



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333 CONTACT: Lauren Wallis
lauren.wallis@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316
FAX: 020 8290 0608 DATE: 4 December 2012

To: Members of the
SCHOOLS' FORUM

Andrew Downes (Chairman)	Secondary Academy Governor
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Colin Ashford	Primary Academy Governor
Anna Boshier	Non-School Representative (Catholic Church)
Geoff Boyd	Primary Maintained Governor
Angela Chapman	Primary Maintained Governor
Nick Cross	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
Patrick Foley	Primary Maintained School Head Teacher
Sam Parrett	Non-School Representative (14-19 Partnership)
Neil Proudfoot	Non-School Representative (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee)
Karen Raven	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
Alison Regester	Non-School Representative (Early Years)
Richard Sammonds	Primary Academy Head Teacher
Keith Seed	Special Head Teacher/Governor
Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe	
1 x vacancy	Primary Maintained School Head Teacher
1 x vacancy	Secondary Maintained School Head Teacher/Governor
1 x vacancy	Pupil Referral Unit Head Teacher/Governor
David Wilcox	Secondary Academy Governor

A meeting of the Schools' Forum will be held at the Education Development Centre on **THURSDAY 13 DECEMBER 2012 AT 4.30 PM** *

*** PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME AND VENUE**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Resources

A G E N D A

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18TH OCTOBER 2012 (Pages 3 - 8)**
- 4 ESTIMATED DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT FOR 2013/14 BASED ON FUNDING BLOCKS (Pages 9 - 12)**

5 CRITERIA FOR GROWTH AND INFANT CLASS SIZE FUNDING (Pages 13 - 16)

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

All meetings would be held at the Education Development Centre and would commence at 4.30pm:

Thursday, 10th January 2013

Thursday, 7th February 2013

Thursday, 14th March 2013

.....

SCHOOLS' FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held at 4.35 pm on 18 October 2012

Present:

Andrew Downes (Chairman)	Secondary Academy Governor
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Colin Ashford	Primary Academy Governor
Geoff Boyd	Primary Maintained Governor
Nick Cross	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
Patrick Foley	Primary Maintained School Head Teacher
Karen Raven	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
Alison Regester	Non-School Representative (Early Years)
Keith Seed	Special Head Teacher/Governor

Also Present:

Dr Tessa Moore	Assistant Director for Education
David Bradshaw	Head of ECS Finance
Amanda Russell	Head of Schools Finance Support
Gillian Bratley	Senior Finance Officer
Lauren Wallis	Democratic Services Officer

14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Anna Bosher, Angela Chapman, Neil Proudfoot, Richard Sammonds, and David Wilcox.

An apology for absence was also received from Cllr. Wells Portfolio Holder for Education.

Beverley Pennekett from the Education Funding Agency had sent her apologies for being late.

The Chairman introduced the meeting by welcoming Don King from the Education Funding Agency and he also acknowledged the presence of representatives from the Borough's schools.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was made Alison Regester in that she represented the Early Years and Childcare Sector and she also managed a private nursery.

16 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH SEPTEMBER

2012

The Vice-Chairman advised that the third paragraph under "Minutes of the Meeting held on 12th July 2012" which read "The Vice-Chairman noted that the Schools' Forum working party would be meeting shortly..." should read "The Vice-Chairman noted that the Schools' Forum working party had not yet met.....".

The Vice-Chairman advised that, in relation to the third paragraph of Minute 4, he had met with Mandy Russell and was now satisfied and his misunderstanding had been clarified and he had no further interest in pursuing this matter.

RESOLVED that, subject to the correction set out above, the minutes of the meeting held on 20th September 2012 be agreed and that matters arising be noted.

17 **2013/14 Funding Review - Outcome of Consultation with Schools**

Report No. ED12052

As agreed by the Schools' Forum held on 20th September 2012, the London Borough of Bromley had released the four funding models to all schools as part of the consultation on the proposed funding formula for 2013/14. The four models were based on the following principles:

Version 6

73 points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum of £150,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on current funding blocks

Version 8

73 points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum of £150,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on fixed amount for all pupils

Version 10

73 points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum of £180,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on current funding blocks

Version 12

73 points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment

Lump Sum of £180,000

Allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation based on fixed amount for all pupils

The schools had also been consulted again on de-delegation for maintained primary schools.

Mandy Russell advised that 38 consultation responses had been received, being 33 from Primary Schools, 1 from a Special School and 4 from Secondary Schools.

However, included within the Primary responses were 6 individual responses from 1 school and 3 from another school. In order to ensure that the results were considered on a fair and equitable basis, only two responses had been included from each school. Whilst there had been a slightly higher number of responses from 1fe schools, there was a fair representation of responses from all sizes of schools. Within the responses, a number of schools had not answered particular questions, or ticked both boxes for some questions, or ticked a particular version that did not correlate to their earlier answers. Details of the consultation responses could be seen at appendix 1 of the report.

On relation to question 1 of the consultation, Mandy Russell advised that all models were based on 73 points or below at Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the schools had been asked to endorse this detail. A positive response had been received so all models would be based on 73 points. Question 2 asked schools to choose between lump sums of £150,000 or £180,000. Question 3 gave different amounts for funding for attainment, deprivation and EAL. The models endeavored to bring about a formula for schools funding that was clear and transparent. As previously mentioned the answers for question 4 did not always correlate with the answers to the 3 previous questions. The answers to questions 1, 2 and 3 should have led schools to the answer for question 4 but this had not always been the case. Version 10 appeared to be the most popular, but did not relate to the answers indicated in the previous questions and therefore the Assistant Director for Education was recommending Option 12 which did relate back to the previous options..

A question was raised about limiting the gains some schools might receive from the funding formulas and had the working group considered capping these gains. In response Mandy Russell drew the Forum's attention to the Minimum Funding Guarantee which was designed to limit any losses to 1.5% and worked in the same way to cap excessive gains. Details of the Minimum Funding Guarantee had been in the first paper from the Department for Education (DfE). The Vice Chairman commented that there was little point in discussing the Minimum Funding Guarantee as it was a Government requirement and Bromley had no option but to accept it even though he considered it to be restrictive. Following further discussion on the possible losses and gains of the models the Forum noted that a great deal of time had been spent on the figures and all that hard work had concluded with four models.

Concern was expressed that sixth form pupils were not included in the calculations for the models that only included pupils up to 16 years of age. Previously calculations had included pupils up to the age of 18 years.. Mandy Russell gave an explanation of how this was taken into account in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and that Government Regulations set out the rules. Beverley Pennekett of the Education Funding Agency confirmed that the DSG would not be available to subsidise sixth form funding and the post 16 funding would continue to be distributed by the EFA.

With the permission of the Chairman, an observer addressed the meeting commenting that the school he represented stood to lose a third of its funding under the new proposals and that the process would be inherently unfair to sixth

form pupils. Mandy Russell responded that the Minimum Funding Guarantee would prevent this scale of loss.

Moving on to the subject of the Lump Sum, at the last meeting of the Forum it has been advised that a Lump Sum of £150,000 might be better than a Lump Sum of £180,000 as more would lose out but it would be fairer and smaller schools would be better protected. The Chairman advised that the consultation results showed a preference for the £180,000 Lump Sum.

Concern was expressed that not many secondary schools had responded to the consultation. The consultation period was very tight due to the timeframe laid down by the EFA and it was felt that this was the reason for the poor response. Therefore there was concern that the consultation had not been robust and was therefore not as statistically relevant as it should be. The Chairman noted that the Forum was not bound by the results of the consultation but it was part of the process and would provide a view of the best way forward. Mandy Russell explained that the initial modelling had included the original EFA ceiling and the modelling had started at £150,000. The goalposts were then moved to £200,000 resulting in the Lump Sum of £180,000 being included in the modelling. A number of other factors were also considered including standards grants, a large number of which had a lump sum element, premises and building related funding and formulas not related to pupil numbers. The proposed Lump Sums took all these factors into consideration. However this was only a snapshot of current circumstances. The Forum also noted that the difference between Version 10 and Version 12. For Version 10 in relation to deprivation for primary and secondary schools the figures were £1,237 and £1,318 respectively. For attainment it was £2,042, for primary £3,567, for secondary and EAL £379 and £2,158. For Version 12 the figures for deprivation, attainment and EAL were flat rates of £2,500, £1,500 and £1,000 respectively. These differences had been caused by a different method of calculation as instructed by the Government. The Forum members debated moving forward with differential levels of funding for primary and secondary schools compared to having one set figure for both sectors. In conclusion of this part of the debate the Chairman drew the Forum's attention to a letter from the DfE dated 10th October 2012 and in particular three points. The first being the Government's undertaking of the effectiveness of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. The second point was the Government's promise of a careful review in early 2013 of the impact of the simpler funding formulae, exploring with local authorities the effect of different factors such as the lump sum and deprivation factors. The third point was the Government's assurance that the Minimum Funding Guarantee would continue to operate beyond 2014-15.

The Chairman proposed to put the three principles contained in the report to the vote after acknowledging that the Vice-Chairman was the only member of the Forum present who was unable to vote on this issue. The Forum voted for the following:

- (i) the 73 points at EYFSP for Primary Attainment
- (ii) the Lump Sum of £150,000

- (c) the allocations for EAL/Attainment/Deprivation be based on a fixed amount for all pupils

be recommended to the London Borough of Bromley for inclusion in the funding formula.

The Chairman continued that based on the above agreed decisions Version 8 was the Version which should be chosen, The Chairman put this to the vote and the vote was lost.

Following further discussion the Forum came to the conclusion that, other than the Lump Sum, the principles supported by the Forum would lead to Version 12. As a result the recommendation of Version 12 to the London Borough of Bromley was put to the vote as the Version as per the results of the consultation.

With regard to de-delegation, Mandy Russell explained that relevant members of the Forum were asked to vote on behalf of the maintained primary schools. With regard to the two areas where schools appeared not be in favour of de-delegation, the Schools' Forum were reminded that as part of the initial consultation, this funding had been included in the current models and that the Ethnic minority funding had been delegated to school 100% through the EAL factor and that the Behaviour Service funding had been allocated 10% AWPU, 45% deprivation and 45% attainment. It was recommended that schools be reminded of this and advised that they would not see a separate allocation as part of the funding formula. For areas where de-delegation was agreed, the Local Authority must be able to clearly demonstrate how the funding would be de-delegated.

The Chairman noted that there were two members of the Forum who were representatives of the primary sector and these representatives were able to vote on this subject. The Forum was informed that head teachers had discussed this question and had come to an agreement in line with the recommendation contained in the report. To clarify, the Chairman stated that the Forum members able to vote on this issue would be voting for items 1, 2 and 3 on appendix B of the report to be de-delegated and items 4 and 5 to not be de-delegated.

RESOLVED that it be recommended to the London Borough of Bromley:

- (a) that the principles behind Version 12 should be used in the 2013/14 funding formula; and**
- (b) that items 1, 2 and 3 on appendix B of the report be de-delegated and item 4 and 5 not be de-delegated.**

18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Karen Raven advised that her Business Manager had attended a conference where it had been learned PFI would come within the lines of additional factors that schools could use. However, Harris (previously Kelsey Park) was due to be demolished and completely rebuilt using PFI. Was the Local Authority aware of this and would it have any impact on Local Authority funding? David Bradshaw

confirmed the news about Harris and the fact that the new build would be PFI funded. He had spoken to the PFA on how any funding gap in the PFI would be dealt with in the funding formula and he agreed that the effect of funding to other schools with PFI needed to be clarified. He continued that when the build was completed and operational that was when the funding mechanism would start and that any gap would be caused by revenue costs.

Karen Raven requested her outrage be recorded.

The Vice-Chairman suggested that that issue be discussed at a future meeting of the Forum. He also advised that the Forum had previously approved a formula that did not include PFI. He further noted that schools should have made arrangements for PFI that would not affect other schools.

Don King from the Education Funding Agency advised that one of the crucial things was that when PFI started the Priority Building Programme there was no commitment as to when the building would start and a rolling programme could be spread over a number of years. He undertook to investigate how gaps in the PFI would be funded and would find out the building programme for Harris Academy. He would send this information to the Forum as soon as possible.

On another subject the proportionality of representation for secondary schools head teachers and governors on the Schools' Forum was raised. The proportionality was calculated using the number of pupils in each sector. The Vice-Chairman advised that the proposed schools membership was 13 members represented by 52% of primary school pupils and 48% of secondary school pupils this proportionally equated to 6 places for primary schools and 5 places for secondary schools. The 13 members also had to include a representative of the Grant Maintained sector and a PRU representative.

19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

All meetings would be held at the Education Development Centre and would commence at 4.30pm:

Thursday, 22nd November 2012

Thursday, 13th December 2012

Thursday, 10th January 2013

Thursday, 7th February 2013

Thursday, 14th March 2013

The Meeting ended at 6.10 pm

Chairman

Report No.
ED12068

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Schools Forum**

Date: **13 December 2012**

**TITLE: ESTIMATED DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT FOR 2013/14
BASED ON FUNDING BLOCKS**

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools Finance Team
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director of Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides details of the estimated Dedicated Schools Grants for 2013/14 based on the three funding blocks.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Schools Forum is asked to discuss the estimated allocation and to consider any potential movement of funds across the three individual blocks.**

3. **COMMENTARY**

- 3.1 As part of the funding review for 2013/14, the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be allocated across three notional, un-ringfenced blocks for High Needs, Early Years and Schools Block. The initial allocations are based on 2012-13 Section 251 budget allocations and local authorities are free to move funding between the blocks based on strategic decisions provided they comply with requirements on the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and central expenditure limits.
- 3.2 The LA has received details of how the DSG will be allocated across the three blocks and has had the opportunity to check the underlying data and to have some input into the initial calculations. We have now received final details of the notional spending block baselines based on 2012/13 DSG.
- 3.3 The DfE have recently announced that 2013/14 allocations will not be announced until the week commencing 10 December. As that is too late for any meaningful data to be brought to the Schools Forum meeting on the 13 December, most the information in this report is based on 2012/13 data.

3.4 The table at **Appendix 1** shows full details of the initial allocations and estimated expenditure under each of the blocks. The Schools Forum are asked to consider the following issues/assumptions on which this data is based:

- **YPLA Post 16 Teachers Pay Grant.**
In previous years the LA has received funding from the YPLA as a contribution towards the cost of Teachers Pay Grant funding within the formula. No information has been provided as to whether this funding will continue. If it is not forthcoming in 2013/14, secondary school budget allocations will need to be adjusted accordingly.
- **Hospital Top Slice.**
This has been calculated by the DfE on the basis of £8.50 per pupil and has been deducted proportionately across all three blocks. Expenditure of £185k (based on 2012/13 budget) has been removed from expenditure in the High Needs Block to offset this.
- **Top Up Funding for 3 Year Olds.**
In the initial consultation it was stated that the 90% protection for 3 year olds would be reduced to 85%. Initial allocations from DfE show all protection being removed at this stage which has resulted in a reduction of £806,025 in the Early Years Block. It is estimated that if this reduces to 85% in the final allocations, the reduction will be around £630k.
- **Funding for Two Years Olds.**
As this funding has only just been announced and will be subject to a separate decision making process, neither the income nor the expenditure has been included at this stage.
- **Schools Block Income.**
The LA has used October pupil data from maintained schools to estimate the funding for 2013/14 based on the DfE baseline per pupil figure. This has generated additional funding of just over £3million.
- **Schools Block Expenditure.**
The estimated MFG has been calculated using October pupil numbers where available and is based on all schools being funded at the floor level of -1.5%. No ceiling for increase has been included as this will be subject to the availability of funding and recommendations of the Schools Forum.
- **Movement Between Blocks.**
A sum of just over £5million has been moved from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block to reflect the funding of £6,000 and below for all statemented pupils to reflect the fact that this funding is included in the funding formula calculations.
- **Potential Headroom.**
The funding sheet indicates that there may be headroom of around £3.6m. In addition to this there may be some further savings in areas for example around capital borrowing and contingency funding. However, this should be viewed with some caution as there may be some calls on this already in respect of the full year effect of any growth that was put in place for 2012/13.

3.5 The Schools Forum is asked to review the funding sheet and to consider any areas for consideration should any headroom be available. Some suggested areas for discussion are as follows:

- (1) Use of headroom to offset reduction to Early Years funding.
- (2) Use of headroom to support MFG. This could be done either by reducing the floor of 1.5% or by introducing a ceiling. The outcome of this would be either that some schools would not lose any funding or that some schools would receive a small increase. It is proposed that funding scenarios based on this would be produced for the next Schools Forum meeting.
- (3) An estimated figure has been included for bulge classes. This may have to be considered as a priority for allocation of additional funding.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 This expenditure is Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and will need to be contained within the overall funding envelope. The financial implications are contained within the main body of the report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

	2012/13 Funding			Total
	£			
DSG		220,809,000		220,809,000
plus YPLA Post 16 SEN Grant		1,605,720		
plus YPLA Post 16 Teachers Pay Grant		387,240	(no info on this yet)	
		222,801,960		222,801,960
	High Needs Block	Early Years Block	Schools Block	
	43,934,053	12,177,338	164,697,609	220,809,000
less Hospital Top-slice	-73,645	-20,193	-274,972	-368,810
less EY baseline		-806,025		-806,025
	43,860,408	11,351,120	164,422,637	
interauthority recoupment YPLA SEN	478,590		-478,590 1,605,720	
High Needs Baseline	44,338,998			
Cross border funding minus funding out to other LAs plus funding in from other LAs	-517,126 844,297			
Provisional Baseline	44,666,169	11,351,120	165,549,767	221,567,056
	Pupil nos 12/13	2912	40552	
	Baseline £ per pupil	3898.05	4082.41	
	Pupil nos 13/14	2912	41327	
Estimated Funding 2013/14	44,666,169	11,351,120	168,713,632	3,163,865
LA adjustment for Matrix	-5,180,895		5,180,895	
	39,485,274	11,351,120	173,894,527	
Expenditure				
Core funding - units - resourced provision	2,470,000 Maintained 760,000	1,182,656 Estimated MFG	167,631,578	
Core funding - PRU	960,000 PVI	9,906,899 Bulge classes	970,000	
Core Funding - Maint Special Schools	5,120,000 Central	520,507 Central Admissions	58,000	
Special Schools/PRU top up	7,023,730 Contingency	551,091	Carbon Reduction	500,000
Units top up	800,000 Schools Forum	15,185	Schools Forum	41,751
Delegated Matrix	873,106		Contribution to capital	167,020
Central Darrick Wood HIU	575,000			
Nurture Unit	77,000			
Provision for pupils with SEN	2,045,389			
SEN Support Services	3,660,759			
Support for Inclusion	1,124,023			
SEN Independent Schools	11,645,800			
SEN Transport	320,000			
Education Out of School	580,355			
Insurance	16,170			
Carbon Reduction	85,000			
Prudential borrowing costs	570,000			
CERA	800,000			
Schools Forum	1575			
Total Expenditure	39,507,907	12,176,338	169,368,349	
Estimated Surplus/ Shortfall	-22,633	-825,218	4,526,178	3,678,327

Report No.
ED12069

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Schools Forum**

Date: **13 December 2012**

TITLE: CRITERIA FOR GROWTH AND INFANT CLASS SIZE FUNDING

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools Finance Team
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director of Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides details of the proposed criteria for funding pupil growth and infant class size funding.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Schools Forum are asked to agree the criteria for funding pupil growth and class size funding and to agree in principle the estimated amount of funding required to support this.**

3. **COMMENTARY**

- 3.1 For a number of years, Bromley along with a number of other local authorities, has faced enormous pressures to find reception places for the increasing number of pupils. This has been achieved in the following ways:
- Permanent expansion of primary schools
 - Bulge classes e.g. additional forms of entry for one or two years only
 - Schools being asked to take a number of pupil over and above their standard admission number.
- 3.2 In order for primary schools to be able to comply with these requests, additional revenue funding has been allocated to schools through a specific factor in the funding formula. In 2012/13 this funding was around £970,000.

Following the review of the funding formula, local authorities are no longer allowed to have a separate factor in their funding formula to provide this funding to schools. However, funding for significant pupil growth can be retained centrally before the formula is calculated, and that funding for additional classes needed as a consequence of infant class size regulations can be funded as part of this. The requirements are that:

- (a) the growth fund can be used only for the purposes of supporting growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need and to support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation;
- (b) the fund must be used on the same basis for the benefit of both maintained schools and recoupment Academies;
- (c) any funds remaining at the end of the financial year must be added to the following year's DSG and reallocated to maintained schools and Academies through the local formula.

3.3 Local authorities are required to produce criteria on which any growth funding is to be allocated. These should provide a transparent and consistent basis (with differences permitted between phases) for the allocation of all growth funding. The criteria should both set out the circumstances in which a payment could be made and provide a basis for calculating the sum to be paid. Local authorities need to propose the criteria to the Schools Forum and gain its agreement before growth funding is allocated. The local authority will also need to consult the Schools Forum on the total sum to be top-sliced from each phase and must regularly update the Schools Forum on the use of the funding.

3.4 In recent years the additional funding for expanding schools and bulge classes has been calculated based on additional AWPU funding for the period Sept to March (i.e. from the date when the additional class opens) plus additional proportional funding to cover other factors in the formula such as SEN, deprivation etc based on the percentage of pupils in the school attracting this funding. This would normally generate funding of around £40 - £50,000. Funding is only paid for the period Sept to March as from the following April funding will be provided through the funding formula as these pupils will now be included in the pupil count.

3.5 Funding for infant class size regulations is allocated where a school is asked to take a small number of pupils above their standard admission number but not sufficient to warrant opening an additional class. In these cases the costs to the school are much less, and funding is based on the approximate cost of proving an additional teacher in order for the school to comply with infant class size legislation. This would normally generate funding of around £33,000 for a full year and £19,250 for the period Sept to March.

3.6 For 2013/14 onwards it is recommended that the following criteria and funding principles should be approved by the Schools Forum:

- (i) Where schools are required to take in between 1 and 6 additional reception pupils for each form of entry, class size legislation funding to be paid for the relevant period only (ie Sept to March) and that the amount of funding should increase to £35,000 for a full year.

- (ii) Where schools are required to take in 7 or more pupils, they will be expected to open an additional class and funding will be calculated as follows:

AWPU x 30 x 7/12ths

SEN per pupil funding x 30 x school % x 7/12ths

Deprivation per pupil funding x 30 x school % x 7/12ths

EAL per pupil funding x 30 x school % x 7/12ths

For example, based on the funding levels in the current modelling, a school taking in 30 pupils and with 10% SEN, 15% deprivation and 3% EAL would receive the following funding

AWPU = £2185 x 30 x 7/12ths = £38,237

SEN = £2500 x 3 x 7/12ths = £4,375

Dep = £1500 x 4.5 x 7/12ths = £3,937

EAL = £1000 x 0.9 x 7/12ths = £525

Total Funding = £47,074

- (iii) Funding will be allocated to all primary schools ie maintained primary schools and academy primaries and will be paid directly by the LA in 7 monthly instalments from Sept to March.
- (iv) This policy will be reviewed in future years to be extended to secondary schools as and when the increase in pupil numbers reaches that sector.

3.7 The Schools Forum is asked to agree that £1million be allocated to be held centrally to cover this funding. This would allow for around 16 bulge classes and 8 class size limitation payments based on the assumption that the number of additional reception pupils will be similar to the number in the current year.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Funding will be contained within the overall Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding envelope. The financial implications are contained within the body of this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

This page is left intentionally blank