

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Present: School Members

Headteachers:- Tony Hartney (Gladesmore) Jane Flynn (Alexandra Primary), Mike Claydon (Northumberland Park), Evelyn Pittman (Tetherdown), Will Warn (Bounds Green), Patrick Crozier (Highgate Wood)

Governors:- Liz Singleton (Secondary Community – Northumberland Park), Melian Mansfield (Children’s Centres (Pembury House), Sarah Crowe (Devonshire Hill), Asher Jacobsberg (Welbourne), Imogen Pennell (Highgate Wood), Vic Seeborun (Special), Miriam Ridge (Our Lady of Muswell), Laura Butterfield (Coldfall) Nathan Oparaeche (St Mary’s CE Junior), Jeffrey Renaud (Earlham)

Non- School Members

Tony Brockman (Haringey Teachers Panel), Susan Tudor- Hart, (EY Private and Voluntary Sector), Cllr Zena Brabazon, and Pat Forward (Unison)

In attendance: Councillor Lorna Reith, Neville Murton, Steve Worth and Carolyn Banks

| MINUTE NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION | ACTION BY |
|-------------------|--|------------------|
| 1. | ELECTION OF CHAIR | |
| 1.1 | The Clerk reported that she had received nominations from Tony Brockman (TB) and Will Warn (WW) for the appointment of Tony Hartney (TH) as Chair of the Forum for the ensuing year. No other nominations were received. Accordingly Tony Hartney was appointed as Chair. | |
| 1.2 | The Clerk reported that she had received a nomination from Imogen Pennell (IP) seconded by Melian Mansfield(MM) for the appointment of Laura Butterfield as Vice – Chair. There were no other nominations received. Accordingly Laura Butterfield was appointed as Vice Chair. | |
| 2. | CHAIR’S WELCOME (Agenda Item 2) | |
| 2.1 | The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. TH reported that this was TB’s last Forum meeting and he paid tribute to the contribution that TB had made both to this group and to Haringey over the years. Cllr Reith also thanked TB for his business like approach and management of the Forum and for the partnership work he had been involved with around Fair funding. Liz Singleton (LS) also praised him for his work in relation to equalities issues. In reply TB stated that he had enjoyed his work in Haringey since 1974. He also stated that Haringey’s Schools Forum was much more effective than many other Forums in the country. He thanked TH as his Vice Chair and Steve Worth (SW) and Neville Murton (NM) for their work in preparing papers and Haringey’s politicians for the good working relationships. Also he thanked all Headteachers and School Governing bodies that he had worked with and all members of the Forum were thanked for their contributions to the Forum. | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|-----------|---|-------|
| 2.2 | A presentation was given to both Andrew Wickham (AW) and TB. SW stated that he had worked with (AW) since 1995. AW replied that although he had given his thanks at the previous meeting he wished to thank TB for all his hard work on behalf of Haringey's children. | |
| 3. | MEMBERSHIP (Agenda Item 3) | |
| 3.1 | Following Andrew Wickham's retirement Evelyn Pittman had been appointed as the Primary Headteacher to the Forum. Linda Sarr was currently filling the outstanding Primary Headteacher vacancy. There were no further vacancies. | CB |
| 4. | APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Agenda Item 3) | |
| 4.1 | Apologies for absence were received from Peter Lewis, Mark Rowland. Alex Atherton. | |
| 4.2 | Bill Barker substituting for June Jarrett and Mike Claydon substituting for Monica Duncan | |
| 5. | DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 4) | |
| 5.1 | There were no declarations of interest. | |
| 6. | MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 JULY 2011 (Agenda Item 6) | |
| 6.1 | AGREED: The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true record subject to the correction to the spelling of Asher Jacobsberg. | |
| 7. | MATTERS ARISING | |
| 7.1 | 8.3- In response to a request from Cllr Brabazon (ZB) for an update on funding for Stroud Green and for clarification as to why Treetops and Jamboree were closing, Cllr Reith advised that discussions were taking place with parents on the possibility of running Jamboree as a voluntary organisation. NM advised all centres had been treated equitably; the resources provided by the Forum for this year only had been distributed as agreed with Stroud Green receiving a share of the provision for extended services. | |
| 7.2 | 8.1- In response to MM's request for details as to how the £522,000 transitional funding had been spent it was AGREED that a general report be provided on the provision allocated and spent on a school by school basis. | NM/BE |
| 7.3 | 12.2- SW gave an update on electronic payments by schools. The Schools Budget Team was currently piloting with one school the BACs payment system with Lloyds Bank, which it was hoped would be rolled out to other schools. RM were also working with the Royal Bank of Scotland and Nat West banks. A development cost of £2000 per banking | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| | group had been quoted by RM for adapting the system for other banks. | |
| 7.4 | 10.4 - In response to a request for an update NM advised that the subsidy provided by the Authority towards the cost of school meals for primary aged children would be considered as part of the budget strategy. Officers would be examining the subsidy to ascertain whether it was still a useful mechanism and options would be debated at the next meeting. | NM |
| 8. | CONSULTATION ON SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM (Agenda Item 8) <i>report for consultation and views</i> | |
| 8.1 | SW gave a detailed presentation on the Government's consultation on school funding reform" proposals for a fairer system" The Forum noted that there were four criteria which would underpin the new funding formula. | |
| 8.2 | The consultation acknowledged that there would be a continuing role for Local Authorities and Schools Forum 8.3 It was noted that the document did not provide any exemplifications which meant that it was difficult to draw specific conclusions. | |
| 8.3 | The Government planned to run a "shadow settlement" in 2012-13 and would not implement any changes until 2013-14 at the earliest. | |
| 8.4 | The national formula for funding local authorities would comprise three main blocks of early years, high needs pupils and schools and a fourth smaller block for centrally retained services. All of these are currently part of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). It was noted that although there would be some discretion to move money within the blocks there would also be pressure to allocate resources in line with the funding formula rather than target it at local priorities. | |
| 8.5 | NM stated that it was hoped that Haringey would benefit from the new formula particularly if a more appropriate Area Cost Adjustment was adopted. | |
| 8.6 | With regard to the national funding scheme the consultation sought preferences on whether to calculate a budget for each school based on its pupil profile and then aggregate these for each local authority, termed "school level" or to calculate a budget for each authority based on all pupils in the LA area, termed "local authority level" | |
| 8.7 | Details as to how the schools block would be derived both for local authorities and then, for schools in each LA area was to be considered as part of the consultation. Details of the factors that the proposed formula would contain were outlined. However some concern was expressed over any proposal which attempted to introduce standardised weighting between sectors because in Haringey the secondary weighting recognised class size of 27 and 20% contact ratios, and this could have significant effect on the overall weightings and therefore had the potential for turbulence in funding levels. | |
| 8.8 | The proposals were aimed at making the funding system more transparent and academy budgets easier to calculate, giving greater clarity as to who is responsible for what and how the funding is derived. Details of how the Local Authorities Central Spend Equivalent Grant would be calculated in the future were also outlined. | |
| 8.9 | With regard to children and young people who required a high level of support, defined as over £10,000 per year, the proposals had been | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| | designed to complement proposals in the Green Paper on Special Educational Needs and underpinned the Government's desire to create a level playing field for all providers of SEN places. | |
| 8.10 | Although the Early Years Single Funding Formula was a new development the DfE were considering introducing a more standardised, transparent and simpler formula but with an element of local discretion. | |
| 8.11 | With regard to the pupil premium the consultation revisited the criteria to be used in determining eligibility and only considered options involving free school meals although it did propose to expand coverage to those who have been eligible at any time over a given period i.e three (Ever 3) and six years (Ever 6) were both being considered. The Forum expressed their concerns that systems were not in place to track back six years and with Haringey's migrant population many deprived families may not fulfil this level of residency. Also the pupil premium was currently paid on a flat rate and did not take account of area cost adjustments or deprivation funding already in the system | |
| 8.12 | Options for the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) were part of the consultation. The two being considered are the General Labour Market model and the Combined Approach (formerly called the Hybrid option) The latter was the one supported by Haringey's Campaign for Fair Funding and recognises the additional staffing costs faced by Haringey. The delay in implementing any changes to 2014/15 at the earliest meant that Haringey would be deprived of adequate funding for at least another year. The Forum felt that there was a need to keep a close eye on developments in this regard. | |
| 8.13 | The Forum gave detailed consideration to the draft response and made the following amendments/additions, which it was agreed that officers would recirculate for final comments before being sent to schools and submission to the DfE. It was also agreed that a covering letter be produced which set out key areas of concern and that this together with the consultation response be sent to the Minister and local MP's. | SW |
| | Draft response | |
| 8.14 | Q 4 This should be No as it should be delegated to the Schools Fora who should be trusted to make decisions in the best interests of pupils in their area. | |
| 8.15 | Q 10 The exclusive use of FSM as a measure of deprivation would build further inequality into the funding system as not every pupil from a deprived background was eligible for or will claim their eligibility. Also there was a particular issue of the transient population of many urban areas and this would not be taken into account. | |
| 8.16 | Q12 There were some concerns over the misinterpretation of this question. It was agreed that all primary schools with Year 6 or lower as the highest year-group should be eligible for the lump sum. | |
| 8.17 | Q15 The response should include concerns over the lack of information on the relative amounts to be distributed through the various blocks and | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | <p>factors. It was essential that the allocations for deprivation and area costs adequately reflected the additional costs faced by local authorities and to that end area costs should be applied in all areas with staffing costs.</p> | |
| 8.18 | <p>Q16 The comments around EAL needed to be strengthened especially as there were significant additional costs placed on some authorities both by the substantial numbers and the turnover of pupils with EAL. This should be recognised as a major funding factor in targeting underachievement. Funding pupils for a limited number of years may be too simplistic as there was a need for a greater understanding of English as a child progressed through its school career. Support may therefore be required at each stage of schooling and should not be limited to primary age pupils. EAL as a factor may require the use of 'Stages of English Language Acquisition' to inform eligibility, without such an assessment this important factor would be a blunt instrument.</p> | |
| 8.19 | <p>Q24 Response changed to No with the comment that whatever approach is adopted it must not deter mainstream schools from taking pupils with special needs. In special schools the current system of fully funded places gives a necessary degree of protection for the high fixed costs they face. It also allows for the stability necessary in planning for integration with mainstream schools.</p> | |
| 8.20 | <p>Q29 In special schools the current system of fully funded places gives a necessary degree of protection for the high fixed costs they face. It also allows for the stability necessary in planning for integration with mainstream schools. A pragmatic approach needs to be taken to ensure efficient and good provision does not become financially unviable.</p> | |
| 8.21 | <p>Q40 Need to ensure that it reflects the views of locally knowledgeable people and uses supplements to target funding at local priorities; notably at improving the quality of early years provision in the borough and at deprivation. There was a need for freedom to implement a formula that targeted local problems and priorities enabled creative approaches that reflected the great diversities within and between local authorities. A prescriptive national formula would compromise such creativity.</p> | |
| 8.22 | <p>Q41 Haringey has placed significant emphasis on deprivation factor within our EYSFF. In part this reflected that nursery age pupils were not in receipt of Pupil Premium and that early intervention, over and above that contained in the reduced Early Intervention Grant, was crucial in narrowing the attainment gap. Such local decisions, informed by local knowledge, would be compromised by a prescriptive national funding formula. It was suggested that something simpler may be more effective</p> | |
| 8.23 | <p>Q48 Addition of comment that the guiding principle in responding to this consultation has been that trust should be placed in locally accountable</p> | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|------------|---|-------|
| | members of the Council and the Schools Forum. Local difficulties and local priorities are best treated at a local level. | |
| 9. | REVIEW OF FULL TIME NURSERY PLACES (Agenda Item 9) <i>report for information/note</i> | |
| 9.1 | SW reported that an officer working group had been set up to examine future funding arrangements for nursery places. It was proposed that a draft policy would be developed and options for the redistribution of funds examined. They would also consider the impact of the Minimum Funding Guarantee on the scope for redistribution. | |
| 9.2 | Recommendations from the officer working group would be considered by the Forum, schools and early years settings. This would be followed by a recommendation to Cabinet with the intention that changes would be made to intakes from September 2012 which would be reflected in budget allocations from April 2012. | SW |
| 9.3 | ZB stated that the funding of free full time places in nursery classes had been an issue for the last ten years and that this matter had to be progressed quickly in order to be in place for the next academic year. She also stated that there should be a debate at the Forum regarding the principles. | |
| 9.4 | In response to a query from Will Warn as to whether there was a proposal to remove funding for all 3 year olds or to reallocate funded places MM advised that she would convene a meeting of the Early years School Funding Steering Group to discuss the options. | MM |
| 9.5 | It was AGREED that Maxine Pattison and Linda Sarr be appointed to the Early Years Single Funding Formula Working Party. | SW/MM |
| 10. | WORKING PARTY AND WORK PLAN UPDATE | |
| 10.1 | <u>Area Cost Adjustment Working Party</u> NM advised that this Working Party had not met recently but that the response to the current consultation included consideration of the area cost adjustment methodology. | |
| 10.2 | <u>Best Value Working Party</u> It was agreed that this Working Party should be reconvened. | NM |
| 10.3 | Details of all Working Parties and their memberships to be provided to the Forum | NM/CB |
| 11. | ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS | |
| | There was none. | |
| 12. | DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING – 8 December 2011 | |
| | The Chair thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting. | |

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011**

The meeting closed at 6.25 pm

TONY HARTNEY

Chair