

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

Attendance

School Members **HEADTEACHERS:**
G. Hill, V. Buckett, *A. Wickham, M. Pattison, C. Witham, S. Easton, C. Shaw, J. Flynn, *H. Chawdhry, *A. Atherton, *T. Hartney, *P. Cozier, J. Jarrett

GOVERNORS:
*S.Crowe, *W. Smith, Dr N. Oparaeché, L. Palmer, *M. Mansfield, *V. Cann, *L. Fisher, *L. Butterfield, *I. Pennell, *S. Miller,

Non School Members *Cllr T. Mallett, *T. Brockman (Chair), *P. Forward, J. O’Neil, *S. Tudor-Hart, *M. Rowland

Observer Cllr L. Reith, R. Whittaker, P. Sutton

Officers *S. Worth, *N. Murton, *I. Bailey, P. Lewis, *J. Smosarski

* Present

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
1.	<p>ELECTION OF VICE - CHAIR</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Two nominations for Vice Chair had been received. Tony Hartney (TH), proposed by Andrew Wickham (AW) and seconded by Patrick Cozier (PC) and Laura Butterfield (LB), proposed by Vicky Cann (VC) and seconded by Imogen Pennell (IP) The candidates withdrew from the room and the proposers spoke briefly about each candidate. Ballot forms were circulated – votes were cast as follows:</p> <p>Tony Hartney 8 votes Laura Butterfield 8 votes</p> <p>A coin was tossed to decide the winner and Tony Hartney won the toss. Tony Hartney was declared Vice Chair.</p>	
2.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr. Reith, Gerald Hill, Maxine Pattison, Cal Shaw, Nathan Oparaeché and Louise Palmer</p>	
3.	<p>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12th NOVEMBER 2009</p> <p>AGREED The minutes of the meeting held on 12th November 2009 were agreed and signed as a true record.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 12th NOVEMBER 2009</p> <p>Minute 4.1.4 – Schools Forum Induction training – 8 members attended</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

a useful and successful session. The Chair thanked Steve Worth (SW) and Neville Murton (NM) for organising and leading the training.

Minute 4.1.5 – LB asked if there had been any response to her query relating to the delay in schools receiving information on the details of service being offered by internal audit. NM replied that he had discussed the issue with Ann Woods, Head of Audit. Ann Woods had tried to contact the Headteacher of Coldfall Primary School but had been unable to do so. She had made no comments to NM as to the reasons for the delay.

Minute 4.1.6 – Single Funding Formula – Written Ministerial Statement ‘Early Years Funding’ tabled

The statement had been released on the day of the meeting. The statement delays the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) until April 2011. The LA is considering the implications of the statement. The LA could choose to join a small group of pathfinder authorities and implement the EYSFF in April 2010 or to wait until 2011. The consultation process has already started and NM recommended that whichever course members opt for the consultation process should continue.

Members discussed whether to recommend that the authority join the pathfinder project. Sarah Crowe (SC) suggested that the authority should delay until 2011 – the issues surrounding full time places have yet to be sorted out and the additional year will give the necessary time to sort out these issues. Melian Mansfield (MM) and NM shared this view. Members agreed not to join the pathfinder authorities.

AGREED – not to implement the EYSFF until April 2011

Members discussed whether to continue with the consultation process, which has recently begun. AW proposed that the consultation process should be abandoned. Once decisions had been taken with regard to full time places the issues we were currently consulting on may well have changed. In addition the implementation will now take place post general election. Inevitably this will lead to further changes. By delaying the consultation the process can be taken in a more timely manner once the outcomes of the election and the implications of future funding for Haringey are known.

MM spoke in favour of continuing and extending the consultation already begun. The working group have completed a huge amount of preparatory work and the additional time will allow for a more thorough, lengthy consultation. Susan Tudor-Hart (STH) agreed with this view adding that the extension would allow for more work to be done in the Private Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector.

TH supported the proposal to abandon the consultation. His reasons were that there was so much uncertainty about the future both locally and nationally. Attendance at the road show already held had been very small and as Haringey was not to take part in the pathfinder project there was no need to consult prematurely.

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

VC supported the proposal to continue with the consultation, the more time available to carry out the consultation the more thorough that consultation could be. In addition the longer period of consultation would allow more time for all schools to look at the implications for their institutions. Ian Bailey (IB) endorsed this point adding that the original period allowed for consultation had been too short and there would now be the opportunity to consult more widely.

Members voted on whether to continue with the consultation:

**VOTES FOR 11
VOTES AGAINST 3
ABSTENTIONS 2**

AGREED; It was agreed to continue with the consultation

The Chair suggested that it was implicit in this decision that there would be an extension of the consultation process and that stakeholders would be written to informing them of the extension.

AGREED: to extend the date of the consultation and advise stakeholders accordingly

NM

The Chair added that the extension would also create the opportunity for the LA to set out their Early Years Policy to inform the consultation. The work of the working party had of necessity focussed on finance rather than education. The working party had been concerned throughout that there was not a clearly defined policy. It was agreed to request such a policy from the LA.

AGREED: to request an Early Years Policy from the LA.

IB

Minute 5 – Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) Update on campaign; an article from the Newham Recorder was tabled

The Chair reported that the campaign in Newham is building up. As a result of the Adjournment debate instigated by Lynn Featherstone, M.P, David Lammy had secured a meeting with Diana Johnson, parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools. She had agreed to meet with a deputation from Haringey including David Lammy, M.P., Cllr Lorna Reith, Tony Brockman and Neville Murton. This meeting took place on the 7th December and those in attendance put the case for Haringey using key elements from the preliminary KPMG research as presented to the last forum meeting. The outcome of this meeting will be a further, in depth meeting with LA officers and senior civil servants to look in detail at the KPMG report. The response from Diana Johnson had been sympathetic.

The meeting had also discussed the timetable in which Ministers would make their decisions after the consultation. Had it not been for the General Election, the department would have expected this to be in June 2009. The deputation had pointed out their concern that decisions were

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

	<p>made prior to the General Election</p> <p>Lynn Featherstone has also secured a meeting, which TB will attend.</p> <p>NM reported that the KPMG report is nearing completion. Alex Atherton (AA) thanked those involved for their work. He was encouraged to see that Newham were taking a more active part in the campaign but disappointed that other authorities in similar circumstances had not chosen to support and join the campaign.</p> <p>AW asked if the KPMG report was to be submitted prior to the consultation or during the consultation. NM replied that it was intended that the report be shared with DCSF officials in the meeting that had been secured between them and Haringey officers.</p> <p>Minute 7.4 - Value for Money working group – the date for a first meeting has yet to be set, as officers have been focussing on the EYSFF.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>2010 – 11 BUDGET STRATEGY</p> <p>It was agreed to consider each recommendation and the appropriate section of the report in order.</p> <p>Recommendation (i)</p> <p>The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is based on pupil numbers taken from the January count. The DCSF publish indicative allocations of DSG based on their own estimations of pupil numbers. These are usually an over-estimation and Haringey has tended to use nil growth to estimate future income. Applying this approach, the estimated pupil numbers for 2010 -11 are 31,876 resulting in a DSG of £170.992m. This results in a £6.487m increase in funding. If pupil numbers rise there would be an increase in funding. If pupil numbers are lower there will be a reduction in funding.</p> <p>AW asked whether pupil numbers were rising – there had been huge pressure on primary school places this year. IB replied that although there had been pressure on Reception places the lower numbers on roll in previous years were still working their way through the system. It was therefore safer to assume that pupil numbers would remain the same. Toni Mallett (TM) asked whether the recession had an impact on pupil numbers as a result of movement from the independent sector. IB replied that this had not had a significant impact in Haringey.</p> <p>Recommendation (i) the Forum notes the estimated increase in DSG of £6.487m (paragraph 2.7) together with the factors that might change it. NOTED Recommendation (i) was noted.</p> <p>Recommendation (ii)</p> <p>There is an anticipated 2.1% increase in the MFG. Table 3 of the report</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

shows how the MFG is put together. **NB – these assumptions include a 1% cost efficiency saving.**

Table 4 lays out the assumed inflation rate in Haringey. Overall this stands at 1.928%

Recommendation (ii) the Forum notes the estimated cost of the MFG of £3.455m (paragraph 3.1.4) together with the other inflationary pressures outside the MFG of £152,500 (paragraph 3.1.5 (i) & (ii))

NOTED: Recommendation (ii) was noted.

Recommendation (iii)

The Forum notes the introduction of the EYSFF from April 2010 together with the current consultation process, the outcomes from which will be reported to the Forum in January (Section 3.2)

Withdrawn: -The recommendation was withdrawn – following the extension of the EYSFF

Recommendation (iv)

The result of the consultation agreed at the Schools Forum meeting on the 5th October is not yet known.

Recommendation (iv) The Forum notes the estimated effect of the proposed formula change for the new Heartlands High School of £66,000 (Paragraph 3.3.1)

NOTED: recommendation (iv) was noted.

Recommendation (v)

The numbers and complexities of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) continues to rise. Sarah Miller (SM) asked what steps the LA was taking to improve provision for children with complex needs within borough –thus negating the need to send children out of borough. IB replied that there would be additional places for children with Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD) at Heartlands High School and the development of the primary inclusive campus and the Secondary Inclusive Campus would provide additional places for children with complex needs. In addition further primary places for children with ASD were being sought.

Paragraph 3.4.2 refers to a review of the funding for secondary aged pupils at the Secondary Pupil Referral Unit – this unit has traditionally been funded for more places than have been taken up – funding will now match actual numbers.

MM asked if point 3 of 3.4.2 (review of central costs attributable to the EYSFF) was still relevant. NM agreed that this would have to be reconsidered.

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

Recommendation (v) the Forum notes the estimated pressures of £140,000 on the SEN budget (paragraph 3.4.1)

NOTED: Recommendation (v) was noted.

Recommendation (vi)

Recommendation (vi) The Forum notes the proposed reprioritisation of resources within central expenditure (paragraph 3.4.2-3.4.3)

NOTED: Recommendation (vi) was noted

Recommendation (vii)

Under the EYSFF regulations this recommendation would have referred to all children whether in the maintained or the PVI sector. The decision to put the ESYFF back by a year means that the inclusion of the PVI sector is not automatic. Inclusion of the PVI sector will impact on the amount of money going into maintained schools. Officers could be requested to explore what this impact would be. The money would be allocated using the AEN /deprivation factor and could only be eligible for pupils within this category. AW asked if there was good quality information on the numbers of children in the PVI sector who would come under this heading. NM confirmed that such information was available, although would be based on the previous years pupils.

STH stated that the funding was for children entitled to extra provision and this should be available no matter where the children were placed. Children should be dealt with equitably.

It would not be possible to consult with all schools on this issue in the timescale and NM proposed to consult with the Forum only. Mark Rowlands (MR) asked how practicable it would be to work out the costs of extending the distribution of any headroom to include the PVI sector. NM said it should be possible to work up some exemplars. Toni Mallett (TM) asked what proportion of children in the PVI sector would be eligible for this funding and whether the agreed levels of deprivation were the same in every sector. NM replied that relative levels of deprivation and ethnic groupings could be calculated. If the PVI sector were to be included the pot of money available would be spread over a wider base and so would reduce the amount that would go into the maintained sector. TH stated that there were serious implications to money being diverted out of the maintained sector and into the independent sector. More work was needed to consider the principles behind such a decision. AW asked if it were agreed to include the PVI sector into this allocation would they receive a similar rate to the maintained schools. NM stated that the rates would be equitable. IB added that each child would need to be assessed on an equitable basis. NM stressed that this discussion relates to headroom only, the EYSFF would be drawing funds from a much larger pot.

The Chair pointed out it was difficult to be making such a decision at this moment with the ministerial announcement only a few hours old. He

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

pointed out that the delay to the EYSFF had come about because of schools protesting about the plans for the single funding formula impacting negatively on their budget shares. It was difficult to then try and make a decision about implementing a single strand of the funding voluntarily, and without the rest of the information. AA agreed that the Forum was not in a position to make a decision although in principle he felt that the AEN funding should apply to all children in their early years. He asked how far had the authority had got with allocating the full AEN/ Deprivation funding by need, as he understood that the percentage being allocated in this way was not as much as had been planned.

MM supported STH 's proposal that the headroom should be allocated across all sectors. STH asked if officers could present the work on this area that had been completed. The Chair felt that officers needed at least a steer from the Forum as to which method they favoured, although it was probable that more work would have to be done. IB stated that the implications were not really known and more work would have to be done to fully understand the implications for all providers.

The Chair requested that officers present full exemplifications for both options – the amount of money that would be available if the PVI sector were included and the amount available if the PVI sector were not included.

Recommendation (vii) - the Forum supports the proposal that any remaining headroom be targeted, through the relevant AEN/Deprivation factors, across all relevant settings. (Paragraph 3.5.4)

WITHDRAWN: Recommendation (vii) was withdrawn. Officers were requested to prepare exemplifications to show the effects of distribution of the remaining headroom through the relevant AEN/Deprivation factors with and without the inclusion of the PVI sector.

Recommendation (viii)

From 2010 the LA will assume financial responsibility from the LSC for the funding of all post 16 provision in the area. **The Chair suggested that the forum should write to the DCSF seeking reassurance that the change over will happen in good time so that schools will receive proper and timely notification of funding for their sixth forms.**

AGREED

AW asked if the figures in table 5 meant that the headroom would be £834,396. NM agreed that this was correct. AW noted that there was considerably more headroom this year than last and that therefore more money could be allocated to the AEN/ Deprivation factor allocation.

Recommendation (viii) The Forum notes the other issues referred to in section 4

NOTED: recommendation (viii) was noted

NM

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2009**

	<p>STH thanked officers for getting papers out in good time and thanked the Chair and officers for conducting the meeting in a clear and concise manner.</p>	
6.	<p>ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS</p> <p>a. Details of the Chancellor's announcement on 0-19 education was (tabled) The Forum noted the document querying whether the term 'real terms growth' was an accurate description of the frontline investment when 0.9% of this came from efficiencies – this was not new money and should more accurately be described as 'cash growth.'</p> <p>b. VC asked if there were to be another full spending review late in 2010 as the three year funding formula would be ending then. NM said this was anticipated.</p> <p>c. VC asked if there were any update on Single Status. NM agreed to contact Steve Davies for an update.</p> <p>d. SW reported that the audit of teachers' pension contributions was unqualified this year. They were qualified last year because of concerns about controls in some schools that had opted out of the LA payroll SLA.</p>	NM
7.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p><u>Thursday 28th January 2010</u> at 3.45 for 4pm (Now revised to a 4.30 start)</p>	
	<p>The Chair thanked everyone for attending</p>	

The meeting closed at 5.55 pm

TONY BROCKMAN
Chair