

**Schools Forum**  
**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

Wednesday 11 December 2019 at 6.00 pm,  
**Dining Room 2 - The Village School, Grove Park,**  
**NW9 0JY**

Item 6      **Funding Formula Consultation**

1 - 32

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p><b>Brent</b></p>	<p><b>Schools Forum</b> 11 December 2019</p> <hr/> <p><b>Report from the Strategic Director of Children and Young People</b></p>
<p><b>SCHOOLS BLOCK – CONSULTATION ON 2020/21 LOCAL FUNDING FORMULA FOR MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS</b></p>	

<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All
<b>Key or Non-Key Decision:</b>	N/A
<b>Open or Part/Fully Exempt:</b> (If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)	N/A
<b>No. of Appendices:</b>	2
<b>Background Papers:</b>	
<b>Contact Officer(s):</b> (Name, Title, Contact Details)	Andrew Ward, Head of Finance – CYP, 0208 937 6462 Dena Aly, Senior Finance Analyst – CYP, 0208 937 2179

## 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1. This report provides Schools Forum with responses to the consultation on local arrangements for the 2020/21 Funding Formula for mainstream schools (appendix 1), and seeks views from Schools Forum on how to proceed with setting the Schools Block budget for 2020/21.

## 2. Recommendations

2.1. Schools Forum is asked to note the consultation responses provided in appendix 2 and summarised in this covering report.

2.2. Schools Forum is asked to support the proposed model of funding and allocation of the additional estimated £3.5 million Schools Block expected for 2020/2021 to enable officers to prepare a Schools Block budget paper for the January Schools Forum:

- 2.2.1. £1.355M to be allocated to the Pupil Growth budget to support rising rolls – principally demographic rise in Secondary pupil numbers
- 2.2.2. £1.645M to be allocated to Primary schools via the proposed mobility funding factor and via the increased pupil funding rates
- 2.2.3. £0.500M to be allocated to Secondary schools via the proposed mobility funding factor and via the increased pupil funding rates.

### 3. Summary

- 3.1. Schools Forum on the 6th November 2019 received information on proposed funding arrangements for the 2020/21 financial year, including the provisional DSG block funding allocations.
- 3.2. The provisional funding allocations announced by the DfE in October indicate that the Schools Block will increase by just under £3.5m, or 1.5%. Under the current arrangements the funding of in-year growth through the rising rolls mechanism would require approx. £1m of additional budget, which would leave the balance to allocate to schools.
- 3.3. The government is still moving towards implementing a full National Funding Formula, but local formulas will remain in place for 2020/21. The main change to the guidance for local funding formula is that a new mobility funding factor has been created and is available for use by Local Authorities to fund schools facing additional costs as a result of having a more mobile pupil population.
- 3.4. Schools Forum on the 6<sup>th</sup> November agreed to consult with all schools about allocating additional funds through the formula and if a mobility funding factor should be included.
- 3.5. The consultation, which is attached to this report, sought schools views on how to balance allocation of the estimated £3.5m additional funds against 3 identified cost pressures:
  - In-year pupil mobility
  - Growth in the numbers of Secondary Pupils
  - General inflationary cost pressures in schools
- 3.6. The consultation was necessarily short given the timings of funding announcements and the budget setting timetable. The consultation received responses from 9 of the 86 schools in Brent, of which 5 were Primary schools and 4 were secondary schools. The full responses are anonymised and are attached to this report as well as being summarised below.
- 3.7. The Education and Skills Funding Agency Schools revenue funding Operational Guidance advises that members of the Schools Forum should take into account consultation responses on local funding formula, but are not obliged to follow majority views from the consultation.

### 4. Consultation responses

- 4.1. The responses to the consultation are provided in appendix 2, and are summarised below for each question in turn.
- 4.2. **Question 1: Do you feel a reasonable balance has been struck between the competing issues and needs in allocating the £3.5 million as per table 2 of this consultation? If not, how would you prefer to rebalance them?**

- 4.3. Of the 9 responses, 5 agreed that the balance outlined in the consultation was reasonable.
- 4.4. There was 1 primary school which wanted more funding allocated to the pupil mobility funding factor.
- 4.5. There was 1 primary school that felt the additional funds should be considered a 'windfall' and used to fund short term pressures. For clarity, officers disagree and consider it most likely that this funding will be recurring in future years, and absorbed into the base line funding.
- 4.6. There were divergent views given from Secondary Schools on the funding made available for growth. One response stated the view that funds should be directed to schools with full pupil rolls. Another response felt that more funding than proposed should be directed to supporting pupil growth.
- 4.7. **Question 2: Given the context of funding constraints and general cost pressures, do the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B provide those schools most affected by pupil mobility with adequate amounts to have an impact?**
- 4.8. Of the 9 responses, 5 indicated that the allocations were too low. The detailed comments made on this are included in appendix 2.
- 4.9. Of the 9 responses, 3 indicated that the respondents thought that the allocations were adequate.
- 4.10. There was 1 response that made no comment on this question.
- 4.11. **Question 3: Considering the funding lag for growing school populations that is inherent in the national system of funding, are you in favour of continuing to move a portion of the Schools Block into a growth fund that supports expanding schools?**
- 4.12. Of the 9 responses, 4 were in favour of continuing to use a growth fund.
- 4.13. Of the 9 responses, 4 can be characterised as not being in favour and seeking alternative use of the funds. The proposed alternatives uses varied.
- 4.14. There was 1 response which suggested central government should fund growth. Officers confirm that this is not currently an option that can be considered in setting the Schools Block budget.
- 4.15. **Question 4: Are the proportional increases to pupil led funding factors a fair method of distributing the increased funding that is available?**
- 4.16. Of the 9 responses, 6 were in favour of allocating the balance of the additional resources to schools using proportional increases to the pupil led funding factors.
- 4.17. Of the responses, 2 did not agree that this is a fair method.
- 4.18. There was 1 response which recognised the inherent tension in the system between allocating against need, and allocating equitable funding per pupil.

## 5. Schools Forum response to the consultation

5.1. It is recommended that Schools Forum support the proposed model and allocation of funding, so that once October pupil census data is released later in December, officers can prepare the 2020/21 Funding Formula and Schools Block budget in time for the January 2020 School Forum.

5.2. If Schools Forum is unable to agree to support this recommendation, the default position will be to prepare a Schools Block budget which maintains the current funding formula and growth funding arrangements.

5.3. The budget setting timetable is given below.

**Table 1 – Budget setting timetable**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
11 Dec 2019	School Forum decides on changes to Funding Formula.
Week commencing 16 Dec 2019	Pupil Census data is released by the DfE, drafting of Funding Formula will commence.
8 Jan 2020	School Forum papers dispatched
15 Jan 2020	Draft Funding Formula and Schools Block budget presented to the Schools Forum for debate and amendment. High level Early Years Block and High Needs Block budgets presented.  Subject to above, Schools Forum recommend the budget to the Council.
21 Jan 2020	Funding Formula to be submitted to DfE for ratification by ESFA.
10 Feb 2020	LB Brent Cabinet Budget meeting
26 Feb 2020	Schools Forum presented with final detail on Early Years and High Needs Block budgets.
February	Maintained schools to be sent funding statements by the 29 February 2020

5.4. All School Forum Members can vote on the Funding Formula, excluding the 16-19 Provider and Trade Union Representatives.

## 6. Financial Implications

6.1. The financial implications have been set out in the consultation document appended to this report.

## **7. Legal Implications**

7.1. There are no legal implications for this report.

## **8. Equality Implications**

8.1. Not applicable.

## **9. Consultation with Ward Members and Stakeholders**

9.1. Not applicable.

## **10. Human Resources/Property Implications (if appropriate)**

10.1. Not applicable.

**Report sign off:**

***Gail Tolley***

Strategic Director of Children and Young People

This page is intentionally left blank

## Consultation on the Brent Mainstream Local Funding Formula 2020/21

### Introduction

This consultation concerns local arrangements for the 2020/21 Funding Formula for mainstream schools. It is being sent to all Headteachers and Chair of Governors of all mainstream schools funded by the Schools Block of the DSG in Brent. It was discussed at Schools Forum on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

There are 4 questions to be answered on the attached Word document. Additional comments can be made here in relation to the issues raised in this consultation.

The consultation will run from 20 November to 29 November 2019. The findings of the consultation will be reported to the next Schools Forum on 11 December 2019. The consultation window and timetable is necessarily short due to the late funding announcements following the spending review, and the legal requirement for the council to set a budget in early 2020.

This consultation is carried out in line with the latest Operational Guidance for funding schools published by the DfE.

The consultation concerns how to change the current funding arrangements to allocate and distribute to schools the estimated £3.5 million additional funding expected for 2020/21.

Financial modelling has been prepared and is included in this consultation to provide an indication of how the proposed changes might affect each school. The modelling has been prepared using October 2018 census pupil numbers and data, and is compared against actual allocations for 2019/20. For simplicity the modelling does not include or show the impact of funding protections (Minimum Funding Guarantee) or any de-delegation arrangements.

For clarity, the modelling **does not** represent estimated school level funding for 2020/21, as this will be calculated from the October 2019 pupil census numbers and data, and this is not yet available.

### Background

On 6 November a report was presented to the Schools Forum on the 2020/21 DSG funding arrangements. It was estimated that the Schools Block of income would increase by approximately £3.5 million when compared to 2019/20.

**Please note, £3.5 million represents an increase of 1.5% to the School Block. Despite the relatively small increase, changing the methodology in the mainstream local Funding Formula requires a consultation with all schools.**

The report highlighted 3 main areas of need that may be deemed to require additional funding;

- Additional pressures felt by schools that experience a greater level of pupil mobility; that is pupils joining and leaving at dates during the academic year. For 2020/21 a new methodology is being applied nationally for this funding factor, this is explained in Appendix A.
- The cost of supporting 'Rising Rolls' in secondary schools. These are in-year payments to support those schools with increased pupil numbers when compared to the number of pupils counted on the previous October census. This is budgeted for in a Growth Fund which is effectively top-sliced from the total Schools Block. Due to demographic changes increasing the number of secondary school age pupils the Growth Fund is forecast to overspend in 2019/20, and spend will increase further in 2020/21.
- General cost inflation and pressures felt by all schools, particularly as teacher pay rises have only been partially funded by the separate government grant.

Schools Forum members discussed the report and the following points were individually made;

- Schools that have growing pupil numbers need financial support over and above the funding provided by the formula.
- The rate of funding for Rising Rolls should be cut to help balance the budget.
- The Teacher Pay Grant is not adequate to cover increased teaching costs.
- The pressures caused by teaching costs increases are being experienced by all schools.
- The primary to secondary funding ratio of 1:1.3, which is in line with the national average, should not be materially changed.
- Some members welcomed the new mobility funding factor. This was seen as an opportunity to address needs hitherto unrecognised in the funding formula. It was felt that deprivation data does not act as a sufficient proxy indicator for pupil mobility.

Schools Forum agreed to consult on changing the funding formula. For the consultation officers were asked to model a proposed funding solution that achieved a reasonable balance in addressing the points above.

## **Proposed changes**

The modelled funding in this consultation strives to achieve a reasonable balance in allocating additional funds in line with the needs outlined at Schools Forum: mobility, secondary pupil number growth, and increased costs.

## **Mobility**

Just over half of Brent schools would benefit from this funding. Appendix B shows the schools that would qualify for this funding, based on October 2018 pupil data, as they

had a pupil mobility score of over 6%. Appendix B also shows the mobility score for all schools, based on October 2018 census data.

Schools are effectively funded for every 'mobile' pupil above the 6% threshold. Please note that this methodology is prescribed by the DfE, and only the funding rate per 'mobile' pupil can be determined locally.

In considering the quantum of funding to distribute via this new funding factor, officers started with the view that the average sum awarded via the factor should be great enough to make a practical difference to the school which received it. Clearly, this has to be balanced against other funding demands.

The average sum modelled for a primary school was approximately £16K. It is felt this would be enough to fund an additional member of non-teaching support staff, at least on a part time basis. Officers are not advocating that funding must be used in this way, but it provides a benchmark on what a useful sum might be. The sums involved are;

- Non-teaching staff at £13 per hour = £13
- 25 hour contract for 38 weeks = £12,350
- +on-costs = approx..£16,000.

As shown in Appendix B achieving this average allocation means that a total of £750k would be allocated using the new mobility funding factor. The rates in the model are;

- Primary £1,060 per pupil over the 6% threshold
- Secondary £1,378 per pupil over the 6% threshold

## **Secondary pupil growth**

The funding system, both nationally and locally, has a funding lag built into it; funding for 2019/20 is based on the previous autumn's pupil numbers. This means a lag of 7 and 12 months for maintained schools and academies respectively. Locally, arrangements can be made to earmark a portion of the total schools block to create a growth fund, which is then available to those schools experiencing the higher increases in pupil numbers.

The growth fund for 2019/20 is £1.4 million, including £800k for the CAFAI provisions. This fund is forecast to overspend by £0.8M on 'Rising Rolls; predominantly in the secondary sector. For 2020/21 it is estimated that the growth fund will need to increase by a further £0.9 million to fund secondary schools with expanding year 7 intakes. This means a growth fund of £3.1 million and so there is an estimated funding gap of £1.7 million which needs to be addressed when setting the budget for 2020/21.

A report on the growth fund was discussed alongside the report on 2020/21 DSG Funding at the Schools Forum on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2019. There were clear views that the growth fund should continue into 2020/21 in order to support those schools with expanding pupil numbers. The view was also expressed that the per pupil rate of

funding for 'Rising Rolls' would need to be reduced in order to help close the funding gap.

Reducing the Rising Rolls funding rates by 15% would cut the funding gap by £0.345m. Table 1 provides the figures. This leaves a funding gap for the growth fund of £1.355 million.

**Table 1**

Estimated Pupils to be funded from Rising Rolls	436
Average Per Pupil Funding Rate 2019/20	£5,248
Estimated total cost	£2.290 million
Average Per Pupil Funding Rate @ 15% reduction	£4,463
Estimated total cost	£1.945
Saving on total cost	£0.345

It is proposed to further close this gap by directing £0.8 million of the additional £3.5 million straight into the growth fund. This leaves the growth fund gap at £0.555 million.

To summarise the above, the £3.5 million has been reduced by a proposed £0.750 million to the mobility funding factor, and by an £0.800 million allocation straight to the growth fund. This leave £1.950 million to be allocated.

The model proposes that the £1.950 million is allocated out to Primary and Secondary schools on a proportionate basis across all other pupil led funding factors. The increases to the Secondary school factors will then be scaled back to release the £0.555 million required for the growth fund budget. This should ensure the primary to secondary funding ratio is not materially impacted.

### **Addressing increased costs**

The model allocates £1.950 million (less £0.555 million for Secondary School growth) to all schools to help address cost pressures common to all schools.

Appendix C shows the pupil led funding factors, the rates and total allocation in 2019/20, and the proposed increased funding rates for 2020/21. The changes to rates will have no material impact on the primary to secondary ratio.

## Summary

The proposed model of funding seeks to balance the allocation of the estimated £3.5 million against the issues identified by Schools Forum. The proposals for the £3.5m can be broken down and summarised as follows in table 2:

**Table 2**

<b>£'M</b>	<b>Funding Need</b>
1.355	Rising Rolls – principally demographic rise in Secondary pupil numbers
1.645	Allocated to Primary schools via the proposed mobility funding factor and via the increased pupil funding rates
0.500	Allocated to Secondary schools via the proposed mobility funding factor and via the increased pupil funding rates
<b>3.500</b>	

For your information, the school level impact of these modelled proposals is provided in Appendix D, and is shown against the 2019/20 funding formula allocations.

## Consultation

The consultation questions are provided below. Please use the attached word document to complete your responses and send back to [Dena.Aly@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Dena.Aly@brent.gov.uk) by 28 November 2019. Responses will be collated and provided to the Schools Forum.

- 1. Do you feel a reasonable balance has been struck between the competing issues and needs in allocating the £3.5 million as per table 2 of this consultation? If not, how would you prefer to rebalance them?**
- 2. Given the context of funding constraints and general cost pressures, do the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B, provide those schools most affected by pupil mobility with adequate amounts to have an impact?**
- 3. Considering the funding lag for growing school populations that is inherent in the national system of funding, are you in favour of continuing to move a portion of the Schools Block into a growth fund that supports expanding schools?**
- 4. Are the proportional increases to pupil led funding factors a fair method of distributing the increased funding that is available?**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix A – New Pupil Mobility Funding Factor and Methodology**

The following extract is from the 'Schools revenue funding 2020 to 2021 Operational guide' September 2019

### **Pupil mobility**

This is an optional factor.

50. The mobility factor allocates funding to schools with a high proportion of pupils who first join on a non-standard date. Mobility funding was previously allocated on the basis of historic spend. However, for 2020 to 2021, we have developed a new methodology that enables us to allocate this funding on a formulaic basis.

51. Rather than relying on a single census, this new methodology involves tracking individual pupils using their unique pupil ID through censuses from the past 3 years. If the first census when the pupil was in the school was a spring or summer census, they are a mobile pupil. This excludes reception pupils who start in January. This methodology also excludes pupils who joined in the summer term after the summer census, or pupils who joined in October before the autumn census.

52. To be eligible for mobility funding, the proportion of mobile pupils a school has must be above the threshold of 6%. We will then allocate a per-pupil amount to all mobile pupils above that threshold. We will publish the NFF factor values for mobility as part of the 2020 to 2021 NFF publication.

53. Mobility will continue to be an optional factor for local authorities' formulae. We will supply local authorities with mobility data calculated according to the new method in the APT. There will be further information about this change in the forthcoming NFF policy document.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix B: Modelled £750k mobility factor.**

School Name	Phase	NOR	NOR Primary	NOR Secondary	Mobility Primary Proportion	Mobility Secondary Proportion	Number of Primary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	Number of Secondary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	£ Primary funding	£ Secondary Funding	GRAND TOTAL
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>41,839</b>	<b>26,249</b>	<b>15,590</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>559,123</b>	<b>190,674</b>	<b>749,797</b>
Anson Primary School	Primary	352.00	352.00	0.00	8.6%	0.0%	9.1		9,678		9,678
Ark Franklin Primary Academy	Primary	574.00	574.00	0.00	4.3%	0.0%					
Avigdor Hirsch Torah Temimah Primary School	Primary	193.00	193.00	0.00	3.3%	0.0%					
Barham Primary School	Primary	845.00	845.00	0.00	6.2%	0.0%	1.9		1,990		1,990
Braintcroft E-Act Primary Academy	Primary	608.00	608.00	0.00	6.9%	0.0%	5.5		5,778		5,778
Brentfield Primary School	Primary	500.00	500.00	0.00	8.0%	0.0%	10.2		10,844		10,844
Byron Court Primary School	Primary	734.00	734.00	0.00	9.7%	0.0%	26.9		28,548		28,548
Carlton Vale Infant School	Primary	110.00	110.00	0.00	6.6%	0.0%	0.6		650		650
Chalkhill Primary School	Primary	449.00	449.00	0.00	10.1%	0.0%	18.6		19,713		19,713
Christ Church CofE Primary School	Primary	174.00	174.00	0.00	8.2%	0.0%	3.7		3,969		3,969
Convent of Jesus and Mary RC Infant School	Primary	248.00	248.00	0.00	1.5%	0.0%					
Donnington Primary School	Primary	205.00	205.00	0.00	9.0%	0.0%	6.3		6,627		6,627
East Lane Primary School	Primary	360.00	360.00	0.00	3.1%	0.0%					
Elsley Primary School	Primary	565.00	565.00	0.00	11.5%	0.0%	31.0		32,825		32,825
Fryer Primary School	Primary	699.00	699.00	0.00	12.3%	0.0%	43.9		46,518		46,518
Furness Primary School	Primary	398.00	398.00	0.00	10.2%	0.0%	16.6		17,639		17,639
Gladstone Park Primary School	Primary	623.00	623.00	0.00	9.2%	0.0%	19.9		21,055		21,055
Harlesden Primary School	Primary	364.00	364.00	0.00	11.1%	0.0%	18.6		19,721		19,721
Islamia Primary School	Primary	420.00	420.00	0.00	6.6%	0.0%	2.6		2,771		2,771
John Keble CofE Primary School	Primary	392.00	392.00	0.00	8.2%	0.0%	8.7		9,208		9,208
Kilburn Grange School	Primary	159.00	159.00	0.00	4.1%	0.0%					
Kingsbury Green Primary School	Primary	619.00	619.00	0.00	6.9%	0.0%	5.3		5,671		5,671
Leopold Primary School	Primary	756.00	756.00	0.00	7.6%	0.0%	12.4		13,113		13,113
Lyon Park Primary School	Primary	831.00	831.00	0.00	5.6%	0.0%					
Malorees Infant School	Primary	179.00	179.00	0.00	4.3%	0.0%					
Malorees Junior School	Primary	256.00	256.00	0.00	7.1%	0.0%	2.8		2,964		2,964
Mitchell Brook Primary School	Primary	610.00	610.00	0.00	12.8%	0.0%	41.4		43,920		43,920
Mora Primary School	Primary	408.00	408.00	0.00	11.5%	0.0%	22.5		23,840		23,840
Mount Stewart Infant School	Primary	259.00	259.00	0.00	2.2%	0.0%					
Mount Stewart Junior School	Primary	380.00	380.00	0.00	2.6%	0.0%					
Newfield Primary School	Primary	307.00	307.00	0.00	11.5%	0.0%	16.9		17,868		17,868
North West London Jewish Day School	Primary	234.00	234.00	0.00	1.9%	0.0%					
Northview Junior and Infant School	Primary	203.00	203.00	0.00	4.7%	0.0%					
Oakington Manor Primary School	Primary	674.00	674.00	0.00	4.0%	0.0%					
Oliver Goldsmith Primary School	Primary	414.00	414.00	0.00	5.1%	0.0%					
Our Lady of Grace Catholic Junior School	Primary	240.00	240.00	0.00	1.2%	0.0%					
Our Lady of Grace RC Infant and Nursery School	Primary	180.00	180.00	0.00	2.1%	0.0%					
Our Lady of Lourdes RC Primary School	Primary	204.00	204.00	0.00	5.1%	0.0%					
Park Lane Primary School	Primary	419.00	419.00	0.00	11.0%	0.0%	20.9		22,158		22,158

**Appendix B: Modelled £750k mobility factor.**

School Name	Phase	NOR	NOR Primary	NOR Secondary	Mobility Primary Proportion	Mobility Secondary Proportion	Number of Primary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	Number of Secondary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	£ Primary funding	£ Secondary Funding	GRAND TOTAL
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>41,839</b>	<b>26,249</b>	<b>15,590</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>559,123</b>	<b>190,674</b>	<b>749,797</b>
Preston Park Primary School	Primary	692.00	692.00	0.00	9.3%	0.0%	22.8		24,130		24,130
Princess Frederica CofE Primary School	Primary	401.00	401.00	0.00	2.4%	0.0%					
Roe Green Infant School	Primary	447.00	447.00	0.00	4.8%	0.0%					
Roe Green Junior School	Primary	470.00	470.00	0.00	4.2%	0.0%					
Salisbury Primary School	Primary	614.00	614.00	0.00	7.2%	0.0%	7.5		7,987		7,987
Sinai Jewish Primary School	Primary	559.00	559.00	0.00	4.5%	0.0%					
St Andrew and St Francis CofE Primary School	Primary	405.00	405.00	0.00	8.4%	0.0%	9.8		10,424		10,424
St Joseph's RC Infant School	Primary	210.00	210.00	0.00	1.3%	0.0%					
St Joseph's RC Junior School	Primary	279.00	279.00	0.00	2.6%	0.0%					
St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School	Primary	454.00	454.00	0.00	4.2%	0.0%					
St Margaret Clitherow RC Primary School	Primary	204.00	204.00	0.00	2.3%	0.0%					
St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Junior School	Primary	349.00	349.00	0.00	4.4%	0.0%					
St Mary's CofE Primary School	Primary	256.00	256.00	0.00	6.9%	0.0%	2.3		2,399		2,399
St Mary's RC Primary School	Primary	252.00	252.00	0.00	7.5%	0.0%	3.7		3,936		3,936
St Robert Southwell RC Primary School	Primary	420.00	420.00	0.00	4.3%	0.0%					
Sudbury Primary School	Primary	831.00	831.00	0.00	7.6%	0.0%	13.1		13,896		13,896
The Kilburn Park School Foundation	Primary	174.00	174.00	0.00	12.3%	0.0%	11.0		11,619		11,619
The St Albans School	Primary	434.00	434.00	0.00	15.6%	0.0%	41.8		44,310		44,310
Uxendon Manor Primary School	Primary	562.00	562.00	0.00	5.1%	0.0%					
Wembley Primary School	Primary	818.00	818.00	0.00	10.3%	0.0%	35.5		37,604		37,604
Wykeham Primary School	Primary	448.00	448.00	0.00	6.1%	0.0%	0.4		439		439
Alperton Community School	Secondary	1,258.00	0.00	1,258.00	0.0%	3.3%					
Ark Elvin Academy	Secondary	918.00	0.00	918.00	0.0%	11.9%		53.8		74,141	74,141
Capital City Academy	Secondary	944.00	0.00	944.00	0.0%	4.3%					
Claremont High School	Secondary	1,326.00	0.00	1,326.00	0.0%	1.8%					
Convent of Jesus and Mary Language College	Secondary	807.00	0.00	807.00	0.0%	8.0%		16.5		22,767	22,767
JFS	Secondary	1,485.00	0.00	1,485.00	0.0%	2.8%					
Kingsbury High School	Secondary	1,661.00	0.00	1,661.00	0.0%	3.8%					
Michaela Community School	Secondary	594.00	0.00	594.00	0.0%	7.3%		7.7		10,654	10,654
Newman Catholic College	Secondary	493.00	0.00	493.00	0.0%	13.6%		37.3		51,332	51,332
Queens Park Community School	Secondary	1,060.00	0.00	1,060.00	0.0%	2.7%					
St Gregory's Catholic Science College	Secondary	911.00	0.00	911.00	0.0%	2.6%					
The Crest Academy	Secondary	899.00	0.00	899.00	0.0%	8.6%		23.1		31,780	31,780
Ark Academy	All-through	1,303.00	404.00	899.00	7.4%	4.5%	5.7		6,063		6,063
Preston Manor School	All-through	1,678.00	421.00	1,257.00	12.6%	2.9%	27.6		29,248		29,248
Wembley High Technology College	All-through	1,078.00	0.00	1,078.00	0.0%	1.6%					

	PRIMARY £	SECONDARY £
AVERAGE ALLOCATIONS	15,975	38,135

Appendix B: Modelled £750k mobility factor.

School Name	Phase	NOR	NOR Primary	NOR Secondary	Mobility Primary Proportion	Mobility Secondary Proportion	Number of Primary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	Number of Secondary pupils above the 6% mobility proportion threshold	£ Primary funding	£ Secondary Funding	GRAND TOTAL
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>41,839</b>	<b>26,249</b>	<b>15,590</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>559,123</b>	<b>190,674</b>	<b>749,797</b>
								PER PUPIL	1060	1,378.00	

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix C: Modelled Impact on Schools Block Funding Rates

Type of Pupil Led Factor	Phase	Factors	2019-20 Baseline			Additional Funding				Reduce Secondary factors to pay for growth fund			Model Allocations	
			Rate	Units	Distributed in 2019/20	Distribute additional funding £	Increase in rate £	Suggested Rate £	Allocation £	Reduction in Rate	Impact £	Net change to funding rates	Allocation £	Change from 2019-20 baseline
Per Head	P	Primary (Years R-6)	3,470	26,407	91,635,044	845,915	32	3,502	92,480,959			32	92,480,959	845,915
Per Head	S	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	5,043	9,478	47,798,454	441,244	47	5,090	48,239,699	(30)	(283,198)	17	47,956,501	158,046
Per Head	S	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	5,566	6,112	34,021,409	314,064	51	5,618	34,335,472	(33)	(201,571)	18	34,133,901	112,492
<b>Total Per Head Factor</b>					<b>173,454,907</b>	<b>1,601,223</b>			<b>175,056,130</b>		<b>(484,769)</b>		<b>174,571,361</b>	<b>1,116,454</b>
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band F	352	4,114	1,447,236	13,360	3	355	1,460,596			3	1,460,596	13,360
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band E	357	2,446	872,695	8,056	3	360	880,751			3	880,751	8,056
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band D	364	2,561	932,421	8,608	3	367	941,029			3	941,029	8,608
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band C	603	4,212	2,537,937	23,429	6	608	2,561,366			6	2,561,366	23,429
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band B	914	3,101	2,834,537	26,167	8	922	2,860,704			8	2,860,704	26,167
Deprivation	P	IDACI Band A	1,290	444	572,559	5,285	12	1,302	577,845			12	577,845	5,285
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band F	373	2,218	827,722	7,641	3	377	835,363	(2)	(4,904)	1	830,459	2,737
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band E	396	1,329	525,865	4,854	4	399	530,719	(2)	(3,116)	1	527,604	1,739
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band D	491	1,329	652,516	6,024	5	495	658,540	(3)	(3,866)	2	654,674	2,158
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band C	654	2,102	1,374,214	12,686	6	660	1,386,900	(4)	(8,142)	2	1,378,758	4,544
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band B	1,005	1,649	1,656,247	15,289	9	1,014	1,671,536	(6)	(9,813)	3	1,661,723	5,476
Deprivation	S	IDACI Band A	1,425	242	345,427	3,189	13	1,438	348,616	(8)	(2,047)	5	346,569	1,142
Looked After Children	P	LAC	1,053	50	52,686	486	10	1,063	53,172			10	53,172	486
Looked After Children	S	LAC	1,053	50	52,686	486	10	1,063	53,172	(6)	(312)	3	52,860	174
English as an Additional Language	P	EAL	1,300	3,992	5,187,145	47,884	12	1,312	5,235,030			12	5,235,030	47,884
English as an Additional Language	S	EAL	1,455	461	670,903	6,193	13	1,468	677,097	(9)	(3,975)	5	673,122	2,218
Prior Attainment	P	Low Prior Attainment	1,251	9,189	11,490,941	106,077	12	1,262	11,597,018			12	11,597,018	106,077
Prior Attainment	S	Low Prior Attainment	1,615	3,560	5,748,076	53,063	15	1,630	5,801,139	(10)	(34,056)	5	5,767,083	19,006
<b>Total Additional Educational Need Factors</b>					<b>37,781,813</b>	<b>348,777</b>			<b>38,130,590</b>		<b>(70,231)</b>		<b>38,060,359</b>	<b>278,546</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>211,236,721</b>	<b>1,950,000</b>			<b>213,186,721</b>		<b>(555,000)</b>		<b>212,631,721</b>	<b>1,395,000</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix D: Modelled Impact at School Level

		Basic Entitlement (Per Head funding) Total		Additional Educational Needs		School Factors Total	Mobility	Total Budget (Pre-MFG and deductions for de-delegation & education functions)				
School Name		Number on Roll (October 2018)	2019/20	Model	2019/20	Model	No Change to calculation	Model	2019/20	Proposed Model	Increase	
			A	B	C	D	E	G	A + C + E	B + D + E + G		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>41,997</b>	<b>£173,454,907</b>	<b>£174,571,361</b>	<b>£37,781,813</b>	<b>£38,060,359</b>	<b>£16,331,145</b>	<b>749,797</b>	<b>£227,567,866</b>	<b>£229,712,662</b>	<b>2,144,797</b>	
Anson Primary School	Primary	352	£1,221,500	£1,232,776	£360,926	£364,257	£203,985	9,678	£1,786,410	£1,810,696	£24,286	Anson Primary School
Ark Franklin Primary Academy	Primary	574	£1,991,878	£2,010,265	£393,071	£396,700	£183,089	-	£2,568,038	£2,590,054	£22,016	Ark Franklin Primary Academy
Avigdor Hirsch Torah Temimah Primary School	Primary	193	£669,743	£675,925	£68,517	£69,150	£177,141	-	£915,401	£922,217	£6,815	Avigdor Hirsch Torah Temimah Primary School
Barham Primary School	Primary	845	£2,932,294	£2,959,363	£701,770	£708,248	£268,764	1,990	£3,902,827	£3,938,365	£35,538	Barham Primary School
Braintcroft E-Act Primary Academy	Primary	608	£2,109,863	£2,129,340	£836,195	£843,914	£185,154	5,778	£3,131,213	£3,164,187	£32,974	Braintcroft E-Act Primary Academy
Brentfield Primary School	Primary	500	£1,735,085	£1,751,102	£704,881	£711,388	£246,785	10,844	£2,686,751	£2,720,119	£33,368	Brentfield Primary School
Byron Court Primary School	Primary	752	£2,607,833	£2,631,907	£601,820	£607,376	£208,231	28,548	£3,417,884	£3,476,061	£58,177	Byron Court Primary School
Carlton Vale Infant School	Primary	110	£381,719	£385,242	£163,615	£165,125	£191,358	650	£736,691	£742,375	£5,684	Carlton Vale Infant School
Chalkhill Primary School	Primary	449	£1,558,106	£1,572,490	£566,023	£571,248	£205,001	19,713	£2,329,130	£2,368,452	£39,322	Chalkhill Primary School
Christ Church CofE Primary School	Primary	174	£603,810	£609,384	£165,784	£167,314	£177,780	3,969	£947,374	£958,448	£11,074	Christ Church CofE Primary School
Convent of Jesus and Mary RC Infant School	Primary	248	£860,602	£868,547	£304,494	£307,305	£177,677	-	£1,342,774	£1,353,529	£10,755	Convent of Jesus and Mary RC Infant School
Donnington Primary School	Primary	205	£711,385	£717,952	£191,584	£193,353	£193,886	6,627	£1,096,855	£1,111,817	£14,963	Donnington Primary School
East Lane Primary School	Primary	378	£1,309,989	£1,322,082	£281,362	£283,959	£175,000	-	£1,766,351	£1,781,041	£14,690	East Lane Primary School
Elsley Primary School	Primary	600	£2,082,102	£2,101,323	£605,701	£611,292	£202,983	32,825	£2,890,786	£2,948,423	£57,637	Elsley Primary School
Fryent Primary School	Primary	699	£2,425,649	£2,448,041	£713,209	£719,793	£212,504	46,518	£3,351,362	£3,426,856	£75,494	Fryent Primary School
Furness Primary School	Primary	398	£1,381,128	£1,393,877	£477,754	£482,164	£181,968	17,639	£2,040,850	£2,075,649	£34,799	Furness Primary School
Gladstone Park Primary School	Primary	623	£2,161,916	£2,181,873	£675,205	£681,438	£183,872	21,055	£3,020,993	£3,068,238	£47,246	Gladstone Park Primary School
Harlesden Primary School	Primary	382	£1,323,870	£1,336,091	£535,832	£540,778	£206,294	19,721	£2,065,995	£2,102,883	£36,888	Harlesden Primary School
Islamia Primary School	Primary	420	£1,457,471	£1,470,926	£540,732	£545,724	£279,435	2,771	£2,277,639	£2,298,856	£21,218	Islamia Primary School
John Keble CofE Primary School	Primary	392	£1,360,307	£1,372,864	£510,857	£515,572	£178,007	9,208	£2,049,171	£2,075,652	£26,481	John Keble CofE Primary School
Kilburn Grange School	Primary	177	£612,485	£618,139	£257,266	£259,641	£193,171	-	£1,062,921	£1,070,950	£8,029	Kilburn Grange School
Kingsbury Green Primary School	Primary	619	£2,148,035	£2,167,864	£547,159	£552,210	£206,238	5,671	£2,901,431	£2,931,983	£30,551	Kingsbury Green Primary School
Leopold Primary School	Primary	756	£2,623,449	£2,647,666	£979,078	£988,116	£531,244	13,113	£4,133,771	£4,180,140	£46,369	Leopold Primary School
Lyon Park Primary School	Primary	831	£2,883,711	£2,910,332	£754,664	£761,630	£248,402	-	£3,886,777	£3,920,364	£33,587	Lyon Park Primary School
Malorees Infant School	Primary	179	£621,160	£626,895	£188,290	£190,028	£196,265	-	£1,005,715	£1,013,187	£7,472	Malorees Infant School
Malorees Junior School	Primary	256	£888,364	£896,564	£201,315	£203,174	£178,465	2,964	£1,268,144	£1,281,167	£13,023	Malorees Junior School
Mitchell Brook Primary School	Primary	610	£2,116,804	£2,136,345	£809,998	£817,476	£206,297	43,920	£3,133,099	£3,204,038	£70,939	Mitchell Brook Primary School
Mora Primary School	Primary	408	£1,415,829	£1,428,899	£430,835	£434,812	£203,996	23,840	£2,050,661	£2,091,548	£40,887	Mora Primary School
Mount Stewart Infant School	Primary	259	£898,774	£907,071	£229,897	£232,020	£198,731	-	£1,327,402	£1,337,822	£10,419	Mount Stewart Infant School
Mount Stewart Junior School	Primary	380	£1,318,665	£1,330,838	£173,225	£174,824	£208,987	-	£1,700,876	£1,714,648	£13,772	Mount Stewart Junior School
Newfield Primary School	Primary	307	£1,065,342	£1,075,177	£445,812	£449,927	£197,833	17,868	£1,708,987	£1,740,805	£31,818	Newfield Primary School
North West London Jewish Day School	Primary	234	£812,020	£819,516	£137,327	£138,595	£179,951	-	£1,129,297	£1,138,061	£8,764	North West London Jewish Day School
Northview Junior and Infant School	Primary	203	£704,445	£710,947	£238,007	£240,204	£188,681	-	£1,131,132	£1,139,833	£8,700	Northview Junior and Infant School
Oakington Manor Primary School	Primary	674	£2,338,895	£2,360,486	£642,322	£648,252	£187,613	-	£3,168,829	£3,196,350	£27,521	Oakington Manor Primary School
Oliver Goldsmith Primary School	Primary	414	£1,436,650	£1,449,913	£341,728	£344,883	£207,833	-	£1,986,211	£2,002,628	£16,417	Oliver Goldsmith Primary School
Our Lady of Grace Catholic Junior School	Primary	240	£832,841	£840,529	£231,639	£233,777	£177,901	-	£1,242,380	£1,252,206	£9,827	Our Lady of Grace Catholic Junior School
Our Lady of Grace RC Infant and Nursery School	Primary	180	£624,631	£630,397	£223,913	£225,980	£177,070	-	£1,025,614	£1,033,448	£7,833	Our Lady of Grace RC Infant and Nursery School
Our Lady of Lourdes RC Primary School	Primary	204	£707,915	£714,450	£269,325	£271,811	£177,985	-	£1,155,225	£1,164,246	£9,021	Our Lady of Lourdes RC Primary School
Park Lane Primary School	Primary	419	£1,454,001	£1,467,424	£427,947	£431,897	£196,414	22,158	£2,078,362	£2,117,893	£39,531	Park Lane Primary School
Preston Park Primary School	Primary	710	£2,462,086	£2,484,814	£565,857	£571,081	£219,625	24,130	£3,247,568	£3,299,650	£52,082	Preston Park Primary School
Princess Frederica CofE Primary School	Primary	401	£1,391,538	£1,404,384	£269,402	£271,889	£179,746	-	£1,840,686	£1,856,019	£15,333	Princess Frederica CofE Primary School
Roe Green Infant School	Primary	447	£1,551,166	£1,565,485	£472,631	£476,994	£421,494	-	£2,445,291	£2,463,973	£18,682	Roe Green Infant School
Roe Green Junior School	Primary	470	£1,630,980	£1,646,036	£337,612	£340,729	£196,550	-	£2,165,142	£2,183,314	£18,173	Roe Green Junior School
Salisbury Primary School	Primary	614	£2,130,684	£2,150,353	£576,018	£581,335	£205,243	7,987	£2,911,946	£2,944,919	£32,973	Salisbury Primary School
Sinai Jewish Primary School	Primary	559	£1,939,825	£1,957,732	£233,377	£235,531	£183,113	-	£2,356,315	£2,376,376	£20,062	Sinai Jewish Primary School
St Andrew and St Francis CofE Primary School	Primary	405	£1,405,419	£1,418,393	£446,727	£450,851	£180,612	10,424	£2,032,759	£2,060,281	£27,522	St Andrew and St Francis CofE Primary School
St Joseph's RC Infant School	Primary	210	£728,736	£735,463	£252,665	£254,998	£177,419	-	£1,158,820	£1,167,880	£9,060	St Joseph's RC Infant School
St Joseph's RC Junior School	Primary	279	£968,177	£977,115	£191,973	£193,746	£178,225	-	£1,338,376	£1,349,086	£10,710	St Joseph's RC Junior School
St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School	Primary	454	£1,575,457	£1,590,001	£441,578	£445,654	£180,101	-	£2,197,136	£2,215,756	£18,620	St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School
St Margaret Clitherow RC Primary School	Primary	204	£707,915	£714,450	£255,221	£257,577	£177,712	-	£1,140,847	£1,149,738	£8,891	St Margaret Clitherow RC Primary School

Appendix D: Modelled Impact at School Level

			Basic Entitlement (Per Head funding) Total		Additional Educational Needs		School Factors Total	Mobility	Total Budget (Pre-MFG and deductions for de-delegation & education functions)			
School Name		Number on Roll (October 2018)	2019/20	Model	2019/20	Model	No Change to calculation	Model	2019/20	Proposed Model	Increase	
			A	B	C	D	E	G	A + C + E	B + D + E + G		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>41,997</b>	<b>£173,454,907</b>	<b>£174,571,361</b>	<b>£37,781,813</b>	<b>£38,060,359</b>	<b>£16,331,145</b>	<b>749,797</b>	<b>£227,567,866</b>	<b>£229,712,662</b>	<b>2,144,797</b>	
St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Junior School	Primary	349	£1,211,089	£1,222,269	£301,121	£303,901	£183,920	-	£1,696,131	£1,710,090	£13,960	St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Junior School
St Mary's CofE Primary School	Primary	256	£888,364	£896,564	£342,992	£346,158	£179,813	2,399	£1,411,169	£1,424,935	£13,766	St Mary's CofE Primary School
St Mary's RC Primary School	Primary	252	£874,483	£882,555	£291,702	£294,394	£179,286	3,936	£1,345,471	£1,360,171	£14,701	St Mary's RC Primary School
St Robert Southwell RC Primary School	Primary	420	£1,457,471	£1,470,926	£282,584	£285,192	£179,538	-	£1,919,594	£1,935,657	£16,063	St Robert Southwell RC Primary School
Sudbury Primary School	Primary	831	£2,883,711	£2,910,332	£579,651	£585,002	£187,719	13,896	£3,651,082	£3,696,949	£45,867	Sudbury Primary School
The Kilburn Park School Foundation	Primary	174	£603,810	£609,384	£199,154	£200,993	£177,209	11,619	£980,173	£999,204	£19,031	The Kilburn Park School Foundation
The Stonebridge School	Primary	452	£1,566,782	£1,581,245	£547,270	£552,322	£216,040	44,310	£2,330,093	£2,393,918	£63,825	The Stonebridge School
Uxendon Manor Primary School	Primary	580	£2,010,964	£2,029,527	£427,277	£431,221	£211,034	-	£2,649,275	£2,671,783	£22,508	Uxendon Manor Primary School
Wembley Primary School	Primary	818	£2,838,599	£2,864,803	£824,511	£832,123	£219,887	37,604	£3,882,997	£3,954,417	£71,419	Wembley Primary School
Wykeham Primary School	Primary	448	£1,554,636	£1,568,988	£514,662	£519,413	£215,116	439	£2,284,414	£2,303,955	£19,541	Wykeham Primary School
Alperton Community School	Secondary	1258	£6,573,390	£6,595,125	£1,025,813	£1,029,205	£505,492	-	£8,104,695	£8,129,822	£25,127	Alperton Community School
Ark Elvin Academy	Secondary	918	£4,825,251	£4,841,206	£1,118,866	£1,122,566	£213,245	74,141	£6,157,362	£6,251,158	£93,795	Ark Elvin Academy
Capital City Academy	Secondary	944	£4,958,988	£4,975,385	£1,098,449	£1,102,081	£244,969	-	£6,302,406	£6,322,435	£20,029	Capital City Academy
Claremont High School	Secondary	1326	£6,956,087	£6,979,087	£569,218	£571,100	£215,267	-	£7,740,572	£7,765,454	£24,883	Claremont High School
Convent of Jesus and Mary Language College	Secondary	807	£4,254,480	£4,268,547	£796,196	£798,829	£203,366	22,767	£5,254,042	£5,293,510	£39,467	Convent of Jesus and Mary Language College
JFS	Secondary	1485	£7,799,274	£7,825,063	£360,341	£361,533	£257,600	-	£8,417,216	£8,444,195	£26,980	JFS
Kingsbury High School	Secondary	1661	£8,727,671	£8,756,530	£1,117,914	£1,121,610	£574,143	-	£10,419,728	£10,452,283	£32,555	Kingsbury High School
Michaela Community School	Secondary	594	£3,119,605	£3,129,920	£481,712	£483,304	£251,423	10,654	£3,852,740	£3,875,302	£22,562	Michaela Community School
Newman Catholic College	Secondary	493	£2,581,998	£2,590,535	£639,220	£641,334	£188,720	51,332	£3,409,938	£3,471,921	£61,983	Newman Catholic College
Queens Park Community School	Secondary	1060	£5,558,637	£5,577,017	£826,929	£829,663	£207,867	-	£6,593,433	£6,614,547	£21,114	Queens Park Community School
St Gregory's Catholic Science College	Secondary	911	£4,773,729	£4,789,514	£536,565	£538,339	£198,540	-	£5,508,834	£5,526,393	£17,559	St Gregory's Catholic Science College
The Crest Academy	Secondary	899	£4,714,258	£4,729,846	£1,067,886	£1,071,417	£205,881	31,780	£5,988,026	£6,038,924	£50,898	The Crest Academy
Ark Academy	All-Through	1303	£6,118,823	£6,147,362	£1,079,111	£1,084,365	£267,951	6,063	£7,465,886	£7,505,741	£39,855	Ark Academy
Preston Manor School	All-Through	1678	£8,062,253	£8,097,567	£1,303,421	£1,309,854	£219,625	29,248	£9,585,299	£9,656,294	£70,995	Preston Manor School
Wembley High Technology College	All-Through	1078	£5,658,308	£5,677,017	£477,109	£478,700	£225,661	-	£6,361,078	£6,381,378	£20,300	Wembley High Technology College

**1. Do you feel a reasonable balance has been struck between the competing issues and needs in allocating the £3.5 million as per table 2 of this consultation? If not, how would you prefer to rebalance them?**

Primary Head	No. more should be allocated to mobility, as detailed in the answer to question 2.
Primary Head	We believe that the whole premise of how to distribute this “windfall” money is flawed. It rests on looking at strategic pressures upon schools that should have already been considered in the existing SFF. The “windfall” cash is unlikely to be repeated in future years. It should therefore be used for short-term relief where most badly needed.
Primary Head	Yes
Primary Head	The balance is reasonable within the funding given. The mobility funding factor is a needed addition.
Primary Chair of Governors	On the whole yes. However, over the last few years the impact of the reduced budgets has had a particularly heavy impact on small ,one-form entry primary schools which are unable to benefit from economies of scale in the same way as larger schools. This has perhaps not been given due consideration.
Secondary Head	Yes, however could final allocations be based on the October 2019 census?
Secondary Head	We feel that the growth factors and rising roll funding will only exacerbate the inequality between schools with full rolls and others. The per pupil funding already provides additional funding for additional students.
Secondary Head	No, a reasonable balance has not been struck. Only £0.8 million (22%) or a total of £1.355 million (38%, including the rewirement from secondary schools addressing increased costs allocation) has been allocated to rising rolls. In my opinion the priority must be to meet the demands created by the increase in pupil numbers. This need must be met first and then any remaining funding should be distributed using another funding factor.  As discussed in Schools Forum a comparison of mobility against deprivation showed a weak correlation. For this reason I would propose using excess

	<p>funding from the 3.5M after rising rolls has been removed to simply increase the per head funding allocation across all schools.</p> <p>Having undergone a significant increase in pupil numbers in recent years, I am confident that we would not have been able to fund the increase in numbers had we not had received the rising rolls delegated funding. A 15% reduction in funding is untenable. A secondary school would not be able to budget for an increase in one or two form groups with a reduction of 15% to the rising rolls funding rates.</p> <p>In our case we have expanded on the basis of funding formula approved by Schools Forum in February 2018. Consequently, all of our financial projections are based on this formula. A significant change (e.g. reduction by 15%) would generate massive instability e.g. for (Name of School) the difference would be a budget reduction of £74,175.</p> <p>Furthermore the rising rolls funding already does not match lag funding and we receive nearly 16% less per student. For example we receive £4,945 for a KS3 rising rolls pupil, however, we typically receive £5,857 per KS3 pupil through lag funding. The difference (£912) is due to the prior attainment factor, the IDACI banding factor and the EAL factor. The difference amounted to £94,848 in just one year. This gap in funding will continue every year for five years, a total of £474,240 but will never be met.</p>
<p>Secondary Head</p>	<p>Yes – a reasonable balance based on the finite money available. However it is important to note that this will not be sufficient to resolve our funding crisis. From (Name of School)'s perspective and extra £24K is only one extra TA. This will not solve our financial issues.</p>

2. **Given the context of funding constraints and general cost pressures, do the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B, provide those schools most affected by pupil mobility with adequate amounts to have an impact?**

<p>Primary Head</p>	<p>No, the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B do not provide adequate amounts to have an impact.</p> <p>For a school with high mobility, we have identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- five factors which incur additional costs</li> <li>- four factors which lead to a lack (or loss) of funding</li> </ul> <p>Five factors which incur additional costs</p> <p>1. Settling in of new pupils There is a high level of administration in admitting a new pupil: offering a place, supporting parents with little English to complete admissions forms, entering information onto a management system; and contacting previous settings to request safeguarding and educational records.</p> <p>Mobile pupils require additional support as they face a substantial cultural, educational and social adjustment. To mitigate this, at our school each new pupil has a home visit conducted jointly by two members of staff in order to ease their transition and provide the best opportunity for them to settle and achieve well. Teachers and leaders give time to offer a welcome and explain routines, match up pupils with a buddy, and ensure the child is settling well.</p> <p>2. Low levels of attainment and low levels or no English Most mobile pupils join the school with very low levels of attainment, and often with little or no English. In many cases they arrive from outside the United Kingdom, as refugees or economic migrants. Many have missed significant amounts of time in school. The school has to provide additional support to help the child to catch up to expected levels. Teaching these pupils requires specialist skills to support pupils who are significantly behind the age-expected levels, and who have little or no English. When there are significant levels of mobile pupils, this lowers the attainment levels for whole cohorts.</p> <p>3. Higher numbers of pupils with Special Educational Needs or Disability (SEND) Almost all mobile pupils with SEND needs, arrive at school with these needs undiagnosed and without additional funding. This means we have to give additional time and source expertise to establish the nature of the special needs, and how best to support them; apply for Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan funding; and pay for their support staff for up to a year until an EHC is given at approx. £20,000 per pupil, per annum.</p> <p>4. Higher numbers of Child Protection, Child In Need and Safeguarding cases</p>
---------------------	---

	<p>Many families relocate for serious safeguarding reasons. Some of these are disclosed on joining and others become apparent after a few weeks. This requires a considerable level of communication with other agencies – Social Care, Health and Police. Additional checks are put in place to more carefully monitor these children. More staff need higher levels of safeguarding training in order to increase capacity and manage the additional meetings.</p> <p>5. Higher numbers of pupils with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties The circumstances leading to children relocating often cause SEMH difficulties. Safeguarding cases contribute to these, as do children relocating as refugees, or those who have been evicted, and those living in poor quality housing with a lack of outdoor space and a lack of opportunities for play. High levels of deprivation are linked with higher incidences of SEMH difficulties. Schools provide additional support to counteract this. Support includes more trained counsellors and psychotherapists, nurture groups and specialist interventions. Higher levels of pupils with SEMH difficulties also affects the other children – and staff. Additional support needs to be provided to counteract this affect.</p> <p>Four factors which lead to a lack (or loss) of funding</p> <p>1. Lack of per-pupil funding. There is an obvious lack of funding if children join the school after the October census date; the full funding for these children is only given after they appear on the following year’s census. In the meantime, despite not being funded, the school meets the child’s needs. In many cases, the mobile child may leave the school before the next October census date. The fluctuations in pupil numbers also lead to uncertainty in planning and setting budgets.</p> <p>2. Lack of Pupil Premium funding Many mobile pupils face high levels of deprivation yet are ineligible for free school meals (FSM) or the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG). The main reasons for this lack of ineligibility include recent arrivals to the UK, lack of parental British Citizenship or otherwise having No Recourse to public funds.</p> <p>3. Lower allocation of High Needs funding In addition to the inaccuracies of Pupil Premium eligibility described above, the crude measure of IDACI is also inaccurate. We know from conducting home visits for all our new arrivals that many live in multiple occupancy housing which is not reflected within the IDACI measure.</p> <p>4. Missing funding for pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) Many mobile pupils have undiagnosed Special Educational Needs which require intense support for the child in the form of 1-2-1, as well as specialist provision and significant work in applying for additional funds through an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP). The school is not funded for this and there is a significant time lag before any funding is awarded. To compound this, in our experience, the majority of pupils with successful EHCP</p>
--	---

## Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

	applications then transfer out of our school – either to a special school which more fully meets their needs, or to relocate again due to family circumstances.
Primary Head	No comment.
Primary Head	No, unfortunately the cost of enrolment administration, additional educational needs, the destabilisation of class and year group cohorts, additional staff input to meet with the pupils’ transition needs amount to more than the cost of an additional TA.
Primary Head	The amounts added to the primary schools is not adequate as the unfunded mobile pupils in many schools should attract higher funding. The added costs to induct such pupils and support them is more than what is being suggested. This is an additional pressure on schools and their limited budgets. The schools identified in AppD to receive funding are mainly in areas with high levels of deprivation and underfunded.
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes , although once again the impact of mobility has a proportionately greater financial impact in one form entry schools. However ,we do believe that the mobility allocations modelled would be enough to make a difference
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes we think so although it will not affect Capital
Secondary Head	No
Secondary Head	Yes

**3. Considering the funding lag for growing school populations that is inherent in the national system of funding, are you in favour of continuing to move a portion of the Schools Block into a growth fund that supports expanding schools?**

Primary Head	Yes.
Primary Head	No. This will have the effect of further depleting the income of small schools, which has already been severely squeezed in recent years, by funnelling away a proportion of the general schools block into a fund to which they may have no possibility of access.
Primary Head	It seems that the only expanding schools are currently the High Schools, who have had 7 years to prepare for the influx. A greater need lies with the primary schools that have expanded and have insufficient pupils to furnish full classes ending up with less than 30 (say 20 – 25) in a class and needing teachers for each class. This added to the on costs that have increased considerably this year, we are on a fast track to being in deficit. Additional, schools are finding it hard to recruit quality teachers, so letting go of effective staff, will add further difficulties.
Primary Head	The school does not support this proposal to support expanding schools. More should be done to support and fund those school which have already expanded to attract full numbers and meet their needs.
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	NO - We feel that the growth factors and rising roll funding will only exacerbate the inequality between schools with full rolls and others. The per pupil funding already provides additional funding for additional students.

## Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

Secondary Head	<p>Yes, and would add that the Schools Forum could forward fund the growth fund and build capacity into the model so that the funding need could be spread over a number of years (e.g. 6/8/10/12 years). When the current demand on the growth funding settles down over the next 2/3/4/5 years as schools catch up with the lag funding, the top slicing of the Schools Block can continue for a few more years to recoup the deficit and also build a reasonable reserve for any future growth funding needs.</p> <p>I hope the revised National Funding Formula on growth funding will help us manage this more effectively and ensure that schools willing to increase their capacity are not underfunded.</p>
Secondary Head	<p>Expansion shouldn't be funded through Schools Block. Expanding schools receive extra funding from government.</p>

**4. Are the proportional increases to pupil led funding factors a fair method of distributing the increased funding that is available?**

Primary Head	No. For the reasons expressed in question 2, more should be allocated to mobility.
Primary Head	No.
Primary Head	This is a challenge as some schools are in greater need, but by the same token you would wish to have an equitable system.
Primary Head	Yes
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes although we would be able to increase the secondary factor by removing the growth and rising roll funding
Secondary Head	Yes. Also, as there is a DfE expectation that the Central Funding Block is significantly reduced over time, the Schools Forum could attempt to urgently drive down costs and commitments in this block, for example, why is £800,000 set aside for CAFAI provision? Furthermore, underspends in the Central Block were also reported at the 6 November Schools Forum meeting.
Secondary Head	Yes



This page is intentionally left blank