

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

Chair: Tony Brockman

Vice-Chair: Tony Hartney

Attendance:

Quorum: 40% of membership

***The Constitution states that non-attendance without apologies 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> Vik Seeborun [The Vale]	(non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1] * Cllr Zena Brabazon
<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Val Buckettt [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>Primary Community [7]</i> Andrew Wickham [Weston Park] present * Maxine Pattison [Ferry Lane] * Chris Witham [Rhodes Ave] * Will Wawn [Bounds Green] * Cal Shaw [Chestnuts] * Jane Flynn [Alexandra Primary] Hasan Chawdhry [Crowland]	<i>Primary Community [7]</i> Miriam Ridge [Our Lady of Muswell] Nathan Oparaeche [St Mary's CE Jnr] * Sarah Crowe [Devonshire Hill Primary] * Asher Jacobsberg [Welbourne] Jeffrey Reynaud [Earlham] A Louis Fisher [Earlsmead] A 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> * Mark Rowland
<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> A 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 [Gladesmore]	
<i>Academies</i> A Paul Sutton [Greig City Academy]	<i>Observers [non-voting]</i>  <i>LBH Cabinet Member for Children &amp; YP</i>  A Cllr Lorna Reith <i>Haringey (Teaching) Primary Care Trust</i> Vacancy	<i>Substitute Members at this meeting</i> * Geraldine Waterman for Hasan Chawdhry  * Ewan Scott for Janet Barter <i>Also present</i> * Steve Worth, School Funding Manager * Neville Murton, Head of Finance CYPS A Ian Bailey, Deputy Director CYPS

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

---

\* Jan Smosarski, Clerk

A Peter Lewis, Director CYPS

\* 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 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

<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, which was being held at Gladesmore School. On behalf of everyone present he thanked Tony Hartney, Headteacher for the very warm welcome received from students and staff and for the excellent refreshments that had been provided.	
1.2.1	The Chair informed the Forum that Steve Worth and he had attended a networking meeting for Chairs and Officers of Schools Forums in the South East of England. Of particular note had been the difference in arrangements for Schools Forums in large counties where more officer time could be given to supporting pre-meetings of the different representational groups on the forum and the availability of members during the working day. Providing officer support for some pre-meetings may be a useful way forward for this forum.	
1.2.2	The Chair proposed that as a form of self-evaluation consideration should be given to inviting the Chair of another forum to our Schools Forum meetings to observe and make suggestions of ways to improve practice at these meetings. This could possibly be a reciprocal arrangement.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>	
2.1	There are currently no vacancies on the forum.	
2.2	The Chair reminded members that protocols for election onto the forum have not been received from all groups. Still to submit protocols are Special School Headteachers, Academies, and Children's Centres.	
2.3	Learning Skills Council – this organisation no longer exists, therefore will be deleted from the membership list.	
2.4	<b>Changes of membership and substitutions must be notified to the clerk prior to the meeting</b>	<u>All</u>
<b>3.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS</b>	
	Apologies for absence were received from Ian Bailey, Peter Lewis, Cllr. Reith, Jane Flynn, Laura Butterfield, Louis Fisher, Monica Duncan, Janet Barter, Alex Atherton, Paul Sutton and June Jarrett	
	Ewan Scott (ES) substituting for Janet Barter.	
	Geraldine Waterman (GW) substituting for Hasan Chawdhry	
<b>4.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> There were no new declarations of interest.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2011</b>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

	<b>AGREED</b> - The minutes were agreed as a true record	
<b>6</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT ON THIS AGENDA</b>	
6.1	<u>Minute 2.2</u> – protocols for membership have now been received from the Trades Union representatives and the PVI sector. Still outstanding are protocols for Special School Headteachers and Children's Centre representatives. These groups were urged to submit their protocols as soon as possible.	<u>LR</u>
6.2	<u>Minute 6.1</u> - Steve Worth (SW) reported that a decision on the request for an additional representative for the PVI Sector had not yet been reached.	<u>NM/SW</u>
6.3	<u>Minute 6.2</u> – Steve Davies has informed the Forum that centrally held job descriptions of all evaluated posts can be made available on request. This includes both standard job descriptions and individualised job descriptions where evaluated. Andrew Wickham (AW) asked for clear criteria for identifying the different levels of posts. He was informed that this could usually be identified through the standard job descriptions.	
<b>7</b>	<b>SCHOOLS BUDGET 2011-12 – Steve Worth (SW)– report for information, consultation and decision</b>	
7.1	SW gave an update on the DSG following the Cabinet Meeting held on the 8 <sup>th</sup> February.	
7.2	Music provision is now to be centrally funded from the government at the same level as last year. This should no longer be a claim on available headroom.	
7.3	Estimates of the amount of DSG made at the last meeting were based on 2010-11 figures. The results of the January count are now available and show an increase in numbers, which will bring an additional £1.4m into the budget. However SW reported that in 33 schools issues on the recording of pupil numbers had been raised where returns had been incorrect. Had these figures not been carefully checked instead of an increase in funding there would have been a reduction of £1.3m. Most of the issues raised had been in the recording of Nursery numbers. This was largely due to changes made in 2010 in the way Nursery numbers were recorded to recognise the implementation of the new entitlement to 15 free hours a week Nursery provision, which can be taken in any setting. Zena Brabazon (ZB) asked how schools were being supported to provide the correct information. Will Wawn (WW) explained that the LA were providing clear explanations and doubted that this would be a problem in future years.	
7.4	<b>Recommendation 1 – That the Forum notes the decision of Haringey's Cabinet on the 2011-12 Schools Budget NOTED</b>	
7.5	<b>Recommendation 2 – That the Forum notes the increase in pupil numbers and DSG funding. NOTED</b>	
7.6.1	Pupil Premium – SW raised an issue with the allocation of the new Pupil Premium. Allocation of these funds will be based on the January count. This means that for a new school such as Heartlands the allocation for the financial year will not take into account the opening of a new year group in September. For 7/12 of that year the school will be losing out on the funding for the six additional classes it has opened. For 2011-12 this	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

	will be the equivalent of 100% increase in pupil numbers and represent a significant financial loss for the school. SW proposed that whilst the school is building up to full numbers this loss should be recompensed. There is no mechanism built into the mechanism by central government but the LA may make such an allowance if it so wishes. The proposal was for 2011-12 to allocate an additional £17,057 to Heartlands.	
7.6.2	Members queried why this recommendation was being made for new schools and not expanding schools. SW explained that where schools were expanding this was usually only by one class in any given year and that the resultant loss was not so great as the doubling of pupil numbers as was the case this year for the new school.	
7.6.3	ZB added that proposed changes to housing benefit would impact on schools in more deprived areas as there would inevitably be a drift to these areas when housing benefit was capped. She wondered whether there would be issues for schools in those areas, as they would be admitting increasing numbers of families with FSM entitlements. SW stated that there would be no additional funding from the government to ease this situation.	
7.6.4	Mark Rowlands (MR) expressed concern that the Forum were being asked to set aside an unknown amount of funds for a number of years. SW had already identified funding for 2011-12 by using the figures identified in the PLASC count and multiplying it by 2. Melian Mansfield (MM) pointed out that every school had an intake in September, which hadn't been included in the January count. SW replied that this was usually compensated for by pupils who had left the school in July and were replaced by the September starters – in schools taking on an additional class the shortfall, whilst being there, was not as great as the shortfall for a new school. It was to ameliorate this anomaly that the proposed payment had been proposed. Susan Tudor – Hart proposed that this could be agreed for this year and then be reviewed annually. Neville Murton (NM) suggested that what was needed was an agreement in principle. Currently the amount of funding per head for the Pupil premium was £440, however it was anticipated that this figure would be increased in the future.	
7.6.5	AW suggested that in addition this issue should be pursued with central government. The Chair agreed that this should be pursued with the DFE. NM confirmed that funding for any new Free School would come via the YPLA. MM suggested that the impact of the differences should be monitored from September.	
7.6.6	<b>Recommendation 3 – That the Forum agrees a lump sum for new schools to compensate for the lag in Pupil Premium funding.</b> <b>Votes for 14</b> <b>Votes against 1</b> <b>Abstentions 3</b> <b>The recommendation was carried. It was further agreed that Officers pursue the lag in funding for new schools with the DFE</b>	<b><u>NM/SW</u></b>

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

7.7.1	<p>Wisdom School – This school situated in West Green is a small independent school. The school has applied to change the status of its primary department from independent to maintained. The application will be considered by the Haringey cabinet on the 26<sup>th</sup> April with a proposed start date of September 2011. This would have to be funded from the DSG and no additional funding would be received from the government until the following financial year. It was recommended to the forum that the sum of £240,000 should be set aside from the DSG to fund the school from September – April. In the event that this was not needed this sum would be put into the headroom.</p>	
7.7.2	<p>STH asked whether the Cabinet could choose a later start date for the school to begin its maintained status i.e. April 2012, when funding could be made available. NM replied that he thought this might be possible. AW asked whether there were any laid down criteria for Cabinet decisions. ZB replied that the LA had a responsibility to consider applications. In this case the proposal had been published on the 21<sup>st</sup> January and would be considered at the next meeting i.e. the 3<sup>rd</sup> March. Information on the conditions necessary to be eligible for maintained status were published on the DFE website. She then read the criteria. Whether the criteria were being met was for the Cabinet to determine. If the application were rejected the school could appeal to the Schools Adjudicator.</p>	
7.7.3	<p>Members discussed whether the £240,000 for which the school could be eligible if the application were successful would be enough to make the school financially sustainable given that the school would no longer be allowed to charge fees. There was a further discussion on the school's premises with AW pointing out that the same school had made an application for Free School status based on the premise that that it would be moving to a different building. NM said that the school currently had primary and secondary departments and that it was only the primary department that had applied for maintained status. The secondary department would continue to operate as an independent school unless the whole school was successful in the application for Free School status in which case both primary and secondary departments would opt for Free School status. A request has been made by the LA to view the schools accounts to be sure of financial sustainability.</p>	
7.7.4	<p>AW suggested that the view of the Schools Forum should be that the money should not be set aside. WW added that if the recommendation were agreed this would be tantamount to the Forum supporting the application. ZB urged the Forum not to support the recommendation as in her view the school was unable to meet the basic standards laid down by the DFE. If the application were refused an appeal could be made to the Schools Adjudicator.</p>	
7.7.5	<p>Tony Hartney (TH) asked what the impact would be if the application were approved and the money had not been set aside. NM replied that procedurally the Forum's views would be reported to the Cabinet, it would be for the Cabinet to make a final decision. The decision as to whether the application was or was not successful would overlap with the setting of school budget shares. NM would need to seek further</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

	advice. The Cabinet might decide that the money should be set aside. If not it would be taken from the headroom or would put the DSG into deficit and this would then become the first charge against the following years DSG. Asher Jacobsberg (AJ) asked if the decision was made not to put any money aside was there a case for the Schools adjudicator to rule that there had been unfair process. The Chair reminded AJ that the decision was one for the Cabinet and not the Schools Forum	
7.7.6	Schools wishing to make comments on the application should do so before the 3 <sup>rd</sup> March. Further information can be obtained via Educom where there is an e-link onto the Wisdom School website.	
7.7.7	<b>Recommendation 4 - The following recommendation was <u>unanimously</u> carried. That the Forum do <u>not</u> wish to set aside funds for the Wisdom School to enter the maintained sector in September 2011</b>	
7.8.1	Carbon Reduction Commitment – the Forum were presented with two options to either pay the levy from the headroom or to indentify carbon usage school by school and charge accordingly. The former would be the simplest measure to implement but does not encourage schools to take individual responsibility in reducing their carbon usage.	
7.8.1	AW pointed out that by removing the bonus element of the strategy this was effectively a new tax and that to break down carbon use school by school would be complex. He was of the view that there was not the capacity to accurately monitor the carbon usage school by school or even effectively across the borough. The School Travel Plan had calculated carbon usage on a school-by-school basis by analysing methods of travel to school – this obviously did not give a true picture of a school's carbon usage. AJ suggested that an analysis of school fuel bills divided by the number of pupils might give an accurate enough picture and encourage schools to reduce energy usage. MM pointed out that some buildings were more energy efficient than others and that it would be unfair to penalise schools because their buildings were inefficient. Members agreed that such schools would effectively be penalised twice – firstly from the high bills they were forced to pay and then by the levy. WW pointed out that schools had sufficient incentive to cut energy usage because of ever increasing energy charges. AJ suggested that figures could be based on whether schools managed to reduce the amount of energy they used year on year. SW reminded members that Haringey does have a fund that schools can bid for to borrow money to make improved energy efficiencies within their schools. He suggested that Ben Brown who runs this scheme come to the May meeting to speak to members about ways energy efficiencies can be made. <b>This was agreed</b>	<u>SW</u>
7.8.2	<b>Recommendation 5 – That the Forum expresses a view on its preferred option for the CRC levy. The Forum agreed that for 2011-12 the levy should be top sliced from the headroom but that this should be reviewed for 2012-13</b>	
8	<b>THE SCHOOLS FORUM BUDGET 2011-2012 – Neville Murton – <i>for consultation and views</i></b>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

8.1	The Forum noted the reduced budget	
<b>9</b>	<b>MEETING SCHEDULE AND WORK PLAN FOR 2011-12 – Neville Murton / Steve Worth – for decision</b>	
9.1	AW asked about the remit for the full time places review group. SW replied that the council was under pressure to ensure that this funding was being used in the best way. The Education Bill allowed schools to make charges for provision in excess of the 15 hours statutory entitlement; it was therefore necessary to review existing provision.	
9.2	MM asked why there were no governors on the proposed steering group. <b>SW agreed to take this point back to the Cabinet</b>	<u>SW</u>
9.3	The Chair expressed the view that the number of places allocated to the Schools Forum were insufficient. <b>It was agreed that 3 places would be more appropriate.</b>	
9.4	Best Value Working Party – AW asked why there was nothing about procurement in the remit of the working party. Primary headteachers in particular were anxious to ensure that advice and support were available to schools and <b>suggested that this become part of the Best Value Working Party remit. This was agreed.</b>	
9.5	<b>Recommendation 1: members agree the proposed meeting dates AGREED – with the following provisos</b> a) the meeting scheduled for 30 <sup>th</sup> June or the 7 <sup>th</sup> July will be held on the 30 <sup>th</sup> June. b) that the meeting scheduled for the 31 <sup>st</sup> March is reviewed as it clashes with the Primary Headteachers Conference	<u>NM/ SW</u>
9.6	<b>Recommendation 2: Members agree the proposed work plan AGREED</b>	
9.7	<b>Recommendation 3: Members agree the recommended membership of the Steering Group for Review of Full time places NOT AGREED</b>	
<b>10</b>	<b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>	
10.1	AW asked when schools were likely to receive their indicative and final budget shares. SW replied that there had been delays in calculating the MFG for schools owing to the delays in getting accurate pupil numbers. He promised indicative budgets would be with schools by the end of the half term holiday with final budget figures following shortly afterwards – by the end of the second week in March.	<u>SW</u>
<b>11</b>	<b>DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING</b> <b>This date of the next meeting to be confirmed</b>	
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.	



**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM  
THURSDAY 17<sup>T</sup> FEBRUARY 2011**

---

The meeting closed at 5.45 pm

**TONY BROCKMAN**

Chair