

**Meeting:** Funding Formula Working group

**Date:** Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> 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.

### **2.0 Review of data sent prior to meeting**

Following on from the initial meeting, data was emailed prior to this meeting showing the individual School effect of the 8 Primary and 8 Secondary scenarios'. A summary analysis was also provided which showed the number of schools that would 'lose' or 'gain' from each of the scenarios and the monetary amounts that these would equate to.

Discussions took place to reaffirm what the main principles the working group were using when deciding the potential scenarios to put forward as recommendations. These were, where possible, to move towards the potential NFF rates using a small stepped change approach and also to direct funding based more on pupil characteristics and not just the size of the school i.e. NOR

Each scenario was looked at in turn and the financial impacts discussed. A number of observations were made as shown below;

#### **Observations of the data**

- It was noted how the pupil characteristics affected the amount the budget would change by. i.e. Changes to funding were not caused just by the NOR that a school has.
- The exemplifications showed that a reduction in lump sum of £7k for primary schools would be too much of a change and have too big an impact financially.
- It was agreed that caution needed to be taken to make sure that no pupils were under funded, however it was felt that we should be supporting pupil requirements and not establishments.

- The Group acknowledged that the increasing of the prior attainment rate was a high priority and therefore required a higher value than it currently has.
- Overall, in keeping with the intended aims of the working group, it was felt that moving the rates towards the proposed NFF was the right thing to do and that we should be preparing schools with a small step change.
- It was decided that the movement of monies between KS3 and KS4 did not have the desired effect. It gave too much turbulence and there was too much 'second guessing' of the outcome of the NFF in this specific example.
- Primary phase – It was acknowledged that overall any change to the lump sum had a negative effect on smaller schools. Therefore, in order to lessen the impact, a number of additional scenarios were looked at in keeping with the group's aims.
- Secondary phase – Any changes made, had a negative effect on Schools that were known to be struggling already.

#### **4.0 Primary Outcome**

After discussing all the scenarios, it was felt an amended version of Primary scenario 8, would best achieve the aims of the group.

Move £100,000 from Deprivation FSM to Prior Attainment  
 Reduce the lump sum per school by £4,000 to £138,000  
 To introduce an EAL's factor with £100,000 in the pot  
 To increase the per pupil pot by the remaining £508,000

#### **5.0 Secondary Outcome**

After discussing all the scenarios, it was felt an amended version of Secondary scenario 7, would best achieve the aims of the group.

Reduce the lump sum per school by £7,000 to £138,000  
 Increase the per pupil pot by £101,500  
 Increase the Prior attainment pot by £101,500

#### **6.0 School Forum 14<sup>th</sup> July**

It was agreed that we would go to School's Forum with 2 proposals for each phase. Either no change, or the change listed above for each phase.

#### **7.0 General Comments regarding the DSG funding**

- It was commented on that the Funding Formula working group were only moving small amounts of money and that any inter block transfers could have far greater an impact.