



Surrey Schools Forum Minutes of Meeting

Thursday 6 October 2022 1.00pm Virtual Meeting on TEAMS

Approved by members at their meeting on 8 December 2022

Present

Chair

Rhona Barnfield Howard of Effingham School Academy member

Joint Vice-Chairs

Kate Keane Ewell Grove Primary Primary Head

Justin Price Freemantles School Special school head

Other school and academy members:

Zoe Johnson-Walker The Winston Churchill School Secondary Head

Geoffrey Hackett Burpham Primary Primary governor

Steph Neale St Pauls Catholic Primary Primary governor

Fred Greaves Oakwood School Secondary governor

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

Elaine Cooper SWAN academy trust Academy member

Jo Hastings Ottershaw Infant and Junior Academy member

Karyn Hing Westfield School Academy member

Paul Kinder Warlingham School Academy member

Jack Mayhew Learning partners MAT Academy member

Susan Wardlow Reigate School Academy member

David Euridge Reigate Valley/Wey Valley AP academy member

Non-school members

Sandra Morrison

NFF schools block.

The average increase for 2023/24 was 1.8% per pupil. As discussed in the consultation paper, there are relatively low increases in MFG and MPPL in the NFF (0.5%), which explains why the average increase in per pupil funding in Surrey schools is so much lower than the 2.4% increase in formula factors nationally.

Central schools services block (CSSB)

Funding would increase by around 2%, less a further 20% reduction in historic commitments funding.

High needs block

There was a 5% increase in the funding floor. Pupil numbers would be updated in December.

Early years

Allocations for 2023/24 had not been announced yet, but DfE had consulted on changes to the national formula.

One member noted that the 1.8% increase for mainstream schools, plus the block transfer, meant an effective 0.8% increase in funding, describing the situation as $1.8\% - 1.0\% = 0.8\%$. He believed we still had to comply with the safety valve agreement but noted

The Chair asked whether there was a possibility of renegotiating the safety valve agreement. LM advised that the agreement required the LA to monitor and report to DfE quarterly. Pressures both on schools and on the high needs block had been flagged as part of quarter 2 monitoring. The LA was not currently renegotiating, but had asked whether the DfE would provide additional funding. DfE had not responded yet. The LA had also written to the new Secretary of State asking him to urgently address the financial situation in schools. The LA was also engaged with the County Councils Network on the national funding formula, on the basis that county schools were less well funded than others.

The Chair noted that many groups were involved in discussions over the financial situation of schools. Any review of safety valve agreements could have an impact beyond Surrey. DP noted that there were 14 such agreements so far.

One member noted that while the safety valve agreement was understood, the agreement contributed to pressures on schools which were causing real hardship and which were affecting Surrey children.

LM advised that pressures on schools had been raised in both quarter 1 and quarter 2 monitoring and the DfE had been asked how they would seek to resolve the issues, eg by additional funding, renegotiating the agreement, or any other suggestion. Surrey had not formally asked to renegotiate. Part of the role of the Forum was to contribute to balancing the DSG. The LA and all other public services were under similar pressures.

CID 7>BDC q0.000008871 0 59>BDC q0.000008871 0 595.32 841.92 reW*nBT/F4 12 Tf1 0 0 1 72.0

LM noted that a significant number of schools had supported the proposed transfer to the high needs block. She suggested that the responses did not suggest a

These proposals were taken together. DG noted clear majority support for all of the proposed de-delegations which were already in place in 2022/23. This was a decision for maintained primary and secondary schools, taken separately.

The Forum supported the proposed de-delegations without a vote.

Early years funding

CS reported that there had been 64 responses to the early years consultation (an increase from 51 in the previous year). Most proposals had received overwhelming support.

The proposal for the hourly rates for two year olds was to bring spending into line with funding, where historically it had been overspent. The corresponding proposal for three year olds was to increase the hourly rate by 6p above the DfE increase to reflect historic underspending.

100% of school respondents and 88% of PVI respondents had supported maintaining deprivation funding.

There had been consistent support for maintaining the level of Early Intervention Fund. Some had wanted a further increase.

The proposed 27p/hr increase for state maintained nurseries employing teachers was not an increase in funding but was to replace a previous separate grant which DfE was now including within Early Years DSG. Surrey had proposed that the increase should apply only where a qualified teacher was actually employed. There had still been strong support for the proposal, although some PVIs employing qualified teachers had asked that the supplement should be extended to them. One member saw it as an anomaly that nursery teachers were funded from the early years block, and wanted to know whether there was parity of funding and if not, for the LA to agree that there would be parity of funding for teachers between early years and schools.

DG noted that the 27p was based on an estimate of the grant to be transferred by DfE into DSG, but the final figure would not be known until November.

V@Á@caÁ~**^•cãÁ@caÁ@Á•^Á-Ácaã+ÁæÁ[{^c@*Á!Á@Á}ã]}•ÁÁca^Á
up with the DfE. The union rep asked for evidence from the LA to support an approach to DfE.

DG noted that if the 27p/hr supplement for teachers was increased, it would mean reductions elsewhere in funding for 3 and 4 year olds.

The proposed central retention of 5% of funding for 3-

70% of respondents had supported linking the free meals funding rate to the schools NFF rate. PVI providers wanted it extended to them.

The proposed distribution of maintained nursery school supplementary grant had been supported.

The Forum agreed the proposed central retention of 5% of funding for three and four year olds, by a clear majority.

6 Other schools funding issues: average pupil number disapplication requests and falling rolls issues

a) Pupil number variations

Schools losing bulge classes

DG advised that the proposal was to apply to the DfE to vary funded pupil numbers for 14 schools losing bulge classes in July 2023, on the basis that this was a planned reduction which could be anticipated. This was a variation which had been applied for, and approved by DfE.

All schools had been contacted: 9 had agreed or declined to comment, 1 had asked for modifications, 1 was being treated as an objection, 3 no responses.

The Forum supported the proposal by 15-0 (voting being open to all members).

School reducing PAN through local realignment

The proposal was to use average pupil numbers (for the affected year groups) to fund a school losing its year 3 PAN as part of a local reorganisation in which an infant school expanded to primary (ie no overall change in places in the area). The school had been contacted and raised no objections.

The Forum supported the proposal by 15-0.

Other schools

LM suggested that further discussions on the issue would be useful in forming future policy. She suggested that Primary Council might be involved, perhaps by

