

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
THURSDAY 05 DECEMBER 2019 AT 4pm**

School Members		
Headteachers		
Special (1)	Martin Doyle (Riverside)	
Nursery Schools (1)	Peter Catling (Woodlands Park)	
Primary (7)	Mary Gardiner (West Green)	Vacancy
	(A)Stephen McNicholas (St John Vianney)	Paul Murphy (Lancasterian)
	Emma Murray (Seven Sisters)	Linda Sarr (Risley Avenue)
	Will Wawn (Bounds Green)	
Secondary (2)	Andy Webster (Park View)	Tony Hartney (Gladesmore)
Primary Academy (1)	Sharon Easton (St Pauls & All Hallows)	
Secondary Academies (2)	Gerry Robinson (Woodside)	Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)
Alternative Provision (1)	(A)Patricia Davies	
Governors		
Special (1)	Jean Brown (The Vale)	
Nursery Centres (1)	Melian Mansfield (Pembury)	
Primary (7)	Laura Butterfield (Coldfall)	
	Hannah D'Aguiar (Chestnuts Primary)	John Keever (Seven Sisters)
	Jenny Thomas (Lordship Lane)	Julie Davies (Tiverton)
	Vacancy	
Secondary (2)	*Johanna Hinshelwood (Hornsey Girls)	Vacancy
	Sylvia Dobie (Park View)	
Primary Academy (1)	Vacancy	
Secondary Academies (3)	Noreen Graham (Woodside)	Vacancy
Non-School Members		
Non-Executive Councillor	CLlr Daniel Stone	
Trade Union Representative	(A)Pat Forward, Sean Fox	
Professional Association Representative	(A)Ed Harlow	
Faith Schools	Geraldine Gallagher	
14-19 Partnership	Kurt Hintz	
Early Years Providers	Susan Tudor-Hart	
Observers		
Cabinet Member for CYPS	CLlr Zena Brabazon	
Also Attending		
LBH Director of Children's Services	Ann Graham	
Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership (HEP)	James Page	
LBH Assistant Director, Schools & Learning	Eveleen Riordan	
LBH Head of SEN & Disability	Vikki Monk-Myer	
LBH Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help & Culture	Ngozi Anuforo	
LBH Assistant Director Commissioning	Charlotte Pomery	
LBH Head of Early Help & Prevention	Martin Clemence	
LBH Head of Audit & Risk Management	Minesh Jani/Jerry Barton	
LBH Head of Finance & Business Partners	Paul Durrant	
LBH Finance Business Partner (Schools & Learning)	Muhammad Ali	
LBH Service Improvement Manager	Karen Oellermann	
Lead for Governor Services (HEP)	Carolyn Banks	
HEP Clerk (Minutes)	Felicity Baird	

(A) = Apologies given

* = Asterisk denotes absence

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT / DECISION	ACTION ASSIGNED TO
1.	CHAIR'S WELCOME	
1.1	The Chair opened the meeting, and welcomed Martin Clemence, LBH Head of Early Help and Prevention to his first Schools Forum meeting.	
2.	APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS	
2.1	The meeting was quorate.	
2.2	Apologies were received from: Stephen McNicholas, Ed Harlow, Cllrs Davies and Brazabon, Paul Durrant, Pat Ford, Patricia Davies. Sean Fox was standing in for Pat Ford	
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.1	There were none.	
4.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 05 DECEMBER 2019	
4.1	It was noted that Peter Catling had been marked as absent from the last meeting in error; he had attended.	
4.2	The Minutes of the meeting on 5 December 2019 were agreed.	
5.	MATTERS ARISING	
5.1	(6.3) The AP Review would be on the agenda of the meeting on 16 January 2020.	
5.2	(6.1/6.2) HNB: This year the Schools Forum had agreed to make the transfer; a full report back to the Forum on the position would take place at January's meeting. No further transfer of funds was to take place than what had already been agreed.	
5.3	(8.4) It was noted that the method statement regarding overspend was included in the report. There was a need to look at the deficit recovery plan and a project focused on reducing the high needs spend had begun and would run alongside the deficit recovery plan. Further information would come from the LA at January's meeting.	
5.4	(8.9) A member queried the £60k to be allocated to Pembury House. It was confirmed that the amount was not finalised because the allocations had not been received. Once the indicative allocations for 2020/21 were known the amount would be finalised.	
6.	DEDICATED SCHOOLS BUDGET MODELLING FOR 2020-21 AND CENTRAL SCHOOLS SERVICES BLOCK ALLOCATION FOR 2020-21	
6.1	The Forum was given an update: that the LA had reinstated the Schools Funding Working Group with some Headteachers, and was looking to build a number of models. Options could be found in Apx A1. Following the general election, a consultation would open and a link would clarify what individual schools would receive. The new figures from the SFA would be added.	
6.2	WW stated that the LA needed to look at the significant disparities in the borough between the national funding formula averages and the local averages and noted his concern for the coming financial year for Primary Schools, adding that when the new funding formula comes in movement would	

	<p>be limited and the LA would have to look elsewhere for funding. LS noted that in addition to funding issues and the primary/secondary funding ratio, primaries were struggling to meet the needs of the increasing number of children with SEND, noting that in a class of 30 pupils at her school, more than a 5th were in need of SEND support. The Chair noted this was a matter that had a history and was shaped by PAN numbers in secondary schools based on class sizes of 27.</p> <p>The Director of Children’s Services informed all she was not aware of the historical background of this in the borough and welcomed dialogue with those involved as a start to look at a way forward. It was noted that Directors at the LA were lobbying central government for additional funding.</p>	
6.3	<p>MM stated that academies had to make a financial submission to highlight any potential financial issues and suggested the practice could be undertaken by at-risk schools. LA noted that schools already undertook a similar task, which was a useful exercise but that the number of children with SEN was increasing, adding strain to schools.</p>	
6.4	<p>ST-H asked members to look at the EYFS perspective, noting that if schools did not transfer to the EY Block, it would impact on those 2 year olds identified as most in need and asked members to consider this if schools did not spend 0.25% for these 2 year olds.</p> <p>Q: Has the LA discussed CSB? A: This will come to the January meeting.</p>	
6.5	<p>The Chair asked for members’ confirmation to proceed with the consultation as planned. This was agreed.</p>	
6.6	<p>The Education Welfare Funding was agreed in principle at the last meeting. The Forum agreed to formally approved the recommendation from the previous meeting.</p>	
7.	<p>HIGH NEEDS BLOCK OPTIONS APPRAISAL</p>	
7.1	<p>There was a predicted deficit of £5.7M, which did not include £300k of 0.25% transferred to the EY Block. It was noted there was a need for the Forum to discuss the AP Review. Decisions on the High Needs Block options could be made at the Forum’s meeting in January.</p>	
7.2	<p>It was noted that the LA’s overall strategy was to maximise the SEND places in schools/colleges. Funding was currently for 73 special school places at all ages. Collaborative work across Early Help/Youth Work was taking place. There was an increase in requests for funding for SEND college places.</p> <p>The higher education top-up had reduced in its prediction by £400k; ensuring there were local college places for SEND children reduced overall costs.</p> <p>Additional alternative provision funding had been put in however this was not a transparent pathway, and needed to be clearer when setting next year’s budget. The options appraisal would be assisted by the AP review.</p>	
7.3	<p>The Chair confirmed the Forum noted the report and asked members to raise any questions.</p> <p>LB stated more input was needed from secondary school Heads, that the AP Review had taken a very long time and the Tuition Service was overwhelmed at present.</p>	

	<p>It was clarified that the average residential rate costed between £180-300k annually. VMM stated that children's outcomes were no better when they were sent out of the borough, it was just a more expensive option, and there was a need for additional family support.</p> <p>Q: What are the checks to ensure that we do not slip into an over-reliance on special schools? A: (MC) Primary and secondary transfers are hard for families. My team will work to ensure an over-reliance does not happen.</p>	
7.4	<p>Members discussed the inadequate funding for SEN and agreed that the best place for most children with EHCPs was in mainstream settings. It was noted that most schools met their local families' needs regarding SEND, but that the LA should look into why not all secondary schools were meeting the needs of these children. It was noted that SEND children brought with them a loss of money for a school, creating both a financial and emotional stress. The Chair said there was a need for an AP update.</p>	
7.5	<p>Members thanked VMM for her work at the LA on SEND.</p>	
8.	<p>EARLY HELP AND PREVENTATIVE SERVICES UPDATE (VERBAL REPORT)</p>	
8.1	<p>AG presented on Early Help. A whole-system review had been requested; after looking at social care, the AP review, there was a need to look at the Early Help service. A new borough plan for the Early Help team came into effect from March 2019 and focused on the importance of early help, alternative provision, SEND, youth at risk, safeguarding, housing, employment and community wealth building. It was noted that all 3 Ofsted inspections since 2012 stated that Early Help needed further work.</p>	
8.2	<p>A draft Early Help strategy had been created, joining agencies together with a view to improve information sharing. AG welcomed engagement from Forum members, noting that an Early Help delivery group would be set up to drive changes.</p>	
8.3	<p>CP presented on the AP Review and asked for more secondary Head representation in the AP Review. The AP Review Steering Group was well-populated but with some gaps, particularly from the secondary sector. She noted that the review had taken time, which needed a whole-system approach, further work on community engagement and a strong link with SEN. It was reported the AP Review was focused on needs rather than behaviours, and the importance of early intervention.</p>	
8.4	<p>It was reported that Haringey was a roll-out borough for Trailblazer funding competition, and the LA was looking at take advantage of various funding sources.</p>	
8.5	<p>Work was taking place on arrangements for the succession of the Octogan Pru, and there was a need for a range of providers and courses.</p>	
8.6	<p>Q: How is the work of children centres incorporated? A: The strategy will be taken to all settings.</p>	
8.7	<p>WW stated he would like to see the CSB funding lines in the report for transparency.</p> <p>VMM noted the importance of interlinking each part of the report, merging Early Help, Early Years and SEN to create a Youth at Risk piece, to clarify where all funding was going.</p>	

8.8	Q: Can we be assured there will be a PRU provision in September 2020? A: There will be. TBAP has only been extended for 1 year.	
9.	WORK PLAN 2019-20	
10.	UPDATE FROM WORKING PARTIES	
10.1	<u>Early Years Working Group</u> NA reported the LA had received an increase in the funding rate for 3-4 years olds from £5.66 to 5.74 per child, with the same increase for 2 year olds (despite 2 year olds requiring double the ratio of staff). The Working Group had discussed what to do with the additional 8p and was inclined to push it onto the base rate; this would be decided after the election.	
10.2	Members noted the importance of the work and quality of the team, all settings were either good or outstanding. NA noted there was a consistent need to capture census data accurately. The allocation of funding for 2year olds was based on actual numbers from the previous year. There was an impact across London as a result of universal benefit changes.	
10.3	The proposal recommended by the Early Years Working Group adding 8p to the rate was agreed.	
11.	INFORMATION ITEMS	
12.	ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS	
13.	DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS	
13.1	16 January 2020; 27 February 2020; 25 June 2020.	
	There was no further business, therefore the meeting closed at 6pm.	