

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2019

At 2.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES: ISABEL COOKE, RICHARD PILGRIM, HELEN MCHALE, ALISON PENNY, JOOLZ SCARLETT, MIKE WALLACE, CHRIS TOMES, AMANDA HOUGH, STEPHEN MCCORMAC FRANCES WALSH, SARAH COTTLE, ALISON PENNY AND MARTIN TINSLEY.

GOVERNOR REPRESENTATIVES: HUGH BOULTER

NON-SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES: ANNE ENTWISTLE

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 13 November 2019

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Wendy Binmore 01628 79625101628796251**

Accessibility - Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting are requested to notify the clerk in advance of any accessibility issues

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings –In line with the council's commitment to transparency the public part of the meeting will be audio recorded, and may also be filmed and broadcast through the online application Periscope. If filmed, the footage will be available through the council's main Twitter feed @RBWM or via the Periscope website. The audio recording will also be made available on the RBWM website, after the meeting.

Filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings may be undertaken by any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any Declarations of Interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes from the previous meeting.	7 - 10
4.	<u>BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST NOVEMBER</u> To receive the above report.	To Follow
5.	<u>SCHOOL FUNDING 2020/21 CONSULTATION REVIEW</u> To receive the above report.	11 - 28

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: 'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: 'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

SCHOOLS FORUM

THURSDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2019

PRESENT: Sarah Ward, Martin Tinsley, Mike Wallace, Andrew Morrison, Hugh Boulter, Richard Pilgrim, Chris Tomes and Joolz Scarlett

Officers: Mark Beeley, Tracey Anne Nevitt and James Norris

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Isabel Cooke, Sarah Cottle and Amanda Butler.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY; That the minutes of the last meeting held on the 16th July 2019 were approved as a correct and true record, subject to the following amendments:

- To correct the spelling of Chris Tomes' name
- To clarify that the thanks on record was to Alison Penny, and not Penny Francis as previously stated
- Removal of the word 'maintained' from the item referring to the Action Plan

BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2019/20

James Norris outlined the item and updated members on the current financial year. Overall, the balance position was good, with a potential underspend. The figures that were quoted from the report were still indicative but would be updated once the next report was commissioned.

James Norris also discussed Service Contract underspends and confirmed that schools would be reimbursed any underspend, which ranged from £865 to £14,851 and was based on the number of pupils enrolled.

Members were then informed that the deficit forecast was down to £896,000, but that there were potential risks of up to £500,000. The main goal therefore was to continue to reduce the deficit and try and further improve efficiencies in schools across the borough.

Afterwards, the forum heard from Tracey Nevitt about the details of funding that schools receive. She explained that money being taken out of schools budgets was delegated money. Detail from the relevant bodies was not yet available, so it would have to be based off the main aims given in the statement. She highlighted that 1 in 10 schools have had significant increase in the funding they get over the next two years.

Two of the formula factors had been changed from optional to compulsory; the minimum funding guarantee and minimal funding per pupil. By partaking in these schemes, they would take up most of the available funds.

In terms of the minimum funding guarantee, Tracey Nevitt informed members that it was about the minimum funding for each pupil between years. For RBWM it was -1.5% for each pupil,

but in the new guidance it needs to be +0.5% up to +1.84%. Funding for this would have to come from schools not in protection.

Members queried about how many schools this would apply to. Tracey Nevitt said she wasn't sure on the exact figure, but believed that it was at least six.

Tracey Nevitt then explained to the Forum about the Minimal funding per pupil, this is calculated by all the pupil led formula factors added together which was then divided by the number on roll at the school. Members were told that in the majority of schools in the Royal Borough the minimum funding was at the right levels. However, the new figures had changed to a minimum funding of £4,800 per KS3 pupil and a minimum of £5,300 per KS4 pupil.

Tracey Nevitt had compared the new data against previous years and discovered that only 15 schools within the borough would see a gain with this change. There would be more models produced to discover how much funding would be used by having to comply with the new guidance. She also confirmed that there wouldn't be a block movement in the current year. For the November meeting, there would be consultation with schools and the aim was to implement formula changes in January.

Members asked for more information about the timeline of the events that Tracey Nevitt was looking for. She confirmed that in the November meeting she would aim to discuss with Members which proposal they would like to move forward with. The Chairman agreed and suggested that once more was known, indicative dates could be sent out regarding when the consultation would be.

Members agreed that on the whole there were lots of positives in the update and that these should be noted.

SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERSHIP FRAMEWORK

James Norris set out the above titled item, and explained how the membership criteria for the meeting works. As of the day of the meeting, there were 13 members and 4 vacancies for the forum.

Members queried whether Ascot had offered a candidate to fill a vacancy, which the Chairman told members that they had not but an invite would be sent out to them. Although he believed they might be part of their own cluster group.

The Forum agreed to take the meeting into Part II for the remainder of the item before returning to Part I once discussions had concluded.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the item whilst discussion takes place on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS 2019/20

James Norris introduced the item to members and explained that a few optional changes would be made to the scheme, none of which were fundamental. No responses had been received to the consultation, at which point the Chairman commented that it would be worth prompting schools in order to gauge their response.

The meeting, which began at 2.00 pm, finished at 2.33 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

Date:	21st November 2019	AGENDA	2
		ITEM:	
Title:	School Funding 2020/21 Consultation Review		
Responsible officer:	Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children's Services		
Contact officer:	James Norris, Head of Finance (RBWM) Achieving for Children	Email	James.norris@achievingforchildren.org.uk

1 PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Schools Forum with:
- a summary and brief analysis of the results of the consultation
 - details from the consultation to enable a decision on which budget model should be implemented.
 - an update on the Growth Fund allocation 2020/21
 - an introduction to the consultation in respect of the Early Years Block Funding 2020/21

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That the Forum note and comment on the:
- contents of this report
 - recommendation to adopt model 3 and the proposal that any headroom is distributed through Free School Meals

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At the Schools Forum 26th September 2019 it was agreed that a consultation would be undertaken on the principles relating to a number of formula factors impacting on the Schools Budget allocation, funding formula for 2020/21 and migration towards the National Funding Formula (NFF).
- 3.2 Of the six models presented to Schools Forum it was agreed three would go forward for consultation. A summary of the proposed formula changes are reflected in the models 1, 2 and 3 as listed below, the original model reference numbers are shown in brackets:

Model 1 (1)

- Minimum Funding Guarantee increased to 0.50%
- Increase AWPU up to National Funding Formula Rate including Area Cost Adjustment
- Increase Lower Prior Attainment up to National Funding Formula Rate including Area Cost Adjustment
- Minor increase in lump sum allowance
- Other factors to remain at 2019-20 unit rates

Model 2 (5)

- Minimum Funding Guarantee increased to 0.50%
- Increase AWPU up to National Funding Formula Rate including Area Cost Adjustment
- Implement new mobility factor at National Funding Formula Rate
- Lower Prior Attainment Increase
- Other factors to remain at 2019-20 unit rates

Model 3 (6)

- Minimum Funding Guarantee increased to 0.50%
- Increase AWPU up to National Funding Formula Rate including Area Cost Adjustment
- Implement new mobility factor at 50% of National Funding Formula Rate
- Lower Prior Attainment Increase
- Other factors to remain at 2019-20 unit rates

3.3 The consultation period was open between the 23rd October to 8nd November 2019. In line with the response rate for 2019/20 a total of 19 school responded representing 32% of schools and 8,630 (41%) of pupils.

4 RESPONSES TO THE SCHOOLS CONSULTATION

4.1 For each question included in the consultation a summary and brief analysis of the results with schools feedback is set out in appendix A.

4.2 An extract of the original consultation document is attached as appendix B.

5 ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESULTS

5.1 The results of the consultation is shown in detail in appendix A. Consultation was on an individual school basis therefore weighted pupil percentages are for information only.

5.2 There was strong support with 68% of responses in favour of increasing the Minimum Funding Guarantee to the lowest level of 0.5% representing an increase of 2.0%. The sector split was consistent with the overall position

with 60% of primary and 78% secondary schools supporting the 2.0% increase.

- 5.3 In respect of the Minimum Funding per Pupil guarantee 100% of respondents supported implementing the National Fair Funding rates. Recognising the national drive to have a compulsory minimum level of funding per school sector.
- 5.4 The implementation of a new mobility factor was supported by 64% of responses. The responses were split by sector with 90% of primary and 33% of secondary in support of this factor. Schools did not provide any suggested alternative rates.
- 5.5 The reduction of the Looked After Children deprivation factor was supported by 84% of schools. The primary & secondary sectors both supported this proposal with responses of 90% & 78% respectively. Schools did not provide any suggested alternative rates.
- 5.6 In respect of the Lower Prior Attainment 100% of respondents supported movement towards the National Fair Funding rates.
- 5.7 Most schools, 90%, supported increasing the Lump Sum per school to the National Fair Funding rate. Schools did not provide any suggested alternative rates.
- 5.8 There was a mixed response in the treatment of headroom being used to target the Free School Meals factor with 58% in support, 21% opposed and 21% unsure. This was a similar response across the sectors.
- 5.9 The results from the consultation gave some clear indications of support for the following changes (responses in favour of the proposed change are shown in brackets):
- the level of Minimum Funding Guarantee increase of 2% (68%)
 - implementing the Minimum Funding Per Pupil rates (100%)
 - the implementation of a new mobility factor (64%)
 - the reduction in the Looked After Children deprivation factor (84%)
 - supporting investment in the Lower Prior Attainment factor (100%)
 - increasing the lump sum allowance to the National Fair Funding rate (90%)
- 5.10 There was a less consistent response in respect of the following (responses in favour of the proposed change are shown in brackets):
- the treatment of headroom being used to target Free School Meals factor (58%)
 - preference for model 3 (42%)
- 5.11 Model 1 was the preferred model of 10% of primary and 44% of secondary schools, representing 26% of the total responses.

- 5.12 Model 2 was the preferred model of 30% of primary and 11% of secondary schools, representing 21% of the total responses.
- 5.13 Model 3 was the overall preferred model receiving support from 50% of primary schools and 33% of secondary schools, representing 42% of the total responses.
- 5.14 There was one school from each sector that did not express a preference for any model, representing 10% of the primary and 11% of secondary schools.
- 5.15 The recommendation is for model 3 to be implemented. This model received the greatest level of support from schools, meets the Minimum Funding Guarantee increase and Minimum Funding per Pupil rates, introduces a new mobility factor (at 50% of the National Fair Funding rate), increases the Lower Prior Attainment factor and invests headroom into the Free School Meals factor.

6 GROWTH FUNDING

- 6.1 The growth fund for 2019/20 is £845,557 with a forecasted underspend of £230,000. The level of funding for 2020/21 will be advised by the ESFA once final pupil numbers are submitted and approved. The updated budget 2020/21 will be shared at the Schools Forum in January 2020.

7 EARLY YEARS NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA

- 7.1 The 2020/21 initial allocations for the early years block will be announced in December 2019.
- 7.2 Local authorities are required to consult providers on annual changes to their local formula. Schools forums must also be consulted on changes to local early years funding formulas, including agreeing central spend, although the final decision rests with the local authority.
- 7.3 It is not expected there will be any significant changes to the local formula for 2020/21, therefore, a short consultation is planned to be undertaken in December 2019. Only one submission will be accepted per setting and school, responses will be collated and anonymised before being published at the Schools Forum in January 2020.
- 7.4 As part of the consultation period a document providing guidance, context and the process for submission will be distributed to all settings and schools.

Appendix A

Consultation Responses

Q1 Minimum Funding Guarantee

What level of increase in the Minimum Funding Guarantee increase would you recommend?

- a) 2.00% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +0.50%
- b) 2.67% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +1.17%
- c) 3.34% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +1.84%

	A	B	C	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	13	3	3	0	19
All schools equally weighted %	68	16	16	0	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	85	6	9	0	100
Summary of comments: Transitioning by 2% would have the least impact on those on MFG					

Q2 Minimum Funding Per Pupil

Do you agree that all the Minimum Funding Per Pupil rates for 2020-21 should be implemented and delegated via the local formula? If not, why?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	19	0	0	19
All schools equally weighted %	100	0	0	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	100	0	0	100
Summary of comments: Agreed that the MFPP rates be implemented in 2020-21 Schools commented that this is fairest for every school				

Q3 Introduction of a new Mobility Factor

Do you agree that a new Mobility Factor should be introduced? Do you agree that National Funding Formula rates should be implemented? If not, what rate would you propose?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	12	7	0	19
All schools equally weighted %	64	36	0	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	42	58	0	100
Summary of comments Mobility is an optional factor and would only benefit a few schools Mobility has a direct impact on funding recognising significant non routine changes in pupil number which the current funding system doesn't Mobility is a NFF factor and therefore transition towards it should be introduced into RBWM formula				

Q4 Reduction in the Looked After Children deprivation factor

Do you agree that the deprivation factor for looked after children will continue to reduce to reflect the direct funding schools receive for this element? If not, what level of reduction would you propose?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	16	2	1	19
All schools equally weighted %	84	11	5	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	87	9	4	100
Summary of comments As this factor is not part of NFF then it should be removed from RBWM factor Schools with highest levels of LAC will be most significantly impacted upon				

Q5 Low Prior Attainment

Do you agree that Lower Prior Attainment factors should move towards the National Funding Formula rates? If not, what rate would you propose?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	19	0	0	19
All schools equally weighted	100	0	0	100
Weighted by pupil numbers	100	0	0	100
Summary of comments The impact of funding is making significant difference to pupils Moving to NFF will have a positive impact on schools				

Q6 Lump Sum Per School

Do you agree that the lump sum factor should be increased? If not, what would you propose?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	17	1	1	19
All schools equally weighted %	90	5	5	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	87	12	1	100
Summary of comments It was appropriate to fund at NFF rate Small schools which attract less funding per pupil will benefit most from this factor Funding should be more focused on pupil led funding not relying on the lump sum factor				

Q7 Headroom

Do you agree that any headroom should be targeted at increasing the Free School Meals factors towards the National Funding Formula rates plus ACA? If not, do you have any other suggestions?

	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	11	4	4	19
All schools equally weighted %	58	21	21	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	70	12	18	100
Summary of comments It was appropriate to move towards funding at the NFF rate Small schools which attract less funding per pupil will benefit from this Funding should be more focused on pupil led funding not relying on the free school meals factor				

Q8 Model Preference

Have you a preferred model, if so which is it?

	1	2	3	Not sure	Total
Number of Responses	5	4	8	2	19
All schools equally weighted %	26	21	42	11	100
Weighted by pupil numbers %	43	16	35	6	100
Summary of comments Model 3 provides the greatest degree of fairness and financial support for the broadest possible cross-section of pupils across the borough					

This page is intentionally left blank



Consultation Document

Schools Funding Formula 2020-21

Purpose of the Consultation

At its informal meeting on 17th October 2019, RBWM School Forum agreed to consult all schools on the following 2020-21 local funding topics:

1. The Minimum Funding Guarantee
2. The Minimum Funding Per Pupil
3. Introduction of a new Mobility factor
4. Reduction in the Looked After Children deprivation factor
5. Targeting of funding to local priorities
6. Increase in the lump sum allowance
7. Use of headroom funding

Your Schools Forum representatives will use your consultation responses to inform how they vote on the 2020-21 funding distribution methodology at the next Schools Forum in November 2019.

The consultation responses will be anonymised and published as part of the Schools Forum papers.

To help inform your response to the consultation a glossary and brief explanation of each question has been provided. It is important that you understand what is being asked and consider your consultation response carefully as the responses will be used to inform decisions about how money will be allocated to schools next year.

To aid understanding of the changes proposed in this paper, schools have been provided with anonymised illustrations showing the estimated funding which they would receive in 2020-21 on the basis of the formula funding proposals in this report, if pupil numbers and other data were unchanged from 2019-20. These will be based on DfE data taken from the October 2018 census. Schools are reminded that actual funding for 2020-21 will be based on the October 2019 pupil census and year on year changes in data may have a significant impact. Therefore, in responding to this consultation, schools are advised to concentrate on the principles rather than simply on the illustrative cash changes.

If you would like to discuss the consultation further please contact your Schools Forum representative. Details of Schools Forum representatives are shown in appendix H.

Schools are asked to complete and return the consultation document by **4pm Friday 8th November**. Only one submission per school can be accepted.

- **Appendix A** provides a template for your response and a full listing of all questions
- **Appendix B** glossary of terms
- **Appendix C** provides NFF, Current Local Formula rates and Models 1, 2 and 3 with indicative formula factor rates.
- **Appendix D** provides indicative percentage increases of how the various models could affect schools
- **Appendix E** primary school graphs
- **Appendix F** secondary school graphs
- **Appendix G** provides some useful information regarding other budget factors
- **Appendix H** School Forum Representatives

Please send your completed consultation response to:

Bursar.support@achievingforchildren.org.uk

Context

There is a significant amount of information published on the DfE's website (2020-21 operational guidance) which can be found [here](#).

This consultation paper does not repeat much of the background to the NFF which can be found via the links above, however it is worth reiterating that the notional allocations published by Government are NOT what individual schools will receive in 2020-21. School allocations depend on the local formula which will be reflective of this consultation.

There have been a number of compulsory changes to the NFF as set out below:

- Local authorities will continue to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee in their local formulae, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. The current level set by RBWM is a negative 1.5%.
- From 2020-21 there will be a compulsory minimum funding per pupil level where every secondary school will receive a minimum of £5,000 per pupil (KS3 £4,800 per pupil and KS4 £5,300 per pupil with an overall £5,000 per pupil for an individual Secondary school), with every primary school getting £3,750 - putting primary schools on the path to receiving at least £4,000 per pupil the following year.

Whilst the NFF allocation to local authorities provides for these increases, there are a number of issues which prevent the nationally calculated allocations being passed on in full to schools.

- The aggregated per pupil level of funding that is available to the Local Authority is lagged to the demographics of pupils on the October 2018 census. Therefore any changes in eligibility in the October 2019 census have to be managed within the overall allocation.
- The premises elements of the formula along with growth funding for new and expanding schools is being funded on a historic basis. Therefore any increase from 2019-20 to these elements of the formula need to be met from the cash increase in the funding allocation.
- The actual formula allocation for 2020-21 will reflect the pupils on roll on the October 2019 census. The formula does not protect schools against a loss of pupil numbers and so schools may still receive a reduction in funding overall.

School budget allocation for 2020-21 will be the third transitional (soft) year. Therefore, although the funding allocated to each local authority is calculated using the NFF, the distribution of this funding to schools will still be based on a local formula.

Schools Forum members and RBWM are seeking schools' views on migration towards. This consultation will inform decisions on the local formula for 2020-21. Academies and Free Schools are reminded that although their funding comes directly from the Education Skills & Funding Agency (ESFA) it is based upon the local formula and so these changes will impact on all school's funding.

If you would like to discuss the consultation further please email James Norris, Tracey Anne Nevitt or Sarah Ward in the AfC Finance Team.

Consultation Focus

Migration towards the National Funding Formula (NFF)

In 2019-20 RBWM local funding formula continued to migrate to the new NFF rates. The DfE has encouraged boroughs and schools to move their local formulas towards the national funding formula methodology in the 'soft' formula years. The 'soft' formula years have now been extended to include the financial year 2020-21, with no date given for the implementation of the 'hard' formula.

After discussions with the schools forum members on 17th October 2019 RBWM proposes to reduce volatility in funding allocations and to work towards migrating to NFF over the next few years.

The schools block is to be allocated to schools via the Schools funding formula, after allowing for growth in year groups for new schools and the estimated increase in business rates for 2020-21. The proposals for allocation are detailed in the appendices. In 2020-21 RBWM does not propose to make any block movements between the Schools Block and High Needs.

The Minimum Funding Guarantee

Local authorities are required to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. The level set by RBWM in 2019-20 was negative 1.5%.

The Minimum Funding Per Pupil

From 2020-21 there will be a compulsory minimum funding per pupil level where every secondary school will receive a minimum of £5,000 per pupil (KS3 £4,800 per pupil and KS4 £5,300 per pupil with an overall £5,000 per pupil for an individual Secondary school), with every primary school getting £3,750 - putting primary schools on the path to receiving at least £4,000 per pupil the following year.

Introduction of a new Mobility factor

The mobility factor is intended to support schools in which a high proportion of pupils first join on a non-standard date. The mobility factor will allocate funding for schools whose proportion of mobile pupils in each phase is above a threshold of 6%.

Reduction in the Looked After Children deprivation factor

The deprivation factor for looked after children will continue to reduce to reflect the direct funding schools receive for this element.

Targeting of funding to local priorities

It is proposed that consultation with schools will focus on formula changes with minimum volatility for the financial year 2020-21 and achieving NFF over the coming years.

Increase in the lump sum allowance

Increase the lump sum allowance reflecting upon the NFF rate in 2020-21.

Consultation Questions

There are three models and a number of in principle questions on which we would like schools responses to.

To assist schools in responding to this consultation, appendix D contains an anonymised by sector schedule of how the adoption of the above three models will impact on individual schools' net funding. These are based on 2019-20 October 2018 pupil data.

Appendix C lists the Schools Formula by factor detailing the following:

- The RBWM 'Soft' formula unit rates for 2019-20
- NFF unit rates including the area cost adjustment (ACA)
- The three financial models for consultation

The three financial models allocate out the provisional 2020-21 funding allocation published to the local authority in October 2019. The basis of the funding and models are the October 2018 school data. Changes to the local formula unit rates from 2019-20 to the models are highlighted to emphasis the targeted funding.

Model 1

- AWPU funded at National Formula Funding (NFF) unit rate in full plus Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)
- Low Prior attainment funded at NFF unit rate in full plus ACA
- Looked After Children funded at 50% of the RBWM 2019-20 unit rate
- Lump sum at equal levels for both sectors
- MFG funded at +0.5%

Model 2

- AWPU funded at NFF unit rate in full plus ACA.
- Low Prior attainment funded at 97.73% of NFF unit rate plus ACA
- Mobility factor at 50% of the NFF unit base rate (no ACA applied)
- Looked After Children funded at 50% of the RBWM 2019-20 unit rate
- Lump sums funded at NFF rate plus ACA
- MFG funded at +0.5%

Model 3

- AWPU funded at NFF unit rate in full plus ACA
- Low Prior attainment funded at 97.1% of NFF unit rate plus ACA
- Mobility factor at 75% of the NFF unit base rate (no ACA applied)
- Looked After Children funded at 50% of the RBWM 2019-20 unit rate
- Lump sums funded at NFF rate plus ACA
- MFG funded at +0.5%

Use of headroom funding

Any headroom resulting from the October 2019 Census data and the final block funding to be targeted at Free School Meals and working towards NFF rates in other formula factors.

Impact on School Budgets

Appendix D reflects the indicative estimated % increases per school per model. The majority of schools are shown with potential funding increases of between 3% and 5%. A small number of schools have percentage increases of 0.5% to 2%. This is due to the minimum funding guarantee. Schools in receipt of MFG top ups in 2019-20 were given extra funding above the 2019-20 base formula funding. The new funding for 2020-21 increases the schools base formula allocation in all 3 models and decreases the MFG 'top-up' element in 2020-21, resulting a in lower % net rise between years. Schools listed with potential increases of over 5% are schools in receipt of Minimum Funding Per Pupil (MFPP) protection allocations. This ensures that the school funding allocations excluding Business rates, divided by the school NOR are at the minimum levels specified by the government.

In Principle Questions

Minimum Funding Guarantee

The DfE requires local authorities to set the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) between minus 0.50% and 1.84% per pupil. This is one of the mechanisms which determine the change in per pupil funding levels which a school can experience from year to year. The level of the MFG controls the level of gain and loss in per pupil funding levels at individual school level when compared to the previous financial year. In this respect, the MFG provides a mechanism for controlling the impact of schools moving to the NFF i.e. a lower MFG allows those schools which gain from the NFF implementation to start to receive some funding benefit.

Models 1 to 3 have been calculated using MFG at +0.5%. In order for schools to see the potential effect if these three models were calculated at +1.17% and 1.84%, please see the table below.

Cost and impact of changes in MFG percentages are detailed below:

Table 1 Cost and impact of changes in MFG percentages

MFG	0.50%	No. of schools	1.17%	No. of schools	1.84%	No. of schools
	£		£		£	
Model 1	68,347	3	76,199	3	84,050	3
Model 2	59,692	3	67,523	3	75,355	3
Model 3	58,015	2	64,197	3	72,029	3

Q1 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

Local authorities are required to set a Minimum Funding Guarantee, which in 2020-21 must be between +0.5% and +1.84%. The level set by RBWM in 2019-20 was negative 1.5%.

What level of increase in the Minimum Funding Guarantee increase would you recommend?

- a) 2.00% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +0.50%
- b) 2.67% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +1.17%
- c) 3.34% increase per pupil from -1.50% to +1.84%

Minimum Funding Per Pupil

From 2020-21 there will be a compulsory minimum funding per pupil level where every secondary school will receive a minimum of £5,000 per pupil (KS3 £4,800 per pupil and KS4 £5,300 per pupil with an overall £5,000 per pupil for an individual Secondary school), with every primary school getting £3,750 - putting primary schools on the path to receiving at least £4,000 per pupil the following year.

Q2 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

Do you agree that all the Minimum Funding Per Pupil rates for 2020-21 should be implemented and delegated via the local formula? If not, why?

Introduction of a new Mobility Factor

The EFA have developed a new methodology for this optional factor which involves tracking individual pupils using their unique pupil ID through censuses from the past 3 years. If the first census when the pupil was in the school was a spring or summer census, they are a mobile pupil. This excludes reception pupils who start in January. This methodology also excludes pupils who joined in the summer term after the summer census, or pupils who joined in October before the autumn census.

The mobility factor is intended to support schools in which a high proportion of pupils first join on a non-standard date. The mobility factor will allocate funding for schools whose proportion of mobile pupils in each phase is above a threshold of 6%.

This factor has not been used in the RBWM local factors. With the change in methodology which is more targeted to pupil movements and the consequential levels of mobility reflected across the borough, we have reflected this factor as an option in models 2 and 3.

Q3 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

Do you agree that a new Mobility Factor should be introduced? Do you agree that National Funding Formula rates should be implemented? If not, what rate would you propose?

Reduction in the Looked After Children deprivation factor

In 2019-20 the LA retained a formula factor for looked after children but reduced its value from £1,900 to £950 per eligible pupil. This recognised the increase of £400 in Pupil Premium Plus for looked after children from £1,900 to £2,300 and the DfE's decision that the hard NFF will not include factor for looked after children. In order to protect volatility and keep RBWM values for inclusion this factor will be maintained in 2020-21 at 50% of the 2019/20 rate, which is £475.

Q4 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

Do you agree that the deprivation factor for looked after children will continue to reduce to reflect the direct funding schools receive for this element? If not, what level of reduction would you propose?

Low Prior Attainment

Lower Prior Attainment is the SEN Notional factor for RBWM schools and contributes towards the first £6,000 for Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs).

Schools SEN budgets are under increasing pressure and the first call on each child's EHCP is from this formula factor. All three models recognise this pressure and show either a partial or full movement towards the NFF rates.

Q5 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

<i>Do you agree that Lower Prior Attainment factors should move towards the National Funding Formula rates? If not, what rate would you propose?</i>
--

Lump Sum Per School

RBWM's local formula had been funding lump sum above the NFF rate in previous years to help protect smaller schools. In 2020-21 the EFA have increased the NFF lump sum above the current RBWM rate.

Q6 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

<i>Do you agree that the lump sum factor should be increased? If not, what would you propose?</i>

Headroom

Available headroom for 2020-21 budget is defined as the sum unallocated within the DSG after accounting for pupil number changes, other demography changes and cost pressures.

Q7 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

<i>Do you agree that any headroom should be targeted at increasing the Free School Meals factors towards the National Funding Formula rates plus ACA? If not, do you have any other suggestions?</i>
--

Model Preference

Three models have been proposed for consideration.

Q8 Schools are asked to respond to the following:

<i>Have you a preferred model, if so which is it?</i>
