

Minutes of Meeting

Thursday 14 November 2019 1.00pm at High Ashurst Outdoor Education Centre

Approved the Forum at its meeting on 10 December 2019

Present

School and academy members:

Rhona Barnfield (Chair)	Howard of Effingham School	Academy member
Kate Keane (Vice Chair)	Ewell Grove Infant and Nursery School	Primary Head
Susan Chrysanthou	Furzeffield Primary	Primary head
Clare McConnell	Bisley CE (A) Primary	Primary head ¹
Tess Trewinnard	Wonersh and Shamley Green CE Primary	Primary head
Jo Luhman	Kings International College	Secondary head
Justin Price	Freemantles School	Special school head
Geoffrey Hackett	Stepgates Community Primary	Primary Governor
Eric Peacock	Thorpe C of E Primary	Primary Governor
Lisa Kent	Manor Mead and Walton Leigh Schools	Special governor ¹
Matthew Armstrong-Harris	Rodborough	Academy member
Ben Bartlett	Hinchley Wood School	Academy member ¹
Kate Carriett	George Abbot School	Academy member
Elaine Cooper	SWAN academy trust	Academy member
Ruth Murton	Thamesmead School	Academy member
Tim Stokes	Carwarden House Community School	Special academy member

Non school members

Sian Bath	Private, voluntary & independent nursery providers
Jayne Dickinson	East Surrey College Post 16 provider
Jonathan Gambier	Guildford Diocese (C of E)
Julianne Birch	RC Diocese of Arundel and Brighton
Tamsin Honeybourne	Teaching union member of Education Joint Committee
Nick Trier	Teaching union member of Education Joint Cttee

Local Authority Officers

Liz Mills (LM)	Director–Education, Lifelong Learning & Culture
Carol Savedra (CS)	Service Team Manager, Commissioning Team
Susie Campbell	Equalities and Wellbeing Service Manager, ELLC
Daniel Peattie (DP)	Strategic Finance Business Partner (CFLC)
Louise Lawson	Deputy Strategic Finance Business Partner (ELLC)
David Green (DG)	Senior Finance Business Partner (Schools Funding)
Mike Singleton	Service manager (Schools Commissioning)

Chris Tweedale, CEO of Guildford Education Partnership (GEP), attended to answer questions on item 7.

¹ Item 1-5

1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed Lisa Kent (new special school governor).and newly appointed officers: Daniel Peattie, Louise Lawson and Mike Singleton.

Apologies for absence had been received from:

Sally Cave	Guildford Children's Centre	Nursery school head
Katie Aldred	Bagshot Infant	Primary head
Fred Greaves	Oakwood School	Secondary governor
David Euridge	Reigate Valley and other PRUs	PRU member
Sir Andrew Carter	South Farnham Primary	Academy member
Gavin Dutton	Pirbright Village Primary	Academy member
Jo Hastings	Ottershaw Infant and Junior Schools	Academy member
Joe Dunne	RC Diocese of Arundel and Brighton	
Andrea Collings	Family Voice Surrey	

2 Declarations of interest

Tamsin Honeybourne and Nick Trier: item 5 (union reps);
Kate Carriett: item 7 (employee of Guildford Education Partnership);
Ben Bartlett: item 6 (head of school with Cullum SEN centre);
Ruth Murton: item 6 (Chair of special school IEB).

3 Minutes of previous meeting (17 September 2019) and matters arising

Accuracy

The minutes were agreed as accurate.

Matters arising

There were no matters arising which were not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

4 Update on October 2019 DfE funding announcements

DG summarised information released by DfE since the previous meeting.

- Net estimated increase in schools block DSG of £26m (before changes in pupil numbers);
- £79,000 reduction in central schools services block;
- £12.2m increase in high needs block (before adjusting for changes in pupil numbers);
- 8p increase in hourly DfE funding rates for early years (roughly 1.5%).

DfE had also consulted on technical aspects of the calculation of the minimum per pupil funding level, and on the circumstances in which LAs might seek a reduction from full MPPL levels.

DfE was also consulting on restricting the right of LAs to use their own funds to fund DSG overspends, which would mean that any DSG overspends were ringfenced and carried forward. DP noted that this proposal followed concerns that LAs were using general fund reserves to fund DSG overspends. However, the proposed restrictions could not remove the Chief Finance Officer's (s151 officer's) statutory responsibility for proper accounting.

LM suggested that it had never been intended that LAs should supplement DSG from general taxation, but many LAs had had to do that due to the SEND reforms being introduced without proper funding. The proposal might be a response to LA concerns but had been initiated by DfE not by LAs. Currently the LA held a sum from general reserves to offset the DSG deficit.

DP advised that the LA was seeking more clarity over the proposals. The DSG deficit existed and could not just be ignored. Audit requirements and the DfE position needed to be made compatible.

Members expressed concern about the DfE position and about the projected deficit in Surrey.

LM suggested that there was already a £200m DSG deficit nationally. The DfE had given no intention that this would be funded centrally, although there had been some past precedents in other service areas. There would still be a need to bring income and expenditure into balance via a recovery plan.

DP advised that at present the requirements to repay the deficit over time from future funding would remain. Members suggested that Surrey should emphasise that that could only be done over a long period. LM agreed that the scale of the task was such that expenditure and funding could not be brought into balance quickly.

5 Surrey schools and early years funding consultation for 2020/21

Early years

CS noted that the early years consultation was open for a further four days. There had been 62 responses so far (more than last year) and the proposals had been largely supported. The increase in the basic hourly funding rates was now expected to be 8p/hr for two year olds (where the whole of the funding goes through the basic rate) and 7p for three/four year olds (where part of the funding goes through other factors).

85% of respondents had supported the 2 year old inclusion fund but most of the opposition appeared to be from providers saying that the proposed funding was insufficient.

A breakdown of the proposed centrally retained funding was tabled.

Members commented on the amount spent on the early years portal. CS noted that it supported up to 28,000 children and 1,200 providers at any one time. Surrey had developed its own system and other LAs (which had not) were paying more than Surrey.

The Vice chair argued that the centrally managed funds were not equitable across providers, ie that state maintained schools did not benefit from centrally funded SEN staff (they had their own SENCOs) or from the portal. She suggested maintained schools were paying twice. LM suggested that this could be investigated further. Members also asked whether early years funding supported the costs of data collection for maintained nurseries (eg SIMS/school census) or allocating funding to maintained nurseries, and how the costs of supporting each sector compared.

Members asked for a comparison between 2019/20 central costs and proposed 2020/21 central costs. CS could supply this, but noted that overall costs had not changed much. The teams had not been expanded but had been reorganised.

The PVI rep fully supported the 5% retention, noting that PVI providers had no other source of support and did not receive funding from other budgets.

Another member sought evidence of the impact of the central funding. CS suggested that Foundation Stage Profile results should in time indicate whether the 2 year old inclusion fund had been successful. LM invited the Forum to suggest any related evidence which they would like to see at future meetings. **Action: agenda item for future meeting**

The Forum supported, by a clear majority, on a show of hands

- An increase of up to £2m in the inclusion fund (for 3-4 year olds);
- An increase in the hourly rates in the early years funding formula for 2 and 3-4 year olds, by the same percentage as the increase in the funding rates paid by the DfE to Surrey;
- Continued provision of an inclusion fund for two year olds

The Forum agreed the proposed central retention of 5% of funding for 3-4 year olds (estimated at £3.3m) and its proposed uses.

Schools and high needs

The Chair commented that the issues in the consultation paper had been unusually complicated, even more so because they were interrelated. She noted that the consultation had only closed on Tuesday 12 November, and expressed thanks on behalf of the Forum to officers for clearly explaining such complex questions and for processing the responses in such a short span of time.

A summary of consultation responses was circulated to members.

Proposal C1 /Q1 Transfer of (0.5% of school) funds from schools block to high needs block

Mainstream schools had opposed this in consultation by 78%:21%².

Ben Bartlett had been asked by secondary colleagues to write to the Secretary of State expressing schools' opposition to the proposed transfer to the high needs block, to counter the LA argument in favour. He asked for sight of the previous year's LA "disapplication request". LM advised that it would be circulated, but that some contractually sensitive information would need to be removed from one of the annexes first. It was also important when reading last year's request to be aware of the principles and context of this year's request. The LA application deadline remained unchanged, but pre-election "purdah" might delay DfE responses.

LM would circulate the 2019/20 LA application to all members. **Action: LM**

² Percentages don't add to 100% because some schools expressed no views.

LM reminded the Forum that the decision whether or not to appeal was for the Cabinet, who might well choose to appeal.

If no funding was transferred to high needs then the 0.5% (approx. £3m) would go into individual mainstream schools' budgets.

The increase in DfE high needs block funding was now estimated at £12.2m (previously estimated at £10m). A £29m overspend was forecast in the present year, which added to the £18m overspend at 31 March 2019 made a total overspend of £47m. A further £48m overspend was forecast for 2020/21 if no savings were made. However, detailed work had been done on savings proposals and she had a level of confidence that savings would be made.

A revised table of funding requirements over the next three years was circulated (attached to these minutes as Annex 1) The LA was working to meet needs earlier, in early years and through early intervention. Bids for the new local learning funds were being received weekly and the majority had been approved. They were largely for capacity building and indicated where there were gaps in our current offer. She recognised the pressures facing schools.

An equality impact assessment of the transfer would be needed. DG commented that initial work did not suggest that the transfer would create strong equalities issues.

The special academy rep commented that, as a special school head, he felt uncomfortable about asking for a transfer of funding from mainstream schools to prop up a system which appeared broken, when mainstream colleagues were very much a part of the solution.

One member asked whether the transfer would have any impact on the post 16 sector³ LM noted that the LA was investing in the post 16 transition team, in developing pathway offers and in the annual review process for post 16s.

Other points made by members in discussion included:

- staff working with SEND pupils were saying to union reps that the funding transfer should not be made, because refusing it was the only way of alerting central government to the crisis in schools funding;
- not all schools would bear a share of the transfer because schools on MFG would be exempt;
- When schools' budgets were under pressure, early intervention often suffers first;
- £5.9m of funding had been transferred into high needs block at the end of 2017/18.

The Chair noted that high needs funding was a national issue.

Ben Bartlett argued that officers had previously advised that there would be no request for funding from schools if DfE made new funding available. New funding had been allocated and yet the LA was still requesting a transfer from schools. He saw no end to such requests.

³ It wouldn't affect mainstream post 16 funding as that is set by ESFA independently of Surrey

LM commented that, while the additional funding was welcome, it was a quarter of what Surrey needed and nowhere near enough. She recognised that schools had made contributions in the past but the funding needed to be seen in the context of a 55% increase in EHCPs since 2015 and costs of £30m for post 16s with EHCPs, there were 25 year olds who had retained EHCPs for the full period permitted by the legislation. £29m had been set aside by the council in 2019/20 to hold against the high needs overspend.

If the £3m was not transferred the high needs deficit would be increased by £3m.

Additionally, special schools were asking for inflation funding, which was over and above current projected costs and would further add to the deficit

Members questioned whether funding was being spent wisely. LM accepted that Surrey was an outlier in the use of the independent sector and that there was a need to spend more on early intervention.

The special school rep thought there had been some proactive moves recently, in creating additional maintained capacity. Changes were starting to make a difference but there needed to be more of them.

Members asked that Cabinet members should be more active in drawing attention to the funding situation and making it a national issue. They wanted the government to know that schools were at crisis point. LM noted that Dave Hill had said publicly, at a Parliamentary Select Committee, that schools' budgets were under pressure, and there had been other lobbying. Julie Iles as lead Cabinet member had specifically said that she wanted to come to Schools Forum to engage with these issues.

The Chair reminded the Forum that the transfer of funding to the high needs block was a decision for Forum, but that the Cabinet could appeal to the Secretary of State. LM confirmed that the Cabinet would decide whether to appeal.

<p>The Forum voted 17-1 against a transfer of funding to the high needs block. The maintained special school rep was the only one voting in favour. The special academy rep abstained.</p>
--

Proposal C2 Additional SEN funding for mainstream schools

Q2 Do you agree that the eligibility criteria for additional SEN funding should be changed to (be calculated on) Oct 2019 EHCP numbers only and that the threshold should be increased to 110% of level 2 notional SEN funding?

This had been clearly opposed in consultation (by 86.5% to 5.8%). One member commented that the responses might have been different if the two parts of the question had been split up.

LM suggested that the current additional SEN funding mechanism did not support the schools which most needed it and that the funding could be better used in another way. The changes made to the threshold in 2019/20 had not yielded the savings intended and the further changes proposed now were intended to realise those savings.

The Chair thought the changes could make some schools more vulnerable and suggested that a small group could be asked to look at the impact of removing in year adjustments. LM was happy to set up a group to look at it.

Action for LM: to set up a group to look at impact of removing in year adjustments.

Officers noted that in year adjustments did not apply to secondary schools but that only 3-4 secondary schools received additional funding anyway.

The Forum opposed the proposals to increase the additional SEN threshold and to remove termly updates, by a clear majority.

Q3 Do you agree that MPPL funding should be taken into account in distributing additional SEN funding?

Again this had been opposed in the consultation (by 59% to 33%).

DG advised that the DfE did not specify how notional SEN funding should be defined, despite the move to NFF. If a school on MPPL saw an increase in incidence of (eg) low prior attainment then its notional SEN budget would increase (and thus its entitlement to additional SEN funding would reduce) but its MPPL funding would reduce..

The Forum opposed, by a clear majority, the proposal to take MPPL funding into account in the additional SEN funding threshold.

Q4 Do you agree that per pupil rates for notional SEN should increase so that the proportion of deprivation/.low prior attainment funding deemed notional SEN remains the same (as total additional needs funding increases)

This had been opposed in consultation by 51% to 39%.

DG noted that the amount of funding distributed through low prior attainment was increasing substantially in moving to the NFF.

The Forum opposed, by 10-4, the proposal to maintain the proportion of deprivation and low prior attainment funding deemed notional SEN (and thus increase the total amount of notional SEN funding.

Proposal C3.1 and Q5a Do you support a reduction in MPPL of up to 0.5%,if there is a transfer to high needs block

This had been opposed in consultation by 72% to 26%.

DG noted that many schools opposing this proposal had given as a reason that they opposed a transfer to high needs block. The proposed MPPL reduction would only be considered should such a transfer be made.

A reduction in MPPL rates would share the cost of a block transfer more widely across schools.

The Forum opposed the proposed reduction in MPPL rates by 13-4

LM agreed that she would not recommend an application to the Secretary of State to set MPPL below the specified rates.

Proposal C3.2 and Q6 The level of the minimum funding guarantee
DG advised that in 2020/21 the LA could set the MFG between 0.5% and 1.84%. For 2020/21, two levels had been proposed (1.34% and 1.84%) The lower option proposed reflected the fact that in 2018/19 and 2019/20 Surrey had set the MFG 0.5% below the maximum permitted.

Schools had supported the higher level of minimum funding guarantee (1.84%) by 70% to 21%.

The Forum supported a 1.84% minimum funding guarantee by 11-2

Proposal C3.3

Q7 Do you support a target minimum ceiling of 5.5% on gains?

This was supported in consultation by 90% to 5%.

The Forum supported the proposed minimum ceiling of 5.5% by a clear majority.

Q8 Do you agree that the ceiling should be lower (than 5.5%) if that is the only way of not reducing the NFF proportion of the formula below 85.1%?

(ie that the ceiling should be lowered if that is necessary to avoid moving away from the NFF)

This was supported in consultation by 81% to 17%

The Forum supported, by a clear majority, the proposal that a lower ceiling should be used if necessary to avoid moving away from the NFF.

Q9 Do you agree that any remaining resources (ie not needed to deliver Q1-8) should be used to move further towards the NFF?

This was supported in consultation by 94% to 3%.

There was no opposition to the proposal to use any remaining resources to move further to the NFF

Proposal C3.4 and Q10 Do you agree that lump sums should be raised by 4% in order to assist small schools?

This had been opposed in the consultation by 58% to 39%.

DG estimated that primary schools of around 300 pupils would break even under this proposal, One form entry infant schools might gain around £1,400 The proposal covered both primary and secondary schools

The Forum voted by a clear majority in favour of increasing existing lump sums by 4%

Proposal C3.5 and Q11 Do you agree that growing schools funding should continue to match the per pupil rates in the mainstream funding formula, even if that means a transfer from the main formula?

This had been supported in consultation by 73% to 13%.

DG reminded the Forum that DfE now provided growth funding through a separate formula. Bulge classes were only eligible for growth funding where the LA needed them. Most PAN increases receiving growth funding had been supported by the LA as basic need.

DG clarified that growing schools funding did not apply to special schools, which were already funded for current place numbers and pupil numbers (ie not on a lagged basis),

The Chair noted that this was a decision for the Forum.

The Forum agreed, by a clear majority the proposal to preserve growing schools funding rates, even if that meant transfers from the main formula.

Q12 Q12 was for comments only.

Proposal C3.6 and Q13 Do you agree that we should continue to fund pupil mobility, and move to the new DfE method?

This had been supported in consultation by 93% to 1%.

DG advised that the new method would be the only one permissible if we wanted to continue to fund mobility. This might increase costs from £140,000 to £200,000.

The Forum supported, by a clear majority, continuing to fund pupil mobility funding,

Proposal C3.7 and Q14 Do you agree that we should continue to provide formula funding for looked after children?

This question had been asked because the factor was not part of the NFF. It had been supported in consultation by 88% to 3%.

The Forum supported the proposal for continued formula funding of looked after children

Proposal C3.8 and Q15 Do you agree that the former combined services funding (within the delegated formula) should be reduced by 20%?

DG advised that DfE had advised of the 20% reduction in October,

The proposal had been supported in consultation by 88% to 4%.

The Forum supported, with no opposition, the proposal to reduce the former combined services funding within the delegated formula by 20%

Proposal C4 and Q16 Do you support returning part of the surplus primary school specific contingency funds (to primary schools)?

This proposal had been supported in consultation by 74% to 3%.

The Forum supported, with no opposition, the proposal to return part of the unspent de-delegated primary contingency funds to primary schools.

Proposal C5 and Q17 Do you support use of in year October data to allocate element 2 place funding for pupils with EHCPs to mainstream sixth forms?

36 secondary schools had supported this in consultation and only one had opposed it.

Some members argued that allocating £6,000 per post 16 EHCP was inconsistent with the proposal for a 110% threshold for additional SEN funding for 5-16s.

DG explained that mainstream sixth forms⁴ did not have a notional SEN budget, that “additional SEN” funding did not apply to post 16s and that the £6,000 per pupil “element 2” funding was in lieu of notional SEN funding.

Officers would look further at whether there was inequity between pre 16 and post 16 sectors in this respect

The Forum supported, with no opposition, the proposal to base “element 2” high needs place funding for mainstream sixth forms on current data (rather than lagged data)

Proposal C3.6 and Q18 De-delegation

The Chair reminded members that de-delegation was a matter for decision by representatives of primary and secondary maintained schools only.

The Vice Chair argued that the LA should be looking towards a traded behaviour service, as there might not always be majority support for de-delegation, and de-delegation might not always be legally permissible

Susie Campbell saw a balance between traded and de-delegated services to have advantages, Parts of the service were already traded. The service was looking at trading beyond Surrey and at other sources of funds. Further information on why de-delegation was seen as beneficial could be provided if it was of interest.

⁴ Mainstream sixth form funding is determined by a separate ESFA funding formula

Capita SIMS

Members asked whether there was scope for combining the early years portal and school census data collection. LM noted that a decision had recently been taken to recommission the Capita (One) system⁵. The issue of combining with early years data collection could be looked at as part of that process

Travellers

One member argued that, while the work of the travellers service benefited Surrey, the primary benefit of the service was not educational. Susie Campbell argued that the service supported overall educational outcomes, eg it supported improved rates of transfer to secondary education and reduced exclusion rates. She could circulate evidence with the minutes.

Representatives of maintained schools agreed to the de-delegation of funding for:

* Behaviour support (primary only)	by 3-2
* CAPITA SIMS (primary and secondary)	unopposed
* Teacher association and trade union representatives (primary and secondary)	unopposed
* Other special staff costs (primary and secondary)	unopposed
* Free school meals eligibility checking (primary and secondary):	Unopposed
* Primary school specific contingency (primary)	Unopposed
* Additional school improvement funding (primary)	Unopposed
* Travellers (primary)	By 3-1

6 High needs place proposals for academies and colleges for 2020/21

LM explained that the LA needed to advise the ESFA by 15 November of the number of places which it proposed to commission from academies and colleges in 2020/.21, as part of the ESFA's wider budget process.

The LA was expected to share its intentions with Schools Forum. Places for maintained providers could be determined later.

Information was circulated, including the principles applied and the proposed changes which had been agreed with providers,

As the overall objective was to increase the use of state maintained providers, the focus was on improving quality in under occupied providers rather than reducing the number of places. But, where there was significant under occupancy, reducing the number of places would be considered. LM noted that the Family Voice rep had previously expressed concern about quality of some provision.

Guildford College⁶ was now part of Activate Learning (an institution outside Surrey) and thus Surrey no longer commissioned its places

⁵ Note: de-delegation funds the school based system. Recommissioning is of the central LA information system.

⁶ All three campuses ie including Merrist Wood and Farnham

So far an increase of 27 places had been agreed in special academies and an increase of 28 in colleges.

MS noted that discussions were still under way with some providers, in particular with one specific academy trust, which had entered Surrey in January 2018. There was a capital strategy to provide an additional 883 places over three years including two approved free schools, a further free school and various bulge classes. The costs in the paper were place funding costs only.

The separate rates per place of £10,000 for special schools and £6,000 for colleges were set by DfE.

One member questioned the use of NMI schools which were graded inadequate. LM advised that the LA would risk assess every such school, considering safeguarding issues in particular, and liaising with families. Sometimes children had to be moved urgently. Sometimes, where there were no safeguarding issues, parents wanted their children to stay.

Case workers were now provided with tools showing the costs, outcomes, and travel distances for every provider, in order to improve decision making. However, this information couldn't be shared as it contained commercially sensitive information (private provider costs). Officers were working with providers to develop more provision closer to home. They sought to avoid using providers for only one or two pupils.

7 Request for falling rolls funding: Kings College, Guildford

MS explained that Kings College had experienced low pupil numbers and difficulties with deficit budgets and that in Oct 2019 the school had had only 313 pupils on roll against a capacity of 900. The school had received £146,000 in "falling rolls" funding in 2018/19, and under the agreed criteria could receive up to £73,000 in 2019/20. Falling rolls funding was intended for schools where numbers were low and had fallen but were expected to increase. An increase in numbers was expected up to 2024/25.

The report discussed the impact on surplus places of closing the school, not because this was proposed, but to demonstrate the continuing need for the school. There would be a deficit of places in Guildford Town if the school closed, but closure was a possibility if the school could not be made sustainable. The forecasts excluded new housing development and thus underestimated the likely shortfall in places. However, house building takes time and the shortfall of places may not increase quickly, so there remains a short to medium term issue of sustainability at Kings College.

Chris Tweedale recalled that Kings College had joined GEP in September 2014 and had later gone into special measures, but had been judged good by OFSTED in 2018. Outcomes were now at national averages.

The school had built up a deficit of £1m due to low pupil numbers, of which £0.5m had been repaid by the MAT, but the deficit was expected to accumulate at £250,000 pa. for the next four years to cover the shortfall in ongoing running costs. The MAT's estimated reserves at the end of 2018/19 were only £2m.

The Multi Academy Trust, together with the Local Authority, has made the case to central government for additional funding to support Kings College. The government had offered an advance payment (repayable at a later date by the MAT) of £250,000 pa to cover the shortfall in ongoing running costs, but expected the LA to make a contribution as it had said it needed the places. The college's 2019/20 budget (£250,000 deficit) had assumed the £73,000 falling rolls fund contribution in 2019/20 and income of £27,000. A continuing increase in the deficit could call into question whether the whole MAT was a going concern. The low pupil numbers at Kings College had partly arisen from expansion at Guildford County and St Peters (which had had basic need funding from the LA) and Christ's College (whose expansion had not been supported by the LA). The Minister has made it clear that, on the advice from the Local Authority, the school is needed to provide places in Guildford. An academy trust could not close a school without Secretary of State's permission other than by giving seven years notice.

Pupil numbers at Kings College had now risen to 328. He urged the Forum to support the proposal.

DG noted that no falling rolls factor was being proposed after 2019/20 so the proposed allocation would have to be a one off. Falling rolls funding was being discontinued in response to reductions in DfE growing schools allocations (from which it was funded) and because most secondary schools which had previously received falling rolls funding had now seen increased pupil numbers for several successive years.

Members asked what would happen if the growth did not happen and the school remained unsustainable. Chris advised that it was likely that the trustees would be seeking further funding from the LA. MS thought this was unlikely to be requested from Schools Forum.

LM noted that it was imperative that the LA and trust worked together to find a solution. The cumulative deficit after four years could be £2m, equal to the MAT's current reserves.

The Forum voted 6-4 in favour of the proposed falling rolls allocation to Kings College (Kate Carriett abstaining)
--

8 Schools Forum issues

Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair

Please could any further nominations be sent to DG by 29 November (david.green.ses@surreycc.gov.uk)

So far there was one nomination for Chair and one for Vice Chair. If there was more than one candidate for each position, an election would be held at the start of the December meeting.

The Chair expressed concern about the need for succession planning and suggested that there should be two Vice Chairs if the regulations and constitution allowed it.

Members supported the proposal for there to be two Vice Chairs.

Next meeting: Tuesday 10 December 2019 1pm at NASUWT Send
Agenda to include (in addition to items already listed):
Special schools funding (including outreach)
Update on Surrey support staff pay award

Workplan and dates for 2020
Proposed dates were tabled.

9 Any other business

There was no other business

Meeting ended 4.10pm

Annex 1 Revised table of high needs block funding projections for the next three years (tabled at the meeting)

Model based on South East average volumes and Surrey unit costs and additional ongoing £12m HNB DSG. In year surplus in 2022/23 and cumulative deficit reduced from £81m to £45m by 31 March 2023.

EHCP Numbers	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY21/22	FY 22/23
Mainstream	4,832	4,314	3,796	3,278
State Specialist	3,110	3,335	3,560	3,785
Independent Provision	1,125	891	658	424
Other	570	511	452	394
Total	9,637	9,051	8,466	7,881
Reduction				
Financial Information	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY21/22	FY 22/23
Placement Costs				
Mainstream	31,505	28,075	24,644	21,214
State Specialist	69,539	74,827	80,128	85,415
Independent Provision	54,370	43,090	31,810	20,530
Support and Fixed Costs	23,320	26,420	26,420	26,420
Total	178,734	172,412	163,002	153,579
Funding Available	151,104	163,104	163,104	163,104
Annual (Surplus)/shortfall	27,630	9,308	- 102	- 9,525
Cumulative deficit	- 45,630	- 54,938	- 54,836	- 45,311

NB Funding shown as available includes £3.1m pa contribution from Schools Block.

