

Papers for meeting of Surrey Schools Forum 8 July 2021

Item 5
Surrey Schools Forum
8 July 2021
For information and discussion

Report of the meeting of the high needs block working group 30 June 2021

The group discussed a range of topics related to the core terms of reference. The group took stock of progress across the year and considered area for focus in the year to come. An update was also held on the second meeting with the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) relating to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Deficit Recovery Plan. The Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Review by the Department for Education (DfE) is continuing and if the current timeline is adhered to then proposals will be shared ahead of the summer recess.

Discussions with ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency)

Local authority (LA) officers recently met with representatives from the ESFA concerning the DSG Recovery Management Plan and high needs pressures facing Surrey.

The discussion was about the costs and funding assumed in the recovery plan. There was some review of the strategies implemented in Surrey. The ESFA were also interested in the relationship between Schools Forum and the authority. Officers highlighted the High Needs Block Working Group and the Chair's inclusion on the SEND Board and Partnership.

Despite requests from LA officers to provide learning and best practice from other authorities, the ESFA indicated they could not do so in the meeting. There was an indication future events may be facilitated through an external consultancy firm, Mott MacDonald, which the LA will look to engage with.

Surrey's High Needs deficit at the end of 2019/20 was 23rd on the list of deficits as a proportion of DSG used to determine the five authorities invited to discuss safety valve funding. The ESFA implied that a similar level of funding and therefore number would be invited this year once outturns were audited.

There was no reassurance that either funding or the SEND review will improve the financial situation in Surrey.

Mainstream SEND review

Eamonn Gilbert will meet Phase Council Chairs on 12 July, to discuss membership of this working group (including how large it would be), terms of reference and a

timeline. He will also be taking views from the Anchor Group of Multi Academy Trust (MAT) Chief Executive Officers and the High Needs Block Working Group to ensure all key stakeholders are represented. The group would start to meet in September. It was important that a broad range of schools was represented, although this could make the size of the group challenging. It was suggested that MATs might be asked to nominate members to the group as MATs contained a range of schools with differing characteristics. The inclusion round table could also be a source of representatives.

If funding was to be managed locally by headteachers then governance arrangements would be crucial in order to ensure accountability and consistency. A quadrant would probably be too large. Past experience had shown that local funding arrangements had worked best when only a small number of schools was involved in each, so that they could hold one another accountable.

Currently the system pushed schools to use 1:1 support. One LA was quoted which had maintained very low levels of Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs) because a local model had been embedded well before the 2014 legislation changes that did not rely on statutory plans to receive support.

Input from health was seen as important,

The group discussed how the mainstream review could be informed by experience from the special schools review. Co-production had been vital, as had representation from a cross section of schools. It would be important for the group to explore the issues fully and to ask challenging questions. Ideally, the group would identify all potential problems so that they could be addressed prior to wider consultation. There are also clear links between the special school banding and that for mainstream funding, particularly around the descriptors of need and an acknowledgement that a child with similar needs could either be educated in a mainstream school, a centre or unit or in a special school so the banding and funding should be equivalent. The review should explore this aspect.

Key stage transfer: wholly maintained approach to high needs placements

Only 55 pre 16 placements for Sept 2021 remained to be finalised out of 1286 required, only 22 of these related to children with plans on 15 February and subject to the statutory deadline. This is significantly fewer than the number unresolved a year ago. Each child now has a proposed destination and the LA is actively consulting with schools. Most of the unresolved places were for reception and in some cases a 30 hour package in an early years setting, with additional support, might be agreed for the next term. Such placements had proved very positive for some parents and children last year, allowing continuation of familiar arrangements.

25 out of 27 capital schemes had been achieved on time and on budget. There are delays in two schemes, the new school in the west of the county for ASD where we were unable to secure secondary provision, and one of the new free schools where work is underway to ensure the scheme can proceed and alternative arrangements are being explored for September 2022.

Additionally, a small number of pupils had been brought back to Surrey from external placements, this was only possible where capacity existed which was not needed for key stage transfers.

The aim was that new placements in non maintained and independent (NMI) schools should only be made where they provided residential placements where these were essential (usually social care driven) or otherwise provided for unique needs which Surrey schools could not meet.

Proposals had been invited for additional ASD places for September 2022; there was funding for a new special school plus expansions of existing schools including new mainstream centres. Officers would contact secondary heads expressing an interest in such provision.

Special schools banding review

To be discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

Inclusion round table

It was again noted that the round table work centred on discussions among school leaders over a change of culture.

Data had been shared with the round table on the differing incidence of SEND in different schools. This would be developed to show SEND, deprivation, and persistent absence levels, but it was important to use it in a way which stimulated discussion without identifying individual schools. The workstream would aim to develop it at quadrant level.

Some schools saw their need profile as unusual. It was difficult for them to know whether this was really so or to identify and link with similar schools (eg to share experience and good practice).

The training and support workstream was drafting a coherent training offer- a large task.

A “roadshow” was proposed early next term to share good practice.

Surrey schools needed the opportunity to celebrate and promote what they are good at. It was suggested that individual schools should be encouraged to share good practice on inclusion.

Team around the School Pilot Project Update June 2021

The proposed pilot would involve 17 Spelthorne primary schools, the primary pupil referral unit, 2 Spelthorne secondary schools, and 2 special schools are interested. A very positive co-production workshop with schools and services was held on 8th June:

- Offers to the pilot schools set out the aims of co-ordinating I-thrive, the new neurodevelopmental pathways, the Building resilience offer from the Voluntary sector partners in the new Alliance, the Early Help offer and the mental health teams in schools work (MHST).
- Principles of working together were considered based on the Time for Kids approach and what we need from each other to make this work successful

Key themes emerged to start to build the evaluation for the pilot around;

- good communication between teams and effective feedback to schools following interventions is essential
- the need for consistency of language across teams
- Time for meetings will be a logistical challenge for everyone.
- Families tell us they want to access earlier support as well as the need to build resilience and independence- more doing than signposting.
- Key to the success will be to understand what this more co-ordinated approach will look like for families and the child's point of view.

Next steps

- Lists of named professionals from services for each school to be provided
- Schools to identify the lead for the Team around the School
- Further workshop for schools and service managers to develop evaluation criteria and systemic issues on July 13th
- School to begin to convene meetings for children of concern.

Alternative provision (AP)

The proposed investment in redeveloping and relocation of the AP estate had been approved. Jane Winterbone Assistant Director Education was leading on a 5 point AP plan. This would continue into the next year. In house capacity was being expanded to provide access to education rather than usage of external independent tutoring services.

Working group priorities for next two years

The group discussed and agreed priority areas that build upon the work undertaken this year and the solid foundation that this provides. It was also agreed that some of this work would need a two year period to deliver and embed. The areas proposed to take forward through the High Needs Working Group are:

- 1) Wholly maintained approach to specialist placements - continue work on providing sufficient specialist places
- 2) Complete special school banding and mainstream SEND funding review
- 3) Embed alternative provision strategy
- 4) Innovation in inclusion – consideration of bold pilots for example:
Moving away from the use of EHCPs and redirecting the equivalent resources to directly meet needs at Special educational needs Support. Planning for cohorts of children rather than individual children to support schools and

settings to put power into the hands of education professionals about the best ways to meet needs, change the way we write EHCPs, and concentrate on practice focussing on meeting need rather than diagnosing need

- 5) Focus on early years (this is important because 25% of EHCPs originated in early years including the early years foundation stage)

Forum are asked to consider the proposed areas for focus over the next two years and shape the proposals for agreement in September 2021.

“De-delegation” proposals for 2022/23

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 2022/23, for those services which were de-delegated in 2021/22.

Scope

In 2021/22 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)
- CAPITA SIMS licences
- Teacher and trade union facility time
- Other special staff costs (eg suspensions)
- Free school meals eligibility checking
- Primary school specific contingency
- Intervention fund (primary schools only)
- Race Equality Minority Achievement (REMA) travellers service (primary schools only).

Continued de-delegation of funding for all of these services is proposed for 2022/23. Further details of the proposals for behaviour support and REMA travellers services are shown in Annex 1, and of the current use of the intervention fund in Annex 2.

The other services proposed for de-delegation can be summarised as follows:

- CAPITA SIMS licences (schools administration software)
The council purchases a collective licence for maintained schools, allowing cost and administrative savings (nursery and special schools and pupil referral units are charged)
- 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.

- Primary school specific contingency.

This benefits only a few schools in any year, but it allows a means of providing additional funding in wholly exceptional circumstances to primary schools. Should de-delegation not be agreed, all maintained primary schools would have to bear all exceptional risks themselves.

Proposed de-delegation rates for 2022/23

Proposed de-delegation rates for 2022/23 are set out in Annex 3. They are the same rates as in 2021/22, subject to the following changes:

- Behaviour support: as in previous years, the rate per deprived pupil would be updated in December, so that the average deprivation funding per pupil remained the same;
- CAPITA SIMS licences-increase in line with the estimated cost of the external licences (as this is the cost of an external service).

Rates for free school meals eligibility checking, primary schools contingency travellers support and intervention fund would remain unchanged.

The total funding held for each service in 2022/23 would be likely to be less than in 2021/22 due to further academy conversions.

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

Action requested of the Forum

Does the Forum wish to suggest any additional information which would help schools to decide whether to support the de-delegation of these services?

Annex 1 Specialist teachers for inclusive practice and REMA travellers services

As requested by Schools Forum, the local authority has developed proposals for traded Specialist Teachers for Inclusive Practice (STIP) and Race Equality and Minority Achievement (REMA) Gypsy Roma Traveller services. These services, for primary maintained schools, are currently funded by de-delegated DSG.

The service has developed a subscription model, whereby schools could opt in to receiving the service and pay an agreed annual charge rather than de-delegating the funding from DSG. However, the authority remains very concerned that the future of these important services could be at risk if it is funded by a subscription model rather than by de-delegation, so will include in the funding consultation a request for de-delegation as in previous years but also provide an illustration of the alternative subscription model.

Financial Background

De-delegation funds over a quarter (29%) of the STIP budget and nearly all (93%) of the REMA Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) budget. De-delegation can be seen as an appropriate funding model when there is a need for a service with capacity to respond to demand which can be unpredictable, urgent and has a high impact on staff and pupils. Pupil behaviour often leads to this kind of urgent demand. The highly mobile nature of Surrey's GRT population also leads to urgent and often unpredicted demand with many pupils arriving in-year.

If de-delegation were withdrawn or significantly reduced, the Council could decide there is insufficient funding from a traded model to continue with services at their current level. This would create a risk to schools of no suitable alternative provider with sufficient scale, capacity and local Surrey knowledge. There would certainly be no alternative provider with links to the Surrey GRT community as these trusted relationships have been developed over years of working with the community. Even if the Council were to continue with the services at their current level, a fully traded model would not provide the capacity for the kind of urgent response described above and would create a particular risk for smaller schools, which might be exposed (to high risk) under a traded model.

Potential Subscription Model

Schools would opt into receiving the STIPS and REMA service at an agreed annual rate, based on the number of pupils on roll. An example of the likely rates are:

School roll numbers for REMA (GRT) annual contribution	Rate per school £
Fewer than 100 pupils	1,584
100 to 249 pupils	3,168
250 to 500 pupils	4,752
Over 500 pupils	6,335

School roll numbers for STIPS annual contribution	Rate per school £
Fewer than 100 pupils	771
100 to 249 pupils	1,542
250 to 500 pupils	2,312
Over 500 pupils	3,083

The following provides an update on both services.

Specialist Teachers for Inclusive Practice

The STIP service currently receives £719,100 from de-delegated funding. This accounts for 28.5% of total budget. The rest is made up from high needs block funding (for learning and language support) and traded income. De-delegation funds the STIP offer to maintained primary schools of evidence-based early intervention, 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.

The STIP service offer is a Surrey wide offer although the delivery model is local and quadrant- based and can be accessed easily via a named member of the STIP team for each school who links directly with the special educational needs co-ordinator (SENCO) and Head teacher. 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 and Surrey's profile of need. It offers direct support in the classroom, as well as advice and guidance on how to implement targeted strategies or more specialist approaches.

A range of support is provided including:

- Support to school staff and families to identify and meet SEN early, in line with the graduated response
- Clinics to staff- which is targeted continuing professional development (CPD) around supporting inclusion and 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 (C&L, C&I, SEMH)
- Support to schools to engage with and support parents of children who have identified SEN
- Support to schools around transition, specifically from early years to Reception and Year 6 to Year 7
- Support to schools to prevent exclusions
- Advice to primary headteachers around exclusions process
- Subsidised centralised training on a range of special educational need and inclusive practice
- Restorative Practice training and guidance
- Anti- Bullying Charter mark accreditation
- Healthy Schools promotion

- Positive Touch, Behaviour Risk Management, De-escalation and Management of Actual and Potential Aggression (MAPA) training
- Literacy for All project
- Modelling tailored interventions for children at Specialist School Support level
- Therapeutic Story Writing/ Story Links training and delivery
- ELKLAN training
- Nuffield Early Language Intervention (NELI) training

The Specialist Teachers for Inclusive Practice currently have 607 vulnerable pupils open to their service with needs categorised at the specialist school support level and above. In addition, the service has supported schools to meet the needs of over 1900 vulnerable pupils at the universal or school support level through training activities, observation and consultations with school staff and parents.

595 cases have been closed over the past academic year. (A case is closed when progress has been made, the pupil has left the school or moved out of area or when a case is transferred to another agency).

Of the 595 closed cases the impact is as follows:

- 57% have made sufficient or significant progress
- 9% have left
- 31% have been transferred to other agencies or services

The service has supported over 400 schools, using virtual software, during the COVID 19 pandemic. Feedback from the training is overwhelmingly positive with average scores of 5 (on a scale of 1-5 – low to high) for presentation and impact on future practice.

If de-delegation were withdrawn or significantly reduced, the Council could decide there is insufficient business for a traded model to continue with services at their current level. This would create a risk to schools of no suitable alternative provider with sufficient scale, capacity and local Surrey knowledge. Even if the Council were to continue with the services at their current level, a fully traded model would not provide the capacity for the kind of urgent response described above and would create a particular risk for smaller schools, which might be exposed (to high risk) under a traded model.

Risks identified by the service include:

- Increase in EHCP
- Increase in Educational Psychology/Speech and Language Therapy referrals
- Increased placement breakdown for SEND pupils
- Reduction in CPD opportunities for school staff
- Reduced access to prompt & reactive support for school managers
- Reduction in inclusive practice in schools due to the frequency & ongoing nature of our support where we can informally assess the systemic approaches to inclusion. We support the LA 'Schools Causing concern' processes, so there would be a lack of feedback to the LA of practice in schools

- Support, proactive involvement in complex cases
- Countywide projects reduced- eg Literacy for All, Resilience,
- Recommended intervention, resources & assessment for schools would be lost
- Rise in parental complaint. We frequently mediate between parents & schools
- Education view in multiagency meetings would be missing
- Signposting schools, other LA services to relevant services
- Learner Single Point of Access support/role. We now sit as part of the multidisciplinary team panel processes
- Impact on exclusion rates- currently we support and advise on primary aged pupils who are at risk of exclusion. We support 'complex' cases where there is a risk of placement breakdown. Without our support of practical strategies to reduce risk of exclusion there would be an increased risk of both permanent exclusions and placement breakdowns. We gatekeep appropriate & equitable access to primary pupil referral units
- Support to SAFE/CAMHS/Social care for training and case management
- Support LA complaints from a range of LA services eg school relations, SEND, Be Heard to provide practical recommendations

One of the biggest benefits to de-delegation is the ability schools have to a prompt, responsive service who deliver a proactive, practice-based support. We can work with all members of the school community. We are specialised teachers who have the unique understanding of what it is like to include children with additional needs. We have a more flexible capacity to respond to needs which ultimately supports the government inclusion agenda.

Race Equality and Minority Achievement (REMA) Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) Service

In 2020-21 de-delegation accounted for 98% of REMA's GRT budget, 2% being made up of traded income with academies and maintained secondaries. REMA received a total of £349,000 from maintained primaries.

This style of funding ensures that a core GRT offer, delivered by a team of Specialist Teachers and Traveller Education Support Workers, is available to all maintained primary schools. In addition to direct pupil involvement, staff teams are supported to build capacity for meeting the needs and challenges of their GRT cohort through consultation and training. A highly mobile GRT population results in an unpredictable pattern of need, and a changing landscape of schools requiring urgent support.

De-delegated funding ensures a strong service offer can be maintained. REMA can plan and ensure capacity for GRT. All maintained primaries are able to receive remote and pre-recorded training, mail outs, consultations and surgery sessions and the help of a Traveller Education Support Worker. Despite Lockdown, 89 (an increase of 8 from

the previous academic year) schools accessed REMA support, about 50% of all maintained primaries. The team has reacted to need, but is encouraging schools to have a pro-active approach, requesting advice and training before a Traveller pupil joins them, to ensure a positive transition.

The pandemic has highlighted the vulnerability of GRT pupils. There is increased awareness of the need to support children whose parents may travel for work, may have lower literacy levels and who belong to a large group of people who do not feel a part of the general community.

The impact of Covid 19 has increased the achievement gap between GRT children and other groups, the result of a lack of school attendance and home learning despite support facilitated by REMA.

REMA's work with schools, other services and families, provides a link, reaching and supporting parents when schools cannot. This enables the Council and its partners to meet their obligation to this vulnerable group. REMA's work with schools enables a targeted response to support those children new to the system as well as providing an instant response to exceptional circumstances. Feedback for all GRT training is good or very good. Schools strongly agree that support from Traveller Education Support Workers makes a difference to a child's relationship with their school. It is estimated that there are around 10- 12,000 Gypsy, Roma and Traveller residents in Surrey which would mean that Surrey has the fourth largest GRT population of any local authority. 1,105 children and young people in Surrey schools ascribe as GRT (a significant number do not ascribe).

Core offer work includes responding to requests for support, in year admissions, surgery sessions, recorded training, remote training, Building GRT Partnerships group and Traveller Education Support Worker time.

REMA also provides other support, which underpins the core offer. This year, this included; school applications including in year, across all phases, school transport applications, liaison with internal and external partners to improve school engagement, behaviour and achieve good pupil outcomes e.g. Admissions, Inclusion, Health, Elective Home Education, SEND, Social Care, other LAs and out of county teams, supported access to Early Years education and contribution to GRT strategy group and other similar activities e.g. Surrey Healthy Schools.

In 2019-2020 there were 250 visits to Early Years settings, funded by Surrey Early Years. This is now a traded service and settings are finding it more difficult to access REMA support, meaning fewer visits in 2020-2021.

Other counties have found that where a continual service is offered, relationships with GRT families are good. If funding is guaranteed, schools benefit from a known system of support. If schools need to buy support, the service struggles to make an impact, and take up is low, reflected in GRT attendance and achievement.

In Surrey Gypsy Roma Traveller pupils make up	
0.7%	of the school population
16%	of electively home educated pupils (April 21)
4%	of fixed term exclusions (18-19)
3%	of permanent exclusions (18-19)
6.5%	of Children missing education and educated other than at school (April 21)

2019 KS2 Reading	National	Gypsy Roma	Irish Traveller
% Achieving expected level	73	28	39

Persistent absence is high within the GRT community and averages 56%. They are overrepresented in the SEND cohort and high numbers have an EHCP.

THE COVID EFFECT

	PRE-COVID	POST -COVID
GRT pupils electively home educated	183 (December 2019)	243 (April 2021)
GRT absence	14.75% (Autumn 2019)	21.53% (Autumn 2020)

Annex 2 Maintained primary schools intervention fund- funding de-delegated from maintained primary schools (update June 2021)

Historically funds have been de-delegated from maintained primary schools in order to provide additional school improvement services and interim leadership costs to schools that face standards and performance issues and where the delegated budget is insufficient to bear the costs. This funding is only targeted and used to support Maintained Primary Schools.

This funding is managed and overseen by Schools Alliance for Excellence (SAFE- Surrey's schools-led education partnership) on behalf of Surrey Maintained Primary schools.

In 2020/21 this funding was allocated by SAfE to:

- provide additional school improvement and leadership to schools designated as 'Support and Challenge'
- cover interim leadership costs where the school's budget cannot support this;

In addition, in 2021/22, given the impact of the pandemic, particularly on aspects of provision such as curriculum development, resumption of Ofsted inspections, the budget challenges facing a large number of maintained schools (particularly smaller ones) we propose to also use the funding to:

- provide additional targeted support to other maintained schools where a need is identified, and the school's budget cannot support this
- fund targeted projects.

The following table summarises the spend and budget for 2020/21 and 2021/22

Year	Budget £	Support and Challenge Support £	Interim Leader- ship £	Targeted Support £	Targeted Projects £	Underspend £
2020/21	431 873	182 730	117 663			131 840
2021/22	417 994	225 000	120 000	47 994	25 000	0

Support & Challenge

A large proportion of the fund is allocated by SAfE to provide additional school improvement and leadership to Support and Challenge (S&C) Schools. In the financial year 2020/21 the fund supported 43 maintained primary schools. This included nine S&C schools that have now improved to a position where they have been removed from the S&C list. Currently there are 39 primary schools being supported.

Each S&C school has an allocated S&C partner (either an National Leader of Education or other headteacher with school improvement experience) who works with the school leadership to devise and cost a support programme. Depending on the school's budget some or all of the support plan may be funded through the intervention. Progress against the action plan is monitored termly through S&C meetings chaired by a SAfE advisor. Schools are not allocated the money – the support provider invoices SAfE directly for the funding.

Progress of Schools identified as Support and Challenge (S&C) from April 20 to March 21

	Total	Schools removed from S&C	S&C currently making good progress against action plan	S&C currently making progress against action plan	S&C currently making little progress against action plan
Primary Support and Challenge 20/21	43	9	18	13	3

As this table shows, the majority of schools are making progress towards meeting the objectives set out in their action plan. The outcome in three of these schools has resulted in the brokering of interim leadership from Surrey Multi-Academy Trusts to ensure rapid improvement.

Due to the pandemic between April 20 and April 21 SAfE consultants and associate School-Based consultants were not able to visit schools on site. However, all S&C schools were closely monitored and supported remotely over the course of the year. On-site visits have now resumed. We are just completing a programme of visits to 65 maintained primary schools to audit their Key Skills Needs Assessments – this includes all outstanding infant schools. The outcomes from these visits suggest that the number of S&C schools is likely to be greater from September. We have therefore budgeted £225,000 from the 21/22 budget for Support and Challenge Schools.

Interim Leadership

In 2020/21 the Intervention fund supported interim leadership in four schools. In each case the school's budget would not support the costs of interim leadership. Each case is considered on its merits and a decision is taken in partnership with the LA after consultation with finance. In all cases half-termly reviews are conducted to ensure value for money. In all cases this funding has enabled the school to stabilise.

Additional Targeted Support

The current programme of Key Skills Needs Assessment visits suggests that as we now come out of the pandemic a number of good or outstanding maintained schools need some additional targeted external support to either maintain or improve provision. These schools are not classified as S&C schools. Where a school's budget precludes the school from affording this it may be fully or partially funded from the intervention fund. For example, currently a number of schools are

accessing subsidised leadership coaching or access to curriculum support programme.

Funded Targeted Projects

From September 2021, in response to thematic issues arising from Teaching and Learning Reviews and quality assurance visits, SAfE plans to provide a number of targeted projects to support maintained primary schools in light of a number of the current challenges facing them in the new academic year. In particular, we will be providing support for small infant schools focused on curriculum development and strategic planning and Assessment and Moderation training in light of the absence of statutory data. SAfE is also providing targeted training for groups of schools as well as individual schools on the resumption of Ofsted inspections under the 2019 Framework.

Details of all schools that are in receipt of this fund are shared with Primary Phase chair through the regular SAfE Primary Risk Assessment meetings and an approval process is in place.

Funding 2021/22

Given the specific challenges facing maintained primary schools at the moment, in particular in light of the challenges of changing pupil demographics that are particularly hitting small schools, budget pressures, changes to the Ofsted framework, the removal of the exemption from inspection of outstanding schools and continuing impact of the implications of COVID the continuation of this funding will enable SAfE to continue to provide part or all of funding for interventions in the most vulnerable schools.

Detailed proposals of targeted projects, additional support and S&C support will be shared with a subgroup of maintained primary phase council members in January 2022.

Removal or reduction in this funding will increase the likelihood for many maintained primary schools being unable to improve or maintain current provision.

Annex 3 Current and proposed de-delegation rates (provisional)

Service	2021/22 Primary	2021/22 Secondary	2022/23 provisional Primary	2022/23 provisional Secondary
Behaviour support services	£6.92 per pupil + £45.10 per Ever 6 FSM pupil + £16.44 per pupil on IDACI band F+ £19.88 per pupil on IDACI band E+ £31.34 per pupil on IDACI band D+ £34.02 per pupil on IDACI band C+ £36.31 per pupil on IDACI band B+ £47.40 per pupil on IDACI band A (IDACI=Income deprivation affecting children index)	n/a	(£6.92 per pupil plus deprivation bands based on the same average deprivation funding per pupil)	n/a
Licences and subscriptions	£4.09 per pupil	£5.49 per pupil (Key stage 3+4)	£4.09 per pupil+ inflation	£5.49 per pupil (Key stage 3+4) + inflation
Special staff costs-union facility time	£1.47 per pupil	£1.99 per pupil in Key stage 3-4	£1.47 per pupil	£1.99 per pupil Key stage 3-4
Special staff costs (other eg suspensions)	£0.59 per pupil	£0.80 per pupil in key stage 3-4	£0.59 per pupil	£0.80 per pupil in key stage 3-4
Free school meals eligibility checking	£275 per school	£435 per school	£275 per school	£435 per school
Primary school specific contingency	£3.23 per pupil	n/a	£3.23 per pupil	n/a

Additional school improvement -devolved funding/ direct school improvement support	£8.75 per pupil	n/a	£8.75 per pupil	n/a
Travellers education	£9.09 per pupil	N/a	£9.09 per pupil	n/a

Other Mainstream funding consultation proposals for 2022/23

Summary

The Forum is invited to discuss proposals for mainstream schools' funding changes, for inclusion in the autumn 2021 schools funding paper. These include the balance between minimum funding guarantee, ceiling etc, and use of the surplus school specific contingency.

Background

Any proposed changes to mainstream schools funding for 2022/23 must be subject to consultation with all schools and with the Schools Forum (in the autumn of 2021) and then approved by Cabinet, in November/December 2021.

This paper summarises the proposals on which the LA plans to consult schools for 2022/23. The outcome of the consultation will be reported to the Forum at the next meeting.

The Forum is asked

- Whether the proposals and questions require clarification
- Whether it would wish any other proposals/questions to be included
- Whether it wishes to make any other comments on the proposal or process.

However, the final decision on the content of the consultation paper is one for the LA.

DFE changes

Often, funding changes are driven by changes by the DfE to the funding framework. Should any additional changes be announced between now and September, which require local choices to be made, officers are happy to consult Forum members informally over the summer (although this may be subject to tight turnaround times in order that the consultation can be published early in September).

2022/23 is the third year of the three years of funding increases announced in autumn 2019, although at the date of writing the DfE has not announced how the growth funding will be allocated in 2022/23, and in particular how it will be divided between schools and high needs blocks. However, some increase in mainstream funding rates can be expected.

Levels of unit of resource, minimum funding guarantee and ceiling

In 2021/22, Surrey schools are funded on the NFF except that

- Funding rates are generally 0.2% above NFF rates (which we could afford due to a reduction in low prior attainment incidence). Basic entitlement rates are 0.5% above NFF (not 0.7%), to support a higher lump sum (see below)
- Lump sum was increased by 3% (the NFF formula factor increase rate), whereas it would have had to be reduced to match NFF. The increase was in order to protect small schools. Surrey's primary lump sum is currently 2.2% above the NFF and Surrey's secondary lump sum is 7.4% above the NFF. Primary and secondary basic entitlements are correspondingly lower. This means that the cost of the higher lump sum for each sector is contained within that sector.

There was no ceiling on schools with large per pupil funding gains in 2021/22, so all schools now receive at least full formula funding.

The overall funding distributed to schools depends on whether or not a transfer is made from schools budget to the high needs block. This issue has still to be considered. Therefore two sets of proposals are presented for consideration, depending on whether or not there is a transfer of funding to the high needs block.

As the government still intends to move to a "hard" NFF (ie no local choice) there is still little point in moving local factors away from the NFF (except as required for a transfer to high needs block).

Proposals if there is no transfer from schools to high needs block

- To set the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) at the highest level permissible (which maximises protection for those schools which remain on MFG, some of which have been on MFG for years), recognising that they will still need to meet the cost of teacher pay increases etc;
- To deliver the minimum per pupil (funding) level (MPPL) in full
- To increase all formula factors (including lump sum) by the same percentage as that by which the DfE increase the NFF factor values (or a higher percentage), less 0.2% for the extra increase provided by Surrey in 2021/22
- To distribute any funds not required for the above purpose by further increasing all NFF factors by a standard percentage (in effect this is an advance on the following year growth, if any)
- Should the above be unaffordable, to implement a lower percentage increase in all formula factors.

Proposals if there is a transfer of 0.5% of schools block to high needs block

To set minimum funding guarantee roughly 0.5% below the minimum and to increase funding rates by roughly 1% below the DfE increases (probably by the same % as the MFG) Note that a 0.5% transfer means those schools which pay for it lose more than 0.5% (relative to no such transfer) because so many schools are on MPPL and those schools lose nothing: 132/358 mainstream schools (36.9%) are on MPPL in 2021/22 but they amount to 41% of the budget-thus a 0.5% transfer to HNB means nearly a 1% loss of funding to those schools which are affected.

Proposals applying whether or not there is a transfer of funding to the high needs block

- To implement any changes in sparsity funding arising from the DfE consultation earlier in the year. Basically, if the DfE implements its proposals, these would mean a small increase in sparsity funding rates and in the number of Surrey schools receiving sparsity funding
- To use a ceiling on per pupil gains only if necessary to deliver the above proposals when new data is available (eg if the cost of additional needs data increases hugely between October 2020 and October 2021)
- To retain the funding factor for looked after children (which is not part of the NFF) at 2021/22 value.

As a reminder, the DfE will fund Surrey for 2022/23 based on October 2021 pupil numbers and October 2020 pupil characteristics. But Surrey must fund schools based on October 2021 pupil numbers and October 2021 pupil characteristics- and the difference between the two could allow Surrey to fund above NFF rates (as in 2020/21 and 2021/22) or create an affordability gap. The actual gap, if any, will not be known until December, when the DfE publishes the 2022/23 funding data.

The level of the notional SEN budget

The level 1 and level 2 notional SEN budgets are sums earmarked for SEN from the mainstream NFF formula budgets. The basis of definition of the notional SEN budget (and its overall level) are local matters. The higher the notional SEN budgets, the more schools are expected to spend on SEN from their own budgets.

It is proposed that in 2022/23, the value of notional SEN funding factors is increased by the same percentage as the increase in the relevant mainstream formula factor values (eg if deprivation and low prior attainment rates in the formula increase by 4%, level 2 notional SEN funding would also increase by 4%). This would mean that schools would be expected to spend roughly the same proportion of their budget on SEN if their pupil characteristics didn't change, and thus that SEN pupils received a share of the benefit of increases in NFF rates.

Maintained Primary schools contingency

In recent years there has been a surplus on de-delegated primary schools contingency and this has been redistributed back to maintained primary schools in the following year as a per pupil rate for the schools which contributed at the time the surplus arose. Maintained primary schools are asked whether they support continuation of such a redistribution if there is any such surplus available.

For 2021/22 we carried forward the equivalent of one year's contingency surplus (ie the sum available for spending in 2021/22 is equal to twice the sum de-delegated in 2021/22) and distributed the remainder. We propose a similar process in 2022/23, which would mean a surplus of up to £150,000 to distribute.

Delegated former combined services funding (confederations and additional school improvement)

In 2021/22 mainstream schools' delegated budgets included a sum funded from the former combined services Dedicated Schools Grant allocations for confederations (primary schools only) and school improvement. These amounts are included in the basic entitlement and deprivation factors and are outside the NFF.

In 2021/22, the sum allocated by DfE for combined services was reduced by 20% and this was reflected in average reductions of £6.40 per primary pupil and £2.21 per secondary pupil in the delegated sums. Should DfE make a further reduction in 2022/23, we propose to pass the reduction on to schools in the same way. There would be no impact on schools on the minimum per pupil funding level or on the minimum funding guarantee. To do otherwise would simply mean a reduction in NFF factors.

Growing schools funding

We are not currently proposing any changes to the methods used for funding growing schools for 2022/23, including the basis of vacancy funding in primary schools.

Action requested of the Forum

The Forum is asked to consider the proposals described in the paper and in particular

- How they could be made clearer to schools as a whole
- Whether they would wish to see any other proposals included?

Early years funding proposals for 2022/23

Summary

As part of the annual school and early years funding consultation in the autumn, the LA will seek providers' views on early years funding for 2022/23. This paper suggests general principles for early years funding for 2022/23. The Forum is invited to consider the LA's outline proposals, and to suggest any other proposals which it would wish to see developed for possible wider consultation. The LA proposes to follow the same general principles in 2022/23 as in 2021/22. The paper also considers a small number of proposed changes for 2021/22.

Background and general principles.

Funding for the funded entitlement to education and childcare is provided within the early years block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

DfE funds Surrey for the funded entitlement for three and four year olds at an hourly rate and funds disadvantaged two year olds at a separate, and higher, hourly rate.

In 2021/22 DfE increased hourly rates to Surrey by 6p/hour for 3-4 year olds and 8p/hr for 2 year olds and Surrey increased the basic hourly rates for providers by the same amount. We do not yet know what increase, if any, DfE will provide in 2022/23.

Funding for two year olds (2021/22 estimated budget £4.8m)

Funding to providers for disadvantaged two year olds is provided at a single hourly rate. Surrey has funded providers at the same rate as the DfE funding rate (£6.04 in 2021/22). There is no inclusion supplement for 2 year olds because provision is already limited to disadvantaged pupils. In Surrey we elect to have a small Early Intervention Fund of £215,000 which is funded from the 5% of funding for three and four year olds which may be centrally retained (see below). We pass through 100% of the 2 year old funding in acknowledgement that they are more costly to providers. However, this budget is consistently overspent because the average termly take-up for which Surrey pays providers exceeds the January count on which the DfE funds Surrey. Therefore we propose to retain some of any DfE increase for 2022/23 to address this.

Funding for three and four year olds (2021/22 estimated budget £73.4m)

In recent years funding for 3-4 year olds has been underspent, largely because for this age group the average of termly take-up (on which Surrey funds providers) has been lower than the average of January take-up (on which DfE funds Surrey). The difference between the two count bases is a risk to the authority (for which a contingency is held) and the underspend arose because it took some time to establish the pattern of termly variation in demand following the introduction of the extended (30 hr) free entitlement for children of working parents in September 2017.

5% of estimated funding for three and four year olds may be used to fund centrally managed services to support the sector subject to the approval of the Schools Forum. It can also be used to support 2 year olds as mentioned above. The remaining 95% must be budgeted to be distributed to providers as funding for individual children (or lump sums for maintained nursery schools).

Following a review in 2019 £2m was moved from the contingency to increase the Early Intervention Fund (see below) in 2020/21 and this has been maintained in 2021/22. A further proposed reduction in contingency in 2021/22 was deferred due to uncertainty over the impact on 2021/22 funding of reduced take-up in Jan 2021 due to the second COVID-19 lockdown, and of a move by DfE to termly funding counts in 2021/22. The current estimated underspend in 2020/21 is around £0.8m, after adjusting for expected DSG adjustments. This compares to an underspend of £3.5m (adjusted) in 2019/20. Current projections are not forecasting any underspend for 2021/22 within the EIF budget.

We aim to remove any “structural underspend” (ie recurring underspend taking one year with another) from the Early Years budget, but COVID related changes in demand make forecasting for 2021/22 and 2022/23 particularly difficult. We are therefore proposing that

- If in January 2022 there appears to be a recurring underspend on three and four year old funding, it is used to increase the basic hourly rate for 2022/23 over and above any increase in DfE funding allocated to the basic rate, UNLESS at that stage there is evidence of unmet demand on the Early Intervention Fund (see below), if there is, any surplus would be allocated to EIF. We have seen a significant increase in applications for EIF in the summer term 2021 which is likely to be due to COVID-19 impact and we expect this to continue into the next academic year.
- Any additional funding allocation from DfE would be split between the hourly rate and EIF. By way of illustration £0.5m would mean an increase of around 4p on the basic rate. We believe that will maintain the level of funding for Surrey providers to a comparable level with our statistical neighbours.
- The hourly rate for deprivation supplement remains at £2.81 in 2022/23 (but we will need to consider whether demand for deprivation supplement is likely to increase, given the increase seen in eligibility for free meals in years R-11)
- Funding rate for free school meals provision to increase in line with likely charges (overall cost is very small).

Early intervention Fund (EIF)

This fund replaced Inclusion Funding and Discretionary Funding as of April 2020 for Early Years and fulfils the requirement for the LA to have an SEN Inclusion fund. EIF can only be awarded for Early Years Funded Entitlement hours including extended entitlement. Any setting, school or childminder who is registered to deliver Early Years Funded Entitlement can apply for funding to support children who are experiencing any barriers to learning and development including social, environmental, early trauma as well as SEND. This funding is awarded by the Early

Years Governance Panel which is made up of multi-disciplinary professionals with specialist knowledge of Early Years and early identification to enable appropriate interventions. Focus for interventions include closing the attainment gap for the most disadvantaged children, supporting emotional resilience, addressing childhood trauma and supporting transition into Reception as well as providing training and resources. There is built in monitoring and evaluation within the funding process and data collected is carefully and regularly monitored to ensure the funding is effective. We expect to see an increase in the number of children achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) at the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), especially in the groups identified as disadvantaged. (please note the recording of GLD for 2022 has been revised therefore comparison of data may be problematic). EIF also promotes maximum take-up for children at risk of not meeting their developmental targets by ensuring that appropriate support is available to providers.

Following the end of the first year of operation we have completed a comprehensive consultation with both providers and multi-disciplinary professionals who are involved in the decision making and allocation of funding through EIF. The response has been overwhelmingly positive (see headline summary below, full responses are in the Appendix).

- **Over 75% of providers and 85% of professionals prefer the new funding model**
- **81% prefer the new process**
- **91% feel the EIF meets the needs of children better than the previous process**
- **81% of providers and 97% of professionals felt the level of awards were appropriate all or most of the time**
- **92% of professionals felt the collaborative decision making was good or very good**
- **100% of professionals felt the process supports collaborative working**

In response to this feedback we would like to extend the types of intervention and for this reason we propose to at least maintain the level of funding for 2022/23 and consider increasing depending on the take-up and distribution in 2021/22.

We would propose that contingency is monitored each quarter and part of any likely underspend on the hourly rate funding is transferred into EIF to keep any full year underspend to a minimum. We would also propose to fund resource places in mainstream schools and maintained nursery schools through EIF in line with our commitment to a fully inclusive model where children can access their Early Years provision in their local mainstream provision.

Early Years Inclusion Planning Pathway (EYIPP)

We want Early Years children to be able to access their Early Education in their own community where their siblings, friends and neighbours go. As we move towards a

fully inclusive model we are aware that a transition process will need to take place within the sector. In order to enable the Early Years sector to be confident in their ability and expertise to support children with more complex needs we need to provide them with appropriate peer to peer support as well as training and resources. The funding for this will be provided through EIF. We also need to support parents in securing the early years provision that is suitable for their child. With such young children this can often be the first conversation they will have specifically about their child's future education and we do not want it to be about SEND; but about their hopes and aspirations for their child. For this reason we have designed the EYIPP meetings which provide an opportunity to meet with the parents of children with an identified need, to help them to look at local provision and explain the package of support that we can put in place. Meetings are set-up and led by the Early Years Inclusion Advisor who will invite other professionals as appropriate.

Centrally managed services

We propose to maintain funding at 5% of total funding for three and four year olds in order to support the Early Years sector to deliver excellent quality provision and to administer the distribution of Early Years Funded Entitlement and related supplements including EIF. This fund also includes EIF for eligible 2 year olds, a budget to support sufficiency and for additional Early Intervention programmes which are targeted at settings in areas of deprivation and where children are not reaching expected levels of development by the end of EYFS. The expectation and intention is that all cost associated with Early Years Funded Entitlement will be met within the Early Years DSG.

Maintained nursery school transitional grant (2021/22 £0.8m, included in 3-4 year old funding above)

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. DfE has not currently guaranteed it beyond March 2022.

Should this funding continue, 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)
- Continue split site funding for Guildford nursery
- Divide the remainder equally between the four maintained nursery schools.

Should the DfE no longer provide this funding, the Forum may be asked to consider use of part of the early years block to provide a contribution to transitional funding, rather than withdrawing the whole of this funding instantly. We would also want to work closely with the nursery schools and governors to achieve a sustainable model for the future.

Place funding for resource places in mainstream maintained nursery schools and mainstream primary schools and for nursery places in special schools

That all resource places will be funded at the current rate but will be offered at part time or full time according to eligibility – either 15 hours (£5,487) or 30 hours per week (£10,974). There is an intention to move to EIF funded places where the amount that would be allocated by EIF exceeds the amount above. We would propose to implement this from September 2021 subject to consultation with the schools affected. As resource places become funded by EIF we would no longer expect to fund vacant places. Please note there will be no reduction in funding for any filled place. As reliance on specialist places reduces as we develop more inclusive models we will review the number of nursery places in Special Schools annually.

Early years pupil premium and disability access fund

These funding rates are set directly by DfE and may not be varied by the LA.

Action requested of the Forum

To support the principles described above.

To consider any additional proposals which they would wish to be explored.

Appendix 1

Purposes for which centrally retained funds are used

The following teams work together to support Early Years provision across all sectors including maintained, private, voluntary, independent sectors to promote quality and improve outcomes for children in Surrey

Educational Effectiveness Team - Provides support and advice to settings in relation to quality of early education and childcare, Ofsted and statutory requirements, with a focus on settings at requires improvement or inadequate, as well as providing targeted support around work with vulnerable groups. This year there is an additional focus on transition as part of the COVID-19 recovery programme.

Graduated Response Early Years Team - Provides support and advice to settings in relation to support for children with SEND, with a particular focus on inclusion, quality and early identification of need. Support, advice and review of EIF funding awards. Managing the EYIPP meeting processes.

Early Years Commissioning - Meeting the Council's statutory duties to ensure a sufficiency of places for funded 2, 3 & 4 year olds across Surrey. Monitoring and delivering sufficiency; providing support, advice and to promote business sustainability; and individual commissioning of provision for the most disadvantaged families. Delivering census, compliance with DfE statutory guidance and requirements. Brokerage of places for vulnerable children and children identified as disadvantaged and those eligible for free early entitlement for two year olds (FEETs funding).

Early Intervention Fund – In response to COVID -19 we have invested in the Early Talk Boost programme to enable children to develop their speech and language skills and have adopted the Thrive approach to support emotional well-being – see programme description below.

Funded Early Education (FEE) Team - Managing the funded entitlement by advising providers, processing, administering and making payments, including support for the FEE portal. Delivering census.

In addition to funding teams as described above centrally retained funds are used for the following.

2 year old Inclusion Fund –enable eligible children with low and emerging SEN to access their funded entitlement.

Sufficiency Fund – Grant funding to create new provision and to support sustainability in areas of identified need.

Provider Portal and Parent Portal - Maintenance and development

Census – statutory requirement and method used by DfE to calculate budget

Communications and publicity – promotional activities to support FEET, 30 hours, Early Intervention Fund, early years pupil premium (EYPP), Deprivation and Disability Access Fund (DAF) uptake.

Early Years Phase Council Budget – To meet expenses as necessary.

Teams Funded and Partially Funded

Educational Effectiveness Team

Graduated Response Early Years Team

Early Help

SEND Advice Service

Children, Schools and Families Performance Improvement Team

Early Years Commissioning Team

Finance Team

Education Safeguarding

Appendix 2 Breakdown of Centrally Retained Funds

Breakdown of Centrally Retained Funds 20/21

Sufficiency Fund	£152,600
Early Intervention Programmes	£45,600
Inclusion 2 year olds	£215,100
Census	£10,000
Communications	£15,000
Portal Maintenance	£40,000
Phase Council Expenses	£5,000
Child costs outside of FEE/FEET criteria	£5,000
Corporate Allocations	£517,052
Staffing	<u>£2,553,911</u>
	£3,559,263

Funded from Early Intervention Centrally retained funds

Early Years Covid-19 response Summer/Autumn 2021

Context

Several external research projects and our own small-scale research survey have identified 2 areas of Early Years development which have been most negatively impacted by COVID-19 and the restrictions of access to nursery provision. [COVID19 briefing on early years providers October 2020](#)

These are:

- **Communication and Language**
- **Personal, Social and Emotional Well-being**

As an urgent and immediate response to this we have identified and designed two projects to mitigate this impact. These projects have been created by the Early Years Educational Effectiveness (EYEE) team in collaboration with Early Years Commissioning, Graduated Response Early Years Team (GREYT) , Early Years Speech and Language Therapy colleagues and Educational Psychology.

Basic aims and outcomes:

- To work with providers to create nurturing environments where children can feel safe, secure and able to learn and develop.
- To mitigate impact of the pandemic on children's Personal, Social and Emotional Well-being development (PSED).
- To mitigate impact of the pandemic on children's Communication and Language development.
- To improve outcomes for all children in Early Years but with specific focus in areas of need including deprivation, vulnerability, attainment gaps etc

- To equip practitioners with the knowledge, skills and confidence to improve quality and inclusion in settings to become models of best practice.
- To support the early identification of children at risk of delay in Communication/language and PSED and to provide suitable interventions through EIF.
- Reduce reliance on EHCP's to secure access to services, assessment and intervention.

Project Summary – Early Talk Boost

Early Talk Boost is a proven intervention package designed by I-Can. This programme supports settings to identify children at risk of language delay and to design and deliver specific interventions to address any barriers to learning at the earliest opportunity. This is proven to de-escalate the level of need and the amount of intervention needed for children to make positive progress.

There will be 12 members of the team trained as Early Talk Boost Tutors within the EYEE team and 4 from the GREYT. Initially practitioners from 45 targeted settings will be trained as communication champions by the teams. SCC will provide training, mentoring, and modelling to these settings across the Summer term 2021 with a view to widening the reach in the Autumn 2021 term and fully embedding within the sector moving forward. The initial 45 settings will become models of excellence which will subsequently provide peer support to other settings.

Early Talk Boost has well established methods of tracking progress and evaluation.

Early Years Speech and Language teams are going to provide some virtual workshops and training which will align with the project described.

As a member of the What Works Network, EIF has a pivotal role for the go to source for evidence and advice for effective intervention for children and young people.

[Early intervention foundation-Early Talk Boost](#)

Project Summary – Thrive Approach

The Thrive Approach is a whole setting model which is grounded in established neuroscience, attachment theory and child development. It is designed to support children's social and emotional well-being and to accelerate children's learning and development in these areas. As a result of implementing the Thrive Approach, children and young people are better placed to engage with their learning and with life. This approach is also aligned to the schools Thrive model as well to the Nurturing Schools project being rolled out by our EP Service.

Practitioners from 40 targeted settings across Surrey will receive full training to become Thrive licensed practitioners. The EYEE will have all 12 team members trained as licenced practitioners as will 4 members of the GREYT. This will provide advisors with the necessary skills to support the setting through their journey. There is potential for some of the team to then continue to become qualified Thrive trainers in the second year of the project. This will allow the project to grow with time and become fully embedded.

Membership of the Thrive Network will allow the settings access to a range of resources and tracking tools as well as support for their parents and home learning.

The Thrive Approach is already being used in 42 schools in Surrey and has a proven track record of evaluation and monitoring success.

Childminders will be able to access an on-line bespoke information and training package.

Criteria to identify targeted settings:

- Ofsted Good or Outstanding
- Area of deprivation (see attached) prioritise according to list (2 being highest priority as we have none in 1)- [Indices of Deprivation 2019 in Surrey - Surrey-i helpdesk | Tableau Public](#) (map)
- High numbers of EYPP/FEET
- Level of EIF support (PSED or Communication/language)
- Thrive – Range of settings – Daycare, Pre-school (no CMs)
- Early Talk Boost – aimed at 3- 5 year olds
- Consider Borough Foundation Stage Profile. Communication/language, PSED and also Literacy – see attached borough ELG data
- Previous commitment to working with SCC

[Impact of Thrive - The Thrive Approach](#)

[Thrive Connection toolkit for children up to age 7.pdf \(thriveftc.com\)](#)

[Thrive Parent and Carers Survival Kit 1.pdf \(thriveftc.com\)](#)

[Thrive Wellbeing toolkit for children up to age 7.pdf \(thriveftc.com\)](#)

[Creative expression of emotion at home - parents.indd \(thriveftc.com\)](#)

[Why our school decided to prioritise mental wellbeing - and what happened as a result - The Thrive Approach](#)

[Why we're backing experts' letter to Gavin Williamson - The Thrive Approach](#)