

**Surrey Schools Forum  
Draft Minutes of Meeting  
Tuesday 10 November 2020 1.00**





Early years interests and health issues needed to be explored as early as possible LM advised that there would be a health representative on the group

The LA was reviewing placements of those children who had been placed in NMI schools because there had been insufficient places in Surrey schools.



LM recognised concerns over the possible impact on individual schools. However, of 45 maintained primary schools which received funding both in 2019/20 and 2020/21:

- \* 44 had had a revenue surplus at 31 March 2020;
- \* 26 had had an in year revenue surplus;
- \* 14 had had in year surpluses exceeding the amount of additional SEN funding allocated;
- \* 10 had had year end surpluses exceeding 15% of revenue funding;
- \* 2 had had year end surpluses exceeding 20% of revenue funding.

This raised questions about the impact of this funding.

An equality impact assessment would be undertaken and where necessary there would be a school level review and possibly a transition plan for loss of funding. This would be set in the context of a more devolved funding approach, through clusters of schools (see item 5b).

LM asked the Forum to help in shaping the proposal, which would be subject to consultation during the next four weeks.

Members discussed whether Schools Forum should add a recommendation to the consultation but it was agreed that normally the Forum considered schools' responses before deciding whether to support a proposal.

LM advised that the outcome of the consultation would be reported to Schools Forum. A decision was needed by 21 January (the deadline for reporting proposed school budgets to the DfE)9ip0 g60.00000808871 0 595.32 841.92 reW\* nBT/F4 12 T



A commissioning strategy i



not. Equally it may be that the Secretary of State's position would be the same as in 2020/21.

One member commented that he understood the reason for the application and the content was much as he would expect, but that many of the figures could be interpreted in different ways. He suggested that headteachers were already under enormous financial pressure. He asked how schools should best present a counter case. LM advised that the appropriate route for schools to make representations was via Julie Iles.

LM urged that members focused their attention on solving the underlying problem: a cumulative high needs block deficit of £80m and £21m of savings already needed for next year. She suggested that there was a need for a joint approach. She recognised that schools were facing pressures which were unimaginable a year ago, Julie Iles observed that any representations were stronger if they were made collectively.

## **8 High needs place planning 2021/22**

EG explained that every year the LA had to advise the ESFA of the number of high needs places it wished to be funded directly by the ESFA in academies and colleges.

For 2021/22 the proposed place numbers were generally based on current actuals unless there was good reason to do otherwise. All academies and colleges with high needs places had been written to and offered the opportunity of a discussion. Very few had taken it up. If places were not filled the provider retained the place funding for the vacant places.

ESFA rarely disagrees with a proposal if the academies/colleges agree. The return was due in on Friday 13 November.

## **9 Surrey pay 2021/22**

Please see separate annex. This item was for consultation only and no formal

## **12 Any other business**

Nick Trier had asked to address the Forum on concerns about the proposals for implementation of the 2020 teachers' pay settlement in Surrey. It was suggested that he contacted schools directly to express his concerns.

**Meeting ended** 4.45pm

Date of next meeting      Thursday 10 December 2020 1pm, virtual meeting on  
TEAMS