



## **Papers for Schools Forum meeting 2 July 2024**

### **Item 7a**

#### **Surrey Schools Forum**

**2 July 2024**

**For discussion and recommendation**

**Lead officer: Julia Katherine**

### **Notional and additional Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) funding for 2025/26**

#### **Summary**

The Forum is asked to consider detailed proposals for additional funding from the high needs block for schools where the incidence of education health care plans (EHCPs) is disproportionately high, relative to their notional SEND budgets, for inclusion in the autumn schools funding consultation paper, for implementation in 2025/26.

#### **Background**

Part of mainstream schools' core National Funding Formula (NFF) budgets must be designated as a "notional SEND budget" which schools are expected to spend on SEND. Schools are expected to fund the first £6,000 of additional support for pupils with EHCPs from their core budgets, in addition to support for pupils with SEND but without EHCPs. The notional SEND budget must be based on NFF formula factors and in 2025/26 Surrey proposes to set the proportion of basic entitlement, deprivation and low prior attainment funding deemed notional SEND funding, at the 2024/25 national average, as previously proposed. However, the DfE recognises that a formula based allocation is unlikely to meet the needs of all schools, and encourages LAs to provide additional funding from the high needs block to assist schools with disproportionately high levels of SEND in funding the first £6,000 per EHCP.

At its May meeting the Forum supported the development of proposals for additional funding from the high needs block for schools where the incidence of EHCPs was disproportionately high, such that the cost of self funding the first £6000 per EHCP exceeded the notional SEND budget. The LA anticipates consulting on such a proposal for implementation in 2025/26. The Forum is asked to consider detailed proposals.

#### **Basis of calculation**

The core proposal is to distribute additional funding based on the amount by which the total cost of the first £6,000 per EHCP exceeds the notional SEND budget, after allowing a proportion of the notional SEND budget for SEND needs other than EHCPs. For 2025/26 we propose to calculate the cost of the first £6,000 EITHER

- 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 do not propose to use actual numbers of SEN support pupils in the funding calculation, as that data is unmoderated.

### **Infant schools**

At the May meeting the Forum expressed particular concern over the SEND pressures faced by infant schools, due to the time taken to assess SEND needs and apply for an EHCP being significant compared to the length of time pupils spent in infant schools. In January 2024 the proportion of children in Surrey mainstream schools with EHCPs was as shown below:

Proportion of children in Surrey mainstream schools with EHCPs (by year group)

Year R	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
3.19%	2.97%	2.92%	3.86%	3.86%	4.10%	4.93%

Average for Year R to 2: 3.03%    Average for Year R to 6: 3.69% (20% higher)

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 to reach the threshold for additional funding towards the first £6,000 per EHCP. In practice, such a change has an impact on very few infant schools, because most are not close to the threshold.

#### **Costs of the various options described above**

Costs of the various proposals are summarised in the annex based on data for the academic year 2023/24, although costs are likely to be underestimated due to the number of EHCPs still in process. Costs are shown based on current numbers and also projected for a 20% increase in EHCPs at individual school level, to give some idea of possible variations.

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

To discuss the proposals.

To make recommendations as to proposals for wider consultation.

## 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 Trill**

### **Falling rolls funding for primary schools with temporary falls in roll**

#### **Summary**

At its May meeting, the Forum asked officers to develop options for distributing additional funding to schools with temporary falls in rolls, for inclusion in the autumn schools' consultation paper. This paper describes possible options for falling rolls funding in 2025/26.

#### **Background**

From 2024/25, the DfE has included a sum within Surrey's Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) based on an indicator of falling rolls (£592,000 in Surrey in 2024/25), although, like the DSG growth fund allocation, it is not ringfenced for falling rolls/growth. The local authority may (but need not) distribute "falling rolls" funding to schools experiencing a temporary fall in rolls, where place planning (as shown in the SCAP return) shows that the places are needed within the next three to five years, due to increased demand in the planning area. The budget and criteria for falling rolls funding require approval by Schools Forum. It is important to emphasise that "falling rolls" funding is not intended as a general solution to the widespread incidence of vacant places, and of falling rolls, in the primary sector.

#### **Existing special case for falling rolls funding**

In 2024/25 Surrey is providing falling rolls funding only for one special case, a school where pupil numbers fell due to a site move, which was intended to support the LA in serving a new housing development. It is proposed that this special case continues in 2025/26, at an estimated full year cost of £240,000 (actual cost will depend on pupil numbers). This is likely to be needed for up to three years from September 2024. Other similar special cases may be needed from time to time, although no others are anticipated in 2025/26.

#### **Options for extending scope of falling rolls funding**

The DfE criteria, as stated in the schools revenue funding operational guide, include that any surplus places to be funded should be needed "within the next three to five years" (following the date of the SCAP data, 2022/23 data for 2024/25, presumed 2023/24 data for 2025/26). The school funding regulations refer to growth in the three years starting with the school year beginning in the funding period, so for 2025/26, growth would need to be by September 2027. The proposals in this paper are based on 2024/25 DfE guidance, which may be subject to change, and final criteria will be subject to DfE approval, so we may need to modify them in due course.

Surrey primary schools are divided into 60 planning areas, of which growth is currently forecast in 14 areas over the period October 2023 to September 2027 (ie within three years starting from September 2025 inclusive). In principle, funding could be provided either on the basis of a formula or subject to schools demonstrating unavoidable costs

which could not be met from NFF funding, or some combination of the two. But any method should be simple and predictable to operate, and it should minimise the administrative burden both to schools and the local authority (LA). Therefore, we propose largely to use a formula basis.

**Basic proposal: only fund schools where pupil numbers have fallen in the last two years**

To provide additional funding for primary schools where:

- Pupil numbers in year R to 6 fell by 5% or more between October 2022 or October 2023 and October 2024 (we would take the higher of October 2021 and October 2022, and fund the excess over 5%) OR
- The proportion of vacancies in October 2024 exceeds the median vacancies for schools in the primary sector in October 2024 (or the Surrey average) (October 2023: 3.33% and 6.26% respectively) OR both criteria must be satisfied simultaneously  
AND
- The places in this school would be needed by September 2027 on the basis of forecast pupil growth in the area (we would assume all vacant places in the area which were ineligible for falling rolls funding were used first - see Annex 1 for illustration).

In calculating the number of vacant places funded in 2025/26, the number of pupils in SEN centres would not be included, where those pupils are outside PAN. Any “planned” reduction due to loss of a bulge class, or to a reduction in PAN, would also be excluded from the calculation of falls in pupil numbers when calculating eligible falls in roll.

Annex 1 provides some data on the impact of these options.

**Proposed funding rates**

The proposed funding is a sum per eligible vacancy, linked to the growing schools vacant place unit of resource (90% of adjusted basic entitlement, £3,329.70 at 2024/25 rates), but it may need to be scaled for affordability. We would aim to contain the cost within the DfE falling rolls fund allocation plus any surplus growth funding, in order to avoid reductions to the main NFF formula. That might mean scaling down the rate per funded vacancy or raising the vacancy threshold.

Should falling rolls funding continue in future years, pupil number data and estimates would be updated every year. This might well change the eligibility of individual schools, if pupil numbers do not change as expected. This means that schools should not see falling rolls funding as a continuing funding stream. We would not anticipate amending allocations already made, if they were not supported by later estimates.

The Forum would be asked to approve actual criteria and funding rates each January, once the DfE growth funding and falling rolls allocations were known.

### **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 sparsity funding in 2024/25 as a result of low pupil numbers.



Illustration of range of school level funding under scenarios above

(Note: this table is provided to illustrate the range of impacts on schools. The actual schools affected may well be different in 2025/26 compared to 2024/25)

Method School	Loss since October 2022 less 1 <sup>st</sup> 5%	Loss since October 2021/2022 Less 1 <sup>st</sup> 5%	All losses if % of vacancies >6.26% of places	All losses if % of vacancies >3.33% of places
A	0	0	0	19,978
B	0	0	0	29,967
C	0	0	0	6,659
D	0	0	0	3,330
E	0	0	29,967	29,967
F	0	23,141	19,978	19,978
G	0	0	16,649	16,649
H	16,482	41,788	66,594	66,594
I	1,998	1,998	16,649	16,649
J	12,653	12,653	0	86,572
K	0	0	19,978	19,978
L	0	0	9,989	9,989
M	23,974	27,137	56,605	56,605
N	46,782	59,435	113,210	113,210
O	0	0	0	13,319
P	0	22,143	73,253	73,253
Q	16,482	44,951	59,935	53,275
R	4,495	4,495	16,649	16,649
S	24,140	30,467	43,286	43,286
T	23,141	23,141	29,967	29,967
U	12,486	37,792	66,594	66,594
V				26,638
Total	183,634	329,141	639,302	819,106

\*percentage increase in main funding formula which would be possible if falling rolls funding were not provided at this level

Where falling rolls funding would not be provided because there is pupil growth in the area but it is insufficient to need additional pupils to be placed in the eligible school  
The following example illustrates this scenario

<i>School</i>	<i>Eligible vacancies</i>	<i>Ineligible vacancies</i>
A	8	4
B	0	3
C	0	3
Total	8	10

Increase in pupil numbers expected by Sept 2027: 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.

In principle, there is no reason to expect any link between incidence of vacant places and incidence of protected characteristics, but the analysis was undertaken to check whether coincidentally there was any such link. We have concluded that there is no strong link.

The tables below show how many of the schools gaining additional funding from the four methods described above rank in each quartile for the five proxy indicators of protected characteristics listed above.

Method: fund falls in roll between October 2022 and October 2023, less first 5%

Number of schools in quartile for	non British (January 2023)	EAL January 2023	%EHCP January 2024	%SEN January 2024	%FSM January 2024
Highest	3	2	1	3	1
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1	2	5	2	3
3 <sup>rd</sup>	2	2	2	2	3
4 <sup>th</sup>	4	4	2	3	3

EAL-English as additional language, FSM-eligible for free school meals

Method: fund higher of falls in roll between October 2021/October 2022 and October 2023, less first 5%

Number of schools in quartile for	non British (January 2023)	EAL January 2023	%EHCP January 2024	%SEN January 2024	%FSM January 2024
Highest	4	2	1	4	2
2 <sup>nd</sup>	2	4	6	3	4
3 <sup>rd</sup>	2	2	2	2	3
4 <sup>th</sup>	4	4	3	3	3

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 2021/2022 and October 2023 for schools where incidence of vacancies exceeds the median (3.33%)

Number of schools in quartile	non British (January 2023)	EAL January 2023	%EHCP January 2024	%SEN January 2024	%FSM January 2024
Highest	4	3	4	5	5
2 <sup>nd</sup>	5	6	9	8	8
3 <sup>rd</sup>	3	3	5	4	6
4 <sup>th</sup>	10	10	4	5	3

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

## **Transfer to high needs block, Minimum funding guarantee, ceiling and other routine formula factor issues**

### **Summary**

This paper summarises the annual decisions which need to be made on the mainstream schools funding formula, on which schools should be consulted within the autumn consultation paper. These are largely unchanged from those considered at the May meeting. All proposals in this paper are subject to there being no significant changes in school funding regulations and guidance for 2025/26 following the election.

### **Transfer of 1% of National funding formula (NFF) funding to high needs block.**

As in 2023/24 and 2024/25 we anticipate asking for a transfer of 1% of schools funding to the high needs block. While it is recognised that this transfer is challenging for schools, it forms part of the safety valve agreement with DfE, which is essential to restore the high needs block to sustainability. Therefore the LA anticipates applying to DfE for such a transfer, whether or not it is supported by schools or by the Forum. The transfer necessitates setting formula funding rates roughly 1.5%-2% lower than if no transfer were made. The gap exceeds 1% because schools on Minimum per pupil level do not contribute. If the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) is set at the highest permissible level, schools on MFG do not contribute either.

### **Balance between minimum funding guarantee, ceiling on gains and increase in formula funding rates.**

A higher minimum funding guarantee means a lower increase in formula funding rates. Historically Surrey has set minimum funding guarantees at the highest permissible level, as this is the only increase in funding rates seen by a significant minority of schools. The balance between the two is best considered when the gap between the two in the NFF is known.

A ceiling, or limit on large per pupil gains, can be used to make the formula affordable, instead of setting lower formula funding rates, and Surrey has used one in 2023/24 and 2024/25, although in 2023/24 only a minority of LAs did. This has the advantage of mitigating huge increases in per pupil funding caused by short term increases in additional needs (which could otherwise then be preserved by minimum funding guarantee for several years) but it also means that schools do not see the full benefit of some nationally driven changes in funding eg split site funding.

### **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 to understand, or otherwise improved.

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

## **Proposals for de-delegation from maintained primary and secondary schools for 2025/26**

### **Summary**

De-delegation is the deduction of funds for a specific service from the budgets of maintained primary and/or secondary schools, with the approval of the Schools Forum. The council is proposing continued de-delegation in 2025/26, for the same services as in 2024/25 (plus union facilities for secondary schools). This paper also covers the maintained primary schools' intervention fund, which technically is a deduction from all maintained schools, but which has been managed as de-delegated, from maintained primary schools only.

### **Scope**

In 2024/25, funding was de-delegated from maintained mainstream schools, and held centrally, for the following services:

- Behaviour support (primary schools only: part of specialist teacher service or STIP service)
- Teacher and trade union facility time (primary schools only)
- Other special staff costs (e.g. suspensions)
- Free school meals eligibility checking
- Race Equality Minority Achievement (REMA) travellers service (primary schools only).
- Maintained primary schools intervention fund

Continued de-delegation of funding for all of these services is proposed for 2025/26.

Further details of the proposals for behaviour support and REMA travellers services are shown in the annexes. The other services proposed for de-delegation can be summarised as follows:

- Teacher association and trade union facility time -  
This funds a small number of teacher association and trade union representatives to provide countywide advice in maintained schools, thus reducing the need for individual schools to release their own staff.
- Other special staff costs -  
This contributes to cost of suspensions and release for specified public duties, which can have significant unplanned effects on a small number of schools.
- Free school meals eligibility checking -

This service supports schools by checking the eligibility of pupils for free school meals, to ensure that all eligible pupils are identified and that schools receive the additional funding provided for these pupils. This includes additional formula funding income and the pupil premium.

As in 2024/25, no request is being made to de-delegate a school specific contingency.

### **Proposed de-delegation rates for 2025/26**

Proposed de-delegation rates for 2025/26 are the same rates as in 2024/25, subject to the following changes:

- Behaviour support: rate per pupil and deprivation rates to be set so that the average deduction per pupil and the average deprivation deduction per pupil increase in line with the increase in basic entitlement rate;
- Rates for free school meals eligibility checking, and travellers support: rates would increase in line with basic entitlement rate.

The total funding held for each service in 2025/26 would be likely to be less than in 2024/25 due to further academy conversions.

De-delegation is not allowed from nursery or special schools or pupil referral units.

We propose to consult on de-delegation of funding from maintained secondary schools for union facilities, which was agreed in 2023/24 but not in 2024/25.

### **Recommendation**

That the Forum support the proposals as a basis for consultation,

The Forum is also asked to suggest any other information which might be useful in encouraging maintained schools to form a view on the proposals.



## 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-delegation and to secondary schools through a traded offer

Introduction - Services and purposes for which continued de-delegation is proposed

The STIP service offer is a Surrey wide offer, although the delivery model is local and quadrant-based and can be accessed easily via an allocated STIP team member for each school who links directly with the special educational needs co-ordinator (SENCO) and Headteacher. The service offer has been developed in response to feedback from schools and delivers a graduated response in line with the SEND Code of Practice. It offers direct support in the classroom, as well as advice and guidance on how to implement targeted strategies or more specialist approaches. Further detail about the service offer is available on the [Surrey Education Services](#) hub.

De-delegation funds the behaviour management support that STIP provide to **maintained primary schools, which is outlined in full in this annex along with detail of the general STIP offer**. In summary, STIP support to maintained primary schools for 'behaviour support' consists of evidence-based early intervention, understanding the function of pupils' behaviour, recommending and modelling of de-escalation strategies, targeted work with individual or groups of pupils, support for staff through training, consultations and surgeries, support for implementing whole-school policies and strategies and direct work with parents.

### STIP Behaviour Support in Context

The service in total provides a range of support including:

- Termly Planning Meeting
- Guidance on identifying children's needs and meeting SEN early
- Clinics to staff, which provide targeted continuing professional development (CPD) on supporting inclusion and the progress of children with additional needs - specifically cognition and learning (C&L), communication and interaction (C&I) and social, emotional and mental health (SEMH)
- Advice to SENCO/school staff on a range of SEN provision/interventions and strategies for C&L, C&I and SEMH.
- Support to schools to monitor and review SEN provision for children at Specialist school support level (C&L, C&I, SEMH)
- Support to schools to engage with and support parents of children who have identified SEN, including children who present with behaviours of concern
- Support to schools around key transitions, specifically from early years to Reception and Year 6 to Year 7
- Guidance to schools around proactive approaches to promote placement stability and prevent exclusions
- Advice to primary headteachers around the exclusions process

- Subsidised centralised training on a range of special educational needs and inclusive practice
- Training on whole school approaches that support the inclusion of every child e.g. Restorative Practice, Anti-Bullying Charter mark accreditation and Healthy Schools
- Positive Touch, Behaviour Risk Management, De-escalation and MAPA training
- Literacy for All
- Modelling tailored interventions for children at Specialist School Support level
- Therapeutic Story Writing/Story Links training and intervention delivery
- ELKLAN training
- Nuffield Early Language Intervention (NELI) training
- Positive Behaviour Support (PBS).
- Restorative Practice

### STIP Service Delivery Academic Year 2022/23

Over the past year the countywide STIP team has:

- Worked with nearly 366 mainstream schools.
- Ongoing cases open to STIP service across the academic year is 600 (current open cases at 602).
- The top 5 areas of STIP support and allocation of STIP resources as follows:
  - Individual advice and support for pupils with SEND Support Needs
  - Planning Meetings
  - Behaviours of concern interventions
  - School Clinics
  - Early intervention support

### Current Open Cases at July 2023 by SEN Stage:

- 64% SEN Support
- 24% Other
- 12% EHCP
- Gender split – of open cases (70% male 30% female)

### **Outcomes** – of 502 cases closed following support and intervention:

- Progress Made: 73%
  - Where schools and families have reported that they are confident they understand a child's needs and how they can meet them.
- Transfer to other service: 14%
  - Where further support and/or assessment is required
- Permanent exclusions (PEX) : 5%
- Left School: 8%

## Training offer

- In 2 terms until 1st April 2023, the STIP team have trained 1,302 members of staff. This training is firmly connected to supporting pupils with behaviours of concerns and including.
  - Positive Behaviour Support
  - Positive Touch
  - Restorative Practice
  - Literacy for All
- 100% of people who have attended our training would recommend them to other colleagues in their school.

## **School feedback on STIP service (June 2023)**

- 208 schools responded to the survey. This is a 20% increase from last year and represents over 50% of schools.
- 98% of schools gave STIP a rating of 3 or more for how satisfied they have been with the service over the past academic year (1 dis-satisfied, 3 satisfied, 5 extremely satisfied).

## Links to Schools Forum Priorities & Inclusion and Additional Needs Strategy

The focus and core offer of our STIP service connects and supports Schools Forum Inclusion and Innovation Working Group (IIWG) priorities and is an integral part of our 'ambitions for children'. The following specific examples of STIP support of IIWG priorities (academic year 2023/24) are noted below (not exhaustive):

- Emotional Wellbeing and Distressed Behaviour (subgroup 2)

Assistant Director for North West (Specialist Teaching Lead) is the lead LA officer, supporting school leaders in the Inclusion and Innovation Working Group subgroup 2.

STIPs will support the development of our whole county nurturing approaches and commissioned Nurture Groups/Centres during (delivery planned for September 2024, coproduction of offer is ongoing). Developing Nurture Approaches and Services is a priority in the STIP Service plan for 2023/24.

- Transition (subgroup 3)

2023/24 will see the launch of the next phase of the ASPIRE project (Yr. 6 to 7 transition) led by STIPs.

Core STIP work described above has the importance of transitions for pupils firmly in scope and part of their work with schools.

- Neuro Diverse (ND) Inclusive Schools (subgroup 1)

STIP have specialist teachers with extensive experience of supporting pupils with ND needs, as part of their core work described in this report. Mindful of this IIWG priority and the

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 support families often by often advocating on their behalf to schools and services, removing barriers such as low literacy, lack of trust and historical myths.

As a team, REMA works with schools, supporting both their GRT and EAL communities. We use our experiences with each cohort to inform our working. We endeavour to be pro-active, encouraging schools to plan ahead for support and expected need.

In addition to the work with the GRT community REMA offer EAL support and Interpreting Services for children where English is not their first language. The team's support has been instrumental in supporting newly arrived children and families from Afghanistan, Ukraine, Hong Kong and Syria to integrate into schools.

GRT Support provided by REMA Sept 2023 - May 2024

### **Overall Core Offer package of support to schools**

Over the last Academic Year Schools asked for more teaching, as a result we adjusted our core offer to provide this

### **Specialist Teacher Support**

- Annual GRT MOT to review whole school provision for GRT pupils and build capacity
- Provide schools with advice/key supporting documents e.g., accurate GRT ascription
- 6-week block of 1:1 reading/phonics support for GRT pupils working out of key stage
- Access to pre-recorded cultural awareness training

- 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 engaged and the parents were really grateful for the additional support. Thank you!

The children have benefitted from one to one support, particularly to help with regulation following challenges in the playground. The support has improved their self esteem and self awareness.

### **Working with other Services**

REMA works with the Inclusion service to address the high levels of persistent absence in the GRT community. Meetings with Primary maintained schools enable the sharing of good practice, with the aim of improving attendance.

The two services continue to liaise closely in the identification of Children Missing Education and subsequent placement into school. this involves contacting hard to reach families, and offering reassurance and support, while ensuring children have the education they deserve.

In addition to the work with the Inclusion Service, REMA contributes to the building of positive relations with the community via the Building GRT Partnerships Group and the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum.

We continue to work closely with Surrey University on a four year project, encouraging primary children to consider Science and tertiary education and support transition to secondary education.

## **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
- Linked Key Indicators around exclusion and attendance directly to service intervention
- Strengthened our relationships with services supporting vulnerable children by developing clear “working together” arrangements with Area Teams eg STIPS and Inclusion Team. We identify and challenge services to support GRT children attending all schools
- Worked to reduce the number of GRT children who are current “Children Missing Education”
- Worked closely within and contributed to the LA’s Children Missing Education (CME) processes. Using our close community links we work to identify GRT children who do not have a school placement. We work with Admissions and the Inclusion Team to support securing a school placement for GRT children who are CME
- Offered training to LA frontline services, highlighting the challenges often encountered by the GRT community that can sometimes prevent GRT children receiving support at earliest opportunity
- Increased number of children supported

### **Recommendations**

Our GRT children are one of Surrey’s most at- risk cohorts of children and young people and are over-represented in the County’s key vulnerable indicators

REMA will work to support the community, to build bridges between GRT families and schools, to positively link the community with support services, to support improving attendance and to raise awareness of the barriers that exist that impact on GRT children and young people achieving good outcomes

**To continue to support the GRT community we recommend that de-delegation continues at current level of £315,000**

**Item 9**  
**Surrey Schools Forum**  
**2 July 2024**  
**For discussion and recommendation**  
**Lead: Carol Savedra**

**Early years funding proposals for 2025/26**

**Summary**

There have been some significant changes to the Early Years Funded Entitlement over the past year. We received Supplementary Funding covering the period September 2023 to April 2024 in preparation for the implementation of the new entitlement. The funding rates were then significantly increased for existing entitlement and the rates for new entitlement were higher than anticipated.

**Funding rate comparison table**

<b>DFE and Surrey hourly funding rates</b>						
	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24 initial</b>	<b>2023/24 final</b>	<b>% increase</b>	<b>2024/25</b>	<b>% increase</b>
	£	£	£		£	
<b>3-4 years</b>						
DFE	5.49	5.81	6.40		6.77	
<b>Surrey Hourly rate</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>5.14</b>	<b>5.72</b>	<b>17.4%↑</b>	<b>6.05</b>	<b>5.7%↑</b>
<b>2 years</b>						
DFE	6.25	6.87	9.79		9.61	
<b>Surrey basic</b>	<b>6.13</b>	<b>6.65</b>	<b>9.03</b>	<b>47.3%↑</b>	<b>8.54</b>	<b>5.4%↓</b>
<b>Under 2 years</b>						
DFE					13.04	
<b>Surrey basic</b>					<b>12.10</b>	

\*23/24 final includes supplementary grant covering period from September 23 to end March 24

The SCC basic hourly funding rate for 2 year olds went down by 5.4% in 24/25 due to SCC retaining 5% and allocating a dedicated EIF budget for 2 year olds. This was endorsed through consultation and by Schools Forum. We were not permitted to retain funding in 23/24 as it was a requirement of the Supplementary Grant that 100% be passed through to providers.



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 to top this up from Centrally Retained funds. We allocated £388,500 in total, securing both existing and new provision. In 2024/25 we have not received any implementation funding and therefore the amount that we can distribute for start-up funding will need to come from Centrally Retained Funds only. As actual take-up is understood, we will calculate how much we are able to commit to supporting the sector in this way.

Due to the significant changes to the Early Years Funding Entitlement and to the lack of trend data available to use, it has been agreed that in autumn 2024 the funding consultation for Early Years will be carried out separately to the schools funding consultation as it was in autumn 2023. Surrey County Council will be seeking Early Years providers' views on the proposals for funding for 2025/26. We are asking Schools

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.**

The consultation will be live for 4 weeks in September and a summary of the responses will be brought to the next Schools Forum in October 2024.

- We will pass through 95% of the DfE funding to providers and will retain 5% centrally to be used as described above.
- If affordable, pass through the value of any uplift from DfE
- We will manage and distribute an Early Intervention Fund (EIF) for each age group for children experiencing barriers to learning. See description of EIF below.

We will continue to apply the same proportions as for 24/25 which is:

- under 2 year olds – 1% of total budget for under 2's
- 2 year olds – 3% of total budget for 2 year olds
- 3 & 4 year olds – 5% of total budget for 3 & 4 year olds

The rationale for this ascending contribution relates to the staff ratios for each age group, the required capacity to recognise emergent need and benefits of early intervention in preparing children for school and preparing schools for the cohort they will be receiving into Reception.

All eligible children will have access to Early Years Pupil Premium and Deprivation Funding. We will apply the rates required by DfE unknown as yet .

This funding rate is set directly by DfE and may not be varied by the LA.

### **Surrey Deprivation Funding**

The Surrey rate for deprivation funding for 3 and 4 year olds is currently funded at £2.81 per hour linked to eligibility for EYPP on economic deprivation factors.

For 2025/26 we propose to continue to fund deprivation according to eligibility for EYPP on economic grounds (roughly=FSM eligibility criteria). DfE have confirmed that all eligible children from 9 months can access EYPP. Deprivation funding will still be linked to EYPP however the funding rates will vary to reflect the levels of deprivation within each age group. This is necessary due to the different criteria for eligibility and the difference in the profile of the cohort. This will be reviewed as we are able to collect data as the new entitlements become available.

### **Proposed rates for deprivation supplement (unchanged from 2024/25)**

Under 2 year olds - £1 per hour

2 year olds - £1 per hour

3- & 4-year-olds £2.81 per hour

Teachers' pay and pension supplement (for maintained schools/academies with teachers in the teacher pension scheme)

In 2024/25 this is paid at £0.54/hr for 3-4 year olds only (apart from maintained nursery schools, for which it forms part of supplementary funding, see below) We are proposing no change for 2025/26

## **Centrally Retained Funds**

### **Support for the sector and administration of the funding**

There have been a number of changes to how the early years sector is supported in Surrey related to the expansion of the entitlements. The document below is designed to give the sector the latest information about the teams and what support is available to Early Years providers in Surrey.

The Early Years Educational Effectiveness Team, Early Years Special Educational Needs and Disability Team and The Early Years Commissioning Team support all registered Early Years providers to develop high quality, inclusive sustainable early education and childcare places which meet local demand. They are also responsible for compliance with statutory requirements. The teams coordinate support to raise quality for all children in existing provision within the private, voluntary and independent sector and in maintained nursery classes and nursery schools.

In addition to the above teams, we also have the Funded Early Education Team who administrate the funding and make the payments. They support settings with their initial registration for funding and they provide advice and support for existing settings.

[Who is who in early years - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

Centrally retained funds also support the Early Years Phase Council with administration costs and provides opportunity for grant funding to support sufficiency and sustainability.

## **Early Intervention Funding (EIF)**

In Surrey we call our Inclusion funding Early Intervention Funding and we have operated a very successful process since April 2020. Up until 2023/24 the fund has only been available for 3 and 4 year olds and in the financial year 2023/24 we distributed over £4.8 million to support children with additional needs. This can include any barriers to learning including social, economic, environmental, early trauma or special educational needs and disabilities. We have also previously had a very modest budget to support disadvantaged funded 2 year olds of £215,000 from centrally retained funds. In 2023/24 we have had a dedicated EIF for 2-year-olds and have distributed over £260,000 We were able to top-up this funding if needed from any unspent Disability Access Funding. For the first time we will be able to provide EIF for eligible children under the age of 2 years. We do not anticipate a high demand but would expect that those who so apply might have a higher level of need.

As this is a period of significant change we will monitor demand and impact over this first few years of operation and will carry out end of year reviews to inform future funding proposals.

### **Maintained nursery school supplementary funding**

This is a separate funding stream within DSG, which provides additional support for maintained nursery schools, recognising that they incur higher costs than other providers through, for example, needing their own premises and a headteacher. It is proposed to maintain the same principles of allocation as in previous years:

- Distribute all of it to maintained nursery schools
- Use first to fund business rates at actual cost (excluding cost of community focused space)

\*use part to fund teacher pay and pension costs, on the same basis as in 2024/25 (£0.63/hr)

- Continue split site funding for Guildford nursery, on the existing basis
- Divide the remainder equally between the four maintained nursery schools.

### **Disability access fund (DAF)**

These funding rates are set directly by DfE and may not be varied by the LA. Any unspent DAF can be allocated through EIF to pupils meeting DAF criteria

### **Free School Meals Funding**

Free school meals funding for eligible children in maintained nursery schools/classes will continue and can be utilised when a child accesses funded entitlement at a maintained nursery before and after the lunch period. We propose to continue with this approach. We propose to maintain the link between the rate per meal and the funding rate per free school meal used in the schools national funding formula, unless there are significant changes to the basis of the schools NFF in 2025/26.