

## APPENDIX D

### TECHNICAL FUNDING SUB-GROUP OF SCHOOLS FORUM

14<sup>th</sup> December 2009 – Notes & Further Action

#### Members Present

Neil Bramwell (Upper School)  
Jim Smart (Lower School)  
Shirley – Ann Crosbie (Special School)

#### Apologies

Ian Greenley (Diocese)

#### Officers Present

Dawn Hill  
Gezim Leka

#### MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The group agreed the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2009.

#### SOCIAL DEPRIVATION (SD)

The Group revisited the Options still on the table from the previous meeting (Option 6, 8 and 9) before proceeding to the additional modelling.

A further 6 models were presented. One based on Option 8 and five focusing only on Category 5 children, as requested in the last meeting:

- Option 8 (2) - as per model 8 but using different factors for each phase: lowers 1.00 middles: 1.05 and uppers: 1.10
- Option 10 (a) - tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 25% to 11% **only for category 5.**
- Option (b) - tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 25% to 5% **only for category 5.**
- Option (c) - tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 25% to 15% for lowers, 25% to 10% for middles and 25% to 5% for uppers using **only for category 5.**
- Option 11 (a) - tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 20% to 11% **only for category 5.**
- Option 11 (b) - tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 20% to 5% **only for category 5.**

The Group agreed that options 6, 8, 10(a,b,c) and 11(a,b) **did not** meet the needs of the schools:

## APPENDIX D

Option 6 – funding follows the child on all category 4 and 5 children. The group felt that as the funding would be paid to the majority of schools (131/139) and Deprivation funding is a finite pot, funding would be too diluted and schools that need to be supported would receive considerably less.

Option 8 – The factors applied to Middles (1.25) and Uppers (1.5) distributed too much of the funding pot away from Nursery/Lower Schools and questioned the correlation with total pupil number and those in category 4 and 5.

Option 10a,b and c – These models used only category 5 children. The group felt that excluding category 4 impacted too greatly on schools with Category 4 children

Option 11 a and b – Again these models used only category 5 children and did not direct the funding appropriately

**Option 8(2) and 9 were considered as the best options to remain on the table.**

Option 8(2) – tapering of total funding pot but applying different factors for each phase: 1 for lowers, 1.05 for middles, and 1.10 for uppers. Funding allocated reducing to 0% for schools having 15% of children in categories 4 and 5.

Option 9 – tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 25% to 15% for lowers, 25% to 13% for middles and 25% to 11% for uppers.

The Group requested the modelling of

Option 8(2) applying:

- (1) a factor that correlated to the pupil numbers in category 4 and 5
- (2) the funding allocated reducing to 30% for schools having 15% of children in categories 4 and 5 (has the effect of directing more funds to less schools)

Option 9 applying:

- (1) tapering using a threshold of 15% for all phases
- (2) the funding allocated reducing to 30% for schools having 15% of children in categories 4 and 5 (has the effect of directing more funds to less schools)
- (3) the funding allocated reducing to 50% for schools having 15% of children in categories 4 and 5
- (4) different threshold ranges for phases

## APPENDIX D

It was agreed that the new models will be emailed to the group for consultation.

### “GHOST” FUNDING

At the meeting of the 22<sup>nd</sup> October it was agreed that further modelling would take place to ensure protection would **only** be given to schools that required a class to be protected and not just a reduction to the amount of ghost funding received.

The group agreed that the protection should be based on two terms (5/12 = 42%) of decrease of allocation to eligible schools.

The four new models were presented along with a schedule of how it was deemed if a school was eligible to receive the protection.

Protection would only be paid to schools where pupil numbers in KS1 drop when compared to the Jan census of the previous year and the number of classes being required in KS1 (multiples of 30).

	Pupil Numbers		Pupil Numbers	
Example: Jan 09	4+H	30	Jan 10	28
	4+S	19		17
	Yr1	39		36
	Yr2	33		32
	Total KS1	121		113
		29 Ghost Pupil		7 Ghost Pupils

School would receive protection as Pupil numbers and Ghost pupils drop.

A School would not receive protection if the pupil numbers went up but Ghost pupils went down as they would receive the equivalent AWPU value relating to the pupils.

### **The principle of identifying eligible schools was agreed by the group.**

The group continued discussing the 4 models of how the protection was to be funded.

- Option 1      Reduce the AWPU value for school by sector or as a whole
- Option 2      Schools that receive an increase on Ghost funding compared to the previous year would receive a reduced amount based on 7.9% which is calculated as £43,263 (amount required to protect) divided by £547,422 (increase in Ghost funding pot to previous year)
- Option 3      Schools that receive an increase on Ghost funding compared to the previous year would receive a reduced amount based on

## APPENDIX D

3.13% which is calculated as £43,263 (amount required to protect) divided by £1,381,346 (the total Ghost funding payable to schools that have an increased value)

Option 4 Recalculate the amount per Ghost pupil calculated as

Teacher M6 (top of the scale including on costs) divided by 30 (KS1 class size)

$$= \quad \text{£}38,162 / 30 = \text{£}1,272$$

This would then become the new value per ghost pupil, sufficient being released to pay for the protection. All schools receiving Ghost funding will be at a slightly reduced rate, £102 on indicative value.

The group agreed the proposal to the School Forum to be:

- 1) Recalculate the amount per Ghost pupil (Option 4)**
- 2) Ghost Funding would no longer be a ring fenced pot**
- 3) The Ghost funding unit will be recalculated each year based on Main Scale 6 divided by 30 pupils.**

This was based on the group agreeing that this is a more realistic approach rather than reducing schools AWPU or increase to funding on previous financial year. Option 4 will also release approx £94k into the overall schools budget pot. It is noted this will fluctuate dependant on ghost pupils in the system.

### CHILDREN OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

At the meeting of the Group on 22<sup>nd</sup> October, it was of the opinion that the mobility issue for Service Personnel children was not unique to that sector of children. The group acknowledged there is a factor in the formula for increases in pupil numbers above 4% in the autumn term but not one for mobility.

A letter had been received from Campton requesting an update on the progress of this factor. The school stated they had communicated extensively with an LA Officer over the last few years on this issue and was aware of other LA's including this factor in their formula.

The group concluded the mobility issue is not unique to schools receiving service personnel children as this could also apply to those close to traveller sites, universities etc.

The group agreed the proposal to the School Forum to be:

- 4) No additional factor is proposed for the funding of Children of Service Personnel.**

## APPENDIX D

### ADDITION FORMULA FACTORS CONSULTED

Over the last term a number of formula queries have been raised by schools. To ensure a consistent and transparent approach, these queries were brought to the group for consideration.

- **Head teacher's salary reimbursement for: Hearing impaired and Language provision**

At the June 2009 School Forum group it was proposed that the additional payment to the schools with a Hearing Impaired unit or Language Provision cease. The group resolved that this must be brought back to a future meeting pending further investigation.

There are three schools which in the past have been reimbursed from School Contingency the value of one additional responsibility point (approx £1,700). This was based on an assumption that the Headteacher of a school with a special unit would be paid at a higher rate, than a school without and therefore cost the school more.

The group were presented with an analysis of Headteacher salaries for schools of similar sizes but no special unit. The conclusion from this was that over the years the differential no longer exists. Schools with units receive specific funding ranging from £170k to £182k (based on historical figures uplifted for inflation).

The group agreed the proposal to the School Forum to be:

- 1) **No further additional payments should be made from School Contingency to schools with special units**
- 2) **The basis of the specific funding for special units to be reviewed**

- **New Schools Factor (Fairfield Lower)**

Fairfield Lower School opened in September 2007. A paper was brought to the School Forum in May 2006 to agree a funding factor for new schools, equivalent to the difference between the Funding Formula and Place Led Formula, for up to the first full five academic years after opening.

The school believe as their rates are particularly high, that this is not a consideration in the way the base model has been built up. School are normally funded pound for pound for the rates element of their formula. During 2008/09 £10,000 had been paid to the school in addition to their initial budget to assist in this factor. The school believes, further to a visit from a LA Finance Officer, they would receive this sum again for 09/10.

The group discussed the basic model used, which consisted of staff, supplies and services and ICT costs. The model assumes a set number of places plus a 50% Non-AWPU value plus Set-up costs per phase.

## APPENDIX D

The group compared the Fairfield Allocation with similar schools of that size and concluded that in their opinion the school were generously funded and questioned why the payment had been made in the previous financial year.

The group agreed the proposal to the School Forum to be:

- 1) No additional contribution to Rates to be made for 2009/10**
- 2) The New Schools Factor should be reviewed as a matter of urgency**

- **Relocating Schools**

Roecroft Lower (Stoffold) is relocating near to the A507 in the summer of 2010 and will have 300 places (moving to two form entry). The school believe that it was advocated that the school should receive financial support for moving, and a sum of £14,650 agreed. The principle we do not believe has previously been brought to the forum for consideration.

Correspondence with the school state that the funding is required for planning, project management and recruiting staff for an increasing role. Steven Bird, planning officer has confirmed that his recollection was a proposed payment from the DSG (contingency) as a one off.

The group discussed the issues involved with a school relocating and felt that many similar disruptions happen in schools for varying reasons. The group did not advocate making this payment and questioned how it would be justified.

The group agreed that the proposal to the Schools Forum to be:

- 1) A payment would not be made to Roecroft until a business plan is provided detailing anticipated additional expenditure for the school**
- 2) The payment relating to the business plan to be agreed by the Director of Children, Families and Learning, payable from School Contingency**
- 3) No additional Formula Factor to be included in the ISB for re-locating schools**
- 4) All relocating schools should provide a business case on an individual basis and paid from School Contingency**

- **Lump Sums**

St Vincent's Lower School is a Catholic School in Houghton Regis. As of September 2007 the school elected to have an additional year group (Year 5) and in September 2008, 2 additional year groups (Year 5 and 6) to provide for the Catholic children in the area. Although the school have been funded for the per pupil element, they have not been funded an additional lump sum for the extra two year groups in KS2.

## APPENDIX D

Lump sum payments included in the ISB in general were discussed. The basis of the allocation is historical and has been uplifted for inflation. The current (09/10) Lump Sums are as follows:

Nursery	£ 37,352
Lower (Yrs 1 – 4 )	£ 39,105
Middle(Yrs 5 – 8)	£ 80,921
Upper (Yrs 9 – 11)	£117,319 (plus Yr 12 out of Year)

The group felt that an additional payment should be made to St Vincent's to take into account the additional year groups over the last 2 and half years. The group requested that lump sums factors should be reviewed before the 11/12 allocations.

The group agreed that the proposal to the School Forum would be:

- 1) To allocate from Contingency an amount of £20,000 to St Vincent's as a contribution to the additional KS2 classes for the period Sept 07 up to March 2010**
- 2) St Vincent's lump sum for the period April 10 to March 11 an additional £7,915 added to the Lower School lump sum (pending lump sum review)**
- 3) To review ALL lump sum factors for all phases, to include Primary (Yr 1 – 6), Secondary (Yr 7 – 13) and through schools (Yr 1 – 8 ) for the 2011/12 Formula Allocation**

- **Early Years**

At the Early Year Reference Group (EYRG) on the 10<sup>th</sup> December it was known that the Government were minded to delay the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) until April 2011, however they were looking for pilot authorities to continue with the implementation, if they felt ready.

The EYRG proposed that they did not put themselves forward as a pilot authority however, did want to propose that Nursery Schools were counted on a headcount basis and not be place funded (as per Lower Schools). As the EYSFF is being delayed, the group felt that this should now fall under the remit of the Technical Funding Sub Group as a formula change.

The Technical Funding Group was presented with the modelling of the implications for Nursery Schools funded on a headcount basis. The group discussed the request and followed with the subsequent proposals to be taken to the School Forum on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010:

- 1) Nursery Schools to be counted on Headcount**
- 2) Same methodology as used for Lower Schools (based on date of birth of child)**
  - **3 year old counted as half or half of value**
  - **4 year old counted as 1 FTE**

## **APPENDIX D**

- 3) No changes to AWPUP for Nursery. The value of the amount per pupil (£192) and Amount per Place (£3,248) based on 09/10 would be added together, allocations to be uplifted for 10/11 as per lower schools.**
- 4) To mirror the formula used for Lower Schools but no change to lump sums**
- 5) Additional factor payable for rises of 4% in pupil numbers for Autumn term (as per All sectors)**
- 6) Protection would be in the form of the MFG**
- 7) Protection to be revisited on implementation of the EYSFF**

Note: Infant class size, small Schools Protection and personalisation is not applicable (as applicable to statutory children only)