



## **Waltham Forest**

### **Schools Forum**

6.30pm – 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013

Waltham Forest Town Hall  
Council Chamber

#### **Attendees:**

##### **Head Teacher Representatives:**

Peter Falconbridge – Joseph Clarke School  
Beverley Hall – St Marys and St Saviours Federation  
John Hernandez – Norlington School for Boys  
Kate Jennings – Ainslie Wood Primary  
Maureen Okoye – Davies Lane Primary School  
Lynnette Parvez – Kelmscott School  
Shona Ramsey – The Lammas School  
Kathryn Soulard – Greenleaf Primary School

##### **Governor Representatives:**

Barbara Barnard – Gwyn Jones Primary  
Aktar Beg – Edinburgh Primary School  
Peter Dawe (Chair) – Dawlish Primary School  
Ian Moyes – Heathcote School  
Rukhsana Yaqoob – Leytonstone School

##### **Non School Representatives**

Steve White – Union Representative  
Msgr George Stokes – Diocesan Representative

##### **Academy Representatives**

Matt Hanks – Roger Ascham Primary  
Mark Morrall – Chingford Foundation / Rushcroft

##### **LBWF**

Debbie Callender – Families Directorate (minutes)  
Sanjaya Gunatilake  
Graham Moss  
Rishi Peetamsingh  
Duncan Pike  
Jaynn Taylor  
Raina Turner

##### **Also Present (Observers)**

Jon Ashwell – Highams Park School

Margaret Burke – Group Manager, Early Intervention & Prevention  
 Shayeed Butt – Parent Governor – Downsell Primary School  
 Sandra Campbell – Church Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre  
 Corinna Creasy – Hornbeam Academy  
 Rinaldo Frezzato  
 John Hemingway – Willowfield Humanities College  
 Graham Jackson – Willowfield Humanities College  
 Dave Knight – UNISON  
 Jo Littman – WF PLA/TSA  
 Eve McLoughlin – Childcare Team Manager  
 Jeremy Monsen – Executive Principal Educational Psychologist  
 Rob Pittard – Norlington School for Boys  
 Michael Rennie – Sir George Monoux College

<b><u>Minutes</u></b>			
<b>Agenda item 1:</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies for absence</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Chair/Clerk</b>
1	Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Chair apologised to members and observers for the lack of refreshments and had asked Duncan Pike, Assistant Director of Finance (Families Directorate) to investigate why these were not delivered.		
1.1	Chair announced that it is with sadness, Margaret (Midge) Broadley passed away last Tuesday morning after a short illness. Midge served as a Schools Forum member from October 2002 until the summer of 2008. She was a determined and committed person to education services. Her husband, Colin accompanied her to many Forum meetings and the Chair will send a letter of condolence in due course. The Chair, forum members and observers stood for a minute's silence in memory of Margaret (Midge) Broadley.		
1.2	Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Nicholas Russell.		
1.3	The Chair announced Mohammed Qureshi can no longer represent his school as a school governor, therefore a by-election is currently taking place to fill this vacancy. The Chair thanked the Clerk for sufficiently making arrangements for the by-election. If a ballot takes place the new member will be able to attend the Forum meeting in March. Pauline Thomas MBE announced her resignation from Schools Forum this week. She has made an outstanding contribution to the Forum and the Chair thanked her for her valued commitment to the pre-school setting. The Chair signed a letter of thanks this evening and wishes Pauline well for the future.		
<b>Agenda item: 2</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012</b>		<b>All</b>

2	The Clerk was asked to make the following amendment: Agenda item 2: <i>The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October were checked for accuracy and then signed off by the <u>Chair</u> as a true record of the meeting.</i>		
2.1	The minutes of the meeting held on the 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2012 were checked for accuracy and then signed off by the Chair as a true record of the meeting.		
	<b>Matters Arising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None were raised</li> </ul>		
<b>Agenda item: 3</b>	<b>Single Status Update (For Information) – <i>standing item – to be tabled</i></b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Tabled item</b>
	The update to Single Status was tabled and distributed at the meeting. No further comments or queries were raised		
<b>Actions:</b>	<b>Forum members duly noted the content of the update</b>		
<b>Agenda item: 4</b>	<b>Trade Union (non-teaching) Facility Time - update</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Tabled item</b>

A consultation feedback document *Functions to be de-delegated – Trade Union staff costs* was tabled at the meeting. Unfortunately, Gerry Kemble, Head of HR Delivery was not in attendance at the meeting to accept queries. However, Duncan Pike was able to provide a verbal support to any queries.

The document outlines that an indicative decision has been made regarding functions to be de-delegated concerning trade union staff costs.

13 Primary schools, three primary area partnerships and a small majority of secondary schools said that trade union staff costs should not be de-delegated. The consequences of that would be to renegotiate the terms and any possible options if de-delegation of trade union trade costs is voted in under agenda 6 of this meeting.

Steve White from the NUT responded with the following points:

- Decisions from other boroughs have deferred.
- The following London boroughs have agreed trade union staff costs should be de-delegated from maintained schools.
  - Camden
  - Wandsworth
  - Haringey (Academies in agreement)
  - Lewisham
  - Newham
  - Sutton
  - Brent
  - Havering (most secondary schools have agreed and primary schools are in favour)
  - Merton
  - Tower Hamlets
  - Barking and Dagenham
  - Greenwich
  - Enfield
  - Hounslow (all primary schools agreed)
  - Hackney
  - Barnet
  - Lambeth
- This covers most London boroughs who have voted to de-delegation.
- Two local authorities are Conservative-led.
- SW feels if the Local Authority does not support de-delegation, they may appear to be “anti-union”.
- Most academies have bought-in to these services
- Bromley academy schools have not bought-in. SW has spoken to headteachers and although unsure what their attitude was they were willing to pay-in.
- SW has not had the opportunity to speak with primary headteachers. SW read out the options.
- The cost shared out is equivalent to the cost of two FTE teaching posts, which is always taken out of school budgets.

- Some councils may appear to be “anti-union”, however they still agreed to de-delegation.
- There is also the moral element of this. Headteachers agree to pay for HR functions to support staff that has to undertake trade union duties.
- Employment tribunal cases are lower in unionised workplaces with union reps resulting in savings to government of £22-£43 million per annum.
- DK also expressed his disappointment with the outcome and supports what SW has said.
- Without a facility agreement it would be impossible to provide the basic support, representation and organisation that is required to cover around 1000 UNISON members across all of the schools in Waltham Forest.
- Regional officers would then be involved, not there to do the work. So it would be a detriment if this arrangement was to cease.
- It would also be difficult for Regional Officers to come to local schools.

Rinaldo Frezzato former Branch Secretary of the NUT made the following points:-

- He spent 22 years working for Waltham Forest Council.
- Three years ago votes were imposed on facility time. The difference was to top-slice school budget to facilitate the facility time, but it was a Labour government back then.
- The Burgundy Book encompassed the 1977 facility agreement.
- He personally handled 70-80 cases in the last year of employment.
- The whole issue of facility time is about fairness and if the votes were against the facility time, he felt the outcome will be “unfair”.

At the recent Secondary Heads meeting, there was a split due to information that was missing. Key difference is the funding between maintained and Academies. What is the arrangement? It wasn't made clear that Academies are prepared to buy-in and share the costs of facility time. Governors will object to this option. Headteachers felt there is still work to be done.

Rinaldo made the following comments:

- At a meeting last summer, there was a “promise” made that would initiate a formal agreement to buy-in to the facility time “pot”. It is unclear how far it has progressed.
- The unions do not want a situation where maintained schools are subsidising Academies.
- Not one Academy has said, “oh yes, we will not change the arrangements”. Most do want to retain the arrangements. Need to put together a formal agreement.

Representatives of the Secondary Heads group have come to the Forum meeting with a vote. They had not seen Gerry's paper at that time.

Voting members were reminded to cast their votes under agenda item 6: *Report on Feedback from Consultation on Centrally Retained Funding, De-delegation and Pooled Service*, with the distinction on pooling services and de-delegation.

Union representatives expressed they hoped voting members have heard enough. They reiterated nearly all London Boroughs have agreed to pay-in.

Msgr George Stokes asked what the “speed this is travelling? is What is the framework? He felt it would have been more helpful if the briefing note was circulated in advance.

	<p>Forum members were reminded again their vote is needed at this evening's meeting in order for the final School Budget Share submission to be made to the DfE for the 18<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The Chair admitted there should have been more time to deliberate over the briefing note, but to cast their votes under agenda item 6.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the union representatives for attending the meeting.</p>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p><b>Voting members to cast votes under agenda item 6: <i>Report on Feedback from Consultation on Centrally Retained Funding, De-delegation and Pooled Service with the distinction on pooling services and de-delegation</i></b></p>		
<b>Agenda item: 5</b>	<b>Report on DSG Funding for Early Intervention and Prevention Service (EIP) and Early Years Support</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Margaret Burke</b>
	<p>The report was circulated to members in advance to the meeting. The report was presented to inform Schools Forum in relation to the pooling services mentioned in item 6 on the agenda. Margaret Burke also provided a verbal report. The outline of the report is Schools Forum has funded, on a pooled basis, the delivery of services to all schools in the borough, initially under the Extended Services umbrella, now known as Early Intervention and Prevention (EIP) Service.</p> <p>The EIP service leads on many services and initiatives in order to support schools to improve outcomes. The main area is the Safeguarding Officer post.</p> <p>The following queries and comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this service offer support to families with child poverty? Is this funding spent on officers' time or moving towards child poverty? <b>Response:</b> building on the learning from the Child Poverty Innovation Pilot, the service continues to offer advice and support to families who are in poverty or experiencing financial hardship. The services assist families to receive the correct benefits. The Parents Forum is also a way to get families to come together.</li> <li>When Babcock ceased trading, is the current team able to continue the extent of the work that Babcock were doing? <b>Response:</b> the officers from Babcock were transferred (TUPE) back to the Council in April last year. The Early Years Teaching consultants is currently under review however they continue to support early years' providers with teaching and learning.</li> <li>Secondary Headteachers would have difficulty on the recommendations to this report as this is an issue for Primary headteachers.</li> <li>The report under agenda item 6, there are some elements on pooled services. Schools finance will ensure more information is available to secondary schools.</li> <li>The service is for both primary and secondary schools.</li> </ul>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum Members noted the content of the proposal</p> <p><b>Action by Schools Forum</b></p> <p>a) That the current Local Authority primary school pooling of the EIP service support arrangements should continue to be funded from the <i>Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG)</i>.</p> <p>b) That LA Secondary / Special Schools pooling of the EIP service support arrangements</p>		

	should continue to be funded from the <i>Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG)</i> .																						
<b>Agenda Item 6</b>	<b>Report on Feedback from Consultation on Centrally Retained Funding, De-delegation and Pooled Services</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Sanjaya Gunatilake</b>																				
	<p>The report was sent to Forum members and associates in advance of the meeting. A revised report was tabled at the meeting. SG also provided a verbal report.</p> <p>The following points/queries were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since November 2011, Schools Forum and schools have informed about the news school funding arrangement being introduced by the DfE for 2013-14.</li> <li>• Two consultation documents were sent out to each school. There were individual responses from 21 out of the 55 schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 1: Analysis of schools participation in the consultation</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sector</th><th>Number of schools in sector</th><th>% of schools within the sector that responded</th><th>Number of responses received</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Infant, Junior &amp; Primary</td><td>43</td><td>34%</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>Secondary</td><td>10</td><td>40%</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>All Through</td><td>2</td><td>100%</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td><td><b>55</b></td><td><b>38%</b></td><td><b>21</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The first round of votes was dismissed by the Chair as it was unclear whether to include governor representatives. A request was made by a headteacher representative for both primary and secondary headteachers to leave the meeting room for a short while to discuss further. When they returned, the following votes were received.</p> <p>Forum voting members were asked to agree the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Schools Forum is asked to note that the following services will be <u>Centrally Retained</u> and to confirm the sums for 2013-14 will be no higher than those held for 2012-13.</b> This was agreed</li> <li><b>2. Primary and Secondary representatives are required to vote on <u>De-Delegation</u> on the following:</b> (Please note that academy representatives are excluded from voting on these matters.) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Basic contingency budget of £300,000 held for all schools - <i>Primary agreed to basic contingency - 5 votes</i></li> <li>II. Additional Contingency Budget £300,000 – <i>this was not agreed by all Primary and Secondary – not carried</i></li> <li>III. Occupational Health budget of £111,000 for 2013-14 and a sum of £28,800 for the period April 2014 to June 2014. - <i>7 for / 5 against - carried</i></li> <li>IV. Trade Union Facility Time Costs for a full year budget of £175,000 - <i>Primary: 1 for / 4 against. Secondary: 1 for / 2 against / 1 abstain – not carried</i></li> </ol> </li> <li><b>3. For <u>Pooled Services</u> Schools Forum is asked to <u>note</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. The outcome of the consultation responses from The Primary Area Partnerships, The</li> </ol> </li> </ol>			Sector	Number of schools in sector	% of schools within the sector that responded	Number of responses received	Infant, Junior & Primary	43	34%	15	Secondary	10	40%	4	All Through	2	100%	2	<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>21</b>
Sector	Number of schools in sector	% of schools within the sector that responded	Number of responses received																				
Infant, Junior & Primary	43	34%	15																				
Secondary	10	40%	4																				
All Through	2	100%	2																				
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>21</b>																				

	<p>Secondary Heads Group and Individual responses by schools.</p> <p>II. That individual confirmation will be required in writing from schools that choose to opt into pooled services. A letter will be sent to all schools to confirm the arrangements for 2013-14 by week ending 25 January 2013.</p> <p>GK's paper was not fully considered.</p> <p>Headteachers are disappointed the information was distributed late. If this information was available beforehand the outcome could have been different. Concerns were raised the paper came to them so late. The headteachers have registered their disapproval with the split vote and the Special School headteacher couldn't vote. None of the Academies have been approached or whether they were asked to be a part of this.</p> <p>The following query was raised by a union representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there any way of rescinding this decision or to change your mind? <b>Response:</b> This can be rescinded next year and suggest asking schools to opt-in or opt-out and ask specific questions about pooling facility time. Academies will also be approached at the same time.</li> </ul>		
<b>Action</b>	<p>1 <b>Schools Forum is asked to note that the following services will be <u>Centrally Retained</u> and to confirm the sums for 2013-14 will be no higher than those held for 2012-13.</b> This was agreed</p> <p>2 <b>Primary and Secondary representatives are required to vote on <u>De-Delegation</u> on the following:</b> (Please note that academy representatives are excluded from voting on these matters.)</p> <p>(I) Basic contingency budget of £300,000 held for all schools - <i>Primary agreed to basic contingency - 5 votes</i></p> <p>(II) (Additional Contingency Budget £300,000 – <i>this was not agreed by all Primary and Secondary – not carried</i></p> <p>(II) Occupational Health budget of £111,000 for 2013-14 and a sum of £28,800 for the period April 2014 to June 2014. - <i>7 for / 5 against - carried</i></p> <p>(IV) Trade Union Facility Time Costs for a full year budget of £175,000 - <i>Primary: 1 for / 4 against. Secondary: 1 for / 2 against / 1 abstain – not carried</i></p> <p>3. <b>For <u>Pooled Services</u> Schools Forum is asked to note</b></p> <p>III. The outcome of the consultation responses from The Primary Area Partnerships, The Secondary Heads Group and Individual responses by schools.</p> <p>IV. That individual confirmation will be required in writing from schools that choose to opt into pooled services. A letter will be sent to all schools to confirm the arrangements for 2013-14 by week ending 25 January 2013.</p>		
<b>Agenda item 7:</b>	<b>Report on Central Expenditure 2011-12 with Projected Outturn</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Rishi Peetamsingh</b>



	<p>The report and Appendix were circulated in advance to the meeting. RP provided a verbal report.</p> <p>No further comments were made.</p>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum members noted the content of the report.</p> <p><b>Action by Schools Forum:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>To note the position predicted for 2012-13 outturn.</b></li> <li><b>To approve to further delegate £450,000 out anticipated underspend of 2012-14 to school and academies in 2013-14.</b></li> </ol>		
<b>Agenda Item 8</b>	<b>Final Dedicated Schools Block for 2013/14 and Proposed Adjustments by the Local Authority between the Early Years, High Needs and Schools Funding Blocks for 2013/14</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Graham Moss</b>
	<p>The report was distributed in advance of the meeting. GM also provided a verbal report.</p> <p>The following points/queries were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes in the school population between October 2011 and October 2012 (excluding pupils funded through the High Needs Block)</li> <li>Schools Forum was provided with provisional data from 4<sup>th</sup> October Census Count at its meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012.</li> <li>There have been technical changes from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) where there is now the additional responsibility placed upon the Local Authority for students aged 16-24 with learning difficulties and disabilities which had been the responsibility of the EFA.</li> <li>On 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012 the EFA and DfE published the final pupil data to be used in calculating school and Academy budget shares for 2013/14. Please refer to <i>Table 1</i> of the report.</li> <li>Shifting funding between Early Years Block and SEN Block.</li> <li>Can the DSG plan for the whole plan be put in a simple format? Reports should provide a summary on how DSG was allocated. <b>Response:</b> It probably can be done and be circulated to secondary headteachers.</li> </ul> <p>No further comments were made.</p> <p>Forum members were asked to review the <i>Action by Schools Forum</i>.</p>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum members noted the content of the report.</p> <p>Forum members agreed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>To note the updated information on DSG for 2013/14 and how the values for the spending blocks for Early Years, High Needs and Schools have been determined by the EFA.</b></li> <li><b>To agree the Local Authority proposals for internal adjustments to the size of the Early Years, High Needs and Schools funding blocks.</b></li> <li><b>To note the likely impact of the introduction of a new Education Services Grant which replaces LACSEG for Academies but also removes most education funding from the national formula grant for Councils.</b></li> </ol>		
<b>Agenda Item 9</b>	<b>High Needs Block and funding for High Needs Pupils in 2013/14</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Graham Moss</b>

	<p>The report was distributed in advance of the meeting. GM also provided a verbal report. The following points/queries were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall funding within the High Needs Block and for what it can be used.</li> <li>• Funding for special schools.</li> <li>• Funding for high needs pupils in mainstream schools.</li> <li>• Funding for Pupil Referral Units and Alternative Provision.</li> <li>• Funding for LDD students aged 16-24 in sixth forms and colleges.</li> <li>• SEN Control Total and forecasted expenditure for 2013/14.</li> </ul> <p>Schools and the Local Authority are working jointly to support High Needs students aged 16-24. The funding for High Needs pupils is another issue. The Local Authority met with the headteachers and other representatives of all special schools last month. The overall feedback on the analysis is to choose Option 1, a 3% reduction in resource ladder levels. The Local Authority would like to express their gratitude that special schools have followed this option. This means the actual resource ladder rates would be reduced by about <b>£0.450m</b> to our special schools to meet the total cost of the increase in numbers of Waltham Forest pupils. The full breakdown of the proposed funding is set out in <i>Appendix A</i>.</p> <p>Academy representative for Chingford Foundation left the meeting room for Action 4.</p> <p>There were no objections to the recommendations.</p> <p>Forum members were asked to review the <i>Action by Schools Forum</i>.</p>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum members noted the content of the report.</p> <p>Forum members agreed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. To note the new figures for the High Needs Block and SEN Control Total.</b></li> <li><b>2. To agree the new rates for the Resource Ladder Levels for special schools &amp; Academies and mainstream schools &amp; Academies.</b></li> <li><b>3. To agree that the minimum funding guarantee for Belmont Park is extended so that there is no reduction in average funding for Waltham Forest Pupils in 2013/14 compared with 2012/13.</b></li> <li><b>4. To agree that SEN underspend for 2010/11 up to £300,000 be earmarked for capital works at Chingford Academy to expand provision from 20 to 30 students and to widen provision to include high-functioning Autism.</b></li> </ol>		
<b>Agenda Item 10</b>	<b>Early Years Block and free education provision for 2, 3 and 4 year olds</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Graham Moss</b>
	<p>The report was distributed in advance of the meeting. GM also provided a verbal report.</p> <p>The following points/queries were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The feedback from the consultation on a revised local funding formula for 2, 3 and 4 year olds (EYSFF) and the funding for 2 year olds from April 2013.</li> <li>• The payment of the current rate of £6.00 per hour for 2 year olds was unsustainable in the medium to long term.</li> <li>• Many local authorities in London were currently paying those settings.</li> <li>• At £5.75 per hour, the Local Authority would be able to expand provision incrementally through the year.</li> <li>• We need to make the point that Waltham Forest is a high poverty borough.</li> </ul> <p>Forum members were asked to review the <i>Action by Schools Forum</i>.</p>		

<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum members noted the content of the report. Forum members agreed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>To note the proposed funding arrangements for free education for three and four year olds for 2013/14.</b></li> <li><b>To discuss the proposed funding arrangements for free education for two year olds and agree what advice it may wish to make to Cabinet when it meets on 12th February 2013 to confirm arrangements for the funding and expansion of provision to meet government statutory targets.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Note that all members of the Schools Form can vote on this issue should it come to a vote</b> This was agreed by all</p>		
<b>Agenda Item 11</b>	<b>Schools Block and Final School Budget Shares for 2013/14</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Graham Moss</b>
	<p>The report was distributed in advance of the meeting. GM also provided a verbal report.</p> <p>The following points/queries were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total funding to schools is greater and the actual number of pupils is less.</li> <li>The issues are the distribution the funding, where some schools gain and some do not.</li> <li>The improvement in Early Years has led to lower attainment.</li> <li>Significant growth in English as a second language</li> <li>Table 4 in the report shows that as the AWPU rate for primary schools is raised, the extent to which the Ceiling Gain can rise becomes less.</li> <li>Further information regarding the SEN information will be become available to schools.</li> <li>In Tables 2 and 3, the roll figures do not seem to tally up. <b>Response:</b> special resource provision may appear only as one. All-through schools are counted under secondary schools and in which the DfE insist on having all-through schools under secondary.</li> </ul> <p>Forum members were asked to review the <i>Action by Schools Forum</i>.</p>		
<b>Actions:</b>	<p>Forum members noted the content of the report. Forum members agreed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>To note how the final pupil data provided by the EFA and DfE changes the distribution of funding to schools &amp; Academies and to discuss any issues arising from this.</b></li> <li><b>To agree with the proposed action by the Local Authority to spend up to the revised Control Total by raising the AWPU for primary schools from £3,200 to £3,240 and to allocate the remainder by raising the Ceiling Gain from 1.7% to 2.0%.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Please note that if there is a vote on item 2 only representatives of schools and Academies may cast a vote.</b> All agreed item 2</p>		
<b>Agenda item 12:</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>		
	None were raised		
<b>Agenda item 13:</b>	Date of next meeting – <b>Wednesday 13th February 2013</b> , Council Chamber, Waltham Forest Town Hall, commencing at 6.30pm (Tea / Coffee & Biscuits from 6.00pm)		

Meeting finished at 8.47pm