

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING  
THURSDAY 24<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2022 AT 4pm**

<b>School Members</b>		
<b>Headteachers</b>		
<b>Special (1)</b>	Martin Doyle (Riverside)	
<b>Nursery Schools (1)</b>	(A) Sian McDermott	
<b>Primary (7)</b>	Mary Gardiner (West Green)	(A) Michelle Randles - maternity leave Substitute member *Grant Bright (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 (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)	Alex MacAskill (West Green Primary)
	(A) Dan Salem (Muswell Hill Primary)	Andrew Willett (Willow Primary)
<b>Secondary Maintained (3)</b>	Helen Froggatt (St Aidan's Primary)	
	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>Alternative Provision (1)</b>	*Laura Butterfield	
<b>Non-School Members</b>		
<b>Non-Executive Councillor</b>	*Cllr Sarah Williams	
<b>Trade Union Representative</b>	Paul Renny	
<b>Professional Association Representative</b>	Ed Harlow	
<b>Faith Schools</b>	*Geraldine Gallagher	
<b>14-19 Partnership</b>	*Kurt Hintz	
<b>Early Years Providers</b>	Susan Tudor-Hart	
<b>Observers</b>		
None		
<b>Cabinet Member for CYPs</b>		
(A) 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	(A) Eveleen Riordan	
LBH Assistant Director, Finance	Thomas Skeen	
LBH Head of Finance	Josephine Lyseight	
LBH Head of Service, Integrated SEND	Mary Jarrett	
LBH Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help & Culture	Ngozi Anuforo	
LBH Assistant Director Commissioning	(A) 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
LBH HR Team	*Antony Lewis

(A) = Apologies given

\* = Asterisk denotes absence

## SUMMARY OF AGREED ACTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT FOR 14 JULY 2022 MEETING

ITEM	ACTION	FOLLOW UP
1.6.4	Raise the outcome of the School Improvement Grant Brokering grant consultation with the two Haringey MPs	AG/ER

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON THURSDAY 13 JANUARY 2022

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION ASSIGNED TO
1.1	<b>WELCOME</b>	
	The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all present to the meeting.	
1.2	<b>OBSERVERS AND REPRESENTATIVES</b>	
	There were no observers or representatives in attendance.	
1.3	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
	The clerk confirmed that apologies had been received from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ann Graham</li> <li>• Eveleen Riordan</li> <li>• Sylvia Dobie</li> <li>• Charlotte Pomery</li> <li>• Sian McDermott</li> <li>• Dan Salem</li> <li>• Cllr Zina Brabazon</li> <li>• Simon Knowles</li> </ul>	
1.4	<b>MEMBERSHIP UPDATE</b>	
	The clerk reported that there had been no further expressions of interest from potential new governor members and there were no further membership updates to report.	
1.5	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
	None	
1.6	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING MEETING ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2022</b>	
	<b>Accuracies</b>	
1.6.1	<b>Item 2.2 bullet point 6 deletion:</b> Provide £60K funding to a Haringey Primary school with a Nursery School on a split site.  <b>Replace with:</b> Provide £60K funding to a Haringey Nursery school on a split site.	
1.6.2	<b>Item 2.18 f) deletion:</b> Recommendation: Provide £60K funding to a Haringey Primary school with a Nursery School on a split site  <b>Replace with:</b> Recommendation: Provide £60K funding to a Haringey Nursery School on a split site	

<p>1.6.3</p> <p>1.6.4</p> <p>1.6.5</p>	<p><b>Actions from the last meeting:</b>  <b>Item 2.6 Update on the transfer from the Schools Block to the CSSB for the Education Welfare Service</b></p> <p>WW explained that ER had confirmed that this had been agreed for the next three years including into the 2022-23 fiscal year and it would next be raised at the Schools Forum Meeting in Autumn Term 2022 for the fiscal year 2023-24.</p> <p>The report on the CSSB is already covered in the report later in the meeting.</p> <p><b>Item 3.6 Raise the outcome of the School Improvement Grant Brokering grant consultation with the two Haringey MPs</b>  This will be brought forward as an action for the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> July.</p> <p><b>Item 4 Circulate Early Years Working Group and High Needs Block Committee minutes from January meetings</b>  Both sets of minutes had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.</p>	<p>ER/AG</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><b>MEMBERSHIP UPDATES</b></p>	
	<p>The Clerk confirmed that there were no membership updates since the last meeting.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p><b>EARLY YEARS BLOCK REPORT</b></p>	
<p>3.1</p>	<p>The report was presented by NA. She explained that Sections 3 and 4 of the report sets out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Early Years block funding allocation for 2022-23, DSG allocations across 2020-21 and 2021-22</li> <li>• The impact of the department’s strategies for ensuring the continuation of early education funding across the various periods of lock down, phased re-opening and a return to full opening of schools and early years settings</li> <li>• The impact of turbulence in the numbers of pupils accessing early education over the last two funding periods, has contributed to a degree of fluctuation in our early years DSG Block allocations</li> <li>• The indicative Early Years DSG allocation for 2022-23 which is lower than previous years</li> <li>• The Autumn 2021 spending review introduced an increase in the hourly funding rate for the Early Years Pupil Premium, rising from 53p per hour per eligible child to 60p per hour (up to £342 per eligible child per year), and an increase in the flat rate payment for the Disability Access Fund, taking it from £615 per eligible child per year to £800 per eligible child per year</li> <li>• The 2021 Spending Review, DfE increased the hourly funding rates for all local authorities by 21p an hour for the two-year-old entitlement and by 17p an hour for the three and four-year-old entitlements</li> <li>• The increase in allocation for Maintained Nursery Schools (MNS) by 3.5% to be based on an hourly rate of £7.71 to cover the increase costs that are likely to be incur.</li> <li>• The outcome of discussions of the Early Years working group including the deprivation supplement rate.</li> </ul> <p>NA highlighted the recommendations made by the Early Years working group as below:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hourly base rate paid for the delivery of the 3- and 4-year-old free entitlement, is increased in 2022-23 to £5.65</li> <li>• A new flat hourly rate of £0.37 is introduced for 2022-23 and paid for all eligible children accessing the universal 3- and 4-year-old free entitlement.</li> <li>• A quality supplement is retained and a funding allocation of £76,000, as in previous years is maintained for 2022-23</li> <li>• The uplifted rate of £6.03 is passed through to early years providers in full, as in previous years, within the revised early years funding formula</li> </ul> <p><b>3.2</b> NA explained that the 2022-23 allocations for the universal and extended 3- and 4-year-old offer have been reduced from 2021-22 levels. This sets a current, indicative 5% maximum of £0.787m for 2022-23. It is anticipated that this figure will increase during the 2022-23 financial year due to expected positive adjustments later in the year.</p> <p><b>3.3</b> In view of this a further recommendation from the Early Years working group was that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools Forum agrees the proposed centrally retained allocations to the maximum 5% ceiling, which indicatively for 2022-23 is £0.787m, depending on in-year adjustments. It is also recommended that Schools Forum agrees for the proposed centrally retained expenditure set out at Appendices B and C.</li> </ul> <p><b>3.4</b> <b>Questions from members:</b> The Chair invited questions from members, which followed as below:</p> <p><b>Question MM:</b> Please clarify the quality supplement.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> This is a supplement that is deployed on a case by case basis to support peer to peer improvement. It is generally fully utilised and spent.</p> <p><b>3.5</b> <b>Question MM</b> Item 2.3 mentions funding for 2 year olds with special education needs. Does this take place?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> NA since 2018 – There has been funding allocated through the high needs block of £42K for the 2 year old SEN block. This isn't a statutory basis but it has been in place.</p> <p><b>3.6</b> <b>Question MM:</b> What work has been done promote the places available for 2 year olds?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> NA in view of the turbulence of the last years places have not been promoted, however work is taking place to identify the information that can be sent out the the public. However, there has been work with partners including social care to raise the awareness of available places with families.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> NA budget allocations tend to be indicative, the allocations does represent a loss.</p> <p><b>3.7</b> <b>Question MM:</b> In item 3.4.2 indicates another adjustment in January 2022 – has this happened and what is the consequence of that?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>Answer NA:</b> Yes it has happened and the consequences will not be known until the outturn has taken place.</p> <p><b>3.8 Question MM:</b> When will settings have their allocations for the year ?</p> <p><b>Answer NA:</b> This will take place imminently.</p> <p><b>3.9 Question MM:</b> Does the second recommendation refer to the deprivation supplement?</p> <p><b>Answer NA:</b> Yes it does</p> <p><b>3.10 Question WW:</b> Does the methodology of clawback still exist or are allocations based on pupil numbers?</p> <p><b>Answer NA:</b> Yes allocations are based on pupil numbers</p> <p>The Chair invited members to vote on the recommendations outlined in Section 4.8 and 4.9 of the report:</p> <p><b>3.11 Recommendation 1</b> The votes cast were: 14 votes in favour None against <b>Decision: Agreed unanimous</b></p> <p><b>3.12 Recommendation 2</b> The votes cast were: 13 votes in favour None against <b>Decision: Agreed unanimous</b></p> <p><b>3.13 Recommendation 3</b> The votes cast were: 13 votes in favour None against <b>Decision: Agreed unanimous</b></p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>DSG CSSB Update</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1</b></p> <p><b>4.2</b></p>	<p>BS presented the report. He explained that section 2 indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had been a year-on-year reduction for Haringey CSSB based on the indicative pupil numbers.</li> <li>• The maximum per-pupil reduction in funding for ongoing responsibilities each LA will receive is -2.5%. Haringey has seen the funding rate reduce by 2.5% and the pupil numbers fall by 1.9% and the overall funding for Haringey has reduced by 4.4%.</li> </ul> <p>BS highlighted Table B which gives a breakdown of proposed allocations of CSSB for 2022-23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding had reduced by £124K which had been offset by copyright licences which had been held centrally. However, £30K VAT had been retained</li> </ul>	

<p><b>4.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had also been a reduction in the grant for looked after children placements, there will be analysis of this in terms of reviewing pupil numbers</li> <li>• The commissioned services from the Haringey Education Partnership – the LA has committed to maintaining the same level of funding for the HEP for 2022-23.</li> </ul> <p>JP thanked the LA for constructive discussions around the funds being allocated to HEP from the CSSB. He re-iterated that it was helpful that the LA had agreed to keep the funding the same despite the loss of the School Improvement and Monitoring Grant.</p> <p>WW acknowledged and thanked BS and MA for a very well presented and concise report.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>DSG High Needs Update</b></p>	
<p><b>5.1</b></p> <p><b>5.2</b></p> <p><b>5.3</b></p> <p><b>5.4</b></p> <p><b>5.5</b></p> <p><b>5.6</b></p> <p><b>5.7</b></p> <p><b>5.8</b></p> <p><b>5.9</b></p>	<p>BS confirmed that there had been an increase of 15% for the High Needs Grant by £6.664m from £43.406m in 2021-22 to £50.070m 2022-23.</p> <p>He highlighted that there had been a revised budget and made reference to table A. Funding is likely to be allocated in a different way whereby funds are likely to be attributable to the various streams in particular the arrangement for funding for Early Help which was previously funded by the High Needs block will change.</p> <p>Funding is likely to correlate to the overspend and in addition pupil numbers are increasing.</p> <p>4.4 million has been allocated to fund additional demand.</p> <p>The overspend has increased over the year, however in year decisions and also looking closely at how funding has been allocated has made a difference.</p> <p>The Chair thanked BS for his report and invited members to ask questions or make comments:</p> <p>WW referred to table A and commented that it could lead to confusion in particular the interpretation of the overspend of £6.7m.</p> <p>JL explained that there needed to be clarity on what is being forecast, allocated and spent.</p> <p>BS confirmed that the purpose of the report was to illustrate the indicative budget and not the out-turn which will be presented to Schools Forum at the July meeting.</p> <p>Question MM : Why is this based on 15% ?</p> <p>Answer JD : This is covered in the presentation to follow at item 6 MD commented that the High Needs Block Working Committee had discussed this at length and had concluded that the Early Help contribution had reduced, however other areas to be funded by the block may be identified.</p>	

<b>6</b>	<b>High Needs Block Recovery update</b>	
<p><b>6.1</b></p> <p><b>6.2</b></p> <p><b>6.3</b></p> <p><b>6.4</b></p>	<p>MJ delivered the presentation that had been circulated to members. Headlines from the presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional finance capacity secured for DSG</li> <li>• Three out of four projects underway</li> <li>• Increase in SEN Contingency from £1.3m to £1.825m</li> <li>• Uplift in HNB grant for 22-23 of £6.7m (£3.1m increase on previously forecasted grant)</li> <li>• DSG Q3 in year position is £6.7m overspend - an increase of £0.3m from Q2</li> <li>• DSG accumulated deficit is forecasted at £23.7m</li> <li>• HNB classifications work ongoing, conclusion to be reported at next meeting</li> </ul> <p>She highlighted the strategy to address spend that included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase to SEN Contingency fund agreed by Schools Forum Jan 2022 (0.25% of DSG equating to £525k)</li> <li>• ISOS had been commissioned to work with schools</li> <li>• Provision of Autism Unit in mainstream secondary school</li> <li>• Increased offer for children with high functioning autism at The Grove (Academy provision)</li> <li>• Additional classroom planned for Riverside to create 8 places for post 16 students- in progress for September 22</li> <li>• Provision for children and young people with SEMH</li> <li>• Improved offer of pathways to employment including supported internships</li> <li>• The development of Strategic Action plan for the Speech, Language and Communication offer in the borough.</li> <li>• Reduction of DSG allocation to Early Help</li> </ul> <p>The Chair invited questions from members:</p> <p>JD explained that the reports and presentation show the worst-case scenario and the actual implications may not be serious. However, the deficit is high and action does need to be taken to address this.</p> <p>Question : AW – Is it there an intention that there will be funding allocated to each area of intervention.</p> <p>Further comments followed as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JD explained that there are plans to do tighter financial modelling to reduce the overspend.</li> <li>• JL confirmed that this is likely to change as more forecasting takes place year on year.</li> <li>• WW explained the impact of savings will be seen over time in the future.</li> </ul>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Use of the Growth Fund 2021-22</b>	
<b>7.1</b>	<p>CK presented the report. He explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth fund has been reserved for historical growth: including oversized KS1 classes and secondary bulge classes</li> <li>• demand was less than previous years with a shortfall in the secondary sector and just one bulge class being required on National Offer Day</li> </ul>	

<p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some schools may have additional pupil numbers, this may change by September. In view of this provisional arrangements have been made for two additional contingency bulge classes for September if required</li> <li>There are smaller cohorts in the primary phase</li> <li>It is unlikely that the growth fund will be used for the secondary sector</li> </ul> <p>CK highlighted that Table 1 shows the estimated indicative figures based on the allocation from last year with figures increasing for reasons including multiple births and appeals. He reported that it is expected that oversized classes will be low again.</p> <p>In view of this, the recommendation outlined in the report is to seek the approval to agree the allocation back to schools of £244,587 unused growth fund in 2021-22 to be distributed via the APT in the March cashflow.</p> <p>The Chair invited comments from members.</p> <p>WW strongly recommended that members agreed to the proposal. Members voted as below: <b>The votes cast were:</b> 13 votes in favour None against <b>Decision:</b> Agreed unanimous</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Updates from Working Groups</b></p>	
<p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p> <p>8.3</p>	<p><b>Schools Block Working Group</b> WW reported that there were no updates as the work carried out by the work of the group takes place from September – January and the group hadn't met since the last meeting.</p> <p><b>High Needs Block Committee</b> The minutes from the last meeting had been circulated to members. MD reported that the group had met and reviewed the SEND consultation, ISOS work with mainstream spend, SEND contingency and recovery plan.</p> <p><b>Early Years Working Group</b> The minutes from the last meeting had been circulated to members. MM reported that the group met twice in January. The work of the group had been covered at in the Early Years Block report that was presented at item. The group had raised the issue of clarity to the Early Years block which has been addressed.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p><b>Workplan</b></p>	
	<p>The clerk reported that there were no additional items to be included in the workplan.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
<p>10.1</p>	<p><b>Teachers' Pensions</b> EH – The Trade Union Representative for explained that there has an issue with teachers pensions that hasn't been signed off by the Treasury. He referred to the joint guidance from Haringey LA and Trade Unions regarding the one-off £1 uplift for each teacher to cover Teachers' Pensions. He emphasised that this should take place in the March pay run.</p>	



<p><b>10.2</b></p>	<p>WW – Thanked EH for his vigilance and explained that it was critical and would be detrimental if schools didn’t take this into effect. This should take place automatically via the Haringey payroll. He advised that any outside payroll providers should be requested to carry this out and urged all Headteachers to check the test payroll for March.</p>	
<p><b>10.3</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk leaving</b> WW explained that it was the last meeting that Neetha will be clerking. He thanked her for her contribution to the work of the forum.</p>	
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p><b>CLOSE</b></p>	
<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thursday 14 July 4pm</li> </ul>	

There being no further business the Meeting closed at 4.40pm

DRAFT