

Kate Carriett
Ruth Murton
Gavin Dutton
Nicky Mann

George Abbot School (academy member)
Thamesmead School (academy member)
Pirbright School (academy member)
Wallace Fields Infant (academy member)

2 Declarations of interest

None

3 Minutes of previous meeting (30 April 2020) and matters arising Accuracy

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as accurate with one minor presentational adjustment.

Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on agenda)

Outturn (item 4)

DG would review CSSB overheads in outturn over the summer (**Action DG**)

Special schools funding (item 5)

EG had arranged a meeting with Ben Bartlett to discuss concerns over the SEND admissions process. It was suggested that representatives of primary and special sectors should also be invited.

EG confirmed that in future there should be a Surrey rep at each annual EHCP review and a discussion about appropriate provision, but that parents would no longer be able to be represented by a rep.

and suggested that academies make the LA aware if they are likely to be in financial difficulty due to C19.

Members suggested that:

- schools faced a loss of lettings and catering income and also faced increased premises and cleaning costs;

- .the scope of the DfE emergency funding had narrowed from that originally suggested;

and asked whether there was evidence for this. They suggested that some needs would reduce, but that the needs of others would increase and that there should be no presumption of a reduction in need.

EG argued that the majority of children with EHCPs would not meet the threshold for adult social care post school. Thus, there was a need to reduce support and increase independence over time to avoid a sudden change when they left education.

However, support would only be reduced where that was appropriate. Reductions would not be automatically built into the banding arrangements.

Members thought preparation for adulthood might involve curriculum changes and more targeted support, rather than reduced support. One member suggested th

Members yo
EG noted that the principles may not be included in the final proposals.

The Family Voice rep asked when service users would be involved in the review, and asked that that should be sooner rather than later. EG suggested that the aim of phase 1 would be an agreed equitable comprehensive banding framework (with multiple layers within it) which would be in the public domain. But he was uneasy about sharing details of individual schools more widely, because data had been shared confidentially by schools. LM noted that schools had shared sensitive information which had not been shared before.

The Chair

Members asked whether the principles developed for special schools would have to be reviewed in order to extend the review to mainstream. EG advised that the sheer volume of mainstream schools necessitated a longer timescale and that special schools had been seeking a review for some time. He emphasised that change would only be by agreement. LM noted that part of the purpose of the Forum discussion was to gain wider agreement. There would be a wider consultation phase later.

Members asked whether the introduction should refer to the importance of encouraging inclusion in mainstream schools. Julie Iles emphasised her total support for inclusion in mainstream schools.

EG noted that the review timescale had been extended, the original target date had been September 2020. The LA was also investing capital in expanding special schools. The aim was that there would be sufficient capacity in Surrey state special schools to meet the needs of Surrey children, thus freeing up funding currently spent on non Surrey placements, which could be fed back into Surrey state schools.

7 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) update including High Needs Block

LL reminded the Forum that at the end of 2019/20 been £32m and its high needs block deficit had been £49m. The planned in year deficit for 2020/21 was £24m which was supported by a contribution from general fund to reserves of £24m. At the end of May no overall variation was forecast.

Any increase in DfE hourly rates would be passed on to providers. The central retention would increase proportionately.

Deprivation funding would continue to be distributed on the basis of eligibility for early years pupil premium.

The inclusion fund had been increased in 2020/21 and it was proposed to retain it at the new level. It was targeted at both SEND and disadvantage.

No changes were proposed in the use of maintained nursery school transitional grant.

It was proposed that specialist provision both in mainstream nurseries and special schools would be funded for 15 hr take up, in order to be fair across the whole system. However, if children were entitled to 30hrs and could not otherwise access 30hrs they would re

The maintained special schools rep was the only one to support a transfer, citing the need to avoid compromising long term recovery plans.

As
major changes to the funding formula. The main proposals were:

To set the minimum funding guarantee at the highest level permissible (which maximises protection for those schools which remain on MFG recognising that they will still need to meet the cost of teacher pay increases etc);

To deliver the minimum per pupil (funding) level in full

To increase all formula factors by the same percentage as the DfE increase the NFF factor values, less 0.7% for the extra increase provided by Surrey in 2020/21)

Should this leave a surplus, to further increase all NFF factors by a standard percentage (in effect this is an advance on the following year growth)

Should the above be unaffordable, to implement a lower percentage increase in all formula factors,

Should a block transfer ie to high needs block, be proposed and approved, to implement it via a lower percentage increase in all formula factors;

To use a ceiling on gains only in the case of huge increases in per pupil gains;

To increase notional SEN budgets

LM reported that Cabinet had agreed some funding for temporary accommodation, pending a wider review, plus funding for a feasibility review of the PRU estate.

most vulnerable learners.

11 Schools Forum business

DG reported that DfE had now made regulations formally permitting Schools

Dates for meetings for 2021 to be circulated before the end of term if possible.

Items for next meeting

Concentrate on outcome of schools funding consultation and DfE recovery plan update

12 Any other business

including the Schools Forum for the efforts made by schools in these unusual times.

Meeting ended 3.30pm

Date of next meetings

Thursday 1 October