

NOTICE OF MEETING

Schools Forum

Thursday 16 October 2014, 4.30 pm

Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell

To: The Schools Forum

Schools Members:

Sue Barber, Primary School Governor
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative
Karen Davis, Primary Head Representative
Ed Essery, Secondary School Governor
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor
Martin Gocke, Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Keith Grainger, Secondary Head Teachers Representative
David Matika, Primary School Governor
John McNab, Secondary School Governor
Joanna Quinn, Primary School Representative
Tony Reading, Primary School Governor
Paul Salter, Secondary School Representative
Trudi Sammons, Primary School Representative
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative
David Stacey, Primary School Governor
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)
Kathy Winrow, Academy School Representative

Non-Schools Members

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)
Robin Sharples, Oxford Diocese (Church of England)
Kate Sillett, PVI Provider Representative
Vacant, 14-19 Partnership Representative
Vacant, Diocese Representative (Roman Catholic)

ALISON SANDERS
Director of Corporate Services

EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS

- 1 If you hear the alarm, leave the building immediately.
- 2 Follow the green signs.
- 3 Use the stairs not the lifts.
- 4 Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

If you require further information, please contact: Amanda Roden
Telephone: 01344 352253
Email: amanda.rodan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
Published: 7 October 2014

Schools Forum
Thursday 16 October 2014, 4.30 pm
Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell

Sound recording, photographing, filming and use of social media at meetings which are held in public are permitted. Those wishing to record proceedings at a meeting are however advised to contact the Democratic Services Officer named as the contact for further information on the front of this agenda as early as possible before the start of the meeting so that any special arrangements can be made.

AGENDA

	Page No
1. Election of Chairman	
2. Appointment of Vice-Chairman	
3. Apologies for Absence/Substitute Members To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute members.	
4. Declarations of Interest Any Member with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or an Affected Interest in a matter should withdraw from the meeting when the matter is under consideration and should notify the Democratic Services Officer in attendance that they are withdrawing as they have such an interest. If the Interest is not entered on the register of Members interests the Monitoring Officer must be notified of the interest within 28 days.	
5. Minutes and Matters Arising To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of 17 July 2014.	1 - 8
6. Internal Audit Report of School Funding To draw the Forum's attention to the findings of the internal audit review of school funding.	9 - 12
7. The Schools Budget - 2014-15 Budget Monitoring To update the Forum on the 2014-15 forecast budget monitoring position for the Schools Budget, to be aware of key issues and management actions being taken.	13 - 20
8. Outcomes from the September Financial Consultation with Schools To report to the Forum a summary of the results of the September Financial Consultation exercise with governing bodies and other interested parties. The report includes schools' views regarding the questions raised and was intended to assist the Forum in making recommendations in respect of the funding framework to be in place for 2015-16.	21 - 56

9. **Exclusion of Public and Press**

To consider the following motion:

That pursuant to Regulation 4 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) Regulations 2012 and having regard to the public interest, members of the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of item 8 which involves the likely disclosure of exempt information under the following category of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972:

- (3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person.

10. **Confidential Annex**

57 - 60

11. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The next meetings of the Schools Forum are scheduled at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House for:

Thursday 27 November 2014
Thursday 15 January 2015
Thursday 12 March 2015
Thursday 23 April 2015

This page is intentionally left blank



**SCHOOLS FORUM
17 JULY 2014
4.30 - 6.30 PM**

Present:

Schools Members

Sue Barber, Primary School Governor
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative
Ed Essery, Secondary School Governor
Martin Gocke, Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Keith Grainger, Secondary Head Teachers Representative
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative
David Stacey, Primary School Governor Representative
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)
Mark Williams, Academy School Representative

Observer:

Councillor Dr Barnard, Executive Member for Children, Young People and Learning

Apologies for absence were received from:

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)
Karen Davis, Primary Head Representative
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor
John McNab, Secondary School Governor
Joanna Quinn, Primary School Representative
Tony Reading, Primary School Governor
Paul Salter, Secondary School Representative
Trudi Sammons, Primary School Representative
Robin Sharples, Oxford Diocese (Church of England)
Kathy Winrow, Academy School Representative

JOHN THROSSELL, VICE-CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR

31. Declarations of Interest

Keith Grainger declared an interest in respect of Items 5 & 7, as the Headteacher of Garth Hill College.

Councillor Dr Barnard declared an interest as a member of the Management Board at the Pupil Referral Unit and as a governor at Garth Hill College.

32. Minutes and Matters Arising

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

33. Membership of the Schools Forum

The Forum received a report regarding a change to the membership of the Forum.

Nominations were recently sought to fill two vacancies for primary school governor representatives on the Forum following the end of the term of office for Tony Reading and there was one other vacancy in this category. One application form was received; from Tony Reading, who was a governor at Sandy Lane Primary School.

In accordance with the Forum's Constitution and as the nomination was uncontested Mr Reading was duly appointed to fill one of the vacancies.

The Forum noted that Mr Reading would be appointed to the Forum for a period of three years until 31 August 2017.

34. Education Capital Programme

The Forum received a report providing an update on the Education Capital Programme.

The Education Capital Programme constituted a significant capital investment into the school estate with multiple projects across all sectors. It was therefore appropriate that the Schools Forum was aware of the Programme and the key projects that came under it.

The value of the school places projects currently funded on the programme was £17.7m. Adding the value of the identified future projects not currently funded, then the overall value of the Education Capital Programme could exceed £100m. There was a further £1.9m available in the current year for school planned maintenance works, £0.6m of Devolved Formula Capital directly managed by schools, £0.3m to assist with the implementation of universal infants free school meals and £0.8m for other projects not directly impacting on schools. In total, the approved capital budget for 2014-15 amounted to £21.3m.

The Forum noted the current status and progress of the projects, which were set out in the main body of the report. Annex 1 provided a summary by financial year. Only those schemes listed in the 2014-15 Current Budget column were approved. All schemes in other columns were subject to Council approval and were on hold.

35. Schools Budget Outturn 2013-14

The Forum received a report informing members of the 2013-14 Schools Budget provisional outturn and which sought members' agreement on the allocation of balances and the use of Earmarked Reserves.

The provisional final accounts for the Schools Budget, as summarised at Annex A, showed a net under spend of £0.495m. This comprised a number of over and under spendings of which the most significant were explained in the body of the report.

The Forum had previously agreed a number of transfers to and from earmarked reserves and these were summarised in Table 1. One new transfer was proposed relating to closing the Family Tree Nursery Reserve and moving the £0.090m balance to the Schools Budget General Reserve. This reflected the likelihood that no further liabilities would arise.

The report concluded that Earmarked Reserves held in the Schools Budget were considered sufficient to meet future know cost pressures together with £0.691m in the General Reserve which was considered adequate to manage unforeseen cost pressures that may arise in-year.

The Forum **NOTED**:

- i. that the outturn expenditure for 2013-14, subject to audit, showed net income of £0.390m which represented a £0.360m under spending (paragraph 5.5);
- ii. that after previously agreed transfers to and from earmarked reserves, the Schools Budget was under spent by £0.495m (paragraph 5.6);
- iii. the main reasons for budget variances (paragraph 5,7);
- iv. the previously agreed year end transfers to and from Earmarked Reserves (paragraphs 5.9 and 5.10);
- v. that the current balances on specific earmarked reserves within the Schools Budget amounted to £5.889m (paragraph 5.8);
- vi. the current balance on the Schools Budget General Reserve of £0.691m (paragraph 5.12);
- vii. the approach to setting a minimum balance for the Schools Budget General Reserve (paragraphs 5.13 to 5.17).

The Forum **AGREED**:

- viii. to close the Family Tree Nursery Reserve and transfer the £0.090m balance into the Schools Budget General Reserve (paragraph 5.11).

36. **School Balances 2013-14**

The Forum received an annual report updating members on the level of balances held by schools as at 31 March 2014 and how these compared to the previous financial year. This showed that there was a £0.135m (2.9%) reduction in aggregate surplus school revenue balances to £4.438m with average surplus balances standing at 6.3% of annual income which was considered more than an adequate level for working balances and that more funds could have been spent by schools on their key priorities. Capital balances reduced by 56% to £0.247m which reflected the lower amounts of funds now being allocated and schools drawing down funds that had been accumulated over a number of years to delivery new projects.

The Forum also reviewed significant surplus school revenue balances, as defined in the approved scheme, and in light of information provided by relevant schools, agreed that all significant surpluses were being held for valid reasons and would not, therefore be subject to claw-back.

In light of the small number of schools that continued to increase their surplus balances, the Forum was asked to consider whether schools should be encouraged to spend more of their budget by making changes to the existing criteria within the claw-back scheme, including removing the clause that excluded schools from the scheme if they lost funding as a result of the April 2013 national funding reforms and whether an absolute cap should be applied to the percentage of budget that could be retained.

The Forum concluded that more information was needed on the claw-back scheme in relation to schools and that a consultation was needed before any amendment could be made to the scheme. Forum members advised caution before making any

changes to the claw-back scheme due to tighter budgets for schools year-on-year, but recognised the need for schools to give reasons for not spending funding.

Forum members were in broad agreement that the clause that excluded schools from the scheme if they lost funding as a result of the April 2013 national funding reforms should be removed and concluded that more information on potential options should be presented at a future meeting when it could be decided if a consultation on potential changes to the scheme should be undertaken with all schools. As well as potential changes to the conditions of the scheme, there would need to be more robust and detailed information provided by schools, including how balances had arisen and explanations as to why they were different from amounts projected in initial budget plans.

Forum members also suggested that schools would welcome support in relation to spending funding, as it was sometimes difficult to monitor budgets in schools on a day-to-day basis and that funding settlements continued to be tight and were expected to remain that way for the foreseeable future.

The Forum **NOTED**:

- i. The level of aggregate surplus revenue balances as at 31 March 2014 totalled £4.438m, a decrease of £0.135m (2.9%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.3 (1));
- ii. That at 6.3% of annual income, average surplus balances were in excess of the amount required for working balances and that more funds could have been spent by schools on their key priorities (paragraph 5.3 (3));
- iii. That significant surplus revenue balances totalled £1.251m, an increase of £0.107m (9.3%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.6);
- iv. The average surplus balance for a primary school is £0.096m (6.4% of budget) and £0.264m (4.3%) for secondaries (paragraph 5.3 (5));
- v. The largest surplus balance as a percentage of budget was 26.9% (was 16.8%) and that there were very limited circumstances where this could be warranted (paragraph 5.3 (6));
- vi. That £0.247m of Devolved Formula Capital grant remained unspent at 31 March 2014, a decrease of £0.196m (56%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.21 (1));
- vii. That relevant schools had indicated that the £0.014m of Devolved Formula Capital grant funding that was due to expire at 31 August 2014 would be fully spent (paragraph 5.21 (5)).

The Forum **AGREED**:

- viii. That all of the qualifying significant surplus balances held by schools would be assigned for relevant purposes as set out in the approved scheme and should not be subject to claw back (paragraph 5.8).
- ix. That the Local Authority would present options to amend the approved claw-back scheme to the next meeting of the Schools Forum to consider whether attempts should be made to reduce the highest levels of surplus balances through encouraging additional spend in relevant schools (paragraph 5.16).

37. **Budget Update 2014-15**

The Forum received a report updating members on the latest position on the 2014-15 budget together with feedback on a number of items that were requested by members at the last meeting.

The level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) income anticipated for 2014-15 had now been confirmed by the DfE with a £0.282m funding reduction on the High Needs Block element of the Schools Budget. In addition, the Forum was aware of an underlying budget pressure on High Needs Pupils which is now estimated at £0.376m. A number of savings had been managed within the Schools Budget which reduced the forecast over spending from these pressures to £0.333m. This forecast was made very early in the financial year and so was subject to change, but the expectation was that the Schools Budget General Reserve would need to be used to fund a significant over spending.

To help alleviate the cost pressure, the Council proposed to develop a 56 place Autistic Spectrum Disorder facility at Eastern Road. This would have benefits for students and reduce costs. The funding model indicated medium term annual savings of around £0.5m, although in the short term, there would be a £0.8m additional cost pressure as the facility moved to full capacity and the number of out of borough places fully reduced.

There were also a number of other budget matters presented to the Forum including proposals for additional financial support to Jennett's Park Primary School, support to small schools experiencing excessive in-year increases in pupil numbers and funding allocations to schools from the High Needs Contingency.

The Forum **NOTED**:

- i. that the amount of DSG funding expected for 2014-15, as confirmed by the Department for Education in April was £76.024m (paragraph 5.2);
- ii. that with the impact of early management actions, there was a forecast over spending on the Schools Budget of £0.333m which in the first instance would need to be financed from the Schools Budget General Reserve (paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9);

The Forum **AGREED**:

- iii. that in order to achieve significant medium term savings, the development of an SEN facility at Eastern Road was a high revenue budget priority (paragraph 5.12);
- iv. that £0.077m of additional financial support was provided to Jennett's Park Primary School in 2014-15 from the school specific contingency (paragraph 5.16);
- v. that as the school was now well established, future top up funding to Jennett's Park Primary Schools should be made on the basis of the per pupil amount from the Funding Formula for Schools for 30 pupils, for the period each new class was open after the funding census has been taken, currently estimated at around £0.049m (paragraph 5.19);

- vi. that changes to the criteria for allocating funds in-year to schools experiencing significant increases in pupil numbers should be presented to all schools as part of the annual financial consultation (paragraph 5.29);
- vii. that a change in the fixed lump sum allocation payable to primary schools should be presented to all schools as part of the annual financial consultation (paragraph 5.29);
- viii. that the original criteria for allocating funds to schools from the SEN Contingency be applied in 2014-15 and that the need for change was reviewed as part of the 2015-16 budget setting process (paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35).

38. **DfE Consultation on Fairer Funding in Schools 2015-16**

The Forum received a report updating members on the Department for Education (DfE) consultation Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16 which presented proposals on how an extra £350m should be allocated to Local Authorities through the Dedicated Schools Grant in 2015-16.

The consultation proposed allocating additional funds to the areas currently receiving the lowest level of funding, aiming to move all Local Authorities to the average funding rates used in School Funding Formulas. Based on 2013-14 data, BFC would receive an additional £1.4m (2.3%) that could be used to fund costs anywhere within the Schools Budget.

The Council's response to the consultation was included at Annex A.

The report also confirmed the intention of the DfE to increase the employer contribution rate to the teachers pension scheme from September 2015 from 14.1% of basic pay to 16.4%. This was estimated to increase costs in schools in a full year by £0.848m.

The Forum **NOTED**:

- i. that based on 2013-14 data, the proposals contained in the DfE consultation Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16 if implemented, would result in an additional £1.4m (2.3%) of funding for the Bracknell Forest Schools Budget (paragraph 5.5);
- ii. the Council's response to the DfE consultation Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16 as attached at Annex A;
- iii. proposals from the DfE to increase the employers contribution to the Teachers Pension Fund from 14.1% to 16.4% of basic pay from September 2015, which was estimated to increase costs in schools by £0.848m in a full year (paragraphs 5.9 and 5.10).

39. **DfE Consultation on Savings to the ESG in 2015-16**

The Forum received an update on the Department for Education (DfE) consultation Savings to the Education Services Grant (ESG) for 2015-16 which sought to gather views on how £200m of savings could be achieved nationally against the services intended to be funded from the ESG in 2015-16 and the potential impact. The likely financial effect from this on BFC was a £0.4m reduction in funding and whilst outside

the Schools Budget, the changes required to be made to achieve the savings would impact on schools.

The Council had reviewed benchmarking data available of the services intended to be funded from the ESG and had concluded that the areas where efforts should be concentrated on were:

- School improvement;
- Asset management;
- Statutory / regulatory duties.

And that the best approach to take to make savings would be through:

- Reducing the scope of services currently being provided without charge to schools;
- Charge schools for a wider range of services;
- A combination of both;
- Charging more costs to capital (subject to accounting code of practice).

The report also presented the consultation response from the Council at Appendix 4.

The Forum **NOTED**:

- i. The proposals from the DfE consultation;
- ii. The anticipated approach to be taken by the Council to achieve the required savings (paragraph 5.36);
- iii. The Council's response to the consultation at Appendix 4.

40. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The Forum noted that the next meetings were scheduled at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House for:

Thursday 18 September 2014
Thursday 16 October 2014
Thursday 27 November 2014
Thursday 15 January 2015
Thursday 12 March 2015
Thursday 23 April 2015

If there was no business to discuss, meetings would be cancelled.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

**TO: SCHOOL FORUM
16 OCTOBER 2014**

**INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT OF SCHOOL FUNDING
Head of Audit and Risk Management**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report the findings of the internal audit review of school funding to the School Forum.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 **To note the significant assurance opinion given on the internal audit report on school funding.**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 To draw the School Forum's attention to the findings of the internal audit review of school funding.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 None.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 School funding arrangements were reviewed in quarter 1 as part of the Annual Internal Audit Plan 2014/15 approved by the Governance and Audit Committee on 1st April 2014. The terms of reference were agreed with the Chief Officer: Strategy, Resources and Early Intervention.
- 5.2 The overall conclusion on the audit was significant assurance, meaning that a sound system of internal controls is in place to meet the system objectives for school funding and testing performed indicated that controls tested are consistently complied with. No recommendations for improvement were raised.
- 5.3 The detailed findings of the audit based on review of documents, discussion and sample testing were as follows.
- There had been robust consultation with the School Forum and all schools in the borough (secondary/primary free schools, maintained schools and academies) on the new school funding arrangements and the final agreed policy has been approved by the Executive Member;
 - There had been clear communication to all schools on the changes to the new school funding arrangements;
 - Funding allocations for each school had been determined using a proforma tool and proforma sheet and had been based on actual pupil numbers. Controls in place within the proforma tool reduce the risk of

data input error, ensuring that only the 12 funding factors in the National Funding Formula can be applied through a drop-down menu and that budgets balance accordingly. The tool also includes a validation tab. Internal audit reviewed a sample of schools and reconciled the 2014/15 indicative budget set for each school against the proforma tool.

- The DfE Statutory Guidelines ensure that a fair and consistent approach is taken and that funding is based on a pupil-led formula. Audit reconciled the proforma against the guidelines issued by the DfE and were able to verify compliance with the National Factors subject to review.
- A control spreadsheet for management checks is maintained and ongoing checks are completed to ensure the data is accurate.
- The School Forum had approved de-delegation of funds for centrally managed services in accordance with DfE requirements; and
- The Education Authority had complied with DfE requirements on maximum permitted lump sums and minimum basic per pupil entitlement and limits on schools contributions to and reimbursements under the Minimum Funding Guarantee had been correctly applied.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 Nothing to add.

Borough Treasurer

6.2 Nothing to add.

Equalities Impact Assessment

6.3 Not applicable

Strategic Risk Management Issues

6.4 Erroneous allocation of funding which does not accurately reflect pupil numbers and is inconsistent with the nationally agreed funding factors would potentially increase financial risks for individual schools. The audit has established that there is a sound control environment in place for the determining school funding.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Internal Audit Plan 2014/15

Unrestricted

Contact for further information

Sally Hendrick –Head of Audit and Risk Management - 01344 352092

Sally.hendrick@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 16 OCTOBER 2014

**THE SCHOOLS BUDGET – 2014-15 BUDGET MONITORING
AND OTHER FINANCIAL MATTERS
(Director of Children, Young People and Learning)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Schools Forum to receive an update on the 2014-15 forecast budget monitoring position for the Schools Budget, to be aware of key issues and management actions being taken.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Forum NOTES:

- 2.1 The budget virements processed to date (paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4);
- 2.2 the budget variances being forecast on the 2014-15 Schools Budget that in total aggregate to a net over spending of £0.762m, (paragraph 5.10);
- 2.3 that insufficient accumulated balances are available to cover the estimated over spending and that a deficit of £0.071m is forecast to be carried forward into 2015-16 and will need to be financed from new year grant income (paragraph 5.10);
- 2.4 the likelihood that at least £1m of the £1.5m additional funds from the *Fairer Funding for Schools in 2015-16* initiative will need to be used to finance increased costs supporting High Needs pupils rather than going into delegated school budgets (paragraph 5.16).

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is appropriate for the Schools Forum to be aware of, and where relevant, comment on these financial matters.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Where relevant, these are set out in the supporting information.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

2014-15 Monitoring of the Schools Budget

Approved budget

- 5.1 A report was presented to the July meeting of the Forum that confirmed current funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) at £76.024m. To this can be added

Unrestricted

other grant income of £8.563m from the Education Funding Agency that is made available to fund sixth forms, the Pupil Premium, PE and Sports activities and the Universal Infant Free School Meals initiative. There is also £0.031m of general income. Therefore, in total, £84.716m is available fund expenditure within the School Budget.

- 5.2 In approving the budget for 2014-15, the Forum also agreed the draw down of funds from Earmarked Reserves to add to expenditure budgets as follows:
- a) £0.168m from the Job Evaluation Reserve to fund the cost to schools arising from the Bracknell Forest Supplement i.e. the Living Wage;
 - b) £0.259m of unspent 2013-14 Early Years funds to continue the roll out of the free entitlement to early years childcare to the most deprived 2 year olds.
- 5.3 There have also been 2 budget adjustments relating to transferring DSG grant funding to capital projects, which results in a reduction in expenditure budgets as follows:
- c) £0.016m from Kennel Lane Special School as a contribution to the recent school refurbishment project;
 - d) £0.265m from Early Years revenue budgets to contribute to the financing of capital works which will increase the number of places available for Early Years providers of the free entitlement and increase the supply of places to meet anticipated demand.
- 5.4 Finally, there has been a further adjustment to the Early Years Block DSG allocation as follows:
- e) £0.098m increase in funding following revised calculation by the DfE that uses January 2014 census data rather than January 2013. Early Years budgets have been increased accordingly to meet additional costs incurred, resulting in a net nil change in overall budget.
- 5.5 The budget changes set out in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 aggregate to a £0.146m net increase in funds. To ensure budgets correctly reflect anticipated spending requirements, adjustments will be made to the areas of the accounts that these changes relate to.
- 5.6 Annex 1 sets out the resultant budgets, with notes a) to e) above referenced in the relevant budget lines where changes have been made in the accounts.

Forecast budget variances

- 5.7 As part of the Council's Financial Regulations, the Schools Budget is subject to monthly budget monitoring. This involves forecasting likely expenditure and income through to the end of the year, identification of reasons for variations against original budgets, and where relevant, setting out options for management action. This process allows for a forecast year end level of balances to be calculated.
- 5.8 It is appropriate for the Forum to be aware of the current forecast year end balance as this may need to be taken into account when the 2015-16 budget is agreed. It is likely that a number of variances identified this year will be on-going and will therefore need to be addressed in next year's budget.

- 5.9 The budget update report presented to the Forum in July indicated a net forecast year end over spending of £0.333m. This mainly related to reduced DSG funding for High Needs Pupils (£0.282m), forecast in-year over spending on provisions for High Needs Pupils (£0.376m – see Annex 2 for breakdown) with a range of managed savings and other budget under spendings that reduced the net over spend forecast for the whole Schools Budget to £0.333m.
- 5.10 Provisional budget monitoring information available at the end of August indicates that the Schools Budget will now over spend by £0.762m this year, with the vast majority of increased spend accounted for against High Needs pupils. This forecast variance comprises an over spend of £1.719m against approved budget allocations and net under spendings of £0.957m. There is a maximum of £0.691m of unallocated surplus funds to apply to fund this forecast cost, meaning there will be a projected £0.071m deficit carried into 2015-16 that will need to be financed from new year income.

Explanations of the significant changes anticipated from the current budget plan are set out below, with Annex 1 showing the overall Schools Budget at a summary level.

Schools Block: Delegated and devolved funding:

- i. **Delegated School Budgets - £0.024m under spend.** The Schools Budget has allocated £0.1m to fund a contingency to support schools with a disproportionate numbers of high needs pupils. Applying the approved eligibility criteria results in £0.076m being allocated to schools and a £0.024m under spending.
- ii. **Other grants - £0.130m under spend.** There is additional income from the Education Funding Agency to support post 16 pupils at Kennel Lane Special school (KLS) of £0.130m which reflects the full year effect of the new grant received for the first time in 2013-14 academic year.

Other Schools Block:

- iii. **Pupil behaviour - £0.018m under spend.** The saving is forecast against staffing where a small number of vacancies have occurred.
- iv. **School staff absence and other items - £0.075m under spend.** The most significant element of the forecast under spending relates to a forecast £0.060m saving on the Early Years contingency. Based on actual head count data from April, only £0.04m of the £0.1m provision for in-year growth in take-up is expected to be required. There is also a £0.02m anticipated saving on school staff maternity leave absence cover, with a £0.015m over spend expected on centralised copyright fees where the DfE has negotiated a discounted rate for all schools in England, the scope of which has been extended with a consequential cost increase.
- v. **Support to schools in financial difficulty - £0.100m under spend.** There is no clear indication of spend against this £0.283m budget, with only two school having contacted the Council requesting additional support, of which £0.010m has been approved by the Director under delegated powers set out in the policy agreed by the Forum. Further financial support is expected to be required to schools in danger of entering or just exiting Ofsted categories although precise amounts are unclear at this stage. This can be a volatile budget.

High Needs Block:

- vi. **SEN provisions and support services – £1.093m over spend.** There are two significant factors in the forecast over spending; the £0.282m reduction in High Needs DSG funding from the 2013-14 level, which has previously been reported to the Forum; and a £0.949m forecast over spending on external placements, where student numbers have increased by 22 from 174 to 196.

Taking account of new starters and leavers, this equates to having to pay for 136 full time equivalent all year round students rather than 115. At an average cost of placement of around £0.042m, the additional student numbers account for the increased spend.

In terms of the student profile, post 16 placements have increased by 19 and therefore represent the major factor in cost increase. This is attributed to the raising in age of participation, the wider and more appropriate range of courses being provided and a high number of students moving from relatively low cost maintain school provision to higher cost out of borough placements. In terms of the category of primary need of students, there continues to be a significant increase in both those with Autistic Spectrum Disorders – up 8 to 48 – and Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties – up 7 to 41.

Making in-roads against the cost increase will be a challenge and take time.

The key actions taken to date include:

- reviewing all education placements on a case by case basis, ensuring the educational provision is appropriate whilst actively working with partners to develop supported work placements for young people who are able to move on;
 - more rigorous negotiation with other agencies, such as Health and Social Care, to make a larger contribution to the costs for students they support;
 - more stringent commissioning processes;
 - developing a business case for the EFA for a higher level of funding which reflects the growth in demands;
 - developing plans to increase the availability of high needs places in local maintained schools;
 - managed savings of £0.138m against other provisions and SEN support services;
 - Examining the scope to make savings on budgets outside the High Needs Block.
- vii. **Education out of school - £0.038m over spend.** The main forecast variances relate to a £0.01m over spend on the cost of home tuition through increased demand and £0.021m as a share of funding the salary of the Head of Targeted Services.

Early Years Block:

- viii. **Early Years provisions and support services - £0.035m over spend.** The additional spend relates to staffing where the assumed vacancy factor is not expected to be achieved..

Dedicated Schools Grant:

- ix. **Dedicated Schools Grant - £0.057m under spend.** The DfE recalculate the Early Years DSG block based on actual participation rates each January. The January 2014 census indicated extra take-up with DSG increased by £0.057m. This was confirmed after the 2013-14 accounts had closed and is therefore additional, one-off income for 2014-15.

Anticipated impact in 2015-16

- 5.11 As set out above, there are insufficient funds in the Schools Block General Reserve to fully fund the forecast over spending, meaning it is likely that a deficit will be carried forward which will need to be recovered as part of the 2015-16 budget setting process. Members of the Forum will also recall that the Borough Treasurer considers that the Schools Budget should hold a minimum surplus of £0.51m to help manage unforeseen cost increases like those currently being experienced. Meeting this objective will also need to be considered as part of the 2015-16 budget setting process.

- 5.12 At this stage it is anticipated that a significant underlying over spending on supporting High Needs pupils will be carried forward into 2015-16. Whilst the DfE has indicated that a small amount of growth will be available in next year's High Needs Block DSG, there is uncertainty as to how this will filter through to individual LAs as demand for places will be funded first i.e. the £10,000 for elements 1 and 2, and this information is not available to the Council. On this basis, the initial planning assumption is that there will be a cash standstill for High Needs DSG income.
- 5.13 Costs will continue to be reviewed and monitored to obtain best value for money and there is an expectation that some improvement in financial performance will be achieved. Work is also underway to more accurately assess the likely full year effect cost of current and future anticipated placements as this may increase costs further.
- 5.14 As previously reported, the most significant impact on reducing spend on high needs pupils would be to increase the number of available places in maintained provision. The Council is seeking to achieve this by developing a 56 place Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) pupil facility by converting the existing vacant building on Eastern Road through use of DfE capital grants.
- 5.15 Provisional calculations of revenue running costs for the facility indicate that once fully open, the facility could generate annual savings on placements of over £0.5m. However, it is unlikely that many pupils can be moved immediately from their current placements, meaning it will take up to 6 years for the facility to be fully open and payments to external providers to have fully reduced. During the short term, with relatively low numbers of pupils on roll, and ongoing payments being made to external providers, there will be a net additional cost which is estimated to aggregate to £0.8m in the first 3 years after opening. This will need to be managed within the Schools Budget until such time as annual savings exceed costs and options are currently being considered. On the basis of the potential for significant future savings, the Forum agreed that the development of this facility is a high priority when setting future revenue budgets and the business plan and funding options will be reported to the Forum when budget decisions are taken.
- 5.16 The size of potential over spend on High Needs pupils next year means that the budget pressures can not be managed exclusively from within the £11.588m High Needs Block DSG. A wider range of funds will need to be used. In all likelihood, this means that a significant share of the £1.5m additional funding due next year under the *Fairer Funding for Schools in 2015-16* initiative will need to be diverted from schools to pay the costs of supporting High Needs pupils outside the mainstream sector. It is expected that at least £1m of the growth will be needed for this purpose, and the October Financial Consultation with Schools seeking views on prioritising the distribution includes only £0.5m of potential additional resources.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions have been considered within the main body of the report.

Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information.

Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 There are no specific impacts arising from this report.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 There is a significant risk that the cost of supporting High Needs pupils will exceed available income in 2015-16. The impact from this is expected to be mitigated by using accumulated surplus funds held in the Schools Budget General Reserve and the new money being made available through the *Fairer Schools Funding for 2015-16* initiative.

7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Not applicable.

Background Papers

Provisional August budget monitoring report

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI

01344 354061)

David.Watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance

(01344 354054)

<mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk>

Doc. Ref

G:\Executive\Schools Forum\68) 180914\2014-15 Schools Budget Monitoring etc.doc

**2014-15 PROVISIONAL BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT FOR THE
SCHOOLS BUDGET AS AT THE END OF AUGUST 2014**

	Approved Budget			Note	Estimated Variance			Note
	Expenditure	Income	Net		Under spending	Over spending	Net variance	
	£000	£000	£000		£000	£000	£000	
<u>Delegated and devolved funding</u>								
Delegated School Budgets	65,762	0	65,762	a, d	-24	0	-24	i
Other School Grants	4,042	-8,563	-4,521		-130	0	-130	ii
	69,804	-8,563	61,241		-154	0	-154	
<u>LEA managed items</u>								
Schools Block								
Pupil behaviour	335	-7	328		-24	6	-18	iii
School staff absence and other items	1,360	-19	1,341		-110	35	-75	iv
Combined Service Budgets	690	0	690		0	0	0	
Support to schools in financial difficulty	285	0	285		-100	0	-100	v
High Needs Block								
SEN provisions and support services	7,476	-2	7,474		-506	1,599	1,093	vi
Education out of school	1,083	-3	1,080	b, c	-6	44	38	vii
Early Years Block								
Early Years provisions and support services	3,829	0	3,829		0	35	35	viii
	15,058	-31	15,027		-746	1,719	973	
Dedicated Schools Grant	0	-76,122	-76,122	e	-57	0	-57	ix
TOTAL - Schools Budget	84,862	-84,716	146		-957	1,719	762	
Unallocated balance at 1 April 2014							-691	
Net over spend forecast for 31 March 2015							71	

High Needs Block Budgets

Budget Item	2013-14 Actual Budget £	2014-15 expected change at March £	2014-15 expected change at July
Element 3 top-up payments. For pupils where assessed needs exceed the £6,000 cost of support threshold set by the DfE:			
BFC maintained schools and academy.	£651,720	£91,000	£129,000
Non-BFC maintained schools	£950,000	£2,000	£2,000
Kennel Lane Special School *	£1,213,650	£23,000	£0
PVI providers	£4,250,000	£-90,000	£-500,000
FE colleges	£315,000	£173,000	£659,000
Elements 1 and 2 for specialist places – For block purchase of places in BFC maintained specialist providers, at the £10,000 per place:			
Kennel Lane Special School	£1,850,000	£0	£0
BFC maintained schools	£292,000	£-32,000	£-32,000
BFC academy **	£50,000	£-50,000	£-50,000
Education out of school:			
College Hall Pupil referral Unit	£711,490	£0	£0
Home Tuition	£252,160	£20,000	£29,000
Family Outreach Work	£99,130	£0	£0
Other support to high needs pupils:			
Teaching and Support Services	£704,350	£0	£0
Sensory Impairment Service	£226,470	£0	£0
Autism Support Service	£84,000	£25,000	£25,000
Traveller Education	£75,140	£0	£0
Other, e.g. specialist equipment, medical support etc	£146,010	£32,000	£64,000
Targeted Services – agreed at Forum September 2013	-	-	£50,000
To purchase of 15 unfunded Element 2 places	-	£90,000	£0
Change in DSG	-	£-11,000	£0
Sub total	£11,871,120	£273,000	£376,000
Remove non-DSG budget items:			
KLS funding from Job Evaluation Reserve		£-23,000	-
Add back estimated increase in DSG income		£11,000	-
Total High Needs Block Budget	£11,871,120	£261,000	£376,000

* £0.023m to be released from the Job Evaluation Reserve to fund the estimated impact from adopting the equivalent of the Living Wage at Kennel Lane Special School.

** From September 2013, EFA became responsible for funding places in academy schools.

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE 16 OCTOBER 2014

OUTCOMES FROM THE SEPTEMBER FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS (Director of Children, Young People and Learning)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report summarises the results of the September Financial Consultation exercise with governing bodies and other interested parties. It reports on schools' views regarding the questions raised and is intended to assist the Schools Forum in making recommendations in respect of the funding framework to be in place for 2015-16.
- 1.2 Decisions taken at this time will be used in the data return required by the Department for Education (DfE) by 31 October to monitor progress against the funding reforms.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

To NOTE:

- 2.1 **The outcomes from the financial consultation with schools as summarised in Annex 2 and the specific comments from schools at confidential Annex 3;**

To AGREE:

- 2.2 **In the absence of a significant majority view from schools, the criteria to be used to allocate funds to schools with a disproportionate number of High Needs pupils (paragraph 5.18);**

To AGREE that the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Learning be recommended to approve:

- 2.3 **The Forum's recommended criteria to be used to allocate funds to schools with a disproportionate number of High Needs pupils (paragraph 2.2);**
- 2.4 **The proposed changes set out in the boxes in paragraphs 5.19 to 5.21.**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 To enable the views of schools to be taken into account when considering the funding framework to be put in place for 2015-16.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 These were included on the consultation document.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

- 5.1 As part of the education funding reforms, each year the DfE issues operation guidance to Local Authorities (LAs) in respect of the funding framework for schools. This is supported by statutory regulations and is used to set out the arrangements that LAs must put in place for school funding and also defines those parts of the framework where there is flexibility to make local decisions.
- 5.2 The DfE monitors each LAs progress against the funding reforms and requires two data returns. The first is required by 31 October, and must confirm which elements of the funding framework will be used, such as which factors will be used in the Funding Formula and the criteria to be applied in the allocation of any centrally managed contingency budgets, with the second due by 20 January 2015 to confirm actual units of resource to be used in calculating individual school budgets.
- 5.3 For the 2015-16 financial year, there have been some relatively minor updates to mandatory provisions, none of which are relevant to BFC, plus some enhanced and extended illustrations of how some of the discretionary elements of the funding framework can operate. So whilst there are no specific issues that need to be addressed through the updated regulatory framework put in place by the DfE, previous reports to the Forum and the resultant discussions by members have highlighted the need to consider making changes to some of the discretionary elements of school funding.

Financial consultations with schools

Process

- 5.4 The Council undertakes financial consultations with schools to gather views on how changes to the education funding framework should be implemented locally. This ensures that relevant decisions of the Schools Forum and Executive Member are taken in the full knowledge of the wishes of schools.
- 5.5 An initial consultation was undertaken with schools in September of which the broad areas where comments were sought related to:
1. should schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils receive additional funding, and if so, how should it be allocated;
 2. should changes should be made to the criteria used to allocate in-year budget additions to schools with significant increases in pupil numbers;
 3. should changes should be made to the way primary schools are funded, with the objective of allocating a larger proportion of funds to schools with less than 2 forms of entry.

As set out above, all of these issues have recently been discussed by the Forum and identified as areas where a change to current arrangements may be desirable.

- 5.6 A range of alternative options were identified for each issue for schools to consider, with attached annexes showing the potential financial effect of each option, by school, based on 2014-15 data, which is subject to change once 2015-16 data becomes available.

- 5.7 Due to the small number of questions posed, there was a 4 week consultation period with responses requested by 3 October. This date allows sufficient time for their consideration by the Schools Forum and Executive Member before the DfE 31 October 2014 deadline.
- 5.8 Taking account of views received from schools last year, where limited change was supported, and to allow for a period of funding stability, no further changes were proposed to the Funding Formula for Schools.
- 5.9 Verbal briefings on the consultation were provided throughout September; for chairs of governors (25 September), headteachers (25 September), bursars (18 September) and clerks to governors (16 September).
- 5.10 The consultation document is set out in full at Annex 1.
- 5.11 A second consultation is currently underway with a response deadline of 5 November with feedback to the Forum at its next meeting on 27 November. This concentrates on budget matters where all decisions of this nature need to be confirmed to the DfE by 20 January 2015. This is seeking views on prioritising the use of the additional resources that will be available next financial year as a result of the outcomes of the DfE consultation on *Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16* that were reported to the Forum in July. Views will also be sought on continuation of de-delegation i.e. on-going central management by the Council of Behaviour Support, anti-bullying, SIMS and CLEAPSS licence fees, official staff absence, such as maternity leave, support to EAL, support to schools in financial difficulty and FSM eligibility checking.
- 5.12 This second consultation also includes proposals in respect of an update to the scheme to claw-back significant surplus school balances with the intention of encouraging schools with the highest proportion of surplus balances to spend more of their annual income.
- 5.13 A two staged approach to consultation is necessary to allow sufficient time for schools to properly consider all the issues whilst at the same time meeting DfE deadlines in respect of local school funding arrangements and complying with local decision making protocols.

Summary of responses to the September consultation

- 5.14 By the publication date for this report, a response had been received from 29 out of 37 schools (78% response rate). A response sheet has been received from 24 primary schools (77%) and 5 secondary schools (83%).
- 5.15 The questions are set out below and responses summarised. Recommendations for change, where relevant, have also been added in boxes. Where questions have been specific to one phase of education, then only responses from relevant schools have been reported.
- 5.16 Due to the nature of some questions, where views were sought on a range of different options, there is not always a clear majority view on the way forward. Whilst all schools were requested to provide a view on all options, a number have understandably only responded against issues that directly relate to them.

Detailed responses

- 5.17 A detailed summary of responses can be found at Annex 2, with restricted Annex 3 listing all the specific comments received.

SEN specific contingency

- 5.18 **Question 1**
In respect of an SEN specific contingency, which Option do you support?

Four options for change - A to D - were presented to schools to consider, each aimed at focussing funds to a minority of schools to help meet the first £6,000 of support needs that schools are responsible for.

The rationale of the contingency is that the normal operation of the simplified Funding Formula does not adequately resource schools for all costs when there is a high concentration of high needs pupils. Each option looked at the number of high needs pupils on roll as the qualifying criteria, but applies different thresholds and measures. A fifth option (E) of not maintaining an SEN contingency was also included for consideration.

Responses from schools did not provide a very clear majority preference. The options and the levels of support are set out below. **The Forum is requested to consider this option and agree which option is adopted.**

- Option A:** No change. Allocate funds to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs pupils and highest proportion of High Needs top-up funding using fixed funding thresholds. Supported by 7 schools – 24%.
- Option B:** Allocate funds only to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs Pupils, varying thresholds each year to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying. Supported by 7 schools – 24%.
- Option C:** Allocate funds to schools with High Needs pupils in excess of one in every 75 pupils on roll in a primary school and one in every 50 pupils on roll in a secondary school. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying. Supported by 6 schools – 21%.
- Option D:** Allocate funds to schools which have the largest difference between their amount of notional SEN funding provided through the Funding Formula and the maximum amount of additional support they are expected to need to finance i.e. £6,000 X the number of high needs pupils. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying. Supported by 5 schools – 17%.
- Option E:** Do not maintain an SEN specific contingency and allocate the budget to an alternative priority. Supported by 4 schools – 14%.

<p>Due to there being no clear preference from schools, the Forum is requested to agree which option should be adopted to support schools with a disproportionate number of High Needs pupils.</p>
--

Significant in-year increases in pupil numbers contingency

This part of the consultation has two questions; the first to seek views on whether different sized schools need different thresholds to trigger additional resources; and the second to see if it is agreed that different sized schools will have different funding thresholds, whether there also be different amounts of top-up funding?

The funding for this contingency is “top-sliced” from the overall budget available for delegated school budgets. The more money included in the contingency, the less available to go into actual budget allocations.

5.19 **Question 2**

What do you consider to be the maximum number of in-year admissions that most schools could accommodate before facing a significant cost increase?

This question was included in response to comments from the Schools Forum as to whether the criteria used to fund schools properly reflects the circumstances of smaller schools. In particular the existing requirement to admit 20 additional pupils before funds are allocated as no schools with less than 2 forms of entry have ever reached this level but could nonetheless admit a significant number of pupils relative to their total roll.

The rationale for the contingency is that schools are funded on prior year October pupil numbers but can have higher numbers at the start of the new academic year that have cost implications. Where these are significant, currently measured as when having to open a new class and employ a teacher, schools should receive extra resources, hence the 20 threshold detailed above.

The consultation sought responses to this question on 4 different school sizes – less than 2 FE, 2 FE, 3 FE, 4FE or above – and 4 options for the threshold to be set at for number of in-year admissions – 10 to 15, 16 to 20, 21 to 25 and “other”.

In terms of the number of in-year admissions that schools could reasonably expect to admit before incurring significant cost increases, the most popular responses were as follows: for less than 2 FE schools 10-15 (68% of respondents), for 2 FE schools 16-20 (46%), for 3 FE schools 21-25 (33%) and for 4 FE and above schools 21-25 (35%).

To maintain affordability to the levels preferred by schools, funding thresholds are proposed to be set at the highest number in each range. The exception to this being for schools with less than 2 FE, where only one school would qualify for funding in 2013-14 if the threshold had been set at 15. Using 10 would have meant 3 schools qualified.

The Forum is recommended to agree the most popular response from the consultation for funding thresholds for in-year admissions, and with the exception of less than 2 FE schools, to adopt the highest number in the suggested bandings for each school size as follows:

- less than 2 FE schools = 10
- 2 FE schools = 20
- 3 FE schools = 25
- 4 FE and above schools = 25

5.20 **Question 3**

In terms of funding allocations, should the amount be the same for all sizes of school at the cost of a teacher, currently £23,390, or should there be differential funding rates?

In considering whether different sized schools should be able to absorb different numbers of in-year pupil admissions before facing a significant cost increase, it follows that in most instances, significant cost increases will also vary according to school size.

The consultation sought responses to this question on the same 4 different school sizes listed above at question 2 above – i.e. less than 2 FE, 2 FE, 3 FE, 4FE or above – and 4 options for the unit of resource – 25%, 50% or 75% of the standard £23,390 or use the standard £23,390.

The majority of responses from schools have supported funding all school sizes at the most generous rate – between 80% and 91% for all 4 options - the cost of employing a teacher at the start of the new academic year. However, at the lowest proposed funding threshold of 10 in-year admissions, it is extremely unlikely that in such instances a school would need to open a new class and employ a new teacher. It is therefore difficult to justify the standard funding rate based on the actual likely cost increase.

For reasons of affordability, and to fund schools for likely cost increases, the Forum is recommended to support a funding rate at 50% of the standard for a growth allowances paid to schools with less than 2 FE at the 10 threshold, with all other funding rates set at the standard amount of £23,390 which is sufficient to cover the cost of employing a teacher.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree the following funding rates for schools experiencing excessive in-year admissions:

- less than 2 FE schools = £11,695 (50% the standard rate)
- 2 FE schools = £23,390 (the standard rate)
- 3 FE schools = £23,390 (the standard rate)
- 4 FE and above schools = £23,390 (the standard rate)

Increasing the value of the primary school fixed lump sum payment

This part of the consultation was added in response to discussions at the Forum where it was suggested that smaller schools tend to experience financial difficulties to a greater extent than larger schools, as evidenced through levels of surplus school balances and requests for assistance from the LA in balancing budgets.

The limited flexibility now available for local discretion in the distribution of funds to schools means that the most effective way of increasing the budgets of smaller schools would be to maximise allocations through the fixed lump sum factor which pays the same cash value to each school, irrespective of size. Assuming such a change would be made on a cost neutral basis, there would need to be a corresponding reduction in the amount of funds distributed by pupil numbers.

5.21 **Question 4 – Primary Schools only**
What value do you believe the fixed lump sum payment to Primary Schools should be set at; £150,000 i.e. the current rate, £160,000 or £170,000 i.e. the maximum amount permitted by the DfE?

Responses from primary schools indicate support for no change to the current £150,000 amount – 10 schools 43%

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that the primary school fixed lump sum payment remains at £150,000.

5.22 **Question 5**
Are there any areas of concern arising from the April 2013 changes or other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?

Responses were received from 12 schools with the following general items identified:

- A key factor on cost increases from in-year admissions is the spread of age ranges and whether they can be accommodated in existing classes and not always an absolute figure
- Concerns about the impact of the Universal Free Infant School Meal and the adverse impact this could have on maximising Pupil Premium income
- Insufficient capital resources being provided to support the Universal Free Infant School Meal initiative
- Concerns about being able to fully fund the cost of supporting SEN pupils
- Concern that the BF Funding Formula does not result in a fair distribution of funds
- Changes should be made to the criteria applied in the scheme to claw back significant surplus balances from schools.

Next steps

5.23 There was a very good response rate from schools to the finance consultation (78%). On most issues there is a clear majority response from schools, which in general the Forum is now being asked to agree. Decisions taken at this meeting will form the basis of recommendations for change to be agreed by the Executive Member, who under the Council's constitution has responsibility for school budget matters. The mandatory data return to the DfE will then be submitted in advance of 31 October deadline.

5.24 In order to gather more information, decisions on a number of budget matters are currently being gathered through a second consultation with schools, the outcomes of which will be reported to the Forum next month.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of the report.

Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The Borough Treasurer is satisfied that no significant financial implications arise from this report. Decisions around the 2015-16 budget will be taken in January 2015 and will need to take account of the financial settlement provided by the DfE and data from the October 2014 school census.

Impact Assessment

- 6.2 Not applicable at this stage.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.3 No significant risk management issues arise at this time.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 All schools.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Meetings and 4 week formal consultation.

Representations Received

- 7.3 Included in the report.

Background Papers

Various supporting documents, including the consultation papers.

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI (01344 354061)

david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance (01344 354054)

paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

G:\Executive\Schools Forum\68) 180914\Outcomes from the financial consultation - 2014 v2.doc



Children, Young People
and Learning
Department

RESPONDING TO DfE REFORM OF SCHOOL FUNDING

A CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS FOR POTENTIAL CHANGES FROM APRIL 2015

SEPTEMBER 2014

List of Contents

Item	Page
Introduction	1
Bracknell Forest approach to the reforms	2
Changes to be considered for April 2015:	
- Updated DfE Operational Guidance on SEN Contingency Funding	2
- Option A: Continue with the existing BF methodology	4
- Option B: Amend the existing BF methodology	4
- Option C: Allocate funds to schools with Numbers of High Needs pupils above a calculated ratio	4
- Option D: Allocate funds to schools with the largest difference between notional SEN funding in the Funding Formula allocation and the expected cost of supplying High Needs pupils	5
- Option E: Do not maintain an SEN specific contingency	5
- Summary of SEN contingency options	5
- Matter raised by the BF Schools Forum	6
- Funding threshold for schools experiencing significant in-year increases in pupil numbers	7
- Increasing the value of the primary school fixed lump sum allocation	8
Any other comments from schools on Education funding?	9
Next Steps	9
- Results of this consultation	9
- Further consultation in October	9
Information sessions	10
Responses	10
Who should respond to this consultation?	10
Contact for queries	10

List of Appendices

Ref	Item	Page
1	Outline of the School Funding Framework	11
2	Allowable Factors for LA Funding Formulas – April 2015	14
	<u>Potential Financial Impact from an SEN contingency:</u>	
3	- Option A: Continue with the existing BF methodology	15
4	- Option B: Amend the existing BF methodology	16
5	- Option C: Allocate funds to schools with numbers of High Needs pupils above a calculated ratio	17
6	- Option D: Allocate funds to schools with the largest difference between notional SEN funding in the Funding Formula allocation and the expected cost of supplying High Needs pupils	18
7	Summary of Options A to D	19
8	Criteria for in-year budget allocations to schools experiencing significant growth in pupil numbers	20
9	Potential financial impact from increasing the value of the primary school fixed lump sum payment	21

Introduction

1. The purpose of this consultation is to gather views from **primary and secondary** schools and other interested parties on a small number of potential changes to school funding arrangements in Bracknell Forest (BF). Whilst there are no specific issues that need to be addressed through the updated regulatory framework put in place by the Department for Education (DfE), the BF Schools Forum is considering the possibility of making changes to some of the discretionary elements of school funding and is therefore interested to hear from schools on the following matters:
 1. whether schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils should continue to receive additional funding, and if so, how this should be allocated;
 2. whether changes should be made to the criteria used to allocate in-year budget additions to schools with significant increases in pupil numbers;
 3. whether changes should be made to the way primary schools are funded, with the objective of allocating a larger proportion of funds to schools with less than 2 forms of entry.

Any changes required to the discretionary elements of school funding must be approved by the DfE before they can be implemented.

2. There are a small number of questions on this consultation with views being sought now as we need to confirm to the DfE no later than 31 October 2014 which elements of the funding framework we intend to use in 2015-16.
3. There is a 4 week consultation period which reflects the small number of questions and the need for the BF Schools Forum to consider responses before making final decisions. **Responses are therefore requested by 3 October 2014.**
4. A second consultation will be undertaken with schools in October relating to prioritising the use of £1.5m of additional resources that are expected to be available next financial year as a result of the outcomes of the DfE consultation on *Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16*. All budget decisions of this nature need to be confirmed to the DfE by 20 January 2015 and will be considered by the BF Schools Forum in November.
5. Schools were informed by email of the potential beneficial impact from the *Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16* proposals in April 2014. This was followed up with a link to the detailed briefing paper presented to the BF Schools Forum on this on 17 July which can be accessed below:

<http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/documents/s76316/9%20-%20DfE%20consultation%20on%20Fairer%20Schools%20Funding%20in%202015-16.pdf>
6. The October consultation may also bring forward proposals in respect of an update to the scheme to claw-back significant surplus school balances, which schools will be asked to comment on in advance of any decision making.
7. This two staged approach to decision making is necessary to allow sufficient time for schools to properly consider all the issues whilst at the same time meeting DfE deadlines in respect of confirming our local school funding arrangements for 2015-16.

Bracknell Forest approach to the reforms

8. Arrangements regarding education funding in BF have been well established on the basis of a partnership with schools and the Schools Forum. Whilst funding decisions on school budgets remain the responsibility of the council, they have always been taken on the basis of recommendations from the Schools Forum which follows consideration of the views gathered from schools through these annual financial consultations.

Changes to be considered for April 2015

Updated DfE Operational Guidance on SEN Contingency Funding

9. Each year the DfE issues operation guidance to LAs in respect of the funding framework for schools. This is supported by statutory regulations and is used to set out the arrangements that LAs must put in place for school funding and also defines those parts of the framework where there is flexibility to make local decisions which the DfE monitor and must approve before they can be implemented. There have been some relatively minor updates for 2015-16 plus some enhanced and extended illustrations of how some of the discretionary elements of the funding framework can operate.

Appendix 1 provides an outline of the school funding framework with Appendix 2 showing the allowable factors in a School Funding Formula.

10. In light of this improved information, the Schools Forum is interested to gather views from schools on the way BF allocates top up funding to schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils i.e. those pupils with assessed support needs greater than the £6,000 funding threshold set by the DfE.
11. The BF Funding Formula uses low prior attainment data as the main proxy for SEN but this will not always provide sufficient resources to schools with a disproportionate number of High Needs pupils. Funding Regulations therefore allow LAs to provide additional resources to schools outside the main funding formula on a consistent and fair basis where the number of high needs pupils cannot be reflected adequately in the funding formula and it would be unreasonable to expect them to pay the costs of the first £6,000 of additional support.
12. The purpose of such funds is therefore to target resources to schools with the greatest proportion of high cost pupils. Being a targeted fund, the expectation of the DfE is that additional funds are targeted to a “minority of schools”.
13. Following last year’s consultation, the Schools Forum agreed that £100,000 of Schools Block Dedicated Schools Grant income should be used to create a new SEN specific contingency to provide additional financial support to schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils. Funding of £1,100 per high needs pupil would be allocated once the following qualifying criteria is met:
 - Where the proportion of pupils on roll classified as high need exceeds 4% of total pupil numbers in a primary school and 2% in a secondary school, and
 - Where the proportion that top up funding paid to support High Needs pupils compared to the total budget allocated via the BF Funding Formula exceeds 2% in a primary school and 1% in a secondary school

14. These funding thresholds were set on high needs pupil data as at October 2012 which would have resulted in 2 primary schools (total of 22 pupils) and 3 secondary schools (total of 70 pupils) receiving funding top ups.
15. Moving to the October 2013 census, 3 secondary schools (total of 67 pupils) triggered additional funding allocations, but there are no qualifying primary schools. The Schools Forum is now interested to learn views from schools as to whether the funding methodology should be amended to ensure that the initial expectations are met and that funding is allocated evenly across primary and secondary schools. Once it has been agreed, the DfE regulatory framework does not allow LAs to make in-year changes to funding criteria.
16. The examples of other LA funding mechanisms now available from the DfE illustrate that funding is generally targeted to schools on the basis of the percentage of high needs pupils on roll or where high needs pupils exceed a specified ratio of pupils on roll.
17. 4 different options to allocate funds have been included in this consultation for schools to consider. There is no requirement to maintain an SEN specific contingency, and this is Option 5.
18. Options A and B are based on the current BF methodology and link additional funding allocations to schools with the highest proportion of pupils with support needs above £6,000. Option C funds schools where they have a ratio of high needs pupils greater than 1 : 75 in primary with 1 : 50 in secondary, with Option D looking more generally at the overall cash amount of notional SEN funding in a school's Funding Formula allocation in relation to the actual number of high needs pupils and therefore the cost of support expected to be incurred.
19. The funding thresholds and ratios in each of the options have been set to best fit the BF profile and may need to be amended over time if the profile changes. The basic principle on new options is to ensure that around half of the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools and to maintain appropriate targeting, limit top up funding to no more than half of schools.
20. To help assess the potential financial impact of the changes, exemplifications at individual school level are included as appendices. These illustrate the financial impact of each change had it been in place for the 2014-15 financial year. **As always, the exemplifications need to be viewed with caution as they are based on current data which is subject to change from the October 2014 census which will be used in actual 2015-16 budgets.** Schools are recommended to consider the merits of the principle behind each option and to not just consider the illustrated financial impact as this could change considerably when 2015-16 budgets are calculated on updated data.
21. At this stage it is assumed that funding allocations will be capped to the existing £100,000 budget, unless insufficient schools meet the qualifying criteria.

Option A – continue with the existing BF methodology

22. Retain the criteria set out above in paragraph 13 allocating funds:
- Where the proportion of pupils on roll classified as high need exceeds 4% of total pupil numbers in a primary school and 2% in a secondary school, and
 - Where the proportion that top up funding paid to support High Needs pupils compared to the total budget allocated via the BF Funding Formula exceeds 2% in a primary school and 1% in a secondary school

Appendix 3 illustrates the 2014-15 impact of this proposal. Note, using this option, it is possible that insufficient numbers of schools will meet the qualifying criteria to fully allocate the £100,000 budget.

Option B – amend the existing BF methodology

23. Reduce the qualifying criteria to only take account of the proportion of pupils on roll classified as high need (i.e. use only the first bullet point in paragraph 22 above) and reset the % thresholds each year from known census data to allow for units of resource to be set that allow for around half of funds to be allocated to both primary and secondary schools and for the whole budget to be allocated to schools. This would result in different units of resource for primary and secondary schools.
24. The qualifying schools would be determined from the number of high needs pupils in each school from the most up to date national census point. The relevant % funding threshold for each phase – currently 4% for primary schools and 2% for secondary schools - would then be calculated from a position of certainty before the start of the relevant financial year.
25. The calculation would be made to ensure that around half of the budget is allocated to primary schools and half to secondary schools and that no more than 50% of schools receive funding. If this methodology had been in place for 2014-15 budgets, the calculation would have been made against the number of high needs pupils in each school at January 2014 with funding thresholds set at 1.75% for primary and 2% for secondary schools with 9 primary and 3 secondary schools receiving funding top-ups.

Appendix 4 illustrates the 2014-15 impact of this proposal.

Option C – allocate funds to schools with numbers of High Needs pupils above a calculated ratio

26. The number of high needs pupils for which schools will be expected to fund the first £6,000 of additional support needs would be restricted to one in every 75 pupils on roll in a primary school and one in every 50 pupils on roll in a secondary school. Schools admitting high needs pupils above these ratios would receive top up funding for each additional pupil.
27. For example, a primary school with 225 pupils would need to have more than 3 pupils with high needs above the £6,000 threshold to receive additional financial support i.e. $225 \text{ NOR} \div 75 \text{ pupil threshold} = \text{first 3 pupils to be self funded from money allocated through the Funding Formula}$. Assuming a per pupil full year funding top up rate of £1,250, then a school with 225 pupils of which 7 had high needs above the £6,000 threshold would receive £5,000 i.e. $7 \text{ high needs pupils} - 3 \text{ to be self funded} = 4$

attract top up funding of £1,250 each for a full year. Note the calculation for the number of high needs pupils that schools need to fund from their Formula Budget allocation is rounded down to the nearest whole number.

Appendix 5 illustrates the 2014-15 impact of this proposal.

Option D – allocate funds to schools with the largest difference between notional SEN funding in their Funding Formula allocation and the expected cost of supporting High Needs pupils

28. Under this option, funds would be allocated to schools which have the largest difference between their amount of notional SEN funding provided through the Funding Formula and the maximum amount of additional support they are expected to need to finance i.e. £6,000 X the number of high needs pupils. Funding allocations would be capped to the maximum of the difference between their amount of notional SEN funding provided through the Funding Formula and the maximum amount of additional support they are expected to need to finance.
29. The notional SEN budget allocation is calculated by applying the percentages detailed below to the corresponding factors in the Funding Formula. There is no prescribed way for LAs to determine notional SEN funding. The percentages were set at levels that would deliver a similar level of funding for SEN as was calculated before the funding reforms. The changes introduced in April 2013 resulted in significantly more funds being allocated through head count and deprivation measures.

Head count - Basic per-pupil entitlement	2%
Deprivation – Free School Meal eligibility	7%
SEN - Low Prior Attainment	100%

30. Overall, just over 5% of budgets allocated through the Funding Formula in 2014-15 are classified as SEN related and this percentage is consistent with the traditional calculation for BF.

Appendix 6 illustrates the 2014-15 impact of this proposal. Note, using this option, it is possible that insufficient numbers of schools will meet the qualifying criteria to fully allocate the £100,000 budget.

Option E – do not maintain an SEN specific contingency

31. There is no requirement to maintain an SEN specific contingency. The funds can be used for an alternative purpose. If this option is the preference of schools, views would be sought in October on where this money should be applied.

Summary of SEN contingency options

32. Appendix 7 illustrates a summary of all the SEN contingency options included in this consultation document.

QUESTION 1 In respect of an SEN specific contingency, which Option do you support?

Option A: No change. Allocate funds to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs pupils and highest proportion of High Needs top-up funding using fixed funding thresholds.

Option B: Allocate funds only to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs Pupils, varying thresholds each year to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying.

Option C: Allocate funds to schools with High Needs pupils in excess of one in every 75 pupils on roll in a primary school and one in every 50 pupils on roll in a secondary school. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying.

Option D: Allocate funds to schools which have the largest difference between their amount of notional SEN funding provided through the Funding Formula and the maximum amount of addition support they are expected to need to finance i.e. £6,000 X the number of high needs pupils. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying

Option E: Do not maintain an SEN specific contingency and allocate the budget to an alternative priority.

Matter raised by the BF Schools Forum

33. During the year, the Schools Forum has considered various aspects of school funding and is now seeking views from schools on one particular area. Funding for the smallest schools, which for this purpose are defined as those with less than 2 forms of entry, and in particular:
- Should there be a lower threshold than 20 for the smallest schools to reach to receive an in-year budget increase from the fund to support schools experiencing significant in-year increases in pupil numbers?
 - Should the fixed lump sum payment made to all primary schools be increased from £150,000 to the maximum permitted by the DfE of £170,000, to be funded from a corresponding reduction in per pupil funding rates?
34. The Forum considers that this issue needs to be considered as smaller schools tend to experience financial difficulties to a greater extent than larger schools, as evidenced through levels of surplus school balances and requests for assistance from the LA in balancing budgets.

Funding threshold for schools experiencing significant in-year increases in pupil numbers

35. In reviewing the 2014-15 funding allocations to schools experiencing significant in-year increases in pupil numbers, of which the existing criteria is set out in Appendix 8, the Schools Forum questioned whether the criteria used to fund schools properly reflects the circumstances of smaller schools. In particular the existing requirement to admit 20 additional pupils before funds are allocated as no schools with less than 2 forms of entry have ever reached this level but could nonetheless admit a significant number of pupils relative to their total roll.
36. The rationale for allocating funds in-year to schools links to needing to open new classes at the start of the academic year to accommodate rising rolls, when original budget allocations are set on pupils on roll at the previous October. Relevant schools need to recruit an additional teacher for a new class that has not been funded and are therefore allocated an additional £23,390 which is the cost of employing a teacher from the start of the academic year to the end of the financial year (September – March). In reviewing the existing criteria, the Schools Forum believe that the following points need to be considered:
- Whether the current level of needing to admit 20 additional pupils is an accurate estimate of the point at which **most** schools would face a significant cost increase by needing to employ a teacher;
 - Whether schools with less than 2 forms of entry need a lower threshold, bearing in mind that funding should only be allocated when there is a significant cost increase in a school and it is unlikely that relevant schools would ever need to open a new class and recruit a new teacher;
 - Any change in eligibility criteria may have a budget impact. If more funds are required to finance a new policy, it may need to be funded at the expense of money going directly into all school budgets at the start of the year.
37. Table 1 below sets out an analysis of the number of schools with less than 2 forms of entry that have admitted more than 10 or 15 pupils in-year since 2011-12 financial year and the associated cost had these funding thresholds been in place. Note, not all additional costs are exact multiples of the £23,390 funding allocation as to avoid double funding, where the growth relates to Key Stage 1 pupils, any funding top up received to comply with Key Stage 1 class size requirements is deducted from any funding allocation for significant in-year increases in pupil numbers.

Table 1: Potential funding thresholds for in-year increases in pupil numbers at schools with less than 2 forms of entry

Financial year	Increase of 10 pupils		Increase of 15 pupils	
	No. extra qualifying schools	Additional cost	No. extra qualifying schools	Additional cost
2011-12	0	£0	0	£0
2012-13	0	£0	0	£0
2013-14	3	£39,976	1	£16,586
2014-15 (estimate)	1	£23,390	0	£0
2015-16 (estimate)	1	£23,390	1	£23,390

QUESTION 2

What do you consider to be the maximum number of in-year admissions that most schools could accommodate before facing a significant cost increase? Irrespective of the size of your school, please indicate one preference in each column.

Increase in pupils	Less than 2 FE	2 FE	3 FE	4 FE and above
10 - 15				
16 - 20				
21 - 25				
Other				

QUESTION 3

In terms of funding allocations, should the amount be the same for all sizes of school at the cost of a teacher, currently £23,390, or should there be differential funding rates? Irrespective of the size of your school, please indicate one preference in each column

Unit of resource	Less than 2 FE	2 FE	3 FE	4 FE and above
25% of standard rate				
50% of standard rate				
75% of standard rate				
Standard rate: £23,390				

Increasing the value of the primary school fixed lump sum payment

38. An alternative, or complementary change to provide additional financial support to smaller schools that the Forum is also seeking views on is to amend the Funding Formula for Schools.
39. The limited flexibility now available for local discretion in the distribution of funds to schools means that the most effective way of increasing the budgets of smaller schools would be to maximise allocations through the fixed lump sum factor which pays the same cash value to each school, irrespective of size. Assuming such a change would be made on a cost neutral basis, there would need to be a corresponding reduction in the amount of funds distributed by pupil numbers.
40. The maximum lump sum payment permitted by the DfE is £170,000. This is £20,000 above the amount currently allocated to primary schools through the BF Funding

Formula. Making this change on a cost neutral basis would require the per pupil funding amount to be reduced by £66.01 to £2,752.17. Appendix 9 illustrates the impact of such a change, if it had been in place for the 2014-15 financial year. As expected, this shows that the smallest school in terms of pupil numbers gains the most, at £8,053 and the largest school loses the most at £22,112. Appendix 9 also shows the financial effect of moving to a fixed lump sum payment of £160,000.

QUESTION 4 – PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY

What value do you believe the fixed lump sum payment to Primary Schools should be set at; £150,000, £160,000 or £170,000?

Any other comments from schools on Education Funding?

41. This consultation asks questions on the issues considered the most important by the Schools Forum. Are there any areas of concern arising from the April 2013 changes or other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?

QUESTION 5

Are there any areas of concern arising from the April 2013 changes or other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?

Next Steps

Results of this consultation

42. The results of this consultation, including all comments made by schools, will be considered by the Schools Forum on 17 October. The Schools Forum will need to take a strategic approach in making decisions but is expected to approve the majority view of schools.
43. Any changes agreed by the Schools Forum will need to be submitted to the DfE for approval by 31 October. Whilst the proposals in this consultation have been framed in accordance with the latest guidance, any change will be individually assessed by the DfE and there is no certainty that approval will be received.

Further consultation in October

44. Headteachers and chairs of governors will be aware from various communications, including a notification with hyperlink to papers to the 17 July Schools Forum meeting, that the DfE have been considering through their *Fairer Funding for Schools in 2015-16* consultation how to allocate an additional £350m to education services through the DSG. The original proposals indicated that BF could receive an extra £1.4m as one of the lowest funded LAs.

45. Decisions have now been taken by the DfE, and these are very much in line with the proposals contained in the initial consultation. The outcome is that an additional £390m will be allocated to LAs, and BF will receive an extra £1.5m.
46. A further consultation will be undertaken with schools in October that will seek views on how this money should be allocated. This will be in the context of the overall budget setting process which needs to be completed and confirmed to the DfE by 20 January 2015.

Information sessions

47. Due to the limited content on this consultation, a separate briefing session is not considered necessary and verbal briefings will therefore be provided at the updates already scheduled in September for chairs of governors (25 September), headteachers (25 September), bursars (18 September) and clerks to governors (16 September):

Responses

48. A separate response form accompanies this consultation, and you are asked to return your signed, scanned reply, **by Friday 3rd October 2014** to:

education.finance@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

or by post to:

Education Finance, Bracknell Forest Council
Time Square, Bracknell, RG12 1JD

Who should respond to this consultation?

49. The Chair of governors, in consultation with the headteacher and other governors. Other relevant organisations.

Queries

50. If you have any queries on this consultation, please contact:

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance
Telephone 01344 354054

Email: paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Outline of the School Funding Framework

Introduction and summary

1. The structure of Education funding has undergone significant change since April 2013. School funding has been greatly standardised and simplified through a new framework put in place by the DfE. This is designed to ensure funds are distributed in accordance with the key policy objective of maximising money into schools with an emphasis on per pupil funding allocations, with top-ups paid for the pupils that need it the most i.e. those from deprived backgrounds and those achieving low attainment scores. Most of the operating framework is now prescribed by the DfE with only limited areas where change is permitted to be made by local areas.
2. For 2015-16, in order to allow time for the recent reforms to bed in, the DfE is making only minor changes to the funding framework, as confirmed in the July 2014 publication of the 2015-16 school budget operational guidance. The impact from this on Bracknell Forest (BF) is relatively modest and relates to improved clarification of previous guidance with enhanced illustrations of practical implementation of the way schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils can be funded.
3. As well as reviewing arrangements for compliance with the DfE regulatory framework, it is also appropriate to consider whether any changes need to be made to the framework for schools where there is local discretion. A need for change could arise from evolving local circumstances, characteristics or knowledge gained from recent experiences.
4. The timetable to make change is set by the DfE which continues to monitor the progress of LAs in the implementation of these funding reforms by requiring confirmation by 31 October 2014 of the local funding framework for schools intended to be in place for 2015-16. In particular, this covers the factors to be used in the Funding Formula for Schools and any contingency funds to be held for allocation in-year to schools.
5. The second key date for submitting data to the DfE is 20 January 2015. This is when units of resource to be used in 2015-16 school budgets, for example the basic per pupil funding amounts need to be confirmed. A further consultation will take place in October that will seek views on areas of budget priority for 2015-16, taking account of the additional £1.5m Schools Budget income expected next year from the outcome of the DfE consultation on *Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16*. Prioritising the allocation of funds for Education is the key decision that remains to be determined locally.
6. This second consultation may also include proposals to change the scheme to claw back significant surplus school balances to encourage some schools to spend more of their money on pupils currently in schools. This is in response to the increasing level of funds held by a small number of schools.
7. The next round of significant change in Education funding is expected in April 2016 which will be the beginning on the next government spending review which will set the budget for the DfE for 3 years. This will provide funding certainty over a long enough timeframe to commence the implementation of a national funding formula for schools which will seek to move money between local areas which will ultimately determine the level of funds available for allocation to individual schools.

Background to Education Funding

8. LAs are funded for their Schools Budget responsibilities through the ring fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The amount of DSG that each LA receives and what it can be spent on are set by the DfE and this determines the minimum amount of money in the Schools Budget.
9. The DSG can only be spent on items defined by the DfE as being within the Schools Budget and this has two elements: amounts delegated to schools; and amounts held centrally by LAs.
10. Funding is allocated to schools through the Funding Formula for Schools¹ which is agreed locally from a set of formula factors that the DfE allows to be used (see Appendix 2 for a full list of available factors). Other significant elements of the national funding framework include guaranteeing each school a maximum decrease in annual per-pupil funding (the 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' (MFG)) and conveying powers to the local Schools Forum² which each LA must establish to assist in education budget setting and other financial and contractual matters.
11. Funding is retained by LAs to finance a range of services to pupils and schools that are not suitable for delegation. The main services managed by BFC on behalf of schools are special educational needs provisions and support services for high needs pupils, education out of school, early years provisions and support and combined services with children's social care that support vulnerable children.

Outline of DfE funding reforms implemented since April 2013

12. Following a period of consultation, in 2012 the DfE started a process to reform school funding so that it becomes "fairer, more consistent and transparent and so that funding intended for education reaches schools and the pupils that need it most". In light of this, following consultation with schools and agreement of the Forum, in April 2013, significant changes were introduced to the BF Funding Formula which resulted in a widespread redistribution of funding between schools. In accordance with DfE requirements, the impact of these changes was moderated by the MFG so that no school could lose more than the 1.5% in per-pupil funding. It was agreed through the consultation that those schools receiving a financial gain from the reforms would have the amount reduced in order to finance the cost of the MFG top up payments being made to prevent any school losing more than 1.5% in per-pupil funding.
13. Other significant changes arising from the reforms that had an impact in BF included:
 - i. Requiring all schools in the country to meet the first £6,000 of additional support needs of individual pupils from within general funding, as allocated through the local Funding Formula. The previous threshold in BF was £1,900. To make this affordable for schools, budgets were increased by a transfer from the "statementing" budget, which had previously funded costs between £1,900 and £6,000, but on an individual named pupil basis, with funding top-ups paid to relevant schools;

¹ The Funding Formula for Schools is the mechanism used to distribute funds to schools. It uses objective criteria with set units of resource and is applied equally to schools with the same characteristics. The Funding Formula is developed each year through consultation with schools. Factors used to distribute funds to schools must be from those on the approved DfE list.

² Each LA is required to create a Schools Forum to represent Education providers and partners. The membership of the BF Forum has been drawn from head teachers, governors and representatives of the teacher associations, diocesan boards, Early Years providers, post 16 SEN providers and the local Academy school.

- ii. Further services that could previously be managed centrally by LAs had to have their funding delegated to individual schools. However, where agreed by the local Schools Forum, the funds could be “de-delegated” and returned for LA central management. In accordance with responses from schools to the annual financial consultation, “de-delegation” has been approved in BF for support to schools in financial difficulty, behaviour support service, support to underperforming ethnic minorities and bi-lingual learners, SIMS and other licence fees and staff supply cover for official duties;
- iii. Creating a separate fund from primary school budgets to be targeted towards schools experiencing additional costs arising from Key Stage 1 class size regulations that limit teaching to 30 children per teacher. Relevant schools were previously funded for this cost pressure through an additional lump sum budget allocation, but this is no longer allowed by the DfE;
- iv. The DSG was re-configured in 2013-14 and now has three component parts, rather than a single per-pupil amount of funding; the Schools Block that funds individual school budgets and a limited range of centrally managed budgets; the Early Years Block that funds provisions for 2, 3 and 4 years olds, again with a limited range of centrally managed budgets; and the High Needs Block that funds support needs of pupils where these are assessed to be above £6,000. The funding allocated to each of these “Blocks” in 2013-14 was based on 2012-13 budgets, adjusted for changes in pupil numbers in mainstream schools and children receiving early years provisions;
- v. Setting school budgets on the most recent October, rather than January census, to allow for earlier publication of budgets.

Allowable factors for LA Funding Formulas - April 2015

The simplification of the Funding Formula means that from the 'Schools Block' only the following 13 options are available to distribute funding to schools for the items subject to delegation, of which only 1 - 8 are relevant to BFC.

Factors that are relevant to BFC

1. A basic per-pupil entitlement – there will be a single unit for primary aged pupils and a single unit for each of Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.
2. Deprivation, measured by Free School Meals (FSM) and/or IDACI. There can be separate unit values for primary and secondary.
3. Looked after children.
4. Prior attainment as a proxy measure for SEN.
5. English as an additional language, for a maximum of 3 years after the pupil enters the school system. There can be separate unit values for primary and secondary.
6. Pupil mobility.
7. A standard lump sum for each school, with an upper limit of £170,000. [£175,000 for London]
8. Rates, which must be at actual cost

Factors where BFC schools do not meet qualifying criteria:

9. Split sites
10. Private finance initiative (PFI) contracts
11. For the 5 local authorities who have some but not all of their schools within the London fringe area, an uplift to enable higher teacher pay scales in those schools to be reflected
12. Sparsity factor for small schools
13. A per-pupil factor which continues funding for post-16 pupils up to the level that the authority provided in 2012-13.

In addition to the factors listed above, one further funding stream is available to schools which is funded outside the 'Schools Block':

1. The Early Years Single Funding Formula that funds relevant schools for the free entitlement to early years education and childcare. No changes are proposed on this for 2014-15.

SEN Contingency: Option A – continue with existing methodology

SCHOOL	No. top-up pupils by school Jan 2014	NOR As at Oct 13	Top-up pupils % (1)	Value of top-up for full year	Budget 14-15	Top-up as % of school budget (2)	Qualify under both criteria?	2014-15 funding on proposed criteria	Notes:
Ascot Heath Inf	2	207	0.97%	£8,741	£752,715	1.16%	No	£0	(1) relevant thresholds:
Ascot Heath Jun	5	239	2.09%	£14,632	£850,082	1.72%	No	£0	Primary >4%
Binfield	1	410	0.24%	£570	£1,341,626	0.04%	No	£0	Secondary >2%
Birch Hill	7	388	1.80%	£22,422	£1,335,325	1.68%	No	£0	(2) relevant thresholds:
College Town Inf	1	213	0.47%	£3,420	£780,406	0.44%	No	£0	Primary >2%
College Town Jnr	4	282	1.42%	£7,980	£992,243	0.80%	No	£0	Secondary >1%
Cranbourne	0	202	0.00%	£0	£743,494	0.00%	No	£0	
Crown Wood	8	426	1.88%	£23,562	£1,494,520	1.58%	No	£0	
Crowthorne CE Primary	4	209	1.91%	£16,722	£772,093	2.17%	No	£0	
Fox Hill Primary	2	193	1.04%	£5,320	£808,259	0.66%	No	£0	
Great Hollands Primary	11	367	3.00%	£37,624	£1,411,797	2.66%	No	£0	
Harmans Water Primary	7	624	1.12%	£19,191	£2,130,624	0.90%	No	£0	
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	1	282	0.35%	£6,841	£1,004,966	0.68%	No	£0	
Holly Spring Junior	9	248	3.63%	£23,372	£913,547	2.56%	No	£0	
Jennetts Park Primary	2	251	0.80%	£6,841	£979,349	0.70%	No	£0	
Meadow Vale Primary	3	503	0.60%	£6,460	£1,720,190	0.38%	No	£0	
New Scotland Hill Primary	4	206	1.94%	£18,110	£755,184	2.40%	No	£0	
Owlsmoor Primary	3	500	0.60%	£12,789	£1,649,156	0.78%	No	£0	
The Pines Primary and Nursery	2	199	1.01%	£10,642	£815,965	1.30%	No	£0	
Sandy Lane Primary	13	638	2.04%	£41,289	£2,163,168	1.91%	No	£0	
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	5	210	2.38%	£27,612	£780,917	3.54%	No	£0	
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	2	206	0.97%	£3,040	£776,215	0.39%	No	£0	
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	3	241	1.24%	£10,641	£860,925	1.24%	No	£0	
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	0	203	0.00%	£0	£726,273	0.00%	No	£0	
Uplands Primary	1	211	0.47%	£3,420	£767,488	0.45%	No	£0	
Warfield CE Primary	2	209	0.96%	£13,682	£786,154	1.74%	No	£0	
Whitegrove Primary	3	444	0.68%	£9,881	£1,463,464	0.68%	No	£0	
Wildmoor Heath	1	181	0.55%	£1,520	£702,853	0.22%	No	£0	
Wildridings Primary	7	369	1.90%	£23,942	£1,343,080	1.78%	No	£0	
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	0	207	0.00%	£0	£758,907	0.00%	No	£0	
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	8	325	2.46%	£37,112	£1,198,628	3.10%	No	£0	
Brakenhale	14	852	1.64%	£49,330	£4,273,048	1.15%	No	£0	
Easthampstead Park	18	694	2.59%	£38,191	£3,751,675	1.02%	Yes	£19,800	
Edgbarrow	23	1,047	2.20%	£82,280	£4,695,440	1.75%	Yes	£25,300	
Garth	25	1,333	1.88%	£44,651	£6,472,338	0.69%	No	£0	
Ranelagh Church of England School	26	775	3.35%	£68,214	£3,444,204	1.98%	Yes	£28,600	
Sandhurst School	11	843	1.30%	£29,832	£3,949,930	0.76%	No	£0	
Primary total	121	9,393	1.29%	£417,378	£33,579,612	1.24%	0	£0	
Secondary total	117	5,544	2.11%	£312,498	£26,586,636	1.18%	3	£73,700	
Total ALL	238	14,937	1.59%	£729,876	£60,166,248	1.21%	3	£73,700	

SEN Contingency: Option B – amend the existing methodology

SCHOOL	No. top-up pupils by school Jan 2014	NOR As at Oct 13	Top-up pupils % (1)	Qualify	No of pupils	2014-15 funding on proposed criteria	Note
Ascot Heath Inf	2	207	0.97%	No	0	£0	(1) relevant thresholds: Primary >1.75% Secondary >2%
Ascot Heath Jun	5	239	2.09%	Yes	5	£3,846	
Binfield	1	410	0.24%	No	0	£0	
Birch Hill	7	388	1.80%	Yes	7	£5,385	
College Town Inf	1	213	0.47%	No	0	£0	
College Town Jnr	4	282	1.42%	No	0	£0	
Cranbourne	0	202	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Crown Wood	8	426	1.88%	Yes	8	£6,154	
Crowthorne CE Primary	4	209	1.91%	Yes	4	£3,077	
Fox Hill Primary	2	193	1.04%	No	0	£0	
Great Hollands Primary	11	367	3.00%	Yes	11	£8,462	
Harmans Water Primary	7	624	1.12%	No	0	£0	
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	1	282	0.35%	No	0	£0	
Holly Spring Junior	9	248	3.63%	Yes	9	£6,923	
Jennetts Park Primary	0	251	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Meadow Vale Primary	3	503	0.60%	No	0	£0	
New Scotland Hill Primary	4	206	1.94%	Yes	4	£3,077	
Owlsmoor Primary	3	500	0.60%	No	0	£0	
The Pines Primary and Nursery	2	199	1.01%	No	0	£0	
Sandy Lane Primary	13	638	2.04%	Yes	13	£10,000	
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	4	210	1.90%	Yes	4	£3,077	
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	0	206	0.00%	No	0	£0	
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	0	241	0.00%	No	0	£0	
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	0	203	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Uplands Primary	0	211	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Warfield CE Primary	0	209	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Whitegrove Primary	0	444	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Wildmoor Heath	1	181	0.55%	No	0	£0	
Wildridings Primary	0	369	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	0	207	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	0	325	0.00%	No	0	£0	
Brakenhale	7	852	0.82%	No	0	£0	
Easthampstead Park	18	694	2.59%	Yes	18	£13,433	
Edgbarrow	23	1,047	2.20%	Yes	23	£17,164	
Garth	25	1,333	1.88%	No	0	£0	
Ranelagh Church of England School	26	775	3.35%	Yes	26	£19,403	
Sandhurst School	11	843	1.30%	No	0	£0	
Primary total	92	9,393	0.98%	9	65	£50,000	
Secondary total	110	5,544	1.98%	3	67	£50,000	
Total ALL	202	14,937	1.35%	12	132	£100,000	

SEN Contingency: Option C – fund schools with High Needs pupils above a calculated ratio

SCHOOL	No. top-up pupils by school Jan 2014	NOR As at Oct 13	No. top-up pupils for schools to fund	Qualify? Yes / No	Pupils to qualify for additional HN funding	2014-15 funding on proposed criteria	Note
Ascot Heath Inf	2	207	2	No	0	£0	Ratio of HN pupils for schools to self fund: Primary 1 : 75 Secondary 1 : 50
Ascot Heath Jun	5	239	3	Yes	2	£2,500	
Binfield	1	410	5	No	0	£0	
Birch Hill	7	388	5	Yes	2	£2,500	
College Town Inf	1	213	2	No	0	£0	
College Town Jnr	4	282	3	Yes	1	£1,250	
Cranbourne	0	202	2	No	0	£0	
Crown Wood	8	426	5	Yes	3	£3,750	
Crowthorne CE Primary	4	209	2	Yes	2	£2,500	
Fox Hill Primary	2	193	2	No	0	£0	
Great Hollands Primary	11	367	4	Yes	7	£8,750	
Harmans Water Primary	7	624	8	No	0	£0	
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	1	282	3	No	0	£0	
Holly Spring Junior	9	248	3	Yes	6	£7,500	
Jennetts Park Primary	2	251	3	No	0	£0	
Meadow Vale Primary	3	503	6	No	0	£0	
New Scotland Hill Primary	4	206	2	Yes	2	£2,500	
Owlsmoor Primary	3	500	6	No	0	£0	
The Pines Primary and Nursery	2	199	2	No	0	£0	
Sandy Lane Primary	13	638	8	Yes	5	£6,250	
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	5	210	2	Yes	3	£3,750	
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	2	206	2	No	0	£0	
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	3	241	3	No	0	£0	
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	0	203	2	No	0	£0	
Uplands Primary	1	211	2	No	0	£0	
Warfield CE Primary	2	209	2	No	0	£0	
Whitegrove Primary	3	444	5	No	0	£0	
Wildmoor Heath	1	181	2	No	0	£0	
Wildridings Primary	7	369	4	Yes	3	£3,750	
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	0	207	2	No	0	£0	
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	8	325	4	Yes	4	£5,000	
Brakenhale	14	852	17	No	0	£0	
Easthampstead Park	18	694	13	Yes	5	£13,158	
Edgbarrow	23	1,047	20	Yes	3	£7,895	
Garth	25	1,333	26	No	0	£0	
Ranelagh Church of England School	26	775	15	Yes	11	£28,947	
Sandhurst School	11	843	16	No	0	£0	
Primary total	121	9,393	106	12	40	£50,000	
Secondary total	117	5,544	107	3	19	£50,000	
Total ALL	238	14,937	213	15	59	£100,000	

SEN Contingency: Option D – fund schools with highest cost above notional SEN funding

SCHOOL	No.HN pupils by school Jan 2014	NOR As at Oct 13	Top-up pupils %	Cost to school (No. HN pupils X £6,000)	2014-15 Notional SEN budget	Qualify Yes/No	Gap between notional SEN & No. of top-ups
Ascot Heath Infant	2	207	0.97%	£12,000	£20,547	No	£0
Ascot Heath CE Junior	5	239	2.09%	£30,000	£24,786	Yes	£5,214
Binfield CE Aided Primary	1	410	0.24%	£6,000	£39,946	No	£0
Birch Hill Primary	7	388	1.80%	£42,000	£53,714	No	£0
College Town Infant and Nursery	1	213	0.47%	£6,000	£24,120	No	£0
College Town Junior	4	282	1.42%	£24,000	£41,256	No	£0
Cranbourne Primary	0	202	0.00%	£0	£22,334	No	£0
Crown Wood Primary	8	426	1.88%	£48,000	£62,666	No	£0
Crowthorne CE Primary	4	209	1.91%	£24,000	£30,166	No	£0
Fox Hill Primary	2	193	1.04%	£12,000	£36,743	No	£0
Great Hollands Primary	11	367	3.00%	£66,000	£79,909	No	£0
Harmans Water Primary	7	624	1.12%	£42,000	£136,695	No	£0
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	1	282	0.35%	£6,000	£44,685	No	£0
Holly Spring Junior	9	248	3.63%	£54,000	£47,654	Yes	£6,346
Jennetts Park Primary	2	251	0.80%	£12,000	£44,340	No	£0
Meadow Vale Primary	3	503	0.60%	£18,000	£72,598	No	£0
New Scotland Hill Primary	4	206	1.94%	£24,000	£20,114	Yes	£3,886
Owlsmoor Primary	3	500	0.60%	£18,000	£66,336	No	£0
The Pines Primary and Nursery	2	199	1.01%	£12,000	£37,113	No	£0
Sandy Lane Primary	13	638	2.04%	£78,000	£133,772	No	£0
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	5	210	2.38%	£30,000	£24,090	Yes	£5,910
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	2	206	0.97%	£12,000	£35,119	No	£0
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	3	241	1.24%	£18,000	£25,775	No	£0
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	0	203	0.00%	£0	£18,330	No	£0
Uplands Primary	1	211	0.47%	£6,000	£19,032	No	£0
Warfield CE Primary	2	209	0.96%	£12,000	£27,385	No	£0
Whitegrove Primary	3	444	0.68%	£18,000	£47,166	No	£0
Wildmoor Heath	1	181	0.55%	£6,000	£29,520	No	£0
Wildridings Primary	7	369	1.90%	£42,000	£84,375	No	£0
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	0	207	0.00%	£0	£28,681	No	£0
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	8	325	2.46%	£48,000	£54,580	No	£0
The Brakenhale	14	852	1.64%	£84,000	£343,280	No	£0
Easthampstead Park Community School	18	694	2.59%	£108,000	£262,848	No	£0
Edgbarrow	23	1,047	2.20%	£138,000	£236,075	No	£0
Garth Hill College	25	1,333	1.88%	£150,000	£415,699	No	£0
Ranelagh CE	26	775	3.35%	£156,000	£149,580	Yes	£6,420
Sandhurst	11	843	1.30%	£66,000	£228,339	No	£0
Primary total	121	9,393	1.29%	£726,000	£1,433,547	4	£21,356
Secondary total	117	5,544	2.11%	£702,000	£1,635,820	1	£6,420
Total ALL	238	14,937	1.59%	£1,428,000	£3,069,367	5	£27,776

SEN Contingency: Summary of Options A - D

School	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Ascot Heath Infant	£0	£0	£0	£0
Ascot Heath CE Junior	£0	£3,846	£2,500	£5,214
Binfield CE Aided Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birch Hill Primary	£0	£5,385	£2,500	£0
College Town Infant and Nursery	£0	£0	£0	£0
College Town Junior	£0	£0	£1,250	£0
Cranbourne Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Crown Wood Primary	£0	£6,154	£3,750	£0
Crowthorne CE Primary	£0	£3,077	£2,500	£0
Fox Hill Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Great Hollands Primary	£0	£8,462	£8,750	£0
Harmans Water Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	£0	£0	£0	£0
Holly Spring Junior	£0	£6,923	£7,500	£6,346
Jennetts Park Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Meadow Vale Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
New Scotland Hill Primary	£0	£3,077	£2,500	£3,886
Owlsmoor Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
The Pines Primary and Nursery	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sandy Lane Primary	£0	£10,000	£6,250	£0
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	£0	£3,077	£3,750	£5,910
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Uplands Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Warfield CE Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Whitegrove Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Wildmoor Heath	£0	£0	£0	£0
Wildridings Primary	£0	£0	£3,750	£0
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	£0	£0	£0	£0
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	£0	£0	£5,000	£0
The Brakenhale	£0	£0	£0	£0
Easthampstead Park Community School	£19,800	£13,433	£13,158	£0
Edgbarrow	£25,300	£17,164	£7,895	£0
Garth Hill College	£0	£0	£0	£0
Ranelagh CE	£28,600	£19,403	£28,947	£6,420
Sandhurst	£0	£0	£0	£0
Primary total	£0	£50,000	£50,000	£21,356
Secondary total	£73,700	£50,000	£50,000	£6,420
Total ALL	£73,700	£100,000	£100,000	£27,776

Criteria for in-year budget allocations to schools experiencing significant growth in pupil numbers

The School Specific Contingency shall include funding for an allocation to those schools that experience exceptional increases in pupil numbers between the October census used for funding original budgets and actual pupil numbers on roll on the following October census

To assist schools in meeting the additional costs arising in such circumstances, an in-year budget addition will be made where the whole school number on roll from Reception up to Year 11 increases up to the point that a new teacher needs to be appointed. An increase of 20 pupils has been established as the relevant threshold point at which additional funding would be allocated. A second allocation would be made should numbers increase by 40 and so on, with further funding allocations for each additional increase above the 20 threshold.

The amount of additional funding is calculated from the cost of appointing a teacher on Mainscale Point 6 – salary and employer on-costs - for the period September to March.

There is one exception to this general rule. This relates to schools that agree with the LA to open a 'surge' class – i.e. one additional class to accommodate up to 30 additional pupils – where additional funding will be allocated irrespective of the actual number of pupils admitted, if the pupils in the 'surge' class are admitted after the census used for funding purposes. The funding allocation will be calculated in the same way as for general in-year growth, applied from the beginning of the term that the 'surge' class is open, *[i.e. rather than against the number of months the 'surge' class is open]*.

Where a 'surge' class opens after the census point used for calculating the school's budget for the next financial year, a further funding top up will be made to cover the full year cost of a teacher on Mainscale Point 6 and a Learning Support Assistant on Bracknell Forest pay point 12 for the relevant financial year. This funding will be made available for one year only at the commencement of the relevant financial year.

The allocated funding may need to be scaled if demand significantly exceeds the budget allocation, with final decisions to be determined each year by the Schools Forum.

Approved by the Schools Forum on 16 September, 2013.

Potential Financial Impact from increasing the value of the primary school fixed lump sum payment

School	Form of entry as at Sept 2014	October 2013 number on roll	Amount of Lump sum						
			£150,000	£160,000		£170,000			
			£'s allocated lump sum and per pupil	£'s allocated lump sum and per pupil	£'s Change	% Change	£'s allocated lump sum and per pupil	£'s Change	% Change
Ascot Heath Infant	2.5	207	£733,362	£736,530	£3,168	0.43%	£739,699	£6,337	0.86%
Ascot Heath CE Junior	2	239	£823,544	£825,656	£2,112	0.26%	£827,768	£4,224	0.51%
Binfield CE Aided Primary	2	410	£1,305,451	£1,301,920	£-3,531	-0.27%	£1,298,389	£-7,063	-0.54%
Birch Hill Primary	2	388	£1,243,452	£1,240,646	£-2,805	-0.23%	£1,237,841	£-5,611	-0.45%
College Town Infant and Nursery	3	213	£750,271	£753,241	£2,970	0.40%	£756,212	£5,941	0.79%
College Town Junior	3	282	£944,725	£945,418	£693	0.07%	£946,111	£1,386	0.15%
Cranbourne Primary	1	202	£719,271	£722,605	£3,333	0.46%	£725,938	£6,667	0.93%
Crown Wood Primary	3	426	£1,350,542	£1,346,483	£-4,059	-0.30%	£1,342,423	£-8,119	-0.60%
Crowthorne CE Primary	1	209	£738,998	£742,101	£3,102	0.42%	£745,203	£6,205	0.84%
Fox Hill Primary	1	193	£693,908	£697,538	£3,630	0.52%	£701,168	£7,261	1.05%
Great Hollands Primary	2	367	£1,184,270	£1,182,158	£-2,112	-0.18%	£1,180,045	£-4,224	-0.36%
Harmans Water Primary	3	624	£1,908,541	£1,897,947	£-10,594	-0.56%	£1,887,353	£-21,188	-1.11%
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	3	282	£944,725	£945,418	£693	0.07%	£946,111	£1,386	0.15%
Holly Spring Junior	3	248	£848,907	£850,722	£1,815	0.21%	£852,538	£3,630	0.43%
Jennetts Park Primary	2	251	£857,362	£859,078	£1,716	0.20%	£860,794	£3,432	0.40%
Meadow Vale Primary	3	503	£1,567,542	£1,560,941	£-6,601	-0.42%	£1,554,340	£-13,201	-0.84%
New Scotland Hill Primary	1	206	£730,544	£733,745	£3,201	0.44%	£736,947	£6,403	0.88%
Owlsmoor Primary	2.5	500	£1,559,087	£1,552,585	£-6,502	-0.42%	£1,546,084	£-13,003	-0.83%
The Pines Primary and Nursery	2	199	£710,817	£714,249	£3,432	0.48%	£717,681	£6,865	0.97%
Sandy Lane Primary	3	638	£1,947,995	£1,936,939	£-11,056	-0.57%	£1,925,883	£-22,112	-1.14%
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	1	210	£741,817	£744,886	£3,069	0.41%	£747,955	£6,139	0.83%
St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	1	206	£730,544	£733,745	£3,201	0.44%	£736,947	£6,403	0.88%
St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	1	241	£829,180	£831,226	£2,046	0.25%	£833,272	£4,092	0.49%
St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	1	203	£722,089	£725,390	£3,300	0.46%	£728,690	£6,601	0.91%
Uplands Primary	1	211	£744,635	£747,671	£3,036	0.41%	£750,707	£6,073	0.82%
Warfield CE Primary	1	209	£738,998	£742,101	£3,102	0.42%	£745,203	£6,205	0.84%
Whitegrove Primary	2	444	£1,401,269	£1,396,616	£-4,653	-0.33%	£1,391,962	£-9,307	-0.66%
Wildmoor Heath	1	181	£660,090	£664,116	£4,026	0.61%	£668,142	£8,053	1.22%
Wildridings Primary	2	369	£1,189,906	£1,187,728	£-2,178	-0.18%	£1,185,550	£-4,356	-0.37%
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	1	207	£733,362	£736,530	£3,168	0.43%	£739,699	£6,337	0.86%
Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	1.66	325	£1,065,907	£1,065,181	£-726	-0.07%	£1,064,454	£-1,452	-0.14%
Totals	58.66	9,393	£31,121,109	£31,121,109	£0		£31,121,109	£0	

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS - September-October 2014		TOTALS			TOTAL
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY	TOTAL	
1	In respect of an SEN specific contingency, which Option do you support?				
A	No change. Allocate funds to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs Pupils and highest proportion of High Needs top-up funding using fixed funding thresholds	5	2	7	24%
B	Allocate funds only to schools with the highest proportion of High Needs Pupils, varying thresholds each year to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying.	6	1	7	24%
C	Allocate funds to schools with High Needs pupils in excess of one in every 75 pupils on roll in a primary school and one in every 50 pupils on roll in a secondary school. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying.	5	1	6	21%
D	Allocate funds to schools which have the largest difference between their amount of notional SEN funding provided through the Funding Formula and the maximum amount of additional support they are expected to need to finance i.e. £6,000 X the number of high needs pupils. Funding thresholds to be varied each year based on current numbers to ensure around half the budget is allocated to both primary and secondary schools, with no more than half of schools qualifying.	5	0	5	17%
E	Do not maintain an SEN specific contingency and allocate the budget to an alternative priority.	3	1	4	14%

53

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS - September-October 2014		TOTALS			TOTAL
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY	TOTAL	
2	What do you consider to be the maximum number of in-year admissions that <u>most</u> schools could accommodate before facing a significant cost increase? Irrespective of the size of your school, please indicate one preference in each column.				
	Less than 2 FE:				
	10-15	15	2	17	68%
	16-20	1	0	1	4%
	21-25	1	0	1	4%
	Other	5	1	6	24%
	2 FE:				
	10-15	6	2	8	33%
	16-20	11	0	11	46%
	21-25	1	0	1	4%
	Other	3	1	4	17%
	3 FE:				
	10-15	3	2	5	21%
	16-20	7	0	7	29%
	21-25	8	0	8	33%
	Other	3	1	4	17%
	4 FE and above:				
	10-15	3	2	5	19%
	16-20	1	2	3	12%
	21-25	9	0	9	35%
	Other	8	1	9	35%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS - September-October 2014		TOTALS			TOTAL
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY	TOTAL	
3	In terms of funding allocations, should the amount be the same for all sizes of school at the cost of a teacher, currently £23,390, or should there be differential funding rates to reflect varying changes in costs? Irrespective of the size of your school, please indicate one preference in each column.				
	Less than 2 FE:				
	25% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	50% of standard rate	1	0	1	5%
	75% of standard rate	1	0	1	5%
	standard rate £23,390	17	2	19	90%
	2 FE:				
	25% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	50% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	75% of standard rate	4	0	4	20%
	standard rate £23,390	14	2	16	80%
	3 FE:				
	25% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	50% of standard rate	2	0	2	10%
	75% of standard rate	1	0	1	5%
	standard rate £23,390	15	2	17	85%
	4 FE and above:				
	25% of standard rate	2	0	2	9%
	50% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	75% of standard rate	0	0	0	0%
	standard rate £23,390	16	4	20	91%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS - September-October 2014		TOTALS			TOTAL
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY	TOTAL	
4	Primary Schools Only. What value do you believe the fixed lump sum payment to Primary Schools should be set at; £150,000, £160,000 or £170,000?				
A	Around £150,000	10	n/a	10	43%
B	Around £160,000	5	n/a	5	22%
C	Around £170,000	8	n/a	8	35%
5	Are there any areas of concern arising from the April 2013 changes, this consultation or other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?				
	Yes	9	3	12	44%
	No	13	2	15	56%
	No response	0	0	0	0%
	Total	24 77.42%	5 83.33%	29 78.38%	
		31	6	37	

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank