COUNCILLORS:	*Alexander, Beynon, *B Harris, *Meehan and *Santry
SCHOOL GOVERNORS:	*Mr T Fyles (Vice-Chair), Ms C Andrews, *Ms B Simon, *Mr J Connerty and *Dr N Oparaeche
LONDON DIOCESAN BOARD FOR SCHOOLS:	*Mr G Marriner and Mr L Haward
WESTMINSTER DIOCESE EDUCATION SERVICE:	*Mr M Pittendreigh (Chair) and *Mrs M Fayker
LEARNING AND SKILLS COUNCIL:	Ms Phillippa Langton

* denotes those present.

In attendance: Mr Nilesh Jethra, Lambeth Council.

MINUTE NO.		CTION Y
SOC23.	APOLOGIES & COMMUNICATIONS	
	The Chair announced that this would be the first and last SOC meeting considering a New School Competition. The Chair further welcomed Nilesh Jethra, Lambeth Council who was in attendance to share his experience of New School Competitions.	
	Apologies for absence were received from Ms C Andrews, Cllr Beynon for whom Cllr Reid was substituting, Mr L Haward for whom Mr Tom Peryer was substituting and for lateness from Mr T Fyles and Dr N Oparaeche.	
SOC24.	URGENT BUSINESS	
	None.	
SOC25.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	None.	
SOC26.	MINUTES	
	That the minutes of the SOC meeting held on 30 October 2006 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.	
SOC27.	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS	
	None.	
SOC28.	NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL COMPETITION	
	Ian Bailey, Deputy Director, Business Support and Development introduced the report by informing the SOC that the new school would be	

located near to Alexandra Palace Station on the border of the East/West within the Haringey Heartlands Area. The proposal was part of the Haringey Building Schools for the future programme. Mr Bailey further outlined there was a need for a new secondary school in Haringey. This was based on rising pupil numbers overall, increasing population, substantial housing development in the borough, rising standards across Haringey in residents choosing Haringey Schools and migration bringing pupils into the Borough through out the year. A detailed analysis of pupil numbers had been presented in a report to the SOC in July 2006. Haringey had an increasing number of pupils in primary schools and projections showed that a new school would be required by 2010.

Mr Bailey proceeded to detail the competition:

- 13.06.06 Initial consultation. There were 21 responses from the public, 15 for a community school, 2 for a voluntary aided school and 4 expressed no preference.
- 04.09.06 Preliminary statutory notice inviting bids for the new school was published and ran for 4 months until 4 January 2007. Four proposers came forward.
- 11.01.07 Second statutory notice detailing proposals received was published and ran until 21 February 2007.
- 06.02.07 Two public meetings were held within the statutory representation period and 110 people attended the second meeting. Written representations had been received from interested parties: 19 for a new community school, 4 in support of Haberdashers Aske's Trust to establish an Academy, 1 in support of more diverse education provision and 2 expressing discontent over the change of regulations during the process.
- 09.02.07 New regulations came into force which impacted on the decision making arrangements for the competition. The regulations provide that the SOC must refer the proposals to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator for a decision if they include a proposal by the Local Authority.

The Committee questioned Mr Bailey on the purchase of the freehold of the land for the school site and how this would be managed if the successful bidder wished to open an Academy. Mr Bailey advised in response that the Council would enter into a development agreement with the Academy for a 125 year lease and submit a new outline business case to the DfES.

Cllr Harris informed the Committee that the School's Adjudicator had provided advice to a prospective bidder who subsequently did not submit a bid. The Committee was concerned and questioned the impartiality of the school's adjudicator. Cllr Meehan responded by stating that when he had learned of this he had written to the Minister, who had then responded by assuring that the School Adjudicator would be independent. Cllr Meehan further commented that to change the legislation halfway through the process was considered to be unhelpful.

The Committee received a presentation from each of the four bidders outlining their proposal:

- CfBT Educational Trust (CfBT)
- Haberdasher's Aske's Hatcham College Trust (HA)
- United Learning Trust (ULT)
- Haringey Council (HC)

The SOC questioned each of the representatives in respect of their presentation and enquired whether they would be able to deliver the new school by September 2010. Each confirmed in the affirmative.

Representations were also received from interested parties:

Tony Brockman ~ (NUT) representing Haringey Teachers, was in support of Haringey Council's bid as it fulfilled the statutory criteria fully. He requested clarity on the public meeting to be held by the School's Adjudicator on 19 April 2007.

Paul Guenault ~ (Highgate Wood School & Chair of 14-19 Task Group) was in support of Haringey Council's bid as it was the only proposal that could realise the innovative and transformational vision of education for which Haringey was striving.

Clive Menzies ~ Chair of Governors, Highgate Wood School. Raised concerns over the effects a non community school would have on other schools in the borough. HA talked about banding which was seen to be selective. Academies tended to select and there was evidence that they excluded at a higher rate than community schools.

RESOLVED

- 1. That it be noted that concerns were raised with regard to the potential conflict of interests and thus the integrity of the process, given the Adjudicator's role in offering advice to prospective bidders, whilst retaining the power to make the final decision about who will set up and run Haringey's new secondary school.
- 2. That it be noted that the SOC raised concerns in respect of the process in which changes to legislation and guidance issued to SOCs in relation to the bidding process and decision-making (during the process itself) would mean that the SOC no longer had final determination on who would set up and run Haringey's new secondary school.
- 3. That it be noted that there was some confusion in respect of the public meeting provisionally planned to take place on 19 April 2007 and the Chair would therefore be seeking clarification from the adjudicator.
- 4. The SOC agreed that the above points would be brought to the attention of the schools adjudicator.

5. That a recommendation be submitted to the Schools Adjudicator that Haringey Council's proposal be solely considered to set up and run Haringey's new secondary school based on agreement from the SOC's representative groups as follows: a. Members of the Council ~ unanimous agreement on Haringey Council's proposal. b. School Governors ~ unanimous agreement on Haringey Council's proposal. c. London Diocesan Board for Schools ~ no decision due to joint merits between Haringey Council and Haberdashers' proposals: concerns over the integrity of the bidding process. d. Westminster Diocese Education Service ~ unanimous agreement on Haringey Council's proposal. e. Learning and Skills Council ~ nil. 6. The representative groups made the following comments: Members of the Council. The Council's bid was based on a proven track record of improvements in school attainment, working together in partnerships, strong leadership, community cohesion, local democracy and accountability. The proposal offered a choice with opportunities to participate in the wider Haringey initiatives for 14 – 19 education and proposed linking of a federation either in the East or West of the borough. The Authority already had excellent collaborative arrangements with other Haringey Schools. A track record of opening a new school in the borough. Reservations were made on the other three bids in the following respect: CfBT -No proven track record. HA -Concern about their proposed administrative arrangements, the potential for divisiveness, the distance for governance arrangements and their 6th form could displace our new 6th form centre. ULT -Members felt they could be over stretching themselves. There was a lack of information provided on the benefactor and they had one or two problems with their current academies.

School Governors

- HA Concern was raised over the unitary governing body for three schools which would not give value to Haringey and there was a possibility of being elitist.
- ULT Concern that this was a vague proposal and not specific to Haringey. There was a lack of information on the sponsor and a lack of confidence in delivering by 2010.

London Diocesan Board

HC & HA Both had merits.

	HA - There were similar aspects in this proposal to that of Fortismere School.		
	Westminster Diocese		
	The group had focused their discussion on why Haringey's bid.		
	 CfBT - Were somewhat inexperienced in this Country. HA - It was felt that this was not a realistic proposal. ULT - There was a lack of vision. HC - A local family of schools with benefits of collaboration. Improvements had occurred through schools working together. Impressed by having Federations which would formalise governance. Haringey has a better overall picture of Haringey's needs. 		
	Learning Skills Council		
	Not present.		
SOC29.	NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS		
	There were no new items of urgent business.		
	The meeting finished at 10:05pm		

MR MIKE PITTENDREIGH Chair