

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28TH JANUARY 2010**

Chair: Tony Brockman

Vice-chair: Tony Hartney

Attendance

Quorum: currently 12 members [40% excluding vacancies and Observers]

The Constitution states that non-attendance at three consecutive meetings results in disqualification of membership. Apologies for absence should be submitted to the Clerk at jmosarski@googlemail.com or telephone GSTU 0208 4895030

Term of Office: 3 years

School Members		Non-School Members
Head teachers	Governors	
Special Schools [1] A Gerald Hill [The Vale]	<i>Special Schools [1]</i> Vacancy[]	(non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1] * Cllr Toni Mallett
Children's Centres [1] Val Buckett [Pembury House CC]	<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Sarah Crowe [Rowland Hill CC]	<i>Professional Association Representative [1]</i> * Tony Brockman [Substitute: Julie Davies] [Haringey Teachers' Panel] <i>Trade Union Representative [1]</i> Pat Forward [UNISON]
Primary Community [7] A Andrew Wickham [Weston Park] A Maxine Pattison [Ferry Lane] Chris Witham [Rhodes Ave] Sharon Easton [StPauls&AllHallows]	<i>Primary Community [7]</i> Walter Smith [Risley Avenue] Nathan Oparaeché [St Mary's CE Jnr] Louise Palmer [Muswell Hill] * Melian Mansfield [Coleridge]	<i>14-19 Partnership [1]</i> * Jane O'Neil {CHENEL}
* Cal Shaw [Chestnuts] * Jane Flynn [Alexandra Primary] * Hasan Chawdhry [Crowland]	A Vicky Cann [Belmont Infant] Louis Fisher [Earlsmead] * Laura Butterfield [Coldfall]	<i>E.Y. Private and Voluntary Sector</i> * Susan Tudor-Hart
<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> * Alex Atherton [Park View Academy] * Tony Hartney [Gladesmore]	<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> Vacancy Vacancy Imogen Pennell[Highgate Wood] A Sarah Miller (Gladesmores)	<i>Faith Schools</i> Mark Rowland
A Patrick Cozier [Highgate Wood] A June Jarrett [Sixth Form Centre]		
	Observers [non-voting] <i>LBH Cabinet Member for Children &YP</i> * Cllr Lorna Reith	Substitute Members at this meeting * Bill Barker (for June Jarrett)
	<i>Learning & Skills Council</i> Ruth Whittaker	
	<i>Haringey (Teaching) Primary Care</i>	Also present

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

Trust

Vacancy

* Steve Worth, School Funding
Manager

*Early Years Dvpmnt & Childcare
P'ship*

* Neville Murton, Head of Finance
CYPS

* Ian Bailey, Deputy Director CYPS

Greig City Academy

* Jan Smosarski, Clerk

Paul Sutton

Peter Lewis, Director CYPS

* indicates attendance

A indicates apologies received

TONY BROCKMAN [CHAIR] IN THE CHAIR

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
1.	CHAIR'S WELCOME	
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He congratulated officers on the development of the schools' forum website and noted that there were a few issues to be resolved. He explained that Steve Worth (SW) had been delayed but would be arriving shortly. Dates for working parties, in particular the Value for Money and the Constitution Working Party needed to be set outside of the meeting.	
2.	APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS	
	Apologies were received from Andrew Wickham, Vicky Cann, Gerald Hill, Patrick Cozier, Maxine Pattison and June Jarrett. Substitute Members – Bill Barker substituting for June Jarrett.	
3.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10th DECEMBER 2009	
3.1	Neville Murton (NM) explained that the minutes had been put into a new format which brought the minutes inline with the format used by the council. Members pointed out a number of minor difficulties which will be addressed.	
3.2	AGREED The minutes of the meeting held on 10 th December 2009 were agreed and signed as a true record.	
4.	MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 10th DECEMBER 2009	
4.1.1	Minute 4.1.6 – Schools and PVI providers have been informed of the change of date for the implementation of the Single Funding Formula. Schools were to be encouraged to respond to the consultation. To date one response has been received. Five people had attended the first consultation meeting; around twenty the second and the third had been cancelled owing to bad weather. This has now been rescheduled for the 2 nd February. Concern was expressed that the information that had gone out with the consultation document was complex and that one of the reasons for the poor response was due to lack of understanding. The Chair noted this concern needed to be addressed before the second phase of consultation began.	
4.1.2	The Chair added that the delay in implementation allowed focus on the educational issues rather than the purely financial concerns, which had dominated discussions so far. He asked if there were any further progress on a policy for Early Years provision as this would be necessary if such discussions were to take place. Ian Bailey (IB) noted the point about the policy on Early Years provision and replied that work is now in progress following agreement of the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP). Elements of a policy do exist for example in the outreach strategy currently out to consultation, the preventative strategy and the family support strategy. The Chair stressed that the policy would need to be in place before the second phase of consultation commenced.	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

<p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p>	<p>Minute 5 – Recommendation (vii) A paper from officers which explained the reasons for the decision not to proceed was noted. NM reported that therefore no further work on the approach had been carried out although it would be completed for the EYF Working Group meetings.</p> <p>Minute 5 Recommendation (viii) – NM reported that data coming in indicated a large increase in SEN numbers. This would have an effect on headroom. A report will be brought to the February meeting.</p> <p>Minute 5 Recommendation (viii) The Chair informed members that a letter had been drafted to the DCSF expressing the hope that post 16 funding would be received in a timely manner.</p> <p>Minute 6c – Alex Atherton asked when the Single Status issues were likely to be resolved. Schools had been accruing money to pay likely deficits for a number of years now without knowing for sure what their liabilities were. NM replied that schools had been given guidance on the amount they should accrue and would be again for this year – delays were not a local matter but a national problem.</p>	<p>NM/SW</p>
<p>5</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p>	<p>AREA COST ADJUSTMENT (ACA Working Party Update)</p> <p>The update fell into three main categories – meetings attended, a report back on the work carried out by KPMG and next steps.</p> <p>Meetings – The Chair, Cllr .Reith and NM had met with Diana Johnson MP (Undersecretary of State)/ David Lammy MP, reported in the meeting of the 10th December. There had been a further meeting with Stephen Kingdom, Head of School Funding. The Chair congratulated NM on the thorough and detailed case he presented. A further meeting had taken place between Lynne Featherstone, M.P. and Vernon Coaker, Minister of State, (Schools and Learners.)</p> <p>KPMG – the most beneficial approach to the ACA for Haringey would be an approach which applied ‘smoothing’ between adjacent authorities. Also a hybrid approach, containing elements of both the General Labour Market approach, and the Specific Cost approach benefits us.</p> <p>The indications from the meetings attended are that the most likely period of consultation for changes to the DSG allocation formula will be from the beginning of February for a period of 12 weeks. This will mean that any decisions on changes will be made after the general election.</p> <p>From the meetings it was clear that neither the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the DCSF were in favour of a cost of living approach based on house prices, or for ‘smoothing’ as this would not provide a ‘pure’ formula that allocated funding solely on the basis of the specific data for an authority.</p> <p>DCSF apparently accepted the merits of including a specific Cost</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

	<p>Approach through a hybrid model – they indicated that there would be an option in the consultation paper for an allocation of the ACA which would reflect teacher salaries rates (70% of the allocation) with 30% being based on a General Labour Market approach. Such a system would benefit Haringey. It would narrow the 18+% difference between Haringey’s funding and schools receiving inner London funding to around 6+%.</p>	
5.7.1	<p>Next Steps – The KPMG research would be used in order to gain more widespread response to the DCSF consultation in support of Haringey’s preferred option (likely to be the hybrid option detailed above). Following discussions between the Chair of the Forum, The Lead Member and Officers it was proposed that, following the next Schools Forum meeting to be held on 25th February there would be a public meeting to give information about the consultation. This would aim to provide a better understanding of the issues, which in turn should result in a wider, and more focused response to the consultation. To facilitate this it was agreed to delay the start of the Schools Forum meeting to 4.30 and to end it by 6.30. The public event would start shortly after that time and would also be held at the PDC. Letters of invitation would be sent out prior to the meeting.</p>	
5.7.2	<p>The Chair reported back on his meeting with Lynne Featherstone, M.P. and Vernon Coaker. (M.P. and Minister of State (Schools and Learners)). Vernon Coaker had stressed that there would be no final decisions this side of a general election. He had also indicated that the two most favoured methods of calculating the ACA were a) General Labour Market (the existing methodology) and b) the hybrid approach detailed in 5.6. It was probable that a number of authorities in the south and inner London would oppose the hybrid approach but a number of authorities in the north would support it. Vernon Coaker and DCSF officials had not refuted that the ‘cliff edge’ differences in Haringey and some of its adjacent boroughs were the biggest in the country. Lynne Featherstone had also put forward a case for interim relief for Haringey but this had been ruled out.</p>	
5.8	<p>Members thanked NM and the Chair for the extensive work and detailed report back. They went on to discuss the likelihood of a concerted response from the Inner London authorities against proposed changes to the formula, as they would be negatively affected. The Chair was unaware of any Inner London authorities currently actively campaigning on the issues. It would be important to ensure that the campaign and the planned public meeting were well advertised. Currently changes to the ACA formula are supported across the main three political parties in Haringey – consequently it was hoped that the outcome of local elections would not affect support within Haringey for the proposed changes.</p>	
5.9	<p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Forum notes the current position and the proposed arrangements for launching the work commissioned from KPMG – NOTED (ii) Approval for the final consultation response to be delegated to the ACA working group of the Schools Forum – AGREED 	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p>	<p>NATIONAL SCHOOL BALANCES</p> <p>There has been an increasing amount of concern within the DCSF at the balance of money being held by schools. Nationally almost £1.8 billion pounds is held in schools' balances. This has led to concern that the money has not been spent on the pupils for whom it was allocated and that there are real issues of poor strategic management at school/governor level. This has in turn led to a range of measures, including the clawback of uncommitted monies being implemented.</p> <p>SW compared Haringey schools revenue balances with averages for London and England. Haringey is well below the London and England figures for balances held by schools and well above in terms of schools in deficit. In 2007-08 it had the third highest number of schools on deficit and in 2008-09 was the thirteenth highest. In 2007-08 Haringey was 134/150 in terms of schools with excess balances (Secondary Schools with more than 5% carried forward and Primary / Special Schools with more than 8% carried forward) This figure had worsened to 136/150 in 2008-09. This would appear to link with the lower levels of funds received in Haringey in comparison with other adjacent authorities.</p> <p>Appendix 2 showed the individual school balances as a percentage of school income. The spread in deciles should show an even spread across the table. In 1999 -2000 31 Haringey schools were in the top five deciles with 60 schools in the bottom five deciles (expected number per decile 9.1) By 2008-09 this had worsened to 21 schools in the first five deciles with 59 schools in the bottom five deciles with an expected number of 8 per decile. This would indicate that Haringey schools are steadily falling behind other authorities.</p> <p>Appendix 3 – A comparison of London Authority balances by ACA weighting. Of the outer east 'sandwich' boroughs and the southwest 'sandwich' boroughs Haringey is the worst off. The appendix also highlights big differences between outer east boroughs and their adjacent inner London authorities</p> <p>Jane O'Neil asked if there were similar data for post 16 funding. SW did not have access to such information. Toni Mallett asked if the lower balances shown in Haringey schools represented schools responding to government encouragement not to carry money forward or showed inequalities in funding. SW replied that there had been a small reduction in money being carried forward nationally in 2008-09.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>(i) That members note the publication of the tables – NOTED</p> <p>(ii) That the implications of the appendices inform the Forum's response to the forthcoming consultation on changes to the methodology for allocating the DSG – NOTED</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>NEW SCHOOL FACTOR</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2010**

7.1	The paper described the consultation with schools on the proposal that a lump sum New School factor is introduced in 2010 using the methodology agreed by the Forum on 5 th October 2009. The consultation ended on January 14 th 2010. Five responses were received all of which were in favour of the recommendation.	
7.2	Recommendation That a lump sum New School factor is introduced for 2010 using the methodology agreed by the Forum on 5th October 2009 – Agreed for inclusion in Cabinet budget report for decision.	
8	FORWARD PLAN	
8.1	The dates and outline agendas for meetings for the next twelve months were circulated with the papers. Jane O’Neil asked if there could be more agenda items related to 14-19 issues, as there were a number of important changes due. Officers agreed to look at this. It was further agreed that the paper should be recirculated by email for further comment (including on proposed dates for meetings) / suggestion by members.	NM/ SW
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending	
9	ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS	
	There was no other business	
10	DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING	
	The next meeting scheduled for the 25 th February will begin at 4.30pm	
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending	

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm

TONY BROCKMAN

Chair