



NOTICE OF MEETING

Haringey Schools Forum

THURSDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 2015 at 4.00 pm - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE. DOWNHILLS PARK ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 6AR

AGENDA

1. CHAIR'S WELCOME

2. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Clerk to report

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations are only required where an individual member of the Forum has a pecuniary interest in an item on the agenda.

4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 22 OCTOBER 2015 (PAGES 1 - 8)

5. MATTERS ARISING

6. BLANK

7. 2016/17 SCHOOLS BUDGET STRATEGY (PAGES 9 - 38)

To consider the issues affecting the determination of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2016-17 and its allocation within the context of the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB).

To introduce the Schools Block budgets that the Council will seek permission to retain in 2016-17 and those it will seek permission to de-delegate. A decision on these will be sought at this and subsequent meetings of the Forum.

8. 2016/17 SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA (PAGES 39 - 56)

To consider responses to the consultation on proposed changes to Haringey's Schools Funding Formula for 2016-17 and to recommend the Forum's view to the Council.

9. CONTRACT FOR TRADE UNION FACILITIES TIME (PAGES 57 - 68)

To present the draft contract for Trade Union Facilities Time for Forum comments and endorsement.

10. EDUCATION FUNDING FOR YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SEND (PAGES 69 - 76)

To outline the requirements for consistent decision making around efficient use of resources in the area of SEND post 19 years education offer.

11. FEEDBACK FROM WORKING PARTIES (PAGES 77 - 86)

- Early Years
- High Needs
- Traded services

12. WORK PLAN 2015/16 (PAGES 87 - 90)

To inform the Forum of the proposed work plan for 2015-16 and provide members with an opportunity to add additional items.

13. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

14. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 14 January 2016
- 25 February 2016
- 19 May 2016
- 30 June 2016

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
THURSDAY 22 OCTOBER 2015**

Schools Members:

Headteachers: **Special (1)** - *Martin Doyle (Riverside),
Children's Centres (1) - *Julie Vaggers (Rowland Hill),
Primary (7) *Dawn Ferdinand, (The Willow), Fran Hargrove (A)(St Mary's CE), *Will Wawn (Bounds Green) *Cal Shaw (Chestnuts), *Julie D'Abreu Devonshire Hill), *Nic Hunt Weston Park) *Angela McNicholas (OLM)
Secondary (2) Helen Anthony (A) (Fortismere), *Tony Hartney (Gladesmore),
Primary Academy (1) Sharon Easton (A) (St Paul's and All Hallows),
Secondary Academies (2) Arthur Barzey (Woodside), *Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)
Alternative Provision *Angela Tempany

Governors: **Special (1)** *Michael Connah (Riverside)
Children's Centres (1) *Melian Mansfield (Pembury)
Primary (7) Asher Jacobsberg (Welbourne), *Laura Butterfield (Coldfall), Andreas Adamides (A)(Stamford Hill), *Zena Brabazon (Seven Sisters) *Lorna Walker (Rokesly Infants), *Michael Cunningham (Muswell Hill), *John Keever (Seven Sisters)
Secondary (3),* Imogen Pennell (Highgate Wood),
Primary Academy (1) * Liza Sheikh Wali (Noel Park)
Secondary Academy (1) *Marianne McCarthy (Heartlands),

Non School Members:- **Non – Executive Councillor** - Cllr Wright
Professional Association Representative - * Niall O'Connor
Trade Union Representative -*Pat Forward (A)
14-19 Partnership – Rob Thomas (A)
Early Years Providers - *Susan Tudor-Hart
Faith Schools - *Geraldine Gallagher
Pupil Referral Unit –*Gordon McEwan

Observers:- **Cabinet Member for CYPS** (*Cllr Ann Waters)

Also attending: Steve Worth, Finance Manager (Schools and Learning)
Carolyn Banks, Clerk to Forum
Vikki Monk- Meyer, Head of Integrated Services
Gill Gibson, Assistant Director - Early Help and Intervention
Gareth Morgan, Head of Early Help and Prevention
Deborah Tucker, Alternative Provision Commissioner
Jane Blakey- Joint Interim Assistant Director, Schools and Learning
Douglas Cook- Traded Services Manager
Jon Abbey – Director of Children's Services

- * Members present
- A Apologies given

TONY HARTNEY IN THE CHAIR

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
1	<p>ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR</p> <p>The Clerk invited nominations for the position of Chair of the Forum. A nomination was received for Tony Hartney to be appointed which was duly agreed. The Chair then sought nominations for the position of Vice Chair and a nomination was received for Laura Butterfield to be appointed as Vice- Chair, which was duly agreed. It was also agreed that the appointments be for a one year term of office.</p>	
2.	<p>CHAIR'S WELCOME</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTION MEMBERS</p>	
3.1	<p>Apologies for absence received from Sharon Easton, Andreas Adamides, Helen Anthony</p>	
3.2	<p>Jane Franklin was substituting for Rob Thomas, and Rhiannon Lloyd for Fran Hargrove</p>	
4	<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 3)</p> <p>Pat Forward and Niall O'Connor declared an interest in the report on Facilities time.</p>	
5	<p>MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 8 JULY 2015</p>	
5.1	<p>The minutes of the meetings held on 8 July were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
6.	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p>	
	<p>8.6 SW advised that applications had been invited from schools in financial difficulty and a Panel set up to consider applications. The Panel had not as yet met.</p> <p>13.3 JB advised that proposals for special needs would be linked to the Early help offer and part of the review of nurseries to be considered by the Early Years Working Party.</p>	
7.	<p>FORUM MEMBERSHIP</p>	
7.1	<p>The Forum agreed the appointment of representatives for 2015-18. It was noted that there were two vacancies for secondary maintained sector governors which fell to the Haringey Governors Association as the nominating organisation to fill. With regard to the place for the 16-19 representative following the receipt of 3 applications it had been necessary to arrange an election, with Rob Thomas from the 6th Form centre securing the most votes.</p>	
7.2	<p>As the outcome for the PVI representative had not been concluded it was agreed that the current representative continue in office until the process is completed. The Forum would be updated on this matter at the next meeting. The Forum also agreed that there be a review of the constitution to ensure that it was compliant with advice from the EFA and that it was fit</p>	

	for purpose.	
	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the new members as detailed in the report be appointed to the Forum for the period 2015-18. 2. That following the election process the Forum confirm that the place for 16 -19 representative be filled by Rob Thomas from the 6th Form Centre. 3. That Angela Tempany be appointed as the representative from the Octagan Alternative Provision Academy in accordance with the Education Funding Agency guidance. 4. That the current representative for the PVI sector continue in post pending the determination of the allocated place. 5. That the Clerk be requested to review the Constitution to ensure that it is fit for purpose and report back to a future meeting. 	CB
8.	FUNDING FORMULA AND DEDICATED SCHOOLS BUDGET 2016/17	
8.1	<p>In view of the expectation that LA's keep their funding formula under review data had been obtained from all LA's in respect of 2015/16 funding methodology and values. In addition the Forum's sub group set up at the last meeting had taken into account the DfE's intention to introduce a national formula, the continuation of the minimum funding guarantee and the nationally relatively high level of Haringey's deprivation funding. The Sub group were of the view that there should not be any general changes to the funding formula for 2016/17. However as a result of concerns about the distribution of funding for high needs pupils across secondary schools it was agreed to propose the removal of the secondary lump sum to create a HNB contingency through which to reallocate resources as shown in Appendix 3 to the report. Furthermore it was noted that the reallocation would be reviewed in January 2016 when the October census data was available and a further consultation with schools would also take place. As an alternative model had been proposed by one of the schools which provided a more finely tuned reallocation it was agreed that there should be a re-consultation with schools and a further report to the next meeting. In response to a query it was noted that the money would be ring fenced. JK asked about the number of referrals made and school allocations, which it was noted appeared to be disproportionate allocated across the borough. MMC was of the view that this was a serious matter for the borough and in particular for Heartlands High School as they took a large number of pupils with statements. WW confirmed that the proposals sought to address this situation. VMM stated that the LA recognised that there was an imbalance and that this was seen as the first step in a change of ethos across the borough.</p>	SW
8.2	Due to an unfavourable response from schools it was not proposed to reduce the lump sum to create a primary specialist intervention provision.	
8.3	The Forum noted that when confirmation and details of the proposed national funding formula become known briefings would be provided for heads and governors.	SW

8.4	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the proposed removal of the secondary lump sum to create a HNB contingency and the proposed reallocation of resources as illustrated in Appendix 3 using current data be endorsed 2. That, following consultation with schools, the reduction of the primary school lump sum to create primary specialist intervention provision be not supported. 	
9.	ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE USE OF PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS AND THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OTHERWISE THAN AT SCHOOL	
9.1	The Forum was provided with a very detailed report giving an overview of the current PRU and alternative provision arrangements, related financial implications and strategic direction of travel. In addition the Forum was updated on key issues regarding budgets and commissioned places at the Octagon AP Academy (OAPA), Haringey's Tuition Medical Needs Service and the KS4 Alternative Provision Roll, together with plans and options for April 2016.	
9.2	The Forum was informed of the referral routes into OAPA together with outcomes for 2013/14 and attendance records. It was noted that in order to meet statutory obligations following a permanent exclusion 58 places had been commissioned at the OAPA, but this could be reduced to 54 to provide a more efficient and focussed model of service delivery and provide funding for pupils at risk of exclusion by increasing provision elsewhere. With regard to SEND funding the Forum noted that places were not specifically allocated at OAPA, the LA had negotiated a revised funding model for 2015/16 in order to gauge and agree funding levels which better reflected the variation of need ranging from a £0 core offer to £11,642. It was important for the LA to ensure that systems and funding arrangements were not prohibitive so that children with SEND were not more likely to be excluded and that they had fair access to commissioned services.	
9.3	Of particular concern was the number of KS1 pupils at risk of permanent exclusion who did not meet the age related threshold for OAPA which meant that arrangements were made with bespoke full or part time provision and specialist provision at the Haringey tuition service.	
9.4	With regard to the Tuition service the Forum noted that the possibility of enrolling students on a permanent basis from schools was being explored, and if possible it was noted that this could be a model to generate an income stream for Heads and produce savings for SEND budgets by keeping children with EHCPs in high quality, cost effective specialist provision within the borough. In addition a scoping exercise was underway to develop further links with CAHMS and other partners to shape resources and training from targeted schools. A further report on	DT/VM M

	the developments, including any proposals for an expansion of the service, including any capacity issues would be presented to a future High Needs Working Group and subsequently to the Forum. SW also confirmed that any budgetary issues would be picked up at future Forum meetings.	
9.5	As a result of needing to find a viable solution for placing children in YR11 who were new arrivals to the country and to the borough the LA has provided the KS4 Alternative Provision Roll for commissioning targeted, quality assured alternative provision. These students it was noted were placed on the role of the Tuition service, with an average of 75 having been placed each academic year over the last three years.	
9.6	The Forum noted that the figures provided in the projected estimate budget for 2016/17 provided for a reconfiguration of the alternative provision commissioning budget, and indicated a projected saving of 48K as a result of the reduced Octagon AP Academy rates 2016/17 which would allow 38K to be transferred to the Haringey Tuition Service for the proposed expanded offer and 10K would be transferred to Commissioning Costs. SW commented that budget proposals for the High Needs Block would be considered at a later Forum. In response to a query it was noted that provision for primary aged pupils was provided to schools at no cost, as it was seen as early intervention.	
9.7	The Forum noted that there were some pupils in the borough with a very high level of need, requiring multi agency support, Reports on young people at risk would be reported to the Primary and Secondary Heads and to the Forum with regard to any funding issues. GG advised that she would wish to see a systems approach to management of such cases and she would wish to take a report to the Early Help Partnership Board. The Forum agreed that a further report on primary alternative provision be presented to the next meeting.	DT
	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <p>1. That the Forum note the number, configuration and costs of commissioned places across the Octagon, Haringey Tuition Service and the Alternative Provision Roll.</p> <p>2. That In line with Priority 1 the Forum supports plans for the use of Money Following Exclusions to commission behaviour and well being interventions and cross phase transition for targeted primary schools.</p>	
10.	FACILITIES TIME	
10.1	JA provided the Forum with an outline discussion report and proposed SLA to enable Academy and Free schools to buy into the provision of Trades Union representation for employees in their school. Detailed arrangements for a protocol were also provided. It was noted that newly elected representatives would not normally be released on a whole time	

	<p>basis for trade union duties. This would ensure that there was a balance between work and trade union duties and those representatives understood the workplace they were representing. JA reminded the Forum that maintained schools had agreed to de-delegate funding for this provision but the LA was seeking to provide a simple mechanism for Academies to buy into.</p>	
10.2	<p>TH suggested that the SLA could either be based on pupil numbers or a flat rate, one for primaries and another for secondary schools. Although some members of the Forum suggested a third option with calculation on the basis of union membership, it was felt that this information may not be so readily available. Some concern was expressed as to whether if an Academy chose not to buy the SLA the union member might be denied union representation. TH advised that union representative would have to take the matter up with the individual school. NO'C advised of the need to resolve the matter and stated that most LA's in the country had a SLA, which was based on pupil numbers, as this was the most stable factor. MMK expressed the view that he would be keen to buy into a SLA on the fairest basis, which he thought would be based on union membership. He also requested information on union costs in order to ensure cost effectiveness. It was also noted that should some Academies not buy in to the SLA there would be a monetary shortfall and this could be an issue for the unions. TH advised that there needed to be a cushion as it could not be expected that there would be 100% buy in, and this would be a guiding factor in respect of the price of the SLA. SW commented that should it be agreed to use trade union membership as the basis for calculating charges it would be a different mechanism to that applied to maintained schools. De-delegation from maintained schools could only be through one of the funding factors and TU membership was not an allowed factor. De-delegation was through the AWPU and therefore directly related to pupil numbers.</p>	
10.3	<p>In response to a query the Forum was assured that schools were not paying for Council employees representation. JA agreed to come back to the Forum in respect of a query from MMK around the cost of an additional representative engaged during the last Academic year and where they were funded from.</p>	JA
	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <p>That further refined detailed proposals based on pupil numbers be presented to the next meeting.</p>	JA
11.	<p>EARLY HELP UPDATE</p>	
11.1	<p>The Forum received an update on the locality model which was part of the Council's Early Help offer. The new structure was supported by a parallel introduction of a single point of access to all of Children and Young People's Services, including Social care, and early help provision would focus on early intervention enabling services to provide the right response at the right time. The targeted response team would provide support where there was a risk of family breakdown and young people who were at risk of offending and coming into care. Within this team there were</p>	

	specialist workers in substance abuse, domestic violence and both children's and adult mental health.	
11.2	The use of DSG funds for Early Help would contribute significantly to deliver front line support and help to forge effective local links. The Forum noted that at present there were 3 vacancies out of an establishment of 45 case holding practitioners, which should be filled by January 2016. It was also noted that there may be a small DSG underspend at the end of the financial year which would be returned to the Schools Forum.	
11.3	Details of the three locality teams which reflected the assessed level of need was noted. In response to a query from ZB around the named linked workers with every Children's Centre, GG advised that the new structure provided an initial establishment of linked workers, but that following the Children's Centre re-commissioning process, , from April 2016 the Early Help model would enable collaborative working to be embedded within the new Children's centre structures. Linked EH staff would add increased visibility and access to the wider early help offer through a regular presence on site.. GG agreed to explain this model and discuss further at a meeting scheduled with ZB and MM .	GG
12.	FEEDBACK FROM WORKING PARTIES	
12.1	<p><u>Early Years</u></p> <p>ZB informed the Forum that the Working Group had looked at possible costings and impact of 30 hour programme for 3 year olds, although no detailed figures were yet known. It was noted that the Government was likely to issue further clarification in the Autumn budget statement at the end of November.</p> <p>In addition it was noted that there remained an issue with the relationship between the demand for places for 2 year olds and the distribution of good quality places.</p> <p>The review of three nursery schools was also being considered by the Group. JV advised that a self review was being undertaken as part of the Early Help strategy.</p>	
12.2	<p><u>High Needs</u></p> <p>The Forum noted the tabled minutes from the High Needs Working Party meeting held on 22 September and it was agreed that in the future the minutes be circulated with Forum papers.</p> <p>Issues discussed included: - Behaviour support to primary schools, Post 16 education, Pathways to support 0-5's and 30 hours childcare sufficiency, the DSG High needs budget and Proposal for changes to secondary school funding formula to reflect statement/EHC population in secondary schools and Year 7 intake.</p>	

12.3	<p><u>Traded Services</u></p> <p>An update on Traded Services progress to date was provided which showed details of the level of trading both within and outside of Haringey, including recent further engagement by schools. The Forum was advised of recent service improvements and plans being developed for enhanced and improved traded service offers ready for Spring 2016 with an expected range of new services, details of which would be available in January/February 2016. It was also noted that there would be a need for a sustainable lightweight management and administrative structure for the service. The Forum was assured of the continued commitment to provide the best quality advice and professional support for all schools across the Borough.</p>	
12.3.1	<p>The Forum noted that the LA was confident in achieving their targets for this financial year. In response to some concern expressed around HR support provided to schools JA assured the Forum that the LA was aware of the matter and looking to redesign the service. JA requested Forum members to contact him directly with any further HR concerns.</p>	All
12.3.2	<p>Furthermore the Forum was assured that the increase in interest from schools outside of Haringey did not impinge upon delivery to in borough schools and schools in Haringey would not be turned away. This was reflected in Trading Protocols in place across the borough.</p>	
13.	<p>WORKPLAN 2015/16</p>	
	<p>The workplan was noted.</p>	
14.	<p>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>The Forum was assured that there was nil cost to schools in respect of the Council's rebranding.</p>	
15.	<p>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 December 2015 • 14 January 2016 • 25 February 2016 • 19 May 2016 • 30 June 2016 	

The meeting closed at 6.15 pm

TONY HARTNEY

CHAIR

**Agenda Item
7**
Report Status

For information/note
 For consultation & views
 For decision

The Children and Young People's Service
Draft Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 3rd December 2015
Report Title: 2016-17 Schools Budget Strategy.
Authors:

Steve Worth – Finance Manager (Schools and Learning)
 Contact: 0208 489 3708 Email: Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk

Purpose:

To consider the issues affecting the determination of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2016-17 and its allocation within the context of the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB).

To introduce the Schools Block budgets that the Council will seek permission to retain in 2016-17 and those it will seek permission to de-delegate. A decision on these will be sought at this and subsequent meetings of the Forum.

Recommendations:

- 1: That Forum agree to create a Growth Contingency of £1.183m for 2016-17.**
- 2: That Forum agree to allocate £168k to the Music and Performing Arts Service in 2016-17.**
- 3: That Forum agree to allocate £299.8k to the Admissions Service in 2016-17.**
- 4: That Forum agree to allocate £10k for the costs associated with the Forum.**
- 5: That Forum agree to allocate £135k for Governor Support in 2016-17.**

6: That Forum agree to allocate £484k for School Standards in 2016-17.

7a: That Members representing primary maintained schools agree to de-delegate Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups.

7b: That Members representing secondary maintained schools agree to de-delegate Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups.

8a: That Members representing primary maintained schools agree to de-delegate a Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty

8b: That Members representing primary maintained schools agree to de-delegate a Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty.

1 Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB).

- 1.1 The DSB encompasses the Dedicated Schools Grant, post 16 funding provided by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) and, for the scope of this report, the Pupil Premium

2 Post 16 Funding.

- 2.1 The EFA provides funding for sixth form provision. Academies receive this directly from the EFA whereas maintained schools receive the funding via the local authority. The 2015-16 financial year allocation for maintained schools was £4.826m. As the funding is calculated by the EFA and paid directly or pass-ported to schools and academies the Forum is not required to make any decision on this funding.

3 Pupil Premium.

- 3.1 The Pupil Premium reached its planned maximum in 2014-15. The current rates are £1,320 per eligible primary age pupil, £935 per eligible secondary age pupil, £1,900 for Looked After Children (LAC) and children adopted from care and £300 for children of service personnel. We have not been notified of any changes to these rates for 2016-17
The Pupil Premium receivable in 2015-16 for schools in Haringey is:

• Academies and free schools	£3.794m
• Maintained Mainstream	£11.347m
• Special Schools	£0.249
• LAC	£0.781m
• Alternative Provision and other	<u>£0.110m</u>
Total	£16.281m

- 3.2 For the first time in April 2015 three and four year olds in nursery provision were eligible for Pupil Premium. This is paid at the rate of £0.53 per hour per eligible child. The indicative allocation for Haringey is £317k for Haringey children.

4 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

- 4.1 The DSG is a ring-fenced government grant covering pupils aged 2 to 16 that can only be used for the purposes of the Schools Budget set out in the School and Early Years Finance Regulations. The DSG is calculated in three blocks: The Schools Block (SB), the Early Years Block (EYB) and the High Needs Block (HNB), which are considered separately below. The Forum can agree to move funding between blocks.
- 4.2 The indicative DSG settlement will be announced in the week commencing December and will be reported to Forum in January. It is expected to be at the same per pupil level as in 2015-16. It will be

updated during and after the financial year as data is confirmed or amended.

5 Schools Block.

- 5.1 The Schools Block will be calculated using pupil numbers recorded in the census for mainstream settings in October 2015, including those in academies and established free schools.
- 5.2 The SB covers the cost of all funding delegated to schools and academies as determined by the local funding formula. The changes proposed for the funding formula for 2016-17 are set out in a separate report to this Forum.
- 5.3 The SB also covers centrally retained funding appropriate to the block. The amount retained reduces the sum to be distributed through the funding formula and so affects both maintained schools and academies. For this reason SB retained services must be accessible to both schools and academies (including from April 2015 free schools and non-recoupment academies) on a fair and equal basis. The services the Council proposes to retain are set out in 5.6.
- 5.4 The Council can also seek to de-delegate funding that has already been delegated to schools through the funding formula. De-delegation is limited to budgets covered by the regulations introduced in April 2013. De-delegation has to be agreed by the Forum representatives for each phase of maintained schools and only applies to maintained schools; academies cannot de-delegate but can buy into central services. The proposals for de-delegation are set out in 5.7.

5.5 Schools Funding Formula.

- 5.5.1 This is the subject of a separate report to this Forum.

5.6 Centrally Retained Budgets – Schools Block.

- 5.6.1 Schools Block. In previous years the Forum has discussed the proposed retention of central schools block budgets and those set out in paragraphs 5.6.3 to 5.6.9 have been agreed with little or no opposition; we seek the Forum's permission to continue to retain these. For the remainder we will bring more detailed proposals and supporting information to the next meeting of the Forum.
- 5.6.2 The Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations cap the centrally retained budgets at their previous level except where stated. The Council could appeal against this cap given the extension of these budgets to cover free schools and non-recoupment academies from April 2015. The Council is not proposing to do so given the numbers involved and the expectation of further delegation in the future.

5.6.3 A Growth Contingency for in-year growth in numbers covering both maintained schools and academies can be top-sliced from the SB before applying the funding formula. The criteria for accessing this fund was agreed by Forum on 16 January 2014; in outline these are:

- Agreed increases in the number of forms of entry in expanding schools.
- Agreed bulge classes.
- Protection for bulge classes throughout Key Stage 1; this provides funding for a minimum of 24 pupils in a bulge class.
- Funding for oversize classes in Key Stage 1.

The Forum agreed to a top-slice of £1.1m for this in 2015-16 and we will be reporting in January on the use of this fund. For 2016-17 the Council is proposing a fund of £1.183m. The estimate underpinning this sum is set out in Appendix 1

Recommendation 1: That Forum agree to create a Growth Contingency of £1.183m for 2016-17.

5.6.4 Music and Performing Arts (£168k). Reductions in the Music Education Grant (MEG) led the Forum to agree 'That the service should be wholly or partly funded from headroom as appropriate.' In 2012-13 the contribution from DSG was £168k and all future contributions must be capped at this level. The Head of Music and Performing Arts presented a report to the Forum on 26th January 2012 setting out the service provided and how the DSG funding was used: £138k in supporting pupils eligible for free school meals and £30k for a primary music specialist. An updated submission is attached as Appendix 2.

Recommendation 2: That Forum agree to allocate £168k to the Music and Performing Arts Service in 2016-17.

5.6.5 Admissions (£299.8k). This is a statutory duty of the local authority on behalf of schools and the retained budget represents 75% of the Admissions and School Organisation Team. As this is a statutory duty an appeal can be made to the Secretary of State for Education if this budget is not agreed. Further information is attached as Appendix 3.

Recommendation 3: That Forum agree to allocate £299.8k to the Admissions Service in 2016-17.

5.6.6 Schools Forum (£10k). Maintaining a schools forum is a statutory duty and a small budget of £10k exists to cover the cost of officer input into preparing forum reports and attending meetings of the forum and its sub-groups, the cost of clerking, room hire, refreshments, stationary etc. The budget also covers any claims by members for childcare and has, in the past, been used to commission external support to the Forum.

Recommendation 4: That Forum agree to allocate £10k for the costs associated with the Forum.

5.6.7 Licences (£181k). The DfE had announced that there would be one license with the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA) and the Music Publishers Association (MPA) to purchase a single national licence for all state-funded schools in England. This means that local authorities and schools would no longer need to negotiate individual licences. A deduction to cover the full amount of this is an allowed exception to delegation from the Schools Block. The amount for 2016-17 has not yet been confirmed.

The Forum is asked to note this deduction.

5.6.8 Governor Support (£135k). The budget represents expenditure on governor support and training which has historically been provided in support of all governing bodies. A fuller description of the service is provided in Appendix 4.

Recommendation 5: That Forum agree to allocate £135k for Governor Support in 2016-17.

5.6.9 School Standards (£484k). This budget has supported the evolving agenda for education services, including pump priming the development of school to school support. Continuation of the budget for 2016-17 will support embedding school to school support across all schools and academies. A fuller explanation of this service can be found in Appendix 5.

Recommendation 6: That Forum agree to allocate £484k for School Standards in 2016-17.

5.6.10 We will be bringing further proposals to the next Forum on the following:

- Supplementary Schools,
- LAC Residential Places,
- Early Help (Integrated Working and Family Support),
- Contribution to Corporate Support Costs.

5.7 Schools Block De-Delegated Budgets.

5.7.1 We are seeking the Forum's permission to de-delegate the following.

5.7.1.1 Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners. Historically, the LA received an element of Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) that was used to provide centrally managed support to schools in respect of raising the attainment of pupils from ethnic minority groups. Following the demise of EMAG, the Forum at its meeting on 17 January 2011 agreed to continue to support this work, approving funding through the DSG. The Council is seeking to continue with the de-delegation of this budget. The amount de-delegated in 2015-16 was £612k (£488k primary, £124k secondary); services provided through de-delegation are only available to maintained schools.

Recommendation 6a: That Members representing primary maintained schools agree to de-delegate Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups.

Recommendation 6b: That Members representing secondary maintained schools agree to de-delegate Support to Underperforming Ethnic Minority Groups.

5.7.1.2 Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty. Schools Forum has historically supported the retention of a contingency to support schools in financial difficulty. Although it is incumbent on all schools to manage their resources efficiently and effectively, there are particular circumstances in which schools find themselves in need of support from their colleagues. Two examples are new management teams with inherited deficits and exceptional circumstances. The local authority proposes to de-delegate this budget to continue to support those schools deemed by the panel to meet the agreed criteria for supporting schools in financial difficulty. This would only apply to maintained schools where the phase had agreed to de-delegation. The de-delegated sum in 2015-16 was £179k.

Recommendation 7a: That Members representing primary maintained schools agree to de-delegate a Contingency for Schools in Financial Support Difficulty.

Recommendation 7b: That Members representing secondary maintained schools agree to de-delegate a Contingency for Schools in Financial Difficulty.

6 High Needs Block

- 6.1 The HNB is allocated nationally as a cash sum per local authority based on 2012-13 budget allocations adjusted for inter-authority movements. The block is not driven by census data and is therefore not as buoyant as the other two; although there may be some increase in funding based on national changes in planned numbers and the national funding envelope.
- 6.2 The HNB covers all funding for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) other than that included in delegated mainstream school budgets. It includes funding for special schools, special units and alternative providers using the place-plus approach; funding for pupils placed in other local authority or private provision and centrally provided services. It also incorporates funding for the extended duty of providing for students in FE establishments with Special Educational Needs (SEN) up to the age of 25. A significant concern is the uncertainty around the costs of the new responsibilities for students up to the age of 25 with SEN which began in September 2013.

- 6.3 A sub-committee of the Schools Forum has been meeting regularly to look at issues within the HNB and will and will be involved in report to come to the Forum in January and February setting out the projected outcome for 2015-16 and budget proposals for 2016-17.
- 6.4 The HNB remains under significant pressure and it is the Council's intention to seek at least the same level of funding as in 2015-16 for current budgets.

7 Early Years Block.

- 7.1 There will be further reports on this block to Forum in January and February.
- 7.2 The EYB is determined by the data from three censuses. The initial block allocation will use the January 2015 data but this will be updated during the course of the year for the January 2016 data and then for the January 2017 data. The final determination of the DSG will not be until May 2017 and will be calculated using 5/12^{ths} of the January 2016 census and 7/12^{ths} of the January 2017 census.
- 7.3 The EYB funds in Haringey:
- The universal early years free educational entitlement for three and four year olds in nursery classes, nursery schools and the Private Voluntary and Independent sector. This includes the agreed number of full-time places.
 - The targeted funding for the two year old entitlement.
 - The childcare subsidy.
 - A contribution to the cost of the Early Years Team and centrally retained budgets that have been delegated in the SB.
- 7.4 A significant change in 2015-16 was the move to participation funding for two year olds. In the previous two years funding had been on an estimated basis and authorities have been allowed to carry forward underspends to use in subsequent years.
- 7.5 Forum and Cabinet have agreed to fund two year old places at the rate of £6 per hour, £0.72 per hour more than received in the DSG. The roll forward of underspends will allow this gap to be met for several years, but will then need to be contained within the EYB.
- 7.6 Current issues in the EYB that will be covered in more detail in other papers are:
- A review of the Early Years Single Funding Formula.
 - Reduction in the number of full-time nursery places.
 - The implications of the extension of the three and four year old free entitlement to 30 hours for the children of working parents.

- National funding changes.

8 Longer Term DSB Strategy.

- 8.1 The longer term strategy has both internal and external drivers. The external ones gained some clarity in the Spending Review on 25 November and the headline announcements are set out below. Forum will be updated on this as further information becomes available.
- 8.1.1 The Review announced consultation in early 2016 on the introduction of a national funding formula for schools from April 2017. This may either take the form of a specific allocation per school using the national formula or the aggregate of these sums allocated to local authorities with the final distribution being determined by schools forums. It is expected that this will affect the distribution of funds between local authorities and between schools. We will comment further on the Haringey's position when more information is available. It should be noted that a national funding formula may have a significant local re-distributive effect in favour of Haringey primary schools and to the detriment of secondary schools as funding will be based on class sizes of 30. The impact may be moderated by transitional arrangements and any local flexibility allowed and exercised.
- 8.1.2 It was announced that the schools budget would be protected in real terms. Previous announcements had suggested that budgets would only be protected in cash terms. The cash term protection will continue for 16-19 year olds alongside some previous targeted savings in this area.
- 8.1.3 The DfE plans to help schools to make procurement savings and will publish a set of specific actions to help schools realise £1bn in procurement savings during this parliament through benchmarking, guidance and improved framework contracts.
- 8.1.4 The Review highlighted the increase to 30 hours of childcare for 3 and 4 year olds with working parents. Upper and lower limits on earnings and hours will be applied to eligibility for the additional 15 hours. A headline announcement on investing over £1bn a year more in childcare for 2, 3 and 4 year old by 2019-20, was also made. The government plans to invest at least £50m capital funding to create additional nursery places and over £300m a year to increase hourly rates.
- 8.1.5 The Review noted capital investment for free schools, additional pupil places and for the rebuilding, refurbishment and essential maintenance of schools.
- 8.1.6 The announcement on the national funding formula stated that it would cover not only schools but also early years and high needs.

8.1.7 Funding for education budgets outside of the Dedicated Schools Budget will be cut nationally by £600m. This includes phasing out the additional funding some academies receive through the Education Services Grant. As a result the role of LAs in working with schools will be reduced and a number of statutory duties removed.

8.2 The internal strategy is to recognise an increasing emphasis on the school as commissioner with an incremental increase in funding delegated to schools or devolved to NLCs. The incremental approach will enable the Council to restructure its service offer to ensure only the highest quality services are traded. A Traded Services Manager has been appointed to drive forward this process. We are not proposing new delegation at this time and if further arrangements are put in place during the year this would be via devolved rather than delegated arrangements.

9 Timetable.

9.1 The expected or required dates leading up to the issue of school budget shares is set out in Table 1.

Table 1 Timetable Leading to Issue of Maintained Mainstream School Budget Shares.

25 November 2015	Spending Review
10 December	October 2015 pupil data sets available
W/C 14 December 2015	Indicative DSG published
14 January 2016	Schools Forum
21 January 2016	Final formula notification of funding formula to DfE
9 February 2016	Cabinet
25 February 2016	Schools Forum
29 February 2016	Deadline for notifying maintained mainstream governing bodies of budget shares.

Appendix 1.

Proposed Growth Fund 2016-17

School	Growth	£000

Alexandra Primary	1 form of entry	78
Bounds Green	1 form of entry	78
Rhodes Ave	1 form of entry	78
St Mary CE	1 form of entry	78
Welbourne	1 form of entry	78
Heartlands	2 forms of entry	315
Provision for 1 bulge class		78
Provision for undersize bulge classes	20 places	72
Provision for oversize KS1 classes	10 Classes	328
Total		1,183

Appendix 2. Music Service.

In 2010 the future allocation of funds from DfE via the Music Education Grant to support LA Music Services was in doubt. Haringey Music Service had been receiving £544k to support it's work in the LA. Schools Forum agreed in principal to underwrite any decrease in order to allow the Music Service to maintain this income. In the event, the amount required from DSG to maintain the status quo was £127k, which increased to £167k the following year to compensate for a further reduction in external funding. Although DSG contributions were subsequently frozen at this level, the external grant (now paid via Arts Council England) has been £368k for 2015-16. Future funding from DfE via Arts Council is not guaranteed and we await an announcement in early 2016 following the comprehensive spending review. The general consensus at time of writing is that the grant will probably continue but is far more likely to decrease than increase. The Music Service will, even in the best scenario, continue to operate on reduced funding compared to previous years.

The DSG allocation is used to fund the Primary Music Specialist post and subsidies for children from low-income families (FSM eligible) having instrumental music lessons, hiring musical instruments and attending out of school *Haringey Young Musicians* activities. Apart from individual lessons in secondary schools, charges are made directly to parents/carers and subsidies given where parents/carers prove their children are eligible for FSM. At secondary level, these subsidies are passed on via schools as reductions to their invoices for traded services. Schools choose whether to pass on some or all of the charges to parents/carers.

1. Schools engaging with music service/benefitting from DSG funding in 2015-16

- All schools have individuals accessing the Music Service, either in or out of school
- Primary Music Specialist engaged with 54 schools last year
- 37 primaries engaged with Whole Class Instrumental Tuition in year 4 which is part-funded by the Arts Council grant

School	Instrumental lessons	PMS	WCIT
Alexandra	Y	Y	N
Alexandra Park	Y		N/A
Belmont Infant	Y	Y	N/A
Belmont Junior	Y	Y	Y
Blanche Nevile	Y		N/A
Bounds Green	Y	Y	Y

Bruce Grove	Y	Y	Y
Campsbourne	Y	Y	Y
Chestnuts	Y	Y	Y
Coldfall	Y	Y	Y
Coleridge	Y	Y	Y
Crowland	Y	Y	Y
Devonshire Hill	Y	Y	Y
Earlham	Y	Y	Y
Earlsmead	Y	Y	N
Eden	Y		N/A
Ferry Lane	Y	Y	Y
Fortismere	Y	Y	N/A
Gladesmore	Y	Y	N/A
Greig City Academy	Y		N/A
Harris Academy Coleraine Park	Y	Y	N
Harris Academy Philip Lane	Y	Y	Y
Heartlands High	Y	Y	N/A
Highgate	Y	Y	Y
Highgate Wood	Y	Y	N/A
Holy Trinity CofE	Y	Y	N
Hornsey Girls	Y	Y	N/A
Lancasterian	Y	Y	Y
Lea Valley	Y	Y	Y
Lordship Lane	Y	Y	N
Mulberry	Y	Y	Y
Muswell Hill	Y	Y	N
Noel Park	Y	Y	N
North Harringay	Y	Y	Y
Northumberland Park	Y	Y	N/A
Our Lady of Muswell	Y	Y	Y
Park View	Y		N/A
Rhodes Avenue	Y	Y	N
Risley Avenue	Y	Y	Y
Rokesly Infant	Y	Y	N/A
Rokesly Junior	Y	Y	Y
Seven Sisters	Y	Y	N
South Harringay Inf.	Y	Y	N/A
South Harringay Jun.	Y		Y
St Aidan's VC	Y		Y
St Ann's CE	Y		Y
St Francis de Sales Jun.	Y	Y	Y
St Francis de Sales RC Infant	Y	Y	N/A
St Gildas RC	Y	Y	N
St Ignatius RC	Y	Y	N
St James CE	Y		Y

St John Vianney RC	Y		N
St Martin of Porres RC	Y		N
St Mary's CofE	Y	Y	N
St Mary's Priory RC Infant	Y		N/A
St Mary's Priory RC Junior	Y		N
St Michael's CE (N6)	Y	Y	Y
St Michael's CE (N22)	Y		Y
St Paul's & All Hallows Primary	Y	Y	Y
St Paul's RC	Y		Y
St Peter in Chains	Y		N/A
St Thomas More	Y		N/A
Stamford Hill	Y	Y	Y
Stroud Green	Y	Y	Y
Tetherdown	Y	Y	N
The Willow	Y		Y
Tiverton	Y	Y	Y
Trinity Primary Academy	Y	Y	Y
Welbourne	Y	Y	Y
West Green	Y	Y	Y
Weston Park	Y	Y	Y
Woodside High	Y		N/A
TOTALS	ALL	54	37

Appendix 3. The Admissions Service (part of Education Services).

1. Context

The Admissions Service discharges the local authority's statutory duties in respect of school admissions and school place planning, adhering to legalisation and statutory guidance laid by central government. The Service works within a PAN London context to ensure that every child in the borough has access to a school place.

2. Statutory Duties

Every local authority is required discharge the following statutory duties

To be responsible for securing that sufficient education is available to meet the needs of the population in their area.

To be responsible for securing sufficient primary and secondary schools in their area.

To comply with the legislative Code on Admissions in exercise and discharge of local authority functions in relation to admissions under the School Standards and Framework Act (SSFA) 1998. The SSFA and relevant regulations confers a number of duties which require the LA to carry out different functions at different times of the admissions cycle.

A local authority shall make arrangements for enabling the parent of a child to appeal against admissions decisions.

To provide advice and assistance to parents when deciding on a school place and allow parents to express a preference.

Reports by local authority to adjudicator about matters relevant to schools admissions as may be required by the School Admissions Code.

For each school year, the local authority must publish the prescribed information about the admission arrangements for each of the maintained schools in their area, and if regulations so provide, such maintained schools outside their area.

A local authority shall make arrangements for enabling the parent of a child to appeal against admissions decisions.

3. The work of the Admissions Service

The following work is undertaken to discharge the statutory duties.

Admission Officers and Place Planners (Education Services) work together to ensure that every resident has access to a school place. (This duty is discharged by the SEN team for those with a statement of special educational needs or education health and care plan.)

Offering places

Children who move in to the borough are offered a place within 20 school days at the maximum (normally within a week) and those applying for reception, junior, secondary and post 14 transfer are offered in accordance with statutory time frames. The Service administers and chairs the in year fair access panel (IYFAP) – ensuring that the most vulnerable and challenging pupils are offered places at the earliest possible time and that no school takes a disproportionately high number of these applicants

Officers share data securely with authorities in London and beyond to ensure that all children have only one offer of a school place on national offer day.

Producing information for parents

Officers prepare proposed admission arrangements each year for community schools and the co-ordinated scheme which sets out the procedures all schools and academies must follow. These arrangements are publically consulted on with the timeframe set out by the School Admissions Code 2014 and determined by the Council's Cabinet. Officers then produce primary and secondary admission booklets setting out admissions information for parents and carers.

The Service maintains a website with the admissions arrangements for all schools and academies in the borough and this includes details of how parents and carers can apply online for a school place or use a paper form. Officers also provide advice and guidance to parents.

School Place Planning

The Place Planning Lead and Deputy to the Service calculate the LA's pupil projections and publish them in the school place planning report every year.

This data is fundamental to informing where additional provision is required in the borough and officers within the Service are responsible for leading through all school organisation projects including school expansion, reduction in pupil admission numbers, change of age range and school closures.

Appeals

Officers from within the Service ensure the arrangement, administering and presenting appeals on behalf of community schools. This work is also provided for academies and free schools where an agreement is made between the Service and the academy/school. If necessary, officers will respond to inquiries or complaints from the Ombudsman.

4. Volumes and current projects

School Place Planning (part of Education Services)

School place planning projections are published in the annual School Place Planning Report which can be viewed at www.haringey.gov.uk/schoolplaceplanning

Officers are currently looking at how additional capacity can be provided at secondary level from 2020, as well as securing contingency plans to

bulge/expand at the primary phase if current projections change and additional capacity is needed. Additional reception capacity will also be required from 2020 in the borough's regeneration areas and officers are monitoring supply of places, including expected additional free school capacity, to see how this can be delivered.

TO BE UPDATED

School Admissions – In Year Admissions 2014/15

Yr Group	Number of Pupils Offered
Reception	531
1	457
2	394
3	389
4	311
5	304
6	141
Total	2527

7	223
8	166
9	176
10	173
11	98
Total	836

Schools Admissions – Reception and Junior (Haringey residents)

	2015
Online On-Time Applications	2441
Total On-Time Applications	2939
Percentage of Applications made Online	83%

The team also administered all late applications

School Admissions - Secondary transfer (Haringey residents)

	2015
Online On-Time Applications	2140
Total On-Time Applications	2532
Percentage of Applications made Online	85%

The team also administered all late applications

School Appeals

	Lodged	Appeals Heard	Appeals Upheld (a place offered as a result of the appeal)
Pupils up to age 11	81	44	6
Pupils age 11-16	117	80	4
Pupils over age 16	0	0	0
Date up to which this information applies	1/9/15	1/9/15	1/9/15

Appendix 4.

Governors Services: Schools Forum - Centrally retained schools budget

Governor's Services are currently in receipt of £135K. Our service provides a core offer to all schools. This includes supporting the LA in fulfilling its statutory requirements and in its aspiration to improve outcomes for Haringey children articulated in council priority 1: Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education

We also provide substantial support for the Schools and Learning team around the governance element of school leadership. In addition we provide traded elements within our training and the clerking service. The funding makes a substantial contribution to the salaries of the GSTU team: a Head of Service, Clerking Service Manager and Admin support.

<p style="text-align: center;">GSTU fulfils the LA Statutory responsibilities in respect of governance.</p>
--

Applicable to all schools:

- To provide training and information for school governors (*Section 22 of the Education Act 2002.*)
- To make the Instrument of Government for all maintained schools and federations of maintained schools (*Education Act 2002 section 19, amended by Education Act 2011 sections 38 and 39. Secondary - School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2007 School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012*)
- Recommendation on the appointment of the one LA governor and that the LA must give notice of any removal of an LA governor (*Education Act 2002 section 19, amended by Education Act 2011 sections 38 and 39. Secondary - School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2007 School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012.*)
- To appoint Parent Governor Representatives to local authority committees dealing with education (*Education Act 1996 Section 499. Secondary - Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001*)

In exceptional circumstances:

- To appoint additional governors if the school is eligible for intervention for failure to comply with a warning notice - this power only lasts for 2 months after warning notice has been given and not complied with by GB (*Education and Inspections Act 2006 Section 64*)
- Provides for LA to set up a temporary governing body for new maintained schools until the governing body is constituted for the school under an instrument (*Education Act 2002 section 34. Secondary - School Governance (New Schools) (England) Regulations 2007.*)
- If local authorities want to put in place an Interim Executive Board (IEB) in a school eligible for intervention, they must apply to the Secretary of State for consent and before doing so, must consult the Governing Body and in the case of foundation or voluntary schools, the appropriate diocesan or appointing authority (*Education and Inspections Act 2006 Section 65*).

GSTU supports school improvement: Governance and Ofsted

The governors' role in the strategic leadership of schools has become increasingly important in the support and challenge offered to schools to contribute to positive outcomes for children. This has been highlighted through an increasingly demanding focus on governance in successive Ofsted Framework requirements in recent years. There is, therefore, also an increasing need for the Governors' Service to support all schools in meeting this challenge. The School Governance regulations of 2013 also highlighted the need for high quality clerking to support the effective working of governing bodies. Whilst the clerking service is traded, advice and support are open to all clerks and non-SLA clerks are invited to termly training.

Core Offer to all Schools

- Helpline advice: by telephone and email
- Termly Governor's Briefing meetings.
- Regular updates through School's Bulletin on current issues and a termly summary of the most relevant information.
- Briefings for clerks (to include non SLA clerks termly) covering national and local developments and issues.
- A place at the Annual Governor and Headteacher Conference.
- Checking and formal approval of the Instruments of Government for all maintained schools.
- More intensive support for governing bodies where significant issues are identified by Ofsted.
- Development of documents to support effective governance (skills audit, self-evaluation toolkit, role profiles to highlight particular areas of responsibility).
- Support for the Haringey Governors' Association

Additional Improvements to service overall since April 2015

- Closer links with Schools and Learning Service
- Increased support for vulnerable schools
- Modernising the service infrastructure to increase efficiency with the installation of a new Traded Services portal for governors
- 100% of all maintained schools supported to reconstitute by the statutory deadline of 1st September, 2015.
- Two thirds of LA clerks completed the National Clerks training programme

Further developments proposed 2015/16 and 16/17:

- Further increasing links with Schools & Learning, particularly around schools identified as at risk.
- 'Professionalisation' of clerking service through greater QA and more clerks enrolling on the National Clerks development Programme
- Improving quality of governor recruitment.
- Continuing to improve central training and bespoke school support.

- Development of a databank of policies and documents to support governors in the discharge of statutory duties and to enhance their effectiveness.
- Improved impact evaluation
- Increase in NLG's enabling greater support to new Chairs and schools where governance may be weak.
- Introduction of a "Developing outstanding governance programme"
- Quality assurance check of school documents to support the assessment of the strength of governance
- Launch of new service for secure and accessible electronic storage of governing body materials
- Establishment of Forum groups for sharing of good practice and support through the SLA online system.
- Development of mechanism for system leadership amongst governors.

Impact Assessment: Overall

Our support for governors, as part of the leadership judgement of a school is a contributory factor to Schools rated good or outstanding at Ofsted:

Primary schools

2015, good or outstanding 87.3%; (National ??%);
2014, good or outstanding 84.1%; (National 81%);
2013, good or outstanding 83% (National 78%);
2012: 66%; 2013: 83% (National 69%)

Secondary schools

2015, good or outstanding 92.3%; (National ??%);
2014, good or outstanding 81.7%; (National 70%);
2013, good or outstanding 91.7%; (National 71%);
2012: 75%; 2013: 100% (Nat 66%)

Special Schools

2015, good or outstanding 100%; (National ??%);
2014, good or outstanding 100%; (National 90%);
2013, good or outstanding 100%; (National ??%);
2012:100%; 2013: 100% (Nat 87%)

Nursery Schools

2015, good or outstanding 100%; (National ??%);
2014, good or outstanding 84.7%; (National 96%);
2013, good or outstanding 100%; (National ??%);
2012: 100%; 2013: 67% (Nat 96%)

Evaluation: Governors' Services Survey on Training & Clerking

The annual survey sent to schools regarding the Service last year reflected a continuing improving picture). Training, Support and Advice was rated 84 % up from the 2014 79% good or better. Clerking received a 82 % rating at this level, an increase from 70% in 2014.

School's Forum Funding

The funding from the Forum currently covers the salary of the Head of Service, the Admin Assistant and 75% of the Clerking Manager who provides substantial support and advice as part of the core offer in addition to her clerking management duties.

Appendix 5. School Improvement Centrally Retained and De-Delegated Budgets.

School quality assurance: centrally retained and de-delegated budgets.

1.1 The quality assurance function for maintained schools in Haringey is a statutory mandatory one for the local authority (LA). The government funds councils through a per-pupil allocation called the education service grant (ESG).

1.2 In Haringey, we have developed this function to broaden the offer to schools and drive school improvement. The offer covers the spectrum of activities from statutory intervention through to challenge and support, underpinned by rigorous data analysis and partnership engagement with schools. This service is proving successful, with over 90 per cent of Haringey schools and academies judged to be good or outstanding. School improvement advisors work alongside head teachers, school leaders, governors academy sponsors and college principals to share and celebrate success and drive improvement.

1.3 The local authority is promoting and developing strategic school to school support through individual commissions and area network arrangements. This sector led improvement model is already improving the quality of education for pupils and students and underpins the rationale for retaining funds from the DSG.

Statutory mandatory service elements and functions.

2.1 The mandatory quality assurance functions of LAs relating to maintained settings and schools are as follows:

ensuring all school in its area are quality assured, and that schools that are at risk of requiring support and challenge in order to remain good or better (note that this is available for academies, as the LA remains responsible for assuring that all children in its area have access to a good or better school under the School Standards and Framework Act, 1998;

challenging and intervening in all schools where children are underperforming compared with their peers and where the quality of education is not good enough;

monitoring teacher assessment of year2 at key stage 1 and of year 6 writing at key stage 2, by arranging visits to 25 per cent of schools and securing compliance with the arrangements for statutory assessments, operating a rota system for schools;

monitoring ks2 national curriculum test arrangements for Year 6 and Phonics Screening for year 1

2.2 In Haringey, each school receives an allocation of time from a school improvement adviser based on the level of concern, both from Ofsted and other intelligence, including data analysis, governance and leadership. This ranges from 'keeping in touch' meetings on a termly basis, to more robust targeted intervention for underperforming schools. Assessment monitoring is done annually as set out in government regulations and statutory guidance.

Statutory non-mandatory services (traded)

3.1 The following services are available:

- a continuous professional development programme to help teachers implement national changes to the curriculum and assessment in 2015-2016;
- convening school based working parties for curriculum development and resource packs promoting good and outstanding teaching;
- developing middle leaders;
- performance management for head teachers;
- Ofsted readiness checks and one day reviews;
- leadership coaching and mentoring;
- Professional support for school self evaluation
- bespoke reviews for individual schools, such as HR and budget management;
- head teacher and deputy head teacher conferences;
- newly qualified teachers - appropriate body functions;
- data analysis and information on new initiatives, legislation, guidance and focus for Ofsted inspections; and
- celebration events to showcase excellence and celebrate achievement.

Proposed budget allocation 2016/17

4.1 The service budget is distributed across the core budget, strategic intervention education services, support to under- performing ethnic minority groups and a balance from the DSG for initiatives such as the network learning communities.

4.2 The budget is proposed to be allocated from:

£254,000 core funding from the council:

£612,000 De-delegated for support to underperforming ethnic minority groups; and

£566,000 to support strategic support and intervention.

Total **£1,432,000**.

Actual proposed and planned expenditure in financial year 2016-17 from the DSG:

description	amount
Salaries, including: 1 x AD, 1 x PA, 5 X SIAs, 1 x P&D and administrative support and costs. Data analysis functions.	£861,000
NLC funding and new initiatives School to School initiatives	£250,000
Executive head functions-existing and proposed	£60,000
Brokered support for S2S support	£50,000
Data analysis to inform the post 16, early years / foundation stage and NCL priorities	£25,000
Head and deputy head teacher conferences subsidy	£6,000
Development of resource packs through the 'school experts'	£10,000

working groups	
School to school special / secondary	£20,000
Head teacher and leadership team secondments - leadership recruitment across NLCs	£30,000
Meeting emerging national priorities for 2016-2017	£30,000
Additional capacity for SIA intervention	£90,000
total	£1,432,000

Risk of reduced funding from the DSG

6.1 The council will not be in a position to increase core funding as schools are receiving funding, through the pupil premium for example, which is being redistributed from council budgets through a national formula. Schools would need to commission services individually or in groups, but may miss the level of expertise and the economies of scale achieved through centrally retained budgets. Therefore risks are that:

- the council will be unable to continue the robust system of school improvement, with the risk of falling standards and lower Ofsted judgements;
- the council will have limited data analysis and professional debate on standards to support school self- evaluation against the new curriculum framework;
- the partnership between schools and the LA and between schools will be damaged;
- school to school functions, which are developing well, might not be taken forward;
- schools will have limited intelligence about the implications of changes in national policy, legislation and guidance;
- a reduction in the school improvement team, limiting its capacity to deliver effective support and intervention, will impact on the level and depth of expertise across all aspects of the work, including continuous professional development;
- primary children will have reduced attainment, impacting on the secondary school baseline data in year 7.

Mitigating the risk of reduced funding

7.1 It will be difficult to mitigate the risk and maintain the levels and pace of improvement for children and young people across Haringey. However, it is likely that the team would be reduced and the universal offer cut dramatically, with limited in depth data analysis to support schools.

The quality of the service

8.1 In the autumn term 2013, schools evaluated the quality of the developing school improvement service. Comments were very favourable and included some real praise for the level of support and challenge. Schools also found link officers to be well informed, knowledgeable and skilled in all aspects of school improvement, whilst recognising that the assistant director

planned to secure further development and improvement in the systems and partnership with and across schools.

8.2 At this time, some schools also recognised that the team could provide more support for special schools and that it was early days to make a definitive judgement, although the signs were promising for the newly formed team.

8.3 The team also evaluate professional development, with very positive ratings, and the Assistant Director liaises with schools to seek their perspectives on the service.

Impact assessment

9.1 Working more closely with schools, head teachers and governors, the impact on standards, the rate of progress and outcomes for children and young people are tangible (see appendix 5A attached). Note that:

Haringey is the most improved authority over the last four years at the end of ks4 - a case study has been written by the DfE, demonstrating progress here;

the support and challenge system promotes high standards and supports leaders to achieve 'good and outstanding' judgements during Ofsted inspections;

overall 100% of secondary, 86% primary, and 100% special and nursery schools are judged to be good or outstanding by Ofsted;

the developing school to school support is impacting on standards and improving the quality of leadership, evident in the Ofsted judgements;

Haringey's average GCSE and A Level results are above national averages against the key reported measures of 5+A*-C including English and maths and the percentage of A level students achieving both 2 and 3 A Levels at A*-E;

at key stage 1 standards in all reported areas are now in line with national and London averages;

at key stage 2 we are in line with or above national averages in all reported areas; and

the progress of children from ethnic minority groups and those receiving the pupil premium is improving and closing the gap.

Areas for further development if DSG funding is agreed

10.1 These are to:

continue to develop the school to school support through Federations, Executive Headships and the network of learning communities;

develop the role of the SIAs in partnership with schools to meet the challenge of the national legislative changes in 2015 – 2016;

align the SIA service with the work of the early years team and post 16 strategy to streamline support and challenge to schools;

track underperforming groups and secure support for children and young people to improve outcomes throughout their school careers – at ks 1 and 2, black African children achieve just below the national averages and

are a focus for further improvement, and the attendance and achievement of traveller children remains a focus;

work with schools and other stakeholders to shape the vision for Post 16 and regeneration; and

develop traded services offer to ensure schools are able to purchase and commission bespoke services from the LA, other commercial providers and other schools or academies.

Appendix 5A

Key Stage 1

In 2010 Haringey was 0.7 below the national average but has surpassed the national by 0.1 in 2015.

measure		2011	2015
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	Haringey	14.5	16.2
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	National	15.2	16.1
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	Difference	-0.7	0.1

The average point score of Haringey FSM pupils in 2015 is 15.5 compared to 14.8 for National FSM pupils.

Ethnicity: Haringey white other 15.6 compared to national 15.5; Haringey black Caribbean 15.4 compared to national 15.5; Haringey black African 16.0 compared to national 16.1.

Key Stage 2

The 2015 results are not validated and so all below relates to 2010 and 2014. In 2010 Haringey was 0.3 above the national average and 0.1 above the national average in 2014.

measure		2011	2014
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	Haringey	27.7	28.8
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	National	27.4	28.7
All subjects (combined reading, writing, maths)	Difference	0.3	0.1

The average point score of Haringey FSM pupils in 2014 was 27.6 compared to 27.0 for national; the average point score of Haringey Non-FSM pupils in 2014 was 29.9 compared to 29.4 for national.

Ethnicity: Haringey white other 28.3 compared to national 28.0; Haringey black Caribbean 27.4 compared to National 27.5; Haringey black African 28.0 compared to National black African 28.4.

GCSE

The 2015 results are not validated and so all below relates to 2010 and 2014.

measure		2010	2014
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)	Haringey	48	59
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)	National	53	55
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics) percentage gap		-10	+7
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)FSM	Haringey		49
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)FSM	National		36
55+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)percentage gap			+28
55+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)non FSM	Haringey		69
5+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)non FSI	National		62
55+ A* - C (including English and mathematics)			+11

percentage gap

Ethnic minority achievement: white other pupils in Haringey attained 55 per cent against the standard measure, against 52 nationally (6 per cent more); black Caribbean 49 against 46 (+ 7 per cent); with black African pupils the only one of the main groups to under-perform (53 per cent against 56, - 5 per cent).

Ofsted

Haringey schools perform extraordinarily well in Ofsted inspections – all nursery, special, secondary and VI form colleges are good or better, with almost 9 in 10 primaries being judged good or better. Overall, over 90 per cent of our schools are good or better.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Agenda Item
8**



Report Status

For information/note
For consultation & views
For decision

Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 3rd December 2015

Report Title: Haringey School Funding Formula 2016-17.

Authors:

Steve Worth – Finance Manager (Schools and Learning)
Contact: 0208 489 3708 Email: Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk

Purpose:

To consider responses to the consultation on proposed changes to Haringey's Schools Funding Formula for 2016-17 and to recommend the Forum's view to the Council.

Recommendations:

Forum consider whether to recommend the proposed change to the Council.

1. Introduction.

1.1. Local Authorities (LAs) are required to keep their funding formula under review and following significant changes in 2013-14 and 2014-15 no material alteration was made for 2015-16. Schools Forum on 8th July 2015 appointed a sub-group to review the formula for 2016-17.

1.2. To help the group in its review, data was obtained for all LA's 2015-16 funding methodologies and values. Further analysis concentrated on the actual/average values for London authorities plus some national values. The analysis compared:

- Haringey's 2015-16 funding formula (actual values).
- All London authorities (average values),
- Inner London authorities (average values),
- Outer East authorities, which have the same area cost adjustment as Haringey (average values).
- The England average.
- Minimum Funding Level (MFL), the factor values used by the DfE in its calculation of MFL in 2015-16, when additional resources were allocated to authorities perceived by the government to be under-funded.

1.3. The group also took account of:

- The Department for Education's (DfE) expressed intention to introduce a national schools funding formula. Subsequently, the Government's Spending Review on 25 November announced that consultation on a national funding formula will begin in 2016 with the intention of introducing one for 2017-18. This is looked at in more detail in the Schools Budget Strategy Report to this Forum..
- The continuation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) that dampens any change to budget allocations between schools.
- Haringey's level of deprivation funding compared with other LAs.
- The distributional impact of varying the factors used.

2. General Formula Review.

2.1. The group's view after considering the foregoing was that there should not be any general changes to the funding formula for 2016-17.

3. Secondary School Special Needs Contingency.

3.1. However, members of the group were concerned about the distribution of funding for high needs pupils across secondary schools. The creation of a High Needs Contingency for Secondary Schools to compensate those taking disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils and encourage those taking disproportionately low numbers was proposed. Various methods of achieving this were looked at but the existence of

the Minimum Funding Guarantee meant that only adjustments using the lump sum would have the desired impact. Consequently schools were consulted on the proposal set out in Appendices 1 and 1a.

3.2. The responses to this proposal are set out in Table 1.

Table 1. Response to the proposal to create a Secondary School Special Needs Contingency (Re-consultation).

Phase	In Favour	Opposed	No View	Comments
Primary	2	0	0	No comments
Secondary	3	3	0	See Appendix 2
Special	1	0	0	Wholly agree. Proposal has been discussed and scrutinised in depth in HNB Sub-Ctte and Forum and is robust
Total	6	3	0	

3.3. Five out of the five secondary schools that responded added comments. Those opposed to the proposal commented in some detail and the comments and supporting documentation from the four are included in Appendix 2. The comments have been anonymised and are quoted verbatim.

3.4. If agreed, the reallocation will be reviewed in January when the October 2015 data is available.

3.5. **Recommendation. That Forum consider whether to recommend the proposed change to the Council.**

Appendix 1. Secondary School Special Needs Contingency.

Background to High Needs Funding.

- 1.1 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), which provides the funding for delegated school budgets and other pupil related activities, is split into three blocks:
 - 1.1.1 The Schools Block, which provides the school budget shares delegated to governing bodies, plus some centrally retained services.
 - 1.1.2 The High Needs Block (HNB), which meet the needs of children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in both mainstream and special schools.
 - 1.1.3 The Early Years Block, which provides funding for pre-reception year children.
- 1.2 The delegated school budget share includes funding to meet the initial needs of pupils with high needs. Included within delegated funding are:

Element 1. The basic cost of educating any pupil, regardless of special or additional educational need; the national notional average is £4,000.

Element 2. Funding to be found from within a school's delegated budget share for the *additional* cost of educating a pupil with high needs; the maximum expected contribution is £6,000. Element 2 is not a specific funding factor and elements of the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) and deprivation and AEN funding contribute to it. The information on budget shares provided before the start of a financial year gives a figure for each school's Notional SEN Budget.
- 1.3 Once the additional cost of providing for a high needs pupil is assessed as exceeding £6,000 then 'top-up' funding, known as Element 3, can be accessed. Funding for Element 3 is centrally retained and comes from the HNB.
- 1.4 The HNB budget has been increased by the Schools Forum over the last two years but remains under considerable pressure.

Secondary Transfer.

- 1.5 The point of transfer from primary school to secondary school is a time of stress when families seek special school or secondary school places where their children can settle and thrive.

- 1.6 There is evidence that some secondary schools are more welcoming to children with special educational needs than others and this has resulted in a disproportionate intake of students with more complex special educational needs in those schools.
- 1.7 As the Notional SEN Budget forms part of Education Health and Care Plan (EH&CP) funding, this means that some secondary schools are receiving funding towards supporting numbers of children that they are choosing not to receive. This not only increases pressure on schools who are taking more than proportionate numbers of high needs students, but also lowers the threshold for special school placements for those students who, as a result, cannot easily be placed locally and who might otherwise stay in mainstream school.
- 1.8 This contributes to the pressure on the HNB and as the grant is ring-fenced this pressure must be contained within the overall DSG and may require a transfer between the Schools and High Needs Blocks. A reduction in school budget shares may compromise schools' capability for early intervention and lead to an increase in the number of EH&CPs, putting further pressure on the HNB.

Proposed Funding Changes.

- 1.9 Only secondary schools are considered in this proposal due to the more static nature of the cohort of children with statements or EH&CPs. Plans and statements are more rarely initiated for children of secondary age as the children's needs, in the main, should have been recognised and appropriately managed at an earlier stage in their time at school.
- 1.10 To help prevent the cycle set out in 1.9 we propose to create a fund in the HNB to support schools taking high needs pupils above a threshold. This will support those schools taking disproportionately large numbers of high needs pupils and encourage increased take-up in those taking disproportionately low numbers.
- 1.11 We propose to create the fund by removing the secondary lump sum as adjusting any other factor may trigger the Minimum Funding Guarantee that would, in some cases, offset the desired impact.
- 1.12 The proposed changes will apply to a school's financial year, April to March for maintained schools and September to August for academies, and the methodology will be different in the first year to subsequent years, as set out below.

- 1.12.1 The reallocation methodology proposed for year 1 (2016-17) is for the funding to be released to secondary schools proportionate to the numbers of Haringey children with statements/EH&CPs to the school roll (Years 7 to 11 only). The financial adjustment will therefore only take account of the AWPU element (directly related to roll) in Notional SEN Budgets. We are excluding the notional deprivation and AEN funding from the adjustment to enable schools to continue to invest in early intervention. The number of plans and statements (as at the October census date) will be allocated to schools based on rolls and where this is lower than actual numbers taken an allocation from the HNB fund will be made. An illustration of the proposed methodology is set out in Appendix 1a.
- 1.12.2 In year two the funding will be released to secondary schools in the same way but only taking account of the numbers of year 7 students with statement/plans proportionate to the year group.
- 1.13 This phased approach will allow schools to redress the balance of their intake over time and recognise the efforts of schools that positively support children with additional needs, and to receive proportionately higher funding toward their management of a student's EHC needs.
- 1.14 Secondary school members of the Formula Review Group have discussed this proposal at the Secondary Heads Forum.

Appendix 2. Secondary School Comments Received (Anonymised).

For:

Secondary School 1.

The disproportionate numbers of SEN students in schools puts pressure (financial and educational) on these schools.

There are a number of schools that discourage families of SEN students – this is unacceptable and should be challenged.

This process is a small step which may nudge those schools that do not encourage students with SEN to alter their practices.

Secondary School 2.

We agree with the methodology of the proposal. This is not about winners and losers it is about costs incurred by schools. It is not about school popularity - since the calculations are based on high needs statements as a proportion of roll it is irrelevant to the allocations how big the roll is or whether the school is full or not. It is also worth pointing out that the fact that this school has a provision for autism is not relevant in relation to the students that we take with EHC plans in the mainstream. Many of the students in the mainstream school have primary needs other than autism.

Against:

Secondary School 3.

The main issue is that the needs of the pupils are not being fully funded. If a child is allocated an amount to support their educational needs the full allocated funds should follow.

By reducing funds to a school via the lump sum, this will in effect reduce a school's ability to support the very children that need it. This measure will not only not "encourage" schools to try to support more children, in effect it could be quite the opposite. There would not be the resources in schools, which could already have major financial issues, to be able to offer the educational support needed.

Secondary School 4.

The proposed revised funding methodology is clearly weighted to the advantage of the few schools in the Borough and the significant detriment of the majority.

There is no explanation or evidence tabled supporting the proposed change in the formula. If introduced this will have such a negative impact on most LBH schools at the very time when all LBH schools are facing significant funding challenges.

1. This proposal fails to properly reflect the reality of the situation around students with statements and those who are not considered eligible for

statement funding yet display the majority of behavioural traits that would justify support funding. Only four of the schools will be financially advantaged from this revised formula: nine will take a very real financial hit under this proposal – yet still face the challenge of managing a diverse and challenging range of student behaviour.

2. Many of the schools that are expected to accept a reduction in funding face the very real challenge of continuing to meet the needs of the broadest cross section of student intake, without the necessary financial resources. Without doubt this model will disadvantage a majority of students with SEND in Haringey.
3. This proposal makes that situation even worse and very hard decisions will have to be taken as to the appropriate response to behaviour management issues that are often intrinsically linked to SEND needs.
4. There is a lack of clarity on why the four schools meet criteria specifically which supports additional funding. What have the other nine schools done (or are not doing) to justify a continuation of the existing funding allowance? What effort has been made to research the situation on the ground in each of these schools and what justification is there that a falling demand will follow – so funding inevitably follows the pupil intake?
5. What is the evidence that “some secondary schools are more welcoming to children with special educational needs than others”. How does this “welcome” play out in terms of a proportionate intake which reinforces the proposed revised formula? Is this “welcome” a reflection of a parental group who have the means - time, language skills, resources, access to information, contacts, and ability to write persuasive Panel friendly statements and have the drive and persistence to deal with the bureaucracy of placement and finally have the stamina to handle the many layers of the selection process? How does this equate to the implementation of the principles of equality and diversity?
6. What is the evidence that supports the view that some schools are better equipped to deal with “complex educational needs”? We do not recall any negative comments from Ofsted (2013) or since regarding the School’s approach to its management of SEND and “behaviour heavy “ students, yet this change in formula feels like a negative response to the support we offer students with SEND.
7. The school prides itself on its strong and dynamic links with the community; it is a diverse school that welcomes children from all communities and across the educational spectrum. It has an outstanding welfare and behaviour support structure and at no time has been challenged for not managing all children equally. Where is the evidence that some schools are “choosing not to receive” students yet receiving funding? Surely a simple audit of funding and student intake would identify the accuracy of this statement which could then inform the proposal. Without more detailed evidence it is hard to believe that the proposed funding formula properly reflects the actuality of this situation on the ground across the Borough. If particular schools are found to be acting inappropriately, they should be dealt with individually by LB Haringey.

8. Para 1.9 suggests that “in the main” primary schools are responsible for initiating statements – and these statements come with the student to secondary school. But what is the evidence that this process is being followed accurately and completely at primary level? – and what confidence is there that “in the main” the evidence supports the dramatic change in the proposed funding formula with the secondary school?
9. Given that the proposal aims to support schools taking high needs pupils above a threshold, what is the benefit to those schools who do not have SEND students but a higher proportion of students who cannot receive a statement but are still in high need of educational or behavioural support? Any reduction in funding will disproportionately impact on the support available to both the wider student cohort but more specifically on those students who have evident behaviour issues but have not had Primary school intervention.
10. This is an untimely, unfair and inappropriate allocation of funding to the schools across Haringey and further discussion should now take place before any change in the existing funding formula is made.

Secondary School 5.

We write rejecting these proposals in the strongest possible terms and on a number of grounds.

Summary

- In the last Secondary and Primary Headteacher Consultation exercise dated September 28, in response to the proposal to create a Secondary School Special Needs Contingency Fund, whilst primary schools were in favour of the changes Secondary schools were not. It is alarming that in the face of this clear lack of mandate the Working Group still recommended the removal of the secondary Lump Sum to create this contingency fund. No explanation has been provided and we are left to draw our own conclusions.
- School Funding in this authority has been based on well-established formulae which these proposals now seek to circumvent.
- Until recently the additional funding for pupils with Statements was not a particular issue. A large contingency was created and all schools were able to trigger the release of these funds for each Statemented pupil according to clear criteria. Indeed until relatively recently **all** Statemented pupils “came to the school” with additional funding.
- Recently all school budgets have been under increasing pressure and this has included radical changes to the way in which special needs pupils are funded. Rather than accept that this increase pressure needs to be fairly distributed using tried and tested formula between all schools/pupils the proposal now seeks to clearly advantage 5 secondary schools within the authority to the detriment of all the others.
- The basic premise concerning the uneven distribution of pupils with Statements/EH&CPs which underpins the proposal is flawed.

- Parents with a Statement/EH&CP are allowed to “name” the secondary school of their choice. This parental factor is the most important factor underpinning numbers of Statemented/EH&CP attending each school not the wishes of individual schools. No evidence is presented which supports the idea that schools are able to influence these choices by being less “welcoming”.
- Within the local authority one school has a specialist unit, it is entirely to be expected that the school attracts large numbers of pupils where this unit is able to meet their special needs.
- Numbers of pupils with Statements/EH&CPs seems to be in line with school popularity as evidenced by first choices and league table position rather than any other factor.
- The premise that only pupils with a Statement/EH&CP have high needs is flawed.
- The premise that all pupils with a Statement/EH&CP are or should be funded at the same rate is flawed.
- The premise that there is a need to “punish” schools who are currently attracting low numbers of pupils with Statements/EH&CPs by removing funding is flawed. The idea that this will “encourage” pupils to attend particular schools and shift parental choice is unfounded for the reasons above - the choice remains with the parent. Reducing funding to these “unpopular” schools make them less likely to be able to meet the needs of all high needs pupils making them even less desirable whilst those who benefit from additional funding will become more popular. These proposals will have exactly the opposite effect than that intended and represent a simple “popularity tax”.
- The financial methodology proposed is based on these views and is designed to circumvent DfE Guidelines. Notional figures are used throughout. A mixture of figures generated by pupil numbers is mixed with figures produced as a flat rate per school.
- Currently pupils with Statements/EH&CPs have access to a large central contingency held by the local authority, others are supported by funded places and still others by specific grants associated with specialised units.
- No account is taken of the additional pressure on some schools which are not full and then take significant numbers of high needs pupils not supported by a Statement/EH&CP.

Discussion

Appendix 1 covers the background and rationale behind these proposals as numbered paragraphs. There are a number of matters here which need to be considered.

Paragraph 1.2 - Element 2. This funding is intended to cover the additional cost of educating people with high needs up to a maximum £6000. (Producing a figure of approximately £10,000 per pupil to be provided by the school.) Quite rightly this funding acknowledges that a large number of students, particularly in the local authority like Haringey, will have high needs but no associated Statement or EH&CPs, however it is very clear that the working party involved in producing these proposals takes a quite different view and is now attempting to claw the funding which has been made available to schools back into a central “top up” fund. Over

time it is our understanding that the factors driving this “notional” special educational need fund have been carefully debated and agreed, at both a local and national level. It now seems that the Working Group are looking to circumvent the transparent methodology we have used for many years to produce school budgets.

Paragraph 1.3 - Element 3. This is the crux of the matter. Although no figure is actually given in the consultation document, this fund is a part of the overall £31 million High Needs Block which is centrally retained by the local authority. (As below)

Post Recoupment High Needs Block 2015-16

Description	£
Delegated to special schools and units and AP and hospital units	4,863,400
AP Commissioning and AP top-up	1,298,400
Mainstream school top-up	4,464,500
Special school and unit top-up	6,880,100
Private, voluntary and independent schools	5,395,500
Bringing in Fund	455,700
Further Education Top-up	2,148,000
Early Years	650,100
SEN Contingency - paid to schools	500,000
In Year Fair Access	338,000
Central Support Services, includes Autism Support, Speech and Language Therapy, Language Support, Visual Impairment Teams etc.	3,724,600
SEN Transport (part)	500,000
	31,218,300

The First Statistical Return available on the DfE Website provides the Underlying Data figures for Statements/EH&CPs 2015-16. These figures show 405 Primary and 380 Secondary Statements/EH&CPs, a total of 785 pupils for next year. It is impossible to know the extent to which each of these have needs beyond the £10,000 now expected to be provided from Elements 1 and 2 as this will be determined by the nature of the Statement/EH&CPs. However, a simple division £4,464,500 identified above indicates that an additional £5,687 is available per pupil if this fund was simply to be divided equally. The High Needs Block also provides a £500,000 contingency which is again paid directly to schools although the criteria are once again unknown. The proposals we are being asked to consider are seeking to add to these “top-up” funds through a different route and one which actively penalises some schools whilst providing a financial advantage to others.

Individual mainstream schools are also able to access additional funding which is, again, not mentioned in the consultation. £1.9 million is set aside to directly fund pupil places in mainstream schools. Alexandra Park School, Hartland’s and

Fortismere benefit from this funding with Heartlands and the Language Unit at Coleraine Park also benefiting from a £233,000 specific grant.

At a time when all schools are experiencing tremendous pressure on budgets our current formula funding arrangements spread the “pain” using well established principles which this proposal seeks to set aside.

Paragraphs 1.5 to 1.8 seek to justify these proposals with some poor logic and frankly offensive statements.

Paragraph 1.6 mentions evidence that some schools are “more welcoming” than others but then fails to provide any such evidence. What is clear is that there is a disparity in the numbers of pupils with Statements/EH&CPs going to the different secondary schools. The reason for this is obvious. It seems that the working party have entirely forgotten one of the critical and most important aspects associated with the provision of a Statement. A Statement allows a parent to “name” a school at secondary transfer, it is in effect a passport which bypasses all the usual admission criteria. Looking at the allocation of Statemented/EH&CPs pupils to schools next year produces a pattern we have seen many times before. The numbers simply reflect and completely mirror that of the league tables and the numbers of first choice applicants. This is entirely logical. A parent holding a Statement gets to choose a school directly and will logically choose a school identified, particularly by league tables, as a better schools in the authority. Schools like ours, which attract perhaps 70 first choices are named on Statements very rarely.

Furthermore, it would be a nonsense to suggest that a parent holding a Statement where the identified need is autism would not name Heartlands as a school of choice with its specialised unit or deliberately choose a school without the expertise, experience or the necessary resources.

What is interesting here is that this disparity in numbers has until recently not been an issue. Pupils with Statements attracted extra funding and schools were happy to accept them. It seems that now the funding arrangements have shifted to acknowledge that not all those pupils with high needs have a Statement/EHCPs this is suddenly a problem and rather than simply being direct and clear about the issue we now find schools, with absolutely no justification, being accused of effectively turning away special needs pupils.

Paragraph 1.7 is also fundamentally flawed. This paragraph completely ignores the fact that this “notional” funding is to support the additional £6,000 for **all** those pupils with special needs **regardless** of whether they have a Statement/EH&CPs or not. In a school like ours large numbers of our pupils arrive after secondary transfer, frequently from overseas, often with English as an additional language and other areas of high need. This year GCA has accepted **56** students as “normal admissions” since the beginning of September, **39** of these are at beginner EAL level. They will have not been through the process of securing a Statement/EHCPs at primary school and will often not understand the process required, (quite aside from the fact that very few Statements/EH&CPs are issued in the secondary sector). That these students arrive with sometimes severe high needs, often compounded by being EAL should not surprise anyone in the authority. By allocating funding using our current factors

which include deprivation, prior attainment and EAL we are able to go some way to meet these acute high needs and it is this capacity which this proposal seeks to dramatically reduce.

Paragraph 1.9 builds on the view that at secondary transfer Statements have not historically been used to bypass the usual admissions process. It is surprising that a group of experienced Headteachers and officers should suddenly forget this truth!

It also seems that the divisive nature of actually obtaining a Statement/EH&CPs has been forgotten. The process is usually started in primary school, requires determination and persistence on behalf the parents, a good understanding of documentation, forms and associated paperwork and clearly discriminates against, less educated, late arrivals into the country, particularly those arriving at secondary age, and those families where English is not their first language. It is exactly these families who have been supported by the “notional” SEN Budget which is now under threat.

Paragraph 1.10 once again ignores the way that historically these numbers of Statements/EH&CPs have built up, or not, in secondary schools over the past years as parents with a Statement/EH&CPs use that statement to choose a school. It is not the other way round. As such the idea of a threshold is ridiculous. The paragraph talks about high needs pupils and seems to equate them only with those who have a Statement/EH&CPs - this is simply not true. Finally, the proposal talks about encouraging increased take-up in those schools taking disproportionately low numbers by penalising them financially, it does not explain how this might work and it seems to make no logical sense! Surely reducing funds makes the school are less attractive choice to parents and it is the parents who are choosing the schools and using the Statement/ECHPs to support that choice not the other way round.

Paragraph 1.11 is somewhat disingenuous. The proposal to remove the secondary lump sum is simply because without entirely restructuring the top-slicing model used to create the High Needs Block this is the only factor which can be changed without breaching DfE Guidelines or triggering the minimum funding guarantee for a school.

Paragraph 1.12 to 1.13 continues the theme. In essence the idea that “The number of plans and statements...will be allocated to schools based on rolls and where this is lower than actual numbers taken an allocation from the HNB fund will be made.” is the flawed conclusion based on two flawed assumptions. The first is that only those pupils with a plan or statement have high needs. The second is that schools are able to exercise choice when it is patently obvious that the choice is that of the parents. Whilst parental choice is the dominant factor unless the local authority is intending to “direct” children with plans of statements to equalise numbers this will simply never happen and it is grossly unfair to penalise schools in this situation.

Appendix 1a – This is attached as Appendix 2a

The appendix is provided with our notes on the methodology.

The “usual” way to create a new “pot” of money would be to top-slice at the level of DSG, transparently, then identify clear criterion for the allocation of those funds or alternatively how they might be accessed through criteria or bidding. What this method does is determine a flat rate of £130 per pupil to produce a new pot of just over £1.4 million. This is divided by the number of Statements/EHCPs to produce a nominal amount per pupil. It ignores the £4.46 million already retained in the High Needs Block where up to £5000 per pupil is already available. It assumes that every pupil with a Statement/EHCP is funded at exactly the same rate which is not true. It produces winners and losers with GCA losing over £70,000 through to Heartlands, (already in receipt of considerable additional funding as above) benefiting by over £170,000. The intention appears to be punitive in terms of the perceived, (but again flawed), notion that some schools are less able to be “welcoming” to special needs pupils. It is iniquitous at every level. This fund is created from funding which even “notionally” is intended for the neediest students using well researched, well-established and well trusted proxy indicators. Suddenly we are to throw this in the air in favour of crude numbers and crude assumptions.

It seems that reducing and increasing budgets to reflect this methodology is outside the DFE guidelines and the LEA is worried about triggering minimum funding guarantees, (which is highly telling in itself, indicating that some schools are already funded extremely close to that minimum guarantee). Instead the methodology seeks to circumvent this entirely sensible precaution by using the Lump Sum to give the desired outcome. GCA is stopped the punitive £73,700. In order that Heartlands can actually benefit to the tune of £170,000 requires £244,538 to be given to that school simply to have £73,700 removed. It is blatantly a process designed to circumvent government guidelines.

Finally, paragraph 1.14 states that this proposal has been discussed at the Secondary Heads Forum. That is true but it did not meet universal approval or gain universal support in that group or during the last consultation.

It is for these reasons that we are unable to agree to reduce the secondary school lump sum and use the funding released to create a secondary school special needs contingency.

Appendix 1a - Indicative Financial Year Effect of Proposed Revised 2016-17 Methodology

School	Row	Roll	Present Total SEN Element 2 Funding	AWPU Factor in Element 2	Number of Haringey EH&CPs - Yrs 7-11	% of Haringey EH&CPs Yrs 7-11	Proportionate Share of Haringey EH&CPs	Variance in Number of EH&CPs	Recast AWPU Factor	Increased Contribution Required	Budget Adjustment required	Lump Sum Change	Net Change
Column	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Formula/Note:		2	3	3	4	% (F5 to F17)/F19	F19/C19*(C5 to C17)	F-H	E19/F19*(F5 to F17)	J-E	K+(-M)	L19/Number of Secondary Schools	L-M
Alexandra Park	5	1,098	£372,398	£142,059	50	16.45%	30	20	£237,087	£95,028	£168,749	-£73,721	£95,028
Fortismere	6	1,203	£287,025	£155,644	22	7.24%	33	-11	£104,318	-£51,326	£22,395	-£73,721	-£51,326
Gladesmore	7	1,246	£601,186	£161,208	44	14.47%	34	10	£208,636	£47,428	£121,149	-£73,721	£47,428
Greig City	8	863	£451,769	£111,655	8	2.63%	24	-16	£37,934	-£73,721	-£0	-£73,721	-£73,721
Harris Academy	9	66	£79,556	£15,331	0	0.00%	2	-2	£0	-£15,331	£58,390	-£73,721	-£15,331
Heartlands	10	972	£492,333	£123,170	62	20.39%	27	35	£293,987	£170,817	£244,538	-£73,721	£170,817
Highgate Wood	11	1,190	£437,557	£153,962	23	7.57%	33	-10	£109,060	-£44,902	£28,819	-£73,721	-£44,902
Hornsey School	12	811	£358,829	£104,927	13	4.28%	22	-9	£61,642	-£43,285	£30,436	-£73,721	-£43,285
Northumberland Park	13	1,035	£617,298	£133,908	26	8.55%	28	-2	£123,285	-£10,623	£63,098	-£73,721	-£10,623
Park View	14	1,073	£604,113	£138,825	23	7.57%	29	-6	£109,060	-£29,765	£43,956	-£73,721	-£29,765
St Thomas More	15	677	£340,528	£87,590	6	1.97%	19	-13	£28,450	-£59,140	£14,581	-£73,721	-£59,140
Tottenham UTC	16	31	£44,557	£8,539	2	0.66%	1	1	£9,483	£944	£74,665	-£73,721	£944
Woodside High	17	809	£445,405	£104,668	25	8.22%	22	3	£118,543	£13,875	£87,596	-£73,721	£13,875
	18												
	19	11,074	£5,132,554	£1,441,486	304	100.00%	304	0	£1,441,486	£0	£958,373	-£958,373	£0

Notes:

1. EH&CPs encompasses both pupils with plans and pupils with statements.

2. Funded Pupil Numbers 2015-16

3. School Budget Share Information

4. Number of Statements Summer 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1a - Indicative Financial Year Effect of Proposed Revised 2016-17 Methodology

School	Roll	Present Total NOMINAL SEN Element 2 Funding	NOMINAL AWPU Factor in Element 2	Derivation of E - AWPU Factor - arbitrary top-slice based on pupil numbers.	NOMINAL SEN Budget after top-slice reduction. (D-E)	Number of Haringey EH&CPs - Yrs 7-11	Number of Statements/EHCP x 1/304 of top-slice fund E.	"New" NOTIONAL SEN Element 2 Funding	Winners and losers!	Nominally add £73,721 to each budget at a flat rate in order to deliberately circumvent DfE Guidelines and avoid triggering MFG.	Finally remove the Lump Sum (not controlled by DfE guidelines) from all schools and allocate the previous column.	Proportionate Share of Haringey EH&CPs	Variance in Number of EH&CPs	Increased Contribution Required	Budget Adjustment required	Lump Sum Change	Net Change
Column	C	D	E	Ea	Eb	F	Fa	Fb	Fc	Fd		H	I	K	L	M	N
Formula/Note:	2	3	3	3a	3b	4	4a	4b	4c			F19/C19*(C5 to C17)	F-H	J-E	K+(-M)	L19/Number of Secondary Schools	L-M
Alexandra Park	1,098	£372,398	£142,059	£129	£230,339	£50	£237,087	£467,426	£95,028	£168,749	£95,028	30	20	£95,028	£168,749	-£73,721	£95,028
Fortismere	1,203	£287,025	£155,644	£129	£131,381	£22	£104,318	£235,699	£51,326	£22,395	-£51,326	33	-11	-£51,326	£22,395	-£73,721	-£51,326
Gladesmore	1,246	£601,186	£161,208	£129	£439,978	£44	£208,636	£648,614	£47,428	£121,149	£47,428	34	10	£47,428	£121,149	-£73,721	£47,428
Greig City	863	£451,769	£111,655	£129	£340,114	£8	£37,934	£378,048	£73,721	£0	-£73,721	24	-16	-£73,721	£0	-£73,721	-£73,721
Harris Academy	66	£79,556	£15,331	£232	£64,225	£0	£0	£64,225	£15,331	£58,390	-£15,331	2	-2	-£15,331	£58,390	-£73,721	-£15,331
Heartlands	972	£492,333	£123,170	£127	£369,163	£62	£293,987	£663,150	£170,817	£244,538	£170,817	27	35	£170,817	£244,538	-£73,721	£170,817
Highgate Wood	1,190	£437,557	£153,962	£129	£283,595	£23	£109,060	£392,655	£44,902	£28,819	-£44,902	33	-10	-£44,902	£28,819	-£73,721	-£44,902
Hornsey School	811	£358,829	£104,927	£129	£253,902	£13	£61,642	£315,544	£43,285	£30,437	-£43,285	22	-9	-£43,285	£30,436	-£73,721	-£43,285
Northumberland Park	1,035	£617,298	£133,908	£129	£483,390	£26	£123,285	£606,675	£10,623	£63,098	-£10,623	28	-2	-£10,623	£63,098	-£73,721	-£10,623
Park View	1,073	£604,113	£138,825	£129	£465,288	£23	£109,060	£574,348	£29,765	£43,956	-£29,765	29	-6	-£29,765	£43,956	-£73,721	-£29,765
St Thomas More	677	£340,528	£87,590	£129	£252,938	£6	£28,450	£281,388	£59,140	£14,582	-£59,140	19	-13	-£59,140	£14,581	-£73,721	-£59,140
Tottenham UTC	31	£44,557	£8,539	£275	£36,018	£2	£9,483	£45,501	£944	£74,666	£944	1	1	£944	£74,665	-£73,721	£944
Woodside High	809	£445,405	£104,668	£129	£340,737	£25	£118,543	£459,280	£13,875	£87,596	£13,875	22	3	£13,875	£87,596	-£73,721	£13,875
	11,074	£5,132,554	£1,441,486		£3,691,068	£304	£1,441,486	£5,132,554	£0	£958,375.08		304	0	£0	£958,373	-£958,373	£0

Notes:

1. EH&CPs encompasses both pupils with plans and pupils with statements.

£130.17
Average cost per pupil to produce £1,441,486 fund. **Entirely arbitrary, no consultation on this rate but "fortuitously" allows the scheme to operate by, ultimately, matching the Lump Sum!**

£5,132,554
The assumption here is - that every Statement/EHCP is fully funded, which is certainly not the case currently.

Take top slice fund and divide by 304.

Gives per pupil: (but note assumption above)

£4,741.73

2. Funded Pupil Numbers 2015-16
3. School Budget Share Information
4. Number of Statements Summer 2015.

To create an additional fund the "usual" way would be a straightforward top-slice and redistribution, with genuine winners and losers, all transparent and clear. BUT the stated motivation here is simply PUNITIVE, based on the notion that some schools are somehow not taking their "fair share" by allegedly controlling or influencing parental choice...

What happens next is that these NOTIONAL and ARBITRARY figures are turned into a reality. The DfE Guidelines mean that the wishes of the Steering Group cannot be implemented. Instead we now notionally add £73,721 to reduce the worst deficit figure to 0. This figure just happens to match the Lump Sum! This provides the necessary uplift such that when the £73,721 is wiped out from all schools the winners still win and the losers still lose. The harsh reality is that High Needs pupils disadvantaged by SEN with no statement/EHCP, late arrival in the country or EAL have been effectively robbed to support those who transferred into a secondary school with a Statement/EHCP who have seen, sadly along with every other pupil in the country, their funding reduced.

£73,721

The logic behind these figures is flawed. The methodology fails to acknowledge the IMPACT of parental choice and the NAMING of schools at Secondary Transfer. Unless and until the LEA directs pupils with Statements/EHCPs these figures are outside the control of schools. Including Heartlands' figures, with a specialist unit, makes no sense further compounding this iniquitous methodology.

This entire section is a wonderful piece of legerdemain! By creating an initial and notional "top slice" pot of £1,441,486 one set of winners and losers is produced. This would require just over £328,000 to be redistributed involving genuine budget cuts for 8 schools. This is outside DfE guidelines since this is genuine pupil funding generated by sensible formula. Instead the flat rate Lump Sum is taken from all schools, exactly matching the maximum budget cut required! The fund thus created is used to offset the budget cuts for all schools, except one, whilst ensuring that the full amount determined by the previous "notional" exercise comes to the winners in this exercise. In effect the very neediest children identified by well established criteria have been seriously disadvantaged to benefit those where a Statement/EHCP already gives them access to substantial additional funding.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Agenda Item
9**



Report Status

For information/note
For consultation & views
For decision

Report to Haringey Schools Forum – 3rd December 2015.

Report Title: Contract for Trade Union Facilities Time.

Authors:

Steve Worth – Finance Manager (Schools and Learning)
Contact: 0208 489 3708 Email: Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk

Purpose:

To present the draft contract for Trade Union Facilities Time for Forum comments and endorsement.

Recommendations:

That members endorse the proposed contract for Trade Union Facilities Time with academy schools in Haringey.

1. Introduction.

- 1.1. The national changes to school funding formula introduced in April 2013 required Local Authorities (LAs) to delegate funding for Trade Union facilities time to schools. It was permitted for LAs to recommend subsequent 'de-delegation' to create a central funding pot for this but this has to be agreed by school members of the local schools forum on a phase by phase basis.
- 1.2. De-delegation can only be from maintained schools and not academies or free schools. The de-delegation can only be through one of the locally agreed schools formula funding factors; in Haringey this is the basic per pupil element, also known as the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU).
- 1.3. Schools Forum at its meeting on 15 January 2015 agreed to de-delegate facilities time for both the primary and secondary sectors.
- 1.4. At the meeting the Forum was advised that a draft Service Level Agreement (SLA) would shortly be prepared and it was hoped that it would be attractive enough to encourage academies to buy into. Unfortunately the preparation of the SLA was delayed. It should be noted that an agreement between the Council and an academy would take the form of a contract rather than an SLA and a draft contract is now put before Forum for comment. It was also agreed that Forum should receive a report in due course on its effectiveness. For maintained schools it was noted that although there would not be a SLA the principles and standards would equally apply.
- 1.5. The draft contract and the supporting Employment Relations Protocol are attached.
- 1.6. At Schools Forum on 6th December 2012 the LA proposed that where de-delegation is approved by maintained schools, academies are also invited to buy into these services, at that time and on the same basis as the delegation i.e. all schools would be charged identically. Academies that decide to use the service at a later date would be charged a different rate reflecting both the actual costs of the service requested but also recognising that at times other than the point of de-delegation additional costs will have to be incurred to meet the additional demand. This approach is carried through to the costing methodology set out in Annex 1 on the assumption that academies and free school that accept by an agreed date will pay the de-delegation rate. Later joiners will be charged at a higher rate.

Annex 1.

Draft contract – with x academy school and TUs

1. Description of the Service

1.1 The service is provided to academies to pay for the provision of Trades Union representation for employees in their school.

1.2 By entering into the contract

- Accredited trade union representatives will provide trade union representation for staff on an individual and collective basis for a single charge to the school.
- The school will have access to experienced and skilled representatives who will work with the school to promote good employee relations.

2. The terms governing the contract are as follows:

2.1 The school will recognise Haringey trade union representatives for trade union duties as specified in the relevant legislation and ACAS Codes of Practice including Health & Safety duties.

The trades unions concerned are as follows:

Teaching	Support Staff
NUT	Unison
NASUWT	GMB
NAHT	Unite
ASCL	
ATL	

2.2 Trade union representatives will focus the use of their time, where possible, on statutory consultation and representation requirements that benefit both the employer and unions.

3. Agreed Protocols

3.1 From time to time the school/Local Authority and trades unions may take differing stances on particular issues; the disagreements will be dealt with professionally, focusing on the issue under discussion. An agreed Protocol (Annex 2) guides practice.

Accredited trade union representatives will have appropriate access to facilities in order to conduct their duties.

4. Costs.

4.1 Those academies and free schools that sign the contract within three weeks of its issue will be charged at the de-delegation rate of £4.69 (based on October 2014 census numbers) for the LA's financial year April 2015 to March 2016 and at the same rate as for maintained schools for the LA's financial year 2016-17.

4.2 Where an academy or free school has not agreed to make the necessary contribution to the Central Fund, it will be for the academy or free school to make its own arrangements as centrally funded representatives will not be funded by the Council to provide these services. Academies that decide to use the service at a later date would be charged a different rate reflecting both the actual costs of the service requested but also recognising that at times other than the point of de-delegation additional costs will have to be incurred to meet the additional demand.

5. Arrangements.

5.1 Full time facilities time arrangements will continue for existing representatives. However, newly elected representatives will not normally be released on a whole time basis for trade union duties. This will ensure that there is a balance between work and trade union duties and those representatives understand the workplace they are representing.

5.2 In the event that a trade union official granted seconded time off regularly fails to attend meetings or engage with managers or HR staff as required, the seconded time off will be reviewed and may be withdrawn at the discretion of the Council, following discussion with the relevant regional officer;

5.3 Time off arrangements will be reviewed on an annual basis, or more frequently if necessary depending upon available funding, operational experience, etc.

Annex 2.

Employment Relations Protocol for Teaching Associations/ Unions and Support staff unions

Introduction

Good employment relations are the cornerstone of managing change and people successfully in any organisation. This protocol sets out the principles for communications and engagement between stakeholders involved in running our schools. The aim is to secure a good education for our children and young people and to provide good working conditions for staff.

This protocol is not designed to replace the industrial relations frameworks and time off agreements that are already in place but they do supplement them.

Principles for engagement

Relevant stakeholders to this protocol recognise that effective employment relations takes place in an atmosphere of mutual respect for the professional expertise and a recognition and understanding of the various responsibilities, of those involved.

It is important for managers to have positive working relationships with employees, based on good communications. It is at this basic level that many issues are raised and resolved informally, without the need to invoke formal procedures. Employee representatives provide an additional channel for employees to communicate with managers, and vice versa.

Employee representatives should improve understanding, lead to better decision making and improve employment relations. Representatives should help to develop trust and cooperation, improve the quality of decisions and encourage employees to feel more responsible for the performance of a school, helping to understand and manage change.

To this end all stakeholders agree that any level of communication and engagement must be conducted in a way that is relevant and necessary, accurate and factual, fair and balanced, and not offensive in any way.

Communication and engagement should be conducted using appropriate communication lines and recognise the relevant hierarchies involved before considering escalation of an issue to a different stakeholder.

Stakeholder roles

In adhering to the principles it is important for each stakeholder to this protocol to understand the respective roles and accountabilities that each

party plays. More information is provided in the appendix to this protocol but the key roles of head teachers and unions are summarised below.

Trade unions are independent bodies certified by a statutory independent committee. Unions have a number of legal rights under statute/ employment law as follows:

- disclosure of information by the employer for collective bargaining purposes, including hours, pay and benefits information; policies on recruitment, redeployment, training, equalities, appraisal, health & safety; numbers employed by grade, department, location, age; financial cost structures.
- reasonable time off, with pay, for union officials to carry out union duties concerned with negotiations on terms and conditions of employment; engagement, non engagement, termination, suspension of workers; allocation of work or duties; matters of discipline or grievance.
- reasonable time off, with pay, for union reps to undergo training in aspects of industrial relations relevant to carrying out their trade union duties.
- consultation prior to redundancy
- consultation prior to business transfers (TUPE)

Note – the law provides workers with the right to be accompanied at disciplinary related hearings or grievance hearings. The worker may choose a companion or a trade union official to accompany him/her. The worker chooses the companion and the union chooses its officials. The employer has no right to choose who the particular companion or union rep is.

Head teachers have responsibility for managing the school including developing policy, goals and objectives for the adoption by the school governors. Head teachers are also responsible for providing detailed plans, procedures, schedules and specifications for daily operations in the school and actions to be taken by school staff.

Resolving Issues and Concerns

Where a stakeholder to this protocol considers that another party has breached the principles of this protocol, they will first raise this with the offending party and seek to resolve the issue informally.

If this does not result in a moderation/ alteration of the offending practice then the issue may be raised more formally with the Assistant Director for School Improvement or the Head of Human Resources of the Local Authority, as appropriate – see below.

Formal process – Level 1

The Assistant Director School Improvement or Head of Human Resources will investigate the issues raised with relevant parties and seek appropriate remedies/ changes to behaviour/ actions.

A failure to resolve the issues/ concerns at this level may result in raising the issue with the appropriate body the person is accountable to.

Level 2

The issue will be raised with the appropriate body the person is accountable to and they will seek appropriate remedies/ changes to behaviour/ actions to resolve the issue. The parties will receive written confirmation of any investigation and its subsequent recommendations.

Appendix

Stakeholders – roles and accountabilities

Stakeholder	Role	Accountability
Teacher Association/ Unions reps Support staff union reps	Trade unions are independent bodies certified by a statutory independent committee. Unions have a number of legal rights under statute/ employment law as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disclosure of information by the employer for collective bargaining purposes, including hours, pay and benefits information; policies on recruitment, redeployment, training, equalities, appraisal, health & safety; numbers employed by grade, department, location, age; financial cost structures. • reasonable time off, with pay, for union representatives to carry out union duties concerned with negotiations on terms and conditions of employment or the physical conditions in which workers are required to work; the engagement, non engagement, termination, suspension of workers; allocation of work or duties; matters of discipline or grievance. • reasonable time off, with pay, for union reps to undergo training in aspects of industrial relations relevant to carrying out their trade union duties. • consultation prior to redundancy • consultation and negotiation prior to business transfers (TUPE) • trade union membership – recruiting and organising. 	To their union members/ regional/ national bodies. For issues of misconduct to their employer.

Stakeholder	Role	Accountability
Head Teachers/ School leaders	<p>Developing policy, goals and objectives for the adoption by the school governors. Providing detailed plans, procedures, schedules and specifications for daily operations in the school and actions to be taken by school staff.</p> <p>More specifically the school teachers pay and conditions document provides that Head teachers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide overall strategic leadership and, with others, lead, develop and support the strategic direction, vision, values and priorities of the school. • Develop, implement and evaluate the school's policies, practices and procedures. • Lead and manage teaching and learning throughout the school. • Promote the safety and well-being of pupils and staff. • Ensure good order and discipline amongst pupils and staff. • Lead, manage and develop the school workforce, including appraising and managing performance. • Organise and deploy resources within the school. • Promote harmonious working relationships within the school. • Maintain relationships with organisations representing teachers and other members of the school's workforce. • Lead and manage the school's workforce with a proper regard for their well-being and legitimate expectations, including the expectation of a healthy balance between work and other commitments. • Promote the participation of staff in relevant continuing professional development. • Participate in arrangements for the appraisal and review of other teachers and support staff. • Decide whether a teacher at the school who applies for a post-threshold teacher assessment meets the relevant standards. • Consult and communicate with the governing body, staff, pupils, parents and carers. 	To the Governing body.

Stakeholder	Role	Accountability
School Governors	<p>Provide a strategic view for the school by establishing a vision, purpose and aims. Agree school improvement strategy, including statutory targets and appropriate budget/ staffing structures. Monitor and evaluate school performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role is NOT to get involved in the day to day operations/ running of the school. 	<p>To the LA/DfE for the way the school is run. And acting in the best interests of all the pupils in the school</p>
Councillors and the Lead Member for Children's Services (a statutory role)	<p>Responsible for the Local Authority vision for schools within the borough. Deal with policy matters for the local authority.</p> <p>The Lead Member for Children's Services has responsibility for children and young people receiving education or children's social care services in their area and all children looked after by the local authority or in custody (regardless of where they are placed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No councillor should get involved in operational matters related to the running of the school. 	<p>All members act on behalf of the Local Authority</p> <p>The Lead Member holds political responsibility for children's services</p>
Director of Children's Services (DCS) [a statutory role] and other DCS lead managers	<p>The DCS is appointed for the purposes of discharging the education and children's social services functions of the local authority. This includes (but is not limited to) responsibility for children and young people receiving education or children's social care services in their area and all children looked after by the local authority or in custody (regardless of where they are placed). This includes ensuring that the safety and the educational, social and emotional needs of children and young people are central to the local vision.</p> <p>Other relevant managers (usually reports to the DCS) also hold the above responsibilities.</p>	<p>Accountable for operational matters within Children's services to the council and Chief Executive.</p>
Human Resources	<p>HR advisors advise managers within the service how to conduct people management interventions and follow best practice in relation to people management.</p>	<p>HR advisors take professional responsibility for advice given but decision making needs to be held by relevant school leaders</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

CONCERNS RAISED BY A HEADTEACHER

Level one – Informal Process

Where the headteacher has a concern over the conduct of a borough level union representative when acting in his or her capacity as a trade union representative, as a first step, the headteacher will meet with that trade union representative to discuss those concerns with a view to reaching a resolution. By agreement, the parties may contact a paid trade union official or an official of the local authority or any other relevant party to assist in reaching a resolution.

Where the headteacher has a concern over the conduct of a school based union representative when acting in his or her capacity as a trade union representative, as a first step, the headteacher will meet with that trade union representative to discuss those concerns with a view to reaching a resolution. That school based representative may choose to be accompanied to the meeting by a trade union colleague.

All meetings will take place as soon as possible.

Level Two – Formal Process

Where it has not been possible to reach a resolution under Level One, then as a second step in any process, the headteacher will refer the concern to the Chair of the Schools Forum, Head of HR, Assistant Director Schools and Learning who will consider the merits of the complaint and, if appropriate, refer it to a paid official of the trade union. The official will meet with a designated Governor to reach a formal resolution. That meeting may be attended by the headteacher and elected trade union official. The resolution could include by agreement (but is not limited to):

- (i) mediation, including involvement of an external mediator;
- (ii) a recommendation as to the future conduct of the trade union representative;
- (iii) a recommendation as to the future management of issues arising between the headteacher and the trade union representative;
- (iv) no further action taken.

CONCERNS RAISED BY A TRADE UNION REPRESENTATIVE

Level one – Informal Process

Where a borough level or school based union representative has a concern over the conduct of a headteacher or a governor, which has arisen out of relations with that trade union, then as a first step this will be raised with the headteacher or governor to discuss. By agreement, the parties may contact a paid trade union official or an official of the local authority or any other relevant party to assist in reaching a resolution.

All meetings will take place as soon as possible.

Level two – Formal Process

Where it has not been possible to reach a resolution under Level One, then as a second step in any process, the trade union representative will refer the concern to the full time official at a regional level, who, if appropriate will liaise with the Chair of the Schools Forum, Head of HR, Assistant Director Schools and Learning who will consider the merits of the complaint and, if appropriate, refer it to a designated governor. The governor will meet with a paid trade union official to reach a formal resolution. That meeting may be attended by the headteacher and the trade union representative. The resolution could include by agreement (but is not limited to):

- (v) mediation, including involvement of an external mediator;
- (vi) a recommendation as to the future conduct of the headteacher;
- (vii) a recommendation as to the future management of issues arising between the trade union representative and the headteacher (or his or her representative);
- (viii) no further action taken.

This protocol will be reviewed in 12 months from [date to be agreed].



**Agenda Item
10**

**Report to Haringey Schools Forum –
3 December 2015**

Report Status

For information/note
 For consultation & views
 For decision

Report Title: Education Funding for Young People 19-25 years with SEND

Author: Vikki Monk Meyer – Head of Integrated Service for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

Contact: 0208 489 3190 Email: Vikki.monk-meyer@haringey.gov.uk

Purpose: To outline the requirements for consistent decision making around efficient use of resources in the area of SEND post 19 years education offer

Recommendations:

For the schools forum sub group to agree in principal to the criteria for education funding outlined in the report

Background Information

The Children and Families Act 2014 extended the right for young people to engage in Education with statutory support up to the age of 25 years, for those with an identified special educational need or disability which requires adjustments to be made for them.

Young people may require additional support with their learning if they have a Special Educational Need or Disability.

An SEN or disability is defined by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 as:

“...a physical or mental impairment which has substantial and long-term adverse effect on (the person’s) ability to carry out normal day to day functions”

A child is described as having a Special Educational Need (Section 312 Education Act 1996) if they have:

“a learning difficulty which calls for a special educational provision to be made for them. Children have a learning difficulty if they:

- a) have a significant greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of the same age: or
- b) have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for children of the same age in schools within the area of the local education authority
- c) are under compulsory school age and fall within the definition at (a) or (b) above and would do so if special educational provision is not made for them”

This paper outlines a proposal for how the funding can be used most effectively to support young people who will gain the most from an extended education opportunity.

The SEND Code of Practice 2014

The SEND code states that Young people with an Educational Health and Care plan have the right to request to stay within education at an establishment of their choice, subject to this being compatible with their continued educational outcomes being achieved. It also states that when a young person with SEND finishes within Education, it is expected that they will be able to use their skills to be gainfully employed and be as independent as possible. For those young people with significant learning difficulties, their transition to Adult Services should be smooth and well co-ordinated, and it should not place them at a significant disadvantage in reaching their desired outcomes, when they leave education.

The code outlines that Local Authorities have to be clear and transparent in their policies of the use of funding to support this extended statutory right.

Support in College

Young people over the age of 19 years who have an SEN or disability may require some level of reasonable adjustment which can be achieved at college through selection of the right courses or some additional support or supervision, through to those young people who will require substantial adjustment to remain within education. In the main, most young people with a special educational need or disability who want to attend college, can do so without significant adjustments being made for them. Their needs can be met from within the colleges local resources. This includes additional advice about study skills, mentoring and pastoral support, repetition of information or presentation of information a different way to allow better access.

The type of support that young person may require will differ in college from that required in school for a number of reasons including; smaller class sizes, more specific skills and knowledge to be learnt that is better matched to their interests and chosen outcomes, and a broader range of ways for their learning to be recognised e.g. more course work than exam

based outcomes. As a result of this, many young people who have had a statement during their school years do not require additional statutory support at college.

Colleges Funding Streams

Colleges are funded through three elements:

Element 1 available to support all learners in their course equal to approximately £4,000. This amount is delegated directly to the college

Element 2 provided through the education funding agencies to the college to fund the addition support required by a wide range of learners with special educational needs, up to the value of £6,000

Element 3 provided by the young person’s Local Authority to support learners in education who require support and adjustments over and above that usually available within the college course. The amount of element 3 funding per student is agreed between the young person, college and the council and will be represented within the young person’s Education Health and Care plan

Currently any Young Person with SEND can request, or have requested on their behalf, an extension of their education placement or a return to education.

The extended option for education is an opportunity to offer some targeted support to those young people who may have missed education, or take longer to reach educational milestones, for instance those with ADHD, high level Autism, mental health difficulties, and who may not be able to easily access training or employment without additional education.

Element 3 Funding up to 25 years

There is no additional funding available to support the increased age range and offer of education for young people with SEND. This means that capacity needs to be found within the current high needs block dedicated schools grant for this additional cohort of young people.

The high needs block budget for the age range of 16- 21 year olds was approximately £2,500,000 and additionally £1,400,000 on young people in out-borough and independent settings. This covered 468 numbers of young people.

The 16+ line on the High Needs Block has over spent this year.

Table below shows proportion of funding to date:

Age of Young People	Number of Young People in Age Range	Approximate Costs
17-19 years	305	£3,600,000
20-24 years	68	£905,000
22-24 years	24	£252,000

The numbers of young people remaining within education shows a potentially increasing trajectory, with a small proportion of the young people receiving a higher level of funding as the age ranges increase. To ensure that the services delivered are effective and also achieving the intended out comes for the young people, there need to be a range of key principles on which the funding for young people is based and then shared with the young people themselves, parents and colleges.

There are a number of options to ensure the increased duties are met, and the High Needs Block remains within budget.

A key principal approach is described below.

Decision Making for Agreement of Top Up Funding

Decision making around additional 'top up' funding for post 19 education services for a young person should take into account a number of factors. This includes reaching an agreement with a young person on whether the council will agree to fund the top up on a course when they are accessing education.

If the young person is receiving services from adult services, any educational costs would need to be agreed between Health, Education and Social Care, dependent on the agencies involved with the young person in adulthood.

Factors to be considered include:

- The desired outcomes for the young person – can these be achieved by the young person via the colleges differentiation of materials and teaching.
- The college will need to demonstrate that they have already made reasonable adjustments to support the young person, and that these are equal to or above £6,000.
- The course is appropriate for that young person's aspirations and outcomes
- The level of and type of support is going to be effective in achieving the young persons' desired outcome

From the information provided, the young person will be eligible for continued education funding if:

- The young person is continuing to make progress in their learning
- The young person is motivated by, and interested in the course requested as shown by their proactive choice of course.
- The course they have selected is shown to be appropriate for their interests and desired outcomes
- The course they have selected is appropriate for their skills and abilities as shown by previous academic achievements
- The course they have selected will add to their skills and knowledge in a productive way

Funding for courses may not be agreed if:

- In order to achieve progress in the course, the young person is additionally tutored for the majority of the time

- The young person does not have capacity to demonstrate engagement in the learning experienced during the course, as assessed through a mental capacity assessment
- The young person has already completed the course once, and is not demonstrating progression
- The course does not appear to be of interest to the young person

Young People Receiving a Service from the Adult's Social Care.

For those young people who also have services from Adults Social Care, there is an interaction between the services that would be considered to meet the young person social care needs, and the skills and knowledge they would like to achieve by attending a course of study.

The young person capacity to make decisions around their choice of course may need to be assessed, in order to ensure that they are proactively engaging in their choice. The young person would need to show that they understood that they were in the process of learning a new skill, and that they would be able to gain from the outcome e.g. knowing how much money to take to a shop to purchase an item of food. Knowing if they should expect change and roughly how much.

Advocacy should be offered where necessary.

The decision making around whether to agree educational funding is a joint agreement between the Council's Children's Services for Education, the Council's Adult Social Services, and the Clinical Commissioning Group for any young person who is also receiving services from these agencies.

Whilst there is an interaction between the outcomes agreed with a young person around their education needs and their social care needs, for the majority of those young people with profound or significant learning difficulties, it is anticipated that their desired outcomes will be met, in the main, through a social care package provided by the Adult Learning Disabilities Combined Team.

What happens if Funding is not agreed?

Where funding for additional support in education is not agreed, the young person will be advised clearly why this has been the case, and advice on reasonable adjustments or alternative courses or pathways given. The anticipated outcome of funding not being agreed would depend on the individual and may range from:

- The young person choosing an alternative course
- The young person attending their chosen course with support available from with the college but no requirement for top up funding
- The young person engaging with an alternative offer of daily experiences e.g. day opportunities offered through health or social care.

Requirements of services arising from this paper:

- Assessment of Mental Capacity – Social Care/Educational Psychology
- Choosing appropriate courses – provision mapping, careers guidance for those with SEND
- Assessment of learning styles and progress - Educational Psychology/Teaching advisory services for those over 19 years

This report should be read in conjunction with the Adult Strategy for enablement

This page is intentionally left blank



Schools Forum Early Years Working Group

Date: 12th October 2015

Location: Room G7, PDC

Time: 1.30– 3.00pm

Name	Designation/ Representation
Melian Mansfield (MM)	CHAIR
Melanie Widnall (MW)	Early Years Quality
Charles Cato (CC)	Early Years Finance
Dawn Ferdinand (DF)	
Jennifer Mclean (JM)	Two Year Old Programme Manager
Ngozi Anuforo (NA)	Early Years Commissioning Manager
Christine Yianni (CY)	Early Years Commissioning / Business Support Officer
Steve Worth (SW)	Finance Manager
Nick Hewlett	Early Years Interim Principal Advisor
Diane Richardson (DR)	Pembury Children's Centre Business Manager
Susan Tudor-Hart (STH)	PVI Settings Rep- Schools Forum
Zena Brabazon (ZB)	Governor Seven Sisters School and South Grove Children Centre
Julie Vaggers (JV)	Head of Rowland Hill Nursery & Children's Centre
Others Present	
Lineth Hypolite-Lett	Locum Clerk

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting.
- 1.2 An apology for absence was received in advance of the meeting from Duwan Farquharson.

2. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

- 2.1 The minutes of the SF-EYWG meeting held on 29th June 2015 had been circulated to the group prior to the meeting which were noted and confirmed as a correct record of the meeting subject to the following amendments:
 - 2.2 **[3.3]:** delete the last sentence.
 - 2.3 **[3.3]:** delete action point
 - 2.4 **[4.3.point 2]:** remove information in brackets

ZB joined the meeting at this point.

2.2 Matters arising

- 2.2.1 **[3.4 ACTION]:** NA advised the Forum that the information had since been updated and a copy of the report will be sent to members electronically after today's meeting.

ACTION LA to email Update on the delivery of the free education entitlement for eligible two year olds in Haringey

- 2.2.2 [3.10]: MM said that she had contacted both Catherine West and David Lammy about the implementation of an increase of 25 free hours.
- 2.2.3 [3.11]: DF was not present to give an update on his action point to capture initial thoughts on vulnerable children in the wider strategy. Therefore, this action point was deferred to the next meeting.

3. STANDING ITEM DfE UPDATE: 30 HOURS EXTENSION

- 3.1 NA proceeded to take members through a presentation on an update on the government's approach in terms of the delivery of the free education for two year olds.
- 3.2 A cost survey had been issued with a closing date of 10th August 2015 for all feedback received. It was noted that there had been 70% of local authority (LA) involvement. Early implementation (2016) meant that any LA and individual providers would be invited to express an interest early in September. In terms of expressing an interest there was a concern raised in relation to other providers expressing an interest after a problem that occurred during a meeting about this issue. NA suggested that to clarify to those concerned that transparency of LAs would be useful for others to know. ZB further suggested that NA could write to those groups and STH as Convener of The Schools' Forum could undertake the distribution of it.

ACTION NA to draft letter / STH to distribute

- 3.3 MM wanted to determine the response from schools. NA indicated that that a letter will be sent to all schools including childminders. She further advised members that the government will go back to the House of Lords with the outcome of the consultation.
- 3.4 Continuing with the presentation, NA summarized headlines from the Childcare Policy Statement. It was noted however, that eligibility criteria for statutory sick pay did not state the length of time. There will be a similar checking process through DWP.
- 3.5 Under the Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Act, childminders can work either in school settings or other non-domestic premises. It was noted that some childminders felt that this could in effect cause difficulties for the childminder as the role is a home based one. Members discussed this matter after which it was deemed that the process would enable childminders to come together. Another element noted was that LAs will be expected to provide information to parents and regularly report on the take up of provision. ZB stated that she had explored the Haringey website and she could not find any information relating to childcare. In addition to that, she did not find the website to be particularly user friendly especially in terms of parents trying access information. It was noted that Nursery school links had since been added.
- 3.6 Members discussed the information described in the Delivering 30 hours free childcare: A road map to September 2017 map. Questions were raised in relation to timescales being feasible and the rate of pay. NA advised members that time will be stretched. She further indicated that information on the rate of pay will be available in November. There was a concern that once implemented, the new system may decrease numbers by half. It was noted that the provision was not mandatory for parents to take up although the LA must provide what is expected of them. In terms of an option to provide 15 hours as opposed to the full 30 hours, NA confirmed that the matter could not be confirmed until the new statutory guidance is received. A comment was made suggesting that due to the new 30 hours, some minders had already lost places. It was felt that 15 hours allowed for more flexibility. CC indicated that clarity was still needed on the funding rates for those that qualify for just 15 hours. DR was concerned about a gap in achievement as some of those children can actually benefit from the whole 30 hours but do not actually qualify. A question raised about the eligibility of a single parent with a SEN need will be investigated and reported back on by NA.

ACTION NA to investigate eligibility for single parents with an SEN requirement at a meeting due to be held this Thursday

3.7 **Key steps and timeline** - members noted that the LA was in the process of considering all the demands and what the implications were. Members were made aware that a lot of work was involved.

3.8 **Emerging project work stream** – The LA intend to commence small group workshops to look at issues and dynamics from now until the end of the year. ZB raised the matter of the minimum wage that was due to rise to £7.20 per hour in the spring and also the pension increase. This would impact on some providers being unable to contain those increases. MM volunteered to investigate whether the House of Lords had finished its committee phase.

ACTION MM to investigate if the House of Lords has finished its committee phase

3.9 The LAs aim is to create lots of opportunity to speak with parents, schools and all other stakeholders. The challenge noted however, was in receiving pieces of information from parliament.

3.10 **Childcare Sufficiency Assessment: Some key findings** – There had been a lack of demand even though many parents were eligible for a free place. In addition, there still remains a disparity between east and west of the borough. The LA is exploring more variations. Members felt that the findings thus far had proved to be very useful. MM felt that it would be very useful for providers to see the presentation slides. In response NA indicated that providers would be invited to a smaller group meeting.

JV arrived at this point of the meeting.

3.11 NA was requested to investigate the following:

- The issue of the minimum wage as discussed in item 3.8
- A change in parent circumstances
- Further information on the disparity between the east and west of the borough
- The concern of people being made redundant

ACTION N/A to raise points above at the meeting due to be held this Thursday

NH gave apologies and left at this point of the meeting

4. REVIEW OF EYSFF AND DISCUSSION

CC presented on the Early Years Single Formula and highlighted the following key areas:

4.1 **EYSFF Principles early thinking** - One of the council's requirements is to ensure that provision is sustainable. The LA has proposed a supplement of 20% for the most deprived complimentary to EYPP. CC informed members that a discussion was had on how the entitlement would be linked to the child and no longer the child's postcode. It was noted that there was a need to have an SEN supplement to support children that fall into the category of falling behind the threshold. CC further indicated that discussions would be had on what the profile should be.

4.2 It was noted that DF has a list of 20 children with a high level of need who will require more than the usual level of resources and support. NA said that the whole response will be scrutinized to ensure that staff are fully supported and that provision is adequate, such as SLT provision.

- 4.3 STH was concerned about targeting areas of high deprivation. She was of the view that a benchmark supplement was limited in terms of need and that it should be based on an individual need across the borough. NA implied that by default there will always be a geographic dynamics to it. ZB raised a further issue in terms of a new index of deprivation. She stated that the LA has now gone down the list and is no longer in the top 20. She felt that the percentage may need to be assessed and move up from 20% to 30%. NA agreed to send out the paper to all members. Members further resolved that there was a need to reduce inequality and widen access. Further discussion took place after which, it was agreed that this matter be included as a standard item on future agendas.

ACTION NA to send out paper on the proposed supplement to members

ACTION Clerk to add as a standard item on the agenda until further notice

5. TWO YEAR OLD PROGRAMME UPDATE

- 5.1 An update summarised by NA was circulated at the meeting as follows:

- Score cards have been produced and the LA is being benchmarked with its neighbouring LAs.
- Last count suggested that there had been a take up of 832 as at 5th October. It appears to fluctuate as there were 808 in June.
- Providers are being provided with lists of families to enable them to target those families.

- 5.2 JV expressed concern about the evidence of not enough 2 year olds available to take up places. She said that Rowland Hill could not fill vacant places. NA said that some families had moved and some did not show any interest in taking up the offer. JV further commented that the provision in White Hart Lane had above the required needed provision. ZB added that housing issues also posed a concern in terms of how it will impact on parents. NA indicated there will be a census on the children that meet the criteria.

6. EYPP UPDATE – TRIBAL SYSTEM AND CENSUS

- 6.1 All providers had been notified of all the children and cash flow. Forms have been upgraded to include the details of child/parents. It was noted that the deadline submitting the information on time. As more clarity on the process was required, NA said that she would undertake to send dates out to members.

ACTION NA to email details on the expectation of the process.

- 6.2 It was noted that the LA intends to explore how best to work with schools in the future as they will all using different systems from April onwards. November 5th was highlighted as a key dated for autumn data collection for all funded children. Private providers will be receiving a form that is to be completed before the deadline. It was further noted that a new portal will be more simplified for schools. Members noted that the launch date to schools should read January 2016.

ACTION LA to amend launch date to January 2016

- 6.3 ZB inquired whether the report on 2 year olds in relation to children's' centres providing 12% of places will be raised. The answer was yes. ZB further raised the matter of having a clear indication in the manager's report that by cutting centre managers could impact on the two year olds. NA agreed and confirmed that the information will be included. She further indicated that she would speak with Steve Worth about the funding formula in terms of the date of the meeting.

ACTION LA to raise ZB's concerns as noted above / NA to liaise with SW regarding funding formula in respect to meeting date

DF left at this point of the meeting.

7 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 01 December 10am-12noon (**moved from 18th November – room tbc ACTION: Clerk**)
- 5 Jan: 9.30am-11.30am – G6
- 10 Feb: 1-3pm – G7
- 16 March: 1-3pm – G6
- 27 April: 9.30-11.30am – G6
- 15 June: 9.30-11.30am – G7
- 14 July: 1-3pm – G6

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 There was no any other business discussed

The Chair thanked everyone for attending. The meeting closed at 3:15pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

High Needs Block Sub-Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on
13TH November 2015 10am-12 noon. Civic Centre

Present

Martin Doyle – Chair Head Teacher Riverside School
Vikki Monk-Meyer: Head of Service Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
Deborah Tucker: Alternative Provisions Commissioning Lead
Margaret Sumner: Headteacher The Brook
Mike McKenzie: Headteacher APS
Steve Worth: Schools Finance
Katherine Heffernan: Children & Schools Finance Head of Service
Marva Burnett: Minute taker (PA Vikki Monk-Meyer)
Melian Mansfield- Early Years
Fatima (observer)

Apologies Received from:

Mike Connor: Riverside Governors
Tony Hartney : Chair of schools forum and head teacher Gladesmore School
Marion McCarthy: Heartlands Governor -Apologies
Herbie Spence: 6th Form Centre Head of Centre - apologies

1. Feedback from previous minutes

- 1.1 The notes of 22nd September were agreed as a correct record of the meeting. It was discussed to re-name the working part as the sub-committee.
- 1.2 The 30 hours childcare sufficiency discussion will be carried over until the November meeting as Ngozi is unable to attend today – Vikki to speak to Ngozi.
- 1.3 Minutes to go to school forum for 3rd December
- 1.4. Previous items

Outreach support from the Octagon to primary schools was unfortunately rejected by schools forum.

Consultation for element 2 funding changes for secondary schools is in consultation. 5 out of 12 schools have responded.

The proposals for Children’s Centre went to cabinet and was agreed. There is a short period of ‘cooling off’ where there can be challenges on technical grounds. This closes on the 23rd November 2015.

2. High Needs Block Monitoring statement – Steve Worth

2.1 Steve circulated his paper regarding Financial Year to October 2015 (Period 7) and this was discussed. There is a projected over spend of 475K overall. The statement was discussed line by line.

2.3 Pathway to Early Intervention.

This is 395K of which 130K was attributed to this line as part of the Early Years service to children to currently in the children's centre. The outreach service has not started due to the changes in the configuration of the children's centres planned places. This work has paused and will re-commence once the re-structure has finished. The unspent funds on this line are offsetting spends in mainstream schools, which does include top up to nurseries and some children with highly complex needs in pre-school settings in a planned place.

2.4 Bring in fund.

The spend on this line was held pending information on whether the new heartlands Autism School places would need to be funded from within the high needs block. There has been recent information from the education funding agency to say that these places will be funded from outside the high needs block. To date 130K has been spent from this line, representing the top up for children with EHC's/statements attending the Octagon

Unspent funds on this line are creating a buffer to reduce the over spend on other lines. Now the situation is clear with Heartlands this line can be used to create local resource.

2.5 E41215 – Simmons house - Met with last year and agreed budget of £180k, projecting overspent of 14,000

2.6 E41217 – Tuition Service - Tuition service is classed as a school. The Tuition Centre is working with Camh's , commissioning and SEN to draw up a proposals for offering a bespoke curriculum for a small number of complex children with BESD/Mental Health needs currently educated out borough.

2.7 E41248 – SEN – Transport – This budget is fully allocated and supports a council budget of 2,555, 000. The non DSG budget is overspent overall by 81K. This is an improved position from April 2015, with was 250K overspend. There is a project to provide different ways of providing transport e.g. muster points (central point of pick up) , increased independent travel offer and use of personal budgets for travel/transport.

- 2.8 E41250 – LOVAAS (Applied Behavioural Analysis)– historical budget, Martin Doyle asked for a breakdown of how this was used.
- 2.9 E41260 – Independent & Voluntary schools. This is used for children 5-25 years in independent and voluntary schools. This budget should reduce when Heartlands Free School opens. This line includes independent and voluntary schools for over 16 year olds. The group requested drill down information in this area:
- List of schools and cots
 - Age of child
 - The child's needs and reason for placements.
- 2.10 E41283 - Special Schools top up. This is over budget as the schools have been funded for increased places, this also includes children in maintained special schools in other boroughs
- 2.11 E41284 - Top up mainstream schools. This also represents the top up for children in Haringey mainstream and maintained mainstream schools in other boroughs. There was a question about what rate was paid to other boroughs, which was largely similar to Haringey's top up. There were 151 new EHC agreed from Sept – Nov this year and their new top up's were included. There were no statements/EHC's ceased this year as requested at annual review by schools. Other boroughs approaches to this were discussed, and there was a proposal to look at some of the statements and EHC's with lower top up and challenge if these were still required if in place for some time. It was outlined that there was no 'growth' within the HNB which means that all increases in lines need to be found from within the HNB itself.
- 2.12 E41286 Higher Education Top Up. This is the top up line for those children over 16 years to 25 years. There is considerable pressure here which is likely to increase over time. Eligibility criteria and a local approach should be agreed. (see paper).
- 2.13 E42002 – Integrated Work & Family Sup

This funding goes towards family support and early help and is managed by Gareth Morgan overseen by Gill Gibson.

3. **Proposals for management of increased education duties to 25 years** – Vikki introduced a paper that outlined proposals for eligibility criteria for education of young people with SEND over 19 years. The paper was in draft form. Areas for clarification:

- Can the young people still access education without top up? 6K EFA funding should be used
- Why is mental capacity important when accessing education? VMM outlined the overlap between social care outcomes as a result of the care act and the education outcomes

that might be proposed for a young person with profound learning difficulties. The difference may be the young person's awareness of the fact that they are learning and applying a new skill.

- The paper needed more clarity about what was a college responsibility and what would be funded through top up

VMM outlined that all young people known to adult's services would need joint agreement from adults services and potentially the CCG for ongoing education placements. Individual young peoples' provision would therefore have to be agreed as part of their transition. For those young people who have not had an opportunity to access education, this could be an opportunity to return with a higher level of support e.g. those under YOS services.

4. **Options for use of Tuition** – Deborah Tucker and Gordon McEwan outlined a proposal being explored to extend the use of the tuition centre for those with more complex needs. This would include the use of the Bruce Grove Centre to provide an individual curriculum. The tuition centre is registered as a schools so a change in registration should not be necessary. Current work is ongoing to fully cost out what this type provision would look like e.g. Camh's, Teaching, therapies, support staff and use of Bruce Grove.
5. Work plans updates discussed

6. AOB

- 6.1 The date of the next HNB meeting is 8th January 2016 10am-12 noon. Venue TBC.

**Agenda Item
12**



Report Status

For information/note
For consultation & views
For decision

Report to Haringey Schools Forum –Thursday 3rd December 2015

Report Title: Updated Schools Forum Work Plan 2015-16.

Author:

Steve Worth – Finance Manager (Schools and Learning)
Contact: 0208 489 3708 Email: Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk

Purpose: To inform the Forum of the updated work plan for 2015-16 and provide members with an opportunity to add additional items.

Recommendations:

That the updated work plan for 2015-16 is noted.

1. Schools Forum

- 1.1. It is good practice for Schools Forum to maintain a work plan so that members ensure that key issues are considered in a robust and timely way.
- 1.2. Members of the Forum are asked to consider whether there are any additional issues that should be added to the work plan for the next Academic Year.
- 1.3. This work plan will be included on the agenda for each future meeting so that members are able to review progress and make appropriate updates.

Haringey Schools Forum - Work Plan Academic Year 2015-16

14 January 2016

- Update on Dedicated Schools Budget Strategy 2016-17.
- Early Years Block 2016-17.
- Growth Fund.
- Early Help and Preventative Services.
- Update from Working Parties.

25 February 2016

- Scheme for Financing Schools.
- Update on Dedicated Schools Budget Strategy 2016-17.
- High Needs Block 2016-17.
- The Schools Internal Audit Programme.
- Update from Working Parties.

19 May 2016

- Future School Funding Arrangements.
- Arrangements for the education of pupils with special educational needs.
- Administrative arrangements for the allocation of central government grants paid to schools via the authority.
- Early Help and Preventative Services.
- Update from Working Parties.

30 June 2016

- Future School Funding Arrangements.
- Dedicated Schools Budget Outturn 2015-16.
- Outcome of Internal Audit Programme 2014-15.
- Forum Membership
- Update from Working Parties.
- Work plan 2016-17

This page is intentionally left blank