

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

Chair: Tony Brockman

Vice-Chair: Tony Hartney

Attendance:

Quorum: 40% of membership

***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](mailto:jmosarski@googlemail.com) or telephone GSTU 0208 4895030***

Term of Office: 3 years

School Members		Non-School Members
Head teachers	Governors	
Special Schools [1] * Martin Doyle [Moselle]	<i>Special Schools [1]</i> A Vik Seeborun[The Vale]	(non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1] A Cllr Zena Brabazon
<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Val Bucket [Pembury House CC]	<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Melian Mansfield [Pembury House Children's Centre]	<i>Professional Association Representative [1]</i> * Tony Brockman [Substitute: Julie Davies] [Haringey Teachers' Panel] ^ <i>Trade Union Representative [1]</i> Pat Forward [UNISON}  <i>[Children's Service Consultative Cttee]</i>
<i>Primary Community [7]</i> * Andrew Wickham [Weston Park] * Maxine Pattison [Ferry Lane] A Chris Witham [Rhodes Ave] * Will Wawn [Bounds Green]  * Cal Shaw [Chestnuts] A Jane Flynn [Alexandra Primary] * Hasan Chawdhry [Crowland]	<i>Primary Community [7]</i> Vacancy * Nathan Oparaeché [St Mary's CE Jnr] * Sarah Crowe [Devonshire Hill Primary] * Asher Jacobsberg [Welbourne] Vacancy Louis Fisher [Earlsmead] * Laura Butterfield [Coldfall]	<i>14-19 Partnership [1]</i> A June Jarrett [Sixth Form Centre]  <i>E.Y. Private and Voluntary Sector</i> * Susan Tudor-Hart  <i>Faith Schools</i> A Mark Rowland
<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> * Alex Atherton [Park View] * Tony Hartney [Gladesmore] * Patrick Cozier [Highgate Wood] A Monica Duncan [NPCS]	<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> A Janet Barter [Alexandra Park] Vacancy * Imogen Pennell [Highgate Wood] * Sarah Miller (Gladesmores)	
<i>Academies</i> A Paul Sutton [Greig City Academy]		
	<b>Observers [non-voting]</b> <i>LBH Cabinet Member for Children &amp; YP</i> * Cllr Lorna Reith  <i>Learning &amp; Skills Council</i> Ruth Whittaker  <i>Haringey (Teaching) Primary Care Trust</i>	<b>Substitute Members at this meeting</b> * Mike Claydon for Monica Duncan * Ewan Scott for Janet Barter
		Also present

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

---

Vacancy

- A Steve Worth, School Funding Manager
- \* Neville Murton, Head of Finance CYPs
- \* Ian Bailey, Deputy Director CYPs
- \* Jan Smosarski, Clerk
- Peter Lewis, Director CYPs
- Kevin Bartle
- \* Bill Barker[Sixth Form Centre] Observer

\* indicates attendance A indicates apologies received ^apology received after the meeting

TONY BROCKMAN [ CHAIR ] IN THE CHAIR

***The Clerk must be informed of changes in membership and substitutions prior to the meeting.***

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>CHAIR'S WELCOME</b>	
1.1	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The new Constitution, agreed at the last meeting has been circulated with the papers for this meeting. The Chair suggested that the two key items for discussion at this meeting were agenda items 9 and 11. He drew members' attention to the proposed change of date for the next meeting from 9 <sup>th</sup> December to the 16 <sup>th</sup> December.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>	
2.1	There are currently two primary governor vacancies and one secondary governor vacancy.	<b>Clerk</b>
2.2	All representative groups were asked to provide protocols for the selection of Forum representatives. Those that have been received are available from the Clerk. Representative groups who have not yet submitted protocols were reminded that this is a statutory requirement of all School Forums.	
2.3	<b>Changes of membership and substitutions must be notified to the clerk prior to the meeting</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b>	
	Apologies for absence were received from Mark Rowlands, June Jarrett, Chris Witham, Monica Duncan, Zena Brabazon, Jane Flynn and Janet Barter	
	Mike Claydon (MC) substituting for Monica Duncan	
	Ewan Scott (ES) substituting for Janet Barter.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23<sup>RD</sup> SEPTEMBER 2010</b>	
5.1	<b>AGREED</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2010 were agreed and signed as a true record.	
<b>6</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT ON THIS AGENDA</b>	
6.1	<u>Minute 11.4</u> Will Wawn (WW) queried whether Neville Murton (NM) had stated that the MFG could be a negative figure. NM replied that he had and would pick the issue up later in the meeting.	
6.2	<u>Minute 10.2.2</u> Susan Tudor- Hart (STH) asked what progress had been made with the request that there was additional representation from the PVI sectors for Early Years. NM replied that the request had been put to the council but that no final decision had been made. It was noted that	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	the ultimate decision as to whether there should be additional representation rests with the Council and not the schools Forum.	
6.3	<u>Minute 8.2</u> Steve Worth (SW) reported that some claw backs had been made but that some schools had submitted further information, which had meant that money was not clawed back in those cases.	
6.4	Maxine Patterson (MP) said that she had only received hard copies of the papers today. Forum members discussed the proposal, which had accompanied the electronic version of the papers that in the future hard copies would not be sent out. <b>After discussing the issue a compromise agreement was reached – hard copies would be made available at the meetings but members would receive advance copies of the agenda and papers electronically giving the requisite notice.</b>	<u>ALL</u>
<b>7</b>	<b>PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING SINGLE STATUS IN SCHOOLS – Steve Davies (SD) (Item for information)</b>	
7.1	SD reported that a further 488 job descriptions for individual employees had been sent out – all grades had remained the same but employees have the right to appeal against this decision. It is anticipated that the remaining job descriptions will be completed by January.	
7.2	SD reported that a number of schools had not responded to requests for job descriptions and this information was needed to complete the process. <b>Members requested the names of school that had failed to comply with this request and SD agreed to make this information available.</b>	<u>SD</u>
7.3	Laura Butterfield (LB) asked what happened when grades went down rather than up. SD replied that salaries were protected for three years from the implementation of the regrading. After that individual cases would be looked at with the possibility of a phased reduction in salary.	
7.4	It was suggested that staff in schools not complying with requests for information could be notified that they were possibly being disadvantaged by the schools refusal to provide information. SD was unwilling to pursue this option, as it would undermine managers in the schools concerned.	
7.5	Andrew Wickham (AW) asked whether it would be possible for schools to be furnished with copies of the individual job descriptions that had been evaluated, as this could prove useful when schools were trying to create posts that were not covered in the Personnel handbook. <b>SD agreed to do this.</b>	<u>SD</u>
7.6	Melian Mansfield (MM) asked whether Chairs of Governors of schools which had not responded to requests for information had been informed that this was the case. SD replied that they had not and agreed that this would be a useful way forward.	
7.7	Alex Atherton (AA) suggested that dialogue between Education Personnel Services and schools could be improved. He felt that improved communication at this level would help to resolve some of the difficulties in gaining information.	
7.8	MC asked under which powers the LA were acting when they summarily changed pay levels set by schools. He was concerned that such	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	decisions could have a destabilizing effect on schools and employees. SD replied that all but 4 schools had agreed to the package proposed by the LA in 2008-09. Ian Bailey (IB) added that schools could refuse to implement the recommendations but would then open themselves up to legal challenges.	
7.9	Tony Hartney (TH) stated that the exercise had been a complex and lengthy process. In his school there had been a lengthy but very useful meeting with HR when discrepancies had been discussed and resolved. This process needed to happen in all schools to avoid mistakes. Good communication between HR and school was crucial.	
7.10	<b><u>Recommendation:</u> to note the contents of the report NOTED</b>	
<b>8</b>	<b>ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE EDUCATION OF PUPULS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS – Phil DiLeo – (item for information)</b>	
8.1	SW explained that Phil DiLeo was unable to be at the meeting and took members through the report, which is a statutory annual report for School forums.	
8.2	Advice from the DfE is that there should be increasing delegation of funding for SEN to schools. In Haringey the council agreed in 2007 that the full amount of money received for deprivation and additional needs should be distributed to schools via relevant factors in the distribution formula. The implementation of this has been slower than we had hoped, largely because of the impact of the MFG.	
8.3	Table B identifies the number of statements issued each financial year. In 2009-10 this was 135. Table C shows that there has been an increase in statements for children with more complex needs. This has risen year on year and is currently 516	
8.4	Section 5 of the report identifies services to schools, which are funded centrally.	
8.5	Increasing provision for more pupils with complex needs and autistic spectrum disorders helps to reduce expenditure on costly out of borough placements.	
8.6	Sarah Miller (SM) asked if there was any information available to parents as to which school best support pupils with SEN. SW replied that there was an expectation that with the implementation of the new Pupil Premium more monitoring of how schools were raising the achievement of disadvantaged pupils would take place.	
8.7	<b><u>Recommendation:</u> “that members note the funding arrangements for special education needs in mainstream schools”. NOTED</b>	
<b>9</b>	<b>DSG BUDGET STRATEGY 2011-12 – Neville Murton (item for information)</b>	
9.1	NM introduced the item by explaining that the final figures would be available for the December meeting once the funding for individual	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	authorities is known.	
9.2	The present spend plus methodology will continue for a further year but with the introduction of the Pupil Premium. Allocation of funds for the Pupil Premium will use the hybrid ACA methodology favoured by Haringey in the recent funding consultation. NM stated that he believed the Pupil premium would be introduced with effect from September 2011. It is anticipated that the premium will benefit pupils from Reception to 16 although there has been some indication that post 16 students may also benefit. There has been no indication that Nursery aged pupils will benefit from the Premium.	
9.3	Assumptions as to the rates of inflation for the next four years have been indicated by the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). Standards fund will be subsumed into the DSG resulting in an enhanced DSG although there is uncertainty as to how this will work. The government is expecting schools nationally to make £2.1 billion efficiency savings (made up of £1 billion 'back office' savings and £1.1 billion from the public sector pay freeze.)	
9.4	The government has set out its intention to retain a MFG for 2011-12. However it has been suggested that this could be more flexible and not rely on historic funding levels. It has been suggested that the MFG could be negative which would allow flexibility to reflect the expected 'efficiencies' that schools should be making. AW asked how likely it was that the MFG would be a negative figure – NM was of the opinion that this would be very likely.	
9.5	The Chair pointed out that Michael Gove's letter to heads had included the DSG itself in the list of funds over which schools would have total control. He asked if this was an error, or whether it implied that the principles of the central expenditure limit were to be changed. If they were this could remove the key power of school forums and their continued existence would be questionable. NM stated that the levels of any restraints on how the DSG could be spent were still unclear. The Chair referred to the proposed deletion of 51 posts at the PDC and added that there would be additional pressures on schools if cuts to the Area Based Grant resulted in the loss of the School Standards branch, as schools would have to pick up the work currently carried out by School Standards.	
9.6	AA asked what powers the Schools Forum had to influence both LA and schools spending and how could the LA help schools to prepare for the next financial year. IB said that the LA would help schools to broker the best services and in so doing get best value for money. NM said it was within the Forum's powers to make decisions on these issues and there would be opportunities for some movement. However it would be necessary to create some headroom in the DSG. How this can be achieved will be dependent on the percentage that has to go directly to schools. The Best Value Working Party will focus on this aspect.	
9.7	WW requested that schools received the information on their budget share in good time this year. This year schools had received this information late and this was partly due to some schools submitting late or incorrect PLASC returns. Officers agreed to consider ways in which	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	schools could be encouraged to submit timely PLASC returns	<u>NM/ SW</u>
9.8	NM said that the government were minded to allow LA's to replicate the 10-11 distribution of grants incorporated into the DSG. However he was aware that some decisions would have to be taken over some areas of distribution. Not all grants likely to be subsumed into the DSG would have been payable to all schools – e.g. the Specialist Schools Grant, recommendations would have to be bought to the Forum for agreement, it was hoped to cause as little turbulence as possible. Although it was known how much money grants would be bring in this year there was no guarantee that grant funding would continue at similar levels in the future.	
9.9	MM stated that she had been made aware that all schools graded as Satisfactory or in special measures were to be compelled to become academies. Officers and other Forum members were unaware of this proposal.	
9.10	SW stressed that money for the Pupil Premium would not be new money and the effects of the initiative on individual schools would vary, with some schools getting more funding whilst other schools got less. NM added that the rationale for the 'hybrid methodology in the ACA' for allocating funding appeared to become even more compelling – although again there would be 'winners and losers' nationally if this change were introduced. Hence the government's decision not to introduce a new funding formula until after the Pupil Premium had been introduced.	
9.11	MC reminded members that schools also received money from non educational sources e.g. sport or economic regeneration as much of this funding was also likely to cease there would be additional financial pressures on schools.	
9.12	Cal Shaw (CS) asked what impact Free Schools would have on funding. She was aware of one application which had been approved. NM said that there were 3 applications for Free Schools one of which would be approved for this year. The other 2 applications had been made later and were unlikely to be approved this year. The impact of the one school may be clearer by December.	
9.13	<b><u>Recommendation:</u> members are asked to note the factors affecting the DSG Budget Strategy.</b> <b>NOTED</b>	
10	<b>ARRANGEMENTS FOR FREE SCHOOL MEALS INCLUDING THE STANDARDS FUND SCHOOL LUNCH GRANT – (item for information)</b>	
10.1	This is a statutory report, which is presented annually to the Forum. IB agreed to bring more information to the forum when it is available.	
10.2	CS asked what would happen to any money not given to schools. Only schools that kept school meal costs down to £1.90 a day received the grant. Schools charging more did not receive the grant. IB replied that any money not distributed would be shared out to schools where costs had been kept low.	
10.3	Schools were urged to ensure that they maximised the take up of free school meals.	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

10.4	<b>Recommendation: That the Forum notes the current arrangements for free school meals and the School Lunch Grant. NOTED</b>	
11	<b>EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA (EYSFF) –Neville Murton (item for consultation and views)</b>	
11.1	The Chair asked Officers and MM to speak to the report and then questions would be taken. He had a motion he wished the Forum to consider and at the appropriate point in the discussion he would leave the chair and ask the Vice Chair to take the chair.	
11.2	This is the second consultation on the EYSFF. MM stressed that the EYSFF will affect all Early years providers. All young children are to be entitled to 15 hours free Early Years provision a week. The EYSFF Working Party has been meeting for the last two years. Currently different types of early years provision are funded in different ways.	
11.3	An Early Years Policy (draft) has now been completed and forms part of the papers for this meeting.	
11.4	Consultation meetings have been organised – one has taken place with only 10 attendees. It is hoped that attendance at the other 2 meetings will be better.	
11.5	AW suggested that the funding for the new formula should come from top slicing the DSG. It would not be practical or fair to fund the scheme by only redistributing existing Early Years monies. MP raised concerns that there would be additional funding in the west of the borough and a very high deprivation factor would be needed to compensate disadvantaged children in the east of the borough.	
11.6	WW pointed out that the figures presented in the Appendix did not include the Pathfinder Grants. Had these figures been included the variation would be even greater. For his school this would represent a 30% cut (£30,000 equivalent) SW explained that this had been intentional as Pathfinder Grant funding had been very high and would be unsustainable in future years. Money would be diverted to the west of the borough, as this was where the greatest demand for places was. Currently there were empty places in east of the borough provision. The figures presented in the report were based on notional costs rather than income.	
11.7	Susan Tudor- Hart (STH) urged members not to think of the situation in terms of east / west of the borough issues. The intention was not to take money away from the east, but under the Code of Practice ensure that the right to 15 hours free provision was extended to all children. Currently private providers could look to parents to top up the government funding they received. This option would not be open to them once the EYSFF was in place and they would be reliant on the funds they received via the LA. The PVI sector is a very wide group including all non-maintained provision – from playgroups to independent	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	nurseries.	
	<i>6pm Cllr Reith left the meeting</i>	
11.8	AW acknowledged STH's point but stated that the reality of the situation was that money was being taken from the maintained sector .He queried the costings in the report, In particular the percentage of time spent by Headteachers and Administrative Staff on early years work. In his opinion the figures bore no relation to actual time spent.	
	<i>6.10pm Alex Atherton and Asher Jacobsberg left the meeting</i>	
11.9	Val Buckett (VB) expressed concern from her NLC that the deprivation factor would have to be very carefully calculated to ensure children were treated equably. She was particularly mindful that these children would not be benefitting from the Pupil Premium.	
11.10	<b><u>Recommendation:</u> Members to note the consultation, which will be issued on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> November. NOTED</b>	
11.11	TB left the chair in order to present the motion, which he had tabled at the start of the meeting. TH took the chair. The Vice Chair asked if any member had objections to considering the motion. No objections were raised.	
11.12	TB expressed concerns that the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was at variance with the views expressed in the consultation. This was exacerbated by the Early Years Policy having been written after the proposed formula had been constructed. The purpose of the Pupil premium was to move resources towards the most disadvantaged. The EIA moved funding in the opposite direction in the case of pupils of non-statutory school age. The issues were very complex and the implementation had been postponed for one year by the previous government because of this. It was possible that Haringey was finding itself in an unusual or even unique position compared with other LA's but concerns should be raised with MP's and other authorities in order that similarities / differences with other authorities could be considered.	
	<i>6.20pm Mike Claydon left the meeting</i>	
11.13	MM asked if the Code of Practice could be circulated, as this would be helpful.	<b><u>NM</u></b>
	<i>6.22 Ewan Scott left the meeting</i>	
11.14	SW said that the east / west divide may have caused particular problems which may be unique to Haringey with take up in the west far exceeding that of the east. With an entitlement for 15 free hours for every 3 and 4 year old the funding was being focused on where the take up was the greatest which meant the money was inevitably going to the west of the borough. Hassan Chawdhry (HC) suggested that the scheme should be properly funded and additional money found if more places were needed. The creation of additional provision should not be at the expense of other 3 and 4 year olds.	
11.15	Sarah Crowe (SC) pointed out for some Nursery Schools / classes the level of funding indicated will mean that they will be unsustainable. 70%	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	of 3-4 year olds are attending maintained schools.	
	<i>6.25 Patrick Cozier left the meeting</i>	
11.16	<p><b>Members voted to proceed with the motion but to look in detail at the wording.</b></p> <p><b>FOR 13</b></p> <p><b>AGAINST 0</b></p> <p><b>ABSTENTIONS 0</b></p> <p><b>It was agreed to proceed with the motion.</b></p>	
11.17	<p>Members discussed the wording of the motion. Two amendments were proposed and agreed by TB. It was also agreed to change 'our' in the last line to 'these'. The motion was amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Haringey Schools forum is seriously concerned at the potential impact of the EYSFF as set out in the Equalities Impact Assessment which suggests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will lead to a greater proportion of resources in the West Network</li> <li>2. It will bring a greater investment to already advantaged communities.</li> <li>3. It will significantly reduce funding to Nursery Schools and Nursery Classes.</li> <li>4. It will reduce the Council's capacity to use childcare as a key lever in mitigating the effects of poverty.</li> </ol> <p>We note the intention to introduce a deprivation factor to mitigate these effects.</p> <p>However because of current uncertainties of funding we do not know whether there are sufficient resources for the deprivation factor to cancel out the adverse equalities impact without top slicing the DSG and thereby reducing all school budgets. We note that the EYSFF implies a development of service but that this development has not been fully funded. We request that unless this development is fully funded it does not proceed.</p> <p>We therefore agree to raise these concerns about the implementation of the EYSFF with local M.P's, with government and other Local Authorities, whilst recognising our commitment to improve outcomes for all children and maintain the sustainability of all settings.</p>	
11.18	<p>The motion was put to the vote</p> <p><b>FOR 13</b></p> <p><b>AGAINST 0</b></p> <p><b>ABSTENTIONS 0</b></p> <p><b>The motion was carried</b></p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>ELECTRONIC PAYMENT METHODS</b>	
	Deferred	
<b>13.</b>	<b>UPDATE FROM WORKING PARTIES AND PANELS</b>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY, 11<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

	Deferred	
<b>14</b>	<b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>	
14.1	Admissions – All admissions to both primary and secondary schools are now handled by the LA through the Admissions Department. AW reported that Primary Headteachers are very concerned about the delays in getting places filled. Schools have empty places and there are children without schools. If the situation is not resolved before the PLASC count takes place schools / the local authority will be financially penalised. IB reported that the Head of Admissions had met with School administrative Officers, He acknowledged that there had been initial difficulties but that these were now resolved. He stated that all children who had applied for places now had schools. He asked for schools to notify the LA of vacancies as soon as possible.	
<b>15</b>	<b>DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING</b>	
	The next meeting will be on <b><u>16<sup>th</sup> December 2010</u></b> 3.45 for 4p.m. <b>NB this is a change of date</b>	
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending and contributing to what had been a long and complex meeting.	

The meeting closed at 6.55 pm

**TONY BROCKMAN**

Chair