manage. LB said it is something that should be re-visited on more regular basis.
- 8.12 RA said in light of the challenge, it is difficult to put a price to it. Her school has taken on two bulge classes and the work is enormous.
- 8.13 SK agreed that the paper should be differed. She also agreed that it was a lot of money funded under this factor but wanted to know how a lump sum was arrived at. There must have been a formula around it.
- 8.14 LB said she was curious to find out where £30k fixed lump sum for primary schools came from. GT replied that it was in consideration with other boroughs. She added that officers will specifically write to affected schools inviting comments and offering to be able to make representation.
- 8.15 A clarification was requested over a 'near future' for funding falling rolls funding. CD replied that a Cabinet report is submitted every year on projections and this will be used to determine in applying the criteria. This could be 5 years for primary and 5-7 years in secondary.
- 8.16 RM was given permission to speak as an observer. He asked if the falling rolls criteria also applied to schools that are expanding but not filled up. It was confirmed that this was a separate situation and would not apply to expanding schools. MC asked even if they do not fill up and CD replied that they are given 5 terms of guarantee funding. NN

said that Harlesden has expanded and cannot fill up. CD said it is common for the first year not to fill up but if it becomes a longer-term issue then it will require revisit to see how it can be managed. TS asked if the schools that have falling rolls will have support in helping them to fill up. CD said this could be tricky depending on the school's history and building it back up. They have to be recognised by OFSTED and in addition the schools would have to do their bits such as marketing.

- 8.17 SK asked about the falling rolls criteria regarding the proposed eligibility figure of a 20% or more reduction in one year group and whether the total population of the school should be a factor.
- 8.18 GT stated that Brent was a net exporter of children from primary to secondary but the number of schools that are good or outstanding are improving.
- 8.19 Recommendations agreed as follows:
- a. Approved the revised split-site factor criteria.
This was deferred to September 2016 Forum
 - b. Select an option for implementation of the revised split-site factor to existing schools.
This was deferred to September 2016 Forum.
 - c. Approve the introduction of falling rolls and fund and the proposed criteria and allocations.
Against – 1
Agreed – 14
Abstention – 0
 - d. Approve the revised falling rolls fund criteria.
Against – 0
Agreed – 14
Abstention – 1
 - e. Approved the revised additional classes funding criteria.
This was agreed unanimously.

9. Schools Forum Administration Review

[This report was for consultation.](#)

- 9.1 NT presented this report. This paper proposes changes and improvements to the administration to the Schools Forum and its sub-groups.
- 9.2 There are three Task and Finish (T&F) working groups proposed which replaces the old sub groups, High Needs, Early Years and National Fair Funding Formula (NFFF). Currently there are vacancies in all sub

groups due to change in membership. A couple of these groups have not met for some time. The three groups will focus on individual tasks and will be in place throughout the task for a year or two and enable a meaningful discussion. It was felt that the T&F group for the Schools Finance Conference would be more meaningful if managed by T&F group rather than the officers.

- 9.3 The newsletter will need input from Schools Forum Members. There is now a Schools Forum email set up which is accessible to DP and NT where anyone can email and these can be forwarded to Schools Forum members. The minutes and papers are published on website and a circular is sent out to schools as soon as the latest papers become available.
- 9.4 A technical group is being introduced for half an hour prior to the start of the Schools Forum.
- 9.5 KC expressed a concern and said that a lot of work went into the previous sub group setting up place funding for special schools with discussions around cross modernisation using Kington and Harrow models. They looked at bandings where so much work went into it and wouldn't want that to go to waste.
- 9.6 TH said PRUs are same as special schools and felt that they may not get fully represented. He was curious to know why Trade Union is only included in one T&F groups. It was agreed to add Trade Union to the NFFF group too.
- 9.7 KC said she had no objection to group and agreed that PRU is a special case too but as long as there was a proper consultation and wider involvement.
- 9.8 CD said she is used to seeing more people engaged. The High Needs group could involve more people.
- 9.9 It was confirmed that the T&F groups would be chaired by the officers. The NFFF group would be chaired by Head of Finance or Senior Finance Analyst. It was agreed to add Trade Union to this group but bearing in mind there is only one Trade Union representative on the Forum and she may not want to attend.
- 9.10 Governors need to be aware of Schools Forum roll and this is brought up at termly and other follow up governors meetings. Some governors have very little knowledge about Schools Forum.
- 9.11 MH asked if anyone wanted to volunteer for the newsletter but no one expressed immediate interest. MH suggested that Brent Communication Team might be able to take this forward. CD said the newsletter will enable schools and governors to know of Schools

Forum. A lot of people do not know there is a dedicated webpage for schools forum. It's good to know that schools contacted their representatives over split-site issue.

- 9.12 It was agreed that the T&F group members would be invited for expression of interest and nominations. There was no maximum number but the minimum was as proposed in the report therefore there will not be a need for elections. The admin tasks can be carried out by DP and JH.

10 AOB

- 10.1 GT informed members that it was NT's last meeting as she was leaving the council to go and work in a school outside the borough. She has made a positive career choice. NT's work was recognised in support of Schools Forum. GT added that the resources are reduced at the back office in the Civic Centre. LB said as a headteacher, NT has been so supportive, generous and given time and the correct advice.

The Forum ended at 08.10pm.

ACTION LOG

| Item No | Action | Due | Owner |
|----------------|--|------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Decision on Split Site Factor Funding | Sept 16 | All Forum Members |
| 2 | Clarifications and implications of falling roll fund | Dec 16 | Officers |

DRAFT

DRAFT



SCHOOLS FORUM

21 September 2016

Report from the Strategic Director of Children
and Young People

For Decision

4. DSG Funded Services: The Learning Zone at Wembley Stadium

1.0 SUMMARY / INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Wembley Learning Zone has been funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant since April 2007 and is managed by the Children and Young People's Department.
- 1.2 This report updates the Schools Forum on the range of support and activities provided by the Wembley Learning Zone in 2015/16 as well as its 2016/17 offer to Brent schools and service objectives.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Schools Forum is requested to:
 - a) approve the continued DSG allocation to part fund the Wembley Learning Zone for 2017/18.
 - b) agree funding of £88,000.

Voting is open to all schools

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Learning Zone at Wembley Stadium was developed as a partnership between the local authority and Wembley Stadium, providing support to meet the needs of individual schools and their pupils. The wide range of programmes has been successful in helping to engage and inspire young people by using sports, entertainment and the unique history of Wembley Stadium as stimuli.

3.2 In addition to its term-time programme for schools, the Wembley Learning Zone provides opportunities for Brent children to participate in activities provided during school holidays e.g. transition groups for vulnerable young people. As a consequence of its close partnership with the Football Association (FA), the Wembley Learning Zone also provides Brent children with unique opportunities to participate in a wide range of national events (as detailed in 4.1).

4.0 DETAILED OFFER OF THE WEMBLEY STADIUM LEARNING ZONE

4.1 During 2015/16, the Wembley Learning Zone provided a variety of curriculum-based, inclusion-focused and additional enrichment activities for Brent children and young people as summarised below:

i Curriculum-based programmes:

- Key Stage 1 workshops, including Geography, History, Science, Maths and Art
- Key Stage 2 and 3 workshops, including STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) , Art and Design, Geography, History, ICT, Maths and English sessions
- Long cross curricular courses (6 sessions+ per programme)-Maths, English or research projects
- A wide range of curriculum-linked, enrichment opportunities and bespoke workshops as requested by schools
- Key Stage 4- preparation for further education or working life

ii Inclusion-focused activities:

- Brent Outreach Autism Team transition days (transition from primary to secondary school and to post16 / adulthood)
- Young Carers consultations
- Multi-Family Therapy Groups run by Inclusion Support Team
- Inclusion Support Transition workshops
- GCSE exam venue for young people permanently excluded from Brent schools
- NEET prevention (Not in Education, Employment or Training) - celebratory event through Skills UK Training
- Workshops for children and young people with PMLD (Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties)– 6 session, 15 hours of delivery to students from Mandeville School
- Enabling young people with SEMHD (Social, Emotional and Mental Health Difficulties) to have access to the 1966 World Cup Celebration at the SSE Arena
- Re-engagement in education

iii Additional enrichment activities:

- 53 mascot and flag bearer positions for England, FA Cup and other games
- 1000 free tickets to local schools for the Non-League Finals day
- 100 free Club Wembley tickets to a FA (Football Association) Cup semi-final
- Free tickets to a BAFTA Premiere for local schoolchildren
- Light Up the Arch: a chance for some local school children to program Wembley's famous arch with their own light patterns
- A Day of Inspiration: a free day for local schools to participate in a workshop from a Premier League reporter and an inspirational lyricist and performer.

4.2 The Wembley Learning Zone was also hosting a range of conferences, seminars and workshops such as:

- Brent's Healthy Weight Conference
- Supplementary Schools Outreach Seminar
- STEMNET (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Network) event for local teachers and professionals volunteering in schools
- Brent School Effectiveness Service training
- School Governors training events

5.0 TAKE UP AND IMPACT

5.1 In 2015/16 The Wembley Learning Zone has succeeded in expanding its offer to a larger number of Brent schools. It has also targeted more vulnerable groups of children and young people including: students on autistic spectrum, children with disabilities, children looked after, children and young people with SEMHD (Social, Emotional and Mental Health Difficulties) and PMLD (Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties) and school excludees.

| | 2014- 15 | 2015 - 16 |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Sessions delivered | 165 | 236 |
| Number of hours | 454.5 | 590 |
| Number of young people accessing activities at WLZ (accumulative attendance) | 6015 | 6605 |
| Number of hours for Inclusion-focused activities | 27 | 70 |
| Number of young people who accessed inclusion-focused activities | 502 (121 adults) | 742 (444 adults) |
| Number of hours for training, meetings and conferences (Brent Schools and community) | 51.5 (260 delegates) | 56 (827 delegates) |
| Number of Brent Schools accessing the Wembley Learning Zone | 32 | 36 |

5.2 Teachers have reported that the Wembley Learning Zone has had a very positive impact on young people; helping them to engage in curriculum and inspiring them by using sports, entertainment and the unique history of Wembley Stadium as stimuli. The analysis of student and teacher feedback forms shows that learners participating in the programmes have made good progress, developed academic curiosity, demonstrated high level of engagement and enhanced their self-esteem.

5.3 The Wembley Learning Zone succeeded in achieving its 2015/16 objectives:

- To increase participation for vulnerable groups – 159% increase in users
- To increase the number of Brent primary and special schools using the service – 12.5% increase
- To support the Brent Schools Partnership and the two teaching school alliances, by making the Wembley Learning Zone available for events targeted at Brent teachers and school leaders – 218% increase in trainings, meetings and conferences for Brent schools
- To increase the take-up for use by Brent Key Stage 3 and 4 pupils: 2014–15 = 214 students / 2015–16 = 440 students – 105.6% increase in users (mostly from vulnerable groups)

6.0 THE WEMBLEY LEARNING ZONE 2016/17 OBJECTIVES

6.1 The Wembley Learning Zone's revised support programme for Brent schools will be consulted upon and agreed by the Wembley Learning Zone Advisory Board. It is proposed that the Wembley Learning Zone continues to support Brent schools and the local community through the provision of a range of activities, events and programmes (as outlined in 4.0), with the addition of the following programmes for Brent schools:

- FA-funded (Football Association) film project for Brent young people, celebrating England's 1966 World Cup triumph.
- Film project raising awareness for Brent's Young Carers
- 20 free student sports coaches placements from UCFB (a Higher Education institution offering undergraduate and postgraduate university degrees and executive education in the football, business, sports and leisure industries)
- A free 6-week multi-sport programme, available for 10 Brent schools, delivered by Tottenham Hotspur Foundation coaches

6.2 The Wembley Learning Zone's service objectives for 2016/17 are as follows:

- To further improve participation of local vulnerable groups
- To maintain current level of participation of Brent schools
- To host events targeted at Brent teachers and school leaders
- To ensure Brent children and young people have access to unique opportunities offered by FA (Football Association) and other partners (e.g. Tottenham Hotspur)

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The funding provided by the Schools Forum forms a significant part of the Wembley Learning Zone's running costs and without it, the facility would be financially unviable leading to the loss of a unique learning environment and a meeting space for Brent children.

7.2 The Wembley Learning Zone is funded through three income streams:

- DSG funding approved by the Schools Forum (£88,000)
- Provision of the Wembley Learning Zone's facilities by Wembley Stadium at zero cost
- Additional income generated through venue hire, workshops and long courses, for schools and other community groups. Brent schools receive concessions whereas non-Brent schools are charged the full price (annual income circa £30,000).

8.0 RISK ANALYSIS

- Without this funding, which contributes to a significant element of the running costs of this service, the future support of Wembley Stadium in terms of the running costs, as well as access to the Stadium itself, may be lost.
- There is a risk of losing the positive impact on pupils' confidence, self-esteem and learning through projects and activities developed with schools in a safe and inspirational learning environment.
- The accessible and affordable link to special events, such as the NFL (National Football League) Programme, Rugby World Cup, football and the entertainment world may be lost.
- The learning zone would not be able to provide a unique training venue for conferences, meetings and continued professional development for schools.

9.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The funding provided by the Schools Forum covers the learning zone's staffing costs and contributes towards the running costs of the centre.

9.2 The following table sets out the current staffing of the Wembley Learning Zone staff:

| Post | Full time equivalent |
|--|----------------------|
| Wembley Learning Zone Manager (employed by Brent LA) | 1.00 |
| Assistant Manager/Tutor (currently private contractor) | 1.00 |
| Teaching Assistant (school secondment) | 0.25 |

10.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS


10.1 The proposals in this report fund a unique learning environment for Brent children which include re-engagement activities for disaffected children and young people, and provide accessible and affordable links for Brent children to special events.

11.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The proposals in this report have no legal implications.

CONTACT OFFICERS

Anna Selwyn
Head of EOTAS (Education Other Than At School)
0208 937 3519

| | |
|--|---|
|  Brent | SCHOOLS FORUM 21 September 2016 Report from the Strategic Director Children and Young People |
| For Decision | |
| 5. The Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre - Request for Dedicated Schools Grant funding in 2017-18 | |

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report outlines the services currently delivered to schools by the Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre and provides an update on the centre.
- 1.2 The report is presented to support the Schools Forum to decide on the continuation of funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2017-18 to part cover the centre's running costs, and to subsidise the cost of residential and day visits for Brent schools.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The Schools Forum is requested to:
 - a) Approve the continued DSG to part fund the Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre for 2017-18.
Voting is open to all Schools Forum members
 - b) Agree funding of £60,000.
Voting is open to all Schools Forum members

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. The Gordon Brown Outdoor Education Centre provides an extensive programme of outdoor learning activities for schools through residential and day visits. The centre is owned by the London Borough of Brent and is set in twenty-five acres of rural countryside near Hook in Hampshire and is situated in the Rotherwick Village Conservation Area.
- 3.2. Children visiting the centre have an opportunity to experience learning linked to the curriculum in a safe outdoor environment which includes raising their awareness of environmental and sustainability issues. Over the coming year, the centre will be aiming to better link its outdoor environmental education offer to schools' health and wellbeing strategies, including the promotion of healthy eating and physical activity (as recently outlined in the Government's Childhood Obesity Strategy).

- 3.3. The centre supports children to develop resilience, team working and risk management skills in a unique and safe environment away from home, often for the first time. Visiting schools and teachers are encouraged to tailor the activity programme to meet their children's particular needs, whether that is for sessions linked to the national curriculum and personal, social and health education.

4. DETAILS OF THE 2015/16 PROGRAMME

- 4.1. The centre has continued to see a year on year increase in school take-up of both residential and day visits. In addition to the 39 residential visits to the centre's two dormitory blocks last year, a further three Brent schools took advantage of the centre's camping offer, and 13 Brent schools (561 Brent children) undertook day visits.

Table 1: Brent School Residential Visits

| | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Main block | 23 | 24 | 21 |
| Shrubbery block | 17 | 16 | 18 |
| Total residing children (all schools) | 1,677 | 1,705 | 2,452 |

Brent schools accounted for 60 per cent of all residential visits to the centre and their bookings receive priority over non-Brent schools.

- 4.2. The total number of holiday activity days provided increased by 14 per cent in 2015/16 compared to the previous year, generating an additional income stream for the centre. This revenue supports the centre's sustainability as a residential centre for Brent children.

| | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Holiday activity days | 2,891 | 2,969 | 3,399 |

- 4.3. The centre continues to improve and extend its facilities. The following enhancements were completed during 2015/16:
- A new high ropes course (which offers a significant new activity for visiting children and has allowed the centre to attract new income streams)
 - A new chicken enclosure
 - An area for a second group of pigs
 - An outdoor seating and picnic area at the camping village
 - New camping area bell tents
 - A small animal shed.

5. OUTLINE OF THE 2016/17 OFFER TO SCHOOLS

- 5.1. The range of activities provided by the centre continues to grow with the staff working closely with visiting teachers to provide a rich and varied combination of outdoor adventure and curriculum themed activities. The centre provides year group appropriate programmes for visiting schools catering for children from Reception to Year 7.

- a. Outdoor activities offered to schools include:
- High ropes
 - Night time exploration

- Orienteering
- Team work and problem-solving challenges
- Animal care
- Environmental art including sculpture
- Habitat building
- Archery

b. Curriculum themed activities include:

- Rocks and soils
- Habitats
- Life cycles
- Food chains
- Weather
- Sustainability and ecology
- Field studies
- History themed activities (including: Greeks, Egyptians, Vikings, Celts, Romans, Tudors and WWII).

5.2. Following the recent appointment of a new Head of Centre, the opportunities to extend the centre's programmes to cover secondary pupils will be explored as will the provision for special schools, and for young people in further education in Brent seeking work experience.

5.3. The DSG funding currently agreed by the Schools Forum has allowed the centre to provide places to Brent Schools at a reduced cost as detailed below:

Table 2: Average weekly cost (based on full occupancy)

| Main Building | | Shrubbery Building | | Tents/Tipis | |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Brent schools | Non-Brent schools | Brent schools | Non-Brent schools | Brent schools | Non-Brent schools |
| £4,434 | £5,124 | £3,610 | £4,163 | £3,467 | £4,053 |

5.4. The average subsidy offered to Brent schools on the hire charge rate per week is approximately 15 per cent. In order to ensure that the centre remains both competitive and affordable for schools, the hire charge rates to schools have not been increased for 2016/17, and the centre continues to review its efficiency in order to keep running costs to a minimum.

6. UPDATE ON REPLACEMENT OF THE SHRUBBERY DORMITORY BLOCK

6.1. Following the approval in 2015 by Brent Council's Cabinet of an invest to save proposal to replace the Shrubbery dormitory with modern living quarters for visiting pupils and teachers, the professional team supporting the project has been appointed and the design proposals have been completed. The new Shrubbery block will provide much needed additional bed spaces at the centre, attracting additional income and enable Brent schools with larger year groups to undertake residential visits.

6.2. Watts' property and construction consultancy is currently reviewing ecology reports and it is anticipated that a pre-planning application will shortly be submitted, followed by a full planning application to Hampshire County Council. In order to maintain the centre's ability to provide residential stays for Brent schools in the 2016/17 academic year, the preferred

timescales for the main construction work for the new Shrubbery block is July-September 2017.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. The funding provided by the Schools Forum currently covers 13 per cent of the centre's running costs and Brent schools are charged approximately 15 per cent less than schools in other local authorities. The funding therefore covers a significant amount of the centre's running costs and without it, the centre would become financially unviable unless it removed the subsidy to Brent schools and developed new income generating activities.

8. STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. The funding provided by the Schools Forum contributes towards the centre's staffing costs. The following table sets out the current staffing establishment at the centre.

| Posts | Full time equivalent |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Centre Manager | 1 |
| Head of Environmental Education | 1 |
| Business Operations Manager | 0.5 vacant |
| Environmental education assistants | 4 |
| Land Manager | 1 |
| Cook and housekeeping staff | 1.9 |
| Finance and Admin staff | 1 |

- 8.2. In addition to the centre's permanent staff, casual and temporary administrative and activity related staff are engaged at times of peak demand, reflecting the seasonal nature of much of the centre's work.

9. DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. The proposals in this report fund a unique outdoor learning environment which provides accessible and affordable residential and day visit opportunities for Brent children.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATION

- 10.1. The proposals in this report have no legal implications.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1. None

CONTACT OFFICERS

John Galligan
Head of Setting and School Effectiveness
0208 937 3325

John Frankis
Systems and Partnership Manager
Setting and School Effectiveness
0208 937 3509



SCHOOLS FORUM

21 September 2016

Report from the Strategic Director of Children
and Young People

For Decision

7. Review of Criteria for Split Site Factor

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At the last School Forum a report was presented which reviewed the split site factor which is currently paid to 5 schools. The main reason for this being presented was that Brent's split site factor appeared to be generous compared to other London Boroughs.
- 1.2 The Forum deferred a decision on this matter until this Forum to allow more time for the schools affected to provide a more detailed response.
- 1.3 Since the last Forum, the Department for Education (DfE) have published revised "Schools revenue funding 2017 to 2018 operational guide" which states that a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) exclusion will not be permissible in this circumstance.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Schools Forum is requested to:
 - a. Defer this decision until the DfE announce their intentions on what may be allowable for this factor from 2018-19;
Voting is open to all School Forum Members
 - b. Support the schools effected to present their case to the National Fair Funding Formula Task and Finish group as a representation on behalf of Brent Schools Forum, when this factor is discussed.
Voting is open to all School Forum Members

3.0 SPLIT SITE FACTOR

- 3.1 At the last Schools Forum, Members were asked to consider an option to reduce the amounts that are paid via the split site factor. The current amounts paid are as follows:-

| School Name | School Type | Split-Site Factor Applied Since: | 2016-17 Split-Site Funding £ | 2016-17 Total Post-MFG Funding (Schools Block) £ | 2016-17 Split Site Funding As % of Total Funding (Schools Block) |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Islamia | Primary | 2007-08 | 97,186 | 2,095,406 | 4.64% |
| Leopold | Primary | 2015-16 | 235,132 | 3,599,502 | 6.53% |
| Roe Green Infants | Primary | 2015-16 | 208,242 | 2,790,563 | 7.46% |
| Alperton | Secondary | Prior to 2005 | 275,553 | 7,044,558 | 3.91% |
| Kingsbury High | Secondary | Prior to 2005 | 333,994 | 9,955,231 | 3.35% |
| | | | 1,150,107 | 25,485,260 | 4.51% |

- 3.2 The options put to members were as follows:-

| School Name | 2016-17 £ | Option 1 | | | Option 2 | | | Option 3 | | |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | 2017-18 £ | Impact £ | Impact % | 2017-18 £ | Impact £ | Impact % | 2017-18 £ | Impact £ | Impact % |
| Islamia | 97,186 | 0 | -97,186 | 4.64% | 95,728 | -1,458 | 0.07% | 72,889 | -24,296 | 1.16% |
| Leopold | 235,132 | 30,000 | -205,132 | 5.70% | 231,605 | -3,527 | 0.10% | 153,849 | -81,283 | 2.26% |
| Roe Green Inf | 208,242 | 30,000 | -178,242 | 6.39% | 205,119 | -3,124 | 0.11% | 133,682 | -74,561 | 2.67% |
| Alperton | 275,553 | 0 | -275,553 | 3.91% | 271,419 | -4,133 | 0.06% | 206,664 | -68,888 | 0.98% |
| Kingsbury High | 333,994 | 0 | -333,994 | 3.35% | 328,984 | -5,010 | 0.05% | 250,496 | -83,499 | 0.84% |
| | 1,150,107 | 60,000 | -1,090,107 | 4.28% | 1,132,855 | 17,252 | 0.07% | 817,580 | -332,527 | 1.30% |

- 3.3 Options 1 and 3 are the only ones that have any significant impact on this factor but they would require the Secretary of States approval to disapply the MFG

4.0 DFE GUIDANCE DISAPPLICATION OF MINIMUM FUNDING GUARANTEE (MFG)

- 4.1 The DfE issued guidance on schools revenue funding for 2017-18 in July. Paragraph 60 of this guidance states “Exceptional requests to disapply the MFG will only be considered if there is a significant change in a school’s circumstances or pupil numbers”. It is considered therefore that such an application in this situation would not be approved. MFG applies to the school funding formula, to prevent schools from losing a set percentage (currently 1.5%) in funding per pupil, year on year. The MFG is applicable to all funding factors except lump sum and rates.
- 4.2 The second stage of the consultation on major school funding reform will be issued in the Autumn. It is expected that split site funding will be an allowable factor and the allowable parameters and flexibility will become clearer once this consultation has been published.

4.3 Given the above facts it is recommended that any decision on this factor should be deferred until 2018-19 in line with the new funding requirements.

5.0 IMPACT ON THE SCHOOLS CONCERNED

5.1 The schools concerned have expressed concern at the proposals that were forwarded to the last forum. These concerns can be summarised as follows:

- i) Schools operate on split sites as a result of past Local Authority decisions, not by choice and that this should be considered as a factor in any decision;
- ii) There are considerable additional staffing costs including teaching, administrative and premises related staff;
- iii) Costs do not cease after 5 years which is suggested in the report;
- iv) Benchmarking the other selected Local Authority areas does not fully reflect the comparative costs in Brent;
- v) The strong indications we have are that the split factor will continue under the new funding arrangements and therefore the DfE does recognise the additional costs that are incurred.

5.2 The schools have carried out analysis of the additional costs that are incurred and these could usefully feed into the future discussion on this factor as part of the DfE funding reform.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The proposals in this report have no financial implications.

7.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The proposals in this report have no staffing implications.

8.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The proposals in this report have no diversity implications.

9.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The proposals in this report have no legal implications.

10.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Item 8 Schools Forum Report 15th June 2016.

CONTACT OFFICERS

Phil Herd
Interim Head of Finance

0208 937 4825



SCHOOLS FORUM

21 Sept 2016

Report from the Strategic Director of Children
and Young People

For Information

8. School Funding Arrangements – 2017 to 2018

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This note provides details on changes to funding for the 2017 to 2018 year based on Department for Education (DFE) announcements.
- 1.2 The funding arrangements for 2017 to 2018 are broadly similar to the current year 2016 to 2017.
- 1.3 The government will respond to the first stage National Funding Formula consultation (Schools Block and High Needs) in the autumn which will now cover the period for 2018 to 2019 and beyond.
- 1.4 The DfE have also published their consultation document on an Early Years National Funding Formula. The implications of this will be discussed at the next Schools Forum.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Schools Forum is requested to:
 - a. note the changes to school funding for 2017 to 2018;
 - b. note the deferment of the impact of the outcome of the March 16 national funding formula consultation to 2018 to 2019.
 - c. form two task and finish groups (schools and high needs) to respond to future funding arrangements.

3.0 SCHOOLS FUNDING – 2017 to 2018

- 3.1 The government released the first part of a two part consultation on a national funding formula in March 2016. Amongst other things, the consultation

requested views on a national funding formula being used to calculate the schools block of funding from 2017 to 2018.

- 3.2 The government announced in July 2016 that its response to this consultation (due in the Autumn) will now apply to funding for 2018 to 2019 and beyond. It announced that the funding arrangements for 2017 to 2018 will be broadly similar to those of 2016 to 2017.

4.0 CHANGES FOR 2017 TO 2018

- 4.1 The DSG blocks have been **rebaselined** to reflect current spending patterns as a result of the Section 251 return. This results in the following 2017-18 funding baselines for Brent:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Schools block adjusted baseline (£m) [b] | 229.00 |
| High needs block adjusted baseline (£m) [c] | 52.68 |
| Early years block adjusted baseline (£m) [d] | 17.81 |
| Total DSG adjusted baseline (£m) [e] = [b] + [c] + [d] | 299.49 |
| Dedicated schools grant (DSG) 2016 to 2017 schools block pupil numbers (headcount) [a] | 41,466 |
| Schools block (£ per pupil) [f] = [b] / [a] | 5522.69 |

- 4.2 Final allocations for schools and high needs blocks will follow in December on the basis of pupil numbers recorded in the October census.
- 4.3 **Education Service Grant (ESG)** – The retained duties element of this grant (£15 per pupil) will be transferred into the schools block for 2017 to 2018. Local authorities will be able to retain funding from the DSG from maintained schools, including special schools and pupil referral units (PRUs), for statutory duties previously covered by the ESG.
- 4.4 The total ESG for Brent in 2016-17 was £2.8m made up of £0.71m retained duties funding at £15 per pupil and £2.1m of general funding.
- 4.5 Local authorities will receive transitional ESG funding from April 2017 to August 2017. The general funding rate will then be removed from September 2017. ESG retained duties rate (£15 per pupil) of £0.71m will be transferred into the schools block for 2017 to 2018.
- 4.6 The DFE will say more about the transitional protection in respect of the general funding rate later in the year.
- 4.7 Regulations will be amended to allow Brent to retain some of their schools block funding to cover the statutory duties that they carry out for maintained schools which were previously funded through the ESG. The amount to be retained by the local authority will need to be agreed by the maintained schools members of the Schools Forum.

- 4.8 A number of the services that are covered by funding that is held centrally are subject to a limitation of no new commitments or increases in expenditure from 2016 to 2017, with **Schools Forum approval** required each year to confirm the amounts on each line.
- 4.9 **High Needs** - for 2017 to 2018, no local authority will see a reduction from its 2016 to 2017 funding for high needs, against the 2016 to 2017 planned spending baseline
- 4.10 The funding will use a national weighting for secondary low attainment figures
- 4.11 **IDACI Banding** - DFE have considered the concerns raised by local authorities and views expressed through the first stage national funding formula consultation, and have decided to update the IDACI banding methodology to return the IDACI bands return to a roughly similar size (in terms of the proportion of pupils in each band) as in 2015 to 2016.
- 4.12 The post 16 funding factor will be removed, but with protection through the minimum funding guarantee (MFG). Brent does not allocate any funding under this factor.
- 4.13 Local authorities are submitting one Authority Proforma Tool (APT) in January 2017.
- 4.14 The DFE released two new consultations that end in September 2016:
- a. plans to change local authority recoupment arrangements for mainstream free schools
 - b. An **early years national funding formula** and changes to the way the three- and four-year-old entitlements to childcare are funded. An Early years update report to the Schools Forum is proposed for the October 2016 forum.

5.0 FUTURE FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

- 5.1 It should be stressed that the DFE intend to publish the second round of future funding consultations in Autumn of this year. These consultations will cover both the Schools and High Needs Block funding of the DSG. They are expected to be radical and have major impact on schools funding arrangements within Brent. It is important that schools and Schools Forum respond to these consultations and implement the reforms appropriately.
- 5.2 It is therefore suggested that 2 task and finish groups are formed, one for schools block and for one high needs. The purpose of these groups will be to:-

- a. Analyse the DFE consultations and form an appropriate response which will be shared with schools and Forum members.
- b. Consider the implications of the proposals and formulate future funding arrangements accordingly.

5.3 Volunteers for these task and finish groups were sought at the last Schools Forum but the response leaves significant gaps both in school phases and school roles. The details are as follows:

| Representative | National Fair Funding Formula | Early Years | High Needs |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Nursery Head Teacher | | 1 | 1 |
| Primary Head Teacher (maintained school) | 1 | 0 | |
| Primary Head Teacher (academy) | 0 | | |
| Primary Governor | 2 | | |
| Primary Bursar/Business Manager | 2 | | |
| Secondary Head Teacher (maintained) | 0 | | |
| Secondary Head Teacher (academy) | 2 | | |
| Secondary Governor | 1 | | |
| Secondary Bursar/Business Manager | 0 | | |
| Trade Union representative | 1 | | 1 |
| Private Nursery Representative | | 0 | |
| Voluntary Nursery Representative | | 0 | |
| Independent Nursery Representative | | 1 | |
| Childminder Representative | | 0 | |
| Special Schools Head Teacher | | | 0 |
| PRU Head Teacher | | | 0 |
| Secondary Head Teacher | | | 1 |
| Primary Head Teacher | | | 0 |

5.4 The shaded area represents members are not required from that sector and the zero represents vacancies. In some cases we have had more expression of interest than minimum requirement but it was agreed that the above representation was minimal and the number could increase.

6.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

July 2016: Statement by Education Secretary Justine Greening about school funding:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/schools-funding>

July 2016: Schools funding arrangements 2017 to 2018

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schools-funding-arrangements-2017-to-2018>

March 2016: Schools national funding formula Government consultation – stage one

https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/supporting_documents/Schools_NFF_consultation.pdf

CONTACT OFFICERS

John Holden

Senior Finance Analyst

0208 937 1482

Phil Herd

Interim Head of Finance – CYP

0208 937 4825