

Local Authority Officers

Liz Mills (LM)	Director–Education and Lifelong Learning
Jane Edwards	Assistant Director-Education
Eamonn Gilbert	Assistant Director-Commissioning
Carol Savedra	Head of Commissioning (Education)
Daniel Peattie	Strategic Finance Business Partner
Sarah Bryan	Deputy Strategic Finance Business Partner
David Green (DG)	Senior Finance Business Partner (Schools Funding)

1 Election of Chair and Vice-Chairs

The Chair and Vice-Chairs had all been renominated unopposed and thus were declared re-elected.

2 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from:

Paul Jackson	NW secondary PRU	PRU representative
Steph Neale	St Pauls Catholic Primary	Primary governor
Jo Hastings	Ottershaw Infant and Junior	Academy member
Sarah Kober	Darley Dene Primary School	Academy member
Sarah Porter	Private, voluntary and independent nurseries	
Christine Ricketts	Post 16 provider	
Folasadi Afolabi	Unions: Education Joint Committee	

3 Declarations of interest for this meeting and register

The Chair reminded members of their duty to keep in mind the needs of all children in all schools, not just their sectional or school/setting interests.

Sir Andrew Carter declared an interest in the falling rolls issue in item 10 as he had been a member of the regional panel considering the case.

4 Minutes of previous meeting (6 October 2022)

Accuracy

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as accurate.

Matters arising

Surrey School funding consultation (September 2022)

Kate Keane had tried to find out the reasons for the low response from primary headteachers:

50% of those giving a reason had not had sufficient time or for various reasons it could not be a priority at that time: September was not seen as a good time. Many had insufficient understanding of the process, so there was a need to make the proposals more accessible. It may be useful to hold a meeting for headteachers to describe the local and national processes and how the local consultation fitted into the national process.

50% of respondents thought their response would make no difference. This might have been due in part to the safety valve block transfer proposals (which had already been agreed) coming first in the paper. There was a need to clarify the scope of Schools Forum's control and influence over the process.

The Chair noted that the messages about the safety valve agreement had been intended to raise awareness among all colleagues, and that they had not been received in the way intended. It might not have been clear to colleagues outside the Forum that the LA still needed to know schools' views on the block transfer proposals.

The Chair asked that a glossary of terms should be compiled.

The Chair agreed that it was important to share more information about the reasons for the consultation process aET60Lwstimeing78y intende co5r agne t

Carol Savedra reported that a quick online poll of maintained school headteachers had shown 79% of 104 respondents (54% of eligible schools) in support of the proposed £6.50 levy.

Non statutory school improvement

The proposed deduction of £8.75/pupil was the same as in 2022/23

The

work was being done in that area, but that it was not a DSG cost.

potentially lose funds) by creating surplus capacity. Jane Edwards noted that opening free schools took many years and that by the time they opened, demand might have changed from that forecast when they were approved. The LA had forecast continuing growth in demand from 2013, based on data available at that time, but circumstances had changed and in fact there had been a continuous fall since then. The school organisation plan was available online. DG commented that the DfE reserved the right to fund academies (at LA expense) for growth which the LA had declined to fund.

Jane advised that the specific school asking for growth after recently reducing its PAN was seen by officers to have a valid case.

DG noted that the proposed criteria included pre opening costs for LA promoted free schools, but didn't expect such funding to be required in 2023/24.

The Forum agreed the proposed criteria for growth funding for 2023/24, subject to funding for schools increasing/exceeding a PAN which had recently been reduced, or requiring additional growth funding after October 2023 census, being considered on a case by case basis.

The Forum agreed the proposed methods for use of average pupil numbers for new schools and schools extending age range.

The Forum agreed to retain the criterion for funding new schools.

The Forum deferred a decision on the proposed growing schools budget for 2023/24 until the January meeting.

Falling rolls funding: Lakeside/Mindenhurst

Jane Edwards advised the Forum that the proposed relocation of this school required Regional Director support, which was conditional on the LA agreeing vacancy funding for three years, plus funding for home to school transport. The proposed relocation was in Surrey's interests.

DG noted that there was some uncertainty over which were the three years for which funding was required. The proposed move date was September 2024 and in 2023/24 the school would be funded on Oct 2022 pupil numbers (which should be unaffected). The provisional proposal was to provide vacancy funding for net losses in pupil numbers due to pupils moving to other local schools, but not for year R losses caused by general falls in pupil numbers in the area (eg year R might be guaranteed funding up to the average level of occupancy in the area). Ag000008u2 Tf1BT/F4 12 T

CS noted that the proposals had drawn on the structure already in place for early intervention fund. One member expressed hope that this might mean continuity for pupils moving from EIF into year R

12 Arrangements for school related government grants 2023/24