

## Schools funding consultation 2021/22

### Summary responses to survey

(Note: questions 1-6 relate to details of the respondent only)

**Total responses to school funding questions: 139**

The tables below summarise schools' responses to questions in the September funding consultation. For each question the number of schools in each sector supporting and opposing the proposal and the total number of responses in support and opposed is shown. The percentages shown are of overall responses. Where they do not add up to 100% this is because some respondents expressed no views.

### Question 7

**If 0.5% of schools block funds are transferred to the high needs block,**

(a) Which level of minimum funding guarantee (MFG) and increase in funding rate do you think best meets the needs of Surrey pupils?

Number of responses	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
MFG of 1.43%/increase in rates of 1.44%	52	10	5	0	0	67	54.0%
MFG of 1.1%/increase in rates of 1.66%	40	14	0	3	0	57	46.0%

(b) Do you agree that a ceiling on per pupil gainers should be used if, and only if, necessary in order to maintain the MFG and increase in per pupil rates at the above levels?

Number of responses	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	Total	%
Yes	79	20	6	3	0	108	90.0%
No	9	3	0	0	0	12	10.0%

(c) If you do not agree that a ceiling should be used, please indicate whether you would prefer cost increases to be managed by

- \* A reduction in MFG or
- \* A smaller increase in formula funding rates than proposed above

The majority of respondents supported proposal 7(b) so question 7c was not considered further.

## Question 8

### If schools block funds are not transferred to the high needs block

(a) Do you agree that the minimum funding guarantee should be set at 2% and the increase in formula factors at a minimum of 2.3% (with any surplus funding going into a further increase in formula factors-currently estimated at a further 0.25%)

Number of responses	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
MFG of 2%/increase in rates of 2.3%	75	19	7	3	0	104	83.9%
MFG of 1.5%/higher increase in rates	14	6	0	0	0	20	16.1%

(b) Do you agree that a ceiling on gains in funding per pupil should be used if, and only if it is necessary in order to deliver NFF funding rates and the 2% MFG?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	75	21	7	3		106	89.1%
no	9	4	0	0		13	10.9%

(c) If not, please indicate whether you would prefer cost increases to be managed by

- \* A reduction in MFG or
- \* A smaller increase in formula funding rates than proposed above?

As the majority of respondents supported proposal 8(b), proposal 8c was not further considered.

## Question 9

Do you support increasing the current lump sums in line with the increase in NFF factor rates, in order to assist small schools?

a) If there is a transfer to high needs block

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	71	16	7	0	0	94	78.3%
no	16	7	0	3	0	26	21.7%

b) If there is no transfer to high needs block

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	69	17	3	0	0	89	74.8%
no	16	7	4	3	0	30	25.2%

### Question 10

Do you agree that the level 1 and level 2 notional SEN funding rates should be increased in line with the general level of increase in formula funding rates?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	Total	%
Yes	56	18	9	3	2	88	66.2%
no	37	8	0	0	0	45	33.8%

### Question 11

Do you agree that in 2021/22 we should continue to provide formula funding for looked after children at the current rate?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	Total	%
Yes	92	26	8	3	2	131	99.2%
no	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.8%

### Question 12

Do you agree that the former combined services funding (for confederations and school improvement) within the formula, should be reduced by 20%, to reflect the funding reduction made by the DfE?.

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	Total	%
Yes	81	23	3	3	0	110	95.7%
no	4	1	0	0	0	5	4.3%

### Question 13

Do you support the proposal that funding for eligible rents should be outside the calculation of minimum funding guarantee and ceiling, so that funding changes are passed straight through to schools?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	68	23	1	3	0	95	100.0%
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

### Question 14

Do you support the proposal that funding for eligible split site costs should be outside the calculation of minimum funding guarantee and ceiling, so that funding changes for both are passed straight through to schools?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	60	21	3	3	0	87	97.8%
no	1	1	0	0	0	2	2.2%

### Question 15

Do you support the proposed basis of returning part of the surplus school specific contingency funds in 2021/22 to those primary schools which were maintained for all or part of 2019/20, on the basis described above?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	Total	%
Yes	77	10	5	3	0	95	94.1%
no	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.9%

### Question 16

Schools are asked to indicate their support for the continued “de-delegation”, at the rates shown in Annex 4, of the following services:

Number of responses	Maintained primary schools	Maintained primary schools	Maintained secondary schools	Maintained secondary schools
	yes	no	yes	no
a) Specialist Teachers (behaviour support) (primary schools only);	48	12		
b)CAPITA SIMS licences;	58	5	6	0
c) Teaching Association and Trade Union facilities time;	48	8	5	1
d) Other Special staff costs (eg for public duties and suspensions);	54	3	4	2
e) Free school meals eligibility checking;	59	3	6	0
f) Primary school specific contingency;	55	7	0	0
g) Additional school improvement services for primary schools (Intervention Fund) for interim leadership and other school improvement costs, where the school faces standards issues and its delegated budget is insufficient to bear the costs	55	8	0	0
h) School improvement support to travellers (primary schools)	42	12	0	0

### Question 17

Do you support the need to increase our capital investment in our own Surrey special schools to increase our capacity to support Surrey pupils with SEND and reduce our reliance on non-maintained/independent and out of county schools with much higher unit costs funded from the High Needs DSG, except where such a non-maintained or out of county school provides a specialism or need which our schools are not able to meet?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	85	25	10	3	2	125	95.4%
no	5	1	0	0	0	6	4.6%

### Question 18

Do you support the proposed principles for the special schools funding review, as described above?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	59	22	10	0	0	91	94.8%
no	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.2%

### Question 19

Do you accept in principle, with some exceptions, the premise that in terms of unit cost per pupil, we would expect

- a placement in a special school to be more expensive than that provided in a SEN centre in a mainstream school
- A pupil with SEND in a mainstream school to be funded at a lower unit cost than a pupil in a SEN centre.

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	61	15	9	3	1	89	71.2%
no	27	8	1	0	0	36	28.8%

### Question 20

Do you support the transfer of 0.5% (approx. £3.4m) of the total Schools block to the High Needs block to fund the existing SEND strategy?

Response	primary	secondary	special	PRU	nursery	total	%
Yes	29	1	10	0	0	40	29.6%
no	67	25	0	3	0	95	70.4%

## **Early years questions**

**There were 79 responses (53 private providers and 26 state maintained nursery providers)**

### **Questions 21/22**

Do you agree that the hourly rates in the early years funding formula for 3-4 year olds (both basic and deprivation) should increase by the same percentage as the funding rates paid by DfE to Surrey?

And

Do you agree that the hourly rates in the early years funding formula for 2 year olds should increase by the same percentage as the funding rates paid by DfE to Surrey?

Yes 75 (94.9%) No 2 (2.5%) No views 2 (2.5%)

### **Question 23**

Do you agree that the basic hourly rate should then increase by a further 8p/hr, subject to affordability?

Yes 76 (96.2%) No 2 (2.5%) No views 1 (1.3%)

### **Question 24**

Do you agree that the inclusion fund for 3-4 year olds should be maintained at the same level in 2021/22 as in 2020/21?

Yes 57 (72.2%) NO 16 (20.3%) No views 6 (7.5%)

### **Question 25**

Do you support the continued provision of an Inclusion Fund for 2 year olds?

Yes 66 (83.5%) No 3 (3.8%) No views 10 (12.7%)

### **Question 26**

Do you support the continued retention of 5% of funding for 3-4 year olds for 2021/22 for use as described in annex 10 of the consultation paper?

Yes 50 (63.3%) No 17 (21.5%) No views 12 (13.2%)

### **Question 27**

Do you support the proposal to offer all Early Years specialist places at 15 hours per week for 38 weeks per year in line with entitlement?

Yes 67 (84.8%) No 3 (3.8%) No views 9 (11.4%)

### **Question 28**

Do you support the proposed changes to the funding rate for free meals provision for entitled pupils in state maintained schools?

Yes 60 (75.9%) No 1 (1.3%) No views 18 (23.8%)