

Agenda

SCHOOLS FORUM

Date: Tuesday 29 November 2016
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: Knight Hall (Main Room 2), The Coach House,
Green Park, Aston Clinton

Reminder - If you are unable to attend a meeting, please send a substitute from the sector you represent.

Agenda Item	Time	Page No
1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP To accept apologies for absence and changes (temporary or otherwise) in membership.	2.00pm	
2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To disclose any Personal or Disclosable Pecuniary Interests	2.05pm	
3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18 October 2016, to be confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.	2.10pm	5 - 12
4 MATTERS ARISING Any matters arising and actions from the previous meeting	2.15pm	
5 SCHOOLS FORUM PAY REVIEW CONSULTATION Update report presented by Mrs S Kershaw.	2.20pm	13 - 16
6 NATIONAL FUNDING PROPOSALS AND F40 To receive an update on known national proposals and an update from Cllr Mohammed from F40 and meetings with Government Ministers	2.35pm	
7 SEND UPDATE Verbal update from Mr N Wilson.	2.50pm	
8 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT	3.00pm	17 - 36

To consider updates on the proposed allocation of DSG plus specific related matters, which are being discussed at SFFG on 22 November

9 CONTINGENCY GROUP UPDATE 3.45pm

10 SCHOOLS FORUM FUNDING GROUP UPDATE 3.55pm
Any items or matters arising from the SFFG that are not covered by the main agenda

11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS 4.00pm
To consider any other urgent business notified to the Chair before the start of the meeting

12 DATE OF NEXT AND FUTURE MEETINGS

SFFG Meeting	Forum Meeting	Funding Group and Forum venue
6 January 17	17 January 17	Green Park, Aston Clinton
20 January	31 January	Green Park, Aston Clinton
10 March	21 March	Green Park, Aston Clinton
5 May	16 May	Green Park, Aston Clinton
30 June	11 July	Green Park, Aston Clinton
15 September	26 September	Green Park, Aston Clinton
13 October	24 October	Green Park, Aston Clinton
17 November	28 November	Green Park, Aston Clinton

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

For further information please contact: Rachel Bennett on 01296 383991, email: rbennett@buckscc.gov.uk

MEMBERSHIP:

Headteachers

**Roger Burman, The Aylesbury Vale Academy
Karen Collett, Haddenham St Mary's Church of England School
Olwyn Davison-Oakley, Seer Green Church of England School
Katherine Douglas, Brookmead School
Karen Duckworth, Padbury CE School
Janice Freeman, King's Wood School & Nursery
Andy Gillespie, Burnham Grammar School
David Hood, Cressex Community School
Owen Lloyd, Iver Heath Junior School
Kevin Patrick, Chiltern Hills Academy
Rebecca Richardson, Haddenham St Marys School
Alan Rosen, Aylesbury High School
Debra Rutley, Wycombe Grange PRU
Sue Skinner, Bowerdean School
Steven Sneesby, Kite Ridge House PRU
Kathryn Tamlyn, Cheddington Combined School**

Governors

**Pete Rowe, Princes Risborough School (Chairman)
John Bajina, Parent Governor, Secondary Sector
Gaynor Bull, Haddenham St Mary's Church of England School
Angela Coneron, The Vale Federation of Special Schools
Simon Kearey, Great Kingshill Church of England School
Andrew Nobbs, Ashmead School
Katy Simmons, Cressex Community School
Peter Ward, Chilternway Academy**

Representatives

**Fiona Brooks, St Mary's Pre-School
Claudia Glasgow, NASUWT
Lindsey Grexhammer, Bucks NUT
Michael Moore, Catholic Diocese of Northampton
Wendy Terry, Manor Farm Pre-School**

Observer

Minutes

SCHOOLS FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM HELD ON TUESDAY 18 OCTOBER 2016 IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 2.10 PM AND CONCLUDING AT 3.30 PM

PRESENT

Headteachers

Mr A Rosen	Aylesbury High School
Mr S Sneesby	Kite Ridge House PRU
Ms S Skinner	Bowerdean School
Mr K Patrick	Chiltern Hills Academy
Mr O Lloyd	Iver Heath Junior School

Governors

Mr P Rowe (Chairman)	Princes Risborough School
Ms A Coneron	The Vale Federation of Special Schools
Dr K Simmons	Cressex Community School
Mrs G Bull	Haddenham St Mary's Church of England School

Representative

Ms W Terry	Manor Farm Pre-School
Ms L Grexhammer	Bucks NUT

In Attendance

Ms J Nicholls, Mr Z Mohammed, Porter and Ms K Rumboll

Officers

Mr J Huskinson, Ms E Wilding, Ms A Sayani, Ms J Nicholls, Mr N Wilson, Ms N Beagle and Ms K Rumboll

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Debra Rutley, Karen Collett, Mr A Gillespie, Mr S Kearey, Andrew Nobbs, Fiona Brooks, Claudia Glasgow, Michael Moore, Janice Freeman, Kathryn Tamlyn, John Banjina, Karen Duckworth, Amanda Picillo.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Wendy Terry declared an interest for the BLT item, as she is a BLT Trustee.



3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on 27 Sept we agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

Action from the last meeting - Councillor Zahir Mohammed agreed to circulate a response that was sent to the Secretary of State on the National Funding Formula along with the reply after today's meeting.

ACTION: Councillor Mohammed

4 MATTERS ARISING

None.

5 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND THE WORK OF THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE LEARNING TRUST (ALLOW 45 MINS)

Mrs Kate Rumboll, Director of Education Standards BLT and Mr Steve Porter, Director of Finance and Corporate Governance BLT attending the meeting to provide an update. During discussion key points were raised as follows:

Headline information from last year

- Continued/sustained improvements in all areas.
- Reports were provided to BCC on a termly basis, including KPI's.
- Percentage of pupils attending schools rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted was increasing, summer 2014 =79%, summer 2015 = 82%, summer 2016 = 86%.
- Percentage of good or outstanding ratings by Ofsted for Primary schools, Aug 2016 = 93% which was the top of the South East.
- BCC had commissioned BLT for a 5 year period, due to come to an end 2018.
- Last year BCC had commissioned an upper school project, how best to build a sustaining network. To support this BLT had put forward £100k for the network of schools working closely with BLT
- Reputation of BLT was strong, particularly outside of Buckinghamshire. Strong leaders working in partnership, increasing number of schools being judged good or better.
- Most areas nationally did not have a school improvement service they can call upon similar to BLT.
- Decreasing number of schools being judged as inadequate.
- Sample comments by external Ofsted validators were available in the report.

Headline for early years

- Rapid improvement reflected.
- Currently 0 inadequate.
- 5 require improvement.
- Good or o/standing had increased from 86.5% to 97.5%.

SEN and inclusion

- KPI's were well met.
- The challenge remained high.
- Last year's grant was adjusted, service was running but exceeded the original commission set out initially.

Finances

- BLT had been running for the last 3 years.

- Year 1: made a substantial profit
- Year 2: 14- June 15: made a substantial loss c.£1.5m. Principle reason, series of actions were taken to take costs out of the organisation as were not sustainable.
- Year 3: 15- June 16: clean audit, result was break-even.
- Validation that actions in 14/15 to adjust cost base, for that year costs were on even keel.
- Current year predicting break-even also.
- Balance sheet - net assets of £800k - substantially un-distributable amount, offset by a small deficit of BLT's useable reserves. This was not a strong position but had improved slightly.
- Years beyond the current year BLT were trying to understand what the landscape would look like.
- BLT would continue to address significant financial challenges going forward.

Proposal - for BLT to bring to a future meeting

- BLT Blueprint for future landscape
- Implications of funding changes.
- Disadvantaged pupils.
- Update on other BLT services (e.g. CPD/training, Governors, Music)

During discussion Schools Forum members raised the following:

- Great to see progress being made however with a third of children still attending schools which require improvement, what was the focused approach planned to tackle this issue.
- Mrs K Rumboll advised BLT accept that there had been progress but that there was still more to be done. BLT were investing their surplus of £100k into the upper school project. A working party was looking at how best to use resources and how the community could be helped.
- Members of the working group advised they were grateful to BLT for the £100k investment however there were limitations with a self-referring group, e.g. contextual factors that were beyond the working groups control, i.e. social care. Therefore BCC challenge would also help.
- Mr Z Mohammed commented that although there was quite a lot of work being done by BLT, there was always more that could be done. Understanding of what the working group would be looking would be required before BCC could explore providing input. There was concern around the number of non-selective schools rated as not good or inadequate by Ofsted, which was high on BCC's focus. Some reports had been disappointing, as they were not due to the school failing but rather some of the processes had not been right. Mr Z Mohammed advised he was in contact with some of these schools and was confident that their position would change. He advised it was a collective effort by all stakeholders to improve the situation.
- Mr Z Mohammed agreed that the £100k investment from BLT would not go very far and that he continued to lobby Government for funding. He had highlighted the disparity of funding for London, e.g. Bucks £4k and London tower hamlets £7k per child. He also continued to raise the profile of Bucks, within both the local and national press and amongst local MPs.

Mr S Porter provided more detailed information on the BLT finances:

Total income £13m - budget for this coming year

- £7m of the £13m was the main grant

- £2m school improvement (which may not be received going forward- Government decision.)
- £2m special teaching/SEN
- £1.6m early years- school improvement and SEN (others work force development, school finance, governor services)
- Other grants of £1.2m, of which £800k was arts council (excluding music business)
- Bulk of remainder was special projects and bits of work £400k

Traded income £5m

- £1.5m music service
- £1.2 Governor service
- Other substantial amount was school improvement aspirational budget £0.9m (schools predominantly across bucks)

Local Authority (LA) Funding £6.8m

- Mr N Wilson advised this previously has been funding between 3 pots, Higher Needs Block, Education Services Grant and Central DSG block. Future provision is uncertain. As of 31 August 2017 Education Services Grant was to disappear from Local Government. This would coincide with the changing of statutory duties of LA's. It was likely £3.9m would be used to fund commission and BLT and statutory duties. Residual duties would then translate to the Central DSG block and decisions would be made at Schools Forum around the allocation of money and BLT. It was not the Higher Needs Block was currently forecasting a £3m overspend.
- The period in which grant would finish was 01 Sept 18. Options were being explored for future provision. Mr S Porter advised the initial term had been for 5 years with the possibility of a 2 year extension.
- Decision making within Schools Forum would remain the same until the new funding formula was implemented. Schools Forum would then run parallel to the process. Schools Forum would still have a role for debating and providing recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Education.
- It was queried whether BLT would in future be producing an income flow by providing services outside of Buckinghamshire. Mr S Porter advised BLT would be able to share plans at a future meetings. There were a series of projects being explored which BLT were not in a position to discuss presently but would be able to at a later date.

It was agreed that the BLT would be invited to a future meeting to provide further details.

ACTION: Mr J Huskinson

BLT attendees were thanked for their attendance and promptly left the meeting.

6 PROVISIONAL 2017-18 BUDGET REQUIREMENT

Mr J Huskinson presented the report, PowerPoint slides attached. During discussion key points were raised as follows:

- As previously reported to Schools Forum in September 2016, by the Director of Education, the high needs block budgets within DSG were under considerable pressure.
- The latest forecast showed a pressure above budget of c £1.9m predominantly on the budget for Independent Schools, despite having increased budgets in 2016/17 to cope with demand.
- Overall the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget was projected to be c £3m over budget.
- The budget for high needs was at present indicating £1.9m overspend, despite

increases in budgets in 2016/17. This had not factored in potential additional growth in post 16 since the start of year.

- Pressures on the DSG would be carried forward; however where there was a DSG reserve this would be used first.
- High needs pressure in 2015/16 had used the remaining DSG reserve.
- The deficit contingency in 2016/17 was £900k over the budget available, with no reserves available to cover this cost. A £0.3m timing issue regarding school rates also appeared as a pressure.
- Trend data suggest c. 100 additional pupils would need support in 2017/18 (dependant on scenarios). Most of these would be in relatively costly provisions.
- The additional budget impact (over the 2016/17 pressure) was c. £2.4m. The recurrent pressure from 2016/17 was currently forecast at £1.9m, therefore the estimated recurrent pressure for high needs in 2017/18 would be increased to c £4.3m (dependant on scenarios).
- The financial benefit of any SEND reform project was unlikely to be realised in 2017/18, so any additional pressure would need to be offset by savings in DSG budgets in 2017/18.
- DSG budgets for 2017/18 will be discussed in more detail in November.
- Positive: the de-delegation issue was a nonrecurring issue.
- Negative: High Needs pressure was a recurrent pressure.

Recommendations

Option 1: The Schools Forum could agree to carry forward the £3.0m 2016/17 budget pressure to 2017/18 and deal with on top of any additional pressures in 2017/18, estimated at £4.3m.

Option 2: Alternatively, the Schools Forum could agree to redirect £3.3m of capital contribution from DSG revenue budgets (£1.65m in 2016/17 and £1.65m in 2017/18) to offset the 2016/17 pressure. This would create an impact on the £300m capital programme over the next 5 years. It would not solve the recurrent c £4.3m 2017/18 pressures.

The officer recommendation would be to support Option 2, as the ability to manage pressures would be relatively easier from capital over a longer term, than from 2017/18 central and schools budgets and the combined effect of 2016/17 and 2017/18 pressures may be too great to be managed just from 2017/18 revenue budgets.

During discussions further points were clarified as follows:

- Mr J Huskinson advised BCC's CEO, Rachael Shimmin, was in support of option 2, as the Capital programme would receive government funding. Last year the Government provided £9m funding on Capital, therefore the £3.3m pressure could potentially be offset with the government funds provided around the growth agenda.
- Mr N Wilson advised the pressure was due to growth in the population, with money being a symptom of growth. Housing was beginning to materialise at a swifter rate therefore the Government would have to fund us for the growth of the area.
- It was queried how confident officer were around the figures for next years funding. Mrs E Wilding advised that although 17/18 forecast details were not in the projections currently, the delay in the funding formula from the government had helped in favour of the Higher Needs pressures. Were the Government to provide £1m next year, this would go towards the £4.3m.
- Mr N Wilson confirmed there was no funding available in the DSG reserve, there

had been rapid deployment of £10m over previous 3 years. Many Local Authorities were using their reserves rapidly, was not just a BCC issue. Higher Needs was the single area that had not been recognised in funding terms which had caused significant pressures nationally.

- A member stated that 3-4 years ago Schools Forum allocated a significant amount of funding to Special Schools to build capacity, so that out of county provision was not going to be as much of an issue. Was this useful and had the money been well spent at this time?
- Mr N Wilson advised the investment in Special Schools was correct. This had held Independent schools where they were, however needed to revisit if further Capital was required and more provision in the County. To be reviewed, this would include provision within the county. It was agreed that at a later date the details of previous initiatives would be explored.

ACTION: Mr N Wilson

- Mrs E Wilding advised that the data was very sensitive therefore any slight change makes a big difference. Also the current details did not include the Higher Needs Block Funding for those children that did not have a statement, this data was currently a working process and would be provided in due course.

ACTION: Mrs E Wilding

DECISION

Option 2 of the recommendation was agreed unanimously by voting members (12) of Schools Forum.

7 IDACI IMPACT ON 2017-18

Mr J Huskinson provided an update. During discussions key points were raised as follows:

- The Government had announced the IDACI data would be reviewed again this year, following issues that were created during last year's review.
- Good news as would be looking at re-banding, which would result in small changes only.
- Subject to real data being available in mid December 2016, unless a school radically changed the nature of its cohorts, there should be no school significantly affected by the change.
- Following discussions at the last Schools Forum Funding Group, it had been suggested that the bands return to roughly a similar size, in terms of pupil proportion for each band.
- The revised bands were shown on the accompanying table, renamed "A" to "G", with the more deprived neighbourhoods being captured by band "A", relating to roughly 6 children in the total

Recommendation

That the Schools Forum agree with the banding values proposed in the table above, for the purposes of modelling the 2017/18 schools formula, notwithstanding that any announcements regarding national fairer funding may result in a further review of these bands.

DECISION

The forum voted unanimously (12) and AGREED to the above recommendation.

Member Comment

- It was suggested that the IDACI formula also be used for the early years formula for deprivation for consistency. Mr J Huskinson confirmed this would be investigated.

ACTION: Mr J Huskinson

8 SEND REVIEW - FOR INFORMATION

Mr N Wilson provided an update on the SEND review. Points were raised as follows:

- Details were available on website for consultation.
- Over 50 responses received so far.
- Consultation due to close 24 October 2016.
- Encouraged Members of Schools Forum to comment.
- Strategy will then be redrafted based on the comments received during the consultation.

9 SCHOOLS FORUM FUNDING GROUP UPDATE

Covered in earlier discussions.

10 CONTINGENCY GROUP UPDATE

None.

11 DATE OF NEXT AND FUTURE MEETINGS

SFFG Meeting	SFFG venue	Forum Meeting	Forum venue
11 November	Aylesbury High School	29 November	Green Park, Aston Clinton
6 January 2017	Green Park, Aston Clinton	17 January 2017	Green Park, Aston Clinton
20 January	Green Park, Aston Clinton	31 January	Green Park, Aston Clinton
10 March	Green Park, Aston Clinton	21 March	Green Park, Aston Clinton
5 May	Green Park, Aston Clinton	16 May	Green Park, Aston Clinton
30 June	Green Park, Aston Clinton	11 July	Green Park, Aston Clinton
15 September	Green Park, Aston Clinton	26 September	Green Park, Aston Clinton
13 October	Green Park, Aston Clinton	24 October	Green Park, Aston Clinton
17 November	Green Park, Aston Clinton	28 November	Green Park, Aston Clinton

CHAIRMAN

Bucks Pay-Schools Annual Pay Review Consultation

Schools Forum Funding Group 22nd November 2016

1. Role of the Schools Forum Funding Group and the Schools Forum

The Senior Appointments and Bucks Pay Award Committee (SABPAC) are required each year to make a decision on the pay award to apply to Bucks Pay- Schools (Schools Support Staff). However, because the budget for pay awards is held by individual schools, they seek input and advice from Schools management via the Schools Forum Funding Group (SFFG) and the Schools Forum (SF). SABPAC will make a provisional decision on December 15th which will then go out for formal consultation via the schools bulletin.

2. Background to the Pay Review April 2017- March 2018

Last year two options were discussed by the SFFG and SF with respect to the ***principle of how to address the National Living Wage (NLW)***.

These were:

- 1) Delete Range 1A entirely
- 2) Maintain Range 1A as a single point which increases in line with the NLW and delete the lower points of Range 1B as these are overtaken by the NLW.

Following feedback from SFFG and SF, SABPAC decided that Option 2 is the most cost effective approach.

This means that each year a decision will be required by SAPAC on whether or not to apply a percentage (or other) pay award to all Bucks Pay Schools pay scales (Ranges 1A – 12) and if so how much.

They will also need to review the value of the NLW and decide the impact on both the increase to R1A needed to remain compliant with NLW and any consequential impact on the bottom of Range 1B.

3. Update on National Living Wage

The NLW introduced in April 2016 is currently £7.20 per hour, to apply to all workers age 25 and over.

The stated aim is for the NLW is to reach 60% of median earnings by 2020. When it was announced in July 2015, it was anticipated that this would be a minimum of £9.00 per hour by April 2020.

However a recent publication by the Resolution Foundation (an independent think tank) has stated that as a result of “Brexit” “many forecasters, including the Bank of England, have revised down their earnings growth; therefore the National Living

Wage has also been revised down." It is now expected to increase to £7.50 per hour in April 2017 and reach £8.60 by 2020 based on current forecasts.¹

This is not a confirmed position and further details are expected as part of the Autumn Statement on 23 November.

The Government has placed a cap on public sector pay increases of an average 1%.

This has resulted in a 1% increase to Teachers pay scales in September 2016.

4. Pay considerations

The Bucks Pay-Schools Range 1A hourly rate is currently £7.40 per hour, which is currently 2.8% above the NLW.

The lowest point on Range 1B is £14,935 per annum/£7.74 per hour. It is assumed that for this year (i.e. from April 2017), NLW will not require the deletion of ISN point 6 (i.e. the bottom step of Range 1B), although the differential between Range 1A and the bottom of Range 1B will decrease.

As we do not yet know the value to which the NLW will increase on 1st April 2017, a number of estimated costs have been calculated based on an increase of NLW to £7.50, £7.60 and £7.70 per hour. These rates equate to increases of 1.35%, 2.70% and 4.05% of the current value (£7.40 per hour).

Therefore when making a decision on what pay award to make to Bucks Pay Schools, three possible options have been identified:

- 1) No increase to any range except to meet NLW requirements
- 2) A percentage increase for all ranges, with an additional increase for R1A to meet NLW if required
- 3) A percentage increase for all ranges, with an additional increase to meet and slightly exceed NLW requirements (e.g. if standard increase was agreed at 1%, and the NLW increases to £7.50 per hour, then an increase of 2.7% could be applied to Range 1A to bring the value up to £7.60 per hour).

SABPAC) discussed Pay for School support staff at the recent committee meeting and support Option 2, as this meets our legal obligations (NLW) and can be achieved in line with the governments national guidelines on public sector pay (1%).

Members will be strongly guided by the views of the Schools Forum Funding Group and the School Forum.

¹ <http://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflationandpriceindices/bulletins/consumerpriceinflation/sept2016>

The SSFG are asked to consider the options above. We recognise that the NLW rate from 1st April 2017, has not yet been announced, therefore a view on the preferred principle (i.e. which option) is sought.

It is expected that the April 2017 NLW rate, will be announced in the Autumn statement (23rd November 2016).

There will be a further opportunity for Schools management to share views at the Schools Forum on 29th November and also later on during December and January when a consultation with school employees on a proposal for April 2017, will be published via the Schools Bulletin. SABPAC welcome any further comment over this period and will take it fully into consideration when they make a decision on Bucks Pay-Schools in February 2017.

HR Contact: Sandy Ayton

Telephone: 01296 387090

Email: sayton@buckscc.gov.uk

Report to Schools Forum Funding Group

Title:	Growth Fund and Growing Schools
Date:	29 November 2016
Author:	Finance Director CSCL
Contact officer:	Jonathan Carter 01296 383932 jacarter@Buckscc.gov.uk
Schools affected:	All new schools

Introduction

Schools that are new, growing, being reorganised or have temporary falling numbers may have financial difficulty due to the way that the formula allocates funding.

This paper sets out the additional funding available for new schools, schools growing, being reorganised or with falling rolls and in doing so highlights a gap where schools growing may be financially disadvantaged for a period of time.

Where situations cannot be addressed within the rules and no other options are available, disapplication (approval of the EFA to waive the rules) may be requested.

This paper also asks the Schools Forum to consider the options and recommendations relating to the issue raised and the financial implications of any decision.

The Local Authority's final decision will be made by the Cabinet Member for Education & Skills.

Special funding sources

Formula (lagged data based on previous October census)

All schools will be eligible for formula funding based on lagged pupil census data apart from new schools in their first year of operation (as October census would be not available)

Table 1 below summarises the special funding sources for schools and the situations when these would be applicable.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Table 1 -Special funding sources for schools

Situation and special funding sources	Start-up funding	Diseconomies funding	Growth Fund	Variation to pupils	Falling rolls fund
New school before opening	Yes	No	No	No	No
First few year of new school	No	Possible	No	Yes	No
Subsequent years of new school until all years populated	No	Exceptional	No	Yes	No
Existing school growing with LA support	No	No	Yes	No	No
Existing school expanding onto a new site with LA support	Possible	Possible	Yes	No	No
Existing school with falling rolls, where capacity will be needed in future	No	No	No	No	Yes (if meet criteria)
Schools affected by reorganisation or change in year, supported by LA	No	No	No	Yes	Possible
All other schools	No	No	No	No	No

A brief description of the special fund available is set out below. **Appendix 1** extracts the EFA rules covering these.

Start-up funding

Start-up funding comes out of growth fund also and covers costs for new schools before they open. This has been agreed on a case by case basis to date.

Variations to pupils (in the formula)

Growing schools applies only to new schools and variations are made to the formula data in line with the regulations. If this was not applied, then new schools would receive no funding in their first year and growing schools would be financially disadvantaged as they grow.

The rules allow changes in pupil numbers also for schools affected by reorganisation or changes in years, with support of the Local Authority.

Diseconomies funding

Diseconomies funding is additional funding for new schools on top of growing schools funding, to reflect the diseconomies of scale in the first few (3 to 5) years of a new school until pupil funding gives then sufficient economies of scale. This funding is part of the growth fund. This is agreed on a case by case basis.

Growth Fund

Growth fund only applies to existing schools and may be for as little as one year. Growth fund is a top sliced DSG budget held centrally and managed year to year by the Schools Place Planning team.

Falling rolls funding

Falling rolls funding is only applicable if schools meet certain criteria. The funding is included within the growth fund managed by the Schools Place Planning team.

Gap in the rules

When a new school opens, often it opens with a smaller year 1 and 2 (or year 8 and 9 for secondary) than its Published Admission Number (PAN) which is agreed with the Authority. This is often due to related housing development and the need for the school to be open before housing developments in the area are completed and filled.

While the school is growing (e.g. up to year 6, or year 11) the September increase in pupil numbers is dealt with through the growing schools adjustment allowable in the DFE Authority Pro-forma Tool (APT). After that, the rules do not allow an adjustment and the lagged APT data determines funding.

For schools that started with significantly fewer pupils at the start (e.g. 1 class not 2) the lag in funding means that the school can have a significant risk to financial sustainability, as it will need to resource extra classes which it does not have funding for and the protection under growing schools is no longer available. Table 1 below illustrates this.

Table 2 – Pupil totals in school with smaller year 1 and 2 initially

Pupils	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year	6th Year	7th Year
Reception	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Year 1	30	60	60	60	60	60	60
Year 2	30	30	60	60	60	60	60
Year 3		30	30	60	60	60	60
Year 4			30	30	60	60	60
Year 5				30	30	60	60
Year 6					30	30	60
Total	120	180	240	300	360	390	420
Increase		60	60	60	60	30	30

For two years in this example, the school received lagged funding for 30 less pupils than admitted.

EFA Advice

Advice has been sought from the EFA and a disapplication would be needed, which they would consider. The EFA will ask if Schools Forum support has been given for this and the EFA are unlikely to agree if not given. The Authority therefore seeks the views of Forum in advance of any disapplication being considered.

Proposed Methodology if agreed

There are two options, disapplication for adjustments to the formula, or adjustment to the growth fund criteria to allow growth fund (DSG top-slice) to be used.

Through the formula funding would equate to:

7/12ths x agreed additional pupils x average funding per pupil for that school.

Through growth fund, the funding would be:

7/12ths x agreed additional pupils x AWPU, deprivation & prior attainment only

Schools in scope 2017/18:

- Buckingham Park School opened 4 years ago with Reception (60), Year 1(30) and Year 2(30), in September 2016 they have a Year 6 class for the first time. The model example above is based on this school.
- Khalsa Secondary Academy (40 for 2017/18 + 20 for 2018/19)
- Thomas Fremantle (40 for 2017/18)
- In future years, this could also include Lace Hill School (15 +15) and new schools in Berryfield (30+30) and other future new schools (TBC)

Estimated Financial impact in 2017/18

School	Through pupil number variation:	Through growth fund
Buckingham Park (30)	£59k	£56k
Khalsa (40)	£123k	£108k
Thomas Freemantle	£112k	£106k
Total	£294k	£270k

Options

Option 1 is to not allow a disapplication request and leave the school(s) affected to manage this. Buckingham Park could apply to contingency as a maintained school.

Option 2 is to support the disapplication request being made to the EFA in all applicable cases, either on a Growth Fund basis or a variation in pupil numbers basis

Option 3 is for the Forum or a delegated group of the Forum to review each case on its own merits and where agreed, support the disapplication to the EFA, either on a Growth Fund basis or a variation in pupil numbers basis

Recommendation

Schools Forum Funding Group recommend to Schools Forum Option 2, with advice on whether the Growth Fund or pupil adjustment is the most appropriate being left to the LA and EFA to agree.

DSG draft budgets (separate paper) have been updated to reflect this recommendation and the option not to agree this has been added as a savings idea to be considered.

Appendix 1 –relevant Guidance from DfE

The key guidance is as follows:

1. Schools revenue funding 2016 to 2017 Criteria for allocating growth fund falling rolls fund and targeted high needs funding

Growth Fund

18. Local authorities may top slice the DSG in order to create a Growth Fund to support schools which are required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority, including pre-opening, diseconomy and reorganisation costs. The growth fund may not be used to support schools in financial difficulty (any such support for maintained schools would be provided from a de-delegated contingency) or general growth due to popularity. Criteria for allocating growth funds should contain clear objective trigger points for qualification and a clear formula for calculating allocations.

Compliant criteria would generally contain some of the features set out below:

- Support where a school or academy has agreed with the authority to provide an extra class in order to meet basic need in the area (either as a bulge class or as an ongoing commitment)
- Additional support where a school has extended its age range (the majority of funding would be paid through the funding formula where the local authority should seek a variation in pupil numbers)
- Support where a school has temporarily increased its PAN by X or more pupils in agreement with the authority
- Support for KS1 classes where overall pupil numbers exceed a multiple of 30 by X or fewer pupils
- Pre-opening costs / initial equipping allowance / diseconomy of scale allowance for new maintained schools and recoument academies, including new academies where the school is opening in response to basic need

19. Local authorities should request a variation to pupil numbers where there is a more permanent and significant change to numbers and where it is appropriate for the change to be reflected in all relevant formula factors and not just a marginal cost or AWPU only allocation.

Falling Roles Fund

52. Local Authorities may top slice the DSG in order to create a small fund to support good schools with falling rolls where local planning data show that the surplus places will be needed in the near future. Criteria for allocating falling rolls funding should contain clear objective trigger points for qualification and a clear formula for calculating allocations. Compliant criteria would generally contain some of the features set out below:

- Support is available only for schools judged Good or Outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (note that this is a mandatory requirement)
- Surplus capacity exceeds x pupils or x% of the published admission number
- Local planning data shows a requirement for at least x% of the surplus places within the next x years

- Formula funding available to the school will not support provision of an appropriate curriculum for the existing cohort
- The school will need to make redundancies in order to contain spending within its formula budget

2. Schools revenue funding 2017 to 2018 Operational Guidance

Variations to pupil numbers

39. We expect local authorities to request approval to vary the pupil numbers used for calculating funding for specific schools where:

- there has been, or is going to be, a reorganisation
- a school has changed, or is going to change, its age range either by adding or losing year groups

40. Where approval to vary pupil numbers for individual schools has already been given in the previous years and there are ongoing effects into 2017 to 2018, the approval can carry forward provided that the approved methodology has not changed.

41. For new requests, the local authority will need to explain:

- the rationale for the estimates used, e.g. a weighted average of pupil numbers (5/12ths / 7/12ths), taking into account the changes in pupil numbers from the new academic year
- the number and names of schools affected
- details of the proposed variation, for example: is it an upward or a downward change?
- why the change should not be dealt with through the lagged funding system

42. In general terms, we would wish to continue to provide protection for all schools, including those with downward trends in pupil numbers, so any request for a negative adjustment would need to include compelling evidence as to why this should be approved.

43. Where a new school (other than a free school which is not being opened to meet the need for a new school as referred to in section 6a of the Education & Inspections Act 2006) is due to open, the regulations require that local authorities should estimate the pupil numbers expected to join the school in September and fund accordingly, again explaining the rationale underpinning the estimates.

44. Under these regulations local authorities should estimate pupil numbers for all schools and academies, including free schools, where they have opened in the previous seven years and are still adding year groups. Estimates may be adjusted each year to take account of the actual pupil numbers in the previous funding period.

45. We are consulting on proposals to make all mainstream free schools recoupable from the first year of opening from 2017 to 2018.

46. Whilst the growth fund is a suitable route for short-term increases in pupil numbers and bulge classes, local authorities should request to vary pupil numbers in situations where the scale of change in numbers is sufficiently great that it should be applied to all factors in the formula.

47. If pupil numbers are not adjusted upwards to reflect actual intake, we reserve the right to adjust amounts recouped to enable us to properly fund academies and free schools affected by this. Annex 1 contains more information about when to request a variation and when to use the growth fund.

Treatment in the APT of new and growing schools

120. Regulations require local authorities to provide estimated numbers on the APT for new schools and schools which have opened in the last seven years and do not have pupils in every year group. This means that it is not necessary for local authorities to apply for a pupil number variation in these situations.

121. As the APT covers the financial year and year groups join at the start of an academic year, we would generally expect the estimated numbers to reflect 7/12ths of the financial year. We need to understand details of the academic year numbers as well, so that relevant academies can be funded on that basis (this also applies to variations in pupil numbers where there are changes in age range). Local authorities should work with the schools concerned to provide the most accurate and realistic estimate based on the latest admissions and demographic data.

122. The Regulations are not prescriptive about how future numbers on roll should be calculated, however methodologies could include:

- [October 2016 NOR (from APT) x 5/12ths] + [October 2017 estimated NOR x 7/12ths]
- October 2016 NOR (from APT) + 7/12ths October 2017 estimated intake in new year group

123. Where a school is filling up a large number of empty places in existing year groups, it may be more appropriate to consider the estimated number on roll of the whole school, rather than simply considering the size of the new cohort.

124. The 2017 to 2018 APT will automatically convert the financial year estimated pupil numbers to pupil numbers expected in the academic year and local authorities should assure themselves that these are correct.

125. For a school to be classed as a growing school it has to have opened in the last seven years and not have all year groups present yet. If a school has opened in the last seven years and is already taking in pupils in all year groups, then there is no requirement to estimate numbers. As such existing schools which are extending their age range or becoming all through are unlikely to count.

126. We are consulting on changes to recoupment arrangements for free schools for 2017 to 2018 onward. Under the proposals all mainstream free schools would be recoupable from the first year of opening from 2017 to 2018. This means local authorities would need to estimate pupil numbers and characteristics for all these schools as is the case already for those opened under the presumption arrangements.

127. The regulations allow retrospective adjustments in the following financial year, so that schools are appropriately funded if actual numbers are different from the estimates. This is a matter for local decision, but we would generally expect such a mechanism. It is up to the authority whether or not to use a threshold.

Buckinghamshire County Council

Visit www.buckscc.gov.uk/democracy for councillor information and email alerts for local meetings

Report to Schools Forum Funding Group

Title:	Growth Fund – Start-Up Grant
Date:	29 November 2016
Author:	Jonathan Carter
Contact officer:	Jonathan Carter 01296 383932 jacarter@Buckscc.gov.uk
Schools affected:	All new schools

Background

As set out in a separate paper to this Schools Forum meeting, the growth fund can be used to support the lead-in costs of new schools e.g. to fund the appointment of staff and the purchase of any goods or services necessary in order to admit pupils. These funds are agreed from a top-slice of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), which is available to all schools.

Schools Forum has to agree the DSG top-slice for growth fund and the conditions for its use, including start-up funding.

Green Ridge Academy is due to open in September and a decision regarding the funding available for start-up between now and then is needed.

The LA is seeking to formalise the arrangements for providing start-up funding for any new school. The business case for this school is appended to this report to illustrate the funding potentially needed for a new school before it opens and to help Schools Forum agree the best way to fairly support schools like this in the future.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



DFE requirement

Please find below extracts from the DFE regulation

Finances (pre- and post-opening funding) – the academy presumption guidance at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/501328/Free_school_presumption_guidance_18_february.pdf contains the following text:

23. Local authorities are also required to meet the revenue costs of the new provision. They must make provision in their growth funds to support increases in pupil numbers relating to basic need. This relates to the per-pupil revenue funding in addition to all funding for pre-opening development costs and post-opening funding required to address diseconomies of scale until a school reaches full capacity. This is because the new free school will be funded on a recoupment basis. School funding arrangements allow local authorities to retain funding centrally to cover these costs. This is detailed in the revenue funding guide for local authorities.

24. Local authorities are expected to work with selected proposers to agree a reasonable and mutually acceptable funding allocation for the local authority to cover pre- and post-opening costs.

25. The department will provide a one-off payment of £25,000 to the successful proposer for the legal costs associated with establishing a new free school through this route. Upon opening, the school will be funded by the Education Funding Agency on the same basis as other academies and free schools in the same local authority area.

LA funding may be expected to cover

- Headteacher salary and on-costs for the term before opening;
- Admin support for the head (e.g. office equipment/stationery/telephone costs);
- Salary costs for staff such as a deputy, PA/finance officer, caretaker, for some of the time before opening if not a full term;
- Costs of supplying the school with ICT MI and finance software, and financial costs of preparing budgets;
- Costs of recruiting staff – not just the head but other teaching, admin and support staff for 1 September, including DBS checks;
- Marketing and advertising costs – including admissions-related literature
- Sponsor work on interviewing, work done on an education brief/staffing structure and admissions before the head is in place - for which we would typically expect a sponsor to charge for some head office HR/finance/education “expertise/project management” time.
- Books and equipment

Options

Option A

To agree a set rate for all new schools of £200,000 for primary mainstream schools, historically this has been around the level of funding given to the last two new schools.

To date we have not had a new secondary maintained school, from evidence provided by the DFE they have provided £300,000 of start-up funding.

Option B

For the forum to agree on a case by case basis as it has in the past.

Recommendation

The Schools Forum Funding Group (SFFG) has considered this matter in detail and recommend Option B, to the Schools Forum i.e. the case by case basis.

The SFFG further recommends that to support new schools in their planning assumptions, that there should be a minimum allocation of £150K for new primary schools and £250K for new secondary schools.

The draft budget proposals for growth fund include an estimate for this, whether option A or B is agreed. This figure will vary year on year depending on the number of eligible schools and the specific circumstances. We do not have any specific guidance on growth fund in 2018/19 under a national fairer funding model so this may change in future.

Conclusion

We are seeking Schools Forum guidance and approval on the above process with immediate effect and for School Forum to nominate representatives to review these cases as they arrive, assuming Option B is agreed.

Buckinghamshire County Council

Visit www.buckscc.gov.uk/democracy for councillor information and email alerts for local meetings

Report to Schools Forum Funding Group

Title:	Dedicated Schools Grant 2017-18
Date:	29 November 2016
Author:	Finance Director CSCL
Contact officer:	Jonathan Carter 01296 383932 jacarter@Buckscc.gov.uk
Schools affected:	All new schools

DSG funding 2017-18**1. Purpose of this report**

- 1.1. The continuing pressure on High Need Block activity caused by growth in demand presents a significant funding pressure in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget proposals for 2017/18. The best estimates at this early stage are a pressure of over £6m.
- 1.2. Until further information from the Department of Education (DfE) is provided (expected min December) it is not possible to confirm the net pressure the Schools Forum and Local Authority (LA) have to consider.
- 1.3. The Schools Forum is therefore being asked to consider the principles rather than the specifics of funding proposals at this stage, in order to help budget proposals to be confirmed before the Schools Forum meeting in January.
- 1.4. Due to the uncertainties in data, funding and rules; for this report the DSG budgets for 2016/17 have been assumed and activity from 2016/17 used as the baseline.
- 1.5. As reported to Schools Forum in October 2016 there is a significant pressure on high needs block spending caused by increasing demand for services. Schools Forum supported proposals to manage this (c. £3m) pressure in 2016/17 by allowing non recurrent funding to offset this.
- 1.6. The estimate of growth in high needs activity (c. £3m per year extra) was also shared with the Schools Forum and lead to an assumed gap between 2016/17 high needs budgets and 2017/18 forecast spend of over £6m.
- 1.7. Schools and early years activity has been assumed to be the same as 2016/17 to give consistency.
- 1.8. Ideas for how any pressure might be mitigated are included in this report for Schools Forum to consider and comment on.

2. Background

- 2.1. Under the proposals for a national funding formula, delayed by (at least) one year schools would eventually be funded on the same formula regardless of where they are and the funding provided by the DfE would be ring-fenced to ensure that this was (in effect) passed to schools. Detailed proposals have yet to be announced and the proposals may differ significantly from the current formula agreed in Buckinghamshire.
- 2.2. Any changes in the school funding formula will create turbulence in funding for individual schools from year to year. Individual schools' funding changes are protected by the

Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) which limits per pupil decreases in funding to 1.5% from year to year. In 2017/18 the DfE have clarified that the 1.5% MFG rule remains. Schools who gain funding per pupil may also be subject to a cap on gains. In 2016/17 the Buckinghamshire formula had a 2.0% cap on gains. Capping partially offsets the cost of MFG protection.

3. Education Services Grant

3.1. Due to uncertainties at this stage about responsibility and funding this report will not consider ESG and for modelling purposes we have assumed no change at this stage. As updates are provided, further papers will address this.

4. 2017/18 draft budgets

4.1. A summary of the budgets is set out in the table below and a full breakdown is contained in Appendix 1.

Area	2016/17 agreed budget	2017/18 draft budget	Difference	Explanation
DSG Grant income	(£397.8m)	(£398.4m)	(£0.6m)-	Assumes same data and funding rates. £0.6m extra income is for a post 16 technical change matched by increase in high needs
Licenses	£0.4m	£0.4m	-	Top-sliced from DSG based on license charges set by EFA. Minor increase expected.
Schools ISB (before de-delegation)	£290.2m	£290.2m	-	Assumes same data as rates in formula.
High Needs	£74.3m	£80.9m	£6.6m+	Projected base pressure in 2016/17 is £3m plus c £3m growth in 2017/18 plus £0.6m technical change (which EFA will fund through an increase in DSG)
Early Years	£24.7m	£24.7m	-	Assumes same data.
Growth Fund	£1.4m	£2.1m	£0.7m+	Increase due to growth in school demand overall. This assumes growing schools proposal is agreed.
Capital contribution	£1.65m	£1.65m	-	Last year of this. Has been redirected to cover high needs pressures in 2016/17
Other central spend	£5.2m	£4.9m	(£0.3m)-	Reduction in non-SEND high needs support.
Net	£0m	£6.4m	£6.4M	Pressure due to high needs growth beyond budgets.

5. Options to offset pressures

5.1. The steer from the Schools Forum Funding Group was to look at all areas sharing the challenge in balancing budgets, caused by high needs demand growth. The list below is not exhaustive and Schools Forum is welcome to suggest other areas to be considered.

Ideas to be considered

Area	Idea	Possible impact	Appendix 1 ref
------	------	-----------------	----------------

Area	Idea	Possible impact	Appendix 1 ref
A. Special schools funding	Reduce all top up values to deliver savings (Special schools changes also limited overall by 1.5% MFG)	c. £0.4m reduction in funding	H22
B. Reduce ARP funding	Reduce PRU funding top ups to generate saving of 1.5% (not protected by MFG in same was as schools)	c. £75k reduction in funding	H1
C. Reduce PRU funding	Reduce PRU funding top ups to generate saving of 1.5% (not protected by MFG in same was as schools)	c. £75k reduction in funding	H14
D. Early years inclusion fund	Use "inclusion fund" proposals within early years to cover the early years high needs block	c. £0.5m transfer from high needs to early years	H26
E. Schools ISB	Reduce all pupil-led factors by 1.5% and reduce capping to 0.5% All schools receive 1.5% per pupil less whether in MFG, capped or neither compared to 2016/17.	c. £3.4m reduction.	See Appendix 2.
F. Growth Fund	Forum does not have to agree the extension to growing schools covered in a separate paper. Schools forum could also reduce growth fund to AWPU only.	£270k if not agreeing extension for growing schools. £140k extra if reducing growth fund to AWPU only.	G1
G. High needs block funding	Manage high needs growth funding within existing budget	c. £200k if this has to stay within existing budgets	H25
H. Reduce BASL funding	Efficiencies in delivery could be found from the £115k budget.	c. £35k	C2

5.2. This is not exhaustive and other options can be modelled. The Forum has the ability to agree some budget lines, but the implications on services funded must be considered.

5.3. Equality impact assessments of these ideas have not been undertaken and Government policies may also impact. Until the picture is completely clear detailed Equality Impact Assessments would add little value.

6. Recommendations

6.1. That Schools Forum considers the potential options to manage DSG spend within the overall budget available in 2017/18 and gives in principle views to the LA at the November meeting.

Appendix 1 DSG Draft budgets by line

High Needs

Ref	Activity	2016-17 budget (before recoupment)	Proposed 2017-18 budget	2017-18 Budget change v 2016-17 budget
H1	Additional Resourced Units	£4,780,306	£4,761,000	-£19,306
H2	Alternative Provision	£431,483	£431,000	-£483
H3	BLT - Specialist Teaching Service	£2,219,251	£2,057,000	-£162,251
H4	Early Years EHC Plans	£289,702	£290,000	£298
H5	Educating Children in Public Care (ECPC)	£717,314	£717,000	-£314
H6	Education Psychology	£681,710	£682,000	£290
H7	Educational Equipment	£241,879	£250,000	£8,121
H8	Independent Schools	£13,037,848	£15,219,000	£2,181,152
H9	Kiteridge specialist boarding PRU for 11-19 year olds	£1,088,787	£1,087,000	-£1,787
H10	Other Support	£662,237	£662,000	-£237
H11	Portage	£189,700	£190,000	£300
H12	Post-16 High Needs	£3,943,080	£5,825,000	£1,881,920
H13	PRU place funding	£2,380,000	£2,380,000	£0
H14	PRUs & EOTAS	£2,564,236	£2,564,000	-£236
H15	Recoupment	£2,272,000	£2,546,000	£274,000
H16	Re-integration	£361,698	£362,000	£302
H17	Schools EHC Plans	£5,124,306	£5,381,000	£256,694
H18	Schools Inadequate Notional	£167,755	£150,000	-£17,755
H19	Schools post-16 £6k for EHC Plans	£324,000	£324,000	£0
H20	Special Schools - Place	£13,324,167	£14,610,000	£1,285,833
H21	Chiltern Way Academy project	£300,000	£426,000	£126,000
H22	Special Schools - top up	£13,539,198	£14,427,000	£887,802

H23	Therapies	£1,729,712	£1,481,000	-£248,712
H24	Vulnerable children attainment intervention	£965,748	£935,000	-£30,748
H25	High Needs Block Funding Schools	£500,000	£712,000	£212,000
H26	High Needs Block Funding Early Years (early years inclusion fund)	£477,747	£478,000	£253
H27	High Needs overheads	£1,967,691	£1,968,000	£309
		£74,281,554	£80,915,000	£6,633,446

Early Years

Ref	Activity	2016-17 budget (before recoupment)	Proposed 2017-18 budget	2017-18 Budget change v 2016-17 budget
E1	Early Years - 2 year old	£3,285,719	£3,286,000	£281
E2	Early Years - 3 and 4 year old	£15,214,276	£15,214,000	-£276
E3	Early years data and information	£133,912	£147,000	£13,088
E4	Early Years Central - Childcare training grants	£253,825	£250,000	-£3,825
E5	Early Years Central - Sufficiency and Sustainability	£869,586	£870,000	£414
E6	Early Years in Schools / Maintained nurseries	£4,902,650	£4,903,000	£350
E7	Early years Overheads	£34,212	£34,000	-£212
		£24,694,180	£24,704,000	£9,820

Growth fund

Ref	Activity	2016-17 budget (before recoupment)	Proposed 2017-18 budget	2017-18 Budget change v 2016-17 budget
G1	Growth Fund	£1,438,511	£1,885,551	£447,040
G2	Falling rolls fund	£0	£200,000	£200,000
		£1,438,511	£2,085,551	£647,040

Other central funds

Ref	Activity	2016-17 budget (before recoupment)	Proposed 2017-18 budget	2017-18 Budget change v 2016-17 budget
C1	Admissions	£923,792	£890,000	-£33,792
C2	BASL	£114,750	£115,000	£250
C3	Bucks Learning Trust - Contribution to Combined	£2,196,961	£2,197,000	£39
C4	Capital contribution	£1,650,000	£1,650,000	£0
C5	Independent Schools - non SEN	£585,746	£250,000	-£335,746
C6	Management of Schools Forum	£1,960	£2,000	£40
C7	Practical Learning Opportunities	£224,438	£224,000	-£438
C8	Raising Participation Age	£138,980	£139,000	£20
C9	Safeguarding in Education	£210,169	£210,000	-£169
C10	Schools PRC	£261,591	£317,000	£55,409
C11	Legal (Admissions Appeals)	£318,957	£319,000	£43
C12	Central overheads	£230,098	£230,000	-£98
		£6,857,442	£6,543,000	-£314,442

Appendix 2 Schools Funding Formula models

	2016/17	2017/18	Difference	Difference %	2017/18 (-1.5%)	Difference £	Difference %	2017/18 (-2%)	Difference £	Difference %
AWPU	£226,440,117.67	£226,440,117.67	£0.00	0.00%	£223,043,516.00	-£3,396,601.67	-1.50%	£221,911,315.00	-£4,528,802.67	-2.00%
FSM	£4,175,621.19	£4,175,621.19	£0.00	0.00%	£4,112,987.00	-£62,634.19	-1.50%	£4,092,109.00	-£83,512.19	-2.00%
Deprivation	£2,899,480.27	£2,883,194.86	-£16,285.41	-0.56%	£2,903,859.14	£4,378.87	0.15%	£2,889,274.70	-£10,205.57	-0.35%
LAC	£139,301.38	£139,301.38	£0.00	0.00%	£137,212.00	-£2,089.38	-1.50%	£136,515.00	-£2,786.38	-2.00%
EAL	£2,515,708.25	£2,515,708.25	£0.00	0.00%	£2,477,973.00	-£37,735.25	-1.50%	£2,465,394.00	-£50,314.25	-2.00%
Mobility	£213,419.15	£213,419.15	£0.00	0.00%	£210,218.00	-£3,201.15	-1.50%	£209,151.00	-£4,268.15	-2.00%
Prior Attainment	£17,863,987.52	£17,866,297.27	£2,309.75	0.01%	£17,598,303.10	-£265,684.42	-1.49%	£17,508,971.75	-£355,015.77	-1.99%
Lump Sum	£27,681,600.00	£27,681,600.00	£0.00	0.00%	£27,681,600.00	£0.00	0.00%	£27,681,600.00	£0.00	0.00%
Fringe	£1,382,410.02	£1,382,423.59	£13.57	0.00%	£1,364,194.82	-£18,215.20	-1.32%	£1,357,982.62	-£24,427.40	-1.77%
Split Site	£32,000.00	£32,000.00	£0.00	0.00%	£32,000.00	£0.00	0.00%	£32,000.00	£0.00	0.00%
Rates	£3,107,759.58	£3,107,759.58	£0.00	0.00%	£3,107,759.58	£0.00	0.00%	£3,107,759.58	£0.00	0.00%
Exceptional	£81,386.00	£81,386.00	£0.00	0.00%	£81,386.00	£0.00	0.00%	£81,386.00	£0.00	0.00%
MFG	£3,327,599.87	£2,615,963.09	-£711,636.78	-21.39%	£3,756,508.39	£428,908.52	12.89%	£4,780,236.28	£1,452,636.41	43.65%
Total	£289,860,390.90	£289,134,792.03	-£725,598.88	-0.25%	£286,507,517.04	-£3,352,873.87	-1.16%	£286,253,694.94	-£3,606,695.96	-1.24%
No. of Schools on MFG	101	66	-35		106	5		198	97	
No. of Schools on MFG (Cap)	24	5	-19		5	-19		5	-19	
2016/17	As submitted to the DFE (Excluding rates adjustments pre 16/17) (Cap 2%)									
2017/18	Based on 16/17 Rates and 16/17 Data (Cap 2%)									
2017/18 (-1.5%)	Same as V1 plus all factor pots reduced by 1.5% (Excluding Lump Sum, Rates, Split Site & Exceptional) (Cap 0.5%)									
2017/18 (-2%)	Same as V1 plus all factor pots reduced by 2.0% (Excluding Lump Sum, Rates, Split Site & Exceptional) (Cap 0.0%)									

