

Meeting: Funding Formula Working group

Date: Tuesday 13th June 2017

Time: 8.30-10.30

Venue: Wellshurst Golf Club, Horam,

Attendees: Jane Johnson, Hugh Hennebry, Keith Pailthorpe, Monica Whitehead , Ed Beale, Kirsten Coe and Jill Fisher

Apologies: John Greenwood

1.0 Aim of the Funding Formula working Group

To review the current funding factors and unit rates used by ESCC for 2017/18 and consider whether it is appropriate to retain these factors at their current level for 2018/19.

In addition to this, alternative proposals raised by the group included:

- Investigate making amendments to the funding factors and rates to become more aligned to the potential NFF factors and rates.
- Consider how the available funding factors can be used to offer maximum support and benefit to the children in East Sussex schools.

The Group recognised that it would be difficult to manage the impact on all phases, types and sizes of schools without specific knowledge relating to the National Funding Formula (NFF) or any strategic reviews of schools in East Sussex.

In light of the Conservative policy that ‘no school will lose funding’ the Group considered the benefit of striving for minimal increases and trying to ‘hold’ any decreases to schools funding in order to try and achieve maximum protection for East Sussex schools as the NFF approaches. It was accepted that not losing funding was effectively still a cut in real terms as schools continue to struggle with rising costs.

2.0 Review of data sent prior to meeting

This included the timeline, which set out the timescales from this initial meeting to submitting the funding formula to the DfE, analysis of local authorities schools block funding formula and Funding Rates summary. When looking at the analysis of the ESCC rates compared to all other Local Authorities, it was noted that ESCC Deprivation and Per Pupil rate were lower than the average.

3.0 Observations and Proposals

The Group considered the introduction of an EALS factor to the Primary Phase which could have long term benefits to pupils when reaching the Secondary Phase.

- There was a general agreement that ideally more funding should be focused to prior attainment to support pupil's final outcomes.
- The Group asked LA officers to look into the impact of starting to align KS3 and KS4 rates towards the potential National Funding Formula Rates bearing in mind the expected increase in KS3 numbers.
- The Group acknowledged that the lump sum is an important factor and more significant to smaller schools.
- They also recognised the difference in School 'set ups' for individual academies / maintained schools, multi academy trusts, federated schools and the different effects any change to the lump sum has on these groups.
- There was an agreement that any potential increase in pupil rates in general and a decrease in lump sum could benefit the outcomes of a greater number of pupils.

4.0 Action Summary

- Investigate the effectiveness of EAL spending in Primary schools.
- To model the scenarios below and to review any potential impact to schools and academies.
- To have follow up meeting on the 27th June to discuss scenario's.

5.0 Actions Primary

Scenario 1 – Increase prior attainment unit rate by 1.5%, decrease deprivation accordingly.

Scenario 2 – Decrease lump sum by £2,000 and move to per pupil pot.

Scenario 3 – Decrease lump sum by £7,000 and move to per pupil pot.

Scenario 4 - Decrease lump sum by £2,000, increase prior attainment

Scenario 5 – Decrease lump sum by £7,000, increase prior attainment

Scenario 6 – Decrease lump sum by £2,000, increase prior attainment, introduce EAL

Scenario 7 – Decrease lump sum by £7,000, increase prior attainment, introduce EAL and increase per pupil pot.

****After the meeting had concluded, an additional request was made to provide another scenario (Scenario 8)**

Scenario 8 – Decrease lump sum by £7,000, increase per pupil pot. In addition to this, reduce Deprivation and introduce funding for EAL pupils.

6.0 Actions Secondary

Scenario 1 – Increase prior attainment unit rate by 1.5%, decrease deprivation accordingly.

Scenario 2 – Decrease lump sum by £5,000 and move to per pupil pot.

Scenario 3 – Decrease lump sum by £10,000 and move to per pupil pot.

Scenario 4 - Decrease lump sum by £5,000, increase prior attainment

Scenario 5 – Decrease lump sum by £10,000, increase prior attainment

Scenario 6 – Decrease lump sum by £5,000, increase prior attainment and increase per pupil pot.

Scenario 7 – Decrease lump sum by £10,000, increase prior attainment and increase per pupil pot.

Scenario 8 – Reduce KS4 per pupil rate increase KS3 per pupil rate.