

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL'S FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY 11
OCTOBER 2012 AT 4.00 PM**

School Members		Non-School Members
Head teachers	Governors	
Special Schools [1] * Martin Doyle [Riverside]	<i>Special Schools [1]</i> A Vik Seeborun [The Vale]	<i>(Non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1]</i> * <i>(Non-Executive) LB Haringey Councillor [1]</i> Cllr Zena Brabazon
<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> Val Buckett [Pembury House CC]	<i>Children's Centres [1]</i> * Melian Mansfield [Pembury House Children's Centre]	<i>Professional Association Representative [1]</i> * Julie Davies] [Haringey Teachers' Panel] <i>Trade Union Representative [1]</i> * Pat Forward [UNISON] [Children's Service Consultative Cttee]
<i>Primary Community [7]</i> * Evelyn Pittman (Tetherdown) * Maxine Pattison [Ferry Lane] A Fran Hargroves [St Mary's Infant] * Will Wawn [Bounds Green] * Linda Sarr [St Ann's]	<i>Primary Community [7]</i> * Miriam Ridge [Our Lady of Muswell] * Jan Smosarski [Bruce Grove] Sandra Carr [St John Vianney] * Asher Jacobsberg [Welbourne] Vacancy Louis Fisher [Earlsmead]	<i>14-19 Partnership [1]</i> A June Jarrett [Sixth Form Centre] <i>E.Y. Private and Voluntary Sector</i> * Susan Tudor-Hart
Cal Shaw [Chestnuts]		
A Julie D'Abreu (Devonshire Hill)	* Laura Butterfield [Coldfall]	Faith Schools * Mark Rowland [Thomas Moore School]
<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> * Alex Atherton [Park View] * Tony Hartney [Gladesmore]	<i>Secondary Community [4]</i> * Liz Singleton [NPCS] * Marianne McCarthy [Heartands]	
A Simon Garill [Heartlands]	* Imogen Pennell [Highgate Wood]	
A Monica Duncan [NPCS]	Vacancy	
Academies	Observers [non-voting]	Substitute Members at this meeting
Paul Sutton [Greig City Academy] * Michael McKenzie [Alexandra Park]	<i>LBH Cabinet Member for Children &YP</i> * Cllr Ann Waters	* James Lane for Cal Shaw * Chris O'Connor for Julie D'Abreu * Mike Clayden for Monica Duncan
		Also present * Neville Murton, Head of Finance * CYPS * Steve Worth

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL'S FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY 11 OCTOBER 2012 AT 4.00 PM

<p>7.0</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p>	<p>SCHOOL FUNDING 2013/14 (Agenda item 7)</p> <p>SW gave a detailed presentation on the school funding reform from April 2013. The Forum was reminded that a Working Group had been set up to consider the changes in more detail and they had been meeting since July.</p> <p>The differential in funding between the primary: secondary ratio in Haringey was currently 1:1.42, which was at the higher end of the national range of between 1:1.10 and 1:1.50. The report proposed that this be reduced to 1:1.37.</p> <p>The Forum gave consideration to how the Schools Block would be determined. This was all funding delegated to mainstream schools with the exception of statemented funding, funding for special units, Education Funding Agency payments for post 16 pupils, funding through the Early Years Single Funding Formula and funding for growth in school size. Additionally any adjustments to or from either of the other blocks should be added. It was noted that in the current formula any statements with 15 hours of support or more were currently funded. This was the great majority of statements and the whole of this funding would be in the high needs block. Under the new formula the high needs block would only fund a top up, thereby leaving schools to contribute £6,000 from their delegated budget to support a child with a statement. To align funding with responsibility it was necessary to transfer resources from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block. It was noted that some schools could have difficulties in finding the £6,000 as they received little funding through deprivation and additional educational needs factors. It was therefore AGREED that some of the resources be retained within the high needs block to provide a contingency for this. In addition it was noted that there would be further delegation of resources currently centrally retained and forming part of the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent grant (LACSEG). In response to a question as to whether the figures accurately reflected the costs of statementing SW advised that the proposal was to have some contingency within the high needs block and to establish a criteria for schools in difficulty in meeting these costs to apply to. The Forum noted that the removal of the 90% safety net in funding of three year olds may also lead to a request for movement between the blocks, and it was noted that more information on this would be available when the Autumn term numbers had been estimated.</p> <p>The Forum was pleased to note that around £ 7.3m additional funding across the three blocks was expected from the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) revaluation. The Forum was disappointed to note that the Authority was required to delegate the new funding via the formula and prior to the calculation of the MFG. Since the ACA was to reflect the additional costs of inner London teachers pay it was felt appropriate to delegate this to reflect the proportion of teaching staff; the main driver of this being pupil numbers and a more intensive input would be associated with the levels of deprivation faced by schools. The Forum therefore AGREED that the additional funding be delegated 75% through the basic allocation with a further 25% through the FSM and IDACI factors.</p> <p>MC was of the view that schools operating under capacity and with unusual floor areas would lose out . He also stated that if a school had a significant amount of additional needs they may need more space and therefore he felt that all of the premises factors should go into the AWPU.</p>	<p>SW</p>
--	---	-----------

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL'S FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY 11 OCTOBER 2012 AT 4.00 PM

7.7	JD queried whether the sixth form centre would receive any of the Area Cost Adjustment uplift and was informed that the Centre was mainly funded by the Education Funding Agency and that they had a higher Area Cost Adjustment built in. The proposed Sixth Form Factor was for former grants not subject to any area cost adjustment.	
7.8	The Forum received feedback from the consultation that had been carried out over the summer, and in particular noted the representations on the primary:secondary ratios and the use of the ACA additional funding.	
7.9	<p>Members of the Forum were reminded that the meeting in July had recommended modelling the new factors to achieve a best fit with allocations through the existing formula. It was noted that it was although it was not possible to totally eliminate winners and losers, the additional ACA funding would help to cushion the changes. The subsequent modelling sought to minimise turbulence, to target resources at pupils with the greatest level of deprivation and to narrow the gap between sectors. In response to queries officers advised that there had to be the same unit factors for all schools in a phase and it was not possible to target individual schools. NM explained that it may be possible to explore the use of the transitional arrangements to remove money from schools that appeared to gain significantly, although the Forum notes that any model would have to be applied equally to all schools. SW explained possible reasons why Hornsey School for girls appeared to gain significantly, this included changes made two years ago to the premises factor and possibly because the school has a high level of deprivation. AA expressed some concern that yearly factoring could create problems for the future. It was further noted that the timescales imposed by the DfE meant that there had been little time to carry out the in depth work that was really required.</p>	
7.10	The Forum AGREED the proposed factors and values prior to new delegation. In almost all cases the secondary values were higher than the primary ones, this reflected both the current differences in funding levels, although the proposed formula began to close the gap between sectors and the higher proportion of primary funding provided through the lump sum. With the exception of rates, there was no longer any premises led funding, the basic allocation replaced the Age Weighted Pupil Unit was the main repository of former premises funding. The main source of deprivation funding was delivered through current eligibility for Free Schools Meals and the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI). These factors would be part of the contributions towards the £6,000 additional costs of pupils with statements.	
7.11		
7.12	<p>It was noted that as the payment of the EAL factor for only the first three years of a child's education would tend to benefit primary schools, there was a higher rate in the funding formula for secondary schools. The Looked After Children funding compared with the £561 in the current formula and with the £900 to be received for LAC Pupil Premium for next year. The low attainment factor was to target funding at high incidence low cost SEN and this factor was also part of the contributions to the additional cost of statemented pupils.</p> <p>The Forum also noted details of the post 16 and split site factors.</p> <p>The MFG in 2013/14 and 2014/15 would continue to provide transitional support and in both years would be set at a negative 1.5%, which would mean that all schools would receive at least 98.5% per pupil of their 2012/13</p>	

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL'S FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY 11 OCTOBER 2012 AT 4.00 PM

<p>7.13</p> <p>7.14</p>	<p>level. The Forum noted that the DfE had refused a request to vary the MFG. There was a discussion around proposals to impose a tapering cap on the percentage increase of those schools gaining in cash allocations. There was a discussion around the setting of a cap, which would be set at 8% for primary and 5% for secondary schools and NM explained that the threshold would start at these figures. The Forum discussed whether it was a cap or a threshold limit proposed. NM also advised that the funding model had been produced aimed at minimising turbulence whilst providing more funding to the most deprived schools. Additionally WW explained that the working party had considered setting differential caps. SW added that the transitional arrangements were being put in place to fund the MFG. He also explained that if money is taken away from schools through higher transitional arrangements than required by the MFG then it must be put back into the formula. It was further noted that there was likely to be a National School Funding formula by 2015/16.</p> <p>SW tabled information in relation to the likely pupil premium that schools could expect in 2013/14 and it was noted that there was likely to be an uplift of around £18/19 per child, but this was subject to confirmation.</p> <p>The Forum thanked SW and NM for all their work in work in producing the proposed funding formula. With regard to timescales for schools being notified of their budgets SW advised that, although the deadline was 15 March 2013, it was hoped that the information would be provided earlier. The formula proposals would be submitted to the EFA by the end of October to ensure that the funding was fair and ensure compliance with the regulations and it was hoped that the response would be received by the end of November, with confirmation of the funding for next year by 10 December. NM confirmed that the Local Government settlement would be announced on 12 December and the final settlement would be known by the second week of January, with the final DSG figures being known by Mid January. SW confirmed that the final proposals had to be sent to the EFA by 18 January. It was noted that further updates would be provided to the next two meetings. SW agreed to come back to the Forum regarding the date by which schools have to agree their budgets. SW also advised that there were funding areas that the Forum would be asking to have de-delegated back to the Local Authority. In response to a request for more information to be provided in relation to these services Forum representatives were urged to contact their schools to discuss their particular service provision. NM advised that further information, but not finite details on de-delegation would be provided to the next meeting.</p> <p>RESOLVED:-</p> <p>That the formula factors and values set out in the report be agreed and recommended to the Local Authority.</p>	<p>SW/NM</p> <p>SW</p>
<p>8.0</p>	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 13)</p> <p>LB and IP asked about the renewal of the RM contract for ICT and the mechanisms for control. NM advised that contact should be made with Michael Wood, Head of Procurement who should be able to assist in the matter.</p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>	

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL'S FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY 11
OCTOBER 2012 AT 4.00 PM**

9.0	DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS (Agenda Item 14) The dates of future meetings are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6th December 2012• 24th January 2013• 28th February 2013 All meetings at 3:45 for 4:00pm start	
	The meeting ended at 5.35 pm	