

Minutes of 30th July 2012 Technical Funding Group

Present:

Officers:

Sally Dakin
Helen Redding
Rob Parsons
Dawn Hill
Gezim Leka
Julia Newbury

School Forum Members:

Sue Howley (Lower Maintained)
Richard Holland (Upper Academy)
John Street (Middle Academy)
Martin Foster (Trade Union)
David Brandon-Bravo (Middle Maintained)
Shirley Ann Crosbie (Special Maintained)

Apologies:

Stephen Tiktin (Lower Maintained)
Ann Bell (Nursery and Early Years)

Meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m. and concluded at 12.15p.m.

Handouts provided:

Slides
Individual School Budget breakdown for each phase
Impact of Modelling (9 Models)

Discussions:

Minutes of 18th July 2012 meeting were discussed and agreed.

1. Decisions to date

- Funding to remain within phase were possible, excluding Deprivation and MFG.
- Deprivation pot to remain at 2012/13 levels.
- HILLN and Personalisation to be added to AWPU
- Disallowed factors after allowing for Lump Sum to be converted into AWPU
- IDACI to be used for calculation Social Deprivation.
- In principle 'Capping' gains is accepted.
- Pupil factor for post 16 not required.

2. Outstanding issues

The following outstanding issues were discussed:

- **LAC**

The feed back from the Head of the Virtual School was that as these children move very frequently from one school to another, funding will not follow the child. Also schools with LAC receive Pupil Premium Grant.

The group felt that using the LAC as a separate factor within the ISB did not target the specific group and should therefore not be differentiated.

- **EAL**

Currently £118k is held centrally and not all targeted at EAL, also contributes towards the traveller community. The group agreed that there have not been any issues previously raised with the Forum on

EAL children and from experience those children achieve very well picking up the language very quickly. It was therefore agreed a separate factor would not be required.

- **Pupil Mobility**

Pupil Mobility had been previously raised with the forum approx 3 years ago and related particularly to service children. It was agreed at that time a factor was not required. Since the introduction of the Pupil Premium, Service children now receive additional funding through this route.

The factor is permissible based on those children entering the school at non standard times i.e. August/September and January for reception children. The data provided by the DfE showed a number of incidents across most schools where this applied and did not target specific schools such as Cranfield, Derwent where the University and Forces base impacts those numbers. It was therefore concluded that as the spread was across most schools a Pupil Mobility factor would not be required and funding should be directed through the AWPU.

- **PFI**

The group requested more information from neighbouring authorities and for some clarity from the DfE on the rationale behind this proposed factor. This will be reviewed following further information.

- **Split Site**

The group was presented with a proposed definition, eligibility and how much is allocated could be allocated for this factor.

The factor is intended to contribute towards the additional costs incurred by schools that operate across separate sites. Additional costs typically such as the need to duplicate reception, caretaking, teaching and non - teaching staff, and also resources including equipment on more than one site.

Eligibility for the factor is focused on single schools, based on two or more sites, each separated such that they do not share a common boundary. Federated schools are not eligible for this factor as they remain separate schools.

Calculation will be based on the number of pupils on the smaller school site as a % of the total number on roll of the school in the Oct PLASC, then applying it as a % of the lump sum in the delegated budget of the main site.

Discussion were around future impact of this factor and if this factor will be for all phases including Special Schools. It was felt that Special Schools on split sites would be considered as part of the High Needs Block.

The group agreed in principle of using a Split Site factor and felt that the one suggested seemed appropriate for those schools on clear separate sites.

3. Blocks - DSG Split

The DSG split was reviewed to take into account the £297,953 carry forward from 2011/12.

- Schools	£142,535,173
- Early Years	£ 10,497,178

- High Needs £ 20,882,104

4. **De-delegation**

Key points point discussed;

- Services that will be funded by DSG held centrally such as:
 - Admissions
 - Schools Forum
- The group considered other central services currently funded by DSG and included in the Schools Block. The Trade Union representative expressed concern regarding Facilities Time, which funds union representatives across all schools including Academies. De-delegation is only applicable to Maintained Schools and agreed by phase. It was agreed that at the point of consultation that all services that are requested as retained will be included. Consultation with schools includes Academies.
- The following service that are currently funded by DSG are no longer permitted:
 - DSG held for overheads £250k
 - 14-19 Practical Learning £168k (Upper)
 - Raising Attainment £83k
 - Ethnic Minority £102k
 - AST £40k
 - LACSEG £550k

It was agreed in principle that these would be added to AWPU

- Central Services to be considered further:
 - Evolve £5k
 - Hospital Recoupment £92k
 - Access and Inclusion £72k
 - EY Child Information £44k
 - Trade Union £84k
 - Schools Specific Contingency £215k
 - School Admissions £220k
 - Management Support £24k

5. **Supporting Schools with significant growth**

The draft School Financial Regulations allows LA's to:

- Create a growth fund from the DSG prior to allocating School Budget Shares
- Only for the purpose of supporting growth in Pre16 pupil numbers to meet Basic Need and additional classes to meet infant class size regulations. Ring-fenced for this purpose, any fund remaining at end of year added to the following year's DSG and re-allocated to maintained schools AND academies

The LA will need to produce transparent and consistent basis (difference permitted between phases) and gain agreement from School Forum before allocation.

Officers agreed to draft a criteria and bases for allocation for both Growth Funds and Infant Class size regulations. Funding could be directed from those Central Service which are no longer permitted to be funded by DSG

6. **Early Years**

Group agreed to:

- £100k Lump Sum for Nursery Schools
- Increase PVI rate by 30p to £3.60
- Apply MFG to base rate only for Nursery and PVI

7. Further Modelling on schools

Following the previous meeting of the group, further modelling was provided to show the impact of using IDACI for the distribution of Social Deprivation funding. This was based on funding only being allocated to bands 3 and above.

Lump sums of £125k and £135k were also discussed further. Now the regulations have allowed centrally held funds for infant class size regulations, the group requested the lump sum models to be revisited based on £100k and £120k with a step by step examples of sample schools to show how the new formula would impact. MFG would then be re-run based on both lump sums to understand the impact.

It was further agreed that additional modelling should be carried out taking a look at those most deprived areas and how pupils have been allocated to the specific groups.

It was suggested a model were the Social Deprivation "Pot" is increased by reducing the AWPU would be examined.

8. MFG

The new bases for calculating MFG excludes the following items:

- Post 16 funding from EFA
- Allocations notional High Needs Block (including named pupils and special units)
- EYSFF
- Rates
- Service previously centrally funded and being delegated in 13/14
- Baseline will include lump sum applied in 13/14

MFG for all Schools including Nurseries is based on minus 1.5%

9. Capping

There are four options to be used to fund any increase on MFG:

- Cap all winners to pay for MFG
- Reduce AWPU
- Combination of above
- Funded by delegated Central Services

The principle of capping winners was discussed but no decision made.

10. Consultation with Schools

The Group agreed that the consultation must be open and transparent with a clear record of how any changes have been made, showing movement with the total ISB between factors and phases.

A draft consultation should be presented at the next Schools Forum meeting on 3rd September 2012.

11. DfE Consultations

The group were advised of the DfE consultation launched on 19th July 2012 on the School Finance Regulations 2013. The consultation period will run through to 21st September and the intention is for the regulations to come into force by 1st January 2013.