

AGENDA

Herefordshire Schools Forum

Date: **Friday 4 April 2014**

Time: **10.00 am**

Place: **Whitecross High School and Specialist Sports
College, Three Elms Road, Hereford HR4 ORN**

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

Tim Brown, Governance Services

Tel: 01432 260239

Email: tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Tim Brown, Governance Services on 01432 260239 or e-mail tbrown@herefordshire.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Agenda for the Meeting of the Herefordshire Schools Forum

Membership

Chairman
Vice-Chairman

Mrs D Strutt
Mr NPJ Griffiths

Academies
Academies

Mrs S Bailey
Mr P Barns
Mr P Box
Mrs L Brazewell

Mr P Burbidge
Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins
Mrs J Cecil
Mr J A Chapman
Mr J Docherty
Mr T Edwards

Mr G House
Ms A Jackson
Ms T Kneale

Mr R Leece
Mr C Lewandowski
Mrs R Lloyd
Mr S Pugh

Mrs J Rees
Mr A Shaw
Mrs L Townsend
Mrs S Woodrow
Mrs C Woods
Mr K Wright
2 vacancies

Special Schools
Pupil Referral Unit
Academies
Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Governor
Roman Catholic Church
14-19 Partnership
Academies
Church of England
Academies
Local Authority Maintained Secondary
School Governor
Academies
Early Years Representative
Locally Maintained Primary School
(Nursery)
Trade Union Representative
Trade Union Representative
Early Years Representative
Local Authority Maintained Primary
Schools
Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Academies
Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Locally Maintained Secondary Schools
Local Authority Maintained Primary School
Local Authority Maintained Primary School

AGENDA

	Pages
<p>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence.</p>	
<p>2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY) To receive any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Forum.</p>	
<p>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.</p>	
<p>4. MINUTES To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2014.</p>	5 - 8
<p>5. FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING IN 2015-16 To consider the response to the Department for Education consultation on the 2015-16 school funding arrangements.</p>	9 - 48
<p>6. HIGH NEEDS TARIFF PROPOSALS To defer implementation of the new High Needs Tariff until September 2014 to allow minor adjustments to the proposals, as identified by the independent review, to be finalised and agreed with the Development Top-Up Group to ensure successful implementation in schools and FE providers.</p>	49 - 54
<p>7. UPDATE ON SCHOOLS CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAMMES To update Schools Forum on capital allocations to schools.</p>	55 - 68
<p>8. MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOLS FORUM To review the membership of the Schools Forum and the Budget Working Group.</p>	69 - 72
<p>9. WORK PROGRAMME To consider the Forum's work programme.</p>	73 - 74
<p>10. MEETING DATES The following meeting dates have been scheduled:</p> <p>Monday 17 March 2014 - 9.30 am Friday 16 May 2014 - 9.30 am Friday 11 July 2014 – 9.30 am Friday 24 October 2014 - 9.30 am Friday 5 December 2014 - 9.30 am Monday 19 January 2015 – 2.00 pm Friday 13 March 2015 - 9.30 am</p>	

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of Herefordshire Schools Forum held at Committee Room 1, The Shirehall, Hereford on Friday 17 January 2014 at 2.00 pm

Present:	Mrs D Strutt (Academies) (Chairman)	
	Mr NPJ Griffiths (Academies) (Vice Chairman)	
	Mrs S Bailey	Special Schools
	Mr P Burbidge	Roman Catholic Church
	Mrs S Catlow-Hawkins	14-19 Partnership
	Mrs J Cecil	Academies
	Mr NPJ Griffiths	Academies
	Mr G House	Academies
	Mr R Leece	Trade Union Representative
	Mr C Lewandowski	Trade Union Representative
	Mrs R Lloyd	Early Years Representative
	Mr S Robertson	14-19 Partnership
	Mrs L Townsend	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
	Mrs S Woodrow	Locally Maintained Secondary Schools
	Mrs C Woods	Local Authority Maintained Primary School
	Mr K Wright	Local Authority Maintained Primary School

In attendance: Councillor JW Millar (Cabinet Member – Young People and Children’s Wellbeing)

147. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr P Box, Mrs L Brazewell, Mr J Chapman, Mr J Docherty, Mr T Edwards, Mrs A Jackson, Ms T Kneale, Mrs J Rees, and Mr A Shaw.

148. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

There were none.

149. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr R Leece and Mr C Lewandowski declared an interest in the section on de-delegation in agenda item 5: Report of the Budget Working Group.

150. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

151. REPORT OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP

The Forum considered the report of the Budget Working Group on the following matters: Dedicated Schools Grant funding settlement 2014/15, schools block expenditure, analysis of funding gap; options to balance the schools budget; PFI costs; broadband costs; de-delegation of trade union facilities funding; high needs top-up payments; school exit costs and school balances.

The Vice-Chairman introduced the report on behalf of the Chairman of the Budget Working Group (BWG). He reported that Mr Shaw had wished to remind the Forum of the difficult financial position faced and the BWG's recommended approach that changes should be introduced on a phased basis to allow schools time to plan. He had also requested that his thanks be conveyed to the High Needs Group and the Schools Finance Manager for their work.

The Schools Finance Manager presented the report, commenting on each section of the report in turn.

The first recommendation in the body of the report related to the allocation of the balance of the DSG underspend for 2011/12 which had been discussed by the Forum a number of times, most recently in May 2013. This recommendation was considered first, rather than fourth as set out in the printed recommendations in the agenda papers, because the balancing of the budget was dependent upon the underspend being allocated to support the 2014/15 budget. The Schools Finance Manager noted that in choosing to allocate this sum funds would no longer be available in future to assist schools with deficits.

In relation to dedelegation of Trade Union Facilities funding, the Schools Finance Manager reported that since the publication of the report the Department for Education (DfE) had published the outcome of its consultation exercise on this matter and its response. The DfE had also published non-statutory advice on trade union facility time in schools.

The Forum's attention was drawn to page 8 of the non-statutory advice which stated that, *"To enable schools forum representatives to decide what is best for their schools, the local authority should provide clear information in advance about how funds will be spent and how the service will benefit schools. Schools forum members should seek the views of the schools they represent before the decision is taken."*

The Schools Finance Manager circulated a paper on how funding for Trade Union Facilities had been allocated for 2013/14. He reported that the amount of expenditure proposed for 2014/15 was in line with the level of expenditure envisaged by the DfE. He also noted that in the budget consultation undertaken by the Authority in the autumn of 2013 a clear majority of respondents had supported continued dedelegation.

In response to a question about the impact of the recommended option to balance the schools budget on the vulnerable groups of pupils the Schools Finance Manager referred to the consideration by the BWG set out in paragraph 20 of the report and the BWG's view that various funding changes meant that the recommended option would not have an adverse impact on vulnerable groups.

RESOLVED: That

- (a) the Cabinet Member for Young People and Children's Wellbeing be recommended to approve the use of the remaining DSG underspend from 2011/12, i.e. £485,000, to support the National Schools Funding Formula in 2014/15;**
- (b) the variation of the provisional funding values, as submitted to the Education Funding Agency, for the National School Funding Formula 2014/15 be approved as follows:**
 - (i) the basic entitlement per pupil be reduced by £6 per pupil to £2,759 per primary pupil, £3,583 per Key Stage 3 pupil and £4,512 per Key Stage 4 pupil;**
 - (ii) the Ever-6 free school meal allocation be reduced by £28 for primary**

and secondary pupils to £2,820 per entitled pupil; and

- (iii) no amendments are made to the provisional lump sums for primary and secondary schools to take account of broadband network cost increases; and**
- (iv) the Cabinet Member for Young People and Children's Wellbeing be recommended to approve the variations to the basic per pupil entitlement and Ever-6 free school meal allocation per entitled pupils.**
- (c) the de-delegation of the funding for Trade Union facilities for 2014/15 be approved; and**
- (d) PFI funding arrangements be added to the Forum's work programme for March 2014.**

152. MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOLS FORUM

The Forum considered the requirement in new Regulations that there must be at least one 16-19 provider representative on the Forum.

The Regulations also removed the requirement that the Forum's membership should include at least one representative of the 14-19 Partnership. In consequence the Forum also reviewed the need for the two 14-19 Partnership places currently on the Forum.

The Forum concluded that it would be useful to continue to have representation from the 14-19 Partnership. It was accepted that the size of the Forum should not be increased. It was therefore proposed that the Forum's membership should include one representative from the 14-19 partnership and one representative of 16-19 providers.

RESOLVED:

- (a) to recommend the inclusion of one representative of the 14-19 Partnership within the Forum's membership; and**
- (b) to recommend the inclusion of one 16-19 provider representative on the Forum.**

153. WORK PROGRAMME

The Forum noted its Work Programme.

154. MEETING DATES

Noted.

The meeting ended at 2.55 pm

CHAIRMAN

MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
MEETING DATE:	4 APRIL 2014
TITLE OF REPORT:	FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING IN 2015-16
REPORT BY:	SCHOOL FINANCE MANAGER

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards Affected

County-wide – all schools

Purpose

To consider the response to the DfE consultation on the 2015-16 school funding arrangements.

Recommendation

THAT Schools Forum consider a response to the DfE consultation paper.

Alternative Options

- 1 The alternative option is not to respond to the consultation. By not responding Herefordshire risks the Department for Education (DfE) ignoring Herefordshire's views to the detriment to our schools.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The Authority has received a consultation paper from the DfE on the 2015-16 School Funding Arrangements and School Forum's response will be important in helping shape national policy.

Key Considerations

- 3 The DfE Consultation paper "Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16" is attached as an appendix alongside a blank copy of the Response Form. Schools Forum will receive a presentation at the meeting on the proposed response for discussion in more detail as further information will be received from the DfE at a briefing on 26th March and will be included in the presentation to forum.
- 4 For ease of comparison, the DfE's indicative national formula is set out below alongside Herefordshire's school funding values for 2014/15.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Malcolm Green, Senior Finance Manager on (01432) 260818

Herefordshire school Funding values	2014/15 Value (£)	DfE Indicative minimum funding level 2015-16
Primary per pupil funding (AWPU)	2,759	2,845
Secondary per pupil funding (KS3)	3,583	3,951
Secondary per pupil funding (KS4)	4,512	4,529
Deprivation Ever-6 Free school meals – secondary	2,280	1,080
Deprivation Ever-6 Free school meals – Primary	2,820	893
Looked After Children	1,300	1,009
Low Cost High Incidence SEN primary	228	878
Low Cost High incidence SEN secondary	148	1,961
English as Additional Language - Primary	405	505
English as Additional Language – secondary	405	1,216
Lump Sum - Primary	99,000	117,082
Lump Sum – Secondary	118,750	128,189
Sparsity	14,000	53,988
Pupil mobility	0	0
London Fringe	n/a	n/a
Post-16 DSG funded pupils	n/a	n/a
PFI factor	190,000	Included above
Business Rates	at cost	Included above

5 Further information will be provided to members at the meeting.

6 It is heartening that at long last the f40 campaign has been successful in delivering a £2.6m funding increase for Herefordshire schools in 2015/16. The f40 will continue to lobby government to ensure that the national funding formula is fair for low funded rural counties like Herefordshire. The funding of the lump sum and small rural schools is particularly important for Herefordshire and will be considered in detail by the Budget Working Group when the detailed supporting information is received from the DfE.

Community Impact

- 7 The community impact will be assessed by the DfE nationally. Locally Herefordshire will continue the work to improve funding for Herefordshire schools and to make the best of the national funding opportunities. It is important to respond to all DfE consultations to press the local case for improved school funding.

Equality and Human Rights

- 8 There is widespread recognition that the current school funding system is unfair and out of date. The DfE is committed to addressing this so that, across the country, schools have a fair funding allocation that equips them to provide a world-class education. Herefordshire and the f40 group are working with the DfE to ensure this happens.

Financial Implications

- 9 The DfE have announced an indicative £2.6m increase in schools block DSG for Herefordshire equivalent to a 2.9% increase from £90.9m to £93.5m. At this stage it is still unclear how the DfE have calculated the indicative minimum funding levels and to what extent it will be affordable within Herefordshire's increased DSG.

Legal Implications

- 10 There are no legal implications arising from this consultation

Risk Management

- 11 The DfE will publish detailed guidance in the summer following the conclusion of this consultation which will be considered by the Budget Working Group and School Forum as part of the 2015/16 budget consideration.

Appendices

- 12 Department for Education consultation paper "Review of 2015-16 Fairer Schools Funding in 2015 -16" and response form.

Background Papers

- 13 None.



Department
for Education

Launch date 13 March 2014
Respond by 5 June 2014
Ref: Department for Education

Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16

Fairer Schools Funding in 2015-16

This consultation sets out the Department for Education's proposal to allocate an additional £350m in 2015-16, to increase the per-pupil budgets for the least fairly funded local areas. Our proposal will mean that in 2015-16, every local area will attract a minimum level of funding for each of its pupils and schools, making the distribution of funding to local areas fairer whilst ensuring that no area receives a cut to its per-pupil budget. This consultation invites views on how to set these minimum funding levels, and how we will distribute the additional £350 million funding.

We are inviting views on whether small changes to the operation of the sparsity factor would be helpful.

To

Issued 13 March 2014

Enquiries To If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact the Department on 0370 000 2288

e-mail: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

Contact Details

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's '[Contact Us](#)' page.

1 Introduction

1.1 Making school funding fairer

There is widespread recognition that the current school funding system is unfair and out of date. We are committed to addressing this so that, across the country, schools have a fair funding allocation that equips them to provide a world-class education.

Since we first consulted in 2011 on how to improve the school funding system, we have introduced a number of important changes to how local authorities distribute funding to schools. These changes have already led to a more transparent funding system with more money being allocated based on the needs of pupils. In 2013-14, local authorities allocated almost 90% of funding based on the needs of pupils, compared with 71% in 2012-13.

We are now determined to provide additional funding to the least fairly funded local authorities in 2015-16. After we have met our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15, we have decided to add a further £350m to fund schools in the least fairly funded authorities. This will be the first time in a decade that funding has been allocated to local areas on the basis of the actual characteristics of their pupils and schools, rather than simply their historic levels of spending. **No local authority or school will receive less funding as a result of this proposal.**

Although these proposals do not represent implementation of a national funding formula, this is the biggest step towards fairer funding for schools in a decade. The proposals we are announcing today put us in a much better position to implement a national funding formula when the time is right. This will be when the government has set spending plans over a longer period of time, allowing us to give schools and local authorities more certainty about how the formula will affect them over a number of years.

This proposal relates to 2015-16. Beyond 2015-16, the allocation of funding between local authorities will be a matter for the next spending review.

1.2 Allocating the additional funding fairly

1.2.1 We have carefully considered how we can allocate the £350m as fairly as possible – in a way that reflects the needs of pupils and schools. We are determined to avoid allocating it in a way that could perpetuate the flaws and inconsistencies of the current system, which we have been progressively reforming.

We propose to allocate the additional funding by setting minimum funding levels that a local authority should attract for its pupils and schools in 2015-16. If a local authority already attracts at least these minimum funding levels, then we will not make any change to the amount of funding per pupil that it receives. If a local authority attracts less than these minimum funding levels for the pupils and schools in its area, we will increase its budget so that it meets those levels.

We propose setting a minimum funding level for five pupil characteristics:

- a per-pupil amount ('age weighted pupil unit');
- pupils who are from deprived backgrounds;
- pupils who have been looked after,¹ for example in foster care;
- pupils with low attainment before starting at either their primary or secondary school;
- pupils who speak English as an additional language.

In addition, we propose setting a minimum funding level for two school characteristics currently used by local authorities to allocate money to schools:

- a minimum funding level for each school on top of its per-pupil funding ('lump sum'); and
- a minimum funding level for small schools that are essential to serving rural areas ('sparsity sum').² We propose setting our minimum funding levels based on the average amounts³ that local authorities allocate to these characteristics in their local formulae at present. We propose to

¹ For 2015-16, a single indicator will be provided, covering all pupils who have been looked after for one day or more on the 31 March 2014. This is the same measure as was set out in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

² The sparsity factor is one of a number of permitted factors that local authorities can use in their local funding formula. This formula factor allows local authorities to allocate additional funding to small schools that are essential to serving small rural communities.

³ In order to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document, we have used the published final 2013-14 pro forma data to calculate the average per pupil amounts – with the exception of the lump sum and sparsity sum, where we have used provisional 2014-15 school funding data. To calculate the average per pupil amounts for a particular characteristic, we have only included local authorities that allocated funding for the characteristic in question and the average amounts are calculated as a pupil-weighted average. When final 2014-15 pro forma data is available, we will review the minimum funding levels.

apply the minimum funding level for the basic per-pupil amount ('age-weighted pupil unit') at the average that local authorities currently allocate through this factor. In doing this, we will use roughly 75% of the £350m of additional funding.⁴ We then propose to apply the minimum funding levels for the other characteristics using the rest of the additional funding (roughly 25%). This will mean that we can set each of the other minimum funding levels close to the level of its current local authority average.⁵ We propose to raise the minimum funding levels for local authorities in areas with higher salaries in line with a 'hybrid area cost adjustment'. This takes account of both teacher salary and general labour market data. We set out this approach in detail at Annex C.

Indicative minimum funding levels, based on the data currently available, are as follows. These are subject to revision when we have final confirmation of local authorities' local funding formulae for 2014-15.

Indicative minimum funding levels

- A basic per pupil amount – primary: £2,845; key stage 3: £3,951; key stage 4; £4,529
- Deprivation – between £893 and £1,974 – full breakdown in Annex A
- Looked after children – £1,009
- Low prior attainment – primary: £878; secondary: £1,961
- English as an additional language – primary: £505; secondary: £1,216
- A lump sum for every school – primary: £117,082; secondary: £128,189
- Additional sparsity sum for small schools vital to serving rural communities – up to £53,988
- An area cost adjustment to increase minimum funding levels in areas with higher labour market costs.

⁴ In using the final 2014-15 data this proportion may change. For example, if the average age weighted pupil unit is higher in 2014-15 than in 2013-14, this proportion will increase.

⁵ Each of the indicative minimum funding levels, with the exception of the minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount, has been scaled back from the current local authority average proportionately to use the remaining share of the total available funding (roughly 25%). October 2014 census data will be used to calculate each of the minimum funding levels before Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding is confirmed for 2015-16.

In order to calculate whether a local authority will attract additional funding to reach the minimum funding levels, we will first look at the amount each local authority would be due to receive in 2015-16, given our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15. We will then apply the minimum funding levels to calculate a new total. This will be done by:

- i. multiplying each of the minimum funding levels by the relevant number of eligible pupils or schools in the local authority:⁶
- ii. summing each of the totals in (i) to create a new funding amount for the local authority;
- iii. applying the area cost adjustment to the total in (ii);
- iv. if this total is more than the original total set out in paragraph 12, we will increase the local authority's funding to reach this new level;
- v. if not, the level of funding remains the same.

⁶ At the time DSG allocations are confirmed, the Department will use October 2014 census data. The exemplification in this document uses October 2013 data.

A worked example of our proposed approach is set out below.

Worked Example: Authority X

The following example demonstrates how the minimum funding levels would be applied in imaginary authority X, which has 100,000 pupils. This authority only has KS3 pupils and every deprived pupil also lives in an IDACI 6 area.

i. Total funding 2014-15 £400,000,000

There are 100,000 pupils in authority X and in 2014-15 this authority will receive £400m with each pupil attracting £4,000.

ii. Apply each of the minimum funding levels:

- AWPU KS 3 AWPU MFL x [100,000 pupils in LA] =pound;3,951 x 100,000 =pound;395,100,000
- Deprivation MFL x [5,000 deprived pupils] =pound;1,974 x 5,000 =pound;9,870,000
- LAC MFL x [250 LAC pupils] =pound;1,009 x 250 =pound;252,250
- LPA MFL x [5000 LPA pupils] =pound;1,961 x 5,000 =pound;9,805,000
- EAL MFL x [250 EAL pupils] =pound;1,216 x 250 =pound;304,000
- Lump sum MFL x [100 schools] =pound;128,189 x 100 schools =pound;12,818,900
- Sparsity MFL ⁷ x [10 schools with 300 pupils] =pound;26,994 x 10 =pound;269,940

iii. New MFL total

- The sum of each MFL calculation above is =pound;428,420,090.
- Authority x attracts an ACA adjustment factor of 1.1.
- The adjusted MFL total would be £428,420,090 x 1.1 =strong>£471,262,099
- Divided by the number of pupils in the local authority =strong>£4,713 per pupil

⁷ In this example, each school attracts 50% of the sparsity MFL. This is because the sparsity amount is a tapered sum. With 300 pupils, the secondary schools attract 50% of the MFL. More information on how the tapering works can be found in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

Authority X would receive the higher total budget of £471,262,099 and the higher per pupil amount of £4,713, because their current funding and per pupil amount is less than these new totals.

The table at Annex B lists the 62 local authorities that currently attract less than the indicative minimum funding levels for their pupils and schools. The table indicates the new level of funding per pupil for 2015-16 ⁸ that would result from these indicative minimum funding levels. **Every other local authority will see its per pupil funding maintained in cash terms, consistent with funding decisions since the start of this Parliament. No school or local authority will lose money as a result of this proposal.**

Note that in most cases, we have used published 2013-14 local authority pro-forma data to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document. When final 2014-15 data is available we will review the minimum funding levels and **it is possible some local allocations may vary in order to fit within the envelope of funding we have available.** For example, if the average AWPU turns out to be higher in 2014-15, a greater proportion of the £350m funding would be allocated through the AWPU minimum funding level, meaning a smaller proportion of the overall pot would be allocated through the remaining factors.

1.3 The role of local authority in 2015-16

1.3.1 Our proposal uses seven of the characteristics used in local formulae, but we are not proposing that local authorities should be required to use those seven factors in their local formulae in 2015-16 (with the exception of the basic per pupil amount and the deprivation factor, which are mandatory). Nor are we proposing that local authorities choosing to use any of these seven factors should be required to weight that factor at or above the minimum funding level. It will remain for the local authority to decide how best to apply its local formulae to meet its circumstances.

We are not proposing any changes for 2015-16 to the way in which local authorities can allocate funding to schools – except, possibly, minor changes to the sparsity factor. When we introduced the sparsity factor for 2014-15, we said that we would review how useful local authorities had found this factor. We

⁸ Any additional funding allocated would be applied only to the schools block within local authorities' DSG allocations. Local authorities will continue to be free to move funding between their schools, high needs and early years blocks in 2015-16 provided they comply with the requirements of our Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG).

would like to seek views on this through this consultation, particularly to understand if any changes would be helpful for 2015-16. We have set out a number of questions on the sparsity factor as part of the consultation response form provided alongside this document.

We will retain the Minimum Funding Guarantee, which has been in place over many years and which dictates that for the vast majority of schools, funding per pupil cannot drop by more than 1.5% per year.⁹

2 Annex A: Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16

- 2.1 Please click here to download Annex A, the Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16.

3 Annex B: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

- 3.1 Please click here to download Annex B, the Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16.

4 Annex C: Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

- 4.1 Please click here to download Annex C, the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

5 Consultation

- 5.1 To respond to our proposals go to www.education.gov.uk/consultations. The consultation closes on 30 April 2014.

⁹ Some funding is excluded from the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. Details of this are in '2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities.'

6 How To Respond

6.1 Consultation responses can be completed online
www.education.gov.uk/consultations.

by emailing: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

or send by post to:

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for
Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, Darlington, DL3 9BG

7 Additional Copies

7.1 Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from the
Department for Education e-consultation website at:
www.education.gov.uk/consultations

8 Plans for making results public

8.1 The results of the consultation and the department's response will be published
on the DfE e-consultation website in summer 2014.

Annex A: Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16

1. The table below provides more information about each of the indicative minimum funding levels. These may change when we have final confirmation of local authorities' 2014-15 local funding formulae.

		Minimum funding levels		
		Primary	Secondary	
Age-weighted pupil unit		£2,845	Key stage 3: £3,951 Key stage 4: £4,529	
Pupils who have been eligible for free school meals in the past six years		£893	£1,080	For a pupil who is both eligible for free school meals and lives in an IDACI band 1 to 6 area, the local authority would attract both the FSM and relevant IDACI band minimum funding levels.
Pupils who live in an area that is in one of the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) bands	IDACI 1	£237	£321	
	IDACI 2	£290	£423	
	IDACI 3	£387	£530	
	IDACI 4	£453	£596	
	IDACI 5	£511	£659	
	IDACI 6	£741	£894	
Looked after children		£1,009	£1,009	The same measure would be used as is currently set out in the 2014-15 school funding arrangements. The minimum funding level would apply to the children reported to the Department, through the annual children looked after return and who are looked after children, for one day or more at the census point.
Pupils with low prior attainment		£878	£1,961	For the primary measure, this would apply to pupils who did not reach the expected level of development on the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile or who achieved fewer than 78 points on the old EYFSP. For secondary pupils the minimum funding level applies to pupils not reaching L4 at KS2 in either English or maths.
English as an additional language		£505	£1,216	This minimum funding level would apply to pupils with EAL who entered the English state school system in the past three years.
Lump sum		£117,082	£128,189	Middle schools would attract a minimum lump sum weighted by their ratio of primary to secondary year groups in the school. All-through schools would attract the secondary amount.
Sparsity sum		£53,988	£53,988	A taper would apply, whereby the size of the sum is in inverse proportion to the size of the school. The criteria for attracting the minimum funding level would be the same as the criteria for the sparsity factor in local formulas. Details of this are in '2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities'.

Annex B: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

1. Figure B1 below lists the 62 authorities that would receive additional funding under our indicative minimum funding levels, assuming 2014-15 pupil numbers^{1,2}. The minimum funding levels may change when we have final confirmation of LA's 2014-15 local funding formulae.

Figure B1: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Bromley	£4,082	£169.6m	£4,543	£188.7m	11.3%	£19.1m
Cambridgeshire	£3,950	£294.3m	£4,225	£314.8m	7.0%	£20.5m
Brent	£5,066	£190.7m	£5,416	£203.9m	6.9%	£13.2m
Sutton	£4,360	£124.7m	£4,637	£132.6m	6.4%	£7.9m
Northumberland	£4,244	£166.2m	£4,513	£176.8m	6.4%	£10.6m
South Gloucestershire	£3,969	£137.5m	£4,217	£146.1m	6.3%	£8.6m
Shropshire	£4,113	£143.6m	£4,368	£152.5m	6.2%	£8.9m
Merton	£4,534	£98.6m	£4,812	£104.7m	6.1%	£6.0m
Croydon	£4,559	£208.6m	£4,830	£220.9m	5.9%	£12.4m
Bournemouth	£4,154	£79.2m	£4,393	£83.8m	5.8%	£4.6m
Buckinghamshire	£4,040	£275.4m	£4,263	£290.5m	5.5%	£15.2m
Cheshire West and Chester	£4,129	£173.6m	£4,352	£183.0m	5.4%	£9.4m
Leicestershire	£3,995	£339.7m	£4,197	£356.9m	5.1%	£17.2m
Warwickshire	£4,079	£281.3m	£4,267	£294.3m	4.6%	£13.0m
Devon	£4,156	£358.1m	£4,345	£374.3m	4.5%	£16.2m
Surrey	£4,096	£548.8m	£4,282	£573.5m	4.5%	£24.8m
Bury	£4,230	£111.1m	£4,418	£116.1m	4.5%	£5.0m
Norfolk	£4,334	£432.9m	£4,494	£448.9m	3.7%	£16.0m
North Lincolnshire	£4,316	£95.0m	£4,469	£98.4m	3.5%	£3.4m
Westminster	£5,663	£88.2m	£5,862	£91.3m	3.5%	£3.1m

¹ The figures in the table above have been calculated on the basis of 2014-15 pupil numbers (using the October 2013 school census). For 2015-16 we intend to use data from the October 2014 school census.

² The methodology for calculating the indicative funding, as a total and per pupil, is set out in the worked example on page 6.

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Derbyshire	£4,245	£405.0m	£4,392	£418.9m	3.4%	£14.0m
Poole	£4,007	£68.3m	£4,142	£70.6m	3.4%	£2.3m
Redbridge	£4,668	£199.7m	£4,823	£206.3m	3.3%	£6.6m
Rutland	£4,087	£20.9m	£4,214	£21.5m	3.1%	£0.6m
Gloucestershire	£4,203	£316.0m	£4,331	£325.6m	3.0%	£9.6m
Herefordshire	£4,306	£90.9m	£4,430	£93.5m	2.9%	£2.6m
Stoke-on-Trent	£4,507	£145.1m	£4,634	£149.2m	2.8%	£4.1m
Windsor and Maidenhead	£4,325	£77.5m	£4,440	£79.5m	2.7%	£2.1m
Central Bedfordshire	£4,144	£145.7m	£4,253	£149.5m	2.6%	£3.8m
Cheshire East	£4,077	£186.7m	£4,180	£191.4m	2.5%	£4.7m
Cumbria	£4,449	£269.2m	£4,560	£275.9m	2.5%	£6.7m
Suffolk	£4,241	£370.1m	£4,347	£379.3m	2.5%	£9.2m
Swindon	£4,102	£117.7m	£4,203	£120.5m	2.5%	£2.9m
Salford	£4,551	£131.2m	£4,658	£134.3m	2.3%	£3.1m
Bracknell Forest	£4,187	£62.6m	£4,284	£64.1m	2.3%	£1.4m
North Yorkshire	£4,338	£316.5m	£4,435	£323.7m	2.2%	£7.1m
Wiltshire	£4,213	£249.1m	£4,305	£254.5m	2.2%	£5.4m
Reading	£4,454	£71.1m	£4,547	£72.6m	2.1%	£1.5m
Northamptonshire	£4,189	£395.2m	£4,265	£402.4m	1.8%	£7.2m
Worcestershire	£4,231	£291.5m	£4,302	£296.4m	1.7%	£4.9m
Blackpool	£4,459	£80.2m	£4,530	£81.4m	1.6%	£1.3m
Durham	£4,573	£281.1m	£4,643	£285.4m	1.5%	£4.3m
Cornwall	£4,397	£285.0m	£4,451	£288.5m	1.2%	£3.5m
Telford and Wrekin	£4,367	£97.0m	£4,419	£98.1m	1.2%	£1.1m
Medway	£4,352	£161.1m	£4,402	£163.0m	1.2%	£1.9m
Hertfordshire	£4,320	£670.3m	£4,365	£677.3m	1.0%	£6.9m
Somerset	£4,278	£273.2m	£4,320	£275.9m	1.0%	£2.7m
Lincolnshire	£4,329	£392.0m	£4,370	£395.7m	0.9%	£3.7m
Dorset	£4,167	£202.3m	£4,204	£204.1m	0.9%	£1.8m
Peterborough	£4,490	£124.7m	£4,513	£125.3m	0.5%	£0.6m
Barnsley	£4,459	£126.7m	£4,478	£127.3m	0.4%	£0.5m
Bedford	£4,466	£101.0m	£4,484	£101.4m	0.4%	£0.4m

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Plymouth	£4,364	£140.1m	£4,380	£140.6m	0.4%	£0.5m
Isle of Wight	£4,489	£69.6m	£4,504	£69.9m	0.3%	£0.2m
East Riding of Yorkshire	£4,258	£177.9m	£4,271	£178.5m	0.3%	£0.5m
West Berkshire	£4,359	£95.2m	£4,372	£95.5m	0.3%	£0.3m
Walsall	£4,643	£183.3m	£4,655	£183.8m	0.3%	£0.5m
Milton Keynes	£4,440	£167.3m	£4,448	£167.6m	0.2%	£0.3m
Oxfordshire	£4,274	£333.1m	£4,281	£333.6m	0.1%	£0.5m
Barnet	£4,988	£214.3m	£4,994	£214.5m	0.1%	£0.2m
Hillingdon	£4,820	£187.0m	£4,824	£187.2m	0.1%	£0.2m
Derby	£4,544	£154.4m	£4,546	£154.4m	0.0%	£0.1m

Annex C: Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

1. This annex provides a detailed explanation of how we have developed the area cost adjustment that we are proposing is used to ensure that the allocation of additional funding reflects differences in area labour market costs.

2. The hybrid area cost adjustment would be applied to each minimum funding level so that in each local authority area, the minimum funding level reflects any disproportionate differences in labour market costs.

A Hybrid ACA – how does this work?

3. The hybrid ACA has a teachers' pay element and a non-teaching staff element and we describe how both have been calculated below. Both elements are combined to provide an overall adjustment for each local authority and we describe how we do this and how the adjustment has been calculated for an example authority.

Teachers' pay element

4. There are four regional pay bands for teachers: Inner London, Outer London, the Fringe and the Rest of England. We do not think it is right to use the average pay for each of these four pay band areas, because in each, average teacher pay will be influenced by the way in which the local authorities in those areas are currently funded. So we have used the following method:

- From the most recent published School Workforce Census (autumn 2012), we have looked at each teacher's¹ basic pay² and calculated how far that teacher was up the pay ranges for their regional pay band. For example, a classroom teacher in the Rest of England with basic pay of £21,588 in autumn 2012 is at the bottom of the main pay range for the Rest of England, which extends from £21,588 to £31,552.
- We then calculated what the same teacher's pay would be if he or she were in an equivalent position on the pay ranges for the other pay bands. For example if that teacher were at the bottom of the main pay range in Inner London (which runs from £27,000 to £36,387) they would have a basic salary of £27,000.
- We have repeated this for every teacher and every regional pay band.
- For each regional pay band, we calculated the notional average basic pay as if all teachers in England were in that pay band. For example, to calculate the average

¹ All grades of teachers were included in the calculation, including the leadership group.

² 'Basic pay' refers to the pay spines and pay scales defined in the [School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 2012](#) (which was in force at the time when the data was collected). Basic pay excludes items such as allowances for additional responsibilities.

pay in Inner London, we included not only the teachers in Inner London, but also teachers elsewhere, with their pay converted to Inner London rates. In this example, a classroom teacher in the Rest of England whose basic pay is £21,588 would be treated as having a notional basic salary of £27,000, purely for the purpose of calculating the Inner London average. The notional average basic pay for Inner London comes out at £41,388 and for the Rest of England £34,790. These notional amounts are purely for the ACA calculation and are not the actual regional averages.

- The adjustment for Inner London is the ratio of the two, 1.1897.

5. The average basic pay for each band, and the adjustment factors, are shown in figure C1 below.

Figure C1: Notional average basic pay and adjustment factors for teachers' regional pay bands.

	Inner London	Outer London	Fringe	Rest of England
Notional average basic pay for ACA calculation	£41,388	£38,256	£35,827	£34,790
Adjustment factor	1.1897	1.0996	1.0298	1.0000

Non-teaching staff element

6. The non-teaching staff element of the ACA is based on the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) labour cost adjustment (LCA), a general labour market (GLM) measure that is used to allocate funds to local authorities.

7. DCLG's LCA is based on regression analysis³ of pay data from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings⁴. The regression controls for variables such as age, gender, occupation, industry and public/private sector. The output is LCAs for 55 areas of England⁵.

8. DCLG has set a lower limit, to reflect the fact that national pay scales for public sector employees will not completely reflect the local labour market. The effect of the lower limit is that the 23 'cheapest' areas have their LCAs raised to the value of the threshold area, West Sussex Non-Fringe.

³ Further information on [DCLG's LCA methodology](#) can be found on the CLG website.

⁴ Further information on the [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings](#) can be found on the Office for National Statistics website.

⁵ Some local authorities fall into more than one ACA area. For example, Kent is divided into Fringe and Non-Fringe ACA areas. In these cases, a weighted average ACA for the local authorities could be calculated on the basis of the number of pupils in each area.

9. Some local authorities fall into more than one ACA area. For example, Kent is divided into Fringe and Non-Fringe ACA areas. In these cases, a weighted average ACA for the local authorities could be calculated on the basis of the number of pupils in each area.

Hybrid ACA

10. We have used recently published data on local authority expenditure on education (section 251⁶) to calculate the proportion of total school funding that was spent on (1) expenses related to employing **teachers** (the teacher proportion – 54.4%) and (2) expenses relating to employing **non-teaching staff** (the non-teaching staff proportion – 27.4%). The remaining 18.2% of expenditure was on non-staff costs. These splits have been calculated by apportioning the cost lines according to figure C2 on the following page.

⁶ The most recent [Section 251 data](#) (Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009) can be found on the Department's website.

Figure C2: Assumed apportionment of spending between teachers, non-teaching staff and non-pay

Spending by schools	Teachers	Non-teaching staff	Non-Pay	Excluded	Total	References to notes below
Teaching staff (E01)	100%				100%	
Supply teaching staff (E02)	100%				100%	
Education support staff (E03)		100%			100%	
Premises staff (E04)		100%			100%	
Administrative & clerical staff (E05)		100%			100%	
Catering Staff (E06)		100%			100%	
Cost of other staff (E07)		100%			100%	
Indirect employee expenses (E08)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Development and training (E09)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Supply teacher insurance (E10)	100%				100%	
Staff related insurance (E11)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Building maintenance and improvement (E12)		35%	65%		100%	Note 2
Grounds maintenance and improvement (E13)		35%	65%		100%	Note 2
Cleaning and caretaking (E14)		65%	35%		100%	Note 2
Water and sewerage (E15)			100%		100%	
Energy (E16)			100%		100%	
Rates (E17)			100%		100%	
Other occupation costs (E18)			100%		100%	
Learning resources (not ICT) (E19)			100%		100%	
ICT learning resources (E20)			100%		100%	
Examination fees (E21)			100%		100%	
Administrative supplies (E22)			100%		100%	
Other insurance premiums (E23)			100%		100%	
Special facilities (E24)			100%		100%	
Catering supplies (E25)			100%		100%	
Agency supply teaching staff (E26)	100%				100%	
Bought-in professional services - curriculum (E27)		40%	60%		100%	Note 2
Bought-in professional services - other (E28)		40%	60%		100%	Note 2
Loan interest (E29)			100%		100%	
Community focused extended school staff (E31)				100%	100%	Note 3
Community focused extended school costs (E32)				100%	100%	Note 3

Notes

1. Divided between teachers and other staff in the same proportions as E01, E02, E03, E04, E05, E06 and E07 combined.
2. Based on assumptions derived from a sample of company accounts of firms contracted by local authorities to supply these services.
3. Excluded, as not part of the school budget.

11. Figure C2 produces a ratio of Teachers' Pay to Other Pay and Non-Pay expenditure of 54%:27%:18%⁷. In other words, of the expenditure on labour, 66% was spent on teachers and 34% was spent on non-teaching staff. Therefore, for a combined ACA the teacher pay band data will take a weighting of 66% and the general labour market (GLM) will carry a 34% weighting.

12. This approach provides a solution to the geography mismatch between the GLM geographies and the teachers' regional pay bands, as those authorities who are in Outer London but who pay their teachers at Inner London rates have this reflected in the teachers' pay section of the ACA. The hybrid ACA for each local authority, based on the combination of the teaching and non-teaching staff pay data, in the ratios described above, is shown in figure C3.

Example calculation

13. Ealing is in the Inner London teacher pay band, and it has a Labour Cost Adjustment of 1.1671 for non-teaching staff. The ACA for Ealing is calculated as follows:

Example – The area cost adjustment for Ealing	
ACA	= 1 + teacher proportion * (teacher cost adjustment – 1) + non-teaching staff proportion * (LCA – 1)
	= 1 + 54.4%*(1.1897 - 1) + 27.4%*(1.1671 - 1)
	= 1.1489

Area cost adjustment figures by local authority

14. Figure C3 provides the adjustments we are proposing for each local authority. Using the methodology above, the ACA for a local authority area is greater than 1 if either the teacher pay element or the non-teaching staff pay element of the hybrid ACA is greater than 1. The teacher pay element is greater than 1 if all or part of the local authority is in the Fringe, Outer London or Inner London teachers' pay bands. The non-teaching staff pay element is greater than 1 if the GLM labour costs are greater than a

⁷ More precisely, the proportions are 54.4% : 27.4% : 18.2%.

lower limit that has been set by the Department for Communities and Local Government to be equivalent to the West-Sussex Non-Fringe GLM labour cost adjustment⁸.

15. Authorities that are partly in the Fringe teachers' pay band and partly in the Rest of England teachers' pay band appear twice in figure C3, as 'Fringe' and 'Non-Fringe'.

Table of area cost adjustment by local authority

Figure C3: Area cost adjustment by local authority

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Barking and Dagenham	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Barnet	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Barnsley	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bath and North East Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
Bedford	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Bexley	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Birmingham	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Blackburn with Darwen	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Blackpool	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bolton	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Bournemouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bracknell Forest	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Bradford	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Brent	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
Brighton and Hove	Rest	1.0000	1.0061	1.0017
Bristol, City of	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
Bromley	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Buckinghamshire Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1114	1.0467
Buckinghamshire Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.1036	1.0284
Bury	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Calderdale	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Cambridgeshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0464	1.0127
Camden	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Central Bedfordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Cheshire East	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Cheshire West and Chester	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
City of London	IL	1.1897	1.5771	1.2613
Cornwall	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

⁸Further information on the methodology for [DCLG's area cost adjustment](#) can be found on the DCLG website.

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
County Durham	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Coventry	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Croydon	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Cumbria	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Darlington	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Derby	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Derbyshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Devon	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Doncaster	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Dorset	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Dudley	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Ealing	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
East Riding of Yorkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
East Sussex	Rest	1.0000	1.0061	1.0017
Enfield	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Essex Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.0783	1.0377
Essex non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0128	1.0035
Gateshead	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Gloucestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0227	1.0062
Greenwich	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Hackney	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Halton	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Hammersmith and Fulham	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Hampshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Haringey	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Harrow	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Hartlepool	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Havering	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Herefordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Hertfordshire Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1114	1.0467
Hertfordshire Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Hillingdon	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Hounslow	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Isle of Wight	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Isles of Scilly	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Islington	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Kensington and Chelsea	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Kent Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.0783	1.0377
Kent non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0026	1.0007
Kingston upon Hull, City of	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Kingston upon Thames	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Kirklees	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Knowsley	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Lambeth	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Lancashire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Leeds	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Leicester	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Leicestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Lewisham	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Liverpool	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Luton	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Manchester	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Medway	Rest	1.0000	1.0026	1.0007
Merton	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
Middlesbrough	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Milton Keynes	Rest	1.0000	1.1036	1.0284
Newcastle upon Tyne	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Newham	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Norfolk	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North East Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
North Tyneside	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Yorkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Northamptonshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0119	1.0033
Northumberland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Nottingham	Rest	1.0000	1.0100	1.0027
Nottinghamshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0100	1.0027
Oldham	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Oxfordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0802	1.0220
Peterborough	Rest	1.0000	1.0464	1.0127
Plymouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Poole	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Portsmouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Reading	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344
Redbridge	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Redcar and Cleveland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Richmond upon Thames	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Rochdale	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Rotherham	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Rutland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Salford	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Sandwell	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Sefton	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Sheffield	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Shropshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Slough	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Solihull	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
South Gloucestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
South Tyneside	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Southampton	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Southend-on-Sea	Rest	1.0000	1.0128	1.0035
Southwark	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
St. Helens	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Staffordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Stockport	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Stockton-on-Tees	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Stoke-on-Trent	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Suffolk	Rest	1.0000	1.0001	1.0000
Sunderland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Surrey	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Sutton	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Swindon	Rest	1.0000	1.0259	1.0071
Tameside	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Telford and Wrekin	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Thurrock	Rest	1.0000	1.0783	1.0215
Torbay	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Tower Hamlets	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Trafford	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Wakefield	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Walsall	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Waltham Forest	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Wandsworth	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Warrington	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Warwickshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0253	1.0069
West Berkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344
West Sussex Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
West Sussex Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Westminster	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Wigan	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Wiltshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0259	1.0071
Windsor and Maidenhead	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Wirral	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Wokingham	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Wolverhampton	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Worcestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
York	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000



Department
for Education

Consultation Response Form

Consultation closing date: 30 April 2014
Your comments must reach us by that date

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	

Name:	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](#) page.

Please mark the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained school	<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input type="checkbox"/> Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Governor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bursar	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent
<input type="checkbox"/> Schools forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Trade union organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

1 Do you agree that the existing distribution of schools funding is unfair?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

2 Do you agree with our proposed choice of characteristics to which to attach minimum funding levels?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Given our proposal to set minimum funding levels such that we can afford to fund all local authorities at those levels or above in 2015-16, do you agree with the proposed values of the minimum funding levels?

3 a) Age Weighted Pupil Unit

Yes No Not Sure

3 b) Deprivation

Yes No Not Sure

3 c) Looked-after children

Yes No Not Sure

3 d) English as an additional language

Yes No Not Sure

3 e) Low prior attainment

Yes No Not Sure

3 f) Lump sum

Yes No Not Sure

3 g) Sparsity

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

4 Do you agree that labour market cost differences should be taken into account as we allocate the £350m?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

5 Do you agree this should be calculated using the hybrid approach we have set out?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

6 If you do not agree that we should use a hybrid approach, what would you prefer we used?

<input type="checkbox"/> Use teacher pay bands only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use a general labour market measure only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use an alternative method
---	---	--

Comments:

Sparsity Review

7 We introduced a sparsity factor for the first time in 2015-16. How helpful has this factor been in ensuring that sufficient funding is targeted at small schools serving sparsely populated areas?

<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

8 Do you think it would be useful to revise the criteria for the sparsity factor to take into account the average number of pupils in each year group, rather than the number of pupils in the school? If so, how?

Useful

Not useful

Not sure

Comments:

9 Are there any other changes you would like to suggest to improve the operation of this factor, and why?

Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply.	
E-mail address for acknowledgement:	

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Aileen Shaw, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 30 April 2014

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, DARLINGTON DL3 9BG

Send by e-mail to:
SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk



MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
MEETING DATE:	4 APRIL 2014
TITLE OF REPORT:	HIGH NEEDS TARIFF PROPOSALS
REPORT BY:	SCHOOL FINANCE MANAGER

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards Affected

County-wide.

Purpose

To defer implementation of the new High Needs Tariff until September 2014 to allow minor adjustments to the proposals, as identified by the independent review, to be finalised and agreed with the Development Top-Up Group to ensure successful implementation in schools and FE providers.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (i) **The implementation of the new High Needs Tariff proposals be deferred to 1st September 2014 to allow the Top-Up Tariff Development group to finalise the outstanding details; and**
- (ii) **The recommendations from the independent expert review of the proposals be accepted as follows;**
 - **Further independent moderation at Barrs Court school so that the school assessment for all pupils are reviewed;**
 - **School assessment at the other special schools be accepted as the moderation confirmed their accuracy; and**
 - **Peer moderation to be adopted from the Special Schools from September 2014;**

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Malcolm Green on Tel (01432) 260818

- **The Behaviour, Emotional and Social Difficulties (BESD) weighting be increased from 3 to 4 – due to the additional provision that needs to be made because of the presenting difficulties and the impact on other children;**
- **Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLD) factor – the Cognition and Learning category be capped to a maximum number of points (16 points but subject to confirmation) to avoid double counting the weightings/funding in Severe Learning Difficulties/Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties special school provision; and**
- **To undertake further work for all special schools and particularly for Westfield so that the implications of the Minimum Funding Guarantee are clearly understood and appropriate for schools with a budget shortfall.**

(iii) **confirmation of the final proposals be agreed by Schools Forum in July 2014.**

Alternative Options

- 1 The proposals were well supported by schools as part of the autumn budget consultation. Alternatives could have been developed at that stage but were not required. Options now need only to relate to adjustments to the detailed weightings and are more related to successful implementation.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 To defer implementation of the new High Needs Tariff until September 2014 to allow minor adjustments to the proposals, as identified by the independent review, to be finalised and agreed with the Development Top-Up Group to ensure successful implementation in schools and FE providers.

Key Considerations

- 3 The autumn budget consultation with schools included proposals for the introduction of a High Needs Funding Tariff from April 2014 to provide consistency in meeting pupil and student needs across mainstream, special schools and FE providers. The proposals are designed to ensure that pupils and students with the same level of need will receive the same level of top-up funding irrespective of the choice of provision. The DfE has standardised funding arrangements nationally to encourage the development of high quality and innovative provision, to improve transparency and to empower young people and their families and to increase choice.
- 4 The new funding tariff provides a graduated assessment of individual need which will be consistent across all schools and FE providers. The current high needs Banded Funding system in mainstream and special school standard and enhanced funding categories will be replaced by the High Needs Funding Tariff whereby an individual's needs will be split into an arrangement of six separate tariffs (A-F) with top-up funding ranging from £1,350 to £16,000 in addition to the funding delegated directly to the provider.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Malcolm Green on Tel (01432) 260818

Subject to final confirmation with Schools Forum in July, the proposed tariff will be

Tariff	£
A	1,350
B	3,500
C	5,500
D	8,500
E	12,000
F	16,000

- 5 The proposals for the High Need Tariff were well received in the autumn consultation and further detailed steps towards implementation has been taken by the Top-Up Tariff Development Group which meets regularly and comprises representative headteachers, SENCOs, Local Authority SEN and finance Officers and FE providers. The most important step has been to arrange the independent moderation of the tariff proposals and the initial pupil assessments by experienced (and out of county) ex-special school Headteachers now practicing as registered Ofsted inspectors and School Improvement Partners. Their advice will provide a useful comparison with similar schemes in other counties.
- 6 The independent report is set out as Appendix 1 and is summarised as follows;
- The SEN Matrix is useful and user-friendly instrument to provide a broad brushstroke picture of individual pupils' needs.
 - Special Schools to collaborate to provide 'in-house' moderation to allow direct comparison and sharing of expertise.
 - In moderating, observation should be used alongside the paperwork.
 - In terms of wording some attention should be paid to frequency – certainly "persistently" could usefully replace "regularly" at Level 4. Possibly "often within a typical week" might replace "often" at Level 2 and "often within a typical day" might replace "frequently" at level 3.
 - The weightings do not appear to recognize the provision required for BESD and recommendation is to increase the BESD weighting from 3 to 4.
 - Consideration should be given to either using the 'Specific Learning Difficulties' column for only mainstream schools or for mainstream and the BESD special school only and not other special schools.
 - It was felt that the usefulness of the Autistic Spectrum Disorder ('ASD') column was debateable.
- 7 The Development Group discussed in detail whether the ASD should be a separate column or not. It was noted that the ASD weighting/column is included as it is part of the SEN Code of Practice. The group considered that the way pupils present is key (rather than the diagnosis) and that this presentation is already represented in the learning and social behavior columns potentially resulting in these needs being scored twice. It was agreed by the group to keep the ASD column to ensure that it is

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Malcolm Green on Tel (01432) 260818

representative of the SEN Code of Practice but to consider again as part of the implementation review in 2015.

8 The financial implications of the independent report have been assessed as follows;

School	Average top-up payment February 2014	Average top-up at new tariffs-school assessments	Total Increase /(decrease) in Spend	Impact of adjusting BESD weighting to x4	Impact of moderation on all pupils	Revised Increase/ (decrease) in spend
	£	£	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Westfield	£11,611	£9,051	(106)	(46)		(152)
Barrs Court	£8,298	£11,397	+322	(91)	(200)	+31
Blackmarston	£11,195	£12,417	+84	(78)		+6
Brookfield	£8,438	£6,400	(135)	+110		(25)
Total			+165	(£105)	(200)	(140)

9 Taken as a whole the adoption of the suggested changes to the tariff proposals and the full moderation of all the pupils at Barrs Court school will ensure that future high needs total expenditure will be consistent with past total expenditure based on the previous different methodologies. Further discussions are planned with Westfield to ensure that the funding protection available through the Minimum Funding Guarantee will meet the school's needs and be affordable. It continues to be an option to apply to the DfE for an exemption from the MFG and propose an alternative protection scheme; this will be discussed with Westfield and the High Needs Top-up group. In particular, the tariff changes recommended to Schools Forum are as follows;

- Further independent moderation at Barrs Court school for all remaining pupils
- School assessment at the other special schools is accepted as the moderation confirmed their accuracy.
- Peer moderation to be adopted from the Special Schools from September 2014.
- The BESD weighting be increased from 3 to 4 – due to the additional provision that needs to be made because of the presenting difficulties and the impact on other children.

- SpLD factor — the Cognition and Learning category be capped to a maximum number of points (16 points but subject to confirmation) to avoid double counting the weightings/funding in SLD/PMLD special school provision
 - To undertake further work for all special schools and particularly for Westfield so that the implications of the Minimum Funding Guarantee are clearly understood and appropriate for schools with a budget shortfall.
- 10 An appeal process regarding the funding of individual pupils will be set up as follows;
- a. Using High Needs Matrix, SEN Team determine initial allocation via Statutory Assessment
 - b. If school unhappy then discuss with SEN Team with details of changes to High Needs Matrix scoring and additional information as appropriate
 - c. If still unhappy then take school takes to a Panel of peers (as per Banded Funding approach)
 - d. If still unhappy then take to Head of Additional Needs
 - e. Process and individual discussion using High Needs Matrix as the basis for discussion
- 11 The existing high needs top-ups will continue for the Summer term 2014 with a view to implementing the new High Need Tariff Funding from September 2014. There will be a further meeting(s) of the Top-up tariff development group to finalise the outstanding details and agreement sought from Schools Forum in July 2014. It is proposed to undertake an implementation review from January 2015 and to report to Schools Forum in Summer 2015.

Community Impact

- 12 At this stage, there is no significant community impact.

Equality and Human Rights

- 13 The funding reforms are national so the DfE has responsibility for the equality impact assessment on a national basis for England as a whole. Regarding implementation in Herefordshire, the high needs tariff is relates only to Element 3 of the national High Needs Block:
- 14 Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community, and therefore potentially have an effect in terms of equality?**
- 15 The duty on schools to make the specific provision described in Part 3 of the child/young person's Statement of SEN remains and is not impacted by the change to the way that schools in Herefordshire are funded to make the provision for additional needs. So, while the assigned depending on individual need, it should not be prejudicial to the service users.
- 16 Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?**
- 17 Given that the duties on schools to make provision is unaltered, this policy should not change how functions are delivered.

- 18 Will it have a significant effect on how other organisations operate?**
- 19 Overall funding to individual schools may change as a result of the new approach but there are protections in place (e.g. MFG) to ensure that organisations are not significantly adversely affected. Schools can appeal on an individual basis if the assessment is considered insufficient to meet the pupil's needs.
- 20 Does it relate to functions that previous involvement activities have identified as being important to particular protected groups?**
- 21 No

Financial Implications

- 22 Adoption of the moderation report will ensure expenditure is consistent with current spend and further financial analysis will be reviewed by the Top-Up Development group to ensure consistent.

Legal Implications

- 23 To be provided by Legal.

Risk Management

- 24 Independent moderation of new High Needs Tariff proposals has not identified deficiencies in the proposals. The appeal process will provide second and further opportunities for review of individual pupil needs.

Consultees

- 25 None

Appendices

None

Background Papers

None identified



MEETING:	SCHOOLS FORUM
MEETING DATE:	4 APRIL 2014
TITLE OF REPORT:	UPDATE ON SCHOOLS CAPITAL & MAINTENANCE PROGRAMMES
REPORT BY:	HEAD OF EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not a key decision.

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To update Schools Forum on capital allocations to schools.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) the allocations to Herefordshire for new pupil (basic need), maintenance of LA maintained schools, LCVAP allocations and school's devolved capital for 2014-15 be noted;
- (b) progress with spending the basic need, maintenance and LCVAP for 2013/14 be noted; and
- (c) the School Capital Strategy Consultative group be asked to consider the efficient and effective approach to these grants and report back to Schools Forum in July 2014.

Alternative Options

- 1 There are no alternative options as this is a report for information.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The government grant Local Authorities 3 separate funding streams for capital works. There should be an open and transparent approach to the amounts and their use, taking into account devolved capital as well.

Key Considerations

- 3 The allocations for 3 main grants are set out in the table below. The government has taken a two year approach to the new places basic need grant allocation.

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
New Places Basic Need	£2,134,842	£807,190	£864,814		£634,384	£666,103
Locally Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP)	£1,080,000	£950,000	£759,415	£747,864		
Maintenance	£2,695,522	£1,806,617	£1,717,412	£1,512,680		
Universal Infant Meals				£246,883 (LA schools) £83,986 (VA schools)		

- 4 The new places (basic need) allocation includes the development of provision across all state funded schools. While there is still an overall surplus of places there are a number of primary schools that are full. The Strategic Education Board and Capital Strategy Consultative group are developing a programme for looking at these issues.
- 5 There are no specific allocations for capital work linked to provision for children with special educational needs. £830,000 of basic needs funding has been allocated to Westfield School to meet the need for appropriate school, places for pupils with complex special educational needs. Several options for the use of this funding have been developed and are being considered with a decision about the way forward to be made shortly. This will increase capacity in the short term and ensure additional space for September 2014.
- 6 The pressures on special school places, particularly in light of there being no specific funding are being addressed by the Strategic Education Board and the Capital Strategy Consultative group.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Andy Hough, Head of Education Development on Tel (01432) 260920

- 7 The reduction in the maintenance grant allocation reflects the academy conversions. Academies access centrally retained academies maintenance fund (ACMF).
- 8 The maintenance work profiled in the budget for 2013/14 has been affected with the change of property service partner contractor from Amey to Integral. The work to complete the changes to the BMS Trend system is behind schedule as are a number of other agreed projects.
- 9 A document “Duties Associated With Running A School” has been developed and consulted upon and will be circulated before the Easter holiday to assist schools in being clear about their responsibilities particularly in relation to buildings.
- 10 A comprehensive agreed understanding of the condition of all LA maintained buildings is being informed by additional condition surveys that have been commissioned to ensure data is up to date. The Capital Strategy Consultative group will consider the data with a view to making recommendations about the programme in May 2014.
- 11 Progress with the work agreed in the report to Schools Forum on the 12th July 2013 is set out in appendices 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Community Impact

- 12 Schools are a very important part of a community. Parents/carers want there to be a place available at their preferred school. The proposals to allocate the funding to support new places will be mindful of this.

Equality and Human Rights

- 13 There has been agreement about the sharing of costs associated with making provision for pupils with disabilities in schools as there is not specific budget for this purpose. A broader accessibility strategy is being developed to ensure best use is made of the resources available.

Financial Implications

- 14 The basic need and maintenance budgets are direct grants from the government allocated on a formula basis. Basic need funding is allocated by comparing forecast pupil numbers from the school capital survey (SCAP) data provided to capacity, with shortfalls attracting capital funding. Maintenance funding is allocated with reference to school census data using weighted pupil numbers adjusted by a location factor (to represent the local building cost) and adjusted further for modernised schools.
- 15 2014/15 has attracted a one-off capital grant funding for universal infant free school meals, this funding has been allocated based on pupil numbers and is for the expansion and improvement of facilities.
- 16 The LCVAP funding requires schools to make a 10% contribution to any scheme. The complexities of the LCVAP claim system are such that achieving a balanced year end budget can be difficult, schools are required to manage this risk through their cashflow.
- 17 The funding received is allocated to schemes through the school Capital Strategy Group and is detailed in the Appendices to this report.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Andy Hough, Head of Education Development on Tel (01432) 260920

Legal Implications

18 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Risk Management

19 The risks are:

a) Failure of the Local Authority to provide sufficient school places.

Reputational risk is associated with:

- Delivery of capital and maintenance schemes that are going to ensure sufficient school places and buildings that are in a good state of repair.
- Delivery of the schemes to the quality or in the time scales expected.

20 These risks are mitigated through consultation and discussion with members of the capital strategy working group to provide open clear communication with all schools. In addition high quality project management by the school capital team will continue to take place, informed by feedback from those having work undertaken.

21 With the current pupil population projections and the level of surplus of places in both the primary and secondary sector the failure to provide sufficient school places is considered low.

Consultees

22 There have been meetings and discussions held with Property Services, Diocesan representatives and representative head teachers (through the Capital Strategy Group).

Appendices

Appendix 1 – (Locally Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme) LCVAP budget profile 2013/14

Appendix 2 - Basic Need Budget Profile 2013/15

Appendix 3 - Maintenance Budget Profile 2013/14

Appendix 4 – Detailed Maintenance Schedule 2013/14

Background Papers

None identified

Appendix 1

LCVAP Budget Profile 2013/14			
(Locally Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme)			
2013/2014 budget allocation	£759,415	90% allocation	
2013/2014 schools contribution	£84,379	10% contribution	
Carry Forward	0		
Total	£843,794		
Retentions from 2012/2013 to be paid	£16,806		
To be allocated	£826,988		
Item	Amount	Comments	Predicted Spend
DDA adaptations – St Marys RC	£90,000	Proportional contribution based on size of budget (Also £45k from Basic Need, £180k from Maintenance)	£88,889
St Francis – drainage	£52,000	£1136 outstanding to claim	£11,840
Weston-under-Penyard – roof repairs	£30,000	Completed	£29,838
Leintwardine – heating	£75,000	Some extra work needed	£86,864
Cradley - boiler	£23,000	Complete	£24,003
St James Hereford – gable work	£35,000	Increased costs	£56,316
St James Hereford – boilers	£90,000	Complete	£75,337
St Thomas Cantilupe – roof & health & safety	£50,000	Complete and to budget	£49,619
Kimbolton – roof and heater	£30,000	Complete	£27,715
Pembridge – lighting	£6,000	To budget but not all claimed	£2,817
Pencombe – stone works	£18,000	Nearing completion	£18,000
Bishops – windows, roof works etc.	£327,988	Significant works undertaken. Claims still to be processed but concern there will be a shortfall in claims as invoices not available before 4 th March	£367,893
Total	£826,988		£839,131
Retention to carry forward to 2014/2015	TBC		-£12,143
Balance	0		0
*** final claim date for LCVAP 04/03/2014, predicted spend correct as at LCVAP meeting on 04/02/2014			

Appendix 2

Basic Need Budget Profile 2013/15			
Item	Amount	Comments	Predicted spend
2013/2015 Budget Allocation	£864,814		
2012/2013 Carry Forward	£438,032		
Total	£1,302,846		
Leominster Primary School 2013/14	£176,000	Complete	£176,000
Leominster Primary School 2014/15	£176,000	Complete	£176,000
DDA adaptations	£45,000	Proportional contribution based on size of budget. All schemes complete, except Gorsley Goffs.	£45,000
Contingency	£75,000	Not allocated	0
Westfield	£830,846	Scheme and options still under consideration.	£830,846
Total	£1,302,846		£1,227,846
Balance	0		£75,000

Appendix 3

<u>Maintenance Budget Profile 2013/14</u>		
Item	Amount	Comments
2013/2014 Budget Allocation	£1,717,412	
Carry Forward	0	
Allocation to Leominster Primary School	£83,292	Complete
Planned maintenance	£901,300	Schemes ongoing. See Appendix 4
Planned maintenance fees at 15%	£135,195	Ongoing
Contingency for planned maintenance	£130,000	See Appendix 4
Condition reports at £3000	£36,000	Extra have been commissioned
DDA adaptations	£180,000	Proportional contribution based on size of budget. All schemes except Gorsley Goff's complete.
Mobile replacements	£84,000	Complete to budget
Trend costs for year 2013/14	£40,000	Ongoing
Trend removal costs includes survey and works	£40,000	Not all schemes have been costed and an extension to the contract has been proposed
Trend removal cost fees at 15%	£6,000	
Maintenance avoidance	£40,000	
Overall contingency	£41,625	
Total	£1,717,412	
Balance	0	

Proposed Schedule of Planned Maintenance Works 2013 – 2014

Property	Work	Budget	Additional Info	Cost	Estimated spend	Variance
Ashfield Park Primary School	Storm drainage	£40,000.00	Ongoing 95% complete	TBC	£40,000.00	£0.00
Ashfield Park Primary School	Flat roof repairs, gutters and fascias	£19,000.00	Ongoing 95% complete	TBC	£19,000.00	£0.00
Burley Gate C E Primary School	Power upgrade	£18,500.00	Order placed with Integral	£26,672.01	£26,672.01	-£8,172.01
Cleghonger C E Primary School	Flat roof repairs, gutters and fascias	£12,000.00	To be progressed	TBC	£12,000.00	£0.00
Colwall C E Primary School	Boiler and heating replacement	£32,000.00	On Hold	£0.00	£0.00	£32,000.00
Eardisley C E Primary School	Damp issues	£12,000.00	Complete	£3,659.60	£3,659.60	£8,340.40
Eardisley C E Primary School	Upgrade lighting fittings	£10,300.00	Order placed with Integral	£16,904.61	£16,904.61	-£6,604.61
Eardisley C E Primary School	Upgrade boiler parts	£4,000.00	Not needed	£0.00	£0.00	£4,000.00
Ewyas Harold Primary School	Boiler replacement	£6,000.00	Complete 27/09/2013	£8,240.00	£8,240.00	-£2,240.00
Ewyas Harold Primary School	Drainage works	£5,000.00	Complete	£2,358.00	£2,358.00	£2,642.00
Fairfield High School, Peterchurch	External decorations and rainwater goods	£25,000.00	Ongoing	TBC	£10,000.00	£15,000.00
Garway Primary School	Drainage works	£75,000.00	Complete	£39,880.00	£39,880.00	£35,120.00
Gorsley Goff's Endowed Primary School	New mains intake	£25,000.00	Order placed with Integral	£4,571.63	£4,571.63	£20,428.37
Hampton Dene Primary School	Curtain walling replacement	£93,000.00	Complete	£87,604.00	£87,604.00	£5,396.00
Kington Primary School	Window replacement and roofing	£50,000.00	£25,572.64 for two lots of roofing works, £17,898.76 for windows. Order placed	£43,471.40	£43,471.40	£6,528.60
Longtown Primary School	Fire alarm renewal	£6,000.00	Order placed with Integral	£6,640.00	£6,640.00	£6,640.00
Madley Primary School	Roof light replacement	£5,500.00	Complete	£0.00	£0.00	£5,500.00
Madley Primary School	Repairs to external walls	£3,000.00	Ongoing	TBC	£3,000.00	£0.00
Michaelchurch Escley Primary School	Fire precautions	£15,000.00	On Hold	£0.00	£0.00	£15,000.00
Michaelchurch Escley Primary School	Heating controls upgrade and new oil tank	£5,000.00	Oil tank done last year, no point in fixing heating controls as new boiler needed but can wait until next year (approx 10k)	£0.00	£0.00	£5,000.00
Peterchurch Primary School	Replace boilers and heating distribution	£46,000.00	Not needed	£0.00	£0.00	£46,000.00

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Andy Hough on Tel (01432) 260920

Appendix 4 continued

Property	Work	Budget	Additional Info	Cost	Estimated spend	Variance
Riverside Primary School	Resand and seal hall floor	£4,000.00	Complete	£7,238.30	£7,238.30	-£3,238.30
Riverside Primary School	Gutter leaks and fixings				£4,265.00	
Riverside Primary School	Upgrade fire doors and door hinge protection	£15,000.00	Originally £10,000 for gutter leaks and fixings and £5,000 to upgrade fire doors and protection, priced together.	£15,935.00	£11,670.00	-£935.00
St Martin's Primary School	Window replacement	£50,000.00	Complete	£25,338.30	£25,338.30	£24,661.70
St Mary's C E Primary School, Credenhill	Glazed screen and curtain walling replacement	£30,000.00	Complete	£31,238.00	£31,238.00	-£1,238.00
St Mary's C E Primary School, Credenhill	Partial rewire and switchgear upgrade	£18,000.00	Summer 2014	£0.00	£18,000.00	£0.00
St Mary's C E Primary School, Credenhill	Fire alarm replacement					
St Mary's C E Primary School, Credenhill	Emergency Lighting upgrade	£17,500.00	Priced together- order placed	£19,391.87	£19,391.87	-£1,891.87
St Peter's Primary School, Bromyard	Roof maintenance works	£10,000.00	Complete	£12,982.00	£12,982.00	-£2,982.00
St Peter's Primary School, Bromyard	Replace AHU	£5,000.00	Complete	£5,000.00		-£16,414.00
St Peter's Primary School, Bromyard	Lighting upgrade	£9,000.00	Complete	£9,000.00	£21,414.00	£9,000.00
St Peter's Primary School, Bromyard	Power upgrade	£6,500.00	Complete	£6,500.00		£6,500.00
St Weonard's Primary School	Lighting upgrade	£5,500.00	Order placed with Integral	£15,176.70	£15,176.70	-£9,676.70
Trinity Primary School	Curtain walling	£132,500.00	Complete	£132,246.00	£154,841.27	-£22,341.27
Withington	Roof maintenance works and replacement of hall floor	£50,000.00	Hall floor complete. Roof TBC.	£17,953.84	£50,000.00	£0.00
Weobley High School	Switchgear replacement	£25,000.00	Summer 2014	£0.00	£25,000.00	£0.00
Weobley High School	Repairs to emergency lighting, small power, data and distribution boards	£7,000.00	Summer 2014	£0.00	£7,000.00	£0.00
Weobley High School	Lighting replacement	£9,000.00	Summer 2014	£0.00	£9,000.00	£0.00
		Budget	Remaining	Estimated spend to date	Estimated spend	
		£901,300.00	£164,743.31	£538,001.26	£736,556.69	

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Andy Hough on Tel (01432) 260920

Appendix 4 continued

Emergency Works												
Property	Work	Budget	Additional Info	Cost	Estimated spend	Variance						
Stoke Prior	Path and hole	£13,000.00	Complete		£11,461.00							
Cradley	Legionella	£5,500.00	Complete		£5,487.00							
Westfield	Water heater	£4,700.00	Complete		£4,776.00							
Fairfield	Maths mobile roof	£12,004.00	Complete		£12,119.46							
Colwall	Damp investigation works	£15,000.00	Complete		£20,000.00							
Madley	Roof repair	£20,000.00	Included roof light replacement		£28,005.00							
Madley	Boiler	£30,000.00	Complete		£26,141.86							
Garway	Fire exits	£10,000.00	Complete		£19,126.00							
Fairfield	Science block roof	£16,418.00	Ongoing		£16,418.00							
			Budget									
			£130,000.00									
				Remaining								
				-£13,534.32								
					Spend							
					£143,534.32							

*** add £5,500 to budget for planned roof light works at Madley = £8031 over contingency budget

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Andy Hough on Tel (01432) 260920



MEETING:	HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM
MEETING DATE:	4 APRIL 2014
TITLE OF REPORT:	MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOLS FORUM
REPORT BY:	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

Classification

Open

Key Decision

This is not an executive decision.

Purpose

To review the membership of the Schools Forum and the Budget Working Group.

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- (a) it be noted that no amendment to the membership of the Forum is required; and
- (b) it be noted that no amendment to the membership of the Budget Working Group is required.

Alternative Options

- 1 The Forum could take the view that strict proportionality should be applied to the Forum's membership. Alternatively, there is scope to exercise discretion and proceed with the current membership if there is a consensus that the membership is sufficiently broadly proportionate.

Reasons for Recommendations

- 2 The Regulations contain a requirement that primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on the Forum. The recommendations address this requirement.

Key Considerations

- 3 The Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 contain a requirement that primary schools, secondary schools and academies must be broadly proportionately represented on the Forum.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Democratic Services Officer on Tel (01432) 260239

- 4 The Forum's Constitution provides that the term of office of representatives is three years, running from 1 September to 31 August. In the event that a member of the Forum ceases to hold the office, the term of office ceases and another appointment must be made. The replacement will serve the remainder of the term. The terms for all current members are taken to have commenced on 1 September 2012 and will end on 31 August 2015.
- 5 It was, however, decided that the membership of the Forum would be kept under annual review to provide flexibility to ensure that broad proportionality of primary schools, secondary schools and academies was maintained. The three year term of office would be subject to this annual review. This is consistent with the Department for Education Guidance that, *"The term of office should not be of a length that would hinder the requirement for the structure of Schools Forum to mirror the type of provision in light of the pace of academy conversions."*
- 6 The relevant Regulation makes no distinction between primary phase and secondary phase academies. The guidance states that Free Schools are classed as academies for the purpose of this exercise. The calculations of proportionality set out below have been made on that basis.

As at Spring School Census 2014 (conducted 16/01/2014)								
	LA Maintained		Academies		Free Schools		Total	
	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils
Primary	61	9,644	17	3,155	1	34	79	12,833
Secondary	6	3,859	8	5,502	1	30	15	9,391
All through			1	329			1	329
Sub total	67	13503	26	8986	2	64		22553
Special Schools	3	183	1	107			4	290
Pupil Referral Units	3	74					3	74
Total	73	13760	27	9093	2	64	102	22917

- 7 Based on the proportionate number of registered pupils, the numbers of member places (to the nearest whole number) to be filled by primary schools, secondary schools and academies, are:

Maintained Primary $9,644/22,553 = 42.8\% \times 16 = 7$

Maintained Secondary $3,859/22,553 = 17.1\% \times 16 = 3$

Academies $9,050/22,553 = 40.1\% \times 16 = 6$.

(The proportionate split between primary and secondary academies, if applied at the discretion of the Academies, is 2 primary and 4 secondary seats.)

- 8 This means that the proportionality remains as reported to the Forum in May 2013. Applying strict proportionality, the Forum currently has one too many secondary academy representatives and one too few maintained secondary school representatives (either a Headteacher or a Governor).
- 9 There is scope to exercise discretion and proceed with the current membership if there is a consensus that the membership is sufficiently broadly proportionate.
- 10 In May 2013 the Forum was asked to consider whether it would wish to recommend a change to its composition or was satisfied that, subject to the agreement of Herefordshire Association of Secondary Head Teachers and the Herefordshire Association of Governors the current membership continue. Those two bodies indicated their agreement to the membership continuing.
- 11 It is proposed that no change is made to the current membership.

Membership of the Budget Working Group

- 12 Regulations prescribe how the Forum itself is to be constituted. These provisions do not apply to the composition of the Budget Working Group. That is a matter for the Forum itself. The Forum agreed in October 2012 that representative bodies be invited to submit nominations to serve on the Budget Working Group on the basis that the Group will consist of 14 Members with the 11 places available to primary schools, secondary schools and academies, (taking account of the 2 early years places and 1 special schools place) to be allocated on a broadly proportionate basis based on pupil numbers in each category. The Forum also agreed that there should be a minimum of one maintained school representative from the secondary sector and one academy representative from the primary school sector.
- 13 Using the figures from the January 2014 census produces the same allocation of places as at May 2013:
- Maintained Primary $9,644/22,553 = 42.7\% \times 11 = 5$
- Maintained Secondary $3,859/22,553 = 17.1\% \times 11 = 2$
- Academies $9,050/22,553 = 40.1\% \times 11 = 4$ (1 Primary, 3 Secondary)
- 14 There is therefore no reason why the membership of the Budget Working Group cannot continue unchanged.

Community Impact

- 15 None.

Equality and Human Rights

- 16 There are no implications.

Financial Implications

17 None

Legal Implications

18.1 The Department for Education publication: Schools Forums: Operational and Good Practice Guidance – October 2013 indicates that the responsibility for establishing Schools Forums rests with the Local Authority. This reflects the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 and the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 (the Regulations).

18.2 The proposals comply with provisions in the Regulations and guidance governing membership.

Risk Management

19 Failure to comply with the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 in terms of membership, minimum statutory requirements and broadly proportional representation could leave the Local Authority open to legal challenge. This report makes recommendations to mitigate that risk.

Consultees

20 None

Appendices

- None

Background Papers

- None identified.

MEETING:	HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE:	4 APRIL 2014
TITLE OF REPORT:	WORK PROGRAMME
REPORT BY:	GOVERNANCE SERVICES

CLASSIFICATION: Open

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

To consider the Forum's work programme.

Recommendation

THAT: the Work Programme be noted, subject to any comments the Forum wishes to make.

Herefordshire Schools Forum – Work Programme 2014/15

•
Friday 16 May 2014 9.30am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Friday 11 July 2014 – 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitecross Private Finance Initiative update • Report of Budget Working Group (Proposals for inclusion in Schools Consultation Paper) • High Needs Tariff Proposals • Outcome of DfE National Funding Formula Consultation Paper • Pupil Premium for Looked After Children • Workplan

Further information on the subject of this report is available from
Tim Brown, Governance Services on (01432) 260239

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dates of Meetings
Friday 24 October 2014 - 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election of Chairman/Vice-Chairman of Forum • Election of Chairman of Budget Working Group • Report of Budget Working Group (outcome of School budget 2015/16 consultation - approval of provisional National Funding Formula values) • Capital Investment 2014/15 Update • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Friday 5 December 2014 - 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRU Funding – adoption of high needs tariff model for PRUs in 2015/16 • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Monday 19 January 2015 – 2.00pm
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated Schools Grant settlement and proposed schools budget 2015/16 • Capital Investment Programme Principles 2015/16 • Workplan • Dates of Meetings
Friday 13 March 2015 - 9.30 am
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan • Dates of Meetings

Background Papers

- None identified.