



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Philippa Gibbs
philippa.gibbs@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7638

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 7 March 2017

EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Documents Tabled at Meeting held on Wednesday 15 March 2017

- 5 RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA SECOND
CONSULTATION (Pages 3 - 14)**

*Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>*

This page is left intentionally blank

DRAFT LBB SCHOOLS NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA RESPONSE

1. In designing our national funding formula, we have taken careful steps to balance the principles of fairness and stability. Do you think we have struck the right balance?

No

The delivery of a fairer system of school funding has been undermined by an inadequate level of overall funding. Whilst the mechanics and financial impact of the new funding system are set out in detail, the government does not provide evidence that thousands of schools have the ability to maintain or improve performance levels with reduced cash budgets. This is a real concern for schools at a time when savings of 8 per cent are already required to meet wider cost pressures by 2019/20.

83% of Bromley schools are set to face funding cuts as a result of the funding formula, typically of 2 per cent or more. The redistribution method is flawed –there should be a methodology that analyses what schools need, not how the funding is redistributed. Additional funding for schools set to gain will not be sufficient to meet wider cost pressures. Neither fairness nor stability can be achieved under a redistributive model.

London Councils analysis of illustrative school-level allocations suggests that £335 million of additional funding – just 1 per cent of the schools block – could be used to protect all schools from a cash cut and enable gainers to reach their formula allocations sooner. Bromley Council believes that this relatively modest amount of additional investment is the fairest approach to delivering such a far-reaching reform, mirroring arrangements for the high needs national funding formula. We would suggest that the £320m identified in the recent budget statement to support new free schools would be better used to protect existing schools.

The proposed national funding formula is just one of several pressures on school budgets. As the National Audit Office identifies, reform of pension and national insurance contributions, the apprenticeship levy, pay rises, the national living wage and general inflation will all lead to additional costs for schools. Outer London faces a particularly acute challenge around teacher recruitment and retention at all levels, which will only intensify if schools do not have the resources to attract the new teachers needed for a rapidly rising pupil population. These pressures will mean that schools will have to find significant savings from their budgets, which have already been reduced since 2010. This will make it difficult for schools to maintain standards, which poses a real threat to London's school improvement trajectory.

In addition to protecting schools from the impact of the funding formula, we believe that government has a broader responsibility to cushion schools against the impact of wider cost pressures, particularly those that are a direct result of government policy such as the apprenticeship levy.

2. Do support our proposal to set the primary to secondary ratio in line with the current national average of 1:1.29, which means that pupils in the secondary phase are funded overall 29% higher than pupils in the primary phase?

No

Bromley feels that the average is too crude a measure to be used for such an important issue which underpins the new funding formula and that there should have been some evidence base to support this.

Illustrative allocations show that the primary / secondary ratio is a key driver of funding changes at individual school level. Whilst national guidance on the appropriate ratio has been in place for some time, the decision to set this ratio solely through a national average still creates a high degree of turbulence in some areas and for some smaller schools.

For the primary / secondary ratio and the formula more generally, funding would correspond more closely with need if the proposals were underpinned by a much stronger evidence base on school cost drivers. The formula often has the effect of rebalancing funding between different types of school within an area (e.g by phase, school size or selection policy), which can appear arbitrary or unfair at an individual school level when it is the result of an unsophisticated national average approach.

Bromley Schools Forum representatives from the primary and secondary sectors voiced different opinions on this, particularly as there is no evidence to show that the proposed average fairly reflects school's needs, but agreed that the different views were underpinned by an overall lack of funding for all schools.

3. Do you support our proposal to maximise pupil-led funding, so that more funding is allocated to factors that relate directly to pupils and their characteristics?

YES

Yes. Local authorities already aim to channel as much funding as possible through pupil-led factors locally, in line with national guidelines. Whilst this should continue under a national formula, it is equally important that schools with exceptional characteristics - such as split sites and PFI contracts - continue to be recognised fairly in the new funding system.

4. Within the total pupil-led funding, do you support our proposal to increase the proportion allocated to the additional needs factors (deprivation, low prior attainment and English as an additional language)?

YES

Yes. We support the principle of channelling a higher level of funding through additional needs factors in comparison to the proportion of funding currently allocated through these factors locally.

As the consultation recognises, under the current system a local authority might not use a particular factor if data does not vary significantly between schools in its area. For example, if all schools have equally high rates of EAL, funding could be channelled through the base rate instead of the EAL factor. The weightings in local formulas are therefore likely to underestimate the extent to which additional needs drive actual costs.

Under the proposed funding system, there would be an inconsistency between deprivation funding within the formula and deprivation funding channelled through the pupil premium outside of the formula. Whilst deprivation factors based on free school meals (FSM) within the national funding formula will be area cost adjusted, the pupil premium grant based on the same criteria is currently distributed through a flat per pupil rate. The pupil premium should be protected and adjusted for area costs, in line with other education funding streams.

5. Do you agree with the proposed weightings for each of the additional needs factors?

NO

English as an Additional Language data is currently the best available proxy for language proficiency, a key cost driver for many London schools. We agree that a more nuanced and direct measure of language proficiency would better align funding with need and support the ambition to move towards a system that uses data from the new school census question.

Updates to IDACI data will need to be managed carefully. Unlike the most recent update of IDACI data, local authorities will no longer be in a position to manage any turbulence once a 'hard' formula has been introduced. Similarly, the impact of the introduction of Universal Credit on the FSM will need to be recognised in the new formula.

The high weighting proposed for prior attainment nationally is likely to redistribute funding away from relatively high-performing areas such as London.

It is important that pupil premium funding continues to be allocated to disadvantaged pupils alongside the NFF. This funding provides vital additional support to children who do not have access to the educational advantages of their more-affluent peers.

However whilst Bromley might support the factors being proposed we more concerned about the weightings being applied to each factor as there is no evidence to support these.

6. Do you have any suggestions about potential indicators and data sources we could use to allocate mobility funding in 2019-20 and beyond?

Bromley supports the inclusion of mobility as a formula factor, in line with our first round consultation response. The decision to distribute mobility funding based on historic spend is a sensible interim measure, but we agree that a more sustainable methodology is required in the longer-term. Using a historic spend methodology, only 0.1% of funding will be channelled through the mobility factor, which is unlikely to capture the true cost of pupil mobility in London

London Councils commissioned the Education Datalab to produce detailed research into the impact of pupil mobility on London's schools. The report provides evidence of the higher levels of mobility in the capital and provides estimates of the per pupil costs of different types of mobility based on interviews with schools. Practical proposals for the design of a national funding formula factor, based on the national pupil database, are also outlined.

London Councils would therefore like to be involved in further discussions about how to design a pupil mobility factor that captures accurately the true cost of mobility to schools.

7. Do you agree with the proposed lump sum amount of £110,000 for all schools?

No

Following the opening of a number of small free schools in London the financial viability of small schools is not just an issue in rural areas. Given the challenges around securing large sites for new schools in the capital, this is likely to become increasingly relevant at secondary level: 40 secondary schools with fewer than 750 pupils are located in London, representing a relatively proportionate 11 per cent share of the national total.

The proposed formula could be challenging for schools with a particular faith or community focus, some of which can be as small as 1 FE. The impact on these schools should be considered specifically as part of the equalities impact assessment.

To support school place planning, the revenue and capital funding systems should work together to encourage the creation of new schools that are of an efficient size and able to deliver a full curriculum. The level of the lump sum is an important part of this incentive, so clearer national guidance on the minimum size of a sustainable new school would be beneficial.

Bromley has a high proportion of small and 1fe schools which will be severely impacted by this reduction, particularly as the MFG does not really offer any real

protection against these reductions. We would also question the proposal to revert to a single sum for both primary and secondary schools.

8. Do you agree with the proposed amounts for sparsity funding of up to £25,000 for primary schools and up to £65,000 for secondary, middle and all-through schools?

n/a

9. Do you agree that lagged pupil growth data would provide an effective basis for the growth factor in the longer term?

NO

Unfunded pupil growth is a significant challenge in Bromley and London and we do not agree that the proposal to use lagged pupil growth data is an effective solution.

Under the current system, pupils who enter new or expanded schools essentially receive no funding for the first seven months of the academic year (September to March). Pupil growth within the financial year can only be met by recycling existing funding, redirecting funding away from other schools in the area. London Councils analysis suggests that unfunded in-year growth currently costs the capital's education system around £50 million each year.

The cost of pupil growth will not be met by a system with a one year lag included. A fair funding system cannot allow the continuation of unfunded pupils and we believe that in-year contingency funding should be made available for any pupil growth that has not been forecast through the growth factor itself.

10. Do you agree with the principle of a funding floor that would protect schools from large overall reductions as a result of this formula? This would be in addition to the minimum funding guarantee.

YES

We support the principle of a floor funded by additional investment. The decision to introduce a 'hard' formula creates a very high degree of volatility, with the impact of the formula varying significantly between and within local authority areas. A permanent funding floor is therefore essential.

As the consultation recognises, schools in some areas would experience reductions of "over 10 per cent" without the inclusion of a funding floor. Whilst a permanent funding floor is necessary within the current overall schools budget, it will create challenges and distortions for both 'winners' and 'losers'. For those schools that would experience the largest losses under the formula, the floor could lead to a prolonged and unmanageable funding freeze continuing into the next parliament – this would affect schools in London disproportionately unless there is a sustained

investment of additional funding each year to raise all schools up to their final formula allocation more rapidly.

11. Do you support our proposal to set the floor at minus 3%, which will mean that no school will lose more than 3% of their current per-pupil funding level as a result of this formula?

YES

Whilst we support this in principle we are concerned about the lack of clarity about what protections will be offered to schools in year 3.

According to the National Audit Office, schools will be required to make £3 billion of savings by 2019/20. In this challenging financial context, the consultation does not demonstrate that a further 3 per cent cash cut can be delivered without impacting on school standards.

Without conclusive evidence showing that schools are able to keep pace with existing cost pressures, we do not believe that a redistributive model is suitable for the new national funding formula. London Councils analysis shows that the introduction of a stronger funding floor is an efficient mechanism for providing cash protection to all schools in the country whilst ensuring that gainers reach their formula allocation sooner. A funding floor of zero per cent would cost just £335 million, equivalent to 1 per cent of the schools block.

12. Do you agree that for new or growing schools the funding floor should be applied to the per-pupil funding they would have received if they were at full capacity?

NO

As the consultation recognises, effective per-pupil rates are much higher whilst a school is still filling up because the fixed lump sum makes up a greater share of the overall school budget. It would not be appropriate to use the same per-pupil baseline for schools filling up, because funding would be over-allocated to these schools. Further clarity is needed on the exact methodology and proposed data sources.

However, if this principle is to be applied to new or growing schools it should also be afforded to schools which are expanding or take bulge classes as they would face the same cost pressures.

13. Do you support our proposal to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5% per pupil? This will mean that schools are protected against reductions of more than 1.5% per pupil per year.

Yes, the MFG should continue as under the current system. With allocations set centrally for each school in the country, there are likely to be outlying schools that face significant changes in funding each year as data updates. A protection

mechanism is necessary in addition to the funding floor, especially once the local authority role managing turbulence is removed under a 'hard' formula.

14. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed schools national funding formula?

The system of funding new schools from 2018/19 will need to be considered carefully and separate arrangements are likely to be required. Without a baseline against which to apply floors and caps, an unadjusted application of the new formula would lead to severely distorted funding levels for new schools.

Factors based on historic spend are unlikely to meet actual costs in high growth areas such as London. For example, the business rates factor will not meet the cost of bills for new and expanding schools. A mechanism for retrospective or in-year adjustment should be introduced for these factors.

As an outer London authority, we are disappointed that there is no opportunity to comment directly on the ACA figures that have been identified. Bromley will receive an uplift of only 1.0809 whereas some of our neighbouring boroughs which are classified as inner London will receive an uplift of 1.1792. We feel this does not adequately reflect the cost pressures which are faced by outer London boroughs.

15. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the impact of the proposed schools national funding formula?

Many of the cost pressures facing schools, as identified by the National Audit Office, are the direct result of government policy, such as changes to national insurance and pension contributions. Any action the government can take to ease these cost pressures would make the introduction of a fair funding formula less challenging.

For example, the apprenticeship levy will apply inconsistently across schools. Whilst standalone academies are likely to be exempt, community and voluntary schools will be eligible for the levy because the local authority is classed as the employer. London Councils does not believe that this different approach can be justified and we call on the government to apply a consistent exemption to all schools with a pay bill under £3 million.

London has a higher number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASCs) than other regions and some areas have specific funding arrangements in place locally for this potentially key cost driver. UASCs are an example of an exceptional school-level pressure that a 'hard' formula will struggle to capture accurately at a national level but are currently picked up locally. The impact of the formula on similar cost drivers – uncommon, but highly significant for individual schools - will need to be considered carefully.

London's schools are facing considerable pressure to recruit high quality teaching staff across a range of subjects, as well as retaining them in the long term. TES

reports in A Question of Quality: TES Teacher Recruitment Index that London is the region that has the most difficulty currently recruiting teaching staff. Funding reductions could further exacerbate this situation and impact on pupil outcomes.

16. Do you agree that we should allocate 10% of funding through a deprivation factor in the central school services block?

Yes. Local authorities in more deprived areas are likely to incur higher costs.

17. Do you support our proposal to limit reductions on local authorities' central school services block funding to 2.5% per pupil in 2018-19 and in 2019-20?

We support the inclusion of a funding floor in the new central school services block, but the protection that this isolated mechanism provides in 2018/19 will be insignificant when compared to the cuts to funding for central functions in 2017/18.

Our analysis suggests that London boroughs face an effective £38.1m (46 per cent) cut in funding for central functions in 2017/18 as a result of savings to the education services grant, assuming that schools forums approve the central retention of retained duties funding. The government has recognised that this cannot be achieved through efficiencies alone.

To meet the shortfall, boroughs are forced to choose between reducing core school funding (either through a top-slice or buy-back model) or redirecting funding away from other key services through the use of general council funds. Neither option is a sustainable or sufficient solution at a time of unprecedented funding cuts for local government. The significant funding gap for statutory functions that this leaves is an acute risk to school standards and pupil welfare in the capital. Therefore Bromley is calling on the government to reinstate this funding into the education services grant.

18. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed central school services block formula?

Following the effective end of the education services grant and the decision to roll retained duties funding into the schools block, a new system of funding for central functions begins in 2017/18. One year later, a second system of funding central functions will be introduced through the new fourth block of DSG.

The introduction of two new systems in two years appears to lead to an uneven transition path for local authorities. A very large cut to funding for central functions from September 2017 will be followed by small losses or gains from 2018/19. Bromley does not agree with the proposed reduction in funding for central functions but, if the savings do go ahead, this would be an unnecessarily disjointed transition.

DRAFT LBB HIGH NEEDS NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA RESPONSE

1. In designing our national funding formula, we have taken careful steps to balance the principles of fairness and stability. Do you think we have struck the right balance?

Pressures on high needs budgets are amongst the most acute of any local government service area in the capital. Bromley is disappointed that the scale and urgency of this financial challenge has not been recognised in the second round consultation.

Boroughs are already spending significantly more than the allocations provided by central government through the high needs block, which has failed to keep pace with rapid and unpredictable demand pressures in recent years. Reserves and general council funds are not a sustainable funding stream for high needs at a time of unprecedented funding cuts for local government.

Although the effective resources available for high needs have been substantially reduced, the government has not provided evidence to show that the required savings are deliverable without harming standards. Bromley is concerned that insufficient funding from central government is now a serious risk to the welfare and educational outcomes of high needs pupils in the capital and elsewhere.

Whilst we agree with the principle of reforming high needs funding, it will be impossible to achieve fairness through the redistribution of an insufficient funding pot. The acute pressure on high needs budget will only intensify and efficiencies alone will not meet the growing funding gap. We believe that an injection of additional funding into the high needs block is required urgently to keep pace with the triple pressure of rapidly rising demand, rising prevalence rates and changing types of need.

2. We are proposing a formula comprising a number of formula factors with different values and weightings. Do you agree with the following proposals?

- **Historic spend factor – to allocate to each local authority a sum equal to 50% of its planned spending baseline**
- **Basic entitlement – to allocate to each local authority £4,000 per pupil**

Yes, we support the inclusion of a historic spend factor and basic entitlement factor.

3. We propose to use the following weightings for each of the formula factors listed below, adding up to 100%. Do you agree? • Population – 50% • Free school meals eligibility – 10% • IDACI – 10% • Key stage 2 low attainment – 7.5% • Key stage 4 low attainment – 7.5% • Children in bad health – 7.5% • Disability living allowance – 7.5%

The weightings appear to be reasonable, but it is difficult to comment further without a stronger evidence base on high needs cost drivers. We therefore welcome the department's commitment to commission further research into high needs outcomes and costs.

4. Do you agree with the principle of protecting local authorities from reductions in funding as a result of this formula? This is referred to as a funding floor in this document.

Yes. The impact of the high needs funding reform is likely to be particularly volatile, so a strong protection mechanism is essential.

5. Do you support our proposal to set the funding floor such that no local authority will see a reduction in funding, compared to their spending baseline?

Given the acute demand pressures on high needs budgets and the lack of evidence that cash savings are deliverable without affecting outcomes, a redistributive model would not have been appropriate for high needs. We believe that the same argument applies to the schools national funding formula.

The spend baselines are not a true reflection of actual spend and therefore do not provide true protection. Overspends on high needs are widespread in London as a result of a sustained period of the high needs block failing to keep pace with intense demand pressures, but protection is only applied against planned levels of spend. We believe that protection should be applied against actual level of spend.

6. Do you agree with our proposals to allow limited flexibility between schools and high needs budgets in 2018-19?

We would support maximum flexibility between blocks in order to manage high needs pressure and reinforce incentives for the entire education system to improve high needs outcomes.

We do not agree with proposals to restrict the transfer of funding between blocks. It is not clear why Schools Forum approval would not be sufficient to approve the transfer of funding between blocks. This is an established and proven mechanism for making decisions in the interests of the entire local education community, so we do not agree that the approval of a majority of schools by phase should also be necessary.

7. Do you have any suggestions about the level of flexibility we should allow between schools and high needs budgets in 2019-20 and beyond?

The optimal level of flexibility in the long-term will be dependent on the extent to which high needs allocations keep up with actual costs. Given the acute pressure on high need budgets, we would support maximum flexibility between DSG blocks.

A flexible relationship between the schools and high needs block also reinforces incentives to control high needs spend and improve high needs outcomes across the entire local education system. For example, schools that put forward pupils for EHC plans or permanent exclusions do so with the knowledge that funding may be redirected away from the schools block if the high needs block overspends. Mainstream schools currently benefit when high needs spend is spent efficiently and this financial incentive would be weakened under a system of standalone blocks.

Beyond 2019-20, Schools Forum approval should be an appropriate and sufficient mechanism for the transfer of funding between blocks.

8. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed high needs national funding formula?

There is a clear link between cost pressures on the revenue side and the sufficient provision of new high needs places. Special schools and units are facing particularly severe pressure as part of London's broader school place challenge, with the number of pupils educated in dedicated SEND places in the capital increasing 23 per cent between 2011 and 2016. The type of need is changing rapidly, which compounds the difficulty of providing sufficient places. For example, whilst the number of special school pupils with a physical disability fell 36 per cent over the same period in London, the number of special school pupils with autism spectrum disorder increased by over 50 per cent.

The introduction of a dedicated £200 million SEN capital pot is welcome and we believe that this pot should increase to meet the full costs of providing sufficient SEN places. Short-term investment in providing new special school places is likely to be offset by reduced spend on more costly placements in the independent sector in the long-term.

This page is left intentionally blank