

Warrington Schools Forum

Agenda

Thursday 2 March 2017

5.15pm - 7pm

Conference Room 1st Floor New Town House

Car parking will be available from 5pm onwards

	Item	Enc / Verbal	Decision; Discussion; Information	Entitled to vote	Lead
1.	Apologies and welcome				Vice Chair
2.	Minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising	Enc			Vice Chair
3.	Proposals for Early Years Local Offer	Enc	Information/ Decision		Angela Conway
4.	Confirmed Schools Budgets: 2017/2018	Enc	Information		Garry Bradbury
5.	Formula Funding Working Group i. Feedback from meeting 16 Feb 2017 ii. Review of Membership and Term of Reference		Decision		Garry Bradbury Vice Chair
6.	National Funding Formula – School Forum Response to Consultation		Decision		Garry Bradbury All
7.	Meeting schedule Tuesday 27 June 2017, 5.15pm Tuesday 3 October 2017, 5.15pm Tuesday 5 December 2017, 5.15pm (Conference Room, 1 st Floor NTH)				Vice Chair

**Warrington Schools Forum
Minutes
10 January 2017**

Membership

Membership with differentiated voting rights ~ Total Membership of 25, of whom 21 are entitled to vote on funding formula issues											
Sector Representation (21)	Appointed by the Council following election by:	Member	Dates and Attendance								Tenure Ends
			22 March 2016	28 June 2016	4 October 2016	10 January 2017	2 March 2017	27 June 2017	3 October 2017	5 Dec 2017	
Maintained Nursery School Senior Staff (1)	Primary Headteachers Group	Jane Wilkie (JWil)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
Special School Staff (1)	Special School Headteachers Group	Mike Frost (MF)	P	S	P	P					Jan 2020
Special School Governor (1)	Governors Forum	Mike Evans (ME)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
PRU (1)	PRU Management Board	Karen Thomson (KT)	A	S	A	S					Jan 2020
Academy (4)	Academy Schools	Gwyn Williams (GW)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
		Tim Long (TL)	A	P	P	P					Jan 2020
		Judith Wright (JWri)	-	-	A	P					Jan 2020
		Andrew Bent (AB)	P	A	P	X					Jan 2020
Maintained Primary School Sector (9)	WAPH (5)	Andrew Redman (AR)	A	P	P	P					Jan 2020
		Susan Robinson (SR)	-	-	P	P					Jan 2020
		Gary Cunningham (GC)	P	A	P	P					Jan 2020
		Lesley McGann (LMc)	-	-	P	A					Jan 2020
		Lyndsey Glass (LG)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
	Governors Forum (4)	Stuart Munslow (SM)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
		David Hart (DH)	P	P	A	P					Jan 2020
		Janet Lazarus (JL)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
Maintained Secondary School Sector (3)	WASCL (2)	Bev Scott-Herron (BSH)	P	P	P	P					Jan 2020
		Chris Hunt (CH)	-	-	-	P					Jan 2020
	Governors Forum (1)	Rebecca Knowles (RK)	X	X	X	X					Jan 2020

Private Voluntary and Independent Providers (1)	PVI Providers Forum	Ginny Taylor (GT)	P	A	P	S												Jan 2020
Representing		Member	22 March 2016	28 June 2016	4 October 2016	10 January 2017	2 March 2017	27 June 2017	3 October 2017	5 Dec 2017								Tenure Ends
<u>Non-Schools Members (4)</u>																		
Anglican Diocese (1)		Jacqui Wightman (JWig)	P	P	S	P												Jan 2020
Roman Catholic Diocese (1)		Tim Warren (TW)	P	X	X	A												Jan 2020
16-19 Institutions (1)		Gail Stonier (GS)	S	X	P	A												Jan 2020
Parent Governor (1)		TBC	-	-	-													Jan 2020
Independent Chair		Maureen Banner (MB)	P	P	P	P												Jan 2020
Representing																		
<u>Warrington Borough Council</u>																		
Interim Assistant Director Education		Hilary Smith (HS)	P	P	P	P												
Head of Service Pupil Achievement and Support		Lisa Morgan (LM)	-	P	P	A												
Chief Finance Officer		James Campbell (JC)	P	P	P	P												
		Garry Bradbury (GB)	P	P	P	P												
Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services		Cllr Jean Carter (CllrJC)	A	P	A	A												

Key

P ~ Present

S ~ Substitute

A ~ Apologies

- ~ Vacancy

X ~ Absent with no apologies

O ~ Observer

Non-School Member Representing Trades Unions

Shaun Everett (NUT & ATL)

Substitutes:

Lisa Nugent representing Ginny Taylor

Charlotte Healey representing Karen Thomson

Observers:

Presenting an Item:

Simon Bleckly

Sarah Whittaker

Minutes:

Louise Cooper

Warrington Schools Forum

Minutes

Tuesday 10 January 2017

5.15 pm – 7.00 pm

Conference Room 1st Floor New Town House

	<i>Item</i>
1	<p>Apologies and Welcome</p> <p>The chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Tim Warren, Gail Stonier, Ginny Taylor and Lesley McGann.</p>
2	<p>School Audits</p> <p>Simon Bleckly (audit manager) presented the Schools Annual Report which detailed the main findings from the school audits carried out by Internal Audit in 2015-16. The report provides an overall opinion on the governance and control frameworks in place in schools. Findings were similar to the previous year.</p> <p>Section 2 of the report outlined the key issues and recommendations made in school audits 2015-16.</p> <p>The increased risk of fraud was highlighted as schools and headteachers are a target for external fraudsters. To help governors' oversight of the financial management of their school a 'Schools Anti-Fraud Toolkit' and checklist is available via My School Services.</p> <p>The report concluded there is Substantial Assurance that Warrington schools have effective systems of governance and internal controls in place.</p>
3	<p>Teacher Trade Union Facilities Time</p> <p>Sarah Whittaker explained that the purpose of the report was to inform schools forum of the impact of the withdrawal of secondary academy contributions on the funding of trade union facilities time for teaching trade unions in Warrington from April 2017.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the current arrangements for providing Facility Time to Trade Unions benefiting all contributing schools in Warrington remains financially sustainable going forward various options were identified for consideration by schools forum.</p> <p>The following options were discussed:</p> <p>Option1 - Cessation of funding for National Executive Duties</p> <p>Option 2 - Cap on refunds to schools for seconded officials</p>

Option 3 - Increase per pupil charges

Option 4 - Review of the Trade Union Facilities Agreement (TUFA)

A query was raised about the period of time that Warrington had been paying for the National Executive Duties. It was confirmed that this had been in place for a considerable amount of time but there is now discretionary provision for this within the current Facilities Agreement.

It was noted that it would be for academies to decide if they would contribute.

Recommendation

It was recommended that schools forum consider the options presented to them in the paper and make a decision on an approach to addressing the shortfall in trade union facilities time.

It was proposed that option 1 (cessation of funding for National Executive) was agreed by the forum.
AGREED.

It was noted that this would set a precedent in future secondments to National Executives being unable to be supported.

ACTION 1: School Forum to consider in the future capping refunds to schools for seconded officials.

4 School Budget 2017/18 and De-delegation Decisions

Garry Bradbury presented the report to the forum.

Initial DSG Allocation for 2017/18

The information in table 2.3 of the report was discussed which showed the individual block allocations, and for comparative purposes, the equivalent figures for 2016/17.

School budgets 2017/18

The implementation of NFF, and its implications for longer-term schools' funding, will be discussed further at the next Schools Forum meeting. But with the requirement to submit the 2017/18 formula model on or before 20th January, Forum should consider how it should inform the 2017/18 submission.

Set out below are the **principles** that are suggested should be applied:

1. Do not divert funding to SEN contingency
2. As NFF includes a significant low-cost high incidence SEN prior-attainment proxy, the equivalent funding from the SEN contingency, and funding generated by pupil number growth be used to reintroduce this factor (for the primary sector), and to increase its value (secondary sector)
3. Funding freed through the reduction of the Minimum Funding Guarantee 'bill' added to the basic per pupil element for both sectors.
4. The addition to LA funding of £15 per student for the former-ESG element is replicated in an identical addition to individual schools' per pupil funding.
5. Move towards the NFF suggestion of a higher KS4 per pupil funding rate, and a lower KS3 per pupil funding rate, by moving £75 between the respective values.
6. No change to deprivation funding values

It was highlighted that point 5 (moving £75 from Key Stage 3 into Key Stage 4) was not cost neutral. It was therefore **agreed** to reduce the key stage 3 reduction so that it matches the cost of the key stage 4 increase.

The effect of these proposals on individual school allocations was detailed in an appendix.

The above principles were **AGREED** by the forum.

De-delegation decisions.

Miscellaneous Licences.	<i>AGREED (maintained primary & secondary)</i>
CLEAPS	<i>AGREED (maintained primary & secondary)</i>
Free School Meals Assessment	<i>AGREED (maintained primary & secondary)</i>
Teachers' Panel	<i>AGREED (maintained primary & secondary)</i>
Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Costs	<i>AGREED (maintained primary & secondary)</i>

It was highlighted that information requested by the LA relating to free school meals was sent out with inadequate notice for schools to return.

ACTION 2: HS to follow up.

Early years funding 2017/18

The DfE has applied a number of conditions on funding which affect how this funding is allocated at local level; this was detailed in the report.

The information in section 5.4 of the report was discussed by the forum.

The forum **agreed** to the rates and retention proposals but would like to continue to review, vulnerable pupils / SEN support plus/ portage.

It was requested that outreach and portage was looked at in more detail.

ACTION 3: HS to follow up through the Warrington Inclusion Hub.

Recommendations:

It was recommended that Schools Forum:

Note the contents of the report. **NOTED**

Approve each of the funding principles for mainstream school budgets as outlined in section 3.6 of the report. **AGREED**

Approve the Early Years hourly rate proposals outlined in section 5.4 of the report. **AGREED**

Sector representatives from the maintained sectors are asked, for each phase, to decide which funding streams are to be de-delegated for 2017/18. Further, for any existing de-delegations that are decided should be set aside, to suggest the alternative arrangements that should therefore be implemented.

AGREED

5 Update on Consultations

Garry Bradbury presented a briefing note which provided a summary of the impact on Warrington schools of the most recently published DfE funding proposals.

The initial data produced by the DfE suggest that Warrington would fall back to its lowest position in the funding rankings.

The conclusions that were drawn from the proposals were detailed in the briefing note and discussed by the forum.

ACTION 4: GB to produce a document to illustrate schools current position compared to that of 2017-18.

The forum noted that the National Formula was not delivering for Warrington. In addition to the formal response to the government consultation, it was agreed that a campaign should be launched through the council to reflect Warrington's voice and ensure that there is a high level of awareness generated about the proposals. Action should be taken to strongly oppose the proposals and should include schools, parents, the local authority and local councillors.

ACTION 5: HS to share information via WAPH and WASCL and will provide a briefing to members.

6 Minutes From the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 4 October 2016 were approved as an accurate record.

7 Update on High Needs

The purpose of the report was to seek support for implementation:

(i) Of a package of identified measures to address pressure on the High Needs budget in the short-term in order to minimise impact on individual school budgets in 2017/2018

(ii) Of more robust arrangements for claw-back of school balances in the future, in the event that the balance accumulated by any individual maintained school exceeds an agreed level.

The report appendix outlined a three part plan which:

- 1) responds to the overspend in 2016/2017,
- 2) plans to reduce expenditure in 2017/2018, to increase control and effectively reduce spend without impacting on quality
- 3) plan to develop the local offer

The measures listed in the appendix had been discussed at the formula working group meeting.

Appendix

1. Response to overspend in 2016/2017 (predicted: £1.0 million by end of current year)

	Amount/£	Item
1.	520,000	Utilise one-off opportunity of Early Years Funding to “pay back” some of the financial support provided to early years settings in previous years.
2.	181,000	Recovery of past Fox Wood over-allocation of post-16 place funding since move to Woolston.
3.	210,650	Dedelegated primary pupil no. contingency - “unspent”
4.	57,000	Topsliced SEN contingency in secondary phase – “unspent”
Total:	968,650	
Shortfall:	31,350	Against a target of £1.0 million

Items 1 & 2 (above) were **agreed** by the forum.

Items 3 & 4

It was suggested that this was split proportionate to sectors with a proposed additional topslice of £50k for secondary schools. This was **agreed** subject to approval at WASCL.

ACTION 6: the topslice proposal to be presented to WASCL for agreement.

2. Plan to reduce overall expenditure in 2017/18

The full list of measures presented was agreed.

Approach to balance challenge 2016/17 process

It was agreed that 12.5% clawback would automatically apply for balance amounts above triggers.

Recommendations

- identify the option to implement from those identified in 2.13 in the report in order to address the pressure on the High Needs budget; **FULL LIST OF MEASURES IN APPENDIX A WAS AGREED.**
- discuss the suggestions of alternatives to the current balance challenge methodology identified at 3.4 and how this might be implemented in the future; **DISCUSSED**
- note the ongoing challenge in relation to High Needs and that changes to local arrangements are necessary for a potentially financially sustainable offer is to exist in the future; **NOTED**
- note that the process will require investment in capacity to support challenge and scrutiny across the identification, referral and assessment processes; **NOTED**
- note that officers will continue to work with Head-teachers in order to identify any opportunity to reduce financial pressure on the High Needs budget in the future; **NOTED**
- request regular updates on the position on High Needs including the financial implications of any changes to the local offer in the future. **NOTED**

	It was suggested that surplus money from increased class size funding was used for high needs? <i>AGREED.</i>
8	AOB Update on Living Wage The Council has adopted the living wage and all but three schools signed up to this. 40 schools will be affected with increasing salaries for grade 1 or 2 staff. Bespoke emails will be sent to schools from HR.
9	Meeting schedule Thursday 2 March 2017 at 5.15 pm Tuesday 27 June 2017 at 5.15 pm Tuesday 3 October 2017 at 5.15 pm Tuesday 5 December 2017 at 5.15 pm <i>(Conference Room NTH reserved for all these dates)</i>

REPORT

WARRINGTON
Borough Council



Report to: Schools Forum

Item: 3

Date: 2 March 2017

For: Information

Title: Early Years SEND

Author: Angela Conway

Presenter: Angela Conway

1. REPORT PURPOSE

Purpose of the report is to provide Schools Forum with an update on progress with the Portage Service; Early Years Graduated approach and SEND Support Plus and supporting vulnerable two year olds project in Warrington. The report will look at outcomes and associated spend in relation to the three project areas.

2. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The extended free childcare entitlement for working parents of three- and four-year-olds will provide eligible parents with a total of 30 hours of free childcare per week, over 38 weeks or the equivalent number of hours across more weeks per year. Additional free childcare will help families by reducing the cost of childcare and will support parents into work or to work more hours, should they wish to do so. This is in addition to the existing 15 hours of free early education, which is available to all three- and four-year-olds and eligible two-year-olds. For children with multiple complex needs this offer will mean that they will potentially be in nursery education for longer and therefore will need support for longer, which has some financial implications. The Portage Service, Support Plus and Supporting vulnerable two year olds are projects that support all sectors; private; voluntary; childminding and schools in meeting the needs of these children as soon they are identified.

3. Early Years SEND Projects

3.1 Portage

The Portage Service has operated in Warrington now for 12 months. This service is managed by a Senior Portage Worker and they employ two FTE Portage Workers (4 x part time workers). Each part time worker has a case load of between 6 and 8 families and the team are currently managing 29 families. The Portage Service offers intensive support for families with

children with multiple complex needs. Children who access the Warrington Portage Service typically have a developmental delay in two or more developmental/skill areas of between 12 – 18+ months or a recognised disability/diagnosis where significant development delay is likely to feature. The Warrington Portage model requires the worker to work with the family and respond flexibly to the needs of the child and family when providing support; which includes weekly or fortnightly visits, observation at nursery, contacting health professionals and signposting to other support networks in the context of a holistic Early Help offer. The Portage worker will work with the family for a minimum of 8 weeks and during this time they will assess the learning needs of the child. Following this they will host a multiagency Portage planning meeting to establish an action plan. In most case children access the Warrington Portage service until a full transition into a universal service has been established. The Portage Worker will support the parent to take a lead role in identifying what is important to them and their child and plan goals for learning and participation. This is done through setting very small steps appropriate to the child's ability and supporting the family unit in becoming confident to participate in universal services, including mainstream nursery or school provision. In a very short time the service has helped 40 families in total and supported many of them into a Nursery or School setting. To date the team have secured training for the Early Years sector in Basic Portage Awareness and over 90 practitioners have been trained locally. Our Senior Portage worker is now qualified to deliver Basic Portage Awareness training; meaning that the service can sustain any future staff changes and can contribute to income generation by charging for future training. In table 3, section 4 the Portage spend will allow to continue to pay for 2 FTE workers until September 2021

3.2 SEND Support Plus

All nursery settings and schools in Warrington follow a graduated approach with the children in their care. Each child is tracked through nursery to monitor if they are meeting their developmental milestones. For children identified as special educational needs and or disabled, practitioners will put strategies in place to support these children. If the children are still not managing in the setting then all Local Authorities are required to have an Early Years Inclusion Fund to support these children. In Warrington this is called SEND Support Plus funding, which has clear criteria and a panel that meets monthly to allocated the funding to individual children. The funding allocation currently is £60,000 from Core Budget. An additional £50,000 was allocated in 2016/17 as the budget is overspent. The projected spend for 2016/17 is £80,000 leaving a underspend of £30,000. In table 3, section 4 this underspend along with £50,000 from DSG plus the £60,000 from Core Budget is allocated for 2017/18 and then for 3 financial years following. This increase in budget is required to meet the increased demand that is expected when most working parents of 3 and 4 year olds will receive an additional 15 hours free childcare from September 2017. Table 1 details the number of children that are currently being supported @ September 2016.

Table 1

September 2016	Numbers School start 2017	Numbers School start 2018	Additional notes
Number of children currently supported through inclusion fund (Support Plus).	70	14	Total 84
Number of children in receipt of support plus undergoing an EHC assessment.	28	5	These are children where an EHC has been submitted. There are others awaiting EP reports that will then be followed up with an EHC assessment.

3.3 Vulnerable Two Year Olds

In Warrington approximately 40% of 2 year olds receive a free nursery place based on a set of financial characteristics of the family. In addition a multi-agency panel meet termly to allocate places to 2 year olds who are referred into the Early Help Division due to the wider needs of the family and or child. These children do not qualify for a place based on the national criteria, however present with more complex needs and benefit significantly from accessing a free nursery place. In table 3, section 4 the allocation will allow for the next 4 years to support an additional 30 children per year at the financial rate per hour.

2017/18 £4.89 hourly rate x 15 hours per week x 38 weeks per year x 30 children = £ 83,612

2018/19 onwards £5.00 hourly rate x 15 hours per week x 38 weeks per year x 30 children = £ 85,500

4. Finance

The Dedicated Schools Grant, Early Years Blocks allows Local Authorities to retain 7% in 2017/18 and 5% in all financial years following. At the Schools Forum meeting on 10 January 2017 it was agreed that Warrington would retain the following amounts for the purpose of Early Years SEND.

Table 2

2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	TOTAL
£143,482	£225,541	£168,932	£168,932	£706,886

Table 3

	SEND Support Plus	Vulnerable 2 year olds	Portage	
Estimated C/F 2016/17	£30,000	£0	£92,943	
DSG Allocation 2017/18	£50,000	£83,612	£41,050	
DSG Allocation 2018/19	£50,000	£85,500	£41,050	
DSG Allocation 2019/20	£50,000	£85,671	£41,050	
DSG Allocation 2020/21	£50,000	£85,671	£41,050	
Total	£230,000	£340,454	£257,143	
Total DSG only	£200,000	£340,454	£164,200	£704,654

Table 2 details the amounts of funding that will be retained over a 4 year period.

Table 3 details how much will be allocated over that period to the three

project area discussed in this report.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1** For Schools Forum to note the report
- 5.2** For Schools Forum to agree the spend across the three project areas over a 4 year period

REPORT

WARRINGTON
Borough Council



Report to: Schools Forum

Item: 4

Date: 2nd March 2017

For: Information

Title: School Budgets Update 2017/18

Author: Garry Bradbury

Presenter: Garry Bradbury

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In the report “**DSG Budget Update 2017/18**”, discussed at the Schools Forum of 10th January 2017, proposals were tabled around how next year’s Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) would be allocated in its entirety to schools, forming their budget allocations for financial year 2017/18 i.e. the composition of the local funding formula for 2017/18.
- 1.2 The particulars of the formula proposal were discussed, and some modest amendments were recommended (see sections 2.1 & 2.2). These changes were incorporated into the formula model submitted to Education Funding Agency for approval in late January. At the time of writing, official ratification has not been received, but the submission was compliant with national financial regulations in all respects, so we do not anticipate this delay to be a stumbling block in any way.
- 1.3 EFA directs that the mainstream formula supported by Schools Block be approved prior to implementation, and a submission deadline of 20th January made it necessary to discuss this proposal in the previous meeting. However, Schools Block does not fund the full budget allocation to schools – ‘Element 3’ top-ups for mainstream students with SEN, and funding for Designated Provision students are both supported by the High Needs Block, and funding of nursery classes in mainstream primary schools is supported by the Early Years Block. The last Forum meeting discussed proposals which affected both of these Blocks, and these will inform subsequent school allocations.
- 1.4 Consequently, because Schools Forum recommended amendments to the mainstream formula, and similarly made recommendations affecting the other Blocks, the proposed illustrative funding schedule (Appendix 1 of the previous report) tabled requires revision and completion. The Appendix to this report constitutes the full initial delegated revenue budgets for individual mainstream Warrington schools for the period April 2017 to March 2018.

2. MAINSTREAM FORMULA CHANGES FOR 2017/18 POST-FORUM

- 2.1 Because of the likely requirement for per-pupil allocations in secondary phases to be reprofiled after implementation of the proposed National Formula, it was agreed that funding would be transferred from KS3 per pupil allocations into KS4. The original proposal suggested per-pupil funding of £75 be added to KS4 pupil funding, and withdrawn from KS3. However, because of the relative proportions of Key Stages, with KS4 numbers currently around 2/3rds of those in KS4, this required additional amendments within other areas of the formula. Forum recommended instead that while £75 was agreed to be added to KS4 per pupil values, we should take only what would be required from KS3 values, rather than necessitate recalculation of other formula factors to compensate. Subsequent modelling has revealed that a reduction in KS3 per pupil funding of £47.42 satisfies this requirement, and this revision was included in the formula submission.
- 2.2 Detailed discussion of how to underwrite the anticipated overspends on High Needs Block in both 2016/17 and 2017/18 generated two agreed proposals with implications for individual school budgets:
- i) Agreement that low-cost SEN allocations within the main school formula be used to fund up to 15 hours of Teaching Assistant time (or equivalent). This will have the consequence of reducing individual Element 3 top-ups by *up to* £1,500.
 - ii) In recognition of proportionality of sectors' contributions to the overspend, the secondary schools agreed to a general budget topslice of approximately £51k, in addition to the unspent 2016/17 SEN contingency contribution of £57,187. This is achieved by a per-pupil reduction of £4.43.
- 2.3 Additionally, Schools Forum agreed the multi-year proposals regarding Early Years hourly funding rates; consequently 2017/18 nursery classes will be funded at a rate of £4.28/hour.

3. SCHOOL BUDGETS 2017/18

- 3.1 Complete, individual school budgets are shown in the **Appendix**. As is usual, it is intended to provide for schools a comprehensive funding pack detailing individual funding factors and the underlying principles of allocation, as well as greater context regarding the overall Warrington funding settlement. However, a national requirement that school budgets be notified by end-February makes it necessary to reveal these figures ahead of the in-depth corroborative detail (with which Forum members will in any case be more than familiar from previous discussions).

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 It is recommended that Schools Forum members representing mainstream schools:

- (i) Note the contents of the report;
- (ii) Communicate the budget figures to their representative sectors

Appendix: Individual School Budgets 2017/18 (April 2017 -March 2018 Financial Year)

CC	Name	Basic Per Pupil	Deprivation	EAL	Low Cost, High Incidence SEN	High Cost, Low Incidence SEN	Lump Sum	Designated Provision	Rates	Early Years	TOTAL	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Revised TOTAL	De-delegation	Free School Meals	Budget after ALL withdrawals	Notional SEN (within base budget)
		£2,822.36	£3,210.60	£370.45	£139.94	-	£156,677	-	-	-							
35001	Bewsey Lodge	680,189	185,223	9,507	20,178	12,715	156,677	271,698	30,720	101,577	1,468,483	96,976	1,565,459	17,952	20,371	1,527,136	£177,455 11.34%
35002	Dallam	530,604	216,382	9,949	16,509	21,050	156,677	408,824	15,960	93,150	1,469,105	12,930	1,482,035	15,001	23,798	1,443,236	£178,236 12.03%
	Evelyn Street	654,788	176,583	6,400	14,632	497	156,677	0	3,096	59,342	1,072,016	87,809	1,159,825		19,421	1,140,404	£165,064 14.23%
35004	Meadowside	606,807	204,417	4,337	16,044	32,204	156,677	271,698	17,040	71,596	1,380,820	112,229	1,493,049	16,504	22,482	1,454,063	£176,381 11.81%
35005	Oakwood Avenue	1,538,187	418,088	5,951	35,667	17,328	156,677	301,170	7,728	161,305	2,642,100	0	2,642,100	34,882	45,981	2,561,237	£373,016 14.12%
35006	St Elphin's	1,086,609	186,215	15,798	16,364	14,477	156,677	0	9,120	112,769	1,598,029	0	1,598,029	25,972	20,480	1,551,578	£205,877 12.88%
35007	St Andrew's	539,071	189,425	2,184	14,832	0	156,677	0	2,400	0	904,589	8,514	913,103	15,168	20,833	877,103	£162,163 17.76%
35008	St Ann's	558,828	125,213	6,588	16,859	29,958	156,677	0	2,808	91,143	988,074	59,707	1,047,781	15,558	13,771	1,018,452	£134,446 12.83%
35009	St Barnabas'	558,828	147,687	9,114	14,586	4,500	156,677	0	2,904	76,116	970,412	0	970,412	15,558	16,243	938,612	£143,915 14.83%
35010	St Margaret's	1,213,614	240,796	4,736	27,659	12,986	156,677	0	9,408	134,580	1,800,456	0	1,800,456	28,478	26,483	1,745,496	£251,776 13.98%
35011	Our Lady's	539,071	89,897	7,626	12,128	19,310	156,677	0	2,808	63,704	891,221	0	891,221	15,168	9,887	866,166	£110,783 12.43%
35012	Sacred Heart	561,649	83,476	16,429	10,018	4,500	156,677	0	3,024	0	835,773	0	835,773	15,613	9,181	810,979	£108,916 13.03%
35013	St Alban's	533,427	51,369	20,874	14,483	6,976	156,677	0	3,384	65,728	852,918	0	852,918	15,056	5,650	832,212	£96,100 11.27%
35014	St Augustine's	414,887	128,424	10,720	9,381	2,495	156,677	0	2,448	34,112	759,144	12,337	771,481	12,717	14,124	744,639	£118,605 15.37%
35015	St Benedict's	581,406	64,212	8,238	13,648	0	156,677	0	4,152	89,336	917,670	0	917,670	16,003	7,062	894,605	£102,758 11.20%
35016	St Stephen's	589,873	99,528	9,516	10,008	7,500	156,677	0	2,568	0	875,670	18,993	894,663	16,170	10,946	867,547	£117,666 13.15%
35017	Appleton Thorn	572,939	6,421	845	7,015	25,069	156,677	0	17,880	0	786,846	0	786,846	15,836	706	770,304	£65,116 8.28%
35018	The Cobbs Infants	745,104	41,738	556	8,233	18,621	156,677	0	25,200	198,305	1,194,434	0	1,194,434	19,233	4,590	1,170,610	£96,847 8.11%
35019	Broomfields Junior	1,035,807	64,212	1,111	10,551	3,000	156,677	0	26,880	0	1,298,239	0	1,298,239	24,969	7,062	1,266,207	£132,316 10.19%
35020	St Monica's	567,295	28,895	856	6,675	31,898	156,677	0	2,448	0	794,744	0	794,744	15,725	3,178	775,841	£75,591 9.51%
35021	St Wilfrid's	1,174,102	6,421	3,896	10,054	20,908	156,677	0	6,000	0	1,378,058	0	1,378,058	27,698	706	1,349,654	£113,852 8.26%
35022	Bradshaw	561,649	28,895	436	8,026	7,328	156,677	0	13,680	0	776,691	0	776,691	15,613	3,178	757,900	£76,435 9.84%
35023	St Thomas'	589,873	44,948	3,028	5,860	14,528	156,677	0	4,176	51,090	870,181	0	870,181	16,170	4,943	849,067	£84,931 9.76%
35024	Stockton Heath	1,069,675	35,317	4,388	12,981	33,711	156,677	0	38,640	0	1,351,388	0	1,351,388	25,637	3,884	1,321,867	£123,494 9.14%
35025	Stretton St Matthew's	572,939	6,421	435	5,332	0	156,677	0	3,408	0	745,212	0	745,212	15,836	706	728,669	£63,500 8.50%
35026	The Wall Juniors	457,222	32,106	0	4,812	6,199	156,677	0	12,000	0	669,015	0	669,015	13,553	3,531	651,932	£66,907 10.00%
35027	The Wall Infants	349,972	22,474	0	4,613	10,000	156,677	0	11,760	0	555,496	0	555,496	11,437	2,472	541,588	£53,849 9.69%
35028	Statham	541,894	35,317	3,018	5,641	7,232	156,677	0	14,160	0	763,938	0	763,938	15,223	3,884	744,830	£76,296 9.99%
35029	Cherry Tree	601,163	35,317	862	7,740	19,065	156,677	0	17,160	0	837,984	0	837,984	16,393	3,884	817,707	£82,409 9.83%
35030	Ravenbank	1,154,345	73,844	3,030	11,183	32,456	156,677	0	27,360	0	1,458,895	0	1,458,895	27,308	8,121	1,423,466	£147,038 10.08%
35031	Oughtlington	1,182,569	28,895	431	8,494	30,705	156,677	0	29,040	0	1,436,811	0	1,436,811	27,865	3,178	1,405,768	£123,471 8.59%
35032	Glazebury	262,479	25,685	436	2,677	0	156,677	0	2,400	43,913	494,267	511	494,778	9,710	2,825	482,243	£47,043 9.51%
35033	Culcheth	601,163	64,212	1,360	9,043	13,581	156,677	0	13,920	0	859,957	0	859,957	16,393	7,062	836,502	£98,259 11.43%
35034	Newchurch	595,517	25,685	1,296	5,895	4,500	156,677	0	14,400	0	803,970	0	803,970	16,282	2,825	784,864	£75,411 9.38%
35035	Twiss Green	595,517	25,685	1,281	4,265	3,000	156,677	0	17,400	0	803,826	0	803,826	16,282	2,825	784,719	£73,778 9.18%
35036	St Paul of the Cross	488,269	57,791	1,290	8,526	4,500	156,677	0	3,216	0	720,270	0	720,270	14,165	6,356	699,748	£86,051 11.95%
35037	Burtonwood	572,939	64,212	0	10,249	1,492	156,677	0	15,840	0	821,409	0	821,409	15,836	7,062	798,511	£97,076 11.82%
35038	Christ Church	894,689	138,056	1,305	13,308	14,229	156,677	0	4,944	89,555	1,312,762	0	1,312,762	22,185	15,183	1,275,394	£161,450 12.30%
35039	St Oswald's	598,340	19,264	3,452	7,824	6,217	156,677	0	3,216	0	794,990	0	794,990	16,337	2,119	776,534	£74,773 9.41%
35040	Brook Acre	626,564	308,217	4,712	15,782	7,637	156,677	0	18,960	94,982	1,233,531	0	1,233,531	16,894	33,898	1,182,739	£229,576 18.61%
35042	St Bridget's	609,630	150,899	10,325	16,456	4,500	156,677	0	3,720	0	952,207	0	952,207	16,560	16,596	919,051	£151,444 15.90%
35043	St Lewis'	558,828	48,159	1,257	6,374	8,968	156,677	0	2,520	0	782,783	0	782,783	15,558	5,297	761,929	£84,368 10.78%
35044	Croft	592,696	38,528	0	7,470	6,000	156,677	0	16,680	0	818,050	0	818,050	16,226	4,237	797,587	£82,937 10.14%
35045	Locking Stumps	956,781	122,002	6,021	14,606	11,187	156,677	0	24,960	0	1,292,234	0	1,292,234	23,410	13,418	1,255,406	£160,321 12.41%
	Penketh	581,406	22,474	867	8,906	8,495	156,677	0	3,192	0	782,017	0	782,017		2,472	779,546	£75,673 9.68%
35047	St Joseph's	843,885	9,631	1,259	8,553	10,468	156,677	0	3,336	0	1,033,809	0	1,033,809	21,182	1,059	1,011,567	£88,662 8.58%
35048	St Vincent's	702,767	35,317	1,655	6,933	0	156,677	0	4,320	0	907,669	0	907,669	18,398	3,884	885,387	£89,381 9.85%
35049	Penketh South	491,090	22,474	416	7,506	11,055	156,677	0	17,520	75,170	781,908	3,089	784,997	14,221	2,472	768,304	£67,408 8.59%
35050	St Peter's	606,807	0	0	5,752	15,500	156,677	0	3,288	0	788,024	2,827	790,851	16,504	0	774,347	£63,013 7.97%
35051	Woolston CP	643,498	74,442	3,280	10,477	908	156,677	139,368	29,040	0	1,057,690	0	1,057,690	17,228	8,187	1,032,275	£108,367 10.25%
35052	Woolston CE	601,163	12,843	1,286	9,552	9,977	156,677	0	3,552	0	795,050	0	795,050	16,393	1,412	777,245	£73,068 9.19%
35053	Great Sankey	880,576	48,159	2,588	8,629	15,000	156,677	0	40,560	102,810	1,254,998	0	1,254,998	21,906	5,297	1,227,795	£111,019 8.85%
35054	Chapel Ford Village	1,445,048	109,161	4,909	19,041	41,500	156,677	0	48,960	0	1,825,296	0	1,825,296	33,044	12,005	1,780,247	£194,733 10.67%
35055	Park Road	584,229	22,474	1,733	7,981	8,617	156,677	0	14,400	0	796,111	0	796,111	16,059	2,472	777,580	£75,133 9.44%
35056	Barrow Hall	1,569,232	35,317	1,326	18,346	15,676	156,677	0	30,720	0	1,827,294	0	1,827,294	35,495	3,884	1,787,915	£165,713 9.07%
35057	Sankey Valley St James'	570,116	93,107	7,831	11,638	25,000	156,677	0	4,248	84,500	953,118	86,501	1,039,619	15,780	10,240	1,013,599	£114,268 10.99%
35058	Hollinfare St Helen's	389,486	22,474	433	7,888	0	156,677	0	2,664	0	579,623	0	579,623	12,216	2,472	564,935	£60,174 10.38%
35059	Winwick	524,958	32,106	1,723	4,331	11,828	156,677	0	3,672	0	735,294	0	735,294	14,889	3,531	716,874	£71,851 9.77%
35060	Birchwood	527,781	173,373	6,024	10,985	8,903	156,677	0	3,660	67,487	954,890	14,042	968,932	14,945	19,067	934,920	£150,211 15.50%
35061	Gorse Covert	863,642	12,843	6,515	7,860	10,332	156,677	0	31,200	0	1,089,069	0	1,089,069	21,572	1,412	1,066,084	£92,108 8.46%

Appendix: Individual School Budgets 2017/18 (April 2017 -March 2018 Financial Year)

CC	Name	Basic Per Pupil	Deprivation	EAL	Low Cost, High Incidence SEN	High Cost, Low Incidence SEN	Lump Sum	Designated Provision	Rates	Early Years	TOTAL	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Revised TOTAL	De-delegation	Free School Meals	Budget after ALL withdrawals	Notional SEN (within base budget)	
		£2,822.36	£3,210.60	£370.45			£156,677											
35062	Cinnamon Brow	863,642	165,826	2,123	17,422	25,997	156,677	130,088	6,048	94,271	1,462,094	0	1,462,094	21,572	18,238	1,422,285	£177,284	12.13%
35063	Old Hall	1,162,812	48,159	12,141	12,386	10,000	156,677	0	31,680	0	1,433,855	0	1,433,855	27,475	5,297	1,401,083	£137,855	9.61%
35064	Callands	883,399	67,423	7,730	14,939	9,334	156,677	0	26,400	0	1,165,902	0	1,165,902	21,962	7,415	1,136,525	£128,202	11.00%
35065	St Philip's	1,318,043	44,948	3,443	11,704	19,587	156,677	0	6,960	0	1,561,362	0	1,561,362	30,538	4,943	1,525,880	£145,471	9.32%
35066	Grappenhall Heys	592,696	6,421	2,149	5,537	16,490	156,677	0	28,080	52,289	860,338	0	860,338	16,226	706	843,406	£65,380	7.60%
35067	Latchford St James'	527,781	112,371	7,501	12,411	9,000	156,677	0	3,240	73,577	902,559	0	902,559	14,945	12,359	875,255	£121,431	13.45%
35068	Alderman Bolton	801,550	282,532	11,005	23,174	11,653	156,677	0	15,773	104,997	1,407,362	0	1,407,362	20,347	31,073	1,355,942	£238,509	16.95%
	Bruche	584,229	22,474	1,743	10,044	7,022	156,677	0	3,168	58,426	843,783	20,800	864,583		2,472	862,111	£77,198	8.93%
35070	Beamont	1,097,899	298,586	17,467	26,768	40,322	156,677	0	29,520	124,634	1,791,872	0	1,791,872	26,194	32,838	1,732,839	£273,647	15.27%
		49,975,531	5,961,487	310,740	791,446	875,691	10,810,713	1,522,846	906,737	2,470,463	73,625,653	537,265	74,162,918	1,249,225	655,641	72,258,052	£8,393,305	11.32%

CC	Name	Per Pupil*	Deprivation	EAL	Low Cost, High Incidence SEN	High Cost, Low Incidence SEN	Lump Sum	Designated Provision	Rates	Split Site	TOTAL	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Revised TOTAL	De-delegation	Net of Dedelegation	Notional SEN (within base budget)	
		£4,259.30	£3,023.58	£992.75	£782.75		£136,762										
35103	Culcheth	4,611,138	223,745	993	117,152	9,958	136,762	0	210,000		5,309,747	0	5,309,747	35,957	5,273,791	459,780	8.66%
	Penketh	4,057,876	457,006	6,872	146,722	25,648	136,762	182,076	19,392		5,032,353	0	5,032,353		5,032,353	579,493	11.52%
	King's Academy	2,075,836	84,661	2,978	50,425	4,500	136,762	0	3,264		2,358,425	0	2,358,425		2,358,425	197,143	8.36%
	Great Sankey	6,242,261	139,084	3,979	176,534	62,721	136,762	0	46,800		6,808,140	0	6,808,140		6,808,140	558,985	8.21%
35107	St Gregory's	3,674,225	196,017	20,501	121,480	36,632	136,762	304,528	21,120		4,511,263	0	4,511,263	28,920	4,482,344	407,300	9.03%
	University Academy Warrington	1,646,300	322,835	15,418	93,472	34,392	136,762	182,076	13,920		2,445,175	0	2,445,175		2,445,175	340,288	13.92%
	Birchwood	3,686,816	338,641	8,935	153,268	13,113	136,762	0	30,240		4,367,775	0	4,367,775		4,367,775	508,716	11.65%
	Bridgewater	6,157,093	187,704	2,935	130,986	37,679	136,762	304,528	28,320	297,000	7,283,007	0	7,283,007		7,283,007	533,280	7.32%
35115	Sir Thomas Boteler	2,181,632	307,425	4,853	104,339	30,588	136,762	182,076	15,648		2,963,322	0	2,963,322	17,729	2,945,594	368,104	12.42%
	Beamont Collegiate Academy	3,335,899	523,079	20,848	185,054	39,137	136,762	0	21,696		4,262,474	0	4,262,474		4,262,474	617,558	14.49%
35121	Cardinal Newman	3,202,391	260,028	17,916	115,086	34,781	136,762	0	15,936		3,782,898	0	3,782,898	25,448	3,757,451	408,802	10.81%
	Future Tech Studio	626,117	39,307	0	30,410	0	136,762	0	6,192		838,787	38,821	877,608		877,608	81,369	9.27%
	UTC	674,389	67,023	1,569	38,331	0	136,762	0	0		918,072	0	918,072		918,072	105,875	11.53%
	Lymm	6,112,846	232,815	7,942	136,607	22,108	136,762	0	41,520		6,690,599	0	6,690,599		6,690,599	560,245	8.37%
		48,284,819	3,379,369	115,737	1,599,864	351,257	1,914,661	1,155,284	474,048	297,000	57,572,040	38,821	57,610,861	108,052	57,502,808	5,726,937	9.94%

* KS4 value

Schools National Funding Formula Consultation Stage 2

(Closing Date 22nd March 2017)

Overall Approach

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

Yes

No

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

We were disappointed to see that while the illustrative figures, based on 2016/2017 data, suggested a small overall improvement in Warrington's funding base, this in fact masked the fact that the majority of our schools would actually lose funding. Worse, applying the latest 2017/2018 data a greater number still of Warrington schools would lose funding; indeed Warrington as a whole will move from being a modest beneficiary to losing nearly £250,000 of funding.

There are key elements of the government's proposals that we would like to challenge, namely:

1. **Weakness of evidence for proposals and continued use of averages**
2. **The proportion of weighting given to Additional Needs rather than basic entitlement, particularly in view of point 4**
3. **The 3% funding floor, and also a widely varying Area Cost Adjustment, which both individually, and in combination, act to perpetuate historical differences**
4. **Quantum and spending cuts**

These are dealt with in the following sections.

Weakness of evidence for proposals and continued use of averages

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

It is disappointing to see the continued use of averages, which reflect what LAs can currently afford to do, rather than a needs-based model which can evidence that the proposed funding levels are sufficient to cover the required costs of operating schools of different sizes and levels of needs wherever they are in the country. This is not a challenge to the status quo, merely reflective of it.

As part of the ongoing strategic approach to schools funding we would urge the DfE to undertake to analyse and assess activity-led funding to be factored into the funding formula rates prior to the implementation of the hard formula in 2019-20. We would urge the DfE to again consider each element of that model to ascertain the true cost of operating a school to ensure the proposed funding rates are sufficient.

Without the underlying understanding as to what the government is funding it is difficult to understand the rationale for the basic entitlement compared to the additional needs. The

proposals state that there has been a deliberate movement of funding into additional needs, partly to support those “Just About Managing” families, but we don’t consider that the additional needs indicators do support those families and therefore by reducing the basic element of funding this will end up having the opposite effect to that intended.

The proportion of weighting given to AEN (Additional Educational Needs) rather than basic entitlement

Our initial reaction is that too much funding is directed towards deprivation and that when Pupil Premium is also taken into account this could be considered as double funding, especially as the Ever6 Free School Meal indicator will be used in both. Clarity is required between the differences as to what the deprivation funding in the main funding formula and pupil premium are supposed to support.

The 3% funding floor, and ACA, which lock in historical differences

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

However, the proposed 3% funding floor “locks” in some of the historical differences for those schools which have been better funded for several decades. Equally the cost of this protection limits the redistributive impact and will result in the continuation of different funding levels for pupils across the country. Stability for schools in funding is important, but not at the expense of never reaching a fair formula and outcome. The end result of these proposals will simply not reflect the original intention – the funding of similar students on the same basis, irrespective of location.

The proposed Area Cost Adjustment, applied to all formula factors indiscriminately, significantly skews the actual funding levels at Authority level, and is as culpable as the unsatisfactory floor protection in ensuring that the most generously funded regions will continue to enjoy their comparative advantage. We also question the logic of using a different indicator to that employed in the other NFF consultations.

Quantum and spending cuts

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

The removal of the Education Services Grant (ESG) will have an impact on schools. Academies will have costs which were supported by the ESG which they will need to fund from their General Annual Grant and local authority cuts are likely to lead to additional charges to maintained schools.

We understand that the DfE believes that £1 billion worth more cuts are available within the system, but where is the evidence?

Equally the level of revenue funding defines the number of teachers (and therefore the number of pupils per teacher) and education support staff and pastoral care staff and

leaders within the school. The additional needs funding should separately add further staff or therapists to the core staff within the school. Without understanding what is being purchased you cannot say that there is room for cuts. Merely believing does not make it so, no matter how much you would like to think it can. Efficiency and an understanding about what it is that is being purchased must work hand in hand.

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

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

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

Yes

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

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

None of the above

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

We recognise the need for a differential in funding between primary and secondary schools (as we currently have in our own formula) but comparison to an arbitrary ratio is an artificial concept. We do not believe that a simply averaging national funding proportions can represent a true estimation of cost differentials – it is simply reflecting what authorities can already afford. Engineering this ratio will cause significant redistributive consequences to authorities either side of this arbitrary figure. In Warrington, just over £1 million will need be transferred, on no sound evidentiary basis.

The amounts and relative weightings need to be evidence based with reference to actual costs and factors such as:

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

When this has been calculated the ratio will be what it is, and we will support it.

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

We are proposing to maximise the amount of funding allocated to factors that relate directly to pupils and their characteristics, compared to the factors that relate to

schools' characteristics. We propose to do this by reducing the lump sum compared to the current national average (see question 7 on the lump sum value).

Yes

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

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

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

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

We record an in principle agreement. But we question that the proposals achieve this - see also the answer to Q7.

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

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

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

Pupil-Led Factors

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

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

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

The formula will recognise educational disadvantage in its widest sense, including those who are not eligible for the pupil premium but whose families may be only just about managing. It increases the total spent on additional needs factors compared to the funding explicitly directed through these factors in the current system.

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

Yes

No – allocate a greater proportion to additional needs

No – allocate a lower proportion to additional needs

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

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

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

Warrington has previously evaluated IDACI and considers it an unsafe proxy of deprivation, to the extent that we have avoided its use in our local formula – we can therefore hardly recommend it be used nationally. Frequency of update of these data is also a concern.

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

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

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

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

Allocate a lower proportion

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

See answer to Q4 above.

We are supportive of the f40 funding model, which recommended that total deprivation should all be funded via pupil-based indicators – we prefer to avoid an area-based deprivation amount, particularly IDACI, as we do not believe this model works well.

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

Parents with children in infant year groups do not always apply for free school meals

because of the universal infant free meal entitlement. Schools with these year groups (which are the building blocks for a child's future education path) are being underfunded for their pupil needs as a result and to allocate more funding via this route will make that unfairness worse. As a minimum, we believe that the DfE should be developing methods of removing the need for parents to need to apply for free school meals and this should now be an automatic entitlement for all that are eligible.

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

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

Allocate a lower proportion

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

See answer to Q4 above. We do not believe that there should be any element of area based deprivation. And particularly not IDACI.

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

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

Allocate a lower proportion

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

See answer to Q4 above. We have concerns about the reliability and consistency of data being used to determine funding allocations under the current system in this area. National changes in assessments have resulted in data volatility which seriously undermines confidence when using to allocate funding. Warrington primary sector has, after much consideration, spurned use of the LPA factor purely because of the deeply unsatisfactory nature of the proxy indicator available to use.

We suggest there is scope here for a scaled approach.

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

Allocate a higher proportion

The proportion is about right

Allocate a lower proportion

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

See answer to Q4 above.

We have 0.7% in our current model, so think this is probably a little high, but 1.2% is

acceptable.

The weightings are a proportion of the total schools budget.

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

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

We have no comment on mobility as this is not a serious issue for Warrington.

School-Led Factors

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

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

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

Primary

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

Secondary

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

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

See also the answer to Q3.

We are unconvinced that the lump sum should be obliged to be the same in each sector, but certainly believe it should be higher than in the proposal. The funding level suggested is

significantly below the current national average, and to ignore this fact is contradictory to other proposals in the consultation. We are not greatly taken with the use of averaging as a basis of funding, as we have indicated elsewhere, but we support even less an allocation based on nothing more than a desire to starve schools of basic funding. To suggest that this could be tool to deliver administrative and operational savings is unproven and further reduces the funding available to schools for its basic operational needs (unacceptable in a period of such financial pressures). We also feel strongly it is inappropriate that a funding mechanism should be so shamelessly used in service of DfE strategy.

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

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

Primary

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

Secondary

Allocate a higher amount

This is about the right amount

Allocate a lower amount

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

Not Applicable to Warrington – no response

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

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

The use of lagged pupil growth data appears to be a reasonable interim approach to funding growth. However, we would support a fundamental review of how growth in existing schools and new schools is funded. As we move towards a national funding formula there needs to

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

Funding Floor

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

We are concerned that this would artificially inflate the funding of new/growing schools.

Transition

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

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

Yes

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

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

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

The continuing -1.5% per pupil MFG provides sufficient protection to schools on an ongoing basis.

Further Considerations

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

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

Education Services Grant (ESG)

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

Area Cost Adjustment

We would appreciate greater explanation of the proposals use of the hybrid methodology – inconsistent with the ACA used in the High Needs and Early Years consultations. We are concerned that this is delivering too wide a geographical variation and that this is a major factor in insuring there is little meaningful redistribution in funding nationally, especially when taken in conjunction with the 3% funding floor.

Movement between blocks

By ringfencing the Schools Block, the High Needs Block (HNB) becomes very exposed. In the past there was discretion to move funding between the blocks with the agreement of the Schools Forum, especially where the behaviours of some schools were not very inclusive. F40 has been highlighting this point to the DfE for some time now. When the High Needs Block becomes stand-alone the only method available for LAs will be to reduce funding for top-ups for mainstream schools, resource provision, special schools and alternative provision - in other word cut funding to the pupils that need it the most. The majority of pupils in schools without SEN will be protected by the Schools Block ringfence: the majority of pupils that need extra help will get a cut-price service. The answer to this is either to increase the funding into the HNB to ensure that it is adequate for pupils that need the most help (which it currently isn't, nor is it planned to be), or to enable schools via their Schools Forum to allow movement between Schools and High Needs.

Schools Forum and Local Expertise

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

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

Capacity of EfA to consider local issues

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

process. This is the type of work the EFA will need to look at in future and we doubt that they have the capacity or local understanding to do this type of work).

Review Mechanism

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

Auto-registration for free school meals

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

*** Subsequent questions are design for LA responses ***

Central School Services Block (Pages 66-72)

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

Yes

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

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

No - there should not be a deprivation factor

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

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

Equalities Analysis

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