



using the average number of pupils in year R-11 with IPSB funding on Oct 2024, Jan 2025 and May 2025 census dates, excluding any SEN centre pupils.

OR

using the average number of pupils in year R-11 with IPSB funding on May 2024, Oct 2024 and Jan 2025 census data.

Use of a termly average recognises that the number of pupils with EHCPs typically increases during the academic year. Use of May 2025 census data would mean that final funding allocations would not be known until the end of the summer term, but it means that the funding would be more up to date than using previous year data. Schools would be able to estimate funding once they knew how many EHCPs they had. Use of 2024/25 financial year data would mean that the data would be older, but it would mean that schools would know the funding available for the following year before submitting their budget plans, so there is a balance between cost and responsiveness to be considered. It should be noted that in some schools, updating the data in-year might mean a reduction in funding. Funding may cover the whole of the excess cost of the first £6,000, or a proportion of the excess cost. Where an EHCP was backdated to include a previous reference date, any additional funding would be adjusted accordingly.

For academies, the funding would be calculated on the same basis as for maintained schools.

### **The level of notional SEND funding left for children with SEND but without EHCPs**

We have modelled leaving schools with 10%, 20% and 25% of their notional SEND budgets to support children with SEND but without EHCPs. The Annex shows the number of schools affected based on EHCP data for the academic year 2023/24, and setting the notional SEND factors at national average values, as is proposed for 2025/26. We 0 0 1 200.81 356.93 Tm0 g0 G[D)]TJETQq0.000008871 0 595.32 841.92 reW\* nBT[

We could assist infant schools EITHER by discounting a higher percentage of notional SEND funding, or by scaling up the number of EHCPs used in the calculation of the “first £6000” cost. We have modelled the second scenario (see annex) based on scaling up the number of EHCPs by 20% and by 30%. This would mean that fewer EHCPs would be needed t

## Annex Background data supporting proposals for additional SEND funding

Number of schools where the cost of the first £6,000 per EHCP would exceed the notional SEN budget, less various proportions set aside for support for SEN support pupils.

Data uses average EHCP numbers for October, 2023, January 2024 and May 2024, and assumes notional SEND factors are set at national average (as proposed for 2025/26)

Primary schools (including infant and junior)

% of Notional SEND budget set aside for SEND support	Number of schools where cost of £6000/EHCP exceeds residual Notional SEND funding	Total excess cost over residual Notional SEND funding £	Number of schools where cost of £6000/EHCP exceeds residual Notional SEND funding if 20% increase in EHCPs	Total excess cost over residual Notional SEND funding (20% increase in EHCPs)
None	3	29,200	7	124,700
10%	4	65,400	9	195,200
20%	7	124,700	25	353,800
25%	9	162,700	37	511,100

No secondary schools have a shortfall in notional SEND funding based on these criteria.

Infant school data

Additional cost of counting EHCPs at 1.2x actual numbers and at 1.3x actual numbers for the purpose only of allocating additional funding towards the first £6000 (this is over and above the additional costs in the table above)

% of Notional SEND budget allocated to pupils on SEND support	Additional cost if EHCPs in infant schools counted x1.2 £	Additional cost if EHCPs in infant schools counted x1.3 £	Number of schools affected X1.2	Number of schools affected x1.3
None	0	0	0	0
10%	0	1,200	1	2
20%	3,000	26,500	2	7
25%	17,900	56,000	7	8

**Item 7b**

**Surrey Schools Forum**

**2 July 2024**

**For discussion and recommendation**

**Lead officer: Carrie Traill**

**Falling rolls funding for primary schools with temporary fal fu06.1 7s g1**

which could not be met from NFF funding, or some combination of the two. But any

### **Interaction with sparsity funding**

In a small number of cases, falling rolls may generate additional sparsity funding. The LA would reserve the right to suppress falling rolls funding to the extent that it duplicated an increase in sparsity funding.

### **Review of school spending commitments where falling rolls funding is allocated**

Falling rolls funding is intended to allow schools to avoid making staffing or curriculum cuts in response to short term falls in pupil numbers. Therefore we suggest that falling rolls funding should be reduced where the school has a realistic opportunity to make staffing savings (eg by not filling vacancies) but chooses not to do so OR where the school makes redundancies and the LA bears the cost.

### **Equalities impact considerations**

Falling rolls funding forms part of a school's overall funding and is not ringfenced to any specific group of pupils. Therefore any equality assessment can only be done based on the incidence of protected characteristics at school level. Annex 2 shows relevant equalities data for schools identified as in scope for falling rolls funding. Data suggests that there is no clear link between eligible falls in roll and the incidence of protected characteristics. The impact may be different in future years.

We also need to consider any impact on protected characteristics of not distributing the funding through the mainstream formula (which is the default alternative). We have concluded that any overall impact would be small, as the sums involved are only equivalent to up to 0.1% of NFF funding.

### **Impact on academies**

Costs assume that academies will be funded on the same basis as maintained schools (ie for the LA financial year).

### **Action requested of the Forum**

To discuss the proposals and make recommendations for inclusion in the consultation paper,

To suggest how, if appropriate, proposals can be made any easier for colleagues to understand

## Annex 1 Estimated cost of falling rolls funding, based on criteria set out above

Criteria: falling rolls since October 2021/October 2022, loss of pupils in schools in eligible areas

(Note: modelled on October 2021/22 and October 2023 pupil numbers. Actual budget will use October 2022/2023 and October 2024 data).

Number of schools and total cost

	Number of schools to fund	Estimated full year cost at £3329.70/vacancy	Approx % impact on formula*	No of 1fe inf schools
Loss of pupils less first 5% Compared to October 2022	10	£182,600	0.037%	4
Loss of pupils less first 5% Compared to October 2021/2022	12	£329,000	0.040%	4
All loss of pupils in schools where % of vacancies exceeds average median (6.26%). Compared to October 2021/22	15	£639,300	0.077%	4
All loss of pupils in schools where % of vacancies exceeds median (3.33%) Compared to October 2021/22	22	£819,100	0.099%	5

Note: four of these schools receive reW\* nBT/F1 12 Tf.417.43 412.39 65.F1 12 Tf.417.43 412.39 6





It will be possible to accommodate these pupils in schools B and C, where vacancies are ineligible for falling rolls funding (either because they are below the threshold or because these schools have not recently seen a fall in rolls-depending on the criteria adopted) Thus it is possible to meet demand in this area without placing more pupils in school A, and so school A would not be eligible for falling rolls funding.

## **Annex 2 Equalities impact data: considering the impact on pupils with protected characteristics**

In line with previous practice, potential impact on pupils with protected characteristics has been considered using data derived from the school census:

Incidence of children with EAL and of children with non-British ethnicity as a proxy for race

% of children with EHCPs and total % of children with SEND, as a proxy for disability

% of children on FSM as a proxy for economic deprivation (agreed local factor)

Data for pupils is not available for most other protected characteristics.

Fund all losses between October 2021/2022 and October 2023 for schools where incidence of vacancies exceeds the average (6.26%)

Number of schools in quartile	non British (January 2023)	EAL January 2023	%EHCP January 2024	%SEN January 2024	%FSM January 2024
Highest	4	2	3	5	5
2 <sup>nd</sup>	3	6	7	4	4
3 <sup>rd</sup>	3	2	2	4	3
4 <sup>th</sup>	5	5	3	2	3

Fund all losses between October



### **Level of lump sum and small school protection**

The LA proposes to continue to maintain the lump sums for primary and secondary schools above NFF level, with corresponding reductions in basic entitlement funding in each sector, in order to provide limited protection to small schools. It should be emphasised that, if retained, this protection would be temporary if a direct NFF is introduced, although previous experience suggests that minimum funding guarantee protection would apply if the higher lump sums were to be phased out.

### **Sparsity funding, split site funding and minimum funding guarantee**

In 2024/25 split site funding was within the minimum funding guarantee, whereas usually it has been outside, whereas sparsity funding has always been included.

Officers are aware of the possibility of anomalies in both where schools receiving either of them see large changes in pupil numbers. Officers may propose to seek variations in the MFG calculations for such schools if the situation occurs. Any need is unlikely to be known until the autumn.

### **Equalities impact of main formula variations**

This will vary depending on circumstances. For example a ceiling is likely to limit funding growth for schools seeing a year on year increase in pupils with additional needs, but these need not be schools with an overall high level of additional needs, and therefore deemed to have a high incidence of pupils with protected characteristics. Likewise a high minimum funding guarantee may reflect previously high incidence of additional need, rather than present.

In 2024/25, data shows that a higher proportion of schools with above average incidence of SEND and deprivation were on minimum funding guarantee. Data for EAL/ethnicity was inconclusive.

### **Action requested of the Forum**

To discuss the proposals and suggest any way in which they might be made easier for colleagues

**Item 7d**  
**Surrey Schools Forum**  
**2 July 2024**  
**For discussion and recommendation**  
**Lead officer: David Green**

**Proposals for de-delegation**





**ANNEX Detailed proposals for de-delegation of specific services in 2025/26**

**Specialist teachers for Inclusive Practice (STIPs)**

**Additional information on proposal for de-delegation of funding for Specialist Teachers for Inclusive Practice (behaviour support)**

Further information on current service offer available to primary schools through de-

Subsidised centralised training on a range of special educational needs and inclusive practice

## Training offer

In 2 terms until 1st April 2023, the STIP team have trained 1,302 members of

increase in ND needs across all phases, STIP recruitment strategy includes attracting specialist teachers with a strong ND expertise and experience.

A STIP lead sits on the Inclusion Steering Group to contribute and shape our inclusion work and strategies. This included our 'all age autism strategy' and work across the partnership, in reference to the ND Pathway and Mindworks offer.

The following 3 principles within our Inclusion and Additional Needs Strategy are particularly in scope when considering the work of STIP service with schools, children, families and across the partnership.

We will invest in **early identification** of SEN and offer comprehensive **information and support** to all those experiencing SEN and those around them.

We will work as a partnership to ensure that all pupils are **included** where possible in their education establishment and broader community.

We will work to ensure that our systems connect well and that our practice is of the highest standard to improve children and young people's outcomes.

In summary from considering the work of the STIP service, we believe this provides an important layer of support that connects well across our system. The STIP service will continue to provide valuable support and also develop in partnership with schools and other stakeholders.

### **Race Equality Minority Achievement Service (REMA) Proposal for Schools Forum for 2025/26**

It is estimated that there are around 10- 12,000 Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) residents in Surrey which would mean that Surrey has the fourth largest GRT population of any local authority. 1000 children and young people in Surrey schools ascribe as GRT (a significant number do not ascribe).

GRT pupils are disproportionately represented in all data both corporately and in children's services (Education). Although the GRT community is a small percentage of the school population they are over-represented in all the indicators below, making them a vulnerable cohort. This is replicated when looking at data from across the council – children with a child in need plan, adult literacy levels, incidences of domestic abuse for example. The table below highlights how the community is disproportionately represented within selected "vulnerable groups" compared to the whole Surrey school-aged population.

#### **GRT population as a percentage of the overall numbers**

	<b>2021-2022</b>	<b>2022-2023</b>	<b>2023-2024</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
School population	0.7	0.7	0.7
Permanent exclusions	5	8.4	5.7

Persistent absence	63.3	71	67.9
Electively Home Educated	7.6	6.8	10
Child missing education/other than at school	8.1	7.5	9.6

A high number of students from the GRT community are among those who find it hard to follow the expected school routine. This vulnerable cohort of people who travel for work or may have lower literacy levels can feel very isolated from society. The curriculum offered by schools has few connections to their life and some children find it hard to complete an education that holds little interest for them. The achievement gap between vulnerable children and other groups continues to increase. This is reflected in persistent absence, CME, EHE and exclusions. An already vulnerable cohort of children and young people are becoming further disadvantaged.

All maintained primaries have access to Specialist Teachers and Traveller Education Support Workers (TESWs). The team receives referrals directly from schools but also from GRT families. REMA encourages schools to have a pro-active approach, requesting advice and training before a Traveller pupil joins them, to ensure a positive transition. Staff teams are supported to build capacity for meeting the needs and challenges of their GRT cohort through consultation, direct face to face work with the child and family and by training.

REMA's present position.

The current core offer for maintained primaries aims to provide schools with the right tools to support their GRT pupils. It is continually developed and promoted to ensure schools receive the service which best fits them. Specialist teachers work with schools, providing an annual MOT of GRT support, surgeries and advice and support for those pupils who most benefit. TESWs

Staff clinic sessions to improve outcomes for GRT pupils e.g., personalised learning to access the curriculum

Schools and other services are asked to evaluate how effective they feel TESW support has been, 100% agree that it was a positive contribution and that they will use it in the future. This work is not always directly connected to a school, but enables a family to re-engage and can result in a pupil accessing education.

### **Comments from families, schools and pupils:**

#### Comments from families about TESWs

Just phoned the school. Thanks REMA after talking to you made me feel a lot better  
There is no way my granddaughter would be in specialist school without the visits and support of REMA. She absolutely loves it at W school and has come out of her shell. It is so pleasing to the family who were all against her attending.

I reached out to REMA regarding secondary school placement, they were very helpful and gave me reassurance and advice. Thank you

#### From schools about TESWs

Support for a child missing education, who , with help from REMA has now been confirmed as EHE and is applying for college places from September  
The support, advice and guidance from this team is first class! Thank you for everything

#### From schools about teachers

The children have really looked forward to working with REMA. They have been confident and

## **Service Development over the previous year**

### **We have**

Developed our reporting to identify the most vulnerable children in our community, using secure data set which allows our consultations and work with schools to focus on the most vulnerable children within our GRT community





The funding rate that we are able to pass through to providers depends on the rate that we receive from DfE. This has previously been calculated on January census data. The DfE have calculated funding for the new entitlements based on termly headcount which has mitigated any risk which arises from termly variation. Eg If take-up in the summer term significantly increased above Jan census levels. We have not yet been informed whether DfE intend to continue with the 2 methods for the different age groups in 2025/26 or fund based on either census or headcount for all entitlements.

DfE have also announced a requirement that all LAs publish their provider rates no more than 8 weeks after they are informed of their gross rate. This poses a risk if based on census data as this is not available to us until mid-March at the earliest. This is not applicable if they decide on termly headcount although this may pose a different risk as an LA that has benefited from the census model as take-up is comparatively high across the whole year. The average take-up for three and four year olds is lower -than Jan take-up. The -risk applies to three and four year olds only

### **Expansion of the Early Years Entitlements**

In April 2024 the Working Parents Entitlement (WPE) was introduced for 2-year-olds for 15 hours a week for 38 weeks per year.

5750 codes were issued to Surrey parents with 4860 validated. The number validated exceeded the number predicted by Surrey and by DfE by approximately 21%. So far the sector has been able to meet demand. We believe that this is due to the majority of places being taken up by children who are already in nursery but previously funded by parents switching to the new entitlement. The 15 hours entitlement is not sufficient for parents to change their working patterns.

In September 2024 the entitlement will increase to include children of working families from the age of 9 months to school age for 15 hours per week. So far 2911 codes have been issued to Surrey parents which equates to approximately 20% of the population for that age range. Projections are based on 25% of population.

We are expecting a more significant increase in demand from September 2025 when the entitlement increases to 30 hours for children of working families from the age of 9 months to school age. We are supporting the sector to meet the expected need through identifying gaps in the market and providing targeted grant funding to create additional places. Last year we were provided with £205k implementation funding and were able

Forum to endorse the approach that we are proposing in principle and that we intend to consult on.

**Proposal for funding rates and supplements for all ages from 9 months to 4 years to go out for sector consultation in September 2024.**

In 2024/25 this is paid at £0.54/hr for 3-4 year olds only (apart from maintained nursery

