

Surrey Schools Forum Minutes of Meeting (DRAFT)

Tuesday 3 October 2023 1pm on Teams

Agreed by Chair-for consideration by members at the next meeting

Present

Chair

Jack Mayhew Learning Partners MAT Academy member

Joint Vice-Chairs

Kate Keane Ewell Grove Primary Primary Head

Justin Price Freemantles School Special school head

Other school and academy members:

Donna Harwood-Duffy Dorking Nursery school Maintained nursery sch rep

Clare McConnell Bisley Primary School Primary Head

Zoe Johnson-Walker The Winston Churchill School Secondary Head

Lisa Kent Manor Mead and Walton Leigh Schools (special governor)

Sir Andrew Carter South Farnham Educ Trust Academy member

Elaine Cooper SWAN academy trust Academy member

Jo Hastings Ottershaw Infant and Junior Academy member

Karyn Hing Westfield School Academy member

Kerry Oakley Carrington School Academy member

Sue Wardlow Greensand MAT Academy member

John Winter Weydon MAT Academy member

David Euridge Reigate Valley/Wey Valley AP academy member

Non-school members

Sarah Porter Private, voluntary and independent nurseries

Folasadi Afolabi Unions: Education Joint Committee

Tamsin Honeybourne Unions: Education Joint Committee

Matthew Rixson Guildford Diocese (Church of England)

Local Authority Officers

Liz Mills (LM) Director–Education and Lifelong Learning

Mary Burguieres

overrepresented. However, the situation may need to be reviewed as a result of the extension of funded entitlement to new age groups.

4 Update on DSG July 2023 schools funding announcements including growing schools/falling roll issues

High needs block
T

of primary schools and 81% of secondary schools. The proposal was made in case it was needed, as it was unlikely that the LA would have time to re-consult when it knew the outcome of the application to the Secretary of State.

The Forum supported the proposal without further discussion.

Affordability adjustments when data is updated in December (Q10/11)

Changes to the proposed formula are usually needed when data is updated in December, in order to ensure that the formula is affordable if the level of additional need increases. The LA had asked schools, in effect, to choose from four options. Ultimately the LA recommendation (a) for a small additional reduction in formula rates and then a ceiling on per pupil gains was the most popular, but it had not commanded a huge majority (55% of primary schools and 67% of secondary)

c) De-delegation (question 13)

Behaviour support (primary sector only)

De-delegation had been supported by 36 maintained primary schools and opposed by 8.

The sole representative of maintained primary schools present¹ at that point approved the proposal, commenting that she shouldn't go against the consensus.

Union facilities

De-delegation had been supported by 65% of primary schools expressing a view and supported by 60% of maintained secondary schools expressing a view (3-2).

The representative of maintained primary schools approved the proposal.

The representative of maintained secondary schools opposed the proposal, commenting that she had never supported it and that her school provided good local union representation.

LM expressed concerns at the impact on possible future response rates of taking a view opposed to the majority response, noting that it was already difficult to obtain responses to the consultation from headteachers. She agreed that the issue concerned a relatively small sum overall but saw it as an important service.

Officers clarified that separate decisions were made for maintained primary and secondary schools. If de-delegation was approved for maintained secondary schools, individual maintained secondary schools had no choice. If de-delegation was not approved, individual maintained secondary schools would be able to buy in, as academies already could, so the three schools supporting de-delegation would still be able to buy in.

DG confirmed that the vote could be deferred if desired. It was noted that a deferral need not change the outcome.

The Chair agreed to defer the vote to allow the opportunity for wider engagement with the sector.

Other special staff costs

De-delegation had been supported by 73% of maintained primary schools expressing a view and by 80% of maintained secondary schools expressing a view.

Representatives of maintained primary schools (2) and of maintained secondary schools (1) separately approved de-delegation.

¹ One primary representative present at this stage, two later

Vice-Chairs

DG reminded members of the need to elect/re-elect Vice-Chairs. Nomination forms had been circulated with the meeting papers.

Future meetings

The Chair suggested that one “in-person” meeting a year was valuable, but the relatively low attendance at the July meeting had been noted. It was agreed that the May meeting should be “in person” and that the July meeting should be virtual.