

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

Schools Members:

Headteachers: **Special (1)** - *Martin Doyle A (Riverside),
Children's Centres (1) - Julie Vaggers (A) (Rowland Hill),
Primary (7) Dawn Ferdinand (A) (The Willow), *Fran Hargrove(St Mary's CE), *Will Wawn (Bounds Green) *Cal Shaw (Chestnuts), Julie D'Abreu (A) (Devonshire Hill), * Nic Hunt (Weston Park) James Lane (A) (St Francis de Sales)
Secondary (2) *Alex Atherton (Park View), *Tony Hartney (Gladesmore),
Primary Academy (1) *Linda Sarr (A) (St Ann's),
Secondary Academies (2) Simon Garrill (A) Heartlands, *Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)

Governors: **Special (1)** Vik Seeborun (The Vale)
Children's Centres (1) *Melian Mansfield (Pembury)
Primary (7) Miriam Ridge (Our Lady of Muswell), *Asher Jacobsberg (Welbourne),* Louis Fisher (Earlsmead), *Laura Butterfield (Coldfall), Andreas Adamides (A) (Stamford Hill), Jan Smosarski (A) (Bruce Grove), Sandra Carr (A) (St John Vianney)
Secondary (3) *Liz Singleton (Northumberland Park),* Imogen Pennell (Highgate Wood), Keith Embleton (A) (Hornsey)
Primary Academy (1) Vacancy
Secondary Academy (1) *Marianne McCarthy (Heartlands),

Non School Members:- **Non – Executive Councillor** - Cllr Zena Brabazon (A)
Professional Association Representative - Vacancy
Trade Union Representative - *Pat Forward
14-19 Partnership - June Jarrett A
Early Years Providers - *Susan Tudor-Hart
Faith Schools - Mark Rowland (A)
Pupil Referral Unit - Vacancy

Observers:- **Cabinet Member for CYPS** (*Cllr Ann Waters)
Education Funding Agency

Also attending: Steve Worth, Finance Manager (Schools)
Wendy Sagar, Interim Head Finance (CYPS)
Carolyn Banks, Clerk to Forum
Jon Abbey, Assistant Director, CYPS
Paul Senior, Interim Consultant

* Members present
A Apologies given

TONY HARTNEY [CHAIR] IN THE CHAIR

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
------------	------------------	-----------

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

1.	CHAIR'S WELCOME The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.	APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTION MEMBERS	
2.1	Apologies for absence were received from Simon Garrill, Julie Vaggers, Mark Rowland, Jan Smosarski, Cllr Brabazon, Andreas Adamides and June Jarrett.	
	Robert Singh was substituting for Dawn Ferdinand, Melisha Trotman for Julie D'Abreu, Christian Maree for James Lane and Anthony Latchana for Simon Garrill.	
3.	DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 3)	
3.1	There were none.	
4.	MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 3 October (Agenda Item 5)	
4.1	AGREED: The minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true record subject to the following corrections: 9.7 SW had advised that under model 4 some schools in the west of the borough would see a reduction in funding as losses in deprivation and SEN funding were not offset by gains in the basic entitlement.	
5.	MATTERS ARISING 9.3 SW informed that he had updated Forum members by e-mail with the DfE advice. 12. This had been undertaken.	
6.	ALTERNATIVE PROVISION (Agenda Item 6)	
6.1	PS provided the Forum with background information on the historical arrangements that had been in place regarding the establishment of PRU's, (termed Pupil Support Centres or PSCs in Haringey) and of the Regulations that came into place to change funding arrangements from April 2013.	
6.2	The Forum were reminded that an Ofsted inspection in June 2013 of the Octagon (secondary) and Muswell Hill (primary) PSCs had resulted in the provision being placed into special measures. The Secretary of State expectation for PRUs that are placed into special measures was that they will become Alternative Provision (AP) academies. Meetings with DfE had confirmed that they were firmly committed to the academisation agenda and three potential sponsors had been identified, the preferred option being Tri - Borough Partnership who currently oversee leadership of PRUs and Education departments across the three West London authorities of Hammersmith and Fulham, Westminster, and Kensington and Chelsea. In response to a query as to their suitability and their location PS advised that they had proved themselves to be successful and that cutting across boroughs was not an issue. It was further noted that they were the most	

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

	successful PRU model nationally with a very successful formula and good results.	
6.3	Whilst the DfE were very clear on their preferences for Haringey, PS advised that should a compelling alternative approach be presented the Secretary of State was duty bound to consider it. With this in mind PS outlined a possible reconfigured approach which would involve a commissioned Alternative Provision for primary aged pupils on the current site and a move to an outsourced commissioning approach for KS3 and 4 pupils, retaining only a short stay assessment function for KS3/4 pupils at the Octagon, prior to being placed into a suitable commissioned AP setting via the LA In – Year Fair Access Panel (IYFAP). It was noted that this approach would be operationally deliverable and ensure high quality provision, which was stable and sustainable. PS informed the Forum that a decision would be made when the Alternative Provision Management Committee met with the DfE on 18 November. Formal ratification would need to be requested to approve the reconfiguration of the Octagon and Primary PRUs with effect from 1 April or September 2014.	
6.4	The Forum noted that the LA was working on a robust Action Plan to move AP out of special measures. This included the appointment of an Acting Executive Headteacher, with support from two job - sharing deputies. The Forum also noted that there were considerable staffing implications of any decision to close and/ or reconfigure the KS3/4 AP staffing model. In response to questions PS advised the Forum of the number of staff that could be affected by the changes.	
6.5	Should the commissioning approach for KS3/4 AP be approved additional and new AP providers would be needed and a competitive tendering process would be initiated to allow potential providers to demonstrate ability to meet Council criteria for Alternative Provision. Details of a proposed timetable to implement this was noted.	
6.6	In response to a query from MMcC around the number of secondary pupils and their future, it was noted that there were currently 24 on roll, with a capacity of 30; the majority of which had statements. Under future proposals the LA would still retain the statutory duty for ensuring that provision was in place. MMcC expressed her concerns regarding insufficient testing of the alternatives. PS assured the Forum that it was only the model of delivery that was possibly being transferred to Haringey. He further advised that there was very little time for the LA to come up with any alternative models and any deviation from an Academy model would have to be very strong. The Forum noted that the building was likely to be handed over to the provider on a 125 year lease, which was government policy.	
6.7	It was noted that it would be important to extend the LA's commissioning base, and to start to work across boroughs by commissioning places outside of Haringey. The meeting noted that discussions were already underway with range of providers, both existing and new. JA advised if there had been a suitable alternative the LA would have	

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

	explored it; however he also reminded the Forum that the LA has been failing these young people. It was vital that due diligence was applied and that the young people are offered suitable provision.	
6.8	In response to a query from LB around the representation from the PRU on the Forum, JA advised that the governance had been reconstituted and that this would be now addressed.	JA
6.9	In response to a query as to whether the Forum had a role to play in the decision making process and the reason for the report coming to the Forum it was noted that whilst the Management Committee would be making the decisions it had been previously agreed that the Forum would receive regular updates. PS also stated that, as it was important to engage stakeholders and providers, and the views of the Forum would be provided and assist the Management Committee in their deliberations.	PS
7.	CLOSURE OF JOHN LOUGHBOROUGH SCHOOL -UPDATE (Agenda Item 7)	
7.1	SW drew the Forums' attention to an error in Para 1.3 of the report which should read 54 not 56.	
7.2	Further to the update provided at the previous meeting SW advised that the budget share for the remainder of the year remained in the Schools Block and any residual costs would be charged to the School Specific Contingency. The remaining budget share and the estimated charges were noted.	
7.3	The Forum were also informed of additional costs over those previously agreed to support the cost of the two additional Year 10 bulge classes, which gave a total of £322,829. It was agreed that the remaining balance be added to the Growth Fund. A report on this fund will be presented to Forum on 2 December. Any balance remaining on this fund at year end would be added to the following year's Schools Block formula allocations. The Forum expressed their appreciation to Park View School.	SW
7.4	RESOLVED: 1. That the additional costs incurred by Park View School as set out in the report be agreed. 2. That the remaining balances be added to the Growth Fund.	
8.	CONSULTATION ON SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA (Agenda Item 8)	
8.1	Further to the previous meeting SW reported on the responses from 15 Schools received by the deadline and one received after the deadline in respect of the consultation on the 2014/15 formula funding. The Forum also received the recommendations from the Formula Funding Working Party. Having taken a number of factors into account and following detailed deliberations, the Working Party was recommending Model 2. This model brought Haringey into line with the comparator authorities and positioned schools in readiness for the national funding formula likely to be introduced in 2015/16. In terms of the proposal surrounding the ratio	

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

	of primary to secondary per pupil funding, the Working Party was recommending that the differential could be further reduced from 1:1.377 in 2013-14 to 1:1.35 for 2104-15. WW advised that in coming to their recommendations the working party had looked at comparator Local Authorities. He also explained that it was difficult to compare 2012/13 deprivation funding with 2013/14 as different factors had been taken into account.	
8.2	Although a revised Model 2 from the LA had been sent out after the despatch of papers, following discussions at the meeting this was withdrawn.	
8.3	There was a discussion around the value of comparing data with other boroughs and sympathy was expressed with schools in the west of the borough, for which for many the only increase in funding last year was through increases in pupil premium. AA expressed his concern over how far all of the proposed models reduced the value of deprivation and AEN factors against the amount of funding allocated through basic entitlement and he was of the view that there should be no change. TH confirmed that schools in the east of the borough would prefer no change. This view was also supported by a tabled letter from David Lammy MP.	
8.4	The Forum was reminded that should a National Funding Formula be implemented in 2015/16, the funding ratio would then be determined nationally. It was also noted that the DfE had indicated that there would be transitional arrangements in place, but at present no further clarification on this was available.	
8.5	JA advised the Forum that the LA was trying to be fair to all schools and had tried to produce a model that was not contentious. This was confirmed by Cllr Waters who added that the proposed Model 2 was an attempt to give a fair distribution to all schools in the borough especially as there had been a feeling last year that the formula had gone too far with some schools having no increase in funding at all. These proposals were an attempt to balance that position. MMcK also added that under Model 2 there were only two schools that did not gain financially. SW added that the comparative data used the DfE methodology and so was consistent with that of all local authorities.	
8.6	<p>The Schools Block and PVI representatives of the Forum voted as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Forum agree we should equalise the values of the prior attainment factor due to the change in secondary eligibility? This was agreed by 16 Forum members with 2 abstaining. 2. Does the Forum agree that we should increase the proportion of funding distributed through the basic entitlement? This was agreed by 15 Forum members with 3 abstaining. 3. Does the Forum think we should delete any of the deprivation or 	

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

	<p>AEN factors we use or change its relative weighting?</p> <p>This was not agreed by the Forum. It was agreed unanimously to maintain the status quo.</p> <p>4. Does the Forum have a preferred model if we are to increase the proportion of funding distributed through the basic entitlement?</p> <p>Model 1 – 3 votes Model 2 – 15 votes Model 3 – 0 votes</p> <p>5. If the Forum does not support the models presented, what percentage of funding should go through the Basic Entitlement and what percentage through the deprivation factors?</p> <p>This was no longer relevant.</p> <p>6. Does the Forum agree with the approach to further narrow the gap in per-pupil funding between the primary and secondary sectors by reducing the secondary lump sum and the difference in the basic entitlement?</p> <p>This was no longer relevant.</p> <p>7. Does the Forum support a single split site allocation?</p> <p>The Forum agreed to support this, and at the higher rate of £60,000.</p>	
	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the views of the Forum be provided to the Council for consideration by Cabinet.</p>	SW
9.	FEEDBACK FROM WORKING GROUPS (VERBAL)	
9.1	Early Years.	
	MM advised the Forum that the Working Group were having discussions around the Early Years Strategy and the use of the Early Years block. A further report would be presented to the next meeting.	
10.	WORK PLAN FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/14	
	The workplan had been circulated with the papers and was duly noted.	
11.	ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS	
	There was none.	
12.	DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS 2 December 2013 16 January 2014	

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM
THURSDAY 24 OCTOBER 2013**

	26 February 2014 22 May 2014 (this may be changed) 3 July 2014	
--	--	--

The meeting closed at 6.00 pm

TONY HARTNEY

Chair