

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM

|                      |  |                       |                            |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Date:                | <b>05 July 2016</b>  | <b>AGENDA ITEM: 4</b> |                            |
| Title:               | <b>Revising the Growth fund for 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19</b> |                       |                            |
| Responsible officer: | Kevin McDaniel, Head of Schools and Educational Services         |                       |                            |
| Contact officer:     | Edmund Bradley, Finance Partner                                  | Email                 | Edmund.bradley@rbwm.gov.uk |
|                      | Ben Wright, Education Planning Officer                           | E-mail                | Ben.wright@rbwm.gov.uk     |

## 1 REPORT SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper follows a series of proposals and changes to the Growth Fund provision for schools that are expanding the provision to meet agreed basic need demand. The Schools Forum debated further changes in March and determined to maintain the current funding approach for 2016-17 while urgently contemplating change again for 2017-18.
- 1.2 Several schools have expressed dismay about the financial implications of that decision, particularly those whose expansions started prior to financial year 2014/15 or those facing a claw-back. Further, a national funding formula is now under consultation which may remove Schools Forum control over the growth fund from April 2019.
- 1.3 Following discussions with all expanding schools expecting additional children in September 2016 and who are supported by the growth fund, this paper sets out the following:
  - A summary of the regulations which came into force from April 2013 and the history of changes to the RBWM growth fund.
  - The expectations of those schools which have commenced expansion between 2011 and 2016.
  - A proposed funding approach for 2016-17, 17-18, and 18-19 which has been considered by all of the impacted schools and a summary of their responses.
  - A summary of the current 2016-17 funding arrangements with a proposal to remove the clawback arrangements should the revised proposal not be accepted.
- 1.4 Schools Forum is asked to agree the future growth funding methodology for the three financial years starting in 2016-17. The three options are: the revised proposal set out in section 4, the modified current scheme set out in section 5, or the current arrangement.

## 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To agree the proposed growth funding allocation methodology set out in section 4 which, following engagement with all schools directly impacted in the 2016-17 financial year, has wide but not unanimous support. This proposal will remain in force ahead of national funding changes.
- 2.2 In the event the main proposal is not agreed, Forum are asked to agree the proposal to remove the “clawback” element of the current formula in light of the potential impact to future financial planning for all schools. No more resource will be spent seeking a change to the methodology ahead of national funding changes.
- 2.3 Should neither option be accepted, the growth fund will operate as previously agreed at school forum in March 2016 for the next three years and no more resource will be spent seeking a change to the methodology ahead of national funding changes.

## 3 BACKGROUND

## **Regulations**

- 3.1 Under school finance regulations which came into force in 2013-14, local authorities (LAs) can top-slice the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in order to create a growth fund to support maintained and academy schools which are required to provide extra places in order to meet basic need within the authority. In principle, the growth fund is designed to support a school temporarily or permanently increasing their PAN on a planned basis to meet basic need demands in the area before the census process catches up with pupils in the school. This is typically seven months (September to March) for maintained schools and a year for Academy schools.
- 3.2 Regulations make clear that growth fund can only be used to support growth in pre-16 pupil numbers and to meet the start-up costs of new schools. Funding is intended to support growing schools to meet the cost of additional pupils admitted in the new academic year who would not initially be funded through the funding formula.<sup>1</sup>
- 3.3 It cannot be used to support schools in financial difficulty which for maintained schools would normally come from a de-delegated contingency budget.
- 3.4 The Department for Education is currently consulting on a national funding formula which will come into effect from April 2019. The initial consultation suggests that these arrangements will include a Growth factor and that the schools forum will continue to operate the Growth Fund in the three financial years from 2016-17. In the event that other regulations are brought forward, this scheme will be subject to revision

## **History of the Growth Fund in the Borough**

- 3.5 Introduced for 2013-14 in line with national regulations, the Growth Fund methodology has changed over time as the result of discussions at the schools forum. When introduced in financial year 2013/14, the fund provided the appropriate phase AWPU for every place in each year of expansion. This replaced the fixed allocations provided in 2011/12 (£15.4k for 7 months) and 2012/13 (£33.4k for 7 months). The growth fund is a top-slice from the overall DSG and was initially funded by a reduction in the Primary AWPU rate in 2011/12.
- 3.6 After initial operation, the Forum considered that the formula had been over-generous, leading to some schools appearing to gain unduly. The forum approved a revised, complex formula, which came into effect from April 2015 with the following changes:
- Funding for permanent increases would only be allocated for the first three years.
  - Funding would only be allocated for planned increases of ten or more school places.
  - A lump sum of £4,000 per school would be allocated for increases of ten or more pupils, and £6,000 for twenty or more, pro rata-ed for part year, in addition to the per pupil funding.
  - A clawback mechanism would take account of the difference between planned pupil numbers and actual pupils admitted in September.
- 3.7 At the Schools Forum meeting where this change was agreed, there was an extensive discussion about how this change was to be implemented: for new schemes only or retrospectively. The minutes do not give a clear statement and no broad communication has otherwise been made, however in practice the scheme has been applied retrospectively in line with the general understanding of those who took part in the discussion and others who have actively sought guidance.
- 3.8 2015-16 was the first year that growth fund allocations would have been subject to clawbacks. Initial modelling of the adjustments needed showed that clawbacks could be up to £30k or more, equivalent in some cases to 3% of budget. At a meeting on 19 January 2016 Schools Forum discussed the impact of such a clawback on a school's ability to plan

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulations require LAs to provide estimated numbers in the funding formula for new schools which have opened in the last seven years and do not yet have pupils in every year group. In RBWM this applies to Braywick Court and Holyport College and means that the additional pupils they expect in September 2016 will be funded through the formula and not through the growth fund.

ahead with certainty. Forum decided that no claw-backs would be made at least until 2016-17, and that the existing Growth Fund function would be reviewed for 2016-17.

- 3.9 A revised proposal was taken to Schools Forum in March 2016 with a proposal for a new scheme for 2016-17 which addressed many of the weaknesses of the existing scheme. After an extensive discussion, Forum agreed that the new scheme had many merits but timing was poor for 2016-17 and decided by a majority vote to stick with the current scheme and revisit in July for future years. The details of this scheme are summarised in section 5, however it would result in five schools facing a clawback, one seeing a reduced allocation and a further four schools not receiving any growth funding despite having additional pupils in school in September 2016. All funding allocated for the year would be distributed to five schools with a small contingency in case of a high proportion of late applications for September 2016 places.
- 3.10 The Head of Schools has met with those schools that will have started an expansion (not bulge classes) between September 2011 and September 2016 to explain the Growth fund position. As part of that process all schools were asked to outline their understanding of the Growth Funding as it applies to their school and what their expectations have been. This is set out in the following table and provides context to the history of the evolution of the growth fund.

| School Name        | Current Understanding of Growth Fund as it applies to the school  |
|--------------------|---|
| All Saints Junior  | Expansion started in 2014. School was tracking growth fund changes and was aware of three year limit and the potential for clawback. Had therefore planned for growth fund this year and, while clawback was unexpected and seems unfair as the costs have been incurred, the current scheme is acceptable. Future years could be a challenge if further clawback required.   |
| Clewer Green First | As a half-form expansion starting in 2013 they understood that they had received three years funding and were not expecting further money in 2016-17. The request for a clawback cannot be met from their budget in this year, with staffing currently running at 92% of budget.  |
| Furze Platt Junior | Expansion started in 2013. School expected full four years funding from Growth Fund however has a bigger issue with impact of MFG which appears to penalise them for expansion, with gains heavily topsliced to support others. Communications have indicated growth funding falling from £27k to zero over five months making planning very challenging.   |
| Furze Platt Senior | Expansion starts in September 2016 with expectation that revenue funding would come at similar level to last year. Expected to cover growth in curriculum capacity across all subjects which is more expensive than a single teacher. Average teacher cost (excluding leadership) at school is £49k and funding has to more than cover that cost. Further, the school budget will reduce by 40 x AWPU as a previous 'bulge' year left the school last summer. The school was directed by the LA to take these extra students. Therefore, we have an even more significant financial challenge managing growth on 2016-17 whilst facing an overall budget reduction. |
| Holyport Primary   | Expansion started in 2011 to add four classes. School opted to grow all year groups at once and expected £29k each year up to 2017/18.  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | Current proposal of no growth funding and an unexpected £17k clawback makes the budget unsustainable.   |
| Knowl Hill Primary           | New expansion for 2016 which will add 91 places over 3 years, researched the growth fund and have planned budget for three years, which gives chance to make structural changes. Understanding of the pressure for those primary schools expanding by a whole class every year. Risk of a clawback is unhelpful for such planning.  |
| Oldfield Primary             | First children arrived in September 2012 and believe they had agreement for £53k in each of seven years which is unaffected by the Growth Fund changes, of which they were aware. All classes are always full and they require the full 30 place AWPU to ensure that all of their pupils are equally treated.   |
| Riverside Primary            | Expansion started in 2014 following Targeted Basic Need Bid to central government. The school were aware of the three year time limit on growth funding and were expecting final allocation in 2016/17. Also knew of clawback possibility but could not plan for it and a claim for £32k is unaffordable for the school which has already made essential staffing commitments for the new academic year   |
| St Edwards First             | Expansion started in 2013 and business manager had followed Growth Funding discussions so school had planned to not receive further funding in 2016/17 and is relieved to not be facing any clawback.   |
| St Edwards Royal Free Middle | Last group of pupils joining school in September 2016 and expansion started on expectation of funding in every year, however no written information to the school directly at any point. Typical annual cost for a teacher for them is £44k and not receiving growth funding means that the curriculum model will have to change. Clawback is even less affordable.   |
| St. Edmund Campion Primary   | Expansion started in 2011 and expected £23k each year up to and including 2016-17. Were unaware of changes to Growth Funding method and have built budget on this basis.  |
| Wraysbury Primary            | Expansion started in 2011 with 15 places per year nominal expansion. Operated changes to suit increasing pupil numbers. Were aware of Growth Fund discussions and risk of no allocation in 2016/17, however set out on expansion with expectation of funding each year to 2017/18. Clawback is totally unbudgeted and unfair as staffing commitments have already been made. Expanded schools in general also take more pupils after census day and have to carry those pupils for upto a year without funding. |

3.11 These meetings flagged up two issues that need to be addressed before moving forward: equal funding for every pupil and the relationship between expanding schools and the Minimum Funding Guarantee process that every local authority uses to reduce budget turbulence.

3.12 A number of schools believe that the overall budget DSG receives additional money from the Department for Education to allow for these “extra pupils before they are recorded in

their first January census”. That is incorrect. The budget allocated for the growth fund (£370k for 2016/17 and £1.5m for the previous three years) is taken as a slice from the schools block allocation based on actual pupil numbers before delegated budgets are calculated. The more that is given to growth fund, the less there is to divide out between every school. The impact of this along with the formula factors (such as deprivation and low prior attainment) means that each school receives a different amount per pupil.

- 3.13 The MFG process is designed to prevent rapid swings in the *per pupil* budget for a given school. In this scheme, schools that see a reduction in this per pupil budget of more than 1.5% in a given year receive extra funding to replace the loss. That replacement comes from taking budget allocation from those schools with the largest increases in the per pupil budget. The following table shows that there is no correlation between growth in the number on roll (at January census for the coming financial year) and the changes in MFG per pupil.

| School Name                           | Pre-16 NOR |       |       |       |  | Post MFG Budget per pupil |        |        |        |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--|
|                                       | 13-14      | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 |  | 13-14                     | 14-15  | 15-16  | 16-17  |  |
| All Saints C of E Controlled          | 224        | 224   | 260   | 281   |  | £3,790                    | £3,866 | £3,884 | £3,995 |  |
| Clewer Green CE Aided First School    | 218        | 246   | 266   | 288   |  | £3,719                    | £3,636 | £3,662 | £3,735 |  |
| Furze Platt Junior School             | 293        | 314   | 333   | 347   |  | £3,310                    | £3,346 | £3,367 | £3,531 |  |
| Furze Platt Senior School             | 997        | 981   | 1005  | 957   |  | £4,666                    | £4,762 | £4,804 | £4,775 |  |
| Holyport CE Primary School            | 350        | 377   | 374   | 378   |  | £3,285                    | £3,328 | £3,378 | £3,521 |  |
| Knowl Hill C of E Academy             | 69         | 83    | 80    | 91    |  | £5,904                    | £5,532 | £5,489 | £5,242 |  |
| Oldfield Primary School               | 245        | 271   | 300   | 332   |  | £3,412                    | £3,426 | £3,425 | £3,558 |  |
| Riverside Primary School and Nursery  | 209        | 204   | 223   | 243   |  | £4,509                    | £4,723 | £4,494 | £4,288 |  |
| St Edmund Campion Catholic Primary    | 360        | 378   | 398   | 404   |  | £3,302                    | £3,359 | £3,389 | £3,501 |  |
| St Edward's Catholic First School     | 222        | 235   | 254   | 269   |  | £3,591                    | £3,560 | £3,568 | £3,651 |  |
| St. Edward's Royal Free Middle School | 380        | 401   | 434   | 455   |  | £3,932                    | £3,997 | £4,031 | £4,040 |  |
| Wfaysbury Primary School              | 329        | 362   | 365   | 377   |  | £3,490                    | £3,524 | £3,571 | £3,754 |  |

- 3.14 In the absence of a fault in the MFG design and no single “budget per place”, the following proposal has been developed such that it could be implemented immediately and consistently over the next three years, removing the need for further consideration of this tricky issue.

#### 4 PROPOSED SCHEME FOR THREE YEARS FROM 2016-17

- 4.1 A school is eligible for Growth Funding when the decision to provide an extra class or expansion in places is agreed in advance with RBWM and must be related to basic need, i.e. as part of RBWM’s plans to ensure there are sufficient schools places in the Borough. The increase may be a temporary increase in pupil numbers, a bulge class or a permanent increase to the school’s Planned Admission Number (PAN) and the school has to be prepared to maintain the spaces for in year admissions as well as the normal admissions round.
- 4.2 Growth funding will not normally be allocated where:
- A school has surplus places and then takes additional children up to the PAN.
  - It admits over or increases their PAN at their own choice.
  - It is requested to admit additional pupils as a result of appeals, fair access protocol, SEN or Children in Care etc. as these pupils do not meet the basic need criteria.

#### The approach to fairer funding

- 4.3 The proposal has to accommodate the differing types of school and the different scales of expansion over time while being ‘fair’. The common ground for fairness was to the children with the foundation being: “An expanding school needs to have to the budget to make the staffing commitments required to make the extra places available”.
- 4.4 On that basis, the following table sets out for all expansions underway and planned to start admitting pupils by September 2018, defining the scale of the changes in minimum class provision over the life of the expansion. The left side of the table was the starting position of the expansion and the right side is the minimum increase in teaching capacity required to

fulfil the expansion. For example the table indicates that Riverside Primary will grow from 210 to 360 places by Sept 2018 and will have to add a minimum of 5 classes to achieve that. In the same way Furze Platt Junior will have grown from 180 to 240 places over four year and will have had to add a minimum of two classes to achieve it.

| Years | Year grp Size | Total PAN | School                                   | Final PAN | Years from start to Sep 2018 | Total Minimum New Classes |
|-------|---------------|-----------|--|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 7     | 45            | 315       | Holyport CE Primary                      | 420       | 7                            | 4                         |
| 7     | 45            | 315       | St Edmund Campion RC Primary             | 420       | 7                            | 4                         |
| 7     | 45            | 315       | Wraysbury Primary                        | 420       | 7                            | 4                         |
| 7     | 30            | 210       | Oldfield Primary                         | 420       | 7                            | 7                         |
| 4     | 93            | 372       | St Edwards Royal Free Middle             | 480       | 4                            | 4                         |
| 4     | 45            | 180       | Clewer Green CE                          | 255       | 5                            | 3                         |
| 4     | 45            | 180       | Furze Platt Junior                       | 240       | 4                            | 2                         |
| 4     | 45            | 225       | St Edwards Catholic First                | 300       | 5                            | 3                         |
| 7     | 30            | 210       | Riverside Primary School & Nursery       | 360       | 5                            | 5                         |
| 4     | 67            | 268       | All Saints CE Junior                     | 630       | 4                            | 4                         |
| 5     | 180           | 900       | Furze Platt Senior                       | 990       | 3                            | 3                         |
| 7     | 15            | 105       | Knowl Hill                               | 210       | 3                            | 3                         |
| 1     | 30            |           | Homer Bulge Class 2016-17                |           | 1                            | 1                         |
| 1     | 30            |           | Contingency for one bulge class per year |           | 3                            | 3                         |
| 5     | 30            |           | Charters                                 |           | 2                            | 2                         |
| 5     | 30            |           | Cox Green                                |           | 2                            | 2                         |
| 2     | 30            |           | Windsor Learning Partnership - WBS       |           | 2                            | 2                         |
| 2     | 30            |           | Windsor Learning Partnership - WGS       |           | 2                            | 2                         |
| 4     | 30            |           | Dedworth Middle Phase 1                  |           | 2                            | 2                         |
| 4     | 30            |           | Dedworth Middle Phase 2                  |           | 1                            | 1                         |

- 4.5 From this viewpoint, it is then possible to establish for any expansion, a comparable and fair measure of support required: the minimum number of additionally staffed classes. There is no requirement for a school to expand in a particular way with the growth funding supplied, the minimum class required is the proposed measure to determine a fair funding level and for that funding to be paid out over the life of the expansion to enable financial planning.

#### **Financial considerations**

- 4.6 The growth fund is designed to provide support for the 7/12<sup>th</sup> of a financial year before budgets reflect the actual numbers on roll. For Academies, the EFA will provide the additional 5/12<sup>th</sup> (based on the local Growth model) to recognise the longer period before pupil funding catches up. The Growth Fund is not intended to make up for weaknesses in the pupil funding model and therefore one can imagine challenges over time for those school where the pupil take up is low and short term pressure for those that are fully subscribed from day 1.
- 4.7 The annual amount allocated for the growth fund is set by the Schools Forum and is taken from the schools block of the DSG before delegated budgets are calculated. For 2016-17 that allocation is £355k and the remaining budget has been notified to all schools. For the next two years, it is unclear what the scale of the overall DSG will be with the introduction of the soft national funding formula. However in the first round of consultation the DFE asked if we agreed with the proposal to use growth funding at the 2016-17 level. The proposal assumes that the Forum would look to make that level of funding available in the subsequent two years and we have therefore modelled a total budget of £1.065m.

- 4.8 The weakness of the current model is that original allocations have proven to be unaffordable while creating a larger “cliff edge” for those in receipt. The proposal addresses that by attempting to combine both past and future allocations to estimate an “expanded class” funding rate and then distribute future money to provide a fair allocation over the life of all of the expansions.
- 4.9 The starting point for the “expanded class funding rate” has been calculated at £60,990 per year (£35,577 for 7/12<sup>th</sup> of a year). This rate allocates all of the budgeted Growth Fund for the current and next two financial years. This compares favourably with the anecdotal average annual cost of a teacher (not including leadership) in RBWM schools as noted in 3.10, and is higher than the level of funding proposed in the March scheme. It does not differentiate between phases for simplicity of calculation.
- 4.10 The table on the following page sets out the impact of using that rate for all of the schools currently being expanded or starting an expansion by September 2018. It includes a contingency of one class per year given the current pressure on primary places in Maidenhead and Ascot. The table is explained below:

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Column a   | The number of years of expansion at the school from the first September with additional children until the earliest of the expansion being complete or September 2018. |
| Column b   | The assessed number of minimum classes needed to support the expansion up to an including September 2018 admissions  |
| Column c   | The estimated minimum cost based on column b and the 7/12 <sup>th</sup> figure calculated from the estimated Growth Fund over the next three financial years.          |
| Column d   | The sum of Growth Funding received so far since the start of expansion to March 2016.  |
| Column e   | The number of years of expansion undertaken to and including September 2015.   |
| Column f   | The total amount of funding remaining per school calculated as column c minus column d.  |
| Column g   | The number of years of expansion left in the period from September 2015 to September 2018. Calculated as column a minus column e.                                      |
| Column h-j | The remaining funding (column f) spread equally across the remaining number of years of expansion (column g).  |
| Column k   | The total of columns h-j to double check column f  |

- 4.11 The implications of this proposed model are that:
- all schools with an expectation of receiving funding will now receive some, albeit at a lower level than that received in previous years. This is an improvement for 4 schools.
  - New expansions will receive less under this proposal than the current scheme which impacts the planning in 16/17 for 2 schools and a further 4 from 2017-18.
  - There is no clawback for any school reducing pressure on 5 schools.
  - Academy schools will receive additional money equivalent to 5/7<sup>th</sup> of the amount shown for each year to reflect the extended period before pupil-led funding comes into play.

|                                    | a                            | b                         | c                              | d                 | e                   | f                                 | g                             | h               | i               | j               | k                 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| School                             | Years from start to Sep 2018 | Total Minimum New Classes | Total Growth (7/12th @ £35577) | Received so far   | Years funded so far | Total still to fund up to 2018-19 | Years Left to 2018-19 (max 3) | Sep-16          | Sep-17          | Sep-18          | Total             |
|                                    |                              |                           | £35577*b                       |                   |                     | c-d                               | a-e                           |                 |                 |                 |                   |
| Holyport CE Primary                | 7                            | 4                         | £142,310                       | £125,446          | 5                   | <b>£16,864</b>                    | 2                             | £8,432          | £8,432          |                 | <b>£16,864</b>    |
| St Edmund Champion RC Primary      | 7                            | 4                         | £142,310                       | £125,446          | 5                   | <b>£16,864</b>                    | 2                             | £8,432          | £8,432          |                 | <b>£16,864</b>    |
| Wraysbury Primary                  | 7                            | 4                         | £142,310                       | £125,446          | 5                   | <b>£16,864</b>                    | 2                             | £8,432          | £8,432          |                 | <b>£16,864</b>    |
| Oldfield Primary                   | 7                            | 7                         | £249,042                       | £185,387          | 4                   | <b>£63,655</b>                    | 3                             | £21,218         | £21,218         | £21,218         | <b>£63,655</b>    |
| St Edwards Royal Free Middle       | 4                            | 4                         | £142,310                       | £137,110          | 3                   | <b>£5,200</b>                     | 1                             | £5,200          |                 |                 | <b>£5,200</b>     |
| Clewer Green CE                    | 5                            | 3                         | £106,732                       | £76,561           | 3                   | <b>£30,171</b>                    | 2                             | £15,086         | £15,086         |                 | <b>£30,171</b>    |
| Furze Platt Junior                 | 4                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £76,561           | 3                   | <b>£0</b>                         | 1                             | £0              |                 |                 | <b>£0</b>         |
| St Edwards Catholic First          | 5                            | 3                         | £106,732                       | £76,561           | 3                   | <b>£30,171</b>                    | 2                             | £15,086         | £15,086         |                 | <b>£30,171</b>    |
| Riverside Primary School & Nursery | 5                            | 5                         | £177,887                       | £102,622          | 2                   | <b>£75,265</b>                    | 3                             | £25,088         | £25,088         | £25,088         | <b>£75,265</b>    |
| All Saints CE Junior               | 4                            | 4                         | £142,310                       | £79,492           | 2                   | <b>£62,818</b>                    | 2                             | £31,409         | £31,409         |                 | <b>£62,818</b>    |
| Furze Platt Senior                 | 3                            | 3                         | £106,732                       | £0                | 0                   | <b>£106,732</b>                   | 3                             | £35,577         | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£106,732</b>   |
| Knowl Hill                         | 3                            | 3                         | £106,732                       | £0                | 0                   | <b>£106,732</b>                   | 3                             | £35,577         | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£106,732</b>   |
| Homer Bulge Class 2016-17          | 1                            | 1                         | £35,577                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£35,577</b>                    | 1                             | £35,577         |                 |                 | <b>£35,577</b>    |
| Contingency (one class /year)      | 3                            | 3                         | £106,732                       | £0                | 0                   | <b>£106,732</b>                   | 3                             | £35,577         | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£106,732</b>   |
| Charters                           | 2                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£71,155</b>                    | 2                             |                 | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£71,155</b>    |
| Cox Green                          | 2                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£71,155</b>                    | 2                             |                 | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£71,155</b>    |
| Windsor Learning Partnership - WBS | 2                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£71,155</b>                    | 2                             |                 | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£71,155</b>    |
| Windsor Learning Partnership - WGS | 2                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£71,155</b>                    | 2                             |                 | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£71,155</b>    |
| Dedworth Middle Phase 1            | 2                            | 2                         | £71,155                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£71,155</b>                    | 2                             |                 | £35,577         | £35,577         | <b>£71,155</b>    |
| Dedworth Middle Phase 2            | 1                            | 1                         | £35,577                        | £0                | 0                   | <b>£35,577</b>                    | 1                             |                 |                 | £35,577         | <b>£35,577</b>    |
| <b>Sub total</b>                   |                              |                           |                                | <b>£1,110,632</b> |                     | <b>£1,065,000</b>                 |                               | <b>£280,693</b> | <b>£417,803</b> | <b>£366,504</b> | <b>£1,065,000</b> |

4.12 This proposal has been shared with the schools listed in table 3.10 and their comments are summarised below:

| School Name        | Comments on the proposals contained within this report  |
|--------------------|---|
| All Saints Junior  | On balance, I would prefer the proposal in section 4.   |
| Clewer Green First | No comments received.   |
| Furze Platt Junior | <p>We do understand that the LA needs to review structures and systems to ensure that they are all effective and proportionate. The problem is that this does have an impact on our school. We must do what is right for the children in the school.</p> <p>I have read through the figures and these do generalise and therefore support the borough's views. Data though can show many different things and another perspective is not comparing average increase in growth fund per pupil but to compare average fund per pupil for schools expanding to those not expanding. This does again prove to us a link between the MFG topslice and expanding schools budgets. For instance; we have a post MFG per pupil funding of £3531 compared to an average of £4442 for schools supported on the MFG and £3692 for schools with a 'static' budget. I know that some smaller schools have a higher per pupil funding because of staffing and school running cost needs but black and white it is clear that our children are worse off than other children and one of the worst off per pupil in the borough.</p> <p>There always has to be winners and losers and someone has to be lowest but this, added to the growth fund changes, has had a massive impact on our school.</p> <p>We have balanced a budget at the cost of zero funds for ICT development, 1/2 funds for site development and maintenance, 1/3 off all resources and educational goods, 1/3 off all software, 1 TA not replaced and a leading Maths teacher (ex assistant Head) 0.5 teacher not kept in post to name but a few desperate cuts for this year, whilst NOR catches up and nc/pensions smooths over.</p> <p>Again, we know that money is tight in all schools but the jigsaw pieces all go together to make a clear overview of impact on our school.</p> <p>The growth fund just adds to all of this - it is money that we had expected and now not receiving. The new formulae may well show that we have had 'our full amount' but this is not the full amount that we were promised and that we entered a contract with the borough for. Other schools may well be happy to sign it off but we must look after the children at FPJS and this money is vital to help us maintain what we provide until the full NOR hits the budget (as the growth fund sits outside MFG calculations). We do believe that a contract is a contract and emails showing an agreement should not be retracted without agreement from both parties. We are in a situation of promisory estopple at present and we must stick fast in the best interest of FPJS.</p> |

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Furze Platt Senior | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly, we would like to reiterate the point made at Schools' Forum in March that May 2016 is far too late to be making these decisions for 2016 – 17 budgets. We, and other schools, had been developing budgets on the financial parameters of the current model and the point was made, and accepted at the meeting, that it was too late to make changes for 2016. <b>The agreement at the meeting was to stay with the current model for one year allowing time to review the formula for allocations in a timely and considered manner. This is still the position we support, that any agreed changes are implemented in 2017.</b></li> <li>2. We do not understand how the inclusion of the table in 3.13 helps and why it is used to determine that AWPU should no longer be used as a starting point for calculations. It is impossible to compare different models.</li> <li>3. We agree with the rationale for determining when a school should be eligible for growth funding.</li> <li>4. If we are required to choose from the Recommendations on p1 we would advocate <b>2.2.</b></li> <li>5. We strongly reject the proposal in <b>2.1.</b></li> </ol> <p>In summary, we urge the Local Authority to proceed with the 2016 -17 growth funding model in line with the decision made by the Schools Forum for the reasons outlined above, our school budget cannot withstand any deviation of this potential magnitude at this late stage. Whilst your latest proposal is an improvement on the original model tabled at the last Schools' Forum, we still have concerns that require further evaluation and discussion to take place between individual schools, the Schools' Forum and the Local Authority. We recommend these discussions commence as soon as we have closure on the 2016-17 issue.</p> |
| Holyport Primary   | Obviously we are disappointed not to be getting the amount we thought we would get but we do prefer the proposal that is suggested in section 4.   |
| Knowl Hill Primary | I have read your new proposal and shared it with my finance officers. We are happy to go with chart on new document page 8.  |
| Oldfield Primary   | <p>I have now had the opportunity to discuss this with key Governors and my Business Manager. The Governors and I have reviewed your proposal closely, and whilst we understand the arguments regarding limited budget and needing to find a fair compromise, this proposal effectively offers less than half of the BPPE funding for any other child within our school. Effectively meaning that for their first 7/12ths of the year, 30 of the 60 children starting their education at Oldfield School do not exist.</p> <p>Penalising the school and its pupils in this way, whilst still asking us to continue expanding each year, makes no sense to us. We believe that every child deserves the same funding and that without this, inevitably there will be a direct impact on all the children in the school,</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>with regards to their learning and progress.</p> <p>Therefore, we feel that these proposals are unacceptable to Oldfield Primary School and we wish to advise you that RBWM are obliged under the principle of "Promissory Estoppel" to continue our funding as per our previous agreement with RBWM, that has been in place for the last 3 years.</p>   |
| Riverside Primary            | It seems to us that the new proposal in section 4 is a fair way to proceed.   |
| St Edwards First             | We are in favour of the recommendations made in the proposal in section 4.  |
| St Edwards Royal Free Middle | <p>We were dismayed that the funding does not cover the full four years of expansion in our school and we also are concerned about the clawback arrangement. We have been oversubscribed for pupils joining our school in Year 5 each year for over a decade and are always full in this cohort. The only areas the school as a whole has not been full at any given point recently is for occasional in-year moves in Year 8 and sometimes Year 6. I am not sure what the justification for the clawback is in that case since school funding and numbers is usually addressed through AWPU. The Growth funding for expansion is about taking on a significant number of additional pupils over a length of time and to help us as a school adjust to this new intake. It is not the case that we were funded to take an extra 27 pupils in Year 5 and some didn't materialise. The other issue of concern was the level of funding being the same regardless of the age of the children; we are not sure why each type of school (nursery, primary, middle and secondary) attracts the same £35,577 a year for growth funding.</p> <p>However, we welcome your intervention in this process and even though the benefit to our school will be relatively small, we would prefer the proposal being made in section 4 rather than remaining in the current scheme.</p> |
| St. Edmund Campion Primary   | We would like to opt for the recommended methodology set out in section 4.  |
| Wraysbury Primary            | <p>I would make the following comments upon the proposals:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current scheme provides no further funding to the school despite embarking upon expansion with expectation of receiving funding until 2017/18.</li> <li>2. As an expanded school there is often a greater movement of pupils to the school after the October Census day meaning that the school has to fund those pupils for up to a year without funding.</li> <li>3. Any future clawback based on the current scheme would be unbudgeted and unsustainable by the school.</li> </ol> <p>Following a Full Governors Meeting on 16th May 2016 Wraysbury Primary School would prefer that the Proposal in Section 4 is adopted.</p>  |

- 4.13 On the basis of the comments above there are a number of issues arising: the authority of Schools Forum or Local Authority; the nature of initial arrangements; and the timeliness of budget planning. Each is outlined below.
- 4.14 A few schools note the expectation of a contract existing between the school and the local authority however the funding has always been provided from the Dedicated Schools Grant and is subject to the regulations specified by the Government with the grant allocation. Specifically the regulations state "Authorities will need to seek approval from Forums to retain central funding for all of these services" and lists the services to which this applies which includes: "Funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth (any underspend has to be added to the following year's formula allocations), including new schools set up to meet basic need, whether maintained, academy or free school".
- 4.15 It is therefore clear that the Schools Forum, as a statutory representative body, is the approving body for Growth Funding while the Local Authority officers are tasked to undertake the work. The Schools Forum is asked on an annual basis to review elements of the funding regime in their area and to make year on year adjustments as reasonable. It is not within the legal ambit of the local authority to make unilateral amendments to the Growth Funding formula. The Schools Forum regulations are clear that a majority vote by the forum is binding on all schools.
- 4.16 The initial arrangements for almost all schools are different to the scheme currently in operation or proposed and it is clear that there are differing expectation and for some that means a significant change between when the school agreed to expand and what is offered now.
- 4.17 It can be argued that there is moral expectation to carry through on commitments made in the past. The Forum has considered the cost of the initial scheme and have previously considered it unaffordable. There is insufficient Growth Fund allocated in 2016-17 and future commitments would need to be balanced in 2017-18 and 2018-19 by a reduction in the AWPU rates for all schools if the Forum were to consider resetting to the scheme in existence at the start of each expansion. A decision will be required for all future schemes too.
- 4.18 The annual budget setting process is held up by some as a reason to continue without change. No school has been notified of any growth fund for the current financial year and therefore no binding commitment has been made for the future. Further the funding approach has been under discussion for an extended period and it is clear that any school aware of the current arrangements would be aware of the ongoing debate.
- 4.19 On balance, the local authority officer recommendation is that the Schools Forum should adopt the revised proposal set out in section 4 based on the key principle of providing support to secure teaching staff while living within the level of funding the Forum has previously considered balanced with main school budgets. This proposal has the support of the majority of schools who have or are expanding, excluding those whose expansions are about to start or those who believe there is an historic commitment to a higher funding level.

## 5 THE CURRENT SCHEME

- 5.1 Six schools that received funding in 2015-16 would have been subject to a clawback as a result of the difference in leavers and joiners in September 2015 or based on the difference between PAN and their admission number. From the comments in 3.10, this clawback which totals £60,480 in financial year 2016-17 has not be budgeted for and is unaffordable to almost all schools. It is strongly recommended that should Forum decide to continue with the current scheme as set out in the table below, the clawback feature should be dropped and reserves be adjusted at the end of the year to balance the overall DSG.

| Date of expansion | Increase | School   | F/Y 2013-14    |               | F/Y 2014-15    |               | f/Y 2015-16    |          | f/y 16-17 | Total<br>£       | f/Y 2016-17    |               | Grand Total<br>£ |
|-------------------|----------|--|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|                   |          |  | A/Y 2013/14    |               | A/Y 2014/15    |               | A/Y 2015/16    |          |           |                  | A/Y 2016/17    |               |                  |
|                   |          |  | Sep-Mar        | Apr-Aug       | Sep-Mar        | Apr-Aug       | Sep-Mar        | Apr-Aug  |           |                  | Sep-Mar        | Apr-Aug       |                  |
| Sep-10            | 5        | St Marys Catholic                              | 8,222          | 5,800         | 8,120          | 5,800         |                |          |           | 27,942           |                |               | 27,942           |
| Sep-11            | 15       | Holyport CE Primary                            | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-11            | 15       | Oakfield First                                 | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-11            | 15       | St Edmund Campion RC Primary                   | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-11            | 5        | St Luke's Primary                              | 8,222          |               | 8,120          | 5,800         |                |          |           | 22,142           |                |               | 22,142           |
| Sep-11            | 8        | White Waltham                                  | 13,156         |               | 22,272         |               | 9,280          |          |           | 44,708           |                |               | 44,708           |
| Sep-11            | 15       | Waysbury Primary                               | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-12            | 6        | Cookham Dean CE Primary                        | 9,857          |               | 9,744          |               |                |          |           | 19,611           |                |               | 19,611           |
| Sep-12            | 9        | Furze Platt Infant                             | 14,800         |               | 14,616         |               |                |          |           | 29,416           |                |               | 29,416           |
| Sep-12            | 30       | Oldfield Primary                               | 49,334         |               | 48,722         |               | 53,900         |          |           | 151,956          |                |               | 151,956          |
| Sep-13            | 6        | Alexander First                                | 9,857          |               | 9,744          |               |                |          |           | 19,611           |                |               | 19,611           |
| Sep-13            | 15       | Clewer Green CE                                | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-13            | 15       | Furze Platt Junior                             | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-13            | 30       | Lowbrook Primary bulge class                   | 49,334         | 34,801        |                |               |                |          |           | 84,135           |                |               | 84,135           |
| Sep-13            | 15       | St Edwards Catholic First                      | 24,667         |               | 24,361         |               | 27,533         |          |           | 76,561           |                |               | 76,561           |
| Sep-13            | 27       | St Edwards Royal Free Middle                   | 44,401         |               | 43,849         |               | 48,860         |          |           | 137,110          |                |               | 137,110          |
| Sep-14            | 23       | All Saints CE Junior                           |                |               | 37,352         |               | 42,140         |          |           | 79,492           | 42,140         |               | 121,632          |
| Sep-14            | 5        | Braywood CE First                              |                |               | 8,120          |               |                |          |           | 8,120            |                |               | 8,120            |
| Sep-14            | 30       | Datchet St Mary's - bulge class                |                |               | 48,722         | 34,801        |                |          |           | 83,523           |                |               | 83,523           |
| Sep-14            | 30       | Dedworth Green First - bulge class             |                |               | 48,722         |               | 50,254         |          |           | 98,976           |                |               | 98,976           |
| Sep-14            | 30       | Homer bulge class 1                            |                |               | 48,722         |               |                |          |           | 48,722           |                |               | 48,722           |
| Sep-14            | 30       | Riverside Primary School & Nurse               | -              |               | 48,722         |               | 53,900         |          |           | 102,622          | 53,900         |               | 156,522          |
| Sep-15            | 15       | Holy Trinity Sunningdale Primary - bulge class |                |               |                |               | 27,533         |          |           | 27,533           |                |               | 27,533           |
| Sep-16            | 30       | Homer bulge class 2                            |                |               |                |               |                |          |           | -                | 53,900         |               | 53,900           |
| Sep-16            | 17       | Knowl Hill                                     |                |               |                |               |                |          |           | -                | 30,893         | 22,066        | 52,959           |
| Sep-16            | 30       | Planned bulge class Maidenhead                 |                |               |                |               |                |          |           | -                | 53,900         |               | 53,900           |
| Sep-16            | 30       | Furze Platt Senior                             |                |               |                |               |                |          |           |                  | 72,625         | 51,875        | 124,500          |
| Sep-16            |          | Contingency                                    |                |               |                |               |                |          |           |                  | 50,000         |               | 50,000           |
|                   |          | Hilltop  | 21,378         |               |                |               |                |          |           | 21,378           |                |               | 21,378           |
|                   |          |  | <b>401,250</b> | <b>40,601</b> | <b>576,074</b> | <b>46,401</b> | <b>478,598</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>1,542,924</b> | <b>357,358</b> | <b>73,941</b> | <b>1,974,223</b> |

- 5.2 A significant amount of resource has been applied to the Growth Fund mechanism since it's inception in 2013-14. It is strongly recommended that this paper and decision be the final discussion of the topic until the national funding formula is published. It is clear that any variation to the scheme will produce winners and losers however this proposal enables all schools to receive a consistent level of funding.