

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE 28 NOVEMBER 2013

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

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report summarises the results of the Financial Consultation exercise with governing bodies and other interested parties. It reports on schools' views regarding the questions raised and is intended to assist the Schools Forum in making recommendations in respect of the 2014-15 Schools Budget.
- 1.2 Preliminary decisions taken at this time will be used in the calculation of indicative 2014-15 budgets for schools. These are expected to be with schools by the end of term in order to assist in the early stages of financial planning.
- 1.3 A number of budget developments have also been identified by schools through the consultation which are also reported. Decisions on setting the 2014-15 budget will be sought in January 2014, when it is expected that all the relevant information will be available.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Items for all Forum Members:

- 2.1 **The outcomes from the financial consultation with schools as summarised in Annex 1 are NOTED;**
- 2.2 **The additional comments made by schools, as set out in the confidential Annex 3 are NOTED;**
- 2.3 **The recommendations set out in the boxes in paragraphs 5.11 to 5.17 and 5.20 to 5.26 are AGREED and incorporated into the calculations for 2014-15 indicative school budgets;**
- 2.4 **To AGREE that the cost of those schools losing money, and receiving a funding top up through the Minimum Funding Guarantee, should be funded by on-going use of a cap on the increases being received by schools gaining through the changes (paragraph 5.28);**
- 2.5 **To NOTE that should an SEN specific contingency be established, it may need to be funded from Schools Block money rather than the High Needs Block allocation (paragraph 5.30);**

Item for Primary School representatives only:

- 2.6 **The recommendations relating to de-delegation set out in the boxes in paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19 are AGREED for primary schools and incorporated into the calculations for 2014-15 indicative school budgets.**

Item for Secondary School representatives only:

- 2.7 The recommendations relating to de-delegation set out in the boxes in paragraphs 5.18 to 5.19 are **AGREED** for secondary schools and incorporated into the calculations for 2014-15 indicative school budgets.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 To enable the views of schools to be taken into account when considering the 2014-15 Schools Budget.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 These were considered when the consultation document was prepared and subsequently approved by the Schools Forum.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

- 5.1 At its meeting on 12 September, the Schools Forum received an updated report on school funding which set out the areas of change for 2014-15 required by the Department for Education (DfE) and also raised a number of potential areas for change that could be determined by each local area. The Forum noted that the mandatory changes were expected to be straightforward to implement, with minimal impact anticipated and agreed that the briefing note and consultation document presented to the meeting should be distributed to schools and other interested parties. This would allow the views from schools and others to be gathered so they could be taken into account when the 2014-15 budget is agreed in January 2014.
- 5.2 The mandatory changes related to some minor amendments to the operation of the factors allowed to be used in the local Funding Formula and the data that must be taken into account in the distribution of funds to schools. For discretionary changes, this mainly related to seeking views on the appropriate amount of funds to be distributed through the Funding Formula by the different factors e.g. pupil numbers, deprivation measures, low prior attainment etc. The DfE have indicated that, at a minimum, local areas should determine an appropriate proportion or quantum of their schools block funding to allocate through deprivation measures.
- 5.3 The Forum had previously agreed that no changes were required to the factors being used in the BF Funding Formula, and therefore the consultation did not specifically seek to gather views on this area.

Financial Consultation

Process

- 5.4 Following approval, the combined briefing note and consultation document was distributed to schools on Monday 16 September with Friday 25 October set as the closing date for responses. The consultation was supported by briefings to Head Teachers, governors, bursars and the Schools Forum. By the publication date for this report, a response had been received from 29 out of 37 schools (78% response rate). A response sheet has been received

Unrestricted

from 23 primary schools (74%), 5 secondary schools (100%) and 1 secondary academy school (100%). In this report, responses from the secondary academy school have been reported with all other secondary schools.

- 5.5 A written response was also received from the National Union of Teachers. However the format of submission did not lend itself to be incorporated it into the summary analysis. The full detail of the response has been included in the confidential Annex 3 that records all comments received.
- 5.6 The consultation was divided into four sections. The questions are set out below and responses summarised. Recommendations for change, where relevant, have also been added. Where questions have been specific to one phase of education, then only responses from relevant schools have been reported.

Summary of responses

- 5.7 Responses from schools did not generally support changes in the proportion of funds being distributed by the main factors of the Funding Formula. The exceptions to this being support from secondary schools to increase the proportion of funds being distributed through reference to deprivation measures and the fixed lump sum allocation. If these changes to secondary school funding are agreed, it is estimated that in order to balance to current levels of funding, the per pupil funding rate would need to reduce by £54 to £4,027.
- 5.8 Due to the nature of some questions, where views were sought on a range of different options, there is not always a clear majority view on the way forward. However, with the lowest most popular score receiving 48% of the total support, there is considered to be a sufficient consensus of school views for the Forum to be confident on making decisions on all identified matters. Recommendations have therefore been framed based on the majority response from schools, separated between primary and secondary phases where warranted by responses.
- 5.9 In respect of the other aspects of the consultation, there is very strong support for continued de-delegation of budgets back to the Council for central management where this is required by the DfE. Linked to this, some responses query the proposed approach to delegate Behaviour Support Services for the first time next April, and therefore views will be sought from schools during the autumn term to establish whether these services should also continue to operate as a de-delegated budget. There was also support for the creation of an SEN specific contingency, but this creates a budget pressure, and no decision can be taken on this until the financial settlement from the DfE is known. However, it is likely that if such a fund is created, it will need to be financed from Schools Block income and not the High Needs Block, which would be the normal route. Changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools have also received widespread support, with a number of budget pressures identified and general comments made on the education funding framework.

Detailed responses

- 5.10 A detailed summary of responses can be found at Annex 1, with restricted Annex 3 listing all the comments received.

1. Are the significant factors in the BF Funding Formula distributing the right proportion of funds?

5.11 **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?

Responses from 20 schools (69%) supported the proposal. 9 schools (31%) did not agree. No comments were made by schools on this question.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that, if additional funds are to be distributed through re-prioritisation of the factors in the BF Funding Formula, any additional cost should be funded from an equivalent reduction in allocations via per pupil funding through lower units of resource.

5.12 **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?

Responses from all 6 secondary schools (100%) supported the proposal.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that the secondary per pupil funding rate for low prior attainment should be re-set to the amount required to ensure that the total amount of funds allocated through results from national tests remains unchanged.

5.13 **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 correct?

19 schools (66%) consider that the current proportion of funds allocated through measures of low prior attainment is about right. 2 further schools (7%) had no view. 1 school (3%) considered that the current proportion was too high, with the remaining 7 schools (24%) wanting a higher proportion.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that no change is made to the proportion of funds distributed to schools via low prior attainment measures and that it should remain at around 3.5% of total funds.

5.14 **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 correct?

There were different responses to this question from primary and secondary schools which therefore need to be considered separately.

Primary Schools:

12 primary schools (52%) consider that the current proportion of funds allocated through measures of deprivation is about right. 1 other school (4%) had no view. 8 schools (35%) considered that the current proportion was too low, with the remaining 2 schools (9%) wanting a lower proportion.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that no change is made to the proportion of funds distributed to primary schools via deprivation measures.

Secondary Schools:

4 secondary schools (67%) consider that the current proportion of funds allocated through measures of deprivation is too low. The remaining 2 schools (33%) consider the allocation to be about right.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that funds distributed to secondary schools via deprivation measures be increased by 15%. (This reflects the proportionate increase from the current 3.47% rate to the statistical average rate of 4%).

5.15 **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?

Responses from 21 primary schools (91%) agreed with the question. 2 schools (9%) did not.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that the primary per pupil funding rate for pupil mobility should be re-set to the amount required to ensure that the total amount of funds allocated remains unchanged.

5.16 **Question 6**

The BF Funding Formula currently allocates £5.620m, 9.28% of total funds, to schools through a fixed lump sum allocation of £150,000. 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 correct?

There were different responses to this question from primary and secondary schools which therefore need to be considered separately.

Primary Schools:

14 primary schools (61%) consider that the current proportion of funds allocated through fixed lump sum allocations is about right. 7 schools (30%) considered that the current proportion should be increased, with the remaining 2 schools (9%) wanting a lower proportion.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that no change is made to the £150,000 fixed lump sum allocation paid to primary schools.

Secondary Schools:

4 secondary schools (68%) consider that the current proportion of funds allocated through fixed lump sum allocations is too low. Of the remaining 2 schools, 1 (8%) thought it was about right and 1 (8%) didn't have a view.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that the proportion of funds to be distributed to secondary schools via fixed lump sum allocations be increased.

5.17 **Question 7**

If the lump sum payment is increased from the existing £150,000, what value do you think it should be set at?

Responses from primary schools did not support a change in amount of fixed lump sum, so no recommendation is appropriate for question 7.

Secondary schools did support an increase in fixed lump sum payments, with payments of £160,000, £170,000 and £175,000 all receiving equal support from the responses.

As there is no clear view from secondary schools on what the fixed lump sum should be set at, it is proposed that the Forum agrees the middle value option suggested on the consultation document of £170,000.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that the fixed lump sum payment made to secondary schools is increased to £170,000.

2. Additional delegation and de-delegation of budgets. Note only 28 responses are recorded for questions 8 and 9 as they are not relevant to the academy.

5.18 **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?

Responses from all 28 schools (100%) supported continued de-delegation of relevant budgets.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree to continue to de-delegate funding on relevant services for central management by the LA.

5.19 **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 and exceptional costs in primary schools, 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?

Responses from 27 schools (96%) supported de-delegation of relevant budgets. 1 school (4%) did not consider enough information had been provided to make a response.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree to de-delegate funding on relevant services for central management by the LA.

5.20 **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?

Responses from 25 schools (86%) supported the proposal. 3 schools (10%) did not agree and 1 school (3%) did not express a preference. In terms of the 3 schools making responses to this question, concerns were raised about should there be insufficient buy back, would there be an on-going ability to provide behaviour services to prevent exclusions, whether the buy back Service Level Agreement would be what schools wanted, and also that the service issues that had previously suggested that behaviour support should be delegated had now been addressed. Furthermore, the response from the National Union of Teachers asks for alternatives to delegation to be considered.

These responses have led to a re-think on the service delivery model to be adopted, with on-going “de-delegation” now being considered for the Behaviour Support Team and Anti Bullying co-ordinator aspects of the service as they are both demand led and need to react to incidences, school need and circumstances at that particular time on a targeted basis. The service has undergone some significant changes to both reduce costs and to provide a more responsive and proactive service offering training to school staff and also interventions for individuals and their families. The restructuring of the service was undertaken after consultation between school head teachers and the head of service and £70,000 of savings have been made. A study of the levels of support that individual schools have received over the past 2 years, as expected for a demand led service, shows significant variation by school and at the same school between years. This makes it difficult to develop a basis for future charging which in particular is affordable for schools experiencing the greatest need.

If a traded service is the preferred option for the Schools Forum and schools choose not to buy into the services then the services could not be maintained. Without the services of a Behaviour Support Team schools will be more likely to permanently exclude pupils. These children and young people are then most likely to be placed in several different Bracknell Forest schools without any additional support. Schools will have to commission their own Behaviour Support services from elsewhere or provide it from within their own staff. Schools are advised that increasing their own capacity to meet need, though worthwhile, would not exclude the need to commission tier 2 services to support children exhibiting behaviour and emotional difficulties. Any access to tier 3 services for example, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) or Children’s Social Care, and schools will be expected to have already engaged with tier 2 services, either Bracknell Forest’s or commissioned from other providers.

The other impact for consideration is that more requests for high cost out of borough provision are likely. Those will generally be young people who have attended several Bracknell Forest schools and whom the LA is unable to place. This would place additional financial pressures on the High Needs Funding Block.

The work of the Behaviour Support Team in supporting families and young people cannot be overestimated and prevents many families from falling into crisis and being referred to Children’s Social Care. There is also an expectation from CAMHS that tier 2 services engage with children and young people before they will even consider a referral. The service is currently training two members of staff in Theraplay, one member of staff is undertaking cognitive behaviour therapy training and there is a fully trained family therapist. These services will no longer be available to schools. There is also a comprehensive training

programme of professional development for classroom teachers, teaching assistants, playground supervisors and SENCOs. Ongoing support and supervision for staff who regularly work with children with BESD is essential and part of the core offer of the Behaviour Support Team.

Taking comments from the consultation and the other information set out above into account, it is proposed to undertake a further consultation with schools during the autumn term to establish whether there is support to operate behaviour services as a de-delegated budget with funding returned to the council for central management. The outcomes from this consultation will be reported to the Forum which will be asked to make a final decision on the delivery model for Behaviour Services in January 2014.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree that no decision is taken on arrangements for the provision of Behaviour Support Services until further views are gathered from schools.

This proposal does not affect proposals to delegate funding for Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) and Consistency, Management and Discipline Co-operation (CMCD).

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree to delegate funding to schools for SEAL and CMCD on the basis of decisions taken through the autumn 2012 school consultation.

3. Funding mainstream schools for high needs pupils

5.21 Question 11

Do you agree that, subject to sufficient finances being available, 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?

Responses from 23 schools (79%) supported the creation of an SEN Contingency. 1 school (3%) did not make a response. 5 schools (17%) did not agree.

As it is unclear at this time as to whether there will be sufficient funds to create an SEN contingency, the Forum is recommended to delay making a decision on this matter until January.

5.22 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?

In respect of whether an SEN contingency should be created, there was no clear view from schools as to how much money should be included. 14 schools (49%) suggested the amount to be between £50,000 and £100,000, with 12 schools (41%) suggesting no more than £50,000. 3 schools (10%) did not express a preference.

As it is unclear at this time as to whether there will be sufficient funds to create an SEN contingency, the Forum is recommended to delay making a decision on this matter until January.

5.23 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 the qualifying criteria should comprise the following?

Unrestricted

- 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, and
- 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.

Responses from 20 schools (69%) supported the proposed criteria. 7 schools (24%) did not. The remaining 2 schools (7%) did not express a preference.

Should an SEN specific contingency be created, the Forum is recommended to agree that the proposed criteria to allocate funds be adopted.

3. Other matters

Revisions to the Scheme for Financing Schools

5.24 **Question 14**

Do you agree that the wording in the existing premature retirement / dismissal funding policy should be updated [to reflect future proposed funding from a de-delegated contingency budget]?

Responses from 26 schools (90%) supported the revised wording. 3 schools (10%) did not.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree the revised wording be adopted.

5.25 **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?

Responses from 26 schools (90%) supported the revised wording. 3 schools (10%) did not.

The Forum is therefore recommended to agree the revised wording be adopted.

Budget matters

5.26 **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?

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

- Inflation, with specific mention for utilities
- Changes to teachers pay
- Building maintenance
- Support to high needs pupils
- Replacement of IT equipment
- Funding for FSM pupils
- Increase in pupil numbers

Unrestricted

The Forum will consider budget pressures at its January meeting and how they relate to the budget strategy, as set out in Annex 2. Therefore no recommendations are being made at this time.

5.27 **Question 17**

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

Responses were received from 9 schools with the following items identified:

- Impact from the increasing population
- Concerns about the funding reforms having an adverse impact on the support that can be provided to SEN pupils
- Concerns about being able to balance the school budget
- Insufficient capital resources being provided to schools
- Concern that the BF Funding Formula does not result in a fair distribution of funds

Funding the cost of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)

- 5.28 The Forum will recall that the DfE requires all LAs to apply the MFG to individual school budgets and allocate top up funding where per pupil funding rates fall by more than 1.5% between years. In order to be able to finance the cost, which was £0.357m in 2013-14, DfE allows a cap to be applied to reduce funding increases at schools experiencing a gain in per pupil funding. The Forum is recommended to agree that existing arrangements remain in place next year, so if required, those schools above the MFG and in receipt of per pupil funding increases should meet the cost of financing the protection required for schools below the MFG, with schools receiving the largest financial gain, contributing a larger proportion of their increase. The precise threshold at which schools keep all of their gain will be set once the cost of meeting the MFG is known.

Funding the potential SEN specific contingency

- 5.29 In respect of the potential SEN specific contingency referred to in paragraphs 5.21 to 5.23 above, whilst there is no ring fence on the different Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding "blocks", the expectation is that it would be financed from the High Needs Block. However, the DfE will not be confirming each LAs High Needs funding for 2014-15 at the time individual school budgets need to be confirmed. Without confirmation that sufficient funds exist in the High Needs Block to fund an SEN contingency, it is unlikely that the LA will be in a position to propose this funding route.
- 5.30 Therefore, if the Schools Forum decides to create such a fund, it seems likely that it will need to be financed from the Schools Block element of DSG. This decision will need to take account of all potential budget pressures and the amount of "headroom" available in the funding settlement. Whilst a "cash flat" settlement for the Schools Block is expected from the DfE i.e. no increase in DSG per pupil funding rates to reflect inflationary pressures etc, the increase in pupil numbers is expected to generate extra funds as DSG per pupil rates are higher than amounts allocated via pupil related factors in the Funding Formula for schools.

Revised voting arrangements for School Forums

- 5.31 Members of the Forum are reminded that the Regulations that govern the operation of Schools Forums only allow schools and Academy members (and the private, voluntary and independent sector - PVI members) to vote on de-delegation of budgets, with a separate vote required for primary and secondary phases. Therefore, the recommendations in this report have been divided between those addressed to all members, and those addressed

Unrestricted

specifically to school and academy members. The non-schools members who cannot vote on recommendations 2.6 and 2.7 are:

- Diocesan board representative
- Trades union representative

Next steps

- 5.32 The decisions taken at this meeting will determine the calculation of 2014-15 indicative school budgets which are expected to be available by the end of term.
- 5.33 The Council is required to make a final return to the DfE on the actual 2014-15 School Budgets no later than 21 January 2014. This will not allow any changes in the composition of the BF Funding Formula, but must record the final units of resource to be used. As part of the budget setting process, the Forum will be presented with the return for approval at its meeting on 16 January 2014.
- 5.34 The Council's constitution requires formal agreement to the Schools Budget to be agreed by Executive which is expected to delegate this power to the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Learning. The Executive Member decision is scheduled to take place on 20 January 2014 and as in previous years, is expected to endorse recommendations made by the Forum.

Conclusion

- 5.35 There was a very good response rate from schools to the finance consultation (78%) with a strong consensus of the way forward. On most issues there is a clear majority response from schools, which the Forum is now being asked to agree. In order to gather more information, decisions on a small number of matters have been deferred until January.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

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

Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The Borough Treasurer is satisfied that no significant financial implications arise from this report. Decisions around the 2014-15 budget will be taken in January 2014 and will need to take account of the financial settlement provided by the DfE and data from the October 2013 school census.

Impact Assessment

- 6.2 Not applicable at this stage.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

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

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 All schools.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Meetings and 6 week formal consultation.

Representations Received

7.3 Included in the report.

Background Papers

Various supporting documents, including the consultation papers.

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI (01344 354061)
david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance (01344 354054)
paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS – SUMMARY RESONSES		TOTALS		TOTAL	
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY		
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?				
	Yes	15	5	20	69%
	No	8	1	9	31%
	No response	0	0	0	0%
2	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.				
	Yes	N/A	6	6	100%
	No	N/A	0	0	0%
	No response	N/A	0	0	0%
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:				
	A. About right	16	3	19	66%
	B. Too low	5	2	7	24%
	C. Too high	1	0	1	3%
	D. No view	1	1	2	7%
	No response	0	0	0	0%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS – SUMMARY RESONSES		TOTALS		TOTAL	
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY		
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:				
	A. About right	12	2	14	48%
	B. Too low	8	4	12	41%
	C. Too high	2	0	2	7%
	D. No view	1	0	1	3%
	No response	0	0	0	0%
5	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?				
	Yes	21	N/A	21	91%
	No	2	N/A	2	9%
	No response	0	N/A	0	0%
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:				
	A. About right	14	1	15	52%
	B. Too low	7	4	11	38%
	C. Too high	2	0	2	7%
	D. No view	0	1	1	3%
	No response	0	0	0	0%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS – SUMMARY RESONSES		TOTALS		TOTAL	
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY		
7	If the lump sum payment is increased, what value do you think it should be set at?				
	A. Around £160,000	15	2	17	59%
	B. Around £170,000	2	2	4	14%
	C. Around £175,000	4	2	6	21%
	No response	2	0	2	7%
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?				
	Yes	23	5	28	100%
	No	0	0	0	0%
	No response	0	0	0	0%
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?				
	Yes	22	5	27	96%
	No	0	0	0	0%
	No response	1	0	1	4%
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?				
	Yes	21	4	25	86%
	No	2	1	3	10%
	No response	0	1	1	3%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS – SUMMARY RESONSES		TOTALS		TOTAL	
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY		
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?				
	Yes	18	5	23	79%
	No	4	1	5	17%
	No response	1	0	1	3%
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	8	4	12	41%
	Between £50,000 and £100,000	12	2	14	48%
	Greater than £100,000	0	0	0	0%
	No response	3	0	3	11%
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?				
	Yes	15	5	20	69%
	No	6	1	7	24%
	No response	2	0	2	7%
14	Do you agree that the wording in the existing premature retirement / dismissal funding policy should be updated as set out in Appendix 13?				
	Yes	20	6	26	90%
	No	3	0	3	10%
	No response	0	0	0	0%

Unrestricted

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS – SUMMARY RESONSES		TOTALS		TOTAL	
		PRIMARY	SECONDARY		
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?				
	Yes	21	5	26	90%
	No	1	0	1	3%
	No response	1	1	2	7%
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?				
	Yes	8	5	13	45%
	No	4	0	4	14%
	No response	11	1	12	41%
17	Are there any areas of concern arising from the April 2013 changes or other matters on education funding that you would like to raise?				
	Yes	6	1	7	24%
	No	5	1	6	21%
	No response	12	2	16	55%
		23 74%	6 100%	29 78%	

Budget Strategy of the Schools Forum

The following key principles, listed in priority order, have previously been agreed as the budget strategy by the Schools Forum, which will be used as a general guide in making budget decisions:

- A. It has been included in the financial settlement from the DfE and it is consistent with local funding priorities;
- B. It relates to a new or amended statutory responsibility / DfE Regulation;
- C. 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;
- D. The pressure relates to a key local priority;
- E. Any remaining funds should be allocated using per pupil, high deprivation and low prior attainment, 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.