

Papers for Surrey Schools Forum 1 October 2020

Item 6 (part)
Surrey Schools Forum
1 October 2020
For recommendation (part) and decision (part)

Surrey Schools' and Early Years Funding Consultation 2021/22

Outcome of the consultation and actions for Schools Forum

The schools funding consultation is due to close on 28 September and the results will be tabled at the meeting. This paper summarises the questions to be discussed.

School funding proposals requiring a Schools Forum decision

Section C3 and Q16:

De-delegation proposals (for decision by representatives of primary and secondary maintained schools only, and separately)

- a) Specialist Teachers (behaviour support) (primary schools only);
- b) CAPITA SIMS licences;
- c) Teaching Association and Trade Union facilities time;
- d) Other special staff costs (eg for public duties and suspensions);
- e) Free school meals eligibility checking;
- f) Primary school specific contingency;
- g) Additional school improvement services for primary schools (Intervention Fund) for interim leadership and other school improvement costs, where a school faces standards issues and its delegated budget is insufficient to bear the costs;
- h) school improvement: REMA travellers service.

Section C4.2 and Q20

That 0.5% of the Schools Block (estimated at £3.4m) should be transferred to the high needs block in order to fund the existing SEND strategy.

The LA has the right of appeal to the Secretary of State against the Forum's decision on any of the issues listed above in proposals C3 and C4.2.

Proposals on which the Forum is being consulted and asked to make recommendations to Cabinet

Section C1.2 and Q7-8

That the level of the minimum funding guarantee should be set at 1.43% if there is a transfer of funds to the high needs block, or at 2% if there is no such transfer.

That the increase in formula factor rates should be set at approx. 1.44% if there is a transfer of funds to high needs block (thus allowing minimum funding guarantee to be maximised) or at a minimum of 2.3% if there is no transfer.

That a ceiling on per pupil funding gains should only be used if it is necessary in order to deliver the funding rate increases and minimum funding guarantee stated above.

Section C1-3 and Q9

That the lump sum should be increased by 2.1% (if there is a transfer to high needs block) or 3% (otherwise).

Section C1-4 and Q10

That notional SEN factors should be increased in line with the increase in formula funding rates.

Section C1-6 and Q11

That funding for looked after children should be retained at the present rate of £396/pupil.

Section C1-7 and Q12

That the former combined services funding within the delegated budget should be reduced by 20%, in line with DfE reductions.

Section C1-8 and Q13

That funding for eligible rent costs should automatically be outside the minimum funding guarantee.

Section C1-8 and Q14

That funding for eligible split site costs should automatically be outside the minimum funding guarantee.

Section C2 and Q15

That surplus funding from the maintained primary school contingency should be returned to maintained primary schools,

Proposals on which the Forum is being asked for views but which will not be subject to a Cabinet decision in November.

Section C4.1 and Q17/18/19

That there should be an increase in capital investment in Surrey's own state special schools to increase capacity to support Surrey pupils with SEND and reduce reliance on non maintained and independent special schools.

That the principles for the special schools funding review should be as described (in the consultation paper).

That in general, placements in state special schools should be funded at a higher level than those in SEN centres in mainstream schools, which in turn should be funded at a higher level than pupils receiving additional support in mainstream schools

Early years funding proposals: for consultation and recommendation

That the hourly rates in the Surrey formula for 3-4 year olds should increase by the same percentage as the funding rates paid by DfE to Surrey (Q21)

That the hourly rates in the Surrey formula for 2 year olds should increase by the same percentage as the funding rates paid by DfE (Q22)

That the basic hourly rate for 3-4 year olds should then increase by up to a further 8p (subject to affordability after funding any increase required in deprivation funding (Q23)

That the inclusion fund for three and four year olds is maintained at the same level in 2021/22 as in 2020/21 (Q24)

That all early years specialist places should be offered at 15 hrs/week in line with entitlement (Q27)

That the funding rate for free meals provision for entitled early years pupils should be increased to £2.44, in line with the DfE rate for schools.

Early years proposals for Schools Forum decision (as they count as centrally managed funding) decisions on the following proposals, which count as centrally managed funding.

That provision of an Inclusion Fund for 2 year olds should continue (Q25);

The continued retention of 5% of funding for 3-4 year olds for 2020/21 for use as described in the consultation paper. (Q26)

Proposed technical disapplication requests to DfE
Use of estimated average pupil numbers for primary schools losing bulge classes or reducing PAN from September 2021

A “disapplication” request to the DfE is required in order to fund a school for lower pupil numbers than its previous October census count. Surrey has usually applied to do this where a primary school is losing a bulge class or where there has been a reduction or other change in PAN such that fewer classes are required. The logic of the adjustment to pupil numbers is that

- the reduction in pupil numbers is one which can be planned for, over and above the normal year on year variation in pupil numbers which occurs in most schools;
- bulge classes are funded from September in the year in which they were admitted,
- loss of bulge classes/PAN reductions in some schools are balanced by increases elsewhere.

The reduction in funded pupil numbers would reflect only the loss of the bulge class or the change in PAN (ie those changes which would not occur in any other school)..

The LA is expected to consult those schools affected and the Schools Forum and to report the views of both to the DfE. The deadline for requests to the DfE is 11 October

For 2021/22 the LA proposes to submit applications to use average pupil numbers to fund

- 9 schools which are losing bulge classes
- 1 school where there has been a reduction in PAN and a consequent reduction in pupil numbers
- 1 school where there has been a change in the balance between year R and year 3 PANs with a consequent reduction in pupil numbers.

The estimated total saving to the LA at 2020/21 prices if average pupil numbers are used to fund these schools is £526,000.

Any views expressed on the proposal by individual schools which are affected will be reported at the meeting. So far (24 September):

- Three schools accept the proposals
- Two schools have asked that the proposals are not implemented
- Six schools have not expressed a view..

The Forum is asked to consider whether to support the proposed variation in funded pupil numbers for all, some or none of these schools.

David Green 23 September 2020.

Teachers' pay settlement 2020/21

Teachers' pay bulletin no 1, which has been sent to all maintained schools and academies, is reproduced below. The guidance applies only to maintained schools. Please note that it predates the publication of the new document on 23 September.

Teachers' pay 2020 / 2021

On 21 July 2020, the Department for Education (DfE) published the draft 2020 School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD) setting out the proposed pay award for teachers and school leaders working in maintained schools for the academic year 2020/21 – the proposals accept all of the recommendations from the School Teachers Pay Review Body (STRB) 30 report. This includes the introduction of advisory pay points on the main and upper pay range:

- 5.5% uplift to the minimum of the MPR (main pay range)
- 2.75% uplift to the maximum of the MPR
- 2.75% uplift to the minima and maxima of all other pay ranges and allowances.
- That advisory pay points are reintroduced on the MPR and UPR. (upper pay range) (proposed levels for these pay points are set out in annex 1).

The government announcement also makes it clear that the intention is that the pay award will be unfunded, with the cost of implementation to be covered from existing school budgets

At this stage the proposals announced are provisional, we are currently in a period of statutory consultation which ends on 14 September 2020. During this time statutory consultees (including **NEOST**) are invited to comment on the proposals. The final STPCD is not expected to be published until October 2020, once it has been through the full parliamentary process. At this point the new pay scales will be confirmed.

Surrey County Council Local pay negotiations

The proposed pay award represents the first step to delivering the Government's commitment to increase teachers' starting salaries to £30,000 by 2022/23. The pay increase is equivalent to £1,250 on average for teachers and £1,970 on average for headteachers. This means the minimum starting salary for a qualified teacher in 2020/21 will rise to £26,948, within Surrey as part of the London Fringe. The recommendation to introduce advisory pay points on the main and upper pay range will support schools to adopt a pay structure which best supports recruitment and retention. In addition, this approach sets out a possible pathway of pay progression through which teachers can be recognised and rewarded as they build their expertise in the classroom.

However, the draft STPCD does not contain guidance on how assimilation onto the proposed advisory pay points should be managed, and local authorities and schools will need to determine, in consultation with the trade unions, an appropriate methodology and timescale for moving to the published advisory pay points. Surrey County Council's pay team have therefore arranged a series of meetings with the relevant teacher unions to discuss the pay proposals as follows:

- • Wednesday 7th October 2020
- • Wednesday 14th October 2020
- • Wednesday 28th October 2020

The aim of these discussions will be to agree a revised pay model for teachers, a timescale for moving to the advisory pay points and to review teacher policies. Once agreed the pay model will be recommended to maintained schools.

Implications for school pay policies

Schools are strongly advised not to review their pay policy or make any decisions regarding pay until the pay award is confirmed and the council has advised a recommended pay model. Surrey schools that adopt the recommended pay model will not need to consult with the unions on their 2020-21 pay policy (unless of course the school intends to make other changes of substance).

However, schools that intend to implement something different will be required to engage with the recognised unions before adoption of their pay policy.

The contact details for the county representatives of the recognised unions in respect of teachers are set out at the end of this bulletin (please note that school-based representatives of the trade unions are not normally authorised to agree changes to the pay policy so contact should always be made with the county-level representatives). (NOTE : not reproduced here)

Next steps

Pay decisions will continue to be based on evidence of performance through appraisal so schools should plan to complete their end of year review meetings with teaching staff.

There is no additional specific guidance on how schools should conduct their end of year reviews – but previous DfE advice was clear that they should seek to ensure that no teacher is at a detriment where school closure or disruption due to Covid-19 has impacted on their ability to meet performance targets.

Information from the council's joint meetings with the trade unions will be shared as soon as possible. Copies of this bulletin will be made available on the HR pages of the *Surrey Services for Schools Portal*.

All pay changes will be backdated to 1 September 2020.