Appendix 3 - Brent 2027/28 Local Funding Formula Consultation Response

Proposal Number	Proposal	Response received	In support of proposal	Not in support of the proposal	No Preference	Comments
1	Continue to align Brent's local funding formula with the National Funding Formula (NFF), applying NFF factors and rates wherever possible.	10	9	1	0	Whilst there was strong support for continuing to align Brent's local funding formula with the National Funding Formula (9 out of 10 respondents), a number of respondents emphasised the need for local funding arrangements to continue to reflect the specific characteristics and needs of Brent schools. Key concerns raised included the impact of unfunded teacher pay awards, wider inflationary pressures, increasing SEND and EAL needs, pupil mobility, and the potential mismatch between Outer London funding and Inner London staffing costs. These comments largely relate to the overall sufficiency of school funding rather than the principle of alignment with the NFF itself.
2	Apply a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) rate of 0% for 2027/28, in line with the Department for Education's permitted MFG range of -0.5% to 0.0% subject to the overall funding allocation and affordability	10	8	2	0	Consultation responses generally supported setting the MFG at 0%, recognising that this provides the highest level of protection permitted by the DfE and helps minimise reductions in per-pupil funding. However, respondents noted that while the proposal provides funding stability, it does not address wider financial challenges facing schools. The most common concern related to falling pupil rolls and the impact this has on school budgets. Respondents also highlighted broader funding sufficiency issues, including the need to ensure that funding arrangements appropriately reflect the needs of schools with high levels of EAL and other additional needs. These comments relate largely to wider school funding pressures rather than the principle of applying a 0% MFG.
3	Agree the proposed 2027/28 Growth Fund arrangements and eligibility criteria, in line with Department for Education requirements.	10	8	2	0	Consultation responses acknowledged the purpose of the Growth Fund in supporting schools that are required to expand and provide additional places. Respondents highlighted the importance of ensuring that growth-related costs are funded in a timely manner and that eligibility criteria are transparent, consistently applied and responsive to individual school circumstances. However, some respondents questioned the need for a Growth Fund in the context of falling pupil numbers across the borough and suggested that available funding could instead be used to support schools experiencing financial pressures arising from declining rolls. Respondents also emphasised the importance of ensuring that wider funding arrangements continue to reflect the needs of schools with significant levels of SEND and EAL pupils.

Proposal Number	Proposal	Response received	In support of proposal	Not in support of the proposal	No Preference	Comments
4	Continue to review pupil place planning data and consider the need for a Falling Rolls Fund for 2027/28, in line with the DfE's guidance.	10	7	2	1	Consultation responses supported the proposal to continue reviewing pupil place planning data and considering the need for a Falling Rolls Fund in line with DfE guidance. Respondents emphasised the importance of adopting a proactive approach to identifying schools experiencing temporary reductions in pupil numbers while ensuring that clear and transparent eligibility criteria are applied. Feedback highlighted the challenges faced by schools in maintaining staffing and provision, particularly where levels of SEND and EAL need remain high despite fluctuating pupil numbers. Conversely, one respondent expressed concern that support should not be used to sustain schools experiencing long-term and significant declines in pupil numbers where there is limited evidence of future demand, and that wider considerations of financial sustainability and place planning should be taken into account.
5	No transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block is proposed at this stage; however, this position will be kept under review in light of High Needs pressures and the affordability of the overall funding formula.	10	8	1	1	Consultation responses were generally supportive of the proposal not to transfer funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block at this stage. Respondents recognised the financial pressures facing mainstream schools and the importance of retaining Schools Block funding to support the delivery of education and additional provision for pupils with SEND and EAL needs. There was also a view that any future proposal to transfer funding should be subject to transparent consultation and a clear assessment of the potential impact on mainstream school budgets. Additional comments referred to the timeliness of funding processes and the extent to which the proposal would directly benefit individual schools.
6	Continue de-delegated funding arrangements for maintained schools in 2027/28, subject to affordability and approval by maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum.	10	6	2	2	Consultation responses were broadly supportive of continuing de-delegated funding arrangements for maintained schools where services provide clear benefits and represent value for money. Respondents emphasised the importance of transparency around the operation of de-delegated services, including information on costs, take-up, impact and outcomes. Concerns were also raised regarding the increasing scale of some de-delegated budgets, particularly for redundancy-related services, and the need to demonstrate that services continue to offer the most economically advantageous means of support. Overall, respondents supported the continuation of de-delegation, subject to affordability, effective review and clear evidence of benefit to maintained schools.