

## Schools Forum Schools Funding Working Group

### Minutes – 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012

**Present:** Liz Williams, Martin Watson, Phil Cooch, John Hawkins, Catriona Williamson, Neil Baker, Andy Bridewell, Phil Cook

**Apologies:** John Kimberley, Tim Gilson

		Action
1	<p><b>School Funding Reform – progress on formula review</b> This was the only item on the agenda for this meeting.</p> <p>EW presented a report updating the group on the work of the formula review task group in reviewing the funding formula for mainstream schools and also briefly updated the group on the progress on the other elements of the funding reform project.</p> <p><b>Early Years</b> – PC reported that the Early Years Reference Group had met and agreed the required changes to the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF). These changes will be presented to Schools Forum so that they can be agreed for consultation with early years settings.</p> <p><b>Schools Forum Composition</b> – EW reported that she had met with Democratic Services to review the composition of Schools Forum in the context of the DfE's proposals. It was felt that the current membership would almost meet the requirements if the numbers of Academy and Maintained School representatives were amended. A further representative from a maintained secondary school would be required. A report would be brought to the next Schools Forum outlining the new composition of the Schools Forum and to confirm the voting arrangements.</p> <p><b>High Needs Pupils</b> – the SEN Group and the High Needs Pupils Review Group were due to meet this afternoon to review the modelling work carried out so far.</p> <p><b>Review of the Mainstream Funding Formula</b></p> <p>PC outlined the work that had taken place to map the current Wiltshire formula in to the new allowable formula factors. The Formula Review Task Group had met twice and had made the following recommendations to the School Funding Working Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Deprivation</i> <b>That one deprivation driver should be used for the formula.</b> There was some discussion about IDACI being influenced politically as it is based on SOAs and FSM entitlement thresholds changing next year. The models indicated that the impact of using IDACI compared to FSM were not significant. If FSM is chosen as the preferred deprivation driver, the group proposed that FSM Ever 6 should be used as per the FSM PPG. It was also suggested that if LAs received deprivation</li> </ol>	EW

	<p>funding from Government via FSM than there could be a case to use FSM as the formula driver.</p> <p>2. <i>Low cost high incidence SEN</i>  <b>That a mix of drivers should be used for the formula, similar to the current methodology.</b> These would include IDACI or FSM Ever 6, Attainment (based on the drivers allowed) and a per pupil amount.</p> <p>3. <i>Central Budgets and De-delegation.</i>  <b>That the consultation document provides clarity on the implications of delegating central services/budgets. i.e. give examples of the average cost to a school of a teacher on maternity leave; examples of the daily cost of buying behaviour support services; the cost of single site licences etc.</b> The group also asked for clarification on what the central insurance budget paid for and what the miscellaneous heading covered.</p> <p>4. <i>Exceptional factors – rents</i>  <b>That details of the rents that could be treated as an exceptional factor, subject to EFA approval, are presented to the School Funding Group.</b> Those schools who currently receive funding for rent, and the amounts, were shown to the group as part of the review of the modelling work to date.</p> <p>5. <i>Pupil growth</i>  <b>That the LA should make a case for a pupil growth factor.</b></p> <p>6. <i>Service school funding</i>  <b>That a further detailed report is presented on the impact on service schools of the removal of the service factors.</b> A verbal report was presented on the costs associated with service pupils and it was agreed that other service schools would be asked to contribute to this discussion. At the recent Fair Funding Conference the DfE did indicate that they were considering allowing a formula factor for pupil mobility however no detail has yet been provided.</p> <p>7. <i>Split-site funding</i>  <b>That a further detailed report is presented on the impact on split site schools of the removal or changed funding methodology of the split site factor.</b> A verbal report was presented on the costs associated with split sites and it was agreed that other split site schools would be asked to contribute to this discussion.</p> <p>The main issues that had arisen from the modelling work to date were:</p> <p>a) The impact of the removal of the service school factors.</p> <p>b) The impact of a changed split site factor, or of its removal.</p> <p>c) The impact of one basic flat rate (ranging from £100k - £150k)</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>across all phases which, in the secondary phase, clearly affects small secondary schools and in the primary phase has the opposite effect, generally.</p> <p>The last of these was a particular issue because the current Wiltshire formula contains differential lump sums for primary and secondary.</p> <p>JH raised concerns about the loss of the service school factor and the consequences for school budgets. EW replied that the DfE had indicated they were considering the inclusion of a general factor on pupil mobility (although no details had been provided), which may help, but there was no indication that a service school factor would be allowable.</p> <p>The group discussed the implications of the proposals to delegate central DSG budgets and agreed with the Formula Review Group's proposal that the implications of delegation/de-delegation should be made clear in each case. There was also a brief discussion regarding the previous consultation on the potential delegation of SEN support services – the consultation on school funding reform included some of those services and would need to be considered first.</p> <p>The group discussed the consultation that would be issued to schools. It was felt that the consultation element would be fairly limited as there was little scope to offer alternative options on many elements of the formula. It would be possible to consult on which deprivation factor to use and possibly on whether to have separate KS3 and KS4 AWPUs. It was agreed that Schools Forum should consult with schools where different options existed but should make recommendations where a clear view was agreed on by Schools Forum.</p> <p>The importance of schools responding to the consultation was discussed and it was agreed that Governor Support should be asked to alert Chairs of Governors and Clerks to the fact that the consultation was coming and the proposed time scales.</p>	EW
5	<p><b>Date &amp; Time of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the group did not need to meet again prior to the rearranged Schools Forum date of 13<sup>th</sup> July.</p>	