

Meeting:	Funding Formula Working Group
Date:	Friday 14th September 2018
Time:	8.30-10.30
Venue:	Wellshurst Golf Club, Horam,
Attendees:	Jane Johnson, Hugh Hennebry, Monica Whitehead , James Freeston, Phil Matthews ,Ed Beale, Kirsten Coe and Sarah Rice
Apologies:	None

1.0 Aim of the Funding Formula Working Group (FFWG)

To review the current funding factors and unit rates used by ESCC for 2018/19 and consider whether it is appropriate to retain these factors at their current level for 2019/20.

The principles of the FFWG were discussed with the intention being that like 2018/19, the principles are to continue to work towards the NFF rates and to continue with causing the minimum amount of turbulence for schools / academies.

Consideration was given as to how the available funding factors can be used to offer maximum support and benefit to the children in East Sussex Schools / Academies and propose a formula that is fair to as many schools as possible.

2.0 Review information that had been provided

Since the last meeting, ESCC have been looking at other ways of protecting schools that the DFE will use when the NFF is launched in full. ESCC already use MFG and Capping, but have looked at options that use Funding Floor Protection and Minimum per pupil funding.

The group were provided with 5 scenarios to evaluate comparison information and the effect on schools' potential 2019/20 budgets.

3.0 Observations and Proposals

- The Group looked at the Primary and Secondary Scenarios data to establish which scenarios meet the aim of the group. The group also discussed the different protection methods available and their implications.
- The Group agreed that an increase of the MFG rate to 100.5% was important to protect schools from losing funding but also ensure that all schools received a small increase. The 2018/19 rate is 100.0%. (100.0% MFG equates to - 0% drop in per pupil funding)
- The Group explored the use of a new factor, Funding Floor protection, but felt that MFG at 100.5% would offer schools protection.
- The Group looked at the minimum per pupil funding factor and that whilst the NFF has rates of £3,500 Primary and £4,800 for secondary, introducing this factor at a level that is affordable, will ensure that schools that are being under funded receive some additional funding.

- It was agreed that if there are any funds remaining when the funding formula is calculated in Jan 2019, then the minimum per pupil rates will be increased to get as much funding out to the school that are being under funded.
- The group were happy that all deprivation factors are being used in full, which is what the schools they have spoken to would like and that we are using the NFF sparsity calculation.
- The Group agreed that the capping rate of 1.5% still allowed schools to gain and was also affordable.
- It was acknowledged that these changes to MFG, Capping and minimum per pupil funding would not be sustainable for the future, but whilst we have an opportunity to protect schools, it was felt important to capitalise on them for 2019/20.
- Schools Forum – It was felt necessary that we remind Schools Forum that the model is calculated using current 2018/19 budget share pupil numbers / units, and that where schools are expecting a large increase or decrease across the years, the changes will have a greater effect on them than the data is currently showing.

4.0 Action Summary

- The Group would like to recommend scenario 12e to Schools Forum with the view to consult with all Schools shortly after.

5.0 EALs and Behaviour Support De-delegation

- The maintained members of the working group looked at the possible EAL de-delegation calculations for 2019/20 and felt that moving the formula to a fairer split between per pupil and per EALs funding was appropriate now that both Primary and Secondary Schools receive EALs funding in their budget share.
- It was felt that the 50/50 split for EALs was the preferred option.
- The maintained members of the working group looked at changing the way the deprivation element of the Primary Behaviour Support calculations are made and agreed that using all 3 deprivation was the fairest method.