

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING  
THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2021 AT 4pm**

| <b>School Members</b>                                   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Headteachers</b>                                     |  |   |
| <b>Special (1)</b>                                      | Martin Doyle (Riverside)                                       |   |
| <b>Nursery Schools (1)</b>                              | Sian McDermott<br>(Rowland Hill Nursery and Children's Centre) |   |
| <b>Primary (7)</b>                                      | (A) Mary Gardiner (West Green)                                 | (A) Michelle Randles - maternity leave<br>Substitute member – Grant Bright<br>(Rokesly Infants & Nursery) |
|   | Stephen McNicholas (St John Vianney)                           | Paul Murphy (Lancasterian)  |
|   | Ian Scotchbrook (South Haringey)                               | Linda Sarr (Risley Avenue)  |
|   | Will Wawn (Bounds Green)                                       |   |
| <b>Secondary (2)</b>                                    | Andy Webster (Park View)                                       | Tony Hartney (Gladesmore)   |
| <b>Primary Academy (1)</b>                              | (A) Simon Knowles<br>(LDBS Academies Trust)                    |   |
| <b>Secondary Academies (3)</b>                          | Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)                              | Vacancy   |
|   | Elen Roberts (Heartlands High)                                 |   |
| <b>Alternative Provision (1)</b>                        | Gerry Robinson   |   |
| <b>Governors</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Special (1)</b>                                      | Jean Brown (The Vale)  |   |
| <b>Nursery School (1)</b>                               | Melian Mansfield (Pembury)                                     |   |
| <b>Primary Maintained (7)</b>                           | *Hannah D'Aguiar (Chestnuts Primary)                           | John Keever (Seven Sisters)   |
|   | *Jenny Thomas (Lordship Lane)                                  | Appointment to take effect from<br>2 December 2021 - Andrew Willett<br>(West Green Primary)               |
|   | Dan Salem (Muswell Hill Primary)                               | Appointment to take effect from<br>2 December 2021 - Alex McAskell<br>(Willow Primary)                    |
|   | Vacancy  |   |
| <b>Secondary Maintained (3)</b>                         | Laurence Penn (Highgate Wood)                                  |   |
|   | Sylvia Dobie (Park View)                                       |   |
| <b>Primary Academy (1)</b>                              | Vacancy  |   |
| <b>Secondary Academies (3)</b>                          | *Noreen Graham (Woodside)                                      | Vacancy   |
|   | Vacancy  |   |
| <b>Non-School Members</b>                               |  |   |
| <b>Non-Executive Councillor</b>                         | (A) Cllr Sarah Williams  |   |
| <b>Trade Union Representative</b>                       | Paul Renny   |   |
| <b>Professional Association Representative</b>          | (A) Ed Harlow  |   |
| <b>Faith Schools</b>                                    | (A) Geraldine Gallagher  |   |
| <b>14-19 Partnership</b>                                | (A) Kurt Hintz   |   |
| <b>Early Years Providers</b>                            | Susan Tudor-Hart   |   |
| <b>Observers</b>  |  |   |
| Riddhi Kachhela – Student from Goldsmiths College       |  |   |
| <b>Cabinet Member for CYPs</b>                          | Cllr Zena Brabazon   |   |
| <b>Also Attending</b>                                   |  |   |
| LBH Director of Children's Services                     | (A) Ann Graham   |   |
| Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership (HEP) | James Page   |   |
| LBH Assistant Director, Schools & Learning              | Eveleen Riordan  |   |
| LBH Assistant Director, Finance                         | Thomas Skeen   |   |
| LBH Head of Finance                                     | (A) Josephine Lyseight   |   |
| LBH Head of Service, Integrated SEND                    | Mary Jarrett   |   |

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| LBH Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help & Culture  | *Ngozi Anuforo    |
| LBH Assistant Director Commissioning                       | *Charlotte Pomery |
| LBH Interim Schools Finance Manager                        | Brian Smith       |
| LBH Finance Business Partner (Schools & Learning)          | Muhammad Ali      |
| LBH Service Improvement & Children's Services              | *Karen Oellermann |
| Lead for Governor Services (HEP)/Clerk (Minutes)           | Neetha Atukorale  |
| LBH Asst Director Early Help, Prevention and SEND Division | Jackie Difolco    |
| LBH Head of Admissions and School Organisation             | *Carlo Kodsi      |
| LBH Head of Audit and Risk Management                      | Minesh Jani       |

(A) = Apologies given

\* = Asterisk denotes absence

#### SUMMARY OF AGREED ACTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT FOR 2 DECEMBER 2021 MEETING

| ITEM                         | ACTION  | FOLLOW UP                   |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>Matters arising 7.6.1</b> | The revised terms of reference were tabled and agreed. The terms of reference for the HNB, DSG and Early Years working parties are also being reviewed. These will be circulated to members and tabled at the next forum meeting. | <b>WW and MD</b>            |
| <b>Matters arising 7.6.1</b> | Produce a flowchart that shows the officers responsible for the governance structures management and reporting lines of the HNB strategy.   | <b>MJ</b>                   |
| <b>Matters arising 10.5</b>  | Circulate demographic report produced by MJ showing pupils on ECHP plans  | <b>NA - Clerk</b>           |
| <b>Matters arising 10.8</b>  | Circulate the minutes of the meeting on 8 October to all members.   | <b>NA - Clerk</b>           |
| <b>10.12</b>                 | DSG Working group/BS to report outcome of the consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on <b>13 January 2022</b> .   | <b>BS/DSG Working group</b> |

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING

| ITEM NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION  | ACTION ASSIGNED TO |
|----------|---|--------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>ELECTION OF CHAIR</b>  |                    |
|          | <p>The Clerk opened the meeting and invited members to make nominations for Chair for the academic year until July.</p> <p>Laura Butterfield proposed Tony Hartney. This was seconded by Jean Brown. There were no objections to the proposal.</p> <p>Tony Hartney explained that this would be a transitional arrangement until July 2022 as he will be resigning as Headteacher at the end of the academic year with a view to a new Chair taking over from July.</p> <p>Tony Hartney took over as Chairing the meeting at this point.</p> <p>Will Wawn raised a conversation that had taken place with the Chair.</p> <p>The Chair explained that Will Wawn as an extremely knowledgeable member of the forum is willing to support the transitional arrangements with a view to putting himself forward to be elected as Chair.</p> |                    |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | <p><b>ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR</b></p> <p>The Chair proposed Laura Butterfield as Vice Chair. There were no objections to the proposal.</p>   |  |
| 3 | <p><b>CHAIR'S WELCOME</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all present to the meeting</p>  |  |
| 4 | <p><b>APOLOGIES, OBSERVERS, NEW MEMBERS AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b></p> <p><b>Apologies</b><br/>Apologies were received from Josephine Lyseight, Ann Graham and Ed Harlow. Michelle Randles is currently on maternity leave until June 2022.</p> <p><b>New Member</b><br/>The Chair welcomed Sian McDermot (Rowland Hill Nursery and Children's Centre) to the meeting as the replacement member for the Nursery Headteacher place, replacing Peter Catling.</p> <p>Elen Roberts (Heartlands High) was also in attendance as the new Secondary Academy Headteacher Representative.</p> <p><b>Resignation</b><br/>It was confirmed that primary governor representative Julie Davies (Tiverton Primary) had resigned as a governor and from the forum.</p> <p><b>Substitute Members</b><br/>There were two substitute Headteacher members on the forum – Grant Bright (Rokesly Infants &amp; Nursery) representing Michelle Randle and Ian Scotchbrook (South Haringey) replacing Emma Murray who is no longer a substitute member on the forum.</p> <p><b>Observers</b><br/>Requests to attend the meeting had been received from the two observers below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riddhi Kachhela – A Digital Journalism student at Goldsmiths University of London and attending attending the meeting for research into education and training in local government. Riddhi Kachhela was logged into the meeting for the entire duration.</li> <li>• Amber Ludlam – from the Education and Skills Funding Agency. Amber Ludlam did not attend the meeting.</li> </ul> |  |
| 5 | <p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>None were made</p>  |  |
| 6 | <p><b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2021</b></p> <p>The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.</p>  |  |
| 7 | <p><b>MATTERS ARISING/ACTIONS FROM THE LAST MEETING</b></p> <p><b>5.3.1 Report on the outcome of a call for governor nominations to fill vacant places</b><br/>The breakdown of vacancies on the Forum at the last meeting was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Primary maintained governor vacancies</li> <li>• 1 Primary academy governor vacancy</li> <li>• 2 Secondary academy governor vacancies</li> <li>• 1 Secondary academy headteacher vacancy</li> </ul>  |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Governor vacancies had been promoted via the HEP Monday briefings. Four Primary maintained school governors had completed application forms. Two governors were no longer able to make the commitment, which means that the remaining two governors below can be appointed onto the Forum and attend the next meeting on 2 December 2021.<br/>         Alex McAskell – West Green primary governing body<br/>         Andrew Willett - Broadwaters Inclusive Learning Community – The Brook Special Primary School., The Willow Primary School and the Children’s Centre</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that the remaining vacancies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Primary Maintained School Governor vacancy following the resignation of Julie Davies</li> <li>• 1 Primary academy governor vacancy</li> <li>• 2 Secondary academy governor vacancies</li> <li>• 1 Secondary academy headteacher vacancy</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk will continue to promote the Governor vacancies in the Monday briefings and at governor training.</p> <p><b>5.3.2 Report on the Scrutiny panel and the restructure</b><br/>         ER had produced a report and it was presented at item number 9.</p> <p><b>7.4.1 Review the allocation of Schools Forum membership places and table an updated for review at the Schools Forum meeting in October</b><br/>         The Clerk explained that the papers for the review had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The allocations had been reviewed and corrected. This had resulted in an increase in the number of Academy Headteacher places from 2 places to 3 places and also an increase in the number of Academy Governor places from 2 places to 3 places.</p> <p><b>7.4.2 Promote the work of Schools Forum and governor vacancies at training sessions, briefings and the weekly update.</b><br/>         This had been covered at matters arising item 5.3.1 above.</p> <p><b>7.6.1 The Terms of Reference will include the revised allocations and tabled for approval at the Schools Forum meeting in October.</b><br/>         The revised terms of reference were tabled and agreed. The terms of reference for the HNB, DSG working parties are also being reviewed. These will be tabled along with the Early Years working party terms of reference will be tabled at the next forum meeting. <b>ACTION WW,MD, MM</b></p> <p>One member commented that the review of all terms of reference is very useful in terms of clarifying the responsibilities of Schools Forum and the delegated working parties. He suggested that in addition, it would be helpful to have a flowchart that outlines the officers responsible for the governance structures management and reporting lines of the HNB strategy as the focus of Schools Forum needed to be strategic financial oversight. <b>ACTION MJ</b></p> <p><b>10.5 Demographic report showing pupils on ECHP plans for the next meeting</b><br/>         MJ gave presented a demographic report to the forum, which showed the position at the end the last academic year in July 2021. She highlighted that on average there were 3.3% of pupils in Haringey are on an EHCP, the national SEN</p> | <p><b>WW ,MD &amp; MM</b></p> <p><b>MJ</b></p> |
|---|--|

|            |  |   |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p>figure for pupils is 11.97%. The report also indicates schools with a higher than average number of pupils on an EHCP. The Chair thanked MJ for her report. The report will be circulated with the minutes of the meeting. <b>ACTION : NA -Clerk</b></p> <p><b>10.8 Circulate HNB Working party meeting minutes from 23 April.</b><br/>The working party minutes had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 8 October will be circulated to all members.<br/><b>ACTION: NA - Clerk</b></p>   | <p><b>NA - Clerk</b></p> <p><b>NA - Clerk</b></p> |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>ORDER OF AGENDA</b>   |   |
|            | The order of agenda was changed slightly to include the election of the Vice Chair. Item 7.3 Report on the restructure and scrutiny panel presented first as ER attended the meeting whilst on away on annual leave.   |   |
| <b>9</b>   | <b>REPORT ON THE RESTRUCTURE AND THE SCRUTINY PANEL</b>  |   |
| <b>9.1</b> | The report had been circulated prior to the meeting and is for information. The report gives an overview of the purpose and work of the panel.<br>ER explained that the Restructure and Scrutiny Panel had been set up in 2017 under section 12 of the Financial Scheme of Delegation for Schools. In addition to other responsibilities, the panel was set up to appropriately and robustly challenge restructure proposals that have redundancy implications as there can be financial implications for the LA.  |   |
| <b>9.2</b> | In addition, ER highlighted that Section 37 of the Act makes it clear that the costs incurred in respect of securing the dismissal of staff through redundancies do not generally not come from the school's delegated budget unless the Local Authority has good reason for refusing to fund all or part of the costs. 'Good reason', while not defined, can include that the LA believes that the proposed redundancy was unnecessary, efforts to secure redeployment were not adequately explored, where payments are too high or if the school holds a surplus revenue budget which could reasonably be used to fund the additional costs. |   |
| <b>9.3</b> | She explained that the panel is made up of LA officers and three Headteachers including a Primary Headteacher and Secondary Headteacher.   |   |
| <b>9.4</b> | ER referred to table A highlighting the redundancy amounts that ranged from £6,000 to £165,990.15.   |   |
| <b>9.5</b> | The panel has only refused a small number of applications (two) where it is clear either that the restructure doesn't provide any financial saving that is able to contribute towards keeping the school out of licensed deficit, or where there are reserves within the school to enable them to pay for any redundancy costs. It is likely that the criteria and requirements for submitting an application to the panel have ensured a high standard of applications from schools.<br>Following review at the panel, several schools have also had to come back with stronger evidence or a revised approach before being accepted.         |   |
| <b>9.6</b> | The panel has been working well in terms of providing challenge and also for redundancy being used as a last resort. The panel is intended to support schools.   |   |

|             |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|
| <p>9.7</p>  | <p>A feedback survey will be circulated to schools in November to assess the panel experience.</p> <p>A report will be brought to the next Forum (December 2021) to consider an adjustment to the panel criteria to allow for schools to implement a restructure in advance of a move to a deficit budget (and therefore the need for a licensed deficit) and where such a move will allow the school to retain a positive budget going forward. In allowing such cases to go forward, the panel will want to be reassured of the following:</p> <p>a) that the school can demonstrate historic sound financial planning;</p> <p>b) that the restructure put forward is a last resort and that it is evidenced that the restructure will avoid a deficit position within the next 18 months.</p>   |  |
| <p>10</p>   | <p><b>DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG) – FUNDING MODEL STRATEGY 2022-23</b></p>   |  |
| <p>10.1</p> | <p>BS presented the report. He explained that the paper set out the strategy for the allocation of DSG funding for 2022-23. The paper divided up funding into the four blocks – Schools, HNB, Early Years and CSSB.</p>  |  |
| <p>10.2</p> | <p>He highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been national changes to the funding levels. Haringey overall get 2.33% on per pupil funding, however this actually amounts to 1.3 - 1.6% depending on pupil numbers and also the decisions made by Schools Forum regarding allocation.</li> <li>• October census funding will inform the PLASC for 2022-23 DSG block funding. The DSG working group will be looking at minimum funding guarantee (MFG) for 2022-23 between +0.5% and +2%.</li> <li>• Early years final funding allocations have not yet been confirmed, this will take place in late November/early December. This is unlikely to take place in time for the next Schools Forum meeting on 2 December.</li> <li>• Graph A that gives indicative DSG budget for 2022-23 which includes the Teachers Pay Grant (TPG) and Teachers Pension Employers Contribution Grant (TPECG) has been included in the indicative allocations for 2021/22 and 2022/23, which explains the seeming uplift from 2020/21..</li> </ul> |  |
| <p>10.3</p> | <p>He presented the timeline of the approach to the consultation to agree the 2022-23 DSG formula as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>October 2021</b> - Decision for Schools Forum to delegate to the DSG working group to agree the models to be consulted on with schools in</li> <li>• <b>November 2021</b> - DSG working group meet to agree the models to be consulted on and the Schools finance team to issue consultation to schools</li> <li>• <b>December 2021</b> - Collate and evaluate consultation responses from schools and present recommendations to School's Forum in January 2022. BS highlighted that the timeline is tight as the DfE does not confirm allocations until December.</li> <li>• <b>4. January 2022</b> – Presentation of the proposed recommendations and Authority Proforma Tool (APT) following consultation from schools for Schools' Forum approval.</li> </ul>   |  |

|      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 10.4 | <p>He explained that following Lead member approval, the APT will be submitted to the ESFA.</p>   |  |
| 10.5 | <p><b>Schools Block DSG Funding formula 2022-23 proposed models</b></p> <p>BS highlighted the table in the report that showed the breakdown of proposed models.</p> <p>He summarised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a growth allocation of £1.1m which as the same as the previous year, there is likely to be a slight underspend which will be rolled forward to the DSG.</li> <li>• The amount being spent on trade union activity has gone up. This year £132,000 was collected from schools. This is likely to go up to £165,000. This is likely to amount to £7.20 per pupil.</li> <li>• Top slice from Education Welfare Services</li> <li>• Top slice for one nursery school for a nursery split site of £60,000</li> <li>• Although the models outlined in the paper look different, in reality they don't affect any change due to MFG. In light of this, the DSG working group is exploring different models to see the impact schools including different MFGs for the Primary and Secondary sectors</li> <li>• The block transfer from the Schools Block to HNB is (0.25%) £537,000.</li> <li>• Smaller primary schools tended to be more sensitive to changes in funding due to falling roll numbers, not having lettings taking place and also SEND funding</li> <li>• The principle underpinning the proposal for the HNB transfer is to re-allocate all funding back to schools to support SEND.</li> </ul> <p><i>The Chair invited questions and comments.</i></p> |  |
| 10.6 | <p>The Chair of the DGS block working party explained that the proposed timeline for the models had been set for the DSG working group to meet on 17 November 2021, to take into account the October 2021 census data, with a two-week consultation period with clear information in a paper for schools and Chairs of Governors in the last week of November. He also explained that the DSG working party is exploring with the ESFA to agree if proposal of £68,000 lump sum to Tiverton Primary should either be taken from the growth fund or if the disapplication model needs to be used.</p> <p><b>ACTION : BS</b></p>  |  |
| 10.7 | <p><b>Decision to be taken:</b></p> <p><b><i>The Chair confirmed the decision to be taken was for the forum to agree that the DSG working group confirms the final 2022/23 DSG allocation models for consultation with schools in November 2021</i></b></p>   |  |
| 10.8 | <p><b>One member requested confirmation of the membership of the group raising concerns that there was an imbalance of secondary v primary representation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The members of the group were confirmed as WW, TH, MM, BS and MA.</li> <li>• Members of the group confirmed that the group made decisions on behalf of all schools without bias and additional primary representation was welcome.</li> </ul>   |  |

|   |  |                                    |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| <p>10.9</p> <p>10.10</p> <p>10.11</p> <p>10.12</p>          | <p><b>Governor representatives requested consideration of governor and gender representation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair of Schools Forum requested that interested Primary, Female and Governor representatives were most welcome to attend and be part of the group and extended an open invitation for Schools Forum members to attend.</li> <li>WW asked interested members to contact him</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision taken</b><br/>All members present unanimously agreed for the DSG working group to confirm the final 2022/23 DSG allocation models for consultation with schools in November 2021.</p> <p><b>Decision taken</b><br/>All members present unanimously agreed to Agree to delegate to the DSG working group consideration and decision on the disapplication request to the ESFA/SoS for a £68k second year lump sum payment to Tiverton or protection through use of Growth Fund.</p> <p><b>ACTION: DSG Working group/BS to report outcome of the consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on 13 January 2022.</b></p>   | <p><b>DSG Working group/BS</b></p> |
| <p>11</p>   | <p><b>DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT(DSG) – NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA CONSULTATION RESPONSE</b></p>  |                                    |
| <p>11.1</p> <p>11.2</p> <p>11.3</p> <p>11.4</p> <p>11.5</p> | <p>BS presented the report. He explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DfE had carried out a consultation from July 2021 – September 2021 based on the latest proposals some of which were detailed, others were less detailed with further information to follow .</li> <li>There is an expectation that the Department for Education (DfE) will change the local funding formula and the schools’ allocation is likely to move closer to ‘hard’ NFF from 2023-24.</li> <li>The potential implications of this could be less flexibility in terms of local decision making for schools in need of additional funding.</li> <li>In general, the Haringey response to the consultation is in line with the London Councils collective response.</li> </ul> <p><b>The questions raised in the consultation were:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the ‘hard’ NFF be implemented?</li> <li>Should 10% of the ‘hard’ NFF be implemented?</li> <li>Should local decision making be retained?</li> </ul> <p>The Schools Finance Team sent a very detailed report on behalf of Haringey following the consultation with the DSG working group. The Chair of the working group produced a very detailed response which has been included in the report. Updates will be given to the forum.</p> <p>One member requested the rationale behind the funding year not being an academic year.</p> <p>It was confirmed that a lagged funding model builds in more time to make changes as schools accounts need to be consolidated with the council accounts at</p> |                                    |



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>11.6</p> <p>11.7</p>   | <p>the end of the financial year. If maintained schools worked to the academic year they would need to undertake two-year end of year returns which would lead to additional workload pressures. The accounts would need to take place twice which would result in more schools. This was not the case for academies.</p> <p>One member also raised that most London LAs are facing the risk of total cuts to their “historic commitments” funding. This is risk is not the case for Haringey as there is no funding attributed to “historical commitments” as remedial action had been taken.</p> <p>One member commented that detailed analysis needs to take place in view of the White Paper that is likely to be released and Haringey needs to be prepared.</p>  |  |
| <p>12</p>   | <p><b>HIGH NEEDS BLOCK – SEND RECOVERY PLAN</b></p>  |  |
| <p>12.1</p> <p>12.2</p> <p>12.3</p> <p>12.4</p> <p>12.5</p> <p>12.6</p> <p>12.7</p> | <p>MJ delivered the presentation. She explained that the SEND strategy is currently out for consultation. She encouraged all members to respond to the consultation with feedback and comments through the local offer website.</p> <p>There are 3 strands to the SEND strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting to Ofsted on progress</li> <li>• System changes underpinned by a shared SEND strategy</li> <li>• Good financial governance</li> </ul> <p>She explained that the strategy needed to be shared before looking at HNB recovery.</p> <p>The purpose of the plan is to support all children not just children on Education Health care plans to bring around systemic changes in terms of education, health and social care.</p> <p>The strategy was drawn up through research that had been carried out. Meetings had taken place with parents over the summer, parental complaints had been reviewed, the AMAZE report and the Ofsted feedback had been reviewed.</p> <p>The priorities identified in the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early support</li> <li>• Developing local offer</li> <li>• A varied local offer with breaks, good quality breaks and access to parks</li> <li>• Involving parents, carers and young people in developing the offer</li> <li>• Developing a strategy for young adults</li> </ul> <p>A revised strategy will be released after the consultation period.</p> <p>The Chair thanked MJ for her presentation invited members to raise questions and comments.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> One member commented on the timescales of 2022-23 identified in the strategy and suggested that the significant issues needed immediate attention.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> MJ agreed that some urgent priorities needed to met and Ofsted likely to visit within 18 months, however a realistic approach needed to be taken over</p> |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>12.8</p> <p>12.9</p> <p>12.10</p> <p>12.11</p> <p>12.12</p> | <p>time in view of the amount work that needs to be carried out. She suggested that the member included this in the consultation response.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> One member asked how many parents were involved in the initial events</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> MJ confirmed that a virtual event and a face to face event was held 40 parents were involved. Some parents had attended both events.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> One member asked about the deadline for response.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> This was confirmed as 7 November.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> One member commented that positive comments in the presentation needed to be included in the consultation on the website and the stakeholder engagement in the consultation should not just be with parents.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> One member added that parents needed to be assured that provision in schools is good and it needs to be reinforced that schools came out well in the SEND review.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> One member suggested that the issues raised in the strategy should be extended to cover post 16 provision.</p> <p>The Chair thanked MJ for her presentation.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>13</b></p>   | <p><b>HNB – RECOVERY PLAN</b></p>  |  |
| <p>13.1</p> <p>13.2</p> <p>13.3</p> <p>13.4</p> <p>13.5</p>    | <p>MJ delivered the presentation that had been circulated to members. She opened the presentation by highlighting that the HNB recovery plan needed to be about good governance and financial management and there needed to be a joined-up approach.</p> <p>BS explained that a HNB deficit had been developing. He highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The brought forward deficit from 2019-20 was £10.1m</li> <li>• The 2020-21 outturn added a further £6.8m (subject to normal annual audit)</li> <li>• The 2021-22 brought forward deficit for the total DSG stands at £17.0m</li> </ul> <p>MJ explained that there needed to be an understanding of the spend. Work had been carried out to analyse spending.</p> <p>The figures had been used to project growth. She explained there is likely to be an increased demand and spend unless action is taken. There is likely to be an increase of 3000 – 4000 children with EHCPs.</p> <p>MJ reported that there is an increased demand in system- hypothesis: that schools are increasing demands for EHCPs to address funding gaps caused by high costs of SEN and falling rolls. In addition, the needs of pupils can be complex and the early years fund needs to be reviewed. Pathways of intervention need to be</p> |  |

|       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
|       | <p>reviewed for SEND children. A number of strategies were looked at including early intervention and support.</p>  |  |
| 13.6  | <p>MJ proposed that ISOS and Headteachers need to work together to reduce the demand for EHCPS. She explained that some parents do not want social care involvement, out of borough children attend schools in Haringey which leaves schools left to deal with support and the financial implications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The complex needs of pupils could be met out in Haringey Schools.</li> <li>• Preparation for adulthood is important</li> <li>• The spend on therapies is high</li> <li>• The 1.3 million transfer to early help needs to be resolved</li> <li>• The HNB block needs to held to account with Schools Forum being kept updated</li> </ul> |  |
| 13.7  | <p>MJ requested that members come forward to be involved in a strategy working group. The Head of the Alternative provision stated that it was encouraging that MJ and the SEN Team were working together and it was positive to move forward to map out a strategy.</p> <p>Another member commented that it was a positive way forward.</p> <p>One member thanked MJ for her presentation and commented on the approach taken.</p>   |  |
| 13.8  | <p><b>Question</b> - One member commented on the falling rolls in the Primary sector and asked if it was having implications on the number of children on EHCP plans.</p> <p><b>Answer</b> - MJ stated that there didn't appear to be implications on the number of children on EHCP plans although there could be a delay, however there did appear to be an increase in children with complex needs.</p>  |  |
| 13.9  | <p><b>Comment</b> - One member commented that the approach of re-apportioning funding to children that need it was very positive.</p>   |  |
| 13.10 | <p><b>Comment</b> - One member suggested that it needs to be considered if children actually need to be on EHCPS and it's not necessary to have children on plans if they don't need to be.</p>   |  |
| 13.11 | <p><b>Comment</b> - Cllr Brabazon as Cabinet member commented that it was a very good approach and the SMEH needed to be strengthened in the primary sector.</p>  |  |
| 14    | <p><b>PLACE PLANNING UPDATE</b></p>   |  |
| 14.1  | <p>ER gave a verbal update. She explained that there had been a fall in demand for reception places. The LA has been working with a company called ISOS. Some schools have been contacted. Schools have given feedback that the process is moving took quickly. In view of this the process take place more gradually.</p> <p>Conversations will also take place with regards to the secondary pan.</p>   |  |
| 14.2  | <p>The Chair invited comments from members:</p>   |  |

|             |   |   |
|-------------|---|---|
|             | <b>Comment</b> - One member commented that the place planning report presented was of high quality and a very good piece of work.   |   |
| <b>15</b>   | <b>INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE</b>  |   |
| <b>15.1</b> | <p>MJ presented the annual outcome of the schools audit for the financial year 2020-21. He explained that it had been a particularly challenging year for schools and auditors to participate in audits. The outcome of the audits were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No schools were assigned nil assurance</li> <li>• 2 schools were assigned limited assurance</li> <li>• 15 schools were assigned adequate assurance</li> </ul> | . |
| <b>15.2</b> | The improvements were a result of the to improve governance and the training uptake by SBMs and governors   |   |
| <b>15.3</b> | <p>Appendix A shows the number of recommendations. This year there were fewer recommendations, with priority being given to the more serious risks which gives schools a clear focus on the areas to review.</p> <p>The key findings for 2020-21 that needed to be addressed in paragraph 2.10</p>  |   |
| <b>16</b>   | <b>WORKPLAN 2021-22</b>   |   |
| <b>16.1</b> | <p>NA – Clerk explained that the workplan had been circulated. The terms of reference for the working groups would be added in. Members were asked if anything else needed to be added in.</p>  |   |
| <b>16.2</b> | One member added that the Early years strategy needed to be added to the outturn in the event of clawback. This was noted.  |   |
| <b>17</b>   | Updates from working parties  |   |
| <b>17.1</b> | <p>The HNB working party minutes from 8 October will be circulated. <b>Action NA – Clerk</b></p> <p>Early Years working party – most of the work covered was around the Early Years review and has been included into the workplan.</p>   |   |
| <b>18</b>   | <b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>  |   |
|             | None  |   |
| <b>19</b>   | <b>CLOSE</b>  |   |
|             | The Chair thanked members for attending and closed the meeting.   |   |
| <b>20</b>   | <b>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b>  |   |
|             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday 2 December 4pm</li> <li>• Thursday 13 January 4pm</li> <li>• Thursday 24 February 4pm</li> <li>• Thursday 14 July 4pm</li> </ul>  |   |

There being no further business the Meeting closed at 5.15pm