

**RESPONDING TO DfE REFORM
OF SCHOOL FUNDING**

**A BRIEFING NOTE AND
CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS**

SEPTEMBER 2013



**Children, Young People
and Learning Department**

Introduction

The purpose of this briefing note and consultation is to provide an update on the latest stage of funding reforms and gather views from **primary and secondary** schools and other interested parties on potential changes to school funding arrangements in Bracknell Forest (BF). These proposals have been prepared in response to national funding reforms introduced by the Department for Education (DfE) with the latest phase of changes required to be implemented from April 2014.

The key areas where views are being sought from schools relate to the amount of funds distributed through the Funding Formula by the different factors e.g. pupil numbers, deprivation measures, low prior attainment etc. There are no proposals to change the factors currently being used or introduce new ones.

This is a more straightforward consultation than last year, with the DfE requiring Local Authorities (LAs) to review their Funding Formula rather than having to make significant changes.

To help guide the process, the Schools Forum has reviewed and approved the questions posed in this consultation document. The Forum is not making any recommendations for change but is seeking to gather views from schools on the issues raised so they can be taken into account when budget decisions for 2014-15 are taken.

2014-15 budget planning

This consultation also asks schools to identify areas of budget pressure or development which they would like to be considered. Any requests will be **subject to sufficient funds** and prioritisation by the Schools Forum, as part of the normal budget setting process.

Information session

This consultation will be supported by an evening briefing on 15 October. The session will commence at 7.00 pm and be held at the Education Centre (Donnington Room) and will explain the key issues raised and the potential implications. The session will address each question on the consultation and provide an opportunity for attendees to raise questions. The intended audience is governors. Head teachers and bursars will receive briefings through the normal half-termly meetings that have already been scheduled.

If you plan to attend the briefing, please can you confirm to:

education.finance@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

The BF consultation documents can be found at the following website address.

Insert hyperlink

Responses

A separate response form accompanies this consultation, and you are asked to return your signed reply, **by Friday 25th October 2013**, to:

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

Who should respond to this consultation?

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

Queries

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

List of Contents

Item	Page
Executive Summary	1
Background to Education Funding	4
DfE funding reforms implemented in April 2013	4
Changes to be considered for April 2014	5
Bracknell Forest approach to the reforms	6
Matters for update and areas where views are being sought from schools	
- Schools Block related	
- Overview	7
- Pupil-led funding	7
- Prior attainment	8
- Deprivation	10
- Pupil mobility	11
- Sparsity	12
- Lump sum allocations	12
- Additional delegation	14
- Summary of potential impact from changes	18
- Interpretation of the financial exemplifications	18
- Schools Forum	19
- High Needs Funding in mainstream schools	19
Other matters	
- Revision to redundancy policy	22
- Lessons to be learnt from the composition of LA Funding Formulas in 2013-14	22
Budget pressures and developments	23
Next steps	
- Results of consultation	24
- Evening briefing for head teachers and governors	24
- Indicative budgets for 2014-15	24
- Contact for queries	24

List of Appendices

Ref	Item	Page
1	Allowable factors in LA Funding Formulas – April 2014	25
2	Summary of the BF Funding Formula used in 2013-14	26
3	Summary Funding Formulas used by Statistical Neighbour in 2013-14	28
4	Potential financial effect of allocating funds for low prior attainment at the average rate used by BF statistical neighbours	30
5	Potential financial effect from new low prior attainment data for secondary schools	31
6	Potential financial effect of allocating funds for deprivation at the average rate used by BF statistical neighbours	32
7	Potential financial effect from new pupil mobility data for primary schools	33
8	Potential financial effect from allocating different lump sum payments to schools	
	a) at £160k	34
	b) at £170k	35
	c) at £175k	36
9	Outline of services subject to de-delegation and indicative funding allocations	37
10	Outline of newly delegated behaviour support services and potential funding allocations	47
11	Summary potential financial effect from the potential changes, including the impact of the MFG and funding cap applied to schools gaining funds	54
12	Potential funding allocations if a High Needs contingency is established for schools with disproportionate numbers	55
13	Policy for funding school redundancies	56
14	Responsibility for repair and maintenance	58

Executive Summary

1. This document updates schools on the latest stage of Department for Education (DfE) school funding reforms and also seeks views on whether any changes should be introduced in Bracknell Forest (BF).
2. National funding reforms were implemented from April 2013 as part of the government objective to introduce a national funding formula for education. 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, low attainment scores.
3. Further, more straightforward changes are required from April 2014, which centre on whether the changes introduced to date are working as intended.
4. The DfE continue to closely monitor each Local Authority's (LA) progress against the reforms and will again require data at 31 October 2013 and 21 January 2014, which must respectively confirm the Funding Formula and actual units of resource to be used in 2014-15 budgets.
5. To meet these requires, in June 2013, the Schools Forum agreed that a consultation should be undertaken with schools on whether the right amount of funds were being allocated through each of the factors of the Funding Formula. This is consistent with DfE expectations for LAs to review the April 2013 funding arrangements.
6. Whilst fewer questions are included in the consultation compared to last year, there is a large amount of new information that will be of interest to schools and therefore the document has been expanded to include an outline of the wider funding framework.
7. The mandatory changes that are required next year are set out below. At this stage it is expected to be a straightforward process to meet these new requirements with minimal impact expected to arise in most instances.
 - a) LAs must allocate a minimum of 80% of delegated Schools Block funding through the available pupil-led factors – core per-pupil funding, deprivation, low prior attainment, looked after children and English as an additional language. The BF rate is 88.3%.
 - b) Minimum core per-pupil funding values have been set at £2,000 for primary and £3,000 for secondary school pupils. BF rates are £2,849 and £4,080 respectively.
 - c) The test data to be used for prior attainment funding will be changed. This reflects changes in the assessments now being made in the Early Years Foundation Stage profile, and widening eligible pupils in Key Stage 2 tests that fund secondary schools to include pupils that did not achieve Level 4 in English **or** mathematics, rather than only those pupils not achieving in both. This has the effect of doubling the number of pupils eligible for funding and means the unit of resource needs to be halved to remain within budget. It also results in a different distribution of funding between secondary schools.
 - d) LAs and Schools Forums need to consider whether they are allocating the right amount of resources to schools through deprivation measures.
 - e) Funding schools for pupil mobility will be targeted to only those with more than 10% in-year turnover, rather than all in-year admissions as at present. This

means only six primary schools qualify for funding in BF, rather than all 31. No secondary schools qualify.

- f) A new factor will be allowed to reflect sparsity. This is intended to protect rural schools, and in particular the viability of small schools. No BF schools qualify under the DfE criteria so this is not valid.
- g) There must be a representative on the Schools Forum from a provider of education to 14-25 year olds, other than a school.
- h) All LAs must adopt the £6,000 funding threshold for high needs pupils. Schools must cover the cost of special educational needs (SEN) support up to this level from their delegated budget, which is approximately 16 hours a week support. The BF rate is £6,080 so a minor change is needed but there will be no adverse financial impact on schools.

8. This consultation is not making any recommendations for change on the discretionary areas but is seeking views from schools in order to inform on the 2014-15 budget setting process. The focus of questions has been to see how the arrangements in BF compare to our statistical neighbours and the all England average. Appendix 3 of this document sets out the core information used for this purpose. The key areas where views of schools are being sought relate to:

- a) If more funds are to be allocated through one of the factors, the overall impact needs to be cost neutral and a relevant deduction will be made to the core per-pupil funding amount where BF is in the highest 12.5% of all LAs and the 3rd highest in the statistical group of 11 LAs.
- b) Should BF allocate at the statistical neighbour average – median – rate for:
 - i. Prior attainment; which would need £0.060m added.
 - ii. Deprivation; which would need £0.319m added.
 - iii. Fixed lump sum allocation; which would need £0.372m added.

Moving to the average rate, and to maintain the cost neutral approach, core per-pupil funding would reduce from 81% to 79% and from £2,849 in primary to £2,798 and £4,080 to £4,030 in secondary.

- c) For the fixed lump sum allocation, the maximum allowable amount is being reduced from £200k to £175k, but differential primary / secondary rates are allowed for the first time next year, so views are being gathered on whether the BF rate of £150k should be changed.
- d) Whether schools again support de-delegation of budgets i.e. passing back money for Council management. This relates to support to schools in financial difficulty, under performing ethnic minority pupils, SIMS and other licences and staff supply cover, such as maternity leave absence and amounts to £0.843m.
- e) £0.389m of funds to support Behaviour Support Services will be delegated for the first time in April 2014. New SLAs will be available for schools to purchase a range of targeted support services.
- f) Views are also being sought on whether a separate SEN contingency should be created outside delegated school budgets i.e. in the High Needs Block, to make additional payments to schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils (those with over £6,000 of support needs). Creating such a fund would be a budget pressure.

9. Exemplifications on the potential impact from the changes on individual schools are included in the consultation but there are limitations to their accuracy and schools are therefore warned to view the results with caution. The main issues to be aware of are:

- a) The 2014-15 data set e.g. pupil numbers and deprivation and low prior attainment scores are not yet available so the possible changes are being modelled on 2013-14 data. This could change significantly.
- b) The impact of moving to allocating funds for prior attainment, deprivation and fixed lump sum allocations to the average statistical neighbour rate costs £0.751m and the illustrations assume an appropriate deduction to AWPU values will be made to maintain a cost neutral effect. This may not be how such a change, if agreed, would ultimately be financed.

Schools are therefore asked to consider whether the principle behind the potential change is supported and not just consider the indicated financial effect.

10. In reviewing the arrangements put in place from April 2013, a small number of adjustments need to be made to properly comply with DfE Regulations and guidance. These are mainly technical matters with minimal impact envisaged, but nevertheless need to be corrected. They relate to:

- a) There is £0.052m centrally retained in the Schools Budget that is used to pay one-off premature retirement / dismissal costs of school staff. This retained budget is not allowed to be increased from the previous year and can only be used to fund the cost of decisions taken before 1 April 2013, so has a very limited life span. If a general budget is to be available in future to meet such costs, it will need to be included in delegated school budgets and then be subject to de-delegation in order for funding top ups to be made in-year to relevant schools only, at the amount of actual costs being faced.
- b) There is £0.110m in the centrally managed school specific contingency to fund additional financial support to new, amalgamating or closing schools and to meet exceptional unforeseen costs in primary schools. The majority of this budget - £0.100m - has been established exclusively to be paid in-year to Jennett's Park Primary school as it moves from a 1 FE school to a 2 FE school. The remaining £0.010m has been retained to support primary schools facing exceptional, unforeseen costs. The correct way to manage this funding is as a de-delegated item, and it is therefore proposed to include the £0.110m funding within delegated school budgets, on a per-pupil basis to primary schools only, and then seek agreement to de-delegate the funds so funding top-ups can be passed on in-year only to Jennett's Park Primary school and other qualifying schools.
- c) The cost of checking pupil eligibility to free school meals is a Schools Budget funding responsibility, but to date, BF has not recharged any costs associated with this function. To reflect a recent increase in work in this area with the objective of maximising the number of Free School Meals pupils on the school census, thereby increasing income to schools from the Pupil Premium, a new charge of around £0.020m needs to be made to the Schools Budget, which would be a budget pressure.

11. The amounts allocated by BF compared to the statistical neighbours and all England in the summary information of LA Funding Formulas (see Appendix 3) are broadly in line with expectations. However, there is one area that stands out as unexpected and requiring further examination, and this relates to rates, where at 2.26% of funds allocated, BF has the highest proportionate spend of the statistical neighbours, where the average rate is 1.31%, and the second highest in all England, where the average is 1.21%. Work is underway to establish the reason for the relative high cost and whether any actions can be taken to make a reduction.

Background to Education Funding

12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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 1 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.
15. 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 that support children's social care.

DfE funding reforms implemented in April 2013

16. 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.
17. Other significant changes arising from the reforms that had an impact in BF included:
 - i. Recommending 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

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, the 14-19 Partnership and the local Academy school.

individual named pupil basis, with funding top-ups paid to relevant schools;

- ii. Additional delegation to schools for services that could previously be managed centrally by LAs. However, where agreed by the local Schools Forum, the funds could be “de-delegated” and returned for LA central management. De-delegation was approved in BF for support to schools in financial difficulty, support to underperforming ethnic minorities and bi-lingual learners, SIMS and other licence fees and staff supply cover for official duties. De-delegation was also agreed for behaviour support services, but for one year only. Funding for 14-16 flexible learning could not be de-delegated and is now retained by secondary schools;
 - 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;
 - 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. This change is in preparation for the introduction of a national funding formula sometime from 2015 that will redistribute funding between LAs;
 - v. Setting school budgets on the most recent October, rather than January census, to allow for earlier publication of budgets.
18. To help guide the process and to ensure views of schools were taken into account in the framing of the changes that were implemented in April 2013, the Schools Forum established a School Funding Review Group, with membership from headteachers, governors, school bursars and LA officers to work through the new requirements and agree the questions that needed to be asked of schools. Final changes to funding arrangements were agreed by the Schools Forum, after taking account of comments from schools.

For information, Appendix 2 shows the factors and units of resource used in the 2013-14 Funding Formula.

Changes to be considered for April 2014

19. During April and May, the DfE undertook an assessment of the impact of the changes being introduced from April 2013, to ensure that the reforms were working as intended and specifically to identify any unintended outcomes. The DfE were also looking to identify any other changes that may be required to assist in the longer term goal of introducing a national funding formula. The overriding aim for April 2014 was for limited change, as time was needed for the most recent reforms to take effect.
20. The outcome from this review was that in June the DfE confirmed that most of the arrangements put in place have delivered what was intended and will remain in place, with a small number of changes being introduced from April 2014.

The relevant DfE review documents can be accessed at:

School Funding Reform: Findings from the Review of 2013-14: Arrangements for 2014-15 (45 pages)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-funding-reform-findings-from-the-review-of-2013-to-2014-arrangements-and-changes-for-2014-to-2015>

2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Guidance fro LAs (39 pages)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2014-to-2015-revenue-funding-arrangements-operational-information-for-local-authorities>

21. This consultation from BFC seeks comments from schools and other interested parties on relevant matters which are set out in detail below from paragraph 28. The documentation also provides an update on the latest stage of funding reforms.

Bracknell Forest approach to the reforms

22. Arrangements regarding education funding in Bracknell Forest have been well established on the basis of a partnership with schools and the Schools Forum. Taking account of the DfE review of the outcomes from the latest review of funding reforms, the Schools Forum does not consider that any further changes are required to the Funding Formula in terms of the factors to be used to distribute funds to schools, but there are a number of issues where views should be sought from schools. However, the changes likely to be required were not considered significant enough to reconvene the School Funding Review Group.
23. In considering whether changes are required to the way funds are allocated to schools, use has been made of data made available from the DfE on the composition of each LAs 2013-14 Funding Formula. This allows a national perspective on which of the permitted factors have been used and the relative importance placed on them in terms of the proportion of total funds allocated.
24. This can be a useful guide to see how the BF Funding Formula compares to other LAs. To help make a more meaningful comparison, the analysis used restricts detailed comparisons to the BF statistical neighbours (10 other LAs) which the DfE has determined have the closest match to the population characteristics found in BF.
25. As with all statistical data, the analysis needs to be seen as a guide to help form a judgement. It also reflects the first year of the new funding reforms and LAs may be making changes in 2014-15. However, it is up to date and complete, representative of current practices, and the only meaningful comparative data available.
26. Appendix 3 shows an extract of the information by factor for BF and our statistical neighbours. There is also a high level summary of all LAs in England. The Appendix also ranks BF within the statistical neighbours and across England. A rank of 6 in the statistical neighbour group is the mid-point, with 75 being the mid-point for all England.
27. The content of this consultation has been approved by the Schools Forum.

Matters for update and areas where views are being sought from schools

School Block related

Overview

28. The main thrust of the most recent DfE funding review has been to assess the impact arising from the changes made to LA Funding Formulas at April 2013. There are now a very limited number of allowable factors – 13, of which 8 could be, and are used in BF - with further requirements to only use indicators and pupil data for the distribution of funds as provided by the DfE, and in a prescribed and restricted way. The review outcome for each formula factor relevant to BF is detailed in the following paragraphs.
29. On balance, the Schools Forum considers that the DfE review indicates that no changes are required to the factors used in the BF Funding Formula, but that the amount of funds being allocated by the most significant factors should be reviewed. The Forum is not making any recommendations on whether there should be changes, but seeking to gather the views on the issues raised.
30. To help assess the potential financial impact of the changes, exemplifications at individual school level are included as appendices. The possible effect that would arise from setting the amount of funds allocated through the three most significant factors outside core per-pupil funding to the average³ proportion distributed by our statistical neighbours is also modelled. **As always, the exemplifications need to be viewed with caution, with further information on their limitations set out in paragraphs 87 to 89.** Schools are recommended to consider the merits of the principle behind each potential change and to not just consider the illustrated financial impact as this could change considerably when 2014-15 budgets are calculated.
31. If it is agreed through this consultation that different amounts should be allocated through factors of the Funding Formula, it needs to be recognised that there is a finite level of resources in the Schools Budget and if there is a desire to increase funds allocated through one factor, unless there is a sufficient increase in the overall level of resources, a corresponding reduction will need to be made in funds distributed through other factors.

Pupil-led funding

32. One of the prime objectives of the DfE from the funding reforms is to ensure that a high proportion of funding is allocated to schools through pupil-led factors. This approach is designed to encourage popular and good schools to readily admit more pupils in the knowledge that significant funds will follow.
33. To support this objective, from April 2014, the DfE will require all LAs to allocate a minimum of 80% of delegated Schools Block funding through the available pupil-led factors – age weighted pupil unit, deprivation, prior attainment, looked after children and English as an additional language. In 2013-14 only two LAs did not meet this level of delegation, with the BF rate being 88.3% which is the 7th highest rate (out of 11) in the BF statistical neighbour grouping and 113th highest in England (out of 151).

³ Average in this document means the median i.e. the middle value when all results are listed in sequential order. This helps to minimise the effect of any extreme values which may otherwise distort the interpretation.

34. Furthermore, there will be a minimum cash value set for age weighted pupil funding, with the minimum primary rate set at £2,000 and the minimum secondary rate for both Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 set at £3,000. Whilst all LAs were above these levels in 2013-14, with the BF rates £2,849 and £4,080 respectively, the minimum rates may be increased in future years.
35. No action is considered necessary in BF relating to pupil-led funding, including needing to meet the new conditions being introduced by the DfE.
36. When looking purely at the distribution of funds based on the age of pupils, BF is in the highest 12.5% of all LAs (19th out of 151) and the 3rd highest in the statistical neighbours. This suggests that if any redistribution of funds through the Funding Formula is considered desirable and agreed, reducing the age weighted pupil unit funding would seem an appropriate course of action to take and move BF closer to the LA average rate.

QUESTION 1

If a redistribution of funds through Formula Factors is supported, do you agree that when this results in an additional cost, it should be funded through a reduction in funds allocated by reference to pupil numbers, where BF is in the highest 12.5% of LAs in terms of funds distributed?

Prior attainment

37. DfE encourage the use of this factor to target funding to schools for pupils with low cost, high incidence SEN below the £6,000 (approx 16 hours per week support) high needs threshold. This has become a more significant factor now that additional funds must be included in general school budgets to support SEN pupils, rather than making funding allocations to schools on the basis of named pupils. Moving from the £1,900 BF funding threshold in 2012-13 to the new level resulted in an additional £1.031m being added to school budgets through factors in the Funding Formula which reflected the cost being incurred on relevant pupils at that time. The method used to distribute the extra funds was agreed at 80% on pupil numbers, 10% on prior attainment and 10% on deprivation measures which resulted in the closest match of funds to each school that could be found in the allowable factors compared to the previous named pupil basis.
38. Changes to the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile mean that different aged pupils will have a different methodology of funding next year. Those taking the old profile – Years 2 to 5 - will continue to be funded in BF where scores are below 78. For those taking the new Profile from September 2012 – Year 1 pupils - funding will be allocated to pupils who did not achieve the expected level of development in all 12 prime areas of learning as well as mathematics and literacy. The DfE, allow the funding threshold to be set at below either 78 or 73 for pupils in Years 2 to 5, but there are no plans to change the 78 threshold currently in use in BF.
39. For secondary aged pupils, funding is currently targeted to pupils that failed to achieve a Level 4 or higher in English **and** mathematics which amounts to around 10% of relevant pupils. As only 20% of pupils who achieved a Level 4 in English **or** mathematics went on to achieve the 5+ (A*-C) GCSEs including English and mathematics, from next year, the measure will be changed so that pupils will be

identified as having low prior attainment if they fail to achieve a Level 4 or higher in English **or** a Level 4 or higher in mathematics. Nationally, this change is expected to identify around 21% of pupils. Based on 2012 data, increasing the number of pupils eligible to funding creates a budget pressure of £1.3m in secondary schools as the number of eligible pupils rises from 537 to 1,422, which is a 112% increase on the amount of funds currently being allocated and represents 23% of relevant pupils.

40. Such an increase in cost is clearly unaffordable. It is proposed to manage this pressure by recalculating the amount of per-pupil funding paid for each eligible pupil by dividing the new, higher number of eligible pupils into the total initial 2013-14 budget. This cash limits the amount of funds allocated to the current level and is therefore cost neutral. It will result in a lower per-pupil funding rate.

QUESTION 2 – SECONDARY SCHOOLS ONLY

Do you agree that the best way to incorporate the extended eligibility criteria that will be used next year for funding secondary schools for pupils with low prior attainment is to reduce the amount of per-pupil funding to a level that ensures the total amount of funds allocated remains unchanged from that allocated in 2013-14 i.e. £1.157m?

41. In 2012 the Key Stage 2 assessment measure was changed. Those pupils taking the old assessments will be identified from the published data. For pupils at Key Stage 2 from 2013 onwards, the English element of the Key Stage 2 measure will identify those who did not achieve a Level 4 in either the reading or teacher assessed writing elements. Grammar, punctuation and spelling test results are excluded “for now”.
42. In 2013-14, at 3.49%, the proportion of funds allocated through the BF Funding Formula was in the bottom half for both the statistical neighbour grouping (7th out of 11) and all of England (92nd out of 151). Schools are now being asked to consider whether this is the right proportion, with the average rate in the statistical neighbour group being 3.59%. Funding at a proportion of 3.59% would distribute an additional £0.060m, and £2.148m in total.
43. Appendix 4 illustrates what the financial effect on each school would have been in the current financial year, if the level of funding via low prior attainment data was set at the 3.59% average rate of our statistical neighbours and original test scores are used i.e. before taking account of the new criteria to be used in actual 2014-15 budgets. The illustration assumes that the £0.060m increase in funds would be financed by a reduction in per-pupil funding, and would therefore be cost neutral overall.

QUESTION 3

The BF Funding Formula currently allocates £2.088m, 3.49% of total funds, to schools based on low prior attainment data. This is £0.060m below the amount that would have been distributed if the rate had been set at 3.59%, the average proportion of funds allocated by our statistical neighbours. Do you think the current BF allocation proportion is:

About Right Too low Too high No view

44. As set out above, the only updated data that can be made available at this stage to model the potential financial impact from the revised eligibility criteria relates to secondary aged pupils that did not achieve a Level 4 or higher in English or mathematics. However, this is based on 2012 data, which will be updated to 2013 numbers for the 2014-15 actual budgets so needs to be viewed as a guide to the likely change in funding. Appendix 5 shows an illustration by school of the potential impact from modelling the new eligibility criteria, which requires the unit of resource to be reduced in order to ensure that there is no overall financial effect from the change.

Deprivation

45. All LAs are required to include a deprivation factor in their Funding Formula which should be used in addition to funding from the Pupil Premium to target resources to pupils from deprived backgrounds who tend to achieve less well than those from less deprived backgrounds
46. Whilst a number of issues were raised from the review, including not being able to use all available deprivation measures, the limited bands allowed if the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI⁴) is used do not fit the deprivation profile of all LAs and that there was funding turbulence in moving from large historic deprivation related grant allocations to distributions through the new allowable measures, there will be no changes for April 2014. As this is a key factor for the DfE, “we are continuing to ask that Schools Forums and LAs determine locally an appropriate proportion or quantum of their schools block funding to allocate through this factor”. BF allocates 3.5% of funding through deprivation measures, which is ranked 7th highest within the 11 statistical neighbours and 135th against all 151 LAs in England.
47. The BF Funding Formula recognises deprivation by using the two measures permitted by the DfE; pupil eligibility to a Free School Meal (FSM), where all pupils in the same phase are funded at the same rate, and which distributes around 40% of deprivation related funds; and IDACI scores, which are weighted through the prescribed range of bands, with funding increasing through the bands as levels of deprivation increase by a factor of 50%. IDACI scores distribute around 60% of deprivation related funds. The IDACI scores associated with each funding band can be seen in row 2 of Appendix 2.
48. Whilst the DfE analysis from 2013-14 LA allocations is a useful starting point, it is also relevant to consider other factors before a determination is made on the appropriate level of funds to be distributed through deprivation measures.
49. The attainment gap in BF, as measured by average points scored at Key Stage 4 between pupils eligible to a FSM and those not was 36 in 2012, and averages 33 over the last 3 years. For all of England, both the 2012 actual gap and average for the last 3 years was 27. For Key Stage 2, results from BF schools in 2012 show a 24% gap between pupils eligible to a FSM and those not in achieving Level 4 or above in English and mathematics compared to an England average of 17%. These measures indicate that the attainment gap is wider in BF than the average for England.

⁴ IDACI measures by geographical area – post codes – the likelihood of a family with school aged children having low income / receiving income related benefits. It scores the likelihood and relative severity of deprivation on a scale from 0 to 1, with a score of 0.5 meaning the family have a 50% chance of having low income / in receipt of income related benefits.

50. LAs can also be measured for deprivation and ranked against each other. Central Government tends to use the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD⁵) and this scores BF at 291 out of 326 authorities, putting it in the 10% of least deprived authorities. (Note this ranking is against all LAs and not just authorities responsible for education services). There are also authority wide IDACI scores, where BF scores 10.6 and ranks 7th least deprived unitary authority (out of 151).
51. In 2013-14, at 3.47%, the proportion of funds allocated through the BF Funding Formula was in the bottom half for both the statistical neighbour grouping (7th out of 11) and all of England (135th out of 151). As set out above, there are many ways of measuring deprivation, and different significance can be placed on each one. Schools are now being asked to consider whether this is the right proportion, with the median rate in the statistical neighbour group being 4.00%. Funding at a proportion of 4.00% would distribute an additional £0.319m, and £2.392m in total.
52. Appendix 6 illustrates what the financial effect on each school would have been in the current financial year if the level of funding allocated via deprivation data was set at the 4.00% average rate of our statistical neighbours. The illustration assumes that the £0.319m increase in funds would be financed by a reduction in per-pupil funding, and will therefore be cost neutral overall.
53. Any change in proportion of funds allocated to schools through deprivation measures would be made through the existing factors at 40% by FSM eligibility and 60% by IDACI score.

QUESTION 4

There are many different ways to measure deprivation and different levels of significance can be placed on each one. The BF Funding Formula currently allocates £2.073m, 3.47% of total funds to schools based on deprivation data. This is £0.319m below the amount that would have been distributed if the rate had been set at 4.00%, the average proportion of funds allocated by our statistical neighbours. Do you think the current BF allocation proportion is:

About Right Too low Too high No view

Pupil Mobility

54. DfE will be changing the allowable method to distribute funds to schools for pupil mobility so that from April 2014, rather than paying a per-pupil amount for all in-year admissions taken into schools, a 10% threshold on “pupil turnover” will be applied to the mobility factor so that it will only support schools which experience a significant change in pupil numbers, with funding allocated only to the number of pupils above the 10% threshold and not all in-year admissions in qualifying schools. This is much closer to how pupil mobility previously operated in BF.
55. This change is being made because the existing method is considered to spread funding thinly across a large number of schools and does not target funding to those

⁵ IMD identifies the most deprived areas across the country. They combine a number of indicators, chosen to cover a range of economic, social and housing issues, into a single deprivation score for each small area in England.

schools which most need additional support. For BF, it was agreed that only primary schools would have a mobility factor, with £0.016m allocated in 2013-14 to all 31 primary schools. Applying the 10% threshold would have resulted in only six schools receiving an allocation. Using October 2012 census data, no secondary schools qualify for mobility funding based on the new 10% threshold.

56. In changing the eligibility criteria, the same funding issue needs to be resolved on the pupil mobility factor as was faced on prior attainment at Key Stage 2 although in this instance there is a reduction in funds allocated. It is proposed to manage the budget saving in the same way by recalculating the amount of per-pupil funding paid for each eligible pupil by dividing the new, lower number of eligible pupils into the total initial 2013-14 budget. This cash limits the amount of funds allocated to the current level and is therefore cost neutral. It will result in a higher per-pupil funding rate.

QUESTION 5 – PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY

Do you agree that the best way to incorporate the reduced eligibility criteria that will be used next year for funding primary schools for high levels of pupil mobility is to increase the amount of per-pupil funding to a level that ensures the total amount of funds allocated remains unchanged from that allocated in 2013-14 i.e. £0.016m?

57. Appendix 7 shows the impact that the new allocation methodology produces.

Sparsity

58. DfE has indicated that one of the most common concerns raised from the funding reforms is the impact in rural areas and particularly the viability of small schools. To address this issue, an optional sparsity factor will be available to LAs from April 2014 of which the minimum criteria will be:
- For primary schools, fewer than 150 pupils and an average distance (as the crow flies) greater than or equal to 2 miles
 - For secondary. Middle or all through schools, fewer than 600 pupils and an average distance (as the crow flies) greater than or equal to 3 miles
59. For the first year of operation, LAs may reduce the pupil numbers and distance criteria but not increase them.
60. Based on October 2012 data, no schools in BF would qualify for this factor as the smallest primary school had 163 pupils, and the smallest secondary 718 and therefore this new factor is not relevant to BF.

Lump Sum Allocations

61. In 2013-14, LAs were permitted to pay a uniform lump sum allocation to **all** schools up to a maximum of £200k with the amount in BF set at £150k for both primary and secondary schools. This was the maximum affordable in the primary phase, although a much larger value would have been possible for secondary schools. The view of the DfE is that the main purpose of the lump sum is to provide sufficient funding to

necessarily small schools which could not operate on the basis of per-pupil funding alone.

62. For April 2014, the maximum allowable lump sum will be reduced to £175k which is the average amount allocated in 2013-14. The reduction from £200k supports the DfE objective of more money being distributed through pupil-led factors. Differential lump sum payments for primary and secondary schools will also now be permitted. In considering the merits for change, the work undertaken last year for the previous round of changes remains valid and is set out below, but updated where appropriate.
63. A number of Formula Factors were previously used to allocate fixed lump sum payments to schools, some of which were limited only to schools meeting certain conditions, with others paid to all. These were:
- i. A standard rate for each school type (4 different values), to reflect the fact that all schools face an element of fixed costs that do not vary with pupil numbers and this is particularly important for small schools i.e. 1 form of entry primary schools
 - ii. An allocation to secondary schools maintaining a Learning Support Unit which is intended to reduce the number of pupil exclusions, based on the four schools with the highest levels of pupil eligibility to a FSM.
 - iii. Schools undertaking their own admissions appeals (voluntary aided schools) receive funding to reflect the costs directly incurred.
 - iv. A unique cash value for each school to reflect funding previously received through education related grants, such as the Standards Fund. This amount had been frozen at the amount allocated at April 2009, which reflected the circumstances faced by each school at that time, in relation to the prevailing DfE funding priorities.
64. Aggregate funding from the above factors ranged from £122k to £307k in primary schools and from £560k to £828k in secondary schools. Moving to the newly agreed £150k amount required a significant amount of funding – approximately £3m - to be distributed through alternative measures at April 2013.
65. Neither the DfE nor BFC have undertaken any detailed work to establish the amount of lump sum funding that should be paid to ensure necessarily small schools can continue to operate in a funding system geared towards per-pupil funding.
66. Recent experience in BF demonstrates that the smallest primary schools in the borough tend to face the greatest difficulty in balancing their budgets. This is particularly apparent in 1 form of entry schools with average class sizes below 25, as there is limited scope to manage relative high costs per class. Of the five schools in receipt of a licensed budget deficit within the last three years, three have been 1 form entry primary schools.
67. In 2013-14, at 9.28%, the proportion of funds allocated through the BF Funding Formula was in the bottom half for the statistical neighbour grouping (9th out of 11) but in the top half for all of England (52nd out of 151). Schools are now being asked to consider whether this is the right proportion, with the median rate in the statistical neighbour group being 9.90%. Funding at a proportion of 9.90% would distribute an additional £0.372m, and £5.992m in total. This would deliver an average payment to all schools of £160,054.

68. Appendix 8 (a) to (c) models by school of the potential impact from making fixed lump sum payments of £160k, £170k and £175k compared to the current amount of £150k. Increasing the payments costs £310k, £620k and £775k respectively in the primary sector and £60k, £120k and £150k respectively in the secondary sector. The calculation has been made on the assumption that the increase would be financed from a corresponding reduction in per-pupil funding.

QUESTION 6

The BF Funding Formula currently allocates £5.620m, 9.28% of total funds, to schools through a fixed lump sum allocation. This is £0.372m below the amount that would have been distributed if the rate had been set at 9.90%, the average proportion of funds allocated by our statistical neighbours. Do you think the current BF allocation proportion is:

About Right Too low Too high No view

QUESTION 7

If you think that the lump sum payment should be increased, what value do you think it should be set at?

Around £160,000 **Around £170,000** **Around £175,000**
(Average for statistical neighbours) (Average all LAs)

Additional delegation

69. The new funding arrangements also require all LAs to delegate funding for the same services and functions, with a general presumption of additional delegation. However, where relevant representatives on a Schools Forum agree that the whole budget for their phase e.g. primary/secondary, should be returned to the Council for central management, this is allowed. This recognises that there are reasons of cost effectiveness, ease of organisation and management or risk sharing that a strategic approach can bring. The DfE term this approach “de-delegation”.
70. Overall, around £0.843m of funding is involved across the services, as set out in Table 1 below. All schools responding to last year’s consultation supported de-delegation and the return of budgets to the council for central management.

Table 1: Services subject to de-delegation again at April 2014

Ref	Item	£k	Allocation basis
A	Support to schools in financial difficulty	280	Amount per pupil
B	Support to underperforming ethnic minority and bi-lingual pupils	127	Amount per EAL pupil
C	SIMS and other licences	90	Amount per pupil
D	Staff supply cover for official absences *	345	Amount per pupil
	Total	843	

* includes maternity leave, trades union, magistrates and jury duties, council membership and staff suspensions.

71. Whilst the Council accepts that schools should have a choice over whether services should be delegated or not, with the option to de-delegate if supported by relevant representatives on the Schools Forum, there are a number of services that for reasons of cost effectiveness, ease of organisation and management or risk sharing that a strategic approach should be taken. This ensures a collective responsibility to support all schools, sometimes on services that are used infrequently, but often when they are required, significant costs are involved or where central procurement delivers significant cost benefits. All of the budget items in Table 1 above fall within these categories.
72. In particular, funding held in contingencies to support schools in financial difficulty is not considered suitable for delegation to individual schools. This is because this funding stream is targeted to specific schools facing real cost increases, which are generally substantial amounts, and it is not therefore appropriate to be included in the general funding of all schools.
73. Funding for schools in financial difficulties is primarily allocated where a school is in, or at risk of entering an Ofsted category, which ordinarily then requires financial support to put in place changes that will aid a rapid improvement and removal from the category.
74. Moving these funds directly into individual school budgets would take away the ability of the Council, in consultation with the Schools Forum, to provide financial support to schools that face the most challenging financial circumstances. It would place the onus on individual schools to retain sufficient balances to finance the additional costs which generally arise on an unpredictable basis. There would not be a facility to request funding from centrally managed School Budgets.
75. In reviewing the latest guidance from the DfE on de-delegation, it has become apparent that further budgets fall into this category, and which also need to be targeted to a small number of schools only and are not therefore considered suitable for delegation. This relates to premature retirement / dismissal costs of school staff and additional financial support to new, amalgamating or closing schools.
76. There is currently a £0.052m centrally managed budget to cover premature retirement / dismissal costs in schools which is administered in line with the policy agreed by the Schools Forum following consultation with schools and which is set out in the Scheme for Financing Schools⁶. This budget is used to meet the significant one-off redundancy costs that arise when schools need to undertake staffing re-organisations which are irregular in nature and often involve significant costs. This also covers the costs where employees are entitled to a redundancy payment at the end of a fixed term contract. DfE will not allow this budget to fund decisions taken after April 2013 and in order to be able to continue to target financial support to relevant schools, it is proposed to transfer the £0.052m funding into delegated school budgets, on a per-pupil basis, and then de-delegate for central management so funding top-ups can be passed on in-year to only those schools actually facing premature retirement / dismissal costs.
77. There is also £0.110m in the centrally managed school specific contingency to fund additional financial support to new, amalgamating or closing schools and to meet

⁶ All LAs must produce a Scheme for Financing Schools to set out the framework of financial and related functions that schools must comply with. The content of the Scheme must be consistent with statutory guidance issued by the DfE but can be changed in many areas to reflect local circumstances, if agreed by the Schools Forum.

exceptional unforeseen costs in primary schools. The majority of this budget - £0.100m - has been established exclusively to be paid in-year to Jennett's Park Primary school as it moves from a 1 FE school to a 2 FE school from September 2013, at which point there will be a consequential increase in cost base that is not recognised in the initial 2013-14 budget. The remaining £0.010m has been retained to support primary schools facing exceptional, unforeseen costs. The correct way to record this funding is as a de-delegated item, and it is therefore proposed to include the £0.110m funding within delegated school budgets, on a per-pupil basis to primary schools only, and then de-delegate for central management so funding top-ups can be passed on to Jennett's Park Primary school and other qualifying schools. The amount required in this budget will be reviewed during the course of setting the 2014-15 budgets and is expected to be reduced.

78. There is one further change proposed to funding in respect of de-delegation of budgets and this relates to the costs of undertaking FEM eligibility checks. Schools will be aware of the importance of maximising numbers of pupils eligible to FSM for funding purposes in both the BF Funding Formula and the Pupil Premium. Whilst a separate budget for this work was not in place for 2013-14, there has been a considerable amount of work undertaken by the LA to provide schools with more accurate and up to date information on pupil eligibility. The most significant improvement relates to linking the Council's Housing Benefits system to the FSM application process. This means that as soon as a parent receives the relevant benefits, schools are informed to update their census to maximise income and parents receive a letter informing them of their child's eligibility to a FSM.
79. This work has a relatively low cost compared to the additional income identified for schools with costs associated with the licence fee charged by the software provider for data analysis with Housing Benefits and some associated staff time. Overall costs are not expected to exceed £0.020m, and once fully calculated, it is proposed that from April 2014 these are funded from a new de-delegated budget.

Table 2 below summarises the newly classified de-delegation budgets.

Table 2: Newly classified de-delegated budgets

Ref	Item	£k	Allocation basis
E	Premature retirement / dismissal costs	52	Amount per pupil
F	Additional financial support to new, amalgamating or closing schools, plus exceptional costs in primary schools	110	Amount per primary aged pupil
G	Free school meals eligibility checking	20	Amount per pupil eligible to a FSM
Total		182	

Appendix 9 provides an outline of the services proposed to be de-delegated and indicative funding allocations to individual schools. i.e. Table 1 and Table 2 items.

80. In addition to the strategic services set out above, there is also an onus on delegation of behaviour related services, and it was agreed last year that these would be de-delegated for 2013-14 only, and then included in school budgets, with the council offering a traded service for schools to purchase through Service Level Agreements (SLAs) if they wished. Relevant services are set out below in Table 3.

Table 3: Services subject to delegation for the first time in April 2014

Ref	Item	£k	Allocation basis
Behaviour Related Services			
H	Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline (CMCD®)	32	Amount per secondary aged pupil
I	Behaviour and Education Support Team	292	65% by amount per pupil, 15% by deprivation and 20% by prior attainment
J	Anti-bullying co-ordinator	25	Amount per pupil
K	Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning	71	Amount per primary aged pupil
Total		421	

81. The CMCD programme was a time-limited scheme in three secondary schools to improve the quality of teaching and learning. It is proposed that these funds are now delegated to all secondary schools, without the LA offering an SLA. Support for behaviour support, anti-bullying and the social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) and will be offered to schools through new SLAs.
82. Appendix 10 sets out a description of each of the newly delegated services and a funding allocation which is based on the distribution methodology preferred by the majority of schools that responded to the 2012 financial consultation when this question was asked. Formal SLAs will be developed during the autumn term for schools to consider.

QUESTION 8

To continue the strategic and cost effective approach in the use of the funds for contingencies (including schools in financial difficulties), support to underperforming ethnic groups, licences / subscriptions and staff supply cover costs, do you agree that the Schools Forum should again agree to de-delegate all relevant funding for continued central management by the LA? See Table 1 and Appendix 9.

QUESTION 9

Three new budgets have been identified as needing to be subject to de-delegation. In order to continue the strategic and cost effective approach, do you agree that the £0.052m funds for premature retirement / dismissal cost, the £0.110m to support new, amalgamating or closing schools / exceptional costs and £0.020m to perform checks on pupil eligibility to a free school meal should be allocated to schools on a per pupil / FSM eligibility basis and then be de-delegated, with relevant funding returned to the council for central management? See Table 2 and Appendix 9.

QUESTION 10

Do you agree that budgets for behaviour related support services should be delegated to schools based on the majority responses received from schools to the 2012 financial consultation?

Summary potential impact from changes

83. Appendix 11 shows the aggregate impact on individual school budgets, should the changes set out above be agreed, and funding distributed through low prior attainment, deprivation measures and fixed lump sum allocations moved to the average proportion used by our statistical neighbours by reducing per-pupil funding allocations. This summary uses 2013-14 budget data so will be subject to update in 2014-15. It also applies the overall impact of the MFG and the cap applied to schools gaining funds from all the possible changes.
84. In terms of the MFG calculation, schools will be aware that whatever the outcomes of the operation of the local Funding Formula, per pupil funding can reduce by no more than 1.5% each year. This means that all things being equal, where relevant, the amount of MFG relevant schools receive each year will reduce by up to 1.5% of per pupil funding. Therefore, even if no changes are made at April 2014, schools receiving MFG top up in 2013-14 will receive less financial support in 2014-15, and those contributing to the cost would retain more of their gain. Appendix 11 summarises the financial impact arising from the exemplifications shown from Appendix 4 to 8. It also displays the recalculated MFG top up and deduction to budget where there is an increase in funds, and the net overall change.
85. Whilst the level of funding protection for 2014-15 has been confirmed at the same 1.5% maximum reduction in per-pupil fund as applies in 2013-14, it is unclear what arrangements will be put in place from 2015-16, although the DfE have confirmed that protection will continue. However, as protection will eventually be phased out, it is important that the right decisions on the distribution of school funding are taken now as their impact may be more significant in the medium to longer term.
86. Reducing the amount of funds allocated through per-pupil factors to finance increases in other factors would result in a per-pupil funding rate of £2,798 in primary schools (was £2,849 down 1.8%) and £4,030 in secondary schools (was £4,080 down 1.3%). The overall percentage allocated through pupil funding would be 79% (was 81%).

Interpretation of financial exemplifications

87. Whilst financial exemplifications are provided at individual school level to illustrate the potential impact of the various options, it is important to remember that all figures relate to restating the original 2013-14 budget to the new options. All figures are subject to change at the October 2013 census, such as actual pupil numbers, FSM eligibility etc. so should be viewed with caution **and schools are advised to consider the merits of the principle behind each possible change and not just the indicative financial effect.** The main variables at this stage are:
1. Data used to calculate school budgets must be that provided by the DfE. Not all data sets are available, such as prior attainment data.
 2. Calculations are being made against October 2012 census data. It will be subject to update from the October 2013 census, as this will determine 2014-15 budgets. Significant changes could arise from this.
 3. In order to present an illustration of the potential overall impact, some assumptions have had to be made on the decisions that will be taken. For example, that funds allocated through low prior attainment, deprivation and the fixed lump sum allocation will be set at the average (median) percentage used by our statistical neighbours, and the resultant increases will be funded

by reducing the age weighted pupil units.

88. It is also important to note that the exemplifications in Appendices 4 – 10 are before applying the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) which will limit the losses that a school can experience to 1.5% per-pupil. It also excludes the impact of any capping that may need to be applied to schools gaining in order to finance the cost of protecting the losers. These calculations have been added at Appendix 11.
89. The budget figures used exclude the items that have been de-delegated. This means the amounts quoted in the appendices agree with the budget notification schools received from the Council, but the overall totals will not reconcile with the amounts quoted at Appendix 2, the summary LA Funding Formula. This is because Appendix 2 is a standard form all LAs need to submit to the DfE, so for consistency, needs to be completed on the same basis, which is to assume that no funds are de-delegated.

Schools Forums

90. The DfE requires Forums to operate transparently and fairly, which has always been the model adopted in BF and is recognised to be the case in the vast majority of LAs. One area of change that will be required by the DfE is that Forums must include one elected representative from an institution (other than from a school or academy) providing education beyond 16 (but may also be providing education for 14-16 year olds). This will replace the current requirement for a representative from the 14-19 partnership which is currently met in BF through secondary headteacher representatives.
91. This change has been made to allow institutions providing education for students between 14 and 25 (such as further education colleges) that have an interest in local high needs funding and funding for pupils who are educated in further education provision from age 14 to have an input to the decision making process.

High Needs Funding in mainstream schools

92. The new arrangements, with LAs “strongly recommended” to set a threshold of £6,000 before schools could request additional financial support for pupils with SEN has resulted in additional funds being added into the general budgets of schools in many areas, with £1.031m being moved in BF via per-pupil, prior attainment and deprivation measures. This change is probably the primary concern for schools in BF due to now having to manage up to a further £4,180 of pupil support needs from funds that are now allocated through a formulaic approach rather than targeted to named pupils. This introduces greater uncertainty in budget planning and cost control.
93. For 2014-15, LAs will be required to adopt this threshold which will replace the £6,080 threshold used in BF. This slightly higher rate was adopted in order to match to the closest unit of resource in the SEN funding model (Needs Weighted Pupil Unit or NWPU). As the £1.031m budget transfer into the Funding Formula was calculated from the amount of money being spent on the support needs of pupils up to £6,080, general school budgets are resourced to a greater value than required. No change is therefore proposed to be made as a result of the new £6,000 threshold which means there will be no adverse financial impact on schools.
94. The DfE considered adding an additional factor to the allowable list to reflect significant numbers of high needs pupils in a school as the move to a formulaic approach to fund schools for SEN pupils, rather than on the basis of assessed need

of individual pupils can mean that some schools are not receiving sufficient funds to support SEN pupils. On balance, the DfE has determined that more time is needed to consider how such a factor would work in practice.

95. It should also be noted that if such a factor is introduced, it would only reflect the incidence of pupils with support needs above the £6,000 and would not recognise schools with a high incidence of pupils with SEN up to £6,000. The DfE will continue to allow funds from the High Needs Block to be used to support schools with significant numbers of high needs pupils outside the Funding Formula. Where such an approach is adopted, the distribution criteria must be agreed in advance on the basis of experience in 2013-14 and be expressed as a formula that “minimises perverse incentives” i.e. does not encourage schools to take a specific course of action with the intention of gaining additional funds.
96. For 2013-14, the Forum agreed not to create a fund in the High Needs Block to support mainstream schools on the basis that:
- i. Funding protection for the redistribution of SEN related budgets for support needs up to £6,000 was provided by the MFG;
 - ii. Top up funding paid to schools above the £6,000 threshold for high needs pupils is excluded from the MFG so schools receive all of the additional funds. The top up is calculated on the assessed cost of needs, so schools should be fully resourced for the extra costs.

However, the Forum recognises that there are other issues to consider, including the impact of large numbers of high needs pupils in a school and that the alternative may be a more expensive out of borough placement with travel disruption for pupils. It is therefore appropriate to review this for 2014-15 in the light of actual experience.

97. Assuming that such a fund should be created, there are two key issues to resolve: how much money should be included in the fund; and what the allocation criteria to receive top up funding should be.
98. Using the detailed work undertaken to support the changes made to school funding from April 2013, it was established that three schools were subject to a significant reduction in SEN funding from the reforms at an aggregate loss of £190k. This amount is before taking account of the funding protection provided through the MFG so in all likelihood, would be reduced. It is not appropriate to look at the impact of the MFG from one change in the Funding Formula as losses experienced against one change can be offset by gains in others with the total overall impact the most important factor. Therefore, it seems appropriate to make an assumption on the impact of the MFG in terms of the funding protection it provides to schools from changes in the SEN elements of the reforms and also the amount of extra funds that it would be appropriate to make available. At this stage, it is assumed that 50% of the £190k loss of funding set out above would be included in such a fund. This implies the budget for the SEN top up fund should be set at around £100k.
99. In terms of eligibility criteria where such an approach is adopted, as set out above, the distribution criteria must be agreed in advance on the basis of experience in 2013-14 and be expressed as a formula that “minimises perverse incentives”. The DfE does not provide guidance as to what constitutes suitable criteria but have informally indicated that the following would be acceptable:

- i. Where the proportion of pupils on roll classified as high need exceeds an agreed percentage of total pupil numbers i.e. those with support needs above £6,000.
 - ii. 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 an agreed percentage.
100. Appendix 12 displays the relevant data by school included in the initial 2013-14 budget. In order to target resources to the schools with the most significant results against the criteria, it would seem appropriate to set the funding thresholds at 4% for the proportion of pupils classified as high needs in primary schools, and 2% for secondary schools, with the proportion of funding that high needs pupils represent set at 2% for primary schools and 1% for secondary schools. Using these thresholds indicates that 5 schools – 14% of all schools – would qualify for top up funding.
101. In terms of how much top up funding qualifying schools should receive, it is proposed to divide the total agreed budget by the number of high needs pupils in qualifying schools to set a per-pupil amount which would then be the unit of resource thereafter. Assuming a budget of £100k is agreed for such a fund, the 92.5 high needs pupils in qualifying schools would be divided into the total budget to produce a per-pupil allocation of around £1,100. Appendix 12 also shows the qualifying schools and the additional funding they would receive in 2014-15, based on the above assumptions.

QUESTION 11

Do you agree, that subject to sufficient finances being available, that the Schools Forum should establish a budget in the High Needs Block to support schools that meet qualifying criteria in respect of the number of high needs pupils on roll?

QUESTION 12

If a budget is established in the High Needs Block to support schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils, what do you think the amount should be?

**No more than £50,000 Between £50k and £100k Greater than £100k
(please specify amount)**

QUESTION 13

If a budget is established in the High Needs Block to support schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils, do you agree that subject to agreement of the DfE, the qualifying criteria should comprise the following:

- i. **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 i.e. those with support needs above £6,000?**
- ii. **The proportion that top up funding paid to support High Needs pupils represents compared to the total budget allocated via the BF Funding Formula exceeds 2% in a primary school and 1% in a secondary school?**

Other matters

Revisions to the Scheme for Financing Schools

102. Each LA is required to publish a Scheme for Financing Schools (the “Scheme”). This sets out the financial relationship between the LA and the maintained schools which it funds. It is a legally binding document on both the LA and schools relating to financial management and associated issues.
103. The DfE issues statutory guidance to LAs in respect of minimum content of Schemes. Parts of Schemes must be in accordance with “directed scheme revisions” and are mandatory, for other elements of schemes, there is discretion to make changes to reflect local circumstances. The statutory power to update discretionary parts of Schemes rests with maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum, but changes can only be made after a consultation with all governing bodies and head teachers.
104. Two changes are now proposed in respect to the BF Scheme for Financing Schools.

Policy for funding school redundancies

105. As set out above, funding provision for premature retirement / dismissal costs should in future be accounted for as a de-delegated budget and not one held centrally by the LA and a change is proposed for 2014-15. This will require a consequential change to the funding policy. There is no material change in how the scheme will operate, but the wording has been updated with changes clearly identified in Appendix 13 which schools are asked to support.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree that the wording in the existing premature retirement / dismissal funding policy should be updated as set out in Appendix 13?

Responsibility for repair and maintenance

106. Following consultation with schools, the Forum agreed that where the LA undertakes capital maintenance works in a school, the school would contribute 10% of the cost from its Devolved Formula Capital, up to a maximum of 75% of annual income. A change to the existing text is now proposed to make clear that contributions need to be made in the year that works are undertaken. The wording has been updated with changes clearly identified in Appendix 14, which schools are asked to support.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree that the wording relating to responsibility to repair and maintenance should be updated to make clear that financial contributions to schemes due from schools need to be paid in the year that work is completed? The full proposed text is set out in Appendix 14.

Lessons to be learnt from the composition of LA Funding Formulas in 2013-14

107. As would be expected, there is a wide range of proportions allocated through the allowable factors of Funding Formulas by LAs which mainly reflects the different circumstances and priorities found across the country.
108. The amounts allocated through each factor by BF compared to the statistical neighbours and all England in the summary information of LA Funding Formulas (see Appendix 3 of the consultation document) are broadly in line with expectations. The one exception to this relates to rates, where at 2.26% of funds allocated, BF has the highest proportionate spend of the statistical neighbours, where the average rate is 1.31%, and the second highest in all England, where the average is 1.21%.
109. Part of the reason for the high proportional amount of spend relates to the small number of academy schools in BF as academy schools are treated as charities and therefore receive an 80% rebate on their rates bill. An analysis of rates bills for schools in Berkshire shows average spend of 1.47% based on actual cost of rates, which increases to 2.03% if all schools paid full rates liabilities. The rate for BF would increase to 2.51%.
110. The other main factor that accounts for the relative high cost of rates in BF is the impact of the rebuild at Garth Hill. This change resulted in the rates liability increasing by £0.205m. If the old rates liability is used, then the BF proportion of spend would be at 2.16%, just above the area average of 2.03%.
111. Other factors impact on rates liability such as regional characteristics and the size and age of buildings. More work is being undertaken in this area, including surveying other LAs for more data and advice has also been requested from the Council's Corporate Property Team.

Budget pressures and developments

112. Whilst it is unclear to what extent there will be new funds available to consider financing budget pressures or new developments in 2014-15, schools are being asked now if there are any items that the Schools Forum should consider when budget decisions are taken.
113. The new Funding Framework required a change to the way that the budget is set, with a more simplistic, high level approach needing to be adopted. This mainly arises from the tight financial settlements being made by the government and the restricted number of allowable factors which limits the ability to selectively target resources only to those schools facing cost pressures. Therefore, the following key principles, listed in priority order, are used by the Schools Forum as a guide in making budget proposals:
 - i. It has been included in the financial settlement from the DfE and it is consistent with local funding priorities;
 - ii. It relates to a new or amended statutory responsibility / DfE Regulation;
 - iii. There is sufficient income to fully fund changes in pupil characteristics, i.e: changes in pupil deprivation, low prior attainment, number of looked after children, English as an additional language and mobility;

- iv. The pressure relates to a key local priority;
- v. Any remaining funds should be allocated using per-pupil, high deprivation and low prior attainment data, in the same proportion as the distribution of funds at the start of the financial year (around 93.6%/3.1%/3.3% in primary and 90.7%/4.6%/4.7% in secondary). If sufficient funding remains for this principle, schools would then be free to deploy the resources to their key priorities and any school specific pressures.

114. Whilst there may be limited opportunities to consider budget pressures, the Forum is still interested to know to what extent there is a funding gap for schools between what needs to be spent and the amount of resources made available from the DfE.

QUESTION 16

Are you aware of any areas of budget pressure or areas of new development that you would like to be added to school budgets, subject to sufficient funds being available?

Any other matters on Education Funding?

115. This document asks questions on the issues considered the most important by the Schools Forum. Are there any other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?

QUESTION 17

Would you like to change any other matters on education funding in BF?

Next Steps

Results of Consultation

116. The results of this consultation, including all comments made by schools, will be considered by the Schools Forum on 5 December, as part of the budget setting process. The Schools Forum will need to take a strategic approach in setting the budget, including taking account of the overall level of resources.

Evening briefing for head teachers and governors

117. This consultation will be supported by an evening briefing on 15 October. The session will commence at 7.00 pm and be held at the Education Centre (Donnington Room) and will explain the key issues raised and the potential implications. The session will address each question on the consultation and provide an opportunity for attendees to raise questions. The intended audience is governors. Head teachers and bursars will receive briefings through the normal half termly meetings.

118. If you intend to attend the session, please can you confirm to:

education.finance@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Indicative budgets for 2014-15

119. As in previous years, the LA intends to provide all schools with an indicative budget for next year, and this is planned as usual to be in schools by the end of the autumn term. These allocations should be seen as a guide and not a guarantee to future funding and will be subject to change once the data set to be used is made available by the DfE and final budget decisions are taken.

Contact for queries

120. Should 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

G:\New Alluse\PERFORMANCE & RESOURCES\Finance\Fair funding\Consultation 2013\Consultation October 2013 - v4 13 August 2013.doc

Allowable factors for LA Funding Formulas - April 2014

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 on 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 £175,000.
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.

Summary of the BF Funding Formula used in 2013-14

Pupil Led Factors

			Number of Pupils					
	Reception Uplift	No	0					
1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Amount (£) per pupil		Pupil Units		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding(%)	
	Primary (including reception)	£2,849.01	9,002.0		£25,646,791.38	£48,443,516.99	42.87%	
	Key Stage 3	£4,080.32	3,331.0		£13,591,532.67		22.72%	
	Key Stage 4	£4,080.32	2,256.0		£9,205,192.95		15.39%	
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)	Number of eligible primary pupils	Number of eligible secondary pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding(%)
	Primary FSM	£425.12		893.5	0.0	£379,827.43	£2,073,474.38	3.47%
	Secondary FSM		£1,156.72	0.0	415.8	£480,982.54		
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25	£344.34	£961.77	1,226.3	632.4	£1,030,465.08		
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3	£516.51	£1,442.66	130.2	70.1	£168,315.63		
	IDACI Score 0.3- 0.4	£688.68	£1,923.54	5.0	5.0	£13,001.11		
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5	£860.85	£2,264.27	1.0	0.0	£882.59		
	IDACI Score 0.5-0.6	£978.63	£2,692.97	0.0	0.0	£0.00		
IDACI Score 0.6-1	£1,141.74	£3,141.80	0.0	0.0	£0.00			
		Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding(%)
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	LAC_X_Mar11	£211.86		45.9		£9,714.29	£9,714.29	0.02%
4) Low cost, high incidence SEN	LowAtt_%_PRI_78	£533.91		1,743.9		£931,071.01	£2,088,156.54	3.49%
	Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English and Maths)	£2,152.74		537.5		£1,157,085.53		
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	EAL_3_PRI	£272.60		625.8		£170,587.41	£198,937.52	0.33%
	EAL_3_SEC	£272.60		104.0		£28,350.11		
6) Mobility	Primary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£23.95		666.4		£15,957.76	£15,957.76	0.03%
	Secondary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£0.00		255.9		£0.00		

Other Factors

Factor	Description	Total (£)	Proportion of funding(%)
7) Lump Sum	A lump sum of £150,000 per school for 37 schools	£5,550,000.00	9.28%
8) Fringe Payments	N/A	£0.00	0.00%
9) Split Sites	N/A	£0.00	0.00%
10) Rates	Estimated actual cost.	£1,353,495.00	2.26%
11) PFI funding	N/A	£0.00	0.00%
12) Sixth Form	N/A	£0.00	0.00%
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)			
Circumstance		Total (£)	Proportion of funding(%)
Exceptional Circumstance 1	The Authority was granted approval by the EFA 12 September 2012 for Joint Use of Sports facilities to be excepted. This affects 2 secondary schools: Edgbarrow and Sandhurst.	£85,048.47	0.14%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total) (£)			£59,818,300.96
14) Minimum Funding Guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> MFG is set at -1.5%, gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled			
MFG Funding Total (before capping or scaling) (£)			£356,741.65
Capping Factor (%)	1.00%	Scaling Factor (%)	59.59%
Explanation as to how capping and/or scaling has been applied:			
All schools retain the first 1% of any gain, with the remainder of the gain scaled by 59.58794% which is the rate required to fund the cost of MFG.			
If capped and/or scaling applied: Total deduction (£)			-£356,741.75
TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£)			£59,818,300.86
% DISTRIBUTED THROUGH BASIC ENTITLEMENT			80.98%
% Pupil Led Funding			88.32%
RETAINED FOR GROWTH (£)			£392,050.00
PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO			1: 1.32%

Summary of Funding Formulas used by Statistical Neighbours in 2013-14

Local Authority (statistical neighbour)	Basic Entitlement Funding (per pupil)						Other Per Pupil Funding			
	Primary Amount Per Pupil	Primary Proportion of Funding	Key Stage 3 Amount per pupil	Key Stage 3 Proportion of Funding	Key Stage 4 Amount per pupil	Key Stage 4 Proportion of Funding	Deprivation Proportion of Funding	Looked after Children Proportion of Funding	SEN Proportion of Funding (low prior attainment)	EAL Proportion of Funding
Bracknell Forest	£2,849	42.9%	£4,080	22.7%	£4,080	15.4%	3.47%	0.02%	3.49%	0.33%
Buckinghamshire	£2,490	38.2%	£3,375	21.8%	£3,915	16.9%	6.24%	0.00%	5.43%	0.37%
Cambridgeshire	£2,447	38.8%	£3,434	20.6%	£4,464	18.7%	4.00%	0.05%	3.08%	1.00%
Central Bedfordshire	£2,908	43.2%	£4,170	23.5%	£4,879	18.9%	2.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cheshire East	£2,706	37.8%	£3,786	22.4%	£4,532	18.9%	3.40%	0.03%	5.98%	0.12%
Hampshire	£2,471	35.0%	£3,736	21.5%	£4,481	17.8%	4.73%	0.18%	4.85%	0.44%
Hertfordshire	£2,538	35.2%	£3,708	21.8%	£4,895	19.5%	5.90%	0.17%	1.73%	0.66%
Oxfordshire	£2,773	41.3%	£4,106	22.3%	£4,306	16.0%	4.44%	0.00%	4.20%	0.29%
Surrey	£2,579	38.0%	£3,445	19.5%	£4,373	16.8%	11.22%	0.05%	3.59%	0.38%
West Berkshire	£2,907	38.1%	£4,332	25.9%	£4,332	17.8%	3.32%	0.00%	3.30%	0.23%
Windsor and Maidenhead	£2,819	37.3%	£3,910	23.3%	£4,576	19.0%	2.71%	0.00%	6.66%	0.67%

Statistical Neighbours:

Minimum	£2,447	35.0%	£3,375	19.5%	£3,915	15.4%	2.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Maximum	£2,908	43.2%	£4,332	25.9%	£4,895	19.5%	11.22%	0.18%	6.66%	1.00%
Median (rank number 6)	£2,706	38.1%	£3,786	22.3%	£4,464	17.8%	4.00%	0.02%	3.59%	0.37%
BFC Rank (out of 11)	3	2	4	4	10	11	7	6	7	7
BFC cash allocation		£25,646,791		£13,591,533		£9,205,193	£2,073,474	£9,714	£2,088,157	£198,938

All England:

(excluding City of London):

Minimum	£2,122	26.3%	£3,178	13.2%	£3,414	8.6%	0.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Maximum	£5,142	57.9%	£7,496	28.7%	£10,708	21.0%	24.82%	0.41%	9.41%	4.80%
Median (rank number 76)	£2,822	38.1%	£3,973	20.8%	£4,510	16.8%	7.85%	0.03%	3.89%	0.38%
BFC Rank (out of 151)	68	25	63	29	130	100	135	81	92	86

Local Authority (statistical neighbour)	Mobility Proportion of Funding	Lump Sum Fixed Sum per school	Lump Sum Proportion of Funding	London Fringe Proportion of Funding	Split Sites Proportion of Funding	Rates Proportion of Funding	Private Finance Initiative Proportion of Funding	Sixth Form Proportion of Funding	Exceptional Factors Proportion of Funding	Total	Total Funding	Memo Items:		
												Total Through Basic	Pupil Led Funding	Primary: Secondary Ratio
Bracknell Forest	0.03%	£150,000	9.28%	0.00%	0.00%	2.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	100.00%	£59,818,301	81%	88%	1.32
Buckinghamshire	0.00%	£113,145	9.40%	0.49%	0.01%	1.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	100.00%	£262,365,698	77%	89%	1.15
Cambridgeshire	0.00%	£150,000	12.35%	0.00%	0.00%	1.31%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£288,801,336	78%	86%	1.21
Central Bedfordshire	0.00%	£120,000	10.87%	0.00%	0.05%	1.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	100.00%	£142,908,725	86%	88%	1.18
Cheshire East	0.00%	£130,000	9.90%	0.00%	0.09%	1.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£190,483,785	79%	89%	1.26
Hampshire	0.17%	£190,000	13.78%	0.00%	0.01%	1.41%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	100.00%	£683,915,895	74%	85%	1.66
Hertfordshire	0.77%	£147,592	10.85%	1.28%	0.07%	1.44%	0.06%	0.45%	0.09%	100.00%	£651,704,298	77%	86%	1.33
Oxfordshire	0.07%	£120,000	9.84%	0.00%	0.04%	1.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	100.00%	£323,117,274	80%	89%	1.30
Surrey	0.00%	£135,000	8.71%	0.00%	0.09%	1.26%	0.00%	0.29%	0.03%	100.00%	£543,040,366	74%	90%	1.28
West Berkshire	0.00%	£125,733	10.20%	0.00%	0.00%	1.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£94,088,542	82%	89%	1.27
Windsor and Maidenhead	0.00%	£120,478	9.18%	0.00%	£0	1.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£76,129,928	80%	90%	1.26

Statistical Neighbours:

Minimum	0.00%	£113,145	8.71%	0.00%	0.00%	1.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£59,818,301	74%	85%	1.15
Maximum	0.77%	£190,000	13.78%	1.28%	0.09%	2.26%	0.06%	0.45%	0.14%	100.00%	£683,915,895	86%	90%	1.66
Median (rank number 6)	0.00%	£130,000	9.90%	0.00%	0.01%	1.31%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	100.00%	£262,365,698	79%	89%	1.27
BFC Rank (out of 11)	4	2	9	3	8	1	3	3	1	2	11	3	7	3
BFC cash allocation	£15,958		£5,550,000			£1,353,495			£85,048			£48,443,517	£52,813,800	

All England:

(excluding City of London):

Minimum	0.00%	£42,000	2.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£2,514,447	61%	65%	0.00
Maximum	4.30%	£200,000	17.11%	1.28%	21.91%	2.68%	9.59%	1.30%	3.42%	100.00%	£809,832,006	87%	96%	1.66
Median (rank number 76)	0.00%	£125,570	8.02%	0.00%	0.04%	1.21%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	£158,257,509	76%	90%	1.28
BFC Rank (out of 151)	60	33	52	6	108	2	78	17	17	15	146	19	113	45

Potential financial effect of allocating funds for low prior attainment at the average rate used by statistical neighbours

		Original 2013-14 Budget				Funding at Statistical average			Net Change in Funding			
	Primary funding rate	£2,849.01		£499.22		£513.92		-£2.85				
	Secondary funding rate	£4,080.32		£2,128.61		£2,191.29		-£6.03				
Ref	School	Total number on roll October 2012	Number of LPA pupils October 2012	Proportion of pupils classed as LPA	LPA funding	LPA Funding	Change in LPA Funding	Contribution from Headcount Funding	Amount	This Factor	Total Budget	Ref
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	11.2	5.43%	£5,608	£5,773	£165	£589	£424	-7.57%	-0.06%	1
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	27.0	11.30%	£13,488	£13,885	£397	£681	£283	-2.10%	-0.03%	2
3	Binfield Primary	416	22.8	5.49%	£11,391	£11,727	£335	£1,185	£849	-7.45%	-0.06%	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	68.9	18.47%	£34,390	£35,403	£1,013	£1,062	£50	-0.14%	0.00%	4
5	College Town Infant	221	24.0	10.87%	£11,992	£12,345	£353	£629	£276	-2.30%	-0.03%	5
6	College Town Junior	278	53.5	19.23%	£26,689	£27,475	£786	£792	£6	-0.02%	0.00%	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	22.6	11.40%	£11,272	£11,604	£332	£564	£232	-2.06%	-0.03%	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	55.4	14.62%	£27,667	£28,481	£815	£1,079	£265	-0.96%	-0.02%	8
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	42.9	20.51%	£21,402	£22,033	£630	£595	£35	0.16%	0.00%	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	46.9	25.93%	£23,426	£24,116	£690	£515	£174	0.74%	0.02%	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	107.7	34.30%	£53,771	£55,354	£1,583	£894	£689	1.28%	0.05%	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	222.2	35.61%	£110,938	£114,204	£3,266	£1,777	£1,490	1.34%	0.07%	12
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	51.9	20.12%	£25,917	£26,680	£763	£735	£28	0.11%	0.00%	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	65.5	28.85%	£32,689	£33,652	£963	£646	£316	0.97%	0.04%	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	54.1	26.67%	£27,024	£27,820	£796	£578	£218	0.81%	0.03%	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	73.7	15.56%	£36,809	£37,893	£1,084	£1,350	£266	-0.72%	-0.02%	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	10.7	5.17%	£5,319	£5,476	£157	£587	£430	-8.08%	-0.06%	17
18	Owismoor Primary	485	73.9	15.24%	£36,903	£37,990	£1,087	£1,381	£294	-0.80%	-0.02%	18
19	The Pines Primary	174	51.0	29.29%	£25,445	£26,194	£749	£495	£254	1.00%	0.03%	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	191.7	32.65%	£95,687	£98,505	£2,817	£1,671	£1,146	1.20%	0.05%	20
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	23.3	11.11%	£11,648	£11,991	£343	£598	£255	-2.19%	-0.03%	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	201	51.1	25.44%	£25,526	£26,278	£752	£572	£179	0.70%	0.02%	22
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	15.9	6.57%	£7,937	£8,170	£234	£689	£455	-5.74%	-0.05%	23
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	11.0	5.17%	£5,474	£5,635	£161	£604	£442	-8.08%	-0.06%	24
25	Uplands Primary	208	15.7	7.56%	£7,853	£8,085	£231	£592	£361	-4.60%	-0.05%	25
26	Warfield Primary	204	40.1	19.64%	£20,004	£20,593	£589	£581	£8	0.04%	0.00%	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	37.2	8.33%	£18,554	£19,101	£546	£1,270	£724	-3.90%	-0.05%	27
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	37.8	23.17%	£18,855	£19,410	£555	£464	£91	0.48%	0.01%	28
29	Wildridings Primary	340	124.8	36.71%	£62,318	£64,153	£1,835	£968	£867	1.39%	0.07%	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	34.1	16.38%	£17,008	£17,509	£501	£592	£91	-0.54%	-0.01%	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	75.3	23.89%	£37,566	£38,672	£1,106	£897	£209	0.56%	0.02%	31
32	The Brakenhale	882	145.6	16.51%	£309,954	£319,080	£9,126	£5,318	£3,808	1.23%	0.09%	32
33	Easthampstead Park	718	96.9	13.49%	£206,169	£212,240	£6,070	£4,329	£1,741	0.84%	0.05%	33
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	61.2	6.04%	£130,337	£134,175	£3,838	£6,108	£2,270	-1.74%	-0.05%	34
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	139.2	10.66%	£296,353	£305,078	£8,726	£7,875	£851	0.29%	0.01%	35
36	Ranelagh	768	28.6	3.72%	£60,797	£62,587	£1,790	£4,631	£2,841	-4.67%	-0.08%	36
37	Sandhurst	900	66.0	7.33%	£140,503	£144,640	£4,137	£5,427	£1,290	-0.92%	-0.03%	37
Total Primary		9,002	1,744	18.41%	£870,573	£896,206	£25,633	£25,633	£0	0.00%	0.00%	
Total Secondary		5,587	537	9.63%	£1,144,114	£1,177,801	£33,687	£33,687	£0	0.00%	0.00%	
GRAND TOTAL		14,589	2,281	16.99%	£2,014,687	£2,074,007	£59,320	£59,320	£0	0.00%	0.00%	

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£1,490	1.39%	0.07%
Primary Maximum reduction.	£849	-8.08%	-0.06%
Secondary Maximum increase.	£3,808	1.23%	0.09%
Secondary Maximum reduction.	£2,841	-4.67%	-0.08%

Potential financial effect from new low prior attainment data for secondary schools

		Original 2013-14 Budget				Revised Budget - new criteria			Net Change in Funding					
Secondary funding rate		£2,128.61				£828.68								
Ref	School	Total number on roll October 2012	Number of LPA pupils October 2012 current criteria	Proportion of pupils classed as LPA - current criteria	LPA funding	Number of LPA pupils October 2012 2014-15 criteria	Proportion of pupils classed as LPA - 2014-15 criteria	LPA Funding	Change in LPA funding	Contribution from Headcount Funding	Total	This Factor	Total Budget	Ref
32	The Brakenhale	882	145.6	16.51%	£309,987	344.5	39.06%	£285,478	£-24,510	£-5,318	£-29,828	-9.62%	£-0.67%	32
33	Easthampstead Park	718	96.9	13.49%	£206,194	251.2	34.99%	£208,203	£2,008	£-4,329	£-2,321	-1.13%	£-0.06%	33
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	61.2	6.04%	£130,355	182.6	18.03%	£151,332	£20,977	£-6,108	£14,869	11.41%	£0.32%	34
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	139.2	10.66%	£296,389	362.8	27.78%	£300,625	£4,237	£-7,874	£-3,637	-1.23%	£-0.06%	35
36	Ranelagh	768	28.6	3.72%	£60,666	89.9	11.71%	£74,512	£13,846	£-4,631	£9,215	15.19%	£0.26%	36
37	Sandhurst	900	66.0	7.33%	£140,522	190.2	21.14%	£157,651	£17,128	£-5,427	£11,701	8.33%	£0.28%	37
Total Secondary		5,587	537.5	9.63%	£1,144,114	1,421.3	25.45%	£1,177,801	£33,687	£-33,687	£0	3.82%	0.01%	

Eligibility Criteria:

Currently, number of pupils not achieving Level 4 in English **and** maths.
 2014-15, number of pupils not achieving Level 4 in English **or** maths.

Summary:

Secondary Maximum increase. £14,869 15.19% 0.32%
 Secondary Maximum reduction. £-29,828 -9.62% -0.67%

Potential financial effect of allocating funds for deprivation at the average rate used by statistical neighbours

Ref	School	Original 2013-14 Budget				Funding at Statistical average				Net Change in Funding			Ref	
		Number on roll October 2012	£404.81 varies		Total Deprivation	FSM Element	£468.84 varies		Change in Deprivation Funding	Headcount Funding Contribution	Amount	This Factor		Total Budget
			FSM Element	IDACI Element			FSM Element	IDACI Element						
	Primary funding rate		£404.81			£468.84	varies				-£14.55			
	Secondary funding rate		£1,147.36			£1,328.85	varies				-£33.69			
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	£3,238	£325	£3,564	£3,751	£377	£564	-£3,013	-£2,449	-0.42%	-0.33%	1	
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	£3,643	£0	£3,643	£4,220	£0	£576	-£3,478	-£2,902	-0.44%	-0.34%	2	
3	Binfield Primary	416	£4,858	£6,182	£11,039	£5,626	£7,160	£1,746	-£6,054	-£4,308	-0.37%	-0.31%	3	
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	£18,216	£5,546	£23,762	£21,098	£6,423	£3,759	-£5,428	-£1,670	-0.16%	-0.13%	4	
5	College Town Infant	221	£7,287	£1,798	£9,084	£8,439	£2,082	£1,437	-£3,216	-£1,779	-0.29%	-0.22%	5	
6	College Town Junior	278	£4,858	£813	£5,671	£5,626	£942	£897	-£4,046	-£3,149	-0.41%	-0.32%	6	
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	£2,834	£0	£2,834	£3,282	£0	£448	-£2,882	-£2,433	-0.44%	-0.33%	7	
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	£19,431	£14,680	£34,111	£22,504	£17,002	£5,395	-£5,516	-£120	-0.01%	-0.01%	8	
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	£3,238	£1,308	£4,546	£3,751	£1,515	£719	-£3,042	-£2,323	-0.40%	-0.30%	9	
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	£19,026	£3,926	£22,952	£22,036	£4,547	£3,630	-£2,634	£996	0.19%	0.13%	10	
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	£35,623	£76,784	£112,407	£41,258	£88,930	£17,780	-£4,570	£13,210	1.34%	1.05%	11	
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	£36,028	£44,320	£80,348	£41,727	£51,330	£12,709	-£9,081	£3,628	0.20%	0.16%	12	
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	£17,407	£8,394	£25,801	£20,160	£9,722	£4,081	-£3,755	£326	0.04%	0.03%	13	
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	£12,549	£5,556	£18,105	£14,534	£6,434	£2,864	-£3,304	-£440	-0.07%	-0.05%	14	
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	£17,002	£55,039	£72,042	£19,691	£63,745	£11,395	-£2,954	£8,441	1.33%	1.03%	15	
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	£21,233	£57,516	£78,749	£24,591	£66,614	£12,456	-£6,898	£5,558	0.40%	0.33%	16	
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	£2,024	£488	£2,512	£2,344	£565	£397	-£2,998	-£2,601	-0.45%	-0.34%	17	
18	Owlsmoor Primary	485	£12,549	£813	£13,363	£14,534	£942	£2,114	-£7,058	-£4,945	-0.36%	-0.30%	18	
19	The Pines Primary	174	£18,216	£14,804	£33,020	£21,098	£17,145	£5,223	-£2,532	£2,691	0.52%	0.36%	19	
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	£31,170	£42,947	£74,117	£36,101	£49,740	£11,724	-£8,543	£3,181	0.19%	0.15%	20	
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	£2,429	£14,221	£16,650	£2,813	£16,470	£2,634	-£3,056	-£423	-0.07%	-0.05%	21	
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	201	£4,048	£18,965	£23,013	£4,688	£21,965	£3,640	-£2,925	£715	0.12%	0.09%	22	
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	£10,120	£8,622	£18,742	£11,721	£9,986	£2,965	-£3,522	-£557	-0.08%	-0.06%	23	
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	£3,238	£1,301	£4,540	£3,751	£1,507	£718	-£3,085	-£2,367	-0.40%	-0.32%	24	
25	Uplands Primary	208	£2,024	£0	£2,024	£2,344	£0	£320	-£3,027	-£2,707	-0.47%	-0.35%	25	
26	Warfield Primary	204	£1,619	£1,627	£3,246	£1,875	£1,884	£513	-£2,969	-£2,455	-0.43%	-0.31%	26	
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	£2,024	£1,627	£3,651	£2,344	£1,884	£577	-£6,491	-£5,913	-0.48%	-0.40%	27	
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	£4,048	£1,952	£6,000	£4,688	£2,261	£949	-£2,372	-£1,423	-0.31%	-0.21%	28	
29	Wildridings Primary	340	£23,479	£26,268	£49,747	£27,193	£30,424	£7,869	-£4,948	£2,921	0.29%	0.23%	29	
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	£2,024	£0	£2,024	£2,344	£0	£320	-£3,027	-£2,707	-0.47%	-0.36%	30	
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	£16,192	£50,756	£66,948	£18,754	£58,784	£10,590	-£4,584	£6,005	0.64%	0.51%	31	
32	The Brakenhale	882	£133,094	£141,985	£275,079	£154,147	£164,444	£43,511	-£29,718	£13,793	0.36%	0.31%	32	
33	Easthampstead Park	718	£105,557	£272,258	£377,815	£122,254	£315,322	£59,761	-£24,192	£35,569	1.09%	0.92%	33	
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	£27,537	£21,963	£49,500	£31,892	£25,437	£7,830	-£34,132	-£26,302	-0.64%	-0.57%	34	
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	£120,473	£213,210	£333,683	£139,529	£246,935	£52,781	-£44,004	£8,776	0.16%	0.14%	35	
36	Ranelagh	768	£20,440	£33,560	£53,999	£23,673	£38,868	£8,541	-£25,877	-£17,335	-0.55%	-0.49%	36	
37	Sandhurst	900	£69,989	£30,050	£100,039	£81,060	£34,803	£15,824	-£30,324	-£14,501	-0.39%	-0.35%	37	
Total Primary		9,002	£361,678	£466,578	£828,256	£418,887	£540,379	£131,010	-£131,010	£0	0.00%	0.00%		
Total Secondary		5,587	£477,091	£713,025	£1,190,116	£552,555	£825,809	£188,248	-£188,248	£0	0.00%	0.00%		
GRAND TOTAL		14,589	£838,768	£1,179,603	£2,018,371	£971,441	£1,366,188	£319,258	-£319,258	£0	0.00%	0.00%		

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£13,210	1.34%	1.05%	Secondary Maximum increase.	£35,569	1.09%	0.92%
Primary Maximum reduction.	-£5,913	-0.48%	-0.40%	Secondary Maximum reduction.	-£26,302	-0.64%	-0.57%

Potential financial effect from new pupil mobility data for primary schools

Ref	School	Original 2013-14 Budget				Revised Budget - new criteria		Net Change in Funding			Ref
		Total number on roll October 2012	Mobility % provided from DfE dataset Oct 12	Number of Mobility pupils October 2012 - current criteria	Mobility funding	Number of Mobility pupils October 2012 - 2014-15 criteria	Mobility Funding	Amount	This Factor	Total Budget	
	Primary funding rate				£23.95		£314.75				
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	2.90%	6.0	£144	0.0	£0	£-144	-100.00%	-0.02%	1
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	1.67%	4.0	£96	0.0	£0	£-96	-100.00%	-0.01%	2
3	Binfield Primary	416	3.85%	16.0	£383	0.0	£0	£-383	-100.00%	-0.03%	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	4.02%	15.0	£359	0.0	£0	£-359	-100.00%	-0.03%	4
5	College Town Infant	221	7.69%	17.0	£407	0.0	£0	£-407	-100.00%	-0.05%	5
6	College Town Junior	278	7.19%	20.0	£479	0.0	£0	£-479	-100.00%	-0.05%	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	9.60%	19.0	£455	0.0	£0	£-455	-100.00%	-0.06%	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	11.35%	43.0	£1,030	5.1	£1,605	£576	55.90%	0.04%	8
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	6.70%	14.0	£335	0.0	£0	£-335	-100.00%	-0.04%	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	16.02%	29.0	£694	10.9	£3,431	£2,736	394.05%	0.34%	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	9.24%	29.0	£694	0.0	£0	£-694	-100.00%	-0.06%	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	8.17%	51.0	£1,221	0.0	£0	£-1,221	-100.00%	-0.06%	12
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	7.36%	19.0	£455	0.0	£0	£-455	-100.00%	-0.05%	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	6.17%	14.0	£335	0.0	£0	£-335	-100.00%	-0.04%	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	12.81%	26.0	£623	5.7	£1,794	£1,171	188.17%	0.14%	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	4.10%	19.4	£465	0.0	£0	£-465	-100.00%	-0.03%	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	4.85%	10.0	£239	0.0	£0	£-239	-100.00%	-0.03%	17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	485	4.95%	24.0	£575	0.0	£0	£-575	-100.00%	-0.03%	18
19	The Pines Primary	174	6.90%	12.0	£287	0.0	£0	£-287	-100.00%	-0.04%	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	10.05%	59.0	£1,413	0.3	£94	£-1,318	-93.32%	-0.06%	20
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	4.29%	9.0	£216	0.0	£0	£-216	-100.00%	-0.03%	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	201	6.47%	13.0	£311	0.0	£0	£-311	-100.00%	-0.04%	22
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	5.79%	14.0	£335	0.0	£0	£-335	-100.00%	-0.04%	23
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	4.25%	9.0	£216	0.0	£0	£-216	-100.00%	-0.03%	24
25	Uplands Primary	208	8.17%	17.0	£407	0.0	£0	£-407	-100.00%	-0.05%	25
26	Warfield Primary	204	6.37%	13.0	£311	0.0	£0	£-311	-100.00%	-0.04%	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	6.50%	29.0	£694	0.0	£0	£-694	-100.00%	-0.05%	27
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	14.11%	23.0	£551	6.7	£2,109	£1,558	282.91%	0.23%	28
29	Wildridings Primary	340	16.47%	56.0	£1,341	22.0	£6,924	£5,584	416.39%	0.44%	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	6.25%	13.0	£311	0.0	£0	£-311	-100.00%	-0.04%	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	7.62%	24.0	£575	0.0	£0	£-575	-100.00%	-0.05%	31
Total Primary		9,002	7.48%	666.4	£15,958	51	£15,958	£0	-40.51%	0.00%	

Eligibility Criteria:

Currently, All mobility with no threshold.
2014-15, for schools over 10% threshold - for each pupil over 10% threshold .

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase. £5,584 416.39% 0.44%
Primary Maximum reduction. -£1,318 -100.00% -0.06%

Potential financial effect from allocating lump sum payments of £160k

		Original 2013-14 Budget			Increase to £160K		Net Change in Funding		
		£150,000	£2,773.29		£160,000	-£34.44			
		£150,000	£4,008.52		£160,000	-£10.74			
Ref	School	Total number on roll October 2012	Original lump sum	Headcount Funding	Increase in Lump sum	Contribution from Headcount Funding	Amount	This Factor	Total Budget
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	£150,000	£574,071	£10,000	-£7,128	£2,872	0.40%	0.38%
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	£150,000	£662,817	£10,000	-£8,230	£1,770	0.22%	0.21%
3	Binfield Primary	416	£150,000	£1,153,689	£10,000	-£14,326	-£4,326	-0.33%	-0.32%
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	£150,000	£1,034,438	£10,000	-£12,845	-£2,845	-0.24%	-0.22%
5	College Town Infant	221	£150,000	£612,898	£10,000	-£7,611	£2,389	0.31%	0.30%
6	College Town Junior	278	£150,000	£770,975	£10,000	-£9,573	£427	0.05%	0.04%
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	£150,000	£549,112	£10,000	-£6,818	£3,182	0.46%	0.43%
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	£150,000	£1,051,078	£10,000	-£13,052	-£3,052	-0.25%	-0.22%
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	£150,000	£579,618	£10,000	-£7,197	£2,803	0.38%	0.36%
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	£150,000	£501,966	£10,000	-£6,233	£3,767	0.58%	0.47%
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	£150,000	£870,814	£10,000	-£10,813	-£813	-0.08%	-0.06%
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	£150,000	£1,730,534	£10,000	-£21,489	-£11,489	-0.61%	-0.52%
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	£150,000	£715,509	£10,000	-£8,885	£1,115	0.13%	0.12%
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	£150,000	£629,537	£10,000	-£7,817	£2,183	0.28%	0.25%
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	£150,000	£562,978	£10,000	-£6,991	£3,009	0.42%	0.37%
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	£150,000	£1,314,540	£10,000	-£16,323	-£6,323	-0.43%	-0.38%
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	£150,000	£571,298	£10,000	-£7,094	£2,906	0.40%	0.38%
18	Owlsmoor Primary	485	£150,000	£1,345,047	£10,000	-£16,702	-£6,702	-0.45%	-0.41%
19	The Pines Primary	174	£150,000	£482,553	£10,000	-£5,992	£4,008	0.63%	0.53%
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	£150,000	£1,627,922	£10,000	-£20,214	-£10,214	-0.57%	-0.49%
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	£150,000	£582,391	£10,000	-£7,232	£2,768	0.38%	0.35%
22	St Margaret Clitheroe Primary	201	£150,000	£557,432	£10,000	-£6,922	£3,078	0.44%	0.40%
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	£150,000	£671,137	£10,000	-£8,334	£1,666	0.20%	0.19%
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	£150,000	£587,938	£10,000	-£7,301	£2,699	0.37%	0.36%
25	Uplands Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£10,000	-£7,163	£2,837	0.39%	0.37%
26	Warfield Primary	204	£150,000	£565,752	£10,000	-£7,025	£2,975	0.42%	0.38%
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	£150,000	£1,236,888	£10,000	-£15,359	-£5,359	-0.39%	-0.36%
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	£150,000	£452,047	£10,000	-£5,613	£4,387	0.73%	0.66%
29	Wildridings Primary	340	£150,000	£942,919	£10,000	-£11,709	-£1,709	-0.16%	-0.13%
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£10,000	-£7,163	£2,837	0.39%	0.37%
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	£150,000	£873,587	£10,000	-£10,848	-£848	-0.08%	-0.07%
32	The Brakenhale	882	£150,000	£3,535,516	£10,000	-£9,472	£528	0.01%	0.01%
33	Easthampstead Park	718	£150,000	£2,878,118	£10,000	-£7,711	£2,289	0.08%	0.06%
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	£150,000	£4,060,632	£10,000	-£10,879	-£879	-0.02%	-0.02%
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	£150,000	£5,235,129	£10,000	-£14,025	-£4,025	-0.07%	-0.06%
36	Ranelagh	768	£150,000	£3,078,544	£10,000	-£8,248	£1,752	0.05%	0.05%
37	Sandhurst	900	£150,000	£3,607,669	£10,000	-£9,665	£335	0.01%	0.01%
Total Primary		9,002	£4,650,000	£24,965,174	£310,000	-£310,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
Total Secondary		5,587	£900,000	£22,395,607	£60,000	-£60,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
GRAND TOTAL		14,589	£5,550,000	£47,360,781	£370,000	-£370,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£4,387	0.73%	0.66%
Primary Maximum reduction.	-£11,489	-0.61%	-0.52%
Secondary Maximum increase.	£2,289	0.08%	0.06%
Secondary Maximum reduction.	-£4,025	-0.07%	-0.06%

Potential financial effect from allocating lump sum payments of £170k

		Original 2013-14 Budget			Increase to £170K		Net Change in Funding		
	Primary funding rate		£150,000	£2,773.29	£170,000	-£68.87			
	Secondary funding rate		£150,000	£4,008.52	£170,000	-£21.48			
Ref	School	Total number on roll October 2012	Original lump sum	Headcount Funding	Increase in Lump sum	Contribution from Headcount Funding	Amount	This Factor	Total Budget
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	£150,000	£574,071	£20,000	-£14,257	£5,743	0.79%	0.76%
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	£150,000	£662,817	£20,000	-£16,461	£3,539	0.44%	0.42%
3	Binfield Primary	416	£150,000	£1,153,689	£20,000	-£28,651	-£8,651	-0.66%	-0.63%
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	£150,000	£1,034,438	£20,000	-£25,690	-£5,690	-0.48%	-0.43%
5	College Town Infant	221	£150,000	£612,898	£20,000	-£15,221	£4,779	0.63%	0.59%
6	College Town Junior	278	£150,000	£770,975	£20,000	-£19,147	£853	0.09%	0.09%
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	£150,000	£549,112	£20,000	-£13,637	£6,363	0.91%	0.86%
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	£150,000	£1,051,078	£20,000	-£26,103	-£6,103	-0.51%	-0.44%
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	£150,000	£579,618	£20,000	-£14,395	£5,605	0.77%	0.72%
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	£150,000	£501,966	£20,000	-£12,466	£7,534	1.16%	0.95%
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	£150,000	£870,814	£20,000	-£21,626	-£1,626	-0.16%	-0.13%
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	£150,000	£1,730,534	£20,000	-£42,977	-£22,977	-1.22%	-1.04%
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	£150,000	£715,509	£20,000	-£17,769	£2,231	0.26%	0.24%
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	£150,000	£629,537	£20,000	-£15,634	£4,366	0.56%	0.50%
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	£150,000	£562,978	£20,000	-£13,981	£6,019	0.84%	0.73%
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	£150,000	£1,314,540	£20,000	-£32,646	-£12,646	-0.86%	-0.76%
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	£150,000	£571,298	£20,000	-£14,188	£5,812	0.81%	0.76%
18	Owlsmoor Primary	485	£150,000	£1,345,047	£20,000	-£33,404	-£13,404	-0.90%	-0.81%
19	The Pines Primary	174	£150,000	£482,553	£20,000	-£11,984	£8,016	1.27%	1.07%
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	£150,000	£1,627,922	£20,000	-£40,429	-£20,429	-1.15%	-0.98%
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	£150,000	£582,391	£20,000	-£14,463	£5,537	0.76%	0.69%
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	201	£150,000	£557,432	£20,000	-£13,844	£6,156	0.87%	0.80%
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	£150,000	£671,137	£20,000	-£16,667	£3,333	0.41%	0.38%
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	£150,000	£587,938	£20,000	-£14,601	£5,399	0.73%	0.73%
25	Uplands Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£20,000	-£14,326	£5,674	0.78%	0.74%
26	Warfield Primary	204	£150,000	£565,752	£20,000	-£14,050	£5,950	0.83%	0.76%
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	£150,000	£1,236,888	£20,000	-£30,718	-£10,718	-0.77%	-0.72%
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	£150,000	£452,047	£20,000	-£11,226	£8,774	1.46%	1.31%
29	Wildridings Primary	340	£150,000	£942,919	£20,000	-£23,417	-£3,417	-0.31%	-0.27%
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£20,000	-£14,326	£5,674	0.78%	0.75%
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	£150,000	£873,587	£20,000	-£21,695	-£1,695	-0.17%	-0.14%
32	The Brakenhale	882	£150,000	£3,535,516	£20,000	-£18,944	£1,056	0.03%	0.02%
33	Easthampstead Park	718	£150,000	£2,878,118	£20,000	-£15,422	£4,578	0.15%	0.12%
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	£150,000	£4,060,632	£20,000	-£21,758	-£1,758	-0.04%	-0.04%
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	£150,000	£5,235,129	£20,000	-£28,051	-£8,051	-0.15%	-0.13%
36	Ranelagh	768	£150,000	£3,078,544	£20,000	-£16,495	£3,505	0.11%	0.10%
37	Sandhurst	900	£150,000	£3,607,669	£20,000	-£19,331	£669	0.02%	0.02%
Total Primary		9,002	£4,650,000	£24,965,174	£620,000	-£620,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
Total Secondary		5,587	£900,000	£22,395,607	£120,000	-£120,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
GRAND TOTAL		14,589	£5,550,000	£47,360,781	£740,000	-£740,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£8,774	1.46%	1.31%
Primary Maximum reduction.	-£22,977	-1.22%	-1.04%
Secondary Maximum increase.	£4,578	0.15%	0.12%
Secondary Maximum reduction.	-£8,051	-0.15%	-0.13%

Potential financial effect from allocating lump sum payments of £175k

		Original 2013-14 Budget			Increase to £175K		Net Change in Funding		
	Primary funding rate		£150,000	£2,773.29	£175,000	£86.09			
	Secondary funding rate		£150,000	£4,008.52	£175,000	£26.85			
Ref	School	Total number on roll October 2012	Original lump sum	Headcount Funding	Increase in Lump sum	Contribution from Headcount Funding	Amount	This Factor	Total Budget
1	Ascot Heath Infant	207	£150,000	£574,071	£25,000	£17,821	£7,179	0.99%	0.95%
2	Ascot Heath Junior	239	£150,000	£662,817	£25,000	£20,576	£4,424	0.54%	0.52%
3	Binfield Primary	416	£150,000	£1,153,689	£25,000	£35,814	£10,814	-0.83%	-0.79%
4	Birch Hill Primary	373	£150,000	£1,034,438	£25,000	£32,112	£7,112	-0.60%	-0.54%
5	College Town Infant	221	£150,000	£612,898	£25,000	£19,026	£5,974	0.78%	0.74%
6	College Town Junior	278	£150,000	£770,975	£25,000	£23,934	£1,066	0.12%	0.11%
7	Cranbourne Primary	198	£150,000	£549,112	£25,000	£17,046	£7,954	1.14%	1.07%
8	Crown Wood Primary	379	£150,000	£1,051,078	£25,000	£32,629	£7,629	-0.64%	-0.55%
9	Crowthorne Primary	209	£150,000	£579,618	£25,000	£17,993	£7,007	0.96%	0.90%
10	Fox Hill Primary	181	£150,000	£501,966	£25,000	£15,583	£9,417	1.44%	1.19%
11	Great Hollands Primary	314	£150,000	£870,814	£25,000	£27,033	£2,033	-0.20%	-0.16%
12	Harmans Water Primary	624	£150,000	£1,730,534	£25,000	£53,721	£28,721	-1.53%	-1.31%
13	Holly Spring Infant	258	£150,000	£715,509	£25,000	£22,212	£2,788	0.32%	0.30%
14	Holly Spring Junior	227	£150,000	£629,537	£25,000	£19,543	£5,457	0.70%	0.62%
15	Jennetts Park Primary	203	£150,000	£562,978	£25,000	£17,477	£7,523	1.06%	0.91%
16	Meadow Vale Primary	474	£150,000	£1,314,540	£25,000	£40,808	£15,808	-1.08%	-0.95%
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	206	£150,000	£571,298	£25,000	£17,735	£7,265	1.01%	0.95%
18	Owsmoor Primary	485	£150,000	£1,345,047	£25,000	£41,755	£16,755	-1.12%	-1.02%
19	The Pines Primary	174	£150,000	£482,553	£25,000	£14,980	£10,020	1.58%	1.34%
20	Sandy Lane Primary	587	£150,000	£1,627,922	£25,000	£50,536	£25,536	-1.44%	-1.22%
21	St Joseph's Primary	210	£150,000	£582,391	£25,000	£18,079	£6,921	0.94%	0.87%
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	201	£150,000	£557,432	£25,000	£17,304	£7,696	1.09%	1.00%
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	242	£150,000	£671,137	£25,000	£20,834	£4,166	0.51%	0.48%
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	212	£150,000	£587,938	£25,000	£18,251	£6,749	0.91%	0.91%
25	Uplands Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£25,000	£17,907	£7,093	0.98%	0.93%
26	Warfield Primary	204	£150,000	£565,752	£25,000	£17,563	£7,437	1.04%	0.95%
27	Whitegrove Primary	446	£150,000	£1,236,888	£25,000	£38,397	£13,397	-0.97%	-0.90%
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	163	£150,000	£452,047	£25,000	£14,033	£10,967	1.82%	1.64%
29	Wildridings Primary	340	£150,000	£942,919	£25,000	£29,271	£4,271	-0.39%	-0.33%
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	208	£150,000	£576,845	£25,000	£17,907	£7,093	0.98%	0.93%
31	Wooden Hill Primary	315	£150,000	£873,587	£25,000	£27,119	£2,119	-0.21%	-0.18%
32	The Brakenhale	882	£150,000	£3,535,516	£25,000	£23,680	£1,320	0.04%	0.03%
33	Easthampstead Park	718	£150,000	£2,878,118	£25,000	£19,277	£5,723	0.19%	0.15%
34	Edgbarrow	1,013	£150,000	£4,060,632	£25,000	£27,197	£2,197	-0.05%	-0.05%
35	Garth Hill College	1,306	£150,000	£5,235,129	£25,000	£35,064	£10,064	-0.19%	-0.16%
36	Ranelagh	768	£150,000	£3,078,544	£25,000	£20,619	£4,381	0.14%	0.13%
37	Sandhurst	900	£150,000	£3,607,669	£25,000	£24,163	£837	0.02%	0.02%
Total Primary		9,002	£4,650,000	£24,965,174	£775,000	£775,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
Total Secondary		5,587	£900,000	£22,395,607	£150,000	£150,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%
GRAND TOTAL		14,589	£5,550,000	£47,360,781	£925,000	£925,000	£0	0.00%	0.00%

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£10,967	1.82%	1.64%
Primary Maximum reduction.	£28,721	-1.53%	-1.31%
Secondary Maximum increase.	£5,723	0.19%	0.15%
Secondary Maximum reduction.	£10,064	-0.19%	-0.16%

Outline of services subject to de-delegation and indicative funding allocations

		2013-2014 de-delegated budgets				Newly classified de-delegated budgets				
Primary funding rate						£3.56	£12.22	£15.28		
Secondary funding rate						£3.56	£0.00	£15.28		
Reference		A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
Ref	School	Support to schools in financial difficulty	Support to underperforming ethnic minority and bi-lingual pupils	SIMS and other licence fees	Staff supply cover for official absences	Premature retirement / dismissal costs	Support to new, amalgamating or closing schools, plus exceptional costs in primary schools	Free school meals eligibility checking	Total	Ref
1	Ascot Heath Infant	£2,989	£5,278	£1,333	£4,925	£738	£2,529	£122	£17,914	1
2	Ascot Heath Junior	£3,451	£1,747	£1,539	£5,686	£852	£2,920	£137	£16,333	2
3	Binfield Primary	£6,008	£3,643	£2,678	£9,897	£1,483	£5,083	£183	£28,976	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	£5,387	£2,697	£2,402	£8,874	£1,330	£4,558	£687	£25,934	4
5	College Town Infant	£3,192	£8,867	£1,423	£5,258	£788	£2,701	£275	£22,503	5
6	College Town Junior	£4,015	£4,192	£1,790	£6,614	£991	£3,397	£183	£21,182	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	£2,859	£1,235	£1,275	£4,711	£706	£2,419	£107	£13,312	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	£5,473	£6,778	£2,440	£9,017	£1,351	£4,631	£733	£30,423	8
9	Crowthorne Primary	£3,018	£1,815	£1,346	£4,972	£745	£2,554	£122	£14,572	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	£2,614	£3,559	£1,165	£4,306	£645	£2,212	£718	£15,219	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	£4,535	£3,977	£2,022	£7,470	£1,119	£3,837	£1,344	£24,304	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	£9,011	£5,521	£4,018	£14,846	£2,224	£7,625	£1,360	£44,605	12
13	Holly Spring Infant	£3,726	£6,705	£1,661	£6,138	£920	£3,153	£657	£22,960	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	£3,278	£2,982	£1,462	£5,401	£809	£2,774	£474	£17,179	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	£2,932	£1,231	£1,307	£4,830	£724	£2,481	£642	£14,145	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	£6,845	£3,328	£3,052	£11,277	£1,690	£5,792	£801	£32,785	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	£2,975	£1,431	£1,326	£4,901	£734	£2,517	£76	£13,961	17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	£7,004	£3,793	£3,123	£11,539	£1,729	£5,926	£474	£33,587	18
19	The Pines Primary	£2,513	£1,467	£1,120	£4,140	£620	£2,126	£687	£12,674	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	£8,477	£6,448	£3,779	£13,966	£2,093	£7,173	£1,176	£43,112	20
21	St Joseph's Primary	£3,033	£3,688	£1,352	£4,996	£749	£2,566	£92	£16,476	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	£2,903	£4,311	£1,294	£4,782	£717	£2,456	£153	£16,616	22
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	£3,495	£3,675	£1,558	£5,758	£863	£2,957	£382	£18,687	23
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	£3,062	£607	£1,365	£5,044	£756	£2,591	£122	£13,546	24
25	Uplands Primary	£3,004	£406	£1,339	£4,949	£741	£2,542	£76	£13,057	25
26	Warfield Primary	£2,946	£810	£1,313	£4,853	£727	£2,493	£61	£13,204	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	£6,441	£5,247	£2,872	£10,611	£1,590	£5,450	£76	£32,286	27
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	£2,354	£3,457	£1,049	£3,878	£581	£1,992	£153	£13,464	28
29	Wildridings Primary	£4,910	£6,900	£2,189	£8,089	£1,212	£4,155	£886	£28,341	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	£3,004	£1,633	£1,339	£4,949	£741	£2,542	£76	£14,284	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary	£4,549	£1,868	£2,028	£7,494	£1,123	£3,849	£611	£21,523	31
32	The Brakenhale	£23,680	£4,541	£5,129	£20,720	£3,143	£0	£1,772	£58,985	32
33	Easthampstead Park	£19,277	£3,318	£4,175	£16,867	£2,559	£0	£1,405	£47,602	33
34	Edgbarrow	£27,197	£2,620	£5,891	£23,797	£3,610	£0	£367	£63,482	34
35	Garth Hill College	£35,064	£4,192	£7,595	£30,681	£4,654	£0	£1,604	£83,789	35
36	Ranelagh	£20,619	£0	£4,466	£18,042	£2,737	£0	£272	£46,136	36
37	Sandhurst	£24,163	£3,493	£5,234	£21,143	£3,207	£0	£932	£58,172	37
Total Primary		£130,000	£109,296	£57,960	£214,170	£32,090	£110,000	£13,648	£667,164	
Total Secondary		£150,000	£18,164	£32,490	£131,250	£19,910	£0	£6,352	£358,166	
GRAND TOTAL		£280,000	£127,460	£90,450	£345,420	£52,000	£110,000	£20,000	£1,025,330	

A Support to schools in financial difficulty

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This funding is mainly used to support schools facing financial difficulty meeting the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were unable to set a balanced budget and were in need of a loan arrangement at the start of the relevant financial year, and/or • were likely to fall into one of the categories of causing concern, including notice to improve and special measures without additional financial support <p>Funding allocations from this budget are subject to meeting criteria set by the Schools Forum, which also receives regular progress reports.</p>		<p>Where schools enter an Ofsted category of concern (considered inadequate and having serious weaknesses or placed in Special Measures) the LA establishes a Management Intervention Board (MIB). The Board has an independent chair and senior officers of the LA as members. The headteacher and Chair of Governors of the school also attend the MIB to report on progress. A support plan outlines the actions to be taken by the school and the LA in order to effect rapid improvement. This budget supports the additional costs that need to be incurred to effect improvement.</p>
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
<p>A A standard amount per pupil.</p>		<p>There is no available method of allocation that would properly target funds to relevant schools. An amount per pupil is considered the best option.</p>
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to target resources to the schools facing financial difficulty e.g. in an Ofsted category, recently opened etc. • The MIB allows for a successful approach to be adopted to support improvement, aligned with additional resources paid directly to schools and holds relevant schools accountable for how funds are spend. • Any unspent funding at year end must be used in the calculation of total funds available to schools in the next financial year 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	
Primary schools	130	<p>The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function in order to apply a strategic approach to the use of funds, in accordance with policies agreed by the Schools Forum.</p> <p>Contact Paul Clark on (01344) 354054 for further information.</p>
Secondary schools	150	
Total	280	

B Support to underperforming EAL: English as an Additional Language (EAL)

Service description	Main Responsibilities / functions
To support underperforming EAL pupils across Bracknell Forest schools.	To work in partnership with teachers to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial English language assessment • EAL pupil support (see below)
Method of allocation	Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per EAL pupil	The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:	
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of highly specialised and well regarded team able to respond quickly to assess EAL children's needs and provide support for schools. • Initial language assessments carried out both in English and pupil first language (where appropriate) by members of a specialist team. • Detailed individual reports for each EAL pupil assessed written and passed on to relevant schools, families and pupils • Pupils supported in a variety of ways to support the work of the schools and teachers. This can be in class, clearly defined withdrawal based, individual pupil support or group support. • Support and advice provided to 6th forms and EAL pupils in 6th forms to aid transitions through F.E. and onto H.E. • Lesson content devised and delivered by specialist team members around developing academic understanding across all subject areas • Long term focus on assisting curriculum access for EAL pupils to make positive progress • Continuous and effective collaboration with teachers and teaching assistants feeding back lesson progress and sharing good practice • Support for head teachers and SLT to ensure statutory duties are reflected through school policies and functions. Support for staff training and staff meetings. • Support for a range of GCSE language options and IGCSE. Schools and pupils aided in preparation and entry. Advice to schools and parents. • Development and delivery of EAL focused inter-school linking programmes • School based programmes supported and developed to work closely with the local community • Schools supported in communicating with EAL/BME families during parents' evenings • Specialist training courses developed and routinely delivered • Support for pupils not related to their point of entry or length of stay in school but determined by need • Availability of service to schools as and when a new arrival joins. This flexible approach ensures that the initial assessment is carried out within three working days of a referral made and personalised timely recommendations and support is provided. • A pupil takes on average around 3 – 5 years to develop their social communications skills in English. The EAL & Diversity Team support pupils, where appropriate, for periods longer than this to develop their English language skills to progress academically (usually 4 – 7 years for new arrivals). • Progress of supported pupils tracked each half term providing schools and the LA with important performance monitoring information. • EAL progress and attainment data consistently analysed to align services to meet current and determine future trends and to inform reports to the Council and central government. 	

Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function
Primary	108	Contact Kashif Nawaz on (0118) 9366431 for further information on this service.
Secondary	19	
Total	127	

C Licences / subscriptions: SIMS licences

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This budget covers the cost of providing support to the software required to perform most of the administration tasks in schools.</p> <p>It relates to the payment to CAPITA (software supplier) for software maintenance support.</p>		<p>This relates closely to the SIMS Admin SLA currently in place. Responsibilities include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide application support for SIMS and FMS. - Training programme for SIMS - System Upgrades
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil.		The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experienced staff to ensure that the correct pricing from Capita is calculated correctly • Expertise in the various SIMS modules. • In line with our current support for Schools for SIMS support and Training 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	<p>The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function</p> <p>Contact Bertie Savan on (01344) 354085 for further information on this service.</p>
Primary	58	
Secondary	31	
Total	89	

C Licences / Subscriptions: Consortium of Local Education Authorities for the Provision of Science Services (CLEAPSS)

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
This budget covers the cost of paying the annual invoice from C.L.E.A.P.S.S which is an advisory service providing support in science and technology for a consortium of local authorities and their schools including establishments for pupils with special needs.		The CLEAPSS subscription provides advice and resources relating to: health and safety including model risk assessments, chemicals, living organisms, equipment, sources of resources, laboratory design, facilities and fittings, technicians and their jobs, D&T facilities and fittings.
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil.		The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
Main benefits include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By paying one invoice on behalf of all schools is a more cost effective use of administration time. 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function Contact Chris Taylor on 01344 354062 for further information on this service.
Primary	Nil	
Secondary	1	
Total	1	

D Staff supply cover costs: Official absence for reasons of maternity leave, union duties, magistrates duty, jury service, council members, suspension

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>An insurance type scheme is in operation whereby a central budget pays for eligible staff costs when there is an absence from school for official or statutory reasons. The main areas are set out above in the title.</p> <p>Schools are responsible for any back fill costs that they determine are required to be put in place during the absence.</p> <p>The trade union arrangements cover the costs associated with consultation and representation requirements.</p>		<p>Employment law conveys a right for staff to be absent from school for certain official and/or statutory reasons or to perform certain duties. Schools need to comply with these requirements and ensure sufficient staff are in place to meet their responsibilities.</p>
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
<p>A standard amount per pupil.</p>		<p>The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.</p>
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools continue to pick up the costs for cover only, LA funds cost of substantive post therefore easier to budget plan • No doubling up of costs that would otherwise occur with schools need to pay cost of substantive post and supply cover • Insurance scheme shares cost risk to even out peaks and troughs as their incidence is uneven and unpredictable • Continued opportunities for collective consultation and negotiations with trade unions. 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	<p>The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function</p> <p>Contact Paul Young on 01344 354006 for further information on this service.</p>
Primary	213	
Secondary	132	
Total	345	

E Premature Retirement / Dismissal Costs

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
This funding is to cover future costs that are expected to arise in schools through premature retirement and dismissal costs associated with redundancy procedures. This may also, in certain circumstances, include the termination of fixed term contracts. The incidence and likely costs are unpredictable and not generally known when schools set their budget.		Employment law and the approved funding policy set out the circumstances when individual schools will be required to fund the cost of relevant costs.
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil.		There is no available method of allocation that would properly target funds to relevant schools. An amount per pupil is considered the best option.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
Main benefits include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available funds targeted only to those schools actually incurring costs • Easier budget planning for schools as this minimizes the need for schools to budget for a contingency to cover what are unpredictable and generally high costs • No additional costs associated with the termination of fixed term contracts 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function Contact Paul Young on 01344 354006 for further information on this service.
Primary	32	
Secondary	20	
Total	52	

F School Specific contingency

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This funding is to cover significant costs that may be incurred in newly opened and expanding schools, those undertaking an amalgamation or those closing schools.</p> <p>Funds are also retained to help finance significant, unexpected costs that may arise in primary schools, but at the time of setting the budget, the costs are not apparent.</p>		<p>The main reason for holding this budget relates to providing additional financial support to Jennett's Park Primary School as it expands from a 1 form entry school to a 2 form entry school. The simplified Funding Formula cannot adequately recognise the increase in costs being experienced at the start of the new academic year. In such circumstances, the Council will review the financial position of schools and make recommendations to the Schools Forum on the amount of additional funds required. The Forum makes the final decision on any funding allocations.</p> <p>A small amount of funding is also retained for primary schools to bid against should they experience significant cost increases that are outside of their control and were not anticipated when the budget was set.</p>
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil.		There is no available method of allocation that would properly target funds to relevant schools. An amount per pupil is considered the best option.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to target resources to the schools facing cost pressures e.g. new and expanding schools • Safety net to allow a degree of protection to all primary schools • Allows in-year support where circumstances change 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	<p>The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function in order to apply a strategic approach to the use of funds, in accordance with policies agreed by the Schools Forum.</p> <p>Contact Paul Clark on (01344) 354054 for further information.</p>
Newly opened and expanding school	100	
Exceptional costs in primary schools	10	
Total	110	

G Checking Pupil Eligibility to a Free School Meal (FSM)

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
By linking the Council's Housing Benefits system to the FSM application process, as soon as a parent receives the relevant benefits, schools are informed to update their census to maximise income. Parents also receive a letter informing them of their child's eligibility to a FSM.		Ensures schools have relevant information to complete the annual, national census and maximise income.
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil eligible to a Free School Meal		The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to the cost of the service.
Benefits of a centrally managed service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools receive accurate and up to date information on pupils eligible for a Free School Meal, thereby maximising income from the Pupil Premium (expected to be £1,300 per pupil in 2014-15 for primary schools, no update available on likely amount for secondary aged pupils which is £900 in 2013-14) and the BF Funding Formula Potential for more pupils from deprived backgrounds to receive a lunchtime meal 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to seek to de-delegate this function Contact Lesley Adams on 01344 354143 for further information on this service.
Primary	14	
Secondary	6	
Total	20	

Outline of newly delegated behaviour support services and potential funding allocations

		Newly delegated behaviour support budgets				
Primary funding rate		varies	£1.72	£7.91		
Secondary funding rate		varies	£1.85	£0.00		
Reference		I	J	K		
Ref	School	Behaviour Support Team	Anti-bullying coordinator	Social & Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)	Total Behaviour support services	Ref
1	Ascot Heath Infant	£3,901	£356	£1,637	£5,894	1
2	Ascot Heath Junior	£4,857	£411	£1,890	£7,158	2
3	Binfield Primary	£8,029	£716	£3,290	£12,035	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	£9,019	£642	£2,950	£12,611	4
5	College Town Infant	£4,696	£380	£1,748	£6,824	5
6	College Town Junior	£6,295	£478	£2,198	£8,972	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	£4,022	£341	£1,566	£5,928	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	£9,217	£652	£2,997	£12,866	8
9	Crowthorne Primary	£4,819	£360	£1,653	£6,831	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	£5,182	£311	£1,431	£6,925	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	£12,917	£540	£2,483	£15,941	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	£19,711	£1,074	£4,935	£25,720	12
13	Holly Spring Infant	£6,740	£444	£2,040	£9,225	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	£6,269	£391	£1,795	£8,454	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	£7,948	£349	£1,605	£9,903	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	£13,277	£816	£3,749	£17,841	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	£3,829	£354	£1,629	£5,813	17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	£10,598	£835	£3,835	£15,268	18
19	The Pines Primary	£5,628	£299	£1,376	£7,303	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	£18,032	£1,010	£4,642	£23,685	20
21	St Joseph's Primary	£4,863	£361	£1,661	£6,885	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Primary	£5,725	£346	£1,590	£7,660	22
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	£5,246	£416	£1,914	£7,576	23
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	£4,021	£365	£1,677	£6,062	24
25	Uplands Primary	£3,976	£358	£1,645	£5,979	25
26	Warfield Primary	£4,613	£351	£1,613	£6,577	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	£8,600	£767	£3,527	£12,895	27
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	£3,974	£280	£1,289	£5,543	28
29	Wildridings Primary	£11,082	£585	£2,689	£14,356	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	£4,463	£358	£1,645	£6,466	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary	£10,161	£542	£2,491	£13,194	31
32	The Brakenhale	£11,266	£1,631	£0	£12,896	32
33	Easthampstead Park	£10,100	£1,328	£0	£11,427	33
34	Edgbarrow	£9,085	£1,873	£0	£10,958	34
35	Garth Hill College	£14,862	£2,415	£0	£17,277	35
36	Ranelagh	£6,599	£1,420	£0	£8,019	36
37	Sandhurst	£8,738	£1,664	£0	£10,402	37
Total Primary		£231,710	£15,490	£71,190	£318,390	
Total Secondary		£60,650	£10,330	£0	£70,980	
GRAND TOTAL		£292,360	£25,820	£71,190	£389,370	

H Behaviour Support: Consistency, Management and Cooperative Discipline

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This budget covers support for a Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline (CMCD®) programme that was introduced into three secondary schools in 2003. CMCD® offers training to all teachers equipping them with classroom management skills to enhance their practice. Funding has reduced considerably over the years as the programme has become established in schools.</p>		<p>Funds delegated to the schools support revenue costs of staff trainers, resources, training and teacher release to undertake monitoring of classroom practice.</p>
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
<p>A standard amount per pupil.</p>		<p>There is no available method of allocation that would target funds to the three secondary schools using the programme. An amount per pupil is considered the best option.</p>
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
<p>Primary</p> <p>Secondary</p> <p>Total</p>	<p>£k</p> <p>Nil</p> <p>32</p> <p>32</p>	<p>The LA does not intend to offer an SLA for this service.</p> <p>Contact Bob Welch on (01344) 354185 for further information.</p>

I Behaviour Support: Behaviour Support Team

Service description	Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This budget is used to promote and develop healthy emotional well-being and positive behaviour for children and young people.</p> <p>The Behaviour Support Team provides support to young people, children and their families in the home environment as well as helping the schools to manage behaviour.</p> <p>The team will assess the young person, child in their home and also in the school setting. This assessment informs planning and strategies in the school and in the home to help both parents and teachers to manage the child or young persons behaviour.</p> <p>The team provide a wide range of training packages for teaching and support staff. Coaching and mentoring for staff is also available.</p>	<p>Ensuring that through enhancing each school's capacity, regular attendance and successful inclusion is achieved for all in Bracknell Forest mainstream education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing 1:1 support for the child or young person • Webster Stratton – Parenting programme • Strengthening Families • STOP parenting programme for parents of secondary age young people. • Behaviour Management Training to schools • Advice and Strategies to schools • In school support, 1:1 • Pyramid for Parents • Transition programme • Advice and Consultancy around Behaviour to schools. • Support to families for children experiencing emotional and behavioural issues in the school setting and at home. • Advice and training to schools and teaching assistants for children with Statements of Special Educational Needs where the main identified need is BESD. • Supporting inclusion • Training provided; Team Teach, Circle Time, Behaviour Management. • Workshops for parents
Method of allocation	Reason for allocation method
65% by a standard amount per pupil, 15% by deprivation and 25% by low prior attainment.	The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.
Benefits of a centrally managed traded service:	
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to manage and delegate resources on a needs basis. • Ability to flexibly support staff in the workplace. • A Team that has an understanding of the social and emotional aspects of challenging behaviour and the impact on learning. • Pool of suitably qualified and experienced staff available on a needs basis. • Responsive and reactive to the individual needs of each school at short notice. • Ability to share best practice and expertise from each school across the authority. • Highly effective ways of working and knowledge of schools already developed. • Easier to consult and develop services with schools and partner agencies. 	

Behaviour Support: Behaviour Support Team (cont)

Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to offer an SLA for this function.
Primary	260	Contact Mandy Wilton on 01344 354198 for further information on this service
Secondary	57	
Total	317	

J **Behaviour Support: Anti-bullying co-ordinator**

Service description	Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>This budget covers the provision of the anti-bullying coordinator who provides interventions and training in schools. The coordinator regularly delivers a portfolio of interventions as well as running regular workshops for young people, children and teaching staff.</p> <p>Bracknell Forest Council is concerned to try to make the Borough a safe and secure environment for our children and young people and for them to be happy and achieve. Children and young people continue to highlight bullying as an issue and the anti-bullying work is recognised as an important part of the safeguarding agenda.</p>	<p>To support schools and enhance their capacity to address bullying issues to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve pupils emotional wellbeing • Improve positive behaviour • Improve school attendance • Reduce bullying <p>To coordinate and deliver the anti-bullying strategy “Taking Action Together” – Tackling bullying and promoting rights and respect: and the Action Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaise effectively with schools and other professionals and to contribute to interagency partnership work to enable C&YP to ‘feel and stay safe’ • Provide information for example Tackling Bullying – A guide for parents and carers • Provide training to schools, parents/carers and other professionals • Deliver Anti-Bullying road shows at BF School events • Deliver interventions and workshops to schools including assemblies, bespoke interventions and courses to address specific issues. • Work with groups of C& YP • Work with school staff in identifying and addressing bullying in school. • Work on the issues of bullying through different types of media • Lead on Anti-Bullying week which focuses on involving C&YP in initiative to raise awareness around and tackle bullying
Method of allocation	Reason for allocation method
<p>A standard amount per pupil.</p>	<p>The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.</p>

Benefits of a centrally managed traded service:		
Main benefits include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to respond to the individual needs of school at short notice • Ability to respond to parents/carers and support C&YP • Ability to liaise and access appropriate support advice etc from the national Anti-Bullying Alliance and to disseminate appropriately • Ability to coordinate service and to work with other agencies to prevent bullying behaviour 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to offer an SLA for this function
Primary	15	Contact Mandy Wilton on (01344) 354198 for further information on this service.
Secondary	10	
Total	25	

K Behaviour Support: Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)

Service description		Main Responsibilities / functions
<p>SEAL is a whole-school approach to promoting the social and emotional skills that underpin effective learning, positive behaviour, regular attendance, staff effectiveness and the emotional health and well-being of all who learn and work in schools. The SEAL materials provide schools with an explicit, structured curriculum framework and resource for teaching these skills to all students.</p>		<p>Funding is used to support revenue costs to provide advice and guidance to primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>The SEAL programme has been integrated into the Personal, Social and Health education curriculum and the LA's highly successful Rights Respecting Schools project. The budget supports schools to meet in clusters, accreditation routes, resources, staff costs, training and conferences.</p>
Method of allocation		Reason for allocation method
A standard amount per pupil.		The suggested methodology is considered the best option to align funding to need to spend.
Benefits of a centrally managed traded service:		
<p>Main benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to support project work in all schools, supported by LA staff • Coordination of training activities • Monitoring of the impact of the scheme in schools • Dissemination of effective practice to other schools • Liaison with UNICEF related to RRS and ensuring all schools receive appropriate guidance and access to resources and training. 		
Estimated Budget (2013/2014 prices)		Indication of LA service provision
	£k	The LA intends to offer an SLA for this function
Primary	71	Contact Bob Welch on (01344) 354185 for further information on this service.
Secondary	Nil	
Total	71	

Summary impact from changes, including MFG

Ref	School	Summary information						Original MFG		Revised MFG		Change in MFG	Net change in funding		Ref
		13-14 Budget including MFG top-up / contribution to MFG	Low prior attainment data Appendix 4 / 5	Change for Deprivation Appendix 6	Change for Mobility Appendix 7	Change in Lump sum to £160k Appendix 8 (a)	Net change Appendices 5 to 8	Top up addition where below guaranteed amount	Deduction where above MFG and experiencing an increase in per pupil funding	Top up addition where below guaranteed amount	Deduction where above MFG and experiencing an increase in per pupil funding		Amount	Total Budget	
1	Ascot Heath Infant	£756,701	£424	£2,449	£144	£2,872	£145	£0	£15,884	£0	£9,145	£6,739	£6,594	0.87%	1
2	Ascot Heath Junior	£854,386	£283	£2,902	£96	£1,770	£1,512	£0	£17,184	£0	£8,220	£8,964	£7,452	0.87%	2
3	Binfield Primary	£1,376,731	£849	£4,308	£383	£4,326	£9,866	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£9,866	-0.72%	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	£1,319,846	£50	£1,670	£359	£2,845	£4,923	£1,667	£0	£0	£0	£1,667	£6,591	-0.50%	4
5	College Town Infant	£808,635	£276	£1,779	£407	£2,389	£73	£0	£25,092	£0	£17,272	£7,820	£7,746	0.96%	5
6	College Town Junior	£989,741	£6	£3,149	£479	£427	£3,207	£0	£16,980	£0	£5,237	£11,743	£8,536	0.86%	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	£744,043	£232	£2,433	£455	£3,182	£61	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£61	0.01%	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	£1,403,976	£265	£120	£576	£3,052	£2,861	£72,979	£0	£57,452	£0	£15,527	£18,388	-1.31%	8
9	Crowthorne Primary	£778,616	£35	£2,323	£335	£2,803	£180	£0	£11,659	£0	£5,328	£6,331	£6,511	0.84%	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	£796,415	£174	£996	£2,736	£3,767	£7,674	£59,638	£0	£42,610	£0	£17,028	£9,354	-1.17%	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	£1,263,408	£689	£13,210	£694	£813	£12,392	£0	£0	£0	£1,539	£1,539	£10,853	0.86%	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	£2,209,522	£1,490	£3,628	£1,221	£11,489	£7,592	£13,351	£0	£0	£0	£13,351	£20,944	-0.95%	12
13	Holly Spring Infant	£949,244	£28	£326	£455	£1,115	£1,015	£0	£19,443	£0	£11,749	£7,695	£8,710	0.92%	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	£883,386	£316	£440	£335	£2,183	£1,724	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,724	0.20%	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	£825,968	£218	£8,441	£1,171	£3,009	£12,839	£0	£21,408	£0	£25,596	£4,188	£8,652	1.05%	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	£1,670,232	£266	£5,558	£465	£6,323	£1,496	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,496	-0.09%	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	£764,288	£430	£2,601	£239	£2,906	£364	£0	£764	£0	£0	£764	£400	0.05%	17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	£1,658,151	£294	£4,945	£575	£6,702	£12,516	£30,284	£0	£20,754	£0	£9,530	£22,046	-1.33%	18
19	The Pines Primary	£753,122	£254	£2,691	£287	£4,008	£6,665	£30,333	£0	£14,911	£0	£15,422	£8,757	-1.16%	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	£2,096,543	£1,146	£3,181	£1,318	£10,214	£7,206	£35,411	£0	£14,128	£0	£21,283	£28,489	-1.36%	20
21	St Joseph's Primary	£801,384	£255	£423	£216	£2,768	£1,875	£11,676	£0	£211	£0	£11,465	£9,590	-1.20%	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Pry	£770,051	£179	£715	£311	£3,078	£3,661	£0	£16,456	£0	£12,984	£3,472	£7,133	0.93%	22
23	St Michael's (East) Primary	£871,390	£455	£557	£335	£1,666	£318	£0	£8,274	£0	£1,386	£6,887	£7,206	0.83%	23
24	St Michael's (Sand) Primary	£746,835	£442	£2,367	£216	£2,699	£326	£0	£24,697	£0	£17,138	£7,559	£7,233	0.97%	24
25	Uplands Primary	£768,603	£361	£2,707	£407	£2,837	£638	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£638	-0.08%	25
26	Warfield Primary	£782,744	£8	£2,455	£311	£2,975	£216	£0	£6,036	£0	£281	£5,754	£5,971	0.76%	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	£1,493,643	£724	£5,913	£694	£5,359	£12,690	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£12,690	-0.85%	27
28	Wildmoor Heath Primary	£669,795	£91	£1,423	£1,558	£4,387	£4,613	£6,951	£0	£0	£0	£6,951	£2,339	-0.35%	28
29	Wildridings Primary	£1,280,402	£867	£2,921	£5,584	£1,709	£7,662	£5,911	£0	£0	£0	£5,911	£1,752	0.14%	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's Primary	£764,715	£91	£2,707	£311	£2,837	£273	£0	£14,327	£0	£7,500	£6,828	£6,555	0.86%	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary	£1,184,929	£209	£6,005	£575	£848	£4,792	£0	£8,821	£0	£3,355	£5,466	£10,258	0.87%	31
32	The Brakenhale	£4,464,157	£29,828	£13,793	£0	£528	£15,507	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£15,507	-0.35%	32
33	Easthampstead Park	£3,850,854	£2,321	£35,569	£0	£2,289	£35,537	£0	£27,360	£0	£25,870	£1,490	£37,027	0.96%	33
34	Edgbarrow	£4,582,425	£14,869	£26,302	£0	£879	£12,312	£0	£18,984	£0	£0	£18,984	£6,672	0.15%	34
35	Garth Hill College	£6,333,481	£3,638	£8,776	£0	£4,025	£1,113	£0	£103,373	£0	£42,403	£60,970	£62,083	0.98%	35
36	Ranelagh	£3,506,075	£9,215	£17,335	£0	£1,752	£6,368	£88,540	£0	£44,938	£0	£43,602	£49,970	-1.43%	36
37	Sandhurst	£4,205,866	£11,702	£14,501	£0	£335	£2,464	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£2,464	-0.06%	37
Total Primary		33,037,443	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	268,201	-207,025	£150,066	£126,730	£37,841	£37,841	-0.11%	
Total Secondary		26,942,858	£1	£0	£0	£0	£1	88,540	-149,717	£44,938	£68,273	£37,842	£37,841	0.14%	
GRAND TOTAL		59,980,301	£1	£0	£0	£0	£1	356,742	-356,742	£195,004	£195,004	£1	£0	0.00%	

Summary:

Primary Maximum increase.	£10,853	1.05%	Secondary Maximum increase.	£62,083	0.98%
Primary Maximum reduction.	£28,489	-1.36%	Secondary Maximum reduction.	£49,970	-1.43%

Potential funding allocations if a High Needs contingency is established for schools with disproportionate numbers

Ref	School	No. top-up pupils by school	% pupils with top-up		top-up as % total budget		Overall		Ref
			Top-up pupils %	Qualify? Yes / No	Top-up as % of school budget	Qualify? Yes / No	Qualify under both criteria?	2014-15 funding allocations	
	Primary rate		4.00%		2.00%				
	Secondary rate		2.00%		1.00%				
1	Ascot Heath Infant	3	1.45%	No	1.36%	No	No		1
2	Ascot Heath CE Junior	4	1.67%	No	1.54%	No	No		2
3	Binfield CE Aided Primary	2	0.48%	No	0.39%	No	No		3
4	Birch Hill Primary	5	1.34%	No	1.19%	No	No		4
5	College Town Infant and Nursery	1	0.45%	No	0.19%	No	No		5
6	College Town Junior	6	2.16%	No	1.31%	No	No		6
7	Cranbourne Primary	1	0.51%	No	0.46%	No	No		7
8	Crown Wood Primary	4	1.06%	No	0.71%	No	No		8
9	Crowthorne CE Primary	4	1.91%	No	2.11%	Yes	No		9
10	Fox Hill Primary	4	2.21%	No	1.53%	No	No		10
11	Great Hollands Primary	13	4.14%	Yes	3.49%	Yes	Yes	£14,300	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	10	1.60%	No	1.24%	No	No		12
13	Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	3	1.16%	No	1.33%	No	No		13
14	Holly Spring Junior	9.5	4.19%	Yes	2.72%	Yes	Yes	£10,450	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	0	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	No		15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	3	0.63%	No	0.45%	No	No		16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	4	1.94%	No	1.05%	No	No		17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	4	0.82%	No	0.87%	No	No		18
19	The Pines Primary and Nursery	1	0.57%	No	1.30%	No	No		19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	6	1.02%	No	0.46%	No	No		20
21	St Joseph's Catholic Primary	6	2.86%	No	3.14%	Yes	No		21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	3	1.49%	No	1.39%	No	No		22
23	St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided P	5	2.07%	No	2.06%	Yes	No		23
24	St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhur	0	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	No		24
25	Uplands Primary	2	0.96%	No	0.65%	No	No		25
26	Warfield CE Primary	3	1.47%	No	2.19%	Yes	No		26
27	Whitegrove Primary	5	1.12%	No	1.18%	No	No		27
28	Wildmoor Heath	1	0.61%	No	0.23%	No	No		28
29	Wildridings Primary	7	2.06%	No	1.64%	No	No		29
30	Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	0	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	No		30
31	Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	9	2.86%	No	2.66%	Yes	No		31
32	The Brakenhale	18	2.04%	Yes	1.19%	Yes	Yes	£19,800	32
33	Easthampstead Park Community School	14	1.95%	No	0.66%	No	No		33
34	Edgbarrow	30	2.96%	Yes	2.87%	Yes	Yes	£33,000	34
35	Garth Hill College	23	1.76%	No	0.72%	No	No		35
36	Ranelagh CE	22	2.86%	Yes	1.97%	Yes	Yes	£24,200	36
37	Sandhurst	9	1.00%	No	0.52%	No	No		37
Primary total		128.5	1.43%	2	1.27%	7	2	£24,750	
Secondary total		116	2.08%	3	1.45%	3	3	£77,000	
Total ALL		244.5	1.68%	5	1.35%	10	5	£101,750	

Policy for Funding School Redundancies

11.16 Responsibilities for redundancies

The costs of new early retirements or redundancies will continue to be charged to the ~~central part of the Schools Budget~~ where the local authority can demonstrate that the revenue savings achieved by any termination of employment are equal to or greater than the costs incurred. ~~This will be done on the basis that any redundancy situation the school finds itself will be treated as a staffing re-organisation.~~ **This will be achieved through a de-delegated contingency to support individual schools where a governing body has incurred expenditure which it would be unreasonable to expect them to meet from the school's budget share.**

The Council's Redundancy procedures must be followed to enable the redundancy costs to be met from a de-delegated budget ~~being met through this central schools budget~~. This includes early notification of the staffing re-organisation to ensure adequate time for consultation with staff and trade unions. Failure to follow these procedures could result in costs being charged against the delegated school budget.

The severance costs will be calculated under the local authority's policy. Where a school decides to offer more generous terms than the authority's policy, then the excess charge will be made to the delegated school budget.

The Schools Forum must agree to any increase in this budget over the previous financial year. The local authority will make a best estimate of what may be needed, based on past experience, local knowledge of the financial position of individual schools and the context of that year's funding settlement. To achieve best use of resources, the local authority will actively pursue a redeployment policy, to match staff at risk to **suitable** vacancies.

Any costs incurred by the local education authority in respect of any premature retirement of a member of the staff of a maintained school shall be met from the school's budget share for one or more financial years except where the authority has agreed with the governing body in writing (whether before or after the retirement occurs) to meet these costs centrally.

Additions to the policy are in **bold and underlined**.

Deletions to the policy have been ~~struck through~~.

Responsibility for repairs and maintenance

12.4 Authority responsibility

In classifying different types of work, only those that fit the definition of capital determined by the local authority for financial accounting purposes in line with the CIPFA Code of Practice on local authority accounting have been retained as an authority responsibility.

Where there is any doubt, or items of work are not included on the illustrative Annex, it should be assumed that they are a school responsibility and will only be funded from capital if the work is undertaken after agreement has been received from the Chief Officer: Property Services. The authority will not reimburse schools retrospectively where it is found that capital related work has been funded from the school's delegated budget, unless in the opinion of the Borough Surveyor, it would ordinarily have formed part of that year's capital programme.

In undertaking capital maintenance, the authority will adopt the following approach, as agreed following consultation with schools and agreement from the Schools Forum:

- a. Building condition surveys will continue to be used to identify, prioritise and estimate the cost of planned maintenance works, and these will be regularly updated.
- b. The Council will target its resources on the most urgent items, giving priority to compliance, health & safety and those items that have been judged to carry significant risk of disruption to school operations or school closures.
- c. Where the Council undertakes works in a school the school will be expected to contribute 10% of the cost from its Devolved Capital Funding, up to a maximum ceiling of 75% of their Devolved Formula Capital allocation. **The contribution will be paid in the year that the works are undertaken.**
- ~~d. The contribution referred to above in c. will be subject to abatement where a school has previously agreed with the Council for the allocation of its Devolved Formula Capital to an alternative capital project.~~
- d.** The balance of schools Devolved Formula Capital funding will be for the individual school to prioritise. The LA will continue to advise schools to prioritise DFC firstly on Health & Safety/Compliance works, secondly on addressing as many outstanding Priority 1 items as possible.

Additions to the policy are in **bold and underlined**.

Deletions to the policy have been ~~struck through~~.