

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Vacancy | A | Steve Worth, School Funding Manager |
| <i>Early Years Dvpmnt & Childcare P'ship</i> | * | Neville Murton, Head of Finance CYPS |
| | * | Ian Bailey, Deputy Director CYPS |
| <i>Greig City Academy</i> | * | Jan Smosarski, Clerk |
| Paul Sutton | | Peter Lewis, Director CYPS |
| | | Kevin Bartle |
| | * | Bill Barker, Sixth Form College |
| | * | Ann Woods |
| | * | Trudi Eagle |
| * indicates attendance | A | indicates apologies received |

TONY BROCKMAN [CHAIR] IN THE CHAIR

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| MINUTE NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION | ACTION BY |
|-------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. | CHAIR'S WELCOME | |
| 1.1 | The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. As this is the first Forum meeting since the Fair Funding public Meeting he took this opportunity to thank those forum members who attended the public meeting. | |
| 2. | MEMBERSHIP | |
| 2.1 | The Chair welcomed new Forum members Janet Barter, secondary governor at Alexandra Park. Maria Jennings, secondary governor at NPCS and Sarah Crowe, primary governor member at Devonshire Hill Primary. | |
| 2.2 | Sharon Easton, Primary Headteacher has missed more than three meetings without sending apologies. This resulted in a vacancy. There are currently vacancies for a primary headteacher, a primary governor and a Children's Centre governor member | AW |
| 3. | APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS | |
| 3.1 | Apologies were received from Chris Witham, Maxine Pattison, Jane O'Neil, Jane Flynn, Gerald Hill, Cllr. Reith, Cllr. Mallet, Patrick Cozier and Susan Tudor- Hart. | |
| 3.2 | The Chair informed Forum members that he had been advised that in future the forum would have to agree apologies for absence. When sending apologies to the Clerk members are asked in future to give reasons for their absence. | ALL |
| 4. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no new declarations of interest. | |
| 5. | MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25th FEBRUARY 2010 | |
| 5.1 | AGREED The minutes of the meeting held on 25 th February 2010 were agreed and signed as a true record. | |

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 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>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 28TH JANUARY 2010</p> <p>Minute 6.4 – Melian Mansfield (MM) asked whether money allocated for statements was monitored to ensure that it was used for the correct purpose. Neville Murton (NM) explained that this was not done by Finance and the question should be referred to Phil DiLeo. June Jarrett (JJ) added that there was some monitoring as part of the Annual Review process.</p> <p>Minute 8 – School Lunch Grant- NM reported that following the implementation of the recommendation at the last meeting substantially more schools were charging the recommended amount for a school meal. 33 schools charged £1.90 (or in one case £1.80), 23 schools charged £2.00 and 4 schools charged £2.00+</p> <p>MM asked whether there was any information to show that the £1.90 was good value for money. She was requested to put this question in writing to Ian Bailey/</p> <p>Maria Jennings (MJ) asked for an update on uncollected debt and whether there had been any further consideration given to extending the range of payments open to families. NM replied that schools had received advice on debt collection as reported in a previous Forum meeting. Consideration had been given to alternative methods of payment such as direct debit but the implementation of alternative systems was complex.</p> <p>Minute 12.1 – fraud – although declining in Haringey there were still instances of the fraudulent cashing of cheques. However there have been instances of similar fraudulent activities being reported from other boroughs.</p> | |
| <p>7.</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p> | <p>2009-10 FMSiS OUTCOMES AND 2010-11 PROGRAMME - Ann Woods, Head of Audit and Risk Management</p> <p>Ann Woods reported that since writing her report several more schools had confirmed dates for FMSiS audits.</p> <p>If any school found they were unable to meet the agreed date of their audit they must inform Audit as soon as possible as the department was now contracting out the audits and would be charged if contractors visited schools and were unable to carry out the planned audit.</p> <p>In the first three year round of FMSiS audits only one school had failed to meet the standard and this was due to auditors being unable to carry out the assessment in this particular school in spite of several attempts to do so. Ann Woods was now taking advice from central government as to how this issue should be dealt with. Ian Bailey (IB) confirmed that the School Improvement Team were aware of the concerns raised by the Audit Team about this school. MM asked whether governors at the school were aware of the situation and suggested that this should happen via the Governor Support and Training Unit (GSTU)</p> <p>AW asked whether there were any change in the three year audit plan for schools – that is one year an FMSiS audit, one year a general audit and in the third year no audit. Ann Woods replied that a number of schools would be having 'routine' audits but that would not extend to a third of the schools. Schools would be audited on a 'risk' basis following FMSis audits – although there would be a random sample of schools</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>7.5</p> | <p>also receiving general audits. AW requested that a school would not get a general audit and a FMSiS audit in the same financial year. Ann Woods confirmed this would be the case unless a school requested this.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>NOTED 1. That the Schools Forum note the positive results of the 2009-10 FMSiS audit programme.</p> <p>AGREED 2 That the Schools Forum agree the proposed timetable for 2010-11 to ensure that the programme of FMSiS re-assessment can be achieved by 31 March 2011</p> | |
| <p>8.</p> <p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p> <p>8.3</p> <p>8.4</p> <p>8.5</p> | <p>8. INSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR SCHOOLS 2010-11 – Trudi Eagle</p> <p>There have been no changes to the insurance cover arrangements this year. All premiums remain the same. The only change has been in the company providing the buildings liability cover.</p> <p>AW asked if schools were covered for fraudulent cashing of cheques. Trudi replied that they were but schools would be expected to carry out an investigation. Changes are being made to the way in which payments are being made to ensure greater security.</p> <p>Laura Butterfield asked if schools were still had buildings insurance if they opted out of the Property and Contracts SLA. Trudi replied that they were.</p> <p>MM asked what insurance documentation schools got. She was told that this document was sent to Headteachers. MM requested that it was also sent to Chairs of Governors.</p> <p>Recommendation – That the report was noted.</p> <p>NOTED – The Forum noted the report</p> | |
| <p>9.</p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p>9.2.1</p> <p>9.2.2</p> <p>9.2.3</p> <p>9.2.4</p> <p>9.2.5</p> | <p>9. REVIEW OF THE HARINGEY SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA – Neville Murton, Head of Finance for the CYPS</p> <p>The report is the first step to consider whether there should be any changes to the formula funding in 2011-12. Schools Forums are discouraged in making changes to the formula in a three-year period. 2011 will mark the start of a new three-year period.</p> <p>Sixth Form Centre – a specific issue relating to the Sixth Form Centre has been raised in Appendix 1. Bill Barker addressed the forum on this issue. The following points were made in the discussion:</p> <p>The Sixth Form Centre provides the 16-18 education for all young people who attended special schools. Effectively this means that there is a special school within the Sixth Form Centre.</p> <p>The funding for these students does not mirror the funding received by special school pupils. In particular the Minimum Basic Allocation (MBA) for the Sixth Form Centre for funding for a Headteacher is only 55/1200..</p> <p>If the students had remained in their special school it would have received the full MBA.</p> <p>The special school students continue to have needs that involve the time of the Deputy Headteacher and the Headteacher.</p> <p>The LA already subsidises the money allocated by the Learning Skills Council. Any additional funding would increase this subsidy, which comes out of the DSG.</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>9.2.6</p> <p>9.2.7</p> <p>9.2.8</p> <p>9.3</p> <p>9.3.1</p> <p>9.4</p> <p>9.4.1</p> <p>9.5</p> <p>9.5.1</p> | <p>NM stated that officers were sympathetic to the general point raised and noted that it was proposed that they should look at this situation in more detail and bring a proposal back to the Forum for further consideration.</p> <p>The Chair stressed that the submission from the Sixth Form Centre had been allowed because it was the only representative of its phase. Submissions to the Forum by individual institutions are not encouraged.</p> <p>Recommendation 1 AGREED – That the Forum agrees to consider changes to the MBA for the Haringey Sixth Form College and that officers agree a recommended position with the Sixth Form College for consideration at the next meeting of the Forum.</p> <p>Forum members considered the current funding formula and any factors that should be reviewed prior to 2011. AW asked whether some consideration should be given to a review of the AWPU range as he felt that there should be some review before 2014. It was pointed out that implementation of any changes might be in conflict with the minimum funding guarantee, and that it might be better to await the outcome of the DCSF funding consultation.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 AGREED -That Forum members consider the current funding formula and raise with officers any factors that should be reviewed prior to 2011.</p> <p>Members discussed the advantages of schools being able to predict income over a three-year period. It was felt that there should be a review of the AWPU range, which should be reported to the Forum by October 2011.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 AGREED as amended (amendments in italics) – That the Forum agrees to a review of the relative distribution <i>between phases, with that review reported to the Forum by October 2011</i></p> <p>There was a further discussion as to whether the LA may have difficulty in having access to accurate information to prior attainment owing to the SATs boycott. IB stated that there was no lack of information on prior attainment – it would only be the SATs results that were unavailable. It was agreed to add a fourth recommendation.</p> <p>Recommendation 4 AGREED – Officers to bring to the next Forum meeting proposals on how any absences in data on prior attainment will be addressed in the 2011 school budgets.</p> | <p>Officers (NM/ SW)</p> <p>NM</p> <p>NM</p> |
| <p>10</p> <p>10.1</p> | <p>PROPOSED RESPONSE TO THE DCSF CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO THE DSG – Neville Morton</p> <p>The Chair opened the discussion by referring everyone to the tabled guidance on how to respond to the Government's DSG Formula Review and a Q & A sheet relating to issues about the ACA. He urged schools, governing bodies and individuals to respond to the consultation. The consultation closes on June 7th so time is now of the essence. Copies of</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| <p>10.2</p> <p>10.3</p> | <p>responses should be sent to NM who has only received about five copies to date. It was proposed that schools and all other organisations that might respond be circulated with a list of responses received to encourage others to follow suit.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that given the change of government and having lobbied Diana Johnson and Vernon Coker a schools forum deputation should now approach the new Secretary of State. This was agreed and it was agreed that The Chair and Vice Chair should make this approach.</p> <p>The paper sets a steer for responses on all other strands of the consultation. The ACA Working Party will meet on the 20th May and will formulate the forum's response to all sections of the consultation document. Views from the Forum will act as a steer for that Working Party discussion. Members discussed each question in the document, looking at the proposed answers made by Officers and commenting on them.</p> <p>Question 1 – Principles applying to the formula. Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 2 – Mainstreaming of grants into the DSG. Members discussed the proposal to mainstream some grants into the DSG. The Chair expressed concern about the EMA Grant being mainstreamed in this way as the current system ensured that this money was ring fenced and spending was transparent and identifiable. This would not be the case if it were to become part of the DSG. Not all members agreed with this view as some felt that most schools spent in excess of the EMA Grant on ethnic minority support. It was further proposed that where grants are not mainstreamed they should be subject to ACA uplift.</p> <p>Question 3 – Proposed elements of the formula. Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 4 –methodology for calculating basic entitlement. Members discussed the advantages and disadvantages of ALF/ Judgment based funding. The Chair expressed the view that if funding is demonstrably below ALF costs then it is clear that schools are being under funded. NM was of the view that a robust ALF model was unavailable and that there was no time to create one.</p> <p>Question 5 – AEN – Members discussed issues relating to the Local Pupil Premium. There was some concern that a Local Pupil Premium might not benefit areas with high levels of AEN. However the newly renamed DFE have expressed the view that most pupil funding should go to the most disadvantaged pupils. All were agreed that the paragraph on mobility should be strengthened, as this key indicator of deprivation and AEN has not been taken into account in the DSG consultation.</p> <p>Question 6 – preferred indicators for distributing money via deprivation. Members agreed that a hybrid approach between FSM and the Index of Deprivation Affecting Childhood Issues (IDACI) was the best approach for Haringey.</p> <p>Question 7 –Other key indicators - Members generally agreed the</p> | <p>Chair/ Vice Chair</p> |
|-------------------------|---|---|

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>points made.</p> <p>Question 8 – Local Pupil Premium mechanism - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 9 – Whether LA's should develop their own pupil premium mechanism - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 10 – High Cost Pupils – There was concern that there was no correlation between AEN and high Cost pupils and that it could not be acceptable to allocate 50% of the money in this way.</p> <p>Question 11 – census and Middle super Output Area - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 14 –ACA - Members generally agreed the points made. The proposed answer gave a good summary of the situation but will be further developed.</p> <p>Question 15 – transitional arrangements - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 16 – Should floors be paid for by all LA's - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> <p>Question 17 – Improvements to the MFG – Members requested that some response be made to this question.</p> <p>Question 18 - Contingency arrangements - Members generally agreed the points made. Concern was expressed that thresholds have been set overly high resulting in payments never being made.</p> <p>Question 19 Proposals for service children - Members generally agreed the points made.</p> | |
| <p>11</p> <p>11.1</p> <p>11.2</p> <p>11.3</p> <p>11.4</p> | <p>UPDATE FROM WORKING PARTIES AND PANELS</p> <p>ACA Working Party - Covered in Item 10</p> <p>EYSFF – The Chair reported that the working party had previously requested an Early Years Policy from the LA in order that they could carry out the funding allocation exercise. However they had now been informed that the policy would not be available until after the funding formula exercise had been carried out. IB pointed out that a new council and a new government would inevitably affect the policy and that delay was inevitable. AW asked whether any decisions had been made about full time Nursery places as Headteachers were concerned about the impact on funding if full time places were lost.</p> <p>Best Value Working Party – Not met</p> <p>Constitution Working Party – this has met twice and a draft constitution is almost complete. It is hoped to bring this to the next meeting.</p> | |
| <p>12</p> | <p>APPRAISAL OF FORUM</p> <p>A report summarising the responses made by members at the last meeting was noted.</p> | |
| <p>13</p> | <p>ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY, 13TH MAY 2010**

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | There was no other business | |
| 14 | DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING The next meeting will be on July 1 st 2010 | |
| | The Chair thanked everyone for attending | |

The meeting closed at 6.05 pm

TONY BROCKMAN

Chair