

# AGENDA



## SCHOOLS FORUM

---

Date : Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017

Time : 4.30pm

Place : Badminton Road Offices, Ground Floor, Room 0012

---

### Distribution

#### Members of the Committee

Rhona Allgood  
Dave Baker  
Mark Dee  
Mark Freeman  
Kim Garland  
Elizabeth Gibbons  
John Goff  
Geoff Howell  
Liz Jardine  
Emma Jarman

Keith Lawrence (Chair)  
Louise Leader  
Jim Lott  
Sarah Lovell  
Lisa Parker  
Ann Reed (sub)  
Max Reed  
Peter Smart  
Paul Tanner  
Susie Weaver  
Bernice Webber  
Adrian Vye

#### Appropriate Officers

Peter Murphy  
Mustafa Salih  
Helean Hughes

#### Councillors

Jon Hunt  
Trevor Jones

Peter Murphy, Director for Children, Adults and Health, Badminton Road Offices, Yate, South Gloucestershire, BS37 5AF

Telephone (01454) 863253 E-mail [peter.murphy@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:peter.murphy@southglos.gov.uk)

Enquiries to : Mustafa Salih, Interim Head of Financial Management and Business Support, Telephone (01454) 862548 or E-mail [mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk)

## Public Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings

### **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO:**

- Attend all Council, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be dealt with would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
    - Inspect agendas and public reports five days before the date of the meeting.
    - Inspect agendas, reports and minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees for up to six years following a meeting.
  
  - Inspect background papers used to prepare public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report.
  - Have access to the public register of names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
  - Have a reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Committees and Sub-Committees.
  - Have access to a list setting out the decision making powers the Council has delegated to their officers and the title of those officers.
  - Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access. There is a charge of 15p for each side of A4, subject to a minimum charge of £4.
  - For further information about this agenda or how the Council works please contact Martin Dear, Telephone (01454) 863197 or e-mail [mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:mustafa.salih@southglos.gov.uk)
  - Also see our website [www.southglos.gov.uk](http://www.southglos.gov.uk)
- 

## **EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire alarm, fire drill or other emergency, signalled by a continuously ringing bell, please leave from the room via the signs marked "Exit".

---

## **OTHER LANGUAGES AND FORMATS**

**This information can be made available in other languages, in large print, Braille or on audio tape. Please phone (01454) 868686 if you need any of these or any other help to access Council services.**

# AGENDA

1	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	5 mins
2	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	5 mins
3	EVACUATION PROCESS	5 mins
4	ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT	5 mins
5	MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 19 JANUARY 2017	5 mins
6	SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY CORE OFFER FOR SCHOOLS –PRESENTATION	10 mins
7	EDUCATION COMMISSION UPDATE – VERBAL UPDATE	10 mins
8	NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA SECOND STAGE CONSULTATION	20 mins
9	SCHOOLS FORUM CONSTITUTION AND MEMBERSHIP	10 mins
10	DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND THE SCHOOLS FORUM WORK PROGRAMME 2017	5 mins
11	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	5 mins

**SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**Thursday 19 January 2017**  
**Badminton Road Offices**

**PRESENT:**

Dave Baker	Executive Headteacher, Olympus Academy Trust (+ Ridings Federation)
Mark Dee	Executive Headteacher, The Park and Parkwall Primary Federation
Mark Freeman	Headteacher, St Michael's CE VC Primary, Stoke Gifford
Kim Garland	Headteacher, Brimsham Green School
Elizabeth Gibbons	Diocese of Bristol
Clare Haughton	EarlyYears Representative (Voluntary Sector)
Liz Jardine	Early Years (Private Sector)
Emma Jarman	Deputy CEO and Vice Principal, South Gloucestershire and Stroud College
Trevor Jones	Councillor, South Gloucestershire Council
Keith Lawrence (Chair)	Governor, Culverhill School
Louise Leader	Headteacher, Pathways Learning Centre
Jim Lott	Governor, The Tynings Primary School
Sarah Lovell	Finance Director, Cabot Learning Federation
Lisa Parker	Headteacher, Warmley Park School
Ann Reed	Governor, New Horizons Learning Centre
Max Reed	Governor, The Ridge Schools
Peter Smart	Headteacher, The Castle School / WIA

**Chair:** Keith Lawrence

**Officers:**

Mustafa Salih – Interim Head of Financial Management and Business Support  
 Helean Hughes – Acting Head of Education, Learning & Skills  
 Rachel Webb – Senior Education Adviser (Early Years Manager)  
 Tamsin Moreton – Integra Schools Finance  
 Davina Gibbon – Senior Finance Officer, Corporate Finance

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Attendees were welcomed by the Chair

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Ann Reed, Sonya Miller, Paul Tanner, Cllr Jon Hunt, Susie Weaver, Adrian Vye.  
 Steve Forecast has resigned.

### 3. EVACUATION PROCESS

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 4. ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT

None.

### 5. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1 DECEMBER 2016

There is a missing word. Item 7 final paragraph should read:

**That Children's Adults and Health Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> December are informed of the other financial pressures facing schools (e.g. pay awards, pension scheme, apprenticeship levy) and the resulting potential for redundancies.**

### 6. DEPLOYMENT OF THE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2017/2018

- MS presented the report and explained that the DSG had been announced for 2017/2018 for the Schools Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block.
- A year on year analysis of DSG funding is difficult as there have been new additions and a baselining exercise.
- The baselining exercise did not change overall funding but re-aligned the blocks to be in line with the pattern of expenditure.
- Schools Block has additional funding for growing pupil numbers and a transfer of £660,000 funding from what was previously the Education Services Grant Retained Duties element to cover statutory roles. The Education Services Grant General Duties element is no longer funded by the EFA but may be funded from the DSG with Schools Forum approval. For 2017/18 South Gloucestershire Council will fund this from central resources.
- Funding of 3 and 4 year old changing significantly for 2017/18 and there is additional funding from the EFA to fund formula funding rate changes. There is also additional funding to support the increase in EY hours to 30 from September. There is growth in 2 year old funding.
- The EFA has increased High Needs funding but this will still leave South Gloucestershire with a shortfall
- There was a positive response from the CAH Committee to Schools Forum's action to the recovery plan. Deficit recovery plan currently on track.
- Issue raised by schools from the deficit plan consultation was the challenge of meeting funding reductions. Proposal to set £300,000 contingency to support schools and academies with significant financial issues or meeting the deficit plan reductions on a case by case basis. Any contingency balance at the end of the financial year would be available to go back out to reallocate to schools or carry forward into the following financial year. This funding would require annual School Forum approval.

- HH clarified the basis of allocating Pupil Premium Looked After grant and explained that it was the role of the Virtual School Governing Body to determine Looked After funding.

**Agreed:**

**The Schools Forum noted the report and agreed the following:**

**To support the contingency of £300,000 for one year and that all applications for this funding from schools should come to Schools Forum for review and approval.**

**£660,000 to be retained centrally for statutory duties formerly funded by the Education Support Grant.**

## **7. EARLY YEARS FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2017/2018**

- MS introduced the report by explaining the Early Years funding was announced just before Christmas which did not leave a lot of time for colleagues to undertake a consultation exercise with early years providers.
- RW explained that the government consultation outlined the proposed national funding formula for early years settings with the aim of more equal distribution of funding to LAs. The allocations methodology includes three criteria
  - Universal base rate
  - SEN EAL Free School Meal combination base rate
  - Area cost weighting
- Under the new funding criteria South Gloucestershire would receive £4.34 per pupil just above the national minimum at £4.30. 7% of this amount can be retained centrally to ensure the delivery of statutory functions and the remaining 93% allocated to providers with a minimum of 90% allocated on a base rate and a maximum of 10% allocated on supplements. If the base rate funding was set at 90% minimum Early Years providers would see a reduction in funding. In order to address that minimising supplementary allocations was looked at.
- There are two mandatory supplementary allocation plus one other.
  - Deprivation: providers were consulted on two options 1% or 2%. Responses showed support for the work undertaken with deprived children but the response was that 1% was sufficient. Additionally providers responded that deprivation funding should be linked to Early Years Pupil Premium funding.
  - Inclusion: this to support pupils with lower levels of SEN. Consultation welcomed that funding but there was concern on how this funding would be allocated. Proposal to set up a working group to include providers and colleagues with SEN expertise from the authority to ensure funding is allocated appropriately. Set at 2%
  - Flexibility: this is additional support to childminders which reflects the higher unit cost.

- Over 40% of providers responded to the consultation
- Consultation responses included concern about cost of expansion to 30 hours

**Agreed:**

**The Schools Forum noted the report and agreed the following:**

**Allocate a base rate of 96.75% to all providers with effect from April 2017 and that the formula funding is reviewed in January 2018 to enable adjustments to be made when levels of funding change again in April 2018**

**That the deprivation supplement should be set at 1% or £0.04 per hour from April 2017 and that deprivation funding should be linked to children in receipt of Early Years Pupil Premium**

**That the Early Years Inclusion Fund should be set at 2% or £0.08 per hour from April 2017 and that draft guidelines presented to the sector should continue to be developed.**

**That Childminders receive a flexibility payment of 23p per hour for 2017-18 to maintain their current hourly rate.**

## **8. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND THE SCHOOLS FORUM WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

There was no change to work programme

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There a number of School Forum vacancies. Need another secondary academy and a number of governor vacancies. The constitution of the Schools Forum will be discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting closed at 17.30

**SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY CORE OFFER FOR  
SCHOOLS**

**PRESENTATION**

**EDUCATION COMMISSION UPDATE**

**VERBAL UPDATE**

# South Gloucestershire Council

## SCHOOLS FORUM

2 MARCH 2016

## RESPONSE TO NATIONAL SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA STAGE 2 CONSULTATION

### Purpose of Report

1. To consult the Schools Forum on the Council's proposed response to the current DfE consultation.

### Policy

2. Local Authorities must distribute funding to their maintained schools using a formula which accords with the regulations made by the Secretary of State, and enables the calculation of a budget share for each maintained school. The financial controls within which delegation works are set out in the Scheme for the Financing of Schools.

### Background

3. The Department for Education (DfE) previously announced that the introduction of the national funding formula for schools will be deferred by a year to 2018/19. The DfE has a live consultation in process which closes on 22 March 2017 regarding proposals to move to a new National Funding Formula (NFF) in 2018/19.

### DfE Proposals for New NFF

5. The features of the new funding system for schools contained in the DfE consultation proposals include:
  - A move to 4 DSG Blocks: Schools, High Needs, Early Years and Central School Services Block,
  - LAs will be able to operate a local funding formula in 2018/19 but in 2019/20 all schools would be funded directly by the DfE,
  - In year 1 only an extra £184m has been added into the system to speed up increases for schools due to gain. The NAO estimates real terms cost pressures for schools of 8% up to 2019/20 (this has now been accepted by the DfE).
  - Pupils in resource bases will receive £4k of mainstream formula funding and only £6k place funding,
  - During 2018/19 the NFF will be a soft formula with LAs able to vary the formula at local school level and also able to move money between the DSG blocks; neither option will be allowed in 2019/20,

- New NFF will consist of: Basic Entitlement + Deprivation(FSM6+IDACI) + Prior Attainment + EAL + Lump Sum + Sparsity + Area Cost Adjustment + Rates/Split Site + PFI Costs +Mobility + Pupil Growth,
  - Transfer of £1.1bn away from Basic Entitlement to Deprivation, Prior Attainment and EAL,
  - Reduction of lump sum from current maximum of £175k to £110k,
  - Even in gaining LAs some schools may lose funding,
  - MFG will continue at 1.5% per pupil,
  - An absolute floor of -3% per pupil: no schools will ever lose more than 3 % as a result of the new NFF,
  - High Needs Block will also move to new formulaic basis but for South Gloucestershire the High Needs Block will be protected at current levels. LAs will continue to determine SEN funding rates.
6. The DfE has provided illustrative models of the impact of the new Formula and these are attached as Appendix A to this report.
7. The Local Authority has been liaising with other LAs and in particular the F40 group of lower funded LAs to develop its response to the consultation. A proposed response is attached to this report as Appendix B.

### **Consultation**

8. Consultation with the Schools Forum on the LA's proposed response is taking place via this report.

### **Financial Implications**

9. The School Finance Regulations set out the arrangements which Local Authorities must follow when allocating the DSG funding to schools.
10. As the support for schools and other pupil related services expenditure is funded by the dedicated schools budget there is no charge to the Council Budget. Hence there is no charge to the Council Tax payer.
11. The DSG is forecast to overspend in 2016/17. Any overspend will need to be recovered from future year DSG funding.

### **Legal Implications**

12. There is a legal requirement for the local authority to conform with the Financing of Maintained Schools regulations.
13. The Chief Financial Officer, after the end of the financial year, must confirm to the DfE that the grant conditions have been met.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The Schools Forum is being consulted on and asked to approve the proposed response to the DfE consultation as set out in Appendix B.

### Author

Mustafa Salih, Interim Head of Financial Management and Business Support  
Tel: 01454 863197

### Appendices

Appendix A – DfE Illustrative NFF Modelling

Appendix B - South Gloucestershire Proposed Consultation Response

### Background Papers

1. DfE Second Stage NFF Consultation

## National funding formula consultation: Impact of the proposed schools NFF (all schools)

Appendix A

**NB: 1. Shaded Schools are funding "losers". 2. All figures are DfE modelling figures designed to show like for like impact of the NFF proposals, they do not reflect amounts Schools will actually receive as actual amounts would be based on more up to date pupil data. 3. The figures below do not include transitional protection which will apply in 2018/19.**

The school's baseline funding is the total core funding received through the schools block and MFG in 2016-17 (or 2016/17 if an academy). Other grants/funding sources are excluded.

These columns show illustrative NFF funding if the proposed formula had been implemented in full and without any transitional protections in 2016-17. We use pupil numbers and characteristics from 2016-17 to illustrate the NFF impact, and compare to the school's baseline funding, including MFG.

PRIMARY SCHOOL NAME		Adjusted pupil count (APT adjusted pupil count for LA maintained schools, academy adjusted pupil count for academies)	Funding the school received in 2016-17 or 2016/17 £	Illustrative NFF funding if formula implemented in full in 2016-17, without transitional protections		
				Illustrative total NFF funding £	Variation between NFF and baseline	Percentage change compared to baseline
Abbotswood Primary School	Primary	273	990,000	1,065,000	75,000	7.6%
Alexander Hosea Primary School	Primary	213	763,000	769,000	6,000	0.9%
Almondsbury Church of England Primary School	Primary	294	964,000	1,004,000	40,000	4.1%
Bailey's Court Primary School	Primary	442	1,417,000	1,490,000	73,000	5.2%
Barley Close Community Primary School	Primary	336	1,164,000	1,260,000	96,000	8.3%
Barrs Court Primary School	Primary	306	1,046,000	1,095,000	49,000	4.7%
Beacon Rise Primary School	Primary	536	1,638,000	1,785,000	147,000	8.9%
Blackhorse Primary School	Primary	416	1,374,000	1,459,000	85,000	6.2%
Bowsland Green Primary School	Primary	264	984,000	999,000	15,000	1.5%

Broadway Infant School	Primary	177	665,000	676,000	11,000	1.7%
Bromley Heath Infant School	Primary	180	653,000	649,000	(4,000)	-0.6%
Bromley Heath Junior School	Primary	239	796,000	802,000	6,000	0.8%
Cadbury Heath Primary School	Primary	190	742,000	758,000	16,000	2.3%
Callicroft Primary School	Primary	283	1,065,000	1,124,000	59,000	5.5%
Charborough Road Primary School	Primary	257	925,000	964,000	39,000	4.3%
Charfield Primary School	Primary	176	657,000	653,000	(4,000)	-0.5%
Cherry Garden Primary School	Primary	171	666,000	682,000	16,000	2.5%
Christ Church Hanham CofE Primary School	Primary	309	1,023,000	1,072,000	49,000	4.8%
Christ Church, Church of England Infant School, Downend	Primary	225	810,000	822,000	12,000	1.5%
Christ Church, Church of England Junior School, Downend	Primary	292	1,020,000	1,069,000	49,000	4.8%
Christ The King Catholic Primary School, Thornbury	Primary	148	595,000	589,000	(6,000)	-1.0%
Coniston Primary School	Primary	187	777,000	812,000	35,000	4.5%
Courtney Primary School	Primary	199	794,000	827,000	33,000	4.2%
Crossways Infant School	Primary	161	614,000	617,000	3,000	0.5%
Crossways Junior School	Primary	212	742,000	752,000	10,000	1.3%
Elm Park Primary School	Primary	283	962,000	998,000	36,000	3.8%
Emersons Green Primary School	Primary	271	951,000	975,000	24,000	2.5%
Filton Hill Primary School	Primary	205	790,000	848,000	58,000	7.3%
Frampton Cotterell Church of England Primary School	Primary	294	975,000	1,008,000	33,000	3.4%
Frenchay Church of England Primary School	Primary	129	514,000	502,000	(12,000)	-2.3%
Gillingstool Primary School	Primary	167	723,000	756,000	33,000	4.6%
Hambrook Primary School	Primary	205	753,000	767,000	14,000	1.9%
Hanham Abbots Junior School	Primary	373	1,194,000	1,265,000	71,000	6.0%

Hawkesbury Church of England Primary School	Primary	101	459,000	449,000	(10,000)	-2.2%
Holy Family Catholic Primary School	Primary	201	764,000	788,000	24,000	3.2%
Holy Trinity Primary School	Primary	198	732,000	719,000	(13,000)	-1.7%
Horton CofE VA Primary School	Primary	64	349,000	341,000	(8,000)	-2.0%
Iron Acton Church of England Primary School	Primary	79	394,000	385,000	(9,000)	-2.1%
Kings' Forest Primary School	Primary	397	1,358,000	1,484,000	126,000	9.3%
Little Stoke Primary School	Primary	195	790,000	832,000	42,000	5.3%
Longwell Green Primary School	Primary	403	1,273,000	1,369,000	96,000	7.5%
Lyde Green Primary School	Primary	57	329,000	323,000	(6,000)	-2.0%
Mangotsfield Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School	Primary	536	1,650,000	1,753,000	103,000	6.3%
Manorbrook Primary School	Primary	188	722,000	714,000	(8,000)	-1.2%
Marshfield Church of England Primary School	Primary	169	637,000	631,000	(6,000)	-1.0%
Meadowbrook Primary School	Primary	464	1,540,000	1,643,000	103,000	6.7%
North Road Community Primary School	Primary	98	448,000	438,000	(10,000)	-2.2%
Old Sodbury Church of England Primary School	Primary	92	434,000	424,000	(10,000)	-2.2%
Oldbury on Severn Church of England Primary School	Primary	57	336,000	330,000	(6,000)	-1.8%
Olveston Church of England Primary School	Primary	192	699,000	693,000	(6,000)	-0.8%
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School	Primary	197	736,000	751,000	15,000	2.0%
Parkwall Primary School	Primary	141	631,000	669,000	38,000	6.2%
Pucklechurch CofE VC Primary School	Primary	207	768,000	778,000	10,000	1.3%
Rangeworthy Church of England Primary School	Primary	55	326,000	320,000	(6,000)	-1.9%
Raysfield Infants' School	Primary	162	632,000	638,000	6,000	0.9%
Raysfield Junior School	Primary	235	797,000	814,000	17,000	2.2%
Redfield Edge Primary School	Primary	197	745,000	754,000	9,000	1.3%

Samuel White's Infant School	Primary	251	880,000	897,000	17,000	2.0%
Severn Beach Primary School	Primary	115	502,000	490,000	(12,000)	-2.3%
Shield Road Primary School	Primary	208	826,000	875,000	49,000	6.0%
St Andrew's Church of England Primary School, Cromhall	Primary	66	359,000	352,000	(7,000)	-2.1%
St Anne's Church of England Primary School	Primary	404	1,303,000	1,391,000	88,000	6.7%
St Augustines of Canterbury RC Primary School	Primary	243	824,000	846,000	22,000	2.6%
St Barnabas CofE Primary School	Primary	222	824,000	844,000	20,000	2.4%
St Chad's Patchway CofE Primary School	Primary	254	916,000	950,000	34,000	3.7%
St Helen's Church of England Primary School	Primary	183	681,000	690,000	9,000	1.4%
St John's Mead Church of England Primary School	Primary	295	1,009,000	1,056,000	47,000	4.7%
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	Primary	205	772,000	764,000	(8,000)	-1.1%
St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Thornbury	Primary	208	729,000	735,000	6,000	0.9%
St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Yate	Primary	312	1,030,000	1,082,000	52,000	5.1%
St Michael's Church of England Primary School, Stoke Gifford	Primary	675	2,113,000	2,301,000	188,000	8.9%
St Michael's Church of England Primary School, Winterbourne	Primary	207	749,000	769,000	20,000	2.8%
St Paul's Catholic Primary School	Primary	201	743,000	765,000	22,000	2.9%
St Peter's Anglican / Methodist VC Primary	Primary	211	784,000	800,000	16,000	2.0%
St Stephen's Church of England Junior School, Soundwell	Primary	347	1,182,000	1,295,000	113,000	9.5%
St Stephen's Infant School	Primary	266	958,000	1,050,000	92,000	9.6%
Stanbridge Primary School	Primary	411	1,384,000	1,490,000	106,000	7.6%
Staple Hill Primary School	Primary	310	1,204,000	1,297,000	93,000	7.7%
Stoke Lodge Primary School	Primary	504	1,588,000	1,739,000	151,000	9.5%
The Manor Coalpit Heath Church of England Primary School	Primary	210	760,000	767,000	7,000	1.0%
The Meadows Primary School	Primary	193	716,000	722,000	6,000	0.8%

The Park Primary School	Primary	610	2,024,000	2,278,000	254,000	12.6%
The Ridge Junior School	Primary	229	822,000	841,000	19,000	2.4%
The Tynings School	Primary	354	1,183,000	1,285,000	102,000	8.6%
Tortworth VC Primary School	Primary	59	347,000	341,000	(6,000)	-1.9%
Trinity Church of England Primary School	Primary	134	524,000	512,000	(12,000)	-2.3%
Tyndale Primary School	Primary	206	827,000	890,000	63,000	7.6%
Walls court Farm Academy	Primary	232	854,000	903,000	49,000	5.8%
Watermore Primary School	Primary	259	971,000	996,000	25,000	2.6%
Wellesley Primary School	Primary	206	730,000	752,000	22,000	2.9%
Wheatfield Primary School	Primary	411	1,427,000	1,483,000	56,000	4.0%
Wick Church of England Primary School	Primary	181	680,000	695,000	15,000	2.2%
<b>PRIMARY</b>		<b>22,480</b>	<b>80,520,000</b>	<b>83,896,000</b>	<b>3,376,000</b>	<b>4.2%</b>

Secondary School Name	Phase	Adjusted pupil count (APT adjusted pupil count for LA maintained schools, academy adjusted pupil count for academies)	Funding the school received in 2016-17 or 2016/17 £	Illustrative total NFF funding £	Variation between NFF and baseline	Percentage change compared to baseline
Abbeywood Community School	Secondary	768	3,767,000	3,903,000	136,000	3.6%
Bradley Stoke Community School	All-through	954	4,373,000	4,413,000	40,000	0.9%
Brimsham Green School	Secondary	845	4,175,000	4,218,000	43,000	1.0%
Bristol Technology and Engineering Academy	Secondary	169	974,000	979,000	5,000	0.5%
Chipping Sodbury School	Secondary	556	2,768,000	2,732,000	(36,000)	-1.3%
Digitech Studio School	Secondary	164	1,003,000	976,000	(27,000)	-2.7%
Downend School	Secondary	878	4,234,000	4,273,000	39,000	0.9%

Hanham Woods Academy	Secondary	839	4,061,000	4,088,000	27,000	0.7%
John Cabot Academy	Secondary	791	4,141,000	4,020,000	(121,000)	-2.9%
King's Oak Academy	All-through	796	4,574,000	4,440,000	(134,000)	-2.9%
Mangotsfield School	Secondary	1077	5,168,000	5,299,000	131,000	2.5%
Marlwood School	Secondary	586	2,784,000	2,786,000	2,000	0.1%
Patchway Community College	Secondary	525	2,699,000	2,768,000	69,000	2.5%
Sir Bernard Lovell Academy	Secondary	967	4,524,000	4,580,000	56,000	1.2%
The Castle School	Secondary	1314	6,038,000	6,045,000	7,000	0.1%
The Grange School and Sports College	Secondary	107	643,000	655,000	12,000	1.9%
The Ridings Federation Winterbourne International Academy	Secondary	1473	6,557,000	6,564,000	7,000	0.1%
The Ridings Federation Yate International Academy	All-through	987	4,225,000	4,447,000	222,000	5.3%
SECONDARY/ALL THROUGH		13,796	66,708,000	67,186,000	478,000	0.7%
TOTAL		36,276	147,228,000	151,082,000	3,854,000	2.6%

**Schools National Funding Formula Consultation Stage 2****(Closing Date 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017)****Overall Approach**

- 1. In designing our national funding formula, we have taken careful steps to balance the principles of fairness and stability. Do you think we have struck the right balance? (Pages 7-15)**

Yes

**No**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire Council would like to take the opportunity of welcoming this consultation and commend the government for honouring its manifesto commitment to introduce fairer funding for all children in state funded schools in England. We also wish to acknowledge the work that Ministers and the department have undertaken on Stage 1 and in getting the Stage 2 consultation to this stage.

We welcome the fact that the proposed funding formula indicates a total gain of £4 million for South Gloucestershire Council schools once the national formula is fully implemented from 2019-20. Taken together with the £7 million (South Gloucestershire Council's share of the £390 million funding first provided in 2015-16 and now baselined within overall budgets), this means South Gloucestershire Council's poorly funded authorities stand to gain a total of £10 million which they would not otherwise have had.

But we believe that success has to be tempered by an outcome that probably no local authority had really anticipated: that some poorly funded authorities will not gain and that even for poorly funded authorities that will gain many schools within will actually lose funding.

This response, therefore, highlights the main themes on which South Gloucestershire Council would like to see further evidence or discussion prior to the implementation of a new formula and before it can be considered fair. However, we do not wish to see further delays in the implementation of fairer funding shares for the most poorly funded authorities.

There are key elements of the government's proposals that South Gloucestershire Council would like to see amended, namely:

- 1. Weakness of evidence for proposals and continued use of averages**

2. **The 3% funding floor, which locks in historical differences**
3. **Lack of rationale for adopting a hard formula as opposed to a soft formula approach**
4. **The proportion of weighting given to AEN rather than basic entitlement**
5. **Quantum and spending cuts**

These are dealt with in the following sections.

### **Weakness of evidence for proposals and continued use of averages**

As with the first stage of the consultation, there is still a basic weakness in that there is no commitment to a definition of what the government is actually funding. The emphasis is on redistributing money more fairly, which is fine and long overdue, but without some clarity on what level of service the money can purchase, there is a danger that the new system does not take us much further forward but merely trades one form of unfairness for another.

It is disappointing to see the continued use of averages, which reflect what LAs can currently afford to do, rather than a needs-based model which can evidence that the proposed funding levels are sufficient to cover the required costs of operating schools of different sizes and levels of needs wherever they are in the country. As part of the ongoing strategic approach to schools funding, South Gloucestershire Council would urge the DfE to undertake to analyse and assess activity led funding to be factored into the funding formula rates prior to the implementation of the hard formula in 2019-20. The DfE and Ministers have frequently and correctly stated that this is a once in a generation opportunity to get school funding right and to make changes without a proper activity led assessment is in danger of squandering this unique opportunity.

Without the underlying understanding as to what the government is funding it is difficult to understand the rationale for the basic entitlement compared to the additional needs. The proposals state that there has been a deliberate movement of funding into additional needs, partly to support those “just about managing” families, but we don’t consider that the additional needs indicators do support those families and therefore by reducing the basic element of funding this could be having the opposite effect to that intended.

### **The 3% funding floor, which locks in historical differences**

One of the key principles set out in Stage 1 of the consultation, supported by South Gloucestershire Council was that pupils of similar characteristics should attract similar levels of funding wherever they are in the country (allowing for the area cost adjustment). When the funding formula to be implemented is deemed fair, it should be applied to all schools on a consistent basis.

However, the proposed 3% funding floor “locks” in the historical differences for those schools which have been better funded for several decades. Equally the cost of this protection limits the redistributive impact and will result in the continuation of different

funding levels for pupils across the country. Stability for schools in funding is important, but not at the expense of never reaching a fair formula and outcome. If the 3% floor is adopted then the goal of ensuring pupils from similar characteristics attract similar funding can no longer be seen as relevant.

### **The Adoption of a Hard Formula**

The main consideration put forward by the DfE and Ministers in the consultation for adopting a hard formula was to ensure pupils of similar characteristics would attract similar levels of funding. As explained in the previous section of this response with the adoption of the 3% floor that consideration no longer becomes relevant and so the adoption of a hard formula becomes even less supportable. By moving to a hard formula local flexibility is removed from the system causing many unintended consequences and harmful impacts where a one size fits all approach is damaging such as:

- Inability to locally determine lump sums to ensure small schools are funded appropriately according to local circumstances and local priorities,
- Inability to ensure the correct weighting of basic entitlement and deprivation/AEN funding to ensure local circumstances are accounted for and every school receives sufficient core funding,
- Inability to ensure all schools in lower funded authorities benefit from the fairer distribution of funding from the move to a NFF. The current proposed hard formula proposals show that even in gaining LAs some schools will lose funding; if a soft formula was adopted instead then the Schools Forum could ensure no schools are left behind and benefit from a fairer national funding formula in the appropriate way based on local circumstances.

### **The proportion of weighting given to AEN rather than basic entitlement**

Our initial reaction is that too much funding is directed towards deprivation and that when Pupil Premium is also taken into account this could be considered as double funding. Clarity is required between the differences as to what the deprivation funding in the main funding formula and pupil premium are supposed to support.

### **Quantum and spending cuts**

South Gloucestershire Council understands that this consultation is about finding a fair funding methodology and not (at this time) about the quantum of funding available. But, schools in lower funded areas have been making cuts for well over five years now and have reached the limit of where cuts can be made without significantly reducing standards and outcomes for children. We recognise the work that the DfE has undertaken in supporting schools in making efficiencies, but we are struggling to understand where more cuts can be made by schools in the lowest

funded authorities.

School funding is complex with many interconnecting cogs in the machine and this consultation is not broad enough to capture all elements for example the removal of the Education Services Grant (ESG) will have an impact on schools. Academies will have costs which were supported by the ESG which they will need to fund from their General Annual Grant and local authority cuts are likely to lead to additional charges to maintained schools. We cannot see any evidence that these broader connected aspects have been acknowledged or accounted for in this consultation.

We understand that the DfE believes that £1 billion worth of more cuts are available within the system, but we consider that they need to align those cuts with their requirements from the system. Without assessing the needs and costs of running the school system it is not possible to assess the extent of efficiencies that may be driven out of the system. Efficiency and an understanding about what it is that is being purchased must work hand in hand.

## 2. Do you support our proposal to set the primary to secondary ratio in line with the current national average? (Pages 16-17)

We have decided that the secondary phase should be funded, overall, at a higher level than primary, after consulting on this in stage one. We are now consulting on how great the difference should be between the phases.

The current national average is 1:1.29, which means that secondary pupils are funded 29% higher overall than primary pupils.

Yes

No – the ratio should be closer (i.e. primary and secondary phases should be funded at more similar levels)

No – the ratio should be wider (i.e. the secondary phase should be funded more than 29% higher than the primary phase)

**None of the above**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire believes such matters are better decided at the local level in consultation with the Schools Forum taking into account local circumstances and local priorities.

Moreover, South Gloucestershire Council recognises the need for a differential in funding between primary and secondary schools but comparison to a national ratio is an artificial concept. The amounts and relative weightings need to be evidence based with reference to actual costs and factors such as:

- Teaching group sizes.

- Teacher contact time, including an allowance for planning, performance and assessment (PPA).
- Teaching assistant time.
- Absence e.g. sickness, maternity etc.
- Leadership costs.
- Non-class staff costs.
- Resources.
- Exam fees (Key Stage 4 only).

When this has been calculated the ratio will be what it is.

### 3. Do you support our proposal to maximise pupil-led funding? (Pages 17-18)

We are proposing to maximise the amount of funding allocated to factors that relate directly to pupils and their characteristics, compared to the factors that relate to schools' characteristics. We propose to do this by reducing the lump sum compared to the current national average (see question 7 on the lump sum value).

#### Yes

No - you should further increase pupil-led funding and further reduce school-led funding

No - you should keep the balance between pupil-led and school-led funding in line with the current national average

No - you should increase school-led funding compared to the current national average

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See also the answer to Q7.

The balance between the factors must result in adequate funding for all schools regardless of size and location. The interaction of the lump sum with the sparsity factor is therefore key to ensuring that any necessary and vital small schools remain sustainable as a result of the revised funding formula. If this is not sufficiently considered the formula could result in necessary small schools closing and local authorities incurring additional costs to transport pupils. Further still, there is the impact on the individual children (and potentially some very young children) that would find themselves having to travel.

As can be seen from the range of lump sums and the use of sparsity currently, each local authority has taken a different attitude to the use of the lump sum and sparsity allocations. This really is an area where one size does not fit all. Some local authorities use a small lump sum allied to strategic use of the sparsity factor to ensure that the schools that they need are viable. Other authorities use a larger lump

sum with small sparsity allocations where the current sparsity restrictions do not allow for a more targeted use of sparsity factors. In Inner and Outer London in 2015-16 only five of the thirty-two local authorities used a lump sum lower than £110,000, which would be the only source of fixed cost funding, assuming that none of these had sparse schools. These are the authorities that had the discretion to use a lower lump sum and put more through the AWPU across the whole estate, but they didn't.

Therefore, at least in the short- to medium-term, South Gloucestershire Council considers that the distribution of the lump sum and the sparsity factor could be managed locally in line with local priorities and local authority's sufficiency duties along with the other school-led funding arrangements that will need to be made for split sites, PFI and other specific school led costs.

We would anticipate that the Department for Education will suggest that this is not in line with a national formula and pupils across the country receiving the same levels of funding, but the current proposals already see differences in funding for the remaining school-led factors alongside the ACA and proposals for transition and a locked in funding floor.

Pupil-led funding will be the main component of the formula and at that level will be equal – certainly much more equal than it is currently. Schools are not the same and it is reasonable that the school-led factors, held in a ring-fenced budget could be locally directed, possibly even towards CERA, to support some reshaping of the school estate.

At present there is no incentive for local authorities to reshape the estate as any savings made will be to the benefit of the NFF but at the cost to the authority. Even in authorities where all schools are academies, the authority will need to keep an eye on how to evolve the estate to meet its sufficiency duties.

### **Pupil-Led Factors**

We ask respondents to bear in mind with each question on this page that we are redistributing funding. Any money that we put into one factor will have to come from another factor. We have indicated what we think are the right proportions for each factor.

#### **4. Within the total pupil-led funding, do you support our proposal to increase the proportion allocated to the additional needs factors? (Pages 20-21)**

Of the total schools block funding, 76% is currently allocated to basic per-pupil funding (AWPU) and 13% is allocated to the additional needs factors (deprivation, low prior attainment and English as an additional language).

The formula will recognise educational disadvantage in its widest sense, including those who are not eligible for the pupil premium but whose families may be only just about managing. It increases the total spent on additional

needs factors compared to the funding explicitly directed through these factors in the current system.

We are therefore proposing to increase the proportion of the total schools block funding allocated to additional needs factors to 18%, with 73% allocated to basic per-pupil funding.

Yes

No – allocate a greater proportion to additional needs

**No – allocate a lower proportion to additional needs**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

It is vital that the basic level of funding allocated to all schools is adequate for the school to staff and operate sufficiently. The additional needs funding should be as the name suggests, additional. If the DfE can clearly evidence that additional funding needs to be targeted at the AEN factors, this should not be at the expense of the basic entitlement funding which is intended to provide a core baseline of funding for all pupils and is imperative to achieving a fair, balanced and equitable funding formula.

Increasing the deprivation funding is unlikely to reach the JAMs that the funding is trying to support. FSM6 is the same indicator that is used for Pupil Premium and you have stated in the introduction to this section that JAMs are above this threshold. The lower band of IDACI leans towards the more deprived, although a taper below the current threshold might bring JAMs in to this indicator, but more work would be needed to ascertain whether this would work. EAL is aimed specifically at supporting language acquisition and prior attainment is an indicator of SEN.

Therefore, there is no funding for JAMs within AEN, leaving the basic funding as the element that could support these people, yet this is the funding that is being reduced.

Furthermore, South Gloucestershire Council would propose that, if pupil premium grant must remain separate to mainstream funding, it should be revised to provide for the 'Just About Managing' (JAMs) and hence reduce or avoid the double counting in the DfE's proposed funding values and the pupil premium.

**5. Do you agree with the proposed weightings for each of the additional needs factors?**

**Deprivation - pupil based at 5.5% (Pages 21-25)**

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

**Allocate a lower proportion**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See answer to Q4 above.

There is also a question around the double funding of deprivation through pupil premium. Where schools attract relatively low levels of additional needs funding there needs to be confidence that basic funding is sufficient to cover the costs of running the school. The additional needs funding should be as the name suggests – additional and to support creative additional programmes for pupils, not prop up the funding for the majority of pupils. Clarity is required between the differences as to what the deprivation funding in the main funding formula and pupil premium are supposed to support.

Parents with children in infant year groups do not always apply for free school meals because of the universal infant free meal. Schools with these year groups; which are the building blocks for a child's future education path are being underfunded for their pupil needs as a result and to allocate more funding via this route will make that unfairness worse. As a minimum, South Gloucestershire Council believes that the DfE should be developing methods of removing the need for parents to need to apply for free school meals and this should now be an automatic entitlement for all that are eligible.

**Deprivation - area based at 3.9% (Pages 21-25)**

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

**Allocate a lower proportion**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See answer to Q4 above. South Gloucestershire Council does not believe that the IDACI model works well for large rural postcode areas as there as the area is too large to achieve a homogenous population. Given the known and recent difficulties in revaluing the IDACI indices regularly, South Gloucestershire Council considers it better at least in the short- to medium-term, not to use the IDACI model.

**Low prior attainment at 7.5% (Pages 25-27)**

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

**Allocate a lower proportion**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See answer to Q4 above. South Gloucestershire Council has previously raised concerns about the reliability and consistency of data being used to determine funding allocations under the current system in this area and the ensuing need to apply for MFG disapplications. National changes in assessments have resulted in data volatility which seriously undermines confidence when using to allocate funding.

**English as an additional language at 1.2% (Pages 27-28)**

Allocate a higher proportion

**The proportion is about right**

Allocate a lower proportion

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See answer to Q4 above.

This is less about the proportion and more about who is deemed eligible and for how long. Certain groups may require varying levels of support and due to the 3-year limit some secondary schools will never receive support for EAL pupils.

The weightings are a proportion of the total schools budget.

**6. Do you have any suggestions about potential indicators and data sources we could use to allocate mobility funding in 2019-20 and beyond? (Pages 28-29)**

We have decided to include a mobility factor in the national funding formula, following the first stage of consultation. This will be based on historic spend for 2018-19, while we develop a more sophisticated indicator. We would welcome any comments on potential indicators and data sources that could be a better way of allocating mobility funding in future.

Mobility factor needs to provide for two different situations. First, for schools that have a high proportion of service children where whole regiments can be transferred in and out and the mobility factor needs to provide sufficient funding to keep a stable staff in school. Secondly to provide for exceptional turnover of pupils. The current mobility factor requires a 10% turnover before providing even the smallest payment. Schools with

the highest turnover probably require a stepped payment method.

### **School-Led Factors**

We ask respondents to bear in mind with each question on this page that we are redistributing funding. Any money that we put into one factor will have to come from another factor. We have indicated what we think are the right amounts for each factor.

#### **7. Do you agree with the proposed lump sum amount of £110,000 for all schools? (Pages 29-31)**

This factor is intended to contribute to the costs that do not vary with pupil numbers, and to give schools (especially small schools) certainty that they will receive a certain amount each year in addition to their pupil-led funding.

#### **Primary**

##### **Allocate a higher amount**

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

#### **Secondary**

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

##### **Allocate a lower amount**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See also the answer to Q3.

South Gloucestershire Council would challenge the use of the same funding rates across both the primary and secondary sectors. A more sensitive approach could be to link the level of the lump sum to the size of school rather than/or as well as sector. The lump sum is vital to support the operation of all schools, especially small schools. As such South Gloucestershire Council believes that the lump sum needs to be considered alongside the basic per pupil funding amount and sparsity funding to ensure that a necessary small school receives a sufficient funding allocation to be able to operate.

South Gloucestershire Council considers that the distribution of the lump sum and the sparsity factor could be managed locally in line with local priorities along with the other school led funding arrangements that will need to be made. We would

anticipate that the DfE will suggest that this is not in line with a national formula and pupils across the country receiving the same levels of funding, but the current proposals already see differences in funding for the remaining school led factors alongside the ACA and proposals for transition and a locked in funding floor. Pupil led funding will be the main component of the formula and at that level will be equal – certainly much more equal than it currently is. Schools are not the same and it is reasonable that the school led factors, held in a ring-fenced budget could be locally directed. This is where local knowledge and negotiation are essential and the Schools Forum can provide this.

South Gloucestershire Council urges the DfE to undertake a needs-led funding model to set out the expectations for what the lump sum should fund and adopt that. It is a fundamental tenet of accounting principles that school fixed costs should be provided for by a fixed income that is commensurate with the expenditure and likewise that variable expenses should be funded through a variable income stream and per pupil funding is precisely that.

In addition, the attempt to fix the lump sum at the same value for both sectors would appear to go against the DfE recognition of stakeholder feedback from the first stage of reforms back in April 2013 which resulted in local authorities being permitted to allocate different funding levels in their current local funding formula.

**8. Do you agree with the proposed amounts for sparsity funding of up to £25,000 for primary schools and up to £65,000 for secondary, middle and all-through schools? (Pages 31-33)**

We have decided to include a sparsity factor to target extra funding for schools that are small and remote. We are proposing that this would be tapered so that smaller schools receive more funding, up to a maximum of £25,000 for primary schools and £65,000 for secondary schools.

**Primary**

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

**Secondary**

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

See also the answer to Q3.

Although South Gloucestershire Council strongly supports the use of such a factor we do not feel the current DfE proposal adequately reflects the need for small schools in some areas.

Consideration needs to be given to the interaction between the lump sum and support to small schools which may not be reflected in sparsity alone. Equally the use of the distance criteria as the crow-flies is still too rigid and does not allow for local variables.

Importantly, schools also act as a social community hub in an area and are not just stand-alone institutions. Small schools (whether primary or secondary) need to be supported not only to maintain standards but also to preserve, in an efficient manner, their benefit to the community around them.

If the sparsity factor is not adequate, there will be a movement to the closure of small schools with social consequences for communities and financial consequences for the transportation of pupils. Some of our members are aware of Academy Trusts closing small school sites without any consultation. Efficiencies need to be balanced with community needs.

We are aware that the lump sum must not be so large that small schools do not have to consider sensible efficient operating practices such as sharing an executive head.

We would, therefore, strongly recommend local flexibility around the usage of school-led funding factors (lump sum, sparsity etc.), and we believe this is where Schools Forum can exercise creditable local discretion. This will be a more reliable process than one relying on a one-size fits all national formula.

**9. Do you agree that lagged pupil growth data would provide an effective basis for the growth factor in the longer term? (Pages 34-37)**

The growth factor will be based on local authorities' historic spend in 2018-19. For the longer-term we intend to develop a more sophisticated measure and in the consultation we suggest the option of using lagged pupil growth data. We will consult on our proposals at a later stage, but would welcome any initial comments on this suggestion now.

The use of lagged pupil growth data appears to be a reasonable interim approach to funding growth. However, South Gloucestershire Council would support a fundamental review of how growth in existing schools and new schools is funded.

As we move towards a national funding formula there needs to be a consistent approach and guidance to funding growth and new schools. This will undoubtedly require local knowledge and input to ensure that growth is based only on need, otherwise there is the potential for inefficient use of resources. We think that if there were national funding rates based on set criteria it would support some of the additional issues in meeting sufficiency requirements.

## **Funding Floor**

### **10. Do you agree with the principle of a funding floor? (Pages 37-39)**

To ensure stability we propose to put in place a floor that would protect schools from large overall reductions as a result of this formula. This would be in addition to the minimum funding guarantee (see question 13).

Yes

**No**

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

As set out in response to Q1 the proposed 3% funding floor “locks” in some of the historical differences for those schools which have been relatively better funded for several decades. Equally the cost of this protection limits the redistributive impact and will result in the continuation of different funding levels for pupils across the country. MFG should be sufficient protection at -1.5% per pupil per year.

The application of a national funding floor does not enable the model to achieve one of the key principles of “fairness” and will only continue to perpetuate the argument for these changes outlined by the DfE of similar schools in different local authorities being funded at different levels.

If a floor is to be implemented, whether in the short or longer term, there needs to be the ability to apply dis-applications to the calculation should school circumstances change, so not to further lock in historical funding which is no longer appropriate.

### **11. Do you support our proposal to set the funding floor at minus 3%? (Pages 37-39)**

This will mean that no school will lose more than 3% of their current per-pupil funding as a result of this formula.

Yes

**No – the floor should be lower (i.e. allow losses of more than 3% per pupil)**

No – the floor should be higher (i.e. restrict losses to less than 3% per pupil)

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire Council is firmly of the opinion that there should not be a funding floor. (As set out in our response to Q1 and Q10).

The MFG mechanism provides stability to schools and if the NFF identifies schools that have been considerably better funded for many years then this funding should be removed over time and re-distributed accordingly.

MFG should be sufficient protection to allow change over a period of time. This floor locks in past inequities. In fact, new schools in 'floor areas' are likely to attract new floor funding so it will be perpetuated.

**12. Do you agree that for new or growing schools (i.e. schools that are still filling up and do not have pupils in all year groups yet) the funding floor should be applied to the per-pupil funding they would have received if they were at full capacity? (Page 43)**

Yes

No

We believe that, to treat growing schools fairly, the funding floor should take account of the fact that these schools have not yet filled all their year groups.

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire Council agrees that new/growing schools may require additional protection, but there is a need to ensure their funding is not artificially inflated and that there is the ability to apply dis-applications to the MFG should school circumstances change.

**Transition**

**13. Do you support our proposal to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5%?**

The minimum funding guarantee protects schools against reductions of more than a certain percentage per pupil each year. We are proposing to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5% per pupil per year.

**Yes**

No – the minimum funding guarantee should be lower (i.e. allow losses of more than 1.5% per pupil in any year)

No – the minimum funding guarantee should be higher (i.e. restrict losses to less than 1.5% per pupil in any year)

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire Council is of the view that the continuing -1.5% per pupil MFG provides sufficient protection to schools on an ongoing basis.
---

**Further Considerations**

**14. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed schools national funding formula?**

Yes, there are many issues that need to be taken in to account. These include:

**Education Services Grant (ESG)**

The removal of the ESG will have an impact on all schools, whether maintained or academy. Academies will have costs which were supported by the ESG which they will need to fund from their General Annual Grant and local authority cuts are likely to lead to additional charges to maintained schools. This is another cost which schools across the country will have to bear without additional resources.

**Movement between blocks**

By ringfencing the Schools Block, the High Needs Block (HNB) becomes very exposed. In the past there was discretion to move funding between the blocks with the agreement of the Schools Forum. This is important especially where some schools had further to evolve to become more inclusive. South Gloucestershire Council has been highlighting this point to the DfE for some time now. When the High Needs Block becomes stand-alone the only method available for LAs will be to reduce funding for top-ups for mainstream schools, resource provision, special schools and alternative provision - in other word cut funding to the pupils that need it the most. The majority of pupils in schools without SEN will be protected by the Schools Block ringfence: the majority of pupils that need extra help will get a cut-price service. The answer to this is either to increase the funding into the HNB to ensure that it is adequate for pupils that need the most help (which it currently isn't, nor is it planned to be), or to enable schools via their Schools Forum to allow movement between Schools and High Needs.

### **Schools Forum and Local Expertise**

There is no clarity in the consultation about the ongoing purpose of the Schools Forum. The members of Schools Forums and locally elected Councillors have a considerable number of combined years of experience of the management of schools and education. They work in the local area and understand the needs of their communities. This is a huge resource of local expertise about what works locally and supports children locally. By moving to a funding formula managed from the centre, this local expertise could be lost.

There are still significant areas of the NFF and of the HNB funding that will require local authority input, yet the removal of the major element of funding for schools is likely to lead to this becoming a marginalised area of work, especially without a Schools Forum. This in turn could lead to a loss of the relevant officer expertise to understand split sites, other exceptional arrangements and the changes to the school landscape and the impact on the MFG. Any fairness that starts with the National Funding Formula will quickly ebb away, leaving schools in local areas unfairly compared to their neighbouring schools (let alone schools in other parts of the country). Clarity about how this is to be managed in future is needed very shortly.

### **Capacity of EfA to consider local issues**

Following on from above, we question the ability and capacity of the Education Funding Agency to be able to properly consider all the data it uses and to work with schools to apply the necessary local knowledge to a national funding formula. This is what LAs do all the time in the management of their local formula. It is difficult enough to manage at a local level: doing so at a national level will be a considerable challenge. An example of this is that the EFA currently send local authorities lists of data that looks out of step as part of the APT process. This is the type of work the EFA will need to look at in future and we doubt that they have the capacity or local understanding to do this type of work).

### **Review Mechanism**

The NFF is not something that is done once and just applied every year ad infinitum. Yet this is the way that it appears at present. The DfE is basing its formula on average costs without knowing what it is buying. In 4 years' time when the next administration is in place and the next set of ministers want to leave their mark on the education system by the introduction of a priority (e.g. School Standards Grant, Pupil Premium, UIFSM), there must be an understanding of the basic needs before you can successfully make a targeted change to children's lives. As has been seen to date, when additional funding comes in, schools will automatically spend it on the basics before they spend it on the target. There must be a rational process for reviewing, adding or subtracting from the formula and the NFF does not provide that as it currently stands.

### **Auto-registration for free school meals**

South Gloucestershire Council suggests that there ought to be auto-registration for free school meals. Parents with children in infant year groups do not always apply for free school meals because of the universal infant free meal. Schools with these year

groups; which are the building blocks for a child's future education path are being underfunded for their pupil needs as a result and to allocate more funding via this route will make that unfairness worse. As a minimum, South Gloucestershire Council believes that the DfE should be developing methods of removing the need for parents to need to apply for free school meals and this should now be an automatic entitlement for all that are eligible.

### **Central School Services Block (Pages 66-72)**

#### **15. Do you agree that we should allocate 10% of funding through a deprivation factor in the central school services block?**

**Yes**

No - a higher proportion should be allocated to the deprivation factor

No - a lower proportion should be allocated to the deprivation factor

No - there should not be a deprivation factor

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

The principle to allocate a proportion of the central school services block through a deprivation factor to reflect particular central services, such as education welfare services, appears reasonable.

#### **16. Do you support our proposal to limit reductions on local authorities' central school services block funding to 2.5% per pupil in 2018-19 and in 2019-20?**

**Yes**

No - allow losses of more than 2.5% per pupil per year

No - limit reductions to less than 2.5% per pupil per year

Please explain your reasoning and any further evidence we should take into account:

South Gloucestershire Council believes this protection mechanism should be aligned with the MFG at 1.5%. There is no logic or fairness to force LAs to realign services which in most cases support schools to a faster timetable than applies to schools.

**17. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed central school services block formula?**

Paragraph 5.22 refers to the ability of the LA to recycle money that is no longer needed for historic commitments into schools, high needs or early years in 2018-19. Clarity is required as to how this will be taken into consideration against a move towards a 'hard' national funding formula for schools i.e. if funding is moved into the schools block in 2018-19 is there a danger it will be "lost" when the hard funding rates are introduced from 2019-20?

The consultation states that the department will "set out our long-term intention for funding released from historic commitments at a later point". We would request this guidance as early as possible as it is likely to influence Schools Forum decisions on where best to recycle this funding as and when it becomes available.

Finally, South Gloucestershire Council would also urge the DfE to consider the continuation of certain pooled arrangements from within the central schools service block where they are to the benefit of all schools (maintained and academies) across the LA. In much the same way as the national copyright licences, there are opportunities to broker similar arrangements for all schools which removes a considerable amount of administration costs.

**Equalities Analysis**

**18. Is there any evidence relating to the 8 protected characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010 that is not included in the equalities impact assessment and that we should take into account?**

South Gloucestershire Council has nothing to add to this section



## SCHOOLS FORUM

### CONSTITUTION FROM APRIL 2016

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Every local education authority must ensure that the Schools Forum for their area is constituted in accordance with The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012.

#### 2. MEMBERSHIP

2.1 The Forum will comprise:

(a) Schools Membership:

11 Head Teachers (including senior members of staff) 11 Governors, and 1 Pupil Referral Unit Representative as follows:

##### **Head Teacher Representatives (11 in total)**

1 Special School Head (or senior member of staff)

5 Secondary Heads (including senior members of staff) including one representative from each of the 3 locality areas. The number of academy representatives to be proportional to the number of pupils being taught in academy schools.

5 Primary Heads (including senior members of staff) including one representative from each of the 3 locality areas. The number of academy representatives to be proportional to the number of pupils being taught in academy schools.

##### **Governor Representatives (11 in total)**

5 Primary Phase Schools. The number of academy representatives to be proportional to the number of pupils being taught in academy schools.

5 Secondary Schools. The number of academy representatives to be proportional to the number of pupils being taught in academy schools.

1 Special School

**Pupil Referral Unit (1 in total)**

1 Pupil Referral Unit representative

**(b) Non Schools Membership:**

2 Diocesan representatives; 1 Church of England, 1 Roman Catholic (nominated by the relevant diocese)

1 representative of 16 - 19 providers (nominated by the 16-19 providers)

2 representatives from the early years sector; 1 private sector, 1 voluntary sector (nominated by the South Gloucestershire Early Years Working Group)

**NOTE**

- (a) The Chair of the Children and Young People Committee, the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, the Director for Children, Adults and Health (or their representative), Chief Financial Officer (or their representative) and Officers who are providing specific financial or technical advice (including presenting a paper to the Forum) will have a right to attend and speak at meetings.
- (b) Elected Members are able to serve on the Schools Forum either in their capacity as governors or as a non school member.
- (c) Officers who have a direct role in supporting pupils are eligible to serve on the Schools Forum as non-schools members.

**3. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS**

- 3.1 Governor representatives will be appointed by the Governors' Association.
- 3.2 Secondary school head representatives (including senior members of staff) will be appointed by the Secondary Heads' Group.
- 3.3 Infant, junior, primary and special school head representatives (including senior members of staff) will be appointed by the Primary and Special Heads' Executive.
- 3.4 The Pupil Referral Unit representative will be appointed by the Management Committee of the Pupil Referral Unit.
- 3.5 Non-schools members will be appointed by the organisations they represent.

- 3.6 Academy representatives will be appointed by the Academy Schools Trusts.
- 3.7 Each group must inform the Department for Children, Adults and Health of the method used to appoint their representative.
- 3.8 The Director for Children, Adults and Health may appoint schools or academies members to the Schools Forum if the position has been vacant for more than 4 months.
- 3.9 The Governors' Association Secondary Heads Group and the Primary and Special Heads Executive must ensure that every possible eligible member has an opportunity to be involved in the determination of their group's elective process and is given the opportunity to stand for election if they choose to do so.

#### **Observer Status**

The Education Funding Agency has observer status at the Forum with a right to participate in discussions.

#### **4. APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

- 4.1 The electing/appointing bodies are entitled to appoint designated substitutes for each representative they elect to the Forum.
- 4.2 Any Forum member who is unable to attend a meeting may ask one of the designated substitutes from their appointment group to attend on their behalf. All apologies must be given via the Chair of the Schools Forum. The Chair of the Schools Forum must be informed of any substitution.
- 4.3 Designated substitutes will always receive copies of the agenda papers for each meeting for information.

#### **5. TERM OF MEMBERSHIP**

- 5.1 Members hold office for 4 years or until they resign or cease to be qualified to be a member (if earlier). Members may be reappointed after their full term of office.
- 5.2 Membership will cease if a Member ceases to hold the office by virtue of which he/she became eligible for appointment to the Forum.
- 5.3 Membership will cease if a Member resigns from the Forum by giving notice in writing to the Authority.

5.4 If a Member misses 3 meetings within an academic year then their appointment will be reconsidered by the organisation they represent.

5.5 If a Member is unable to attend a meeting then they must inform the Chair of the Forum, with apologies and the name of their substitute member who will attend on their behalf.

## 6. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR OF THE FORUM

6.1 At the start of the academic year the chair shall be appointed by Members of the Forum.

6.2 An elected member or officer may not hold the office of chair of the Schools Forum.

## 7. ROLE OF CHAIR OF THE FORUM

The Chair is responsible for:

- a) Calling the meeting
- b) Agenda Setting
- c) Checking the minutes of the meeting before they are put forward at the subsequent meeting for approval

## 8. ROLE OF THE DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, ADULTS AND HEALTH

The Director is responsible for:

- a) Distributing papers for the meeting to members and substitute members. Ensuring that papers are available on the intranet. Papers to be distributed at least 5 working days before the date of the meeting.
- b) Contacting substitute members when they are required to attend a meeting
- c) The clerking and recording of meetings.
- d) Ensuring that relevant papers, agendas and agreed minutes are published in the public areas of the Council website.

## 9. TERMS OF REFERENCE

9.1 The powers of the Schools Forum are:

- a) to agree minor changes to the operation of the minimum funding guarantee, where the outcome would otherwise be anomalous, and where not more than 50% of the authority's schools are affected. Changes affecting more than 50% of schools will be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval;

- b) to agree the level of school specific contingency at the beginning of each year;
- c) to agree arrangements for combining elements of the centrally retained Schools Budget with elements of other local authority and other agencies' budgets to create a combined children's services budget in circumstances where there is a clear benefit for schools and pupils in doing so;
- d) to agree the amounts of funding to be retained as central expenditure under five areas.
  - i. school specific contingency for the purposes of making in – year adjustments of school budget shares (for named SEN pupils and rates for instance);
  - ii. funding for Combined Services;
  - iii. funding for servicing the costs of a prudential borrowing scheme;
  - iv. funding for premature retirement and redundancy costs;
  - v. SEN Transport costs.
- e) to agree changes to the Scheme of Financial Management.
- f) to agree the criteria on which any funding retained for pupil growth is to be allocated.
- g) to agree the amount to be allocated for central schools and early years block items.
- h) to agree the Scheme for the Financing of Schools.
- i) in exceptional circumstances only:
  - i. to agree an increase in the amount of expenditure a local authority can retain from its Schools Budget above that allowed for in the regulations;
  - ii. to agree an increase in centrally retained expenditure within the Schools Budget once a multi-year funding period has begun; and
  - iii. to agree changes to an authority's funding formula once it has been announced prior to the start of a multi-year funding period.

## 9.2 Consultation with Schools Forums:

Consultation shall take place in sufficient time to allow the views expressed to be taken into account in the determination of the authority's formula and in the initial determination of schools' budget shares before the beginning of the financial year.

### **Consultation on school funding formula**

The Local Authority shall consult on:

- (a) any proposed changes in relation to the factors and criteria that were taken into account, or the methods, principles and rules that have been adopted, in their formula made in accordance with regulations made under section 47 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998;
- (b) the financial effect of any such change;
- (c) updating non-AWPU data within the multi-year budget cycle.

### **Consultation on contracts**

The Local Authority shall at least one month prior to the issue of invitations to tender consult the forum on the terms of any proposed contract for supplies or services being a contract paid or to be paid out of the authority's schools budget where the estimated value of the proposed public services contract is not less than the threshold which applies to the authority in pursuance of Regulation 8 of the Public Services Contracts Regulations 2006 (b).

### **Consultation on financial issues**

- (1) The Local Authority shall consult the forum annually in respect of the relevant authority's functions relating to the schools budget, in connection with the following:
  - (a) the arrangements to be made for the education of pupils with special educational needs;
  - (b) arrangements for the use of pupil referral units and the education of children otherwise than at school;
  - (c) arrangements for early years education;
  - (d) administrative arrangements for the allocation of central government grants paid to schools via the relevant authority;

### **Consultation on other issues**

- (1) The authority may consult the forum on such other matters concerning the funding of schools as they see fit.
- (2) The Director for Children, Adults and Health has the authority to change the terms of reference as new legislation is introduced.

### **Information about consultations**

The Schools Forum will inform the governing bodies of schools maintained by the authority of any consultations carried out by the authority in respect of consultation on financial and other issues.

## 10. MEETINGS

10.1 The Forum will meet approximately every six weeks, excluding August, or at other times at its discretion. Normally the dates of meetings will be fixed annually in advance at the start of each academic year with reference to the key consultative and decision making points in the school funding cycle. A forward plan would then be produced and discussed at each meeting.

10.2 The Forum meetings will be held in public, except where exempt information is being discussed under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended and that papers will be published in paper form and to the worldwide web 5 clear days in advance of meetings.

10.3 A pre meeting will be held half an hour before the designated meeting for the Director for Children, Adults and Health to assist members in the understanding of the agenda items.

10.4 Any elected member or Officer who is not a member of the Schools Forum is entitled to address this Forum (for no more than five minutes) to present a petition, make a statement, contribute views on matters under discussion or ask a question. Normally this will be at the start of the meeting. However the Chair of the Forum has the discretion to allow this to happen at the beginning of the relevant item.

10.5 The Local Authority may ask other individuals or bodies to attend specific meetings as observers. This might include expert advisors on relevant issues.

## 11. QUORUM

11.1 A meeting cannot take place unless at least forty per cent of the whole number of members of the Forum with voting rights are present. This excludes any vacant positions.

## 12. SECRETARY

12.1 The Secretary to the Forum will be an Officer from the Department for Children, Adults and Health.

### 13. **DECISION-MAKING**

- 13.1 The Forum will determine its own voting procedure. It is proposed to adopt the procedures already in place as set out below.
- 13.2 On general matters, the Forum will agree the views or advice to be submitted to the Local Authority by consensus or if this is not possible, by majority vote. If a vote is taken to arrive at a view, each full member (or substitute) present has one vote. The Chair does not have a second or casting vote. Observers attending the meeting may not vote.
- 13.3 On the funding formula only schools members and the private voluntary and independent early years provider member may vote.
- 13.4 On the subject of de-delegation maintained school members may vote in respect of their phase school only.
- 13.5 On the subject of the Scheme for Financing of Schools only school members from maintained schools may vote.

### 14. **URGENT BUSINESS**

- 14.1 The need for a decision or formal view to be expressed by the Schools Forum before the next scheduled meeting will involve the urgent business procedure.
- 14.2 The procedure is to contact all members either by email or other means of correspondence with the urgent item. All members will then have an opportunity to participate and make their views known by a specified date.
- 14.3 The Chair of the Forum cannot make a decision on behalf of the Forum, however the Chair may give the Local Authority a view on an urgent issue.

### 15. **SUB-COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS**

- 15.1 The Forum is allowed sub-committees or working groups, but all advice formally passed to the Local Authority must be approved by the Forum as a whole.

### 16. **COMMUNICATION**

- 16.1 School Forum members will regularly report back to their 'parent' group. Headteacher (including senior members of staff) and Governor

representatives will also regularly report back to the cluster they represent.

16.2 The relevant papers, agendas and agreed minutes of meetings will be available in the public areas of the Council website.

## 17. **MEMBERS' EXPENSES**

18.1 The Local Authority will reimburse the following Members expenses:-

- (a) Actual costs incurred in any supply cover – payment for a supply head teacher (including senior member of staff) and teacher governor representatives;
- (b) Travel expenses (at South Gloucestershire Council members rates);
- (c) Loss of earnings
- (d) Carer's costs (in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Members' allowances).

## Schools Forum Membership – December 2016

1 Special School Head	Lisa Parker, Warmley Park
5 Secondary Heads	Kim Garland, Brimsham Green Peter Smart, The Castle School – Academy Rep Dave Baker, Executive Headteacher, Bradley Stoke and Abbeywood Community Schools – Academy Rep Vacant – Academy Rep Sarah Lovell, Senior Finance Manager, Cabot Learning Federation – Academy Rep
5 Primary Heads	Bernice Webber, Headteacher, Old Sodbury CE Primary Mark Dee, Executive Head, The Park & Parkwall Primaries Mark Freeman, St Michael's CE VC Primary Adrian Vye, St Michael's CE Primary, Winterbourne Susie Weaver, Principal, Wallscourt Farm Academy
5 Secondary Governors	Rhona Allgood, Vice Chair of The Castle School Education Trust – Academy Rep Vacant – LA Maintained School Rep Geoff Howell Governor, Callicroft School – Academy Rep Vacant – Academy Rep Paul Tanner, Chair of the Trust's Finance & Resources Committee, Olympus Academy Trust – Academy Rep
5 Primary Governors	Vacant John Goff, Governor, New Horizons Learning Centre Jim Lott, Governor, The Tynings Max Reed, Governor, The Ridge Vacant
1 Special Governor	Keith Lawrence, Governor Culverhill School
1 C of E Representative	Elizabeth Gibbons, Bristol Diocese
1 RC Representative	Vacant – RC Rep
1 PRU	Louise Leader, Headteacher, Pathways Learning Centre
1 16 – 19 Provider Representative	Emma Jarman, Deputy CEO and Vice Principal, South Gloucestershire and Stroud College
2 PVI Representatives	Liz Jardine - Private Sector Vacant
1 Secondary Head Sub	
1 Primary Governor Sub	Ann Reed, Governor, New Horizons Learning Centre and Culverhill

## SCHOOLS FORUM WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

All meetings at 4.30pm at Badminton Road, Yate

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017</b> <b>Room 0012 Ground Floor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Budget Monitor 2016/17</li> <li>• The Schools Forum Constitution from April 2017</li> <li>• Education Commission Update</li> <li>• National Schools Funding Formula - Stage 2 Consultation Response.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>11<sup>th</sup> May 2017</b> <b>Room 0012 Ground Floor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Schools Block Funding Formulae 2017/18</li> <li>• Education Commission Update</li> <li>• Traded Services Update</li> <li>• Chipping Sodbury - Outturn 2016/17</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>13<sup>th</sup> July 2017</b> <b>Room 0012 Ground Floor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparing for 2018/19 (if known)</li> <li>• Provisional Outturn 2016/17 (including school balances)</li> <li>• Schools Forum Membership</li> <li>• Date of future meetings and the Work Programme 2017/18</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>14<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> <b>Room 0012 Ground Floor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DfE Consultation on School Funding 2018/19</li> <li>• Allocation of Schools Block Growth Funding</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Budget Monitor 2017/18</li> <li>• Education Commission Update</li> <li>• Traded Services Update</li> </ul>

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**