

## **Surrey Schools Forum Draft Minutes of Meeting**

**Thursday 7 October 2021 1.00pm Virtual Meeting on TEAMS (due to COVID 19)**

Approved by Chair

### **Present**

Chair

Rhona Barnfield

Howard of Effingham School (academy member)

Joint Vice Chairs

Kate Keane

Ewell Grove Primary and Nursery Primary Head

Justin Price

Freemantles School

## **1 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies:

|                     |                   |                         |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Donna Harwood-Duffy | Dorking Nursery   | Maintained nursery head |
| Sarah Kober         | Darley Dene       | Academy representative  |
| Clare McConnell     | Bisley CE Primary | Primary Head            |
| Paul Jackson        | NW secondary PRU  | PRU representative      |

New members: Karyn Hing, Sarah Kober (Primary academies), Rob Mayo, Jack Mayhew (secondary academies), Paul Jackson (maintained PRU), Folasadi Afolabi and Tracy Baker (union reps), Matthew Rixson (Guildford Diocese),

## **2 Declarations of interest (where not self evident)**

Chair: CEO of multi academy trust which now includes special schools

Matthew Armstrong-Harris: Cullum centre (SEN centre) and trustee of Inclusive Education Trust of which David Euridge is CEO

Kate Keane: on boards of Schools Alliance for Excellence (SAFE) and Surrey Teaching Schools Network

Justin Price: on SAFE board and secondary governor

Geoffrey Hackett, Susan Chrysanthou: schools with SEN centres

Jack Mayhew: CEO of MAT with both primary and secondary schools

Lisa Kent-member of IEB for primary school

Matthew Rixson: SAFE advisor

Sue Lewis Owner of early years provider and close relative is Surrey specialist teacher

## **3 Minutes of previous meeting (8 July 2021) and matters arising Accuracy**

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as accurate.

### **Matters arising**

None

## **4 Outcome of consultation on schools, high needs and early years funding: decisions and recommendations to Cabinet**

The Chair thanked colleagues for their work in the analysis of responses in a very short time. She noted that the links to the consultation had worked for some but not for others. LM acknowledged that some colleagues had had difficulty in accessing the link. Officers would see what could be learned from this year's experience. The final response rate had actually been higher than in the previous year.

The Chair reminded members that the Forum's role was to look at fair funding for all children in all schools whether primary, secondary or special and that they should consider all children, not just their specific sector, unless the decision was sector specific.

A summary of consultation responses had previously been shared with members. All percentages quoted are of the schools expressing a view on that question.

Questions in the consultation paper were taken in turn: for recommendation to

LM noted that there were already groups of schools working together in Surrey and it might be possible to build on existing groupings where these were effective. There was no fixed model of how schools should be brought together.

Members emphas

been developed quite quickly because of time constraints. She suggested that the Forum should be involved in developing governance models.

**The Forum voted 11-7 in favour of the proposal.**

**Q9 Do you support a contribution of £3.6m (0.5% of estimated NFF schools block) in 2022/23 to the high needs block specifically to fund school led inclusion initiatives?**

This had been supported in consultation by 44.53% of responding primary schools, 57.89% of responding secondary schools and 50% overall.

**The Forum voted 9-8 (with three abstentions) to approve the proposed transfer of £3.6m to high needs block for the purpose proposed.**

The Chair saw this as an indicative vote and suggested that the Forum should return to the issue in December and that volunteers from the Forum should work with LM and LA colleagues on governance arrangements. The LA had statutory responsibility for SEN provision and thus colleagues developing the schools led arrangements should work with LA officers. She suggested that the group might involve the Chair and Vice Chairs plus 3-4 other members. Members could volunteer now or afterwards. The group should be quite small but should include all phases.

Justin Price emphasised that special schools would not benefit from the proposed transferred sum and this was not a way of securing more funding for special schools.

The issue would be added to the agenda for the forthcoming high needs block working group meeting. **Action: Chair and Clerk**

**Q10 Do you agree that, if funding is transferred as above, it should be allocated to schools across the academic year 2022/23?**

In effect this meant agreeing that any underspend at 31 March 2023 would be carried forward at LA level for the same purpose.

Supported in consultation by 77.12% of responding primary schools, 80.56% of responding secondary schools and 78.6% overall.

One member noted that this outcome still meant that a minority of all schools had supported the proposal.

Another asked whether the vote would stand if governance arrangements could not be established.

The Chair suggested that initiatives were most likely to start in September 2022

and thus

**Q12 If there is a transfer of funds to high needs block do you support a Minimum Funding Guarantee of 1.6% (for mainstream schools)?**

Supported



union facilities time which was supported by 91.6% of primary but by only 71% of secondary)

DG reminded the Forum that de-delegation could apply only to maintained and primary schools, and thus only representatives of maintained primary and secondary schools could vote. A separate choice could be made for each sector.

Kate Keane drew attention to doubts over the future of de-delegation under a hard national funding formula, the recent DfE consultation on implementation of a hard formula, and apparent doubts over whether the de-delegated services could survive if fully traded. Most maintained schools had supported de-delegation and therefore why would there be insufficient demand for a traded service? She drew attention to the proposed effect on the workforce.

LM thought a hard NFF would take at least two years to implement, She had asked one of the new assistant directors to lead on developing a new delivery model, working with schools.

LM recognised that this work needed to be a priority, though she noted that under de-delegation, staff were used to the uncertainty of annual decisions.

Representatives of maintained primary schools agreed, by a clear majority, to de-delegation of funding for:

- \* behaviour support
- \* Capita SIMS licences
- \* teacher association and trade union facilities time
- \* other special staff costs
- \* free school meals eligibility checking
- \* primary school specific contingency
- \* additional school improvement services
- \* services for travellers.

The representative of maintained secondary schools present agreed to de-delegation of funding for:

- \* Capita SIMS licences
- \* teacher association and trade union facilities time
- \* other special staff costs
- \* free school meals eligibility checking.



### **Q35-41 Early Years proposals**

A summary of consultation results was shared, including both state and PVI providers. Carol Savedra noted that there had been general support for all proposals from those responding, but a low response from PVI providers to some questions which affected maintained providers only.

#### **Q 35. Do you agree that 100% of the DfE funding for 2-year-olds should continue to be passed on to providers through the hourly rate?**

This was supported by 96.6% of those expressing a view,

#### **The Forum supported the proposal**

#### **Q 36. Do you agree that 50% of any increase in the DfE hourly funding rate for 3–4-year-olds should be used to increase the hourly rate to providers and the other 50% used to increase the value of the Early Intervention Fund?**

Supported by 54.9% of those responding

CS suggested that those opposing the increase in EIF had not disagreed with EIF as such but had wanted a higher basic rate. She suggested that the increase in base funding would only be £45 per child per year if distributed through the hourly rate and therefore the funding would have more impact if distributed through EIF.

One member asked whether there had been underspends on centrally retained early years budgets which could be used to support EIF, allowing a larger increase in basic hourly rate. CS advised that no underspend on centrally retained funds was expected in 2021/22.

Another member expressed concern that the proposal for a smaller incre

**Q 38. Do you support the continued provision of an Inclusion Fund- Early Intervention Funding- for 2-year-olds, funded from the 5% centrally retained funds for three- and four-year-olds?**

Supported by 76.7% of those expressing a view

CS suggested that this was a small sum for a very needy group

**The Forum generally supported the proposal**



**c) Changes to number of maintained school and academy representatives**

The number of maintained primary headteacher representatives had been reduced from 5 to 4, and an additional position created for an alternative provision academy representative. This improved the proportionality of representation between maintained and academy primary and secondary schools. An alternative provision academy representative was mandatory where an LA had alternative provision academies.

**d) Dates of meetings for 2022**

Dates of meetings for 2022 are

14 January 2022

11 May 2022

28 June 2022

6 October 2022

8 December 2022

All 1pm start

**e) Register of interests**

It was for the Forum to decide whether a standing register should be maintained and whether it should be published.

Members asked for more clarity over what should be included.

Professional bodies covered the individual and, where applicable their academy trust.

DG to recirculate form and members to complete it before 1 November meeting.

**Action for DG**

**9 Other business**

None

**Meeting ended** 3.30pm

**Date of next meeting** Monday 1 November 1pm, virtual meeting on TEAMS