



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

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: 14 November 2017

To: Members of the
SCHOOLS' FORUM

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Andrew Downes (Chairman) | Secondary Academy Governor |
| David Bridger (Vice-Chairman) | Non-School Representative (Church of England) |
| David Dilling | Primary Academy Governor |
| Richard Edmunds | Primary Academy Head Teacher |
| Patrick Foley | Primary Maintained Head Teacher |
| Neil Miller | PRU Head Teacher |
| Paul Murphy | Secondary Academy Head Teacher |
| Sam Parrett | Non-School Representative (14-19 Partnership) |
| Karen Raven | Secondary Academy Head Teacher |
| Andrew Rees | Secondary Maintained School Acting Head Teacher |
| Keith Seed | Special Head Teacher/Governor |
| David Wilcox | Secondary Academy Governor |
| 1 x vacancy | Primary Academy Head Teacher |
| 1 x vacancy | Non-School Representatives (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee) |
| 1 x vacancy | Non-School Representative (Catholic Church) |
| 1 x vacancy | Non-School Representative (Early Years) |
| 1 x vacancy | Primary Maintained Governor |

A meeting of the Schools' Forum will be held at the Bromley College of Further and Higher Education, Rookery Lane, Bromley, BR2 8HE on **THURSDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.30 PM** *

*** PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME AND VENUE**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

A G E N D A

- 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 SEPTEMBER 2017 (Pages 3 - 10)**
- 4 **2018/19 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS (Pages 11 - 26)**

- 5 **HARRIS ASPIRE FUNDING: RESPONSE TO QUESTION RAISED AT PREVIOUS MEETING (VERBAL UPDATE)**
- 6 **RECOUPMENT OF FUNDING FOR EXCLUDED PUPILS - RESPONSE TO QUESTION RAISED AT PREVIOUS MEETING (VERBAL UPDATE)**
- 7 **SEND4CHANGE REVIEW (VERBAL UPDATE)**
- 8 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 9 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

All meetings are at Bromley College unless otherwise stated.

11 January 2018

.....

SCHOOLS' FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held at 4.30 pm on 21 September 2017

Present:

Andrew Downes (Chairman)	Secondary Academy Governor
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Linda Day	Business Manager, Chislehurst School for Girls
David Dilling	Primary Academy Governor
Richard Edmunds	Primary Academy Head Teacher
Neil Miller	PRU Head Teacher
Keith Seed	Special Head Teacher/Governor
Sally Weeks	Head Teacher, Poverest Primary School
David Wilcox	Secondary Academy Governor

Also Present:

David Bradshaw	Head of ECHS Finance
Pip Hesketh	Head of Access and Inclusion
Jo Partridge	Democratic Services Officer
Philippa Gibbs	Democratic Services Officer

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Patrick Foley, Paul Murphy, Sam Parrett, Karen Raven and Aydin Önaç. Sally Weeks attended as a substitute for Patrick Foley and Linda Day attended as a substitute for Karen Raven.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Neil Miller declared an interest by virtue of being the Headteacher of Bromley Trust Academy (BTA).

3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 MARCH 2017

Neil Miller asked for an update on the review of the constitution, specifically whether provision would be made for a Special Academy School representative. The Head of ECHS Finance reported that the constitution would be kept as it was, with one Special School Representative. This decision was questioned on the basis that the DfE guidance for Schools' Forums stated that if a Local Authority had both a Special Maintained School and a Special Academy School, a representative from each should sit on the Forum. The Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that he had previously spoken to the DfE about this issue but nevertheless agreed to review the guidance again and report back to the next meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th March 2017, were approved and signed as a correct record subject to item 34: Apologies for absence, second paragraph, third sentence being amended to read:

“The Head of ECHS Finance....”

4 SPENDING BY PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND SPECIAL MAINTAINED SCHOOLS IN 2016/17

Report ED18026

The Schools' Forum considered a report which provided information on all revenue and capital balances held by Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools as at 31st March 2017, and also provided a comparison to the balances held at the same time in the previous year.

The average level of revenue balances both committed and uncommitted for Maintained Primary Schools stood at 10% of School Budget shares compared to 11% at the end of 2015/16. For Maintained Secondary Schools this figure stood at 10% (compared to 9% in 2015/16) and for Special Schools this figure stood at 7.2% (compared to 7% in 2015/16).

All schools with balances in excess of 8% had been asked to complete a proforma detailing the reason for holding a high balance and their plans for reducing the balance in year. One primary school had ended the financial year with a deficit and had been asked to provide a deficit recovery plan.

The Head of ECHS Finance reminded members that the report did not provide spending details for academy schools, and advised that for 2016/17 no schools fell into the categories for which DfE would require further analysis to be undertaken. The Chairman noted that it would be interesting to look back at the report from the previous year to compare whether school expenditure was the same.

RESOLVED: that the balances be noted.

5 PROVISIONAL OUTTURN REPORT 2016/17

Report ED18008

The Schools' Forum considered a report which provided financial information reported to the Education, Children and Families Budget and Performance Monitoring Sub-Committee. This showed an underspend of £109,000 for the “controllable” element of the Non-Schools' Budget, a reduction from the last reported figure of £75,000 overspend based on activity at the end of December 2016. This was largely due to an underspend on staffing and running expenses for the Early Intervention Service including additional recharge of Public Health grant, as well as a small underspend on the Youth Offending Service relating to

staffing and running costs. There was also an underspend of £226,000 on the Schools' Budget which was funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant, and would be added to £1.4m carry forward funding remaining from 2015/16, giving a total of £1.6m to be carried forward into 2017/18. A number of carry forward requests had been agreed by the Council's Executive at its meeting on 20th June 2017, which related to either unspent grant income or delays in expenditure where cost pressures would follow through into 2017/18.

A member noted that the report seemed to show that there had been an overspend of £1.5m for the Beacon House refurbishment. The Head of ECHS Finance said that figure had been presentational, the money had been set aside and no additional cost had been incurred.

RESOLVED: that the report be noted.

6 UPDATE ON 2017/18 DSG EXPENDITURE

Report ED18025

The Schools' Forum considered a report which provided an update on DSG expenditure in 2017/18 with particular focus on the High Needs and Early Years Block.

In January 2017, the Schools' Forum agreed a balanced budget for the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2017/18, on the basis that a balancing figure of £1.057m from the Schools block was used to offset an overspend within the High Needs Block – the Early Years Block was at that time deemed to be self-funding. In August 2017, the Council was notified of an adjustment to the Early Years Block due to reduced pupil numbers on the January 2017 census. As a result of this the overall income for 2017/18 reduced from £20.029m to £19.096m with the reduction relating specifically to 3 and 4 year old and 2 year old funding. The Council reviewed the expenditure based on these numbers and was anticipating a potential underspend in the Early Years Block as a result of the reduction in numbers. However it was recommended that this be held in contingency as the underspend was likely to be recouped retrospectively by the DfE in 2018/19.

The Council was also notified of a retrospective adjustment to the Early Years funding for 2016/17 with £475,000 being deducted from this year's DSG to reflect a decrease in pupil numbers in 2016/17. There had also been a significant increase in High Needs expenditure during the year. This was due mainly to increased pressure resulting in increased place numbers for several of the special schools as this was deemed to be the most economical way for accommodating this pressure as opposed to sending pupils to out of borough placements which were often far more costly. However, as there was no adjustment to the DSG grant to reflect the needs of these pupils additional pressure was placed on the High Needs Block. The High Needs Block had already been charged with finding around £750,000 of savings in year – some of this had already been achieved by applying a 1.5% MFG reduction to top up funding for special schools and units and also to matrix funding for SEND pupils within mainstream schools. Other

savings were identified within the central SEND expenditure. The Council had commissioned a company called SEND4Change to carry out a full review of the overall High Needs Block and whilst it is envisaged that this would highlight areas of best practice where savings could be made it was expected that this would be a long term strategy and would not identify any additional savings within the current financial year.

A net overspend of £0.377m across the whole of the Dedicated Schools Grant had been identified, with the focus specifically on the increased overspend in the High Needs Block. However, the Council had identified an underspend of £1.623m to be carried forward from 2016/17. This could be used to offset the overspend and meant that the Council would move into 2018/19 with an expected underspend of £771,000.

The DfE carried out another exercise in April and May 2017 to collect information from Councils on spend in order to baseline DSG grant funding and mirror expenditure in each block as far as possible. The intention was that this was then used to inform the starting positions of the 2018/19 DSG allocations. The movement between the High Needs and the Schools Block of £1.05m had been consolidated into the re-baselined figures for 2018/19. There was also a further adjustment from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block of £1.54m which related to the proposed changes to funding for unit places in mainstream schools. The Head of ECHS Finance noted that guidance would be published in the summer, and that there could be the option for 0.5% to move across into the High Needs Block.

A member enquired as to where the core funding for the Harris Aspire Academy originated from. The Head of ECHS Finance said that historically the DfE had directed LBB to make payments to High Needs Academies and Free Schools following a 10% top slice. Members queried if Harris Aspire were held to account with regard to the number of students and quality of the provision, and questioned whether predominantly Bromley students were placed in the provision or whether Bromley funding was being used to support non-Bromley students. It was requested that information be provided to the Schools' Forum regarding how many students that attended the Harris Aspire Academy were Bromley residents; if the school was subject to the same scrutiny as other schools within the borough; and if the provision was subject to the same funding cuts as other Bromley schools. The Head of ECHS Finance agreed that it would be a concern for LBB if the provision was not being used by Bromley students and would provide details at the next meeting.

RESOLVED: that the report be noted.

7 SCHOOLS REVENUE FUNDING 2018/19

Report ED18028

The Schools' Forum considered a report which provided an overview of the operational guidance issued to local authorities in August to help them plan the

local implementation of the national funding formula for the 2018 to 2019 financial year.

In August 2017, the DfE published new operational guidance to help local authorities and their school forums to plan the implementation of the new national funding system for the 2018/19 financial year. The full national funding formulae for 2018/19 and 2019/20 would be confirmed in September 2017 with indicative LA level allocations for the schools, central school services and high needs blocks. Final allocations would be issued in December 2017, based on pupil numbers recorded in the October census.

The Government had confirmed that there would be an additional £1.3 billion for schools and high needs across 2018/19 and 2019/20. This would mean an increase for all local authorities over their planned spending for 2017/18.

In 2018/19 and 2019/20 the national funding formula would be used to calculate notional allocations for each school, which would be aggregated and used to calculate the total schools block for each authority, however in those years local authorities would continue to determine final funding allocations for schools through their local formula.

There were a number of both significant and smaller changes to the funding system which were set out in detail in the report. The Head of ECHS Finance noted that these changes had resulted in an additional £1.54m in funding for LB Bromley.

The local authority was required to engage in open and transparent consultation with all schools and academies, as well as with the Schools' Forum, about any proposed changes to the local funding formula including the method, principles and rules adopted. Any consultation had to include a demonstration of the effect of any changes on individual schools or academies. The Head of ECHS Finance advised members that allowable school funding factors had seen the baseline totality for the DSG increase by 1.5%, however it was noted that this figure was provisional until the October census. Three choices had been suggested for consultation with the schools – to continue to use the existing LA funding formula; to move directly to the national funding formula; to adjust the existing formula to move towards the national funding formula over a period of either one or two years.

A member noted that there was a problem within the funding formula in relation to Special School's core funding. It would result in a student at a mainstream school being allocated funding of over £16,000, as opposed to £10,000 if they were in a Special School. The Head of ECHS Finance agreed to raise this with the DfE.

Following a discussion, members agreed that the consultation process should begin and schools should be presented with two options - to continue to use the existing LA funding formula or to move directly to the national funding formula. A comment should also be added that if the schools disliked both options they should indicate if they would support a hybrid in between the two. The Head of ECHS Finance suggested that another meeting of the Schools' Forum, or a

working group, should meet to discuss the outcome of the consultation before the next scheduled meeting in November 2017.

RESOLVED: that

1. The report be noted; and

2. The LA consult with all schools providing at least two comparisons and the proposed time frame for consultation be agreed.

8 PRIMARY INCLUSION OUTREACH STRATEGY

Report ED18029

The Schools' Forum considered a report proposing that the development of Inclusion Outreach Services for Primary Schools for a two year period. Primary school permanent exclusions in Bromley had tripled in number since 2012 whilst the national trend was one of reducing numbers. In 2016/17 a total of 84 pupils were permanently excluded (compared to 46 in 2012). Of these, 17 were primary school pupils (compared to 5 in 2012). It was noted by the Head of Access and Inclusion that most neighbouring boroughs had low numbers of permanent exclusions of primary school children, most with none.

Previous decisions to reduce the Council run support services and instead re-distribute funding to schools had led to a greatly diminished ability to support schools from the centre. This was particularly acute where schools were supporting children who had additional learning needs or complex social and familial circumstances but did not meet the thresholds either for a statutory Education Health and Care Plan or for social care support. These children did not have the infrastructure of entitlement but without intervention, ran the risk of developing needs that would one day reach the required thresholds. The re-distribution of funding between schools was intended to give each school an individual allocation with which to procure their own support services. The Inclusion Support Advisory Teaching (ISAT) Team supported schools at a strategic level with systems development, training and advice. There was no capacity within the team (which comprised three posts) to support individual children.

What was being proposed was to pump-prime a specialist Inclusion Outreach Service to primary schools in order to support them with their most challenging children, as a pilot for 2 years. The funding would be split over either two or three financial years. It was hoped that the value and impact of the pilot will be demonstrated and it was the intention that schools each contributed to the project in year three to make it self-funding. Effectively, it would provide the foundation for collectively funded Outreach Services.

A member enquired as to why neighbouring boroughs had much lower exclusion numbers. The Head of Access and Inclusion responded that some neighbouring boroughs had central support services in place, while at LBB no one had been in

her post for the previous four years. Bromley had also seen a significant change in demographic whereas boroughs such as Croydon, for example, had not had the demographic shift that Bromley had experienced, and were therefore better equipped to deal with families that had lived in the borough for a number of years and may have been previously known to the central service.

In response to a question, the Head of Access and Inclusion advised members that exclusions were not always random and that some schools had higher rates of exclusion than others. These were often schools located within areas where the community faced a number of social challenges including low income and health issues. SEN students accounted for 75% of the cases, but tended to be students with underlying needs that had not been identified.

A member asked what the capacity for the service was in terms of number of pupils, and the criteria if the service became overwhelmed. The Head of Access and Inclusion highlighted that the service was overwhelmed currently, but that level of detail had not yet been finalised. There was a need to be flexible and work with the ISAT team to exceed what would normally be expected. Capacity would depend on the individual needs of the child, but could be up to 30 children at any one time. An individual package would be created for each child, with support being offered for two or three days a week.

In response to a question, the Head of Access and Inclusion advised members that the service would have tight performance requirements and a continuous review process. A review would take place at the end of the first year, as if the service was to continue into a third year, the procurement process would need to begin mid-way through the year two.

Members enquired as to what consultation had taken place with the primary schools regarding the service. The Head of Access and Inclusion noted that visibility was an issue, and that they did not want to compromise the services that schools were already buying in, but needed to ensure that the entitlement was offered. The Head of Access and Inclusion had attended the Primary Heads Forum and the Schools Partnership Board to present the service and had found the response to be generally supportive. A further presentation would be made at the next Primary Heads Forum to provide more details of the service.

Members raised concerns regarding the viability of the service continuing for a third year if not all schools agreed to pay. The Head of Access and Inclusion understood the concern which highlighted the importance of the review process. Some members felt that it was unfair if the cost was not spread borough-wide and suggested schools could agree and sign up before the service was implemented. The Head of Access and Inclusion said there was a need for an advisory board, consisting of Primary Headteachers and Finance Support which would create ownership and oversight.

A discussion took place and members agreed to support the development and commissioning of an Outreach Service for Bromley Primary Schools for two years in principle, but raised concerns regarding its sustainability. A request was made for Secondary School Headteachers to provide the Schools' Forum with

Schools' Forum
21 September 2017

information on their permanent exclusions including numbers of students, if any money was recouped and if so, what the money was used for. The Head of ECHS Finance agreed to report back at the next meeting.

RESOLVED: that the development and commissioning of an Outreach Service for Bromley Primary Schools for two years, in order to prevent the permanent exclusion of pupils be supported in principle.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

23rd November 2017
11th January 2018

The Meeting ended at 6.07 pm

Chairman

Report No.
ED18035

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **SCHOOLS' FORUM**

Date: **Thursday 23 November 2017**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **2018/19 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Amanda Russell, Head of Schools Finance Support
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: Amanda.Russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director: Education (ECHS)

Ward: Borough-wide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides an update on recent consultation with schools regarding the 2018/19 Dedicated Schools Grant and outlines the proposals for further consultation regarding the introduction of the National Funding Formula
-

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 **The Schools Forum is asked to:**

- i) **Discuss and note this information**
- ii) **Give an opinion on the proposed Local Authority request to Dis-apply (EFA) Regulations**
- iii) **Agree the proposal to consult with schools regarding the introduction of the National Funding Formula**

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: Funding for schools impacts education for children.
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Various DSG funded cost centres across ECHS
 4. Total current budget for this head: £265m gross
 5. Source of funding: DSG
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Not Applicable
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All pupils at Bromley schools
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 The Indicative Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding has now been provided to all LAs – this is currently based on 2017/18 pupil numbers so will be uplifted in December to reflect the October 2017 census numbers. The DSG for 2018/19 will be divided into four blocks – High Needs, Early Years, Schools and Schools Central blocks. No information had been published to date regarding the Early Years Block however it is anticipated that as in previous years, this block will be balanced to ensure that the expenditure matches the expected income.#

3.2 The LA has therefore focussed on the other three blocks at this stage to estimate likely expenditure and to anticipate any potential shortfalls or budget pressures.

3.3 Central Schools Block

Expected Funding	£1,926,600
Forecast Expenditure	£2,090,420
Potential shortfall	£163,820

Nb full details of all these calculations can be seen at **appendix 1**.

3.4 The expenditure in this block includes specific areas as defined in the DfE Operational guidance, including the cost of Access and Admissions services, schools central licensing costs, and other retained duties previously funded through the Education Services Grant. It is expected that the LA will need to identify savings of around £164k from within the block in order to achieve a balanced budget.

3.5 High Needs Block

Expected HN Funding	£46,341,455
Less HN recoupment	-£7,003,000
Actual HN Funding	£39,338,455
Forecast Expenditure	£41,045,700
Potential shortfall	£1,707,245

3.6 There has been identified pressure on the HN block for the past few years, which is attributable in part to the government changes to extend the scope of the HN block to include pupils from 0 to 25, which was previously 5 to 19. This issue was highlighted as part of the 2017/18 budget setting process and the LA Officers worked with a working group from Schools Forum representatives to identify where savings could be made – some of these savings have not been achieved as expected, due in part to changes of personnel within the LA and also due to the fact that the LA is currently waiting for the outcomes of the full SEND review which is currently being undertaken by SEND4Change and funded by a specific DfE Grant.

3.7 It is hoped that this review will help the LA to re-focus some of the areas within the HN block and to affect some savings, however it is expected that any changes/savings will only be achieved in the medium to long term and will not have an impact of the 2018/19 budget.

It is unlikely that the LA would be able to identify £1.7m of savings for next year, particularly as any savings which are identified would possibly not be able to be implemented until September 2018 and therefore would only realise a part year effect.

3.8 Schools Block

Expected Funding	£201,363,279
Less Growth fund	-£2,800,000
Funding available to schools	£198,563,279

3.9 Funding for the Schools Block has been calculated using the NFF funding for each school plus an additional amount based on the LAs funding for growth and for rates which sit outside of the NFF. The LA has agreed with the Schools Forum that there will be a full consultation with all schools to decide which formula should be used to calculate schools funding for 2018/19 – ie should Bromley continue to use their existing local formula or should they move to the national funding formula. Each LA has the option of deciding the method of distribution locally for 2018/19 and 2019/20 prior to the introduction of the NFF in 2020/21.

3.10 The DfE Operational guidance states that the Schools block will be ring-fenced from 2018/19, but local authorities will retain limited flexibility to transfer up to 0.5% of their schools block into another block, with the approval of the Schools Forum. To make such a transfer, local authorities are required to consult with all maintained schools and academies, and it is recommended that the Schools Forum should take into account the views of the schools before giving their approval.

3.11 However, the LA can submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State in cases where;

- The authority wishes to move more than 0.5% of the schools block; or
- The Schools Forum has turned down a proposal from the authority to move funding out of the schools block (either above or below the 0.55 limit) but the authority nevertheless wishes to proceed with the transfer.

3.12 The authority has considered these options very carefully in view of the predicted shortfall in the High Needs block and has concluded that they should consult with schools on the basis of requesting to move funding from the schools block to the High Needs block.

3.13 The potential shortfall of £1.7m would equate to 0.85% of the Schools Block and therefore would be outside of the recommended figure of 0.5%, which actually equates to £1,006,816. The local authority would like to request a disapplication for £1m which actually equates to 0.49% - the High Needs Block would then need to either find further savings of around £700k or the local authority would need to consider other options such as setting a deficit budget in the high needs block.

3.14 The impact on the Schools Block would be as follows:

Expected Funding	£201,363,279
Less Growth fund	-£2,800,000
Less Transfer to High Needs Block	-1,000,000
Funding available to schools	£197,563,279

- 3.15 Following the last SF meeting and a subsequent separate meeting with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Schools Forum, the LA issued a consultation document to all schools outlining the background to these proposals and asking schools to comment on the proposal to move £1m from the Schools Block as this is a specific requirement of the disapplication process.
- 3.16 An analysis of the consultation responses can be seen at **appendix 2**. Based on this information, the Schools Forum is asked to formally agree whether or not they support the LA's proposal to submit a disapplication request to the Secretary of State. The Disapplication request form can be seen at **appendix 3**.
- 3.17 Following on from the recommendation by the Schools Forum, the LA has committed to issue a second round of consultation with all schools regarding the decision to either move to the NFF in 2018/19 or to continue to use the Bromley Funding Formula. Depending on the outcome of the disapplication request it is assumed that there will be either £197.5m or £198.5m to be allocated.
- 3.18 The LA has looked at the two basic options ie either to move immediately to using the National Funding Formula or to continue to use the Bromley Formula with regard to affordability and is recommending that instead of adjusting the elements within the formula to manage the affordability, that this should be done by adjusting the capping and scaling factors and the minimum funding guarantee.
- 3.19 The capping and scaling factor will adjust the amount of additional funding that a school may gain through the move to the NFF whereas the MFG will adjust the amount that any school could lose. The capping factor can be set at any level below 3% whereas the MFG cannot go below -1.5%.
- 3.20 The LA has produced a number of models which are as follows:

	Funding Formula	Ceiling	MFG	Primary : secondary ratio	Cost £
DfE NFF	Baseline data	3%	+0.5%		£199.3m
Option 1	National FF	3%	0.0%	1 : 1.34	£199.6m
Option 2	National FF	3%	-1.5%	1 : 1.34	£198.0m
Option 3	National FF	2%	-1.5%	1 : 1.34	£197.3m
Option 4	National FF	1%	-1.0%	1 : 1.34	£197.0m
Option 5	National FF	1%	-0.5%	1 : 1.34	£197.5m
Option 6	Bromley FF	3%	0.0%	1 : 1.25	£197.2m
Option 7	Bromley FF	3%	-1.5%	1 : 1.25	£195.8m

Full details of the modelling data on a school by school basis can be seen at **appendix 4**.

- 3.21 It should be noted that although option 1 is effectively the model that DfE has used to calculate the funding for the DSG, it is not affordable for all schools to receive this level of funding as it does not take account of the impact of increases in rates, and the increase in the growth costs (both explicit and implicit). Explicit growth costs are deemed to be the funding that is allocated by the LA to growing schools outside of the funding formula and implicit growth is funding for new free schools within the funding formula.
- 3.22 Assuming that the transfer to the HN **does** take place and therefore there is £197.5m to allocate to schools then:

- Options 1 and 2 are not affordable
- Options 3.4, 5 and 6 are affordable and “reasonable”
- Option 7 does not allocate enough funding and would require a lot of “tweaking”

Assuming that the HN transfer does **not take** place, then option 2 would also be affordable.

3.23 It is important to emphasise that these models are indicative only as they are based on 2016/17 pupil data so the actual allocations for 2018/19 are likely to change and therefore schools will be advised against using this information as part of their 2018/19 budget setting processes.

3.24 The Schools Forum is asked to consider these options and to agree the basis on which the LA should consult with schools – it is assumed that the consultation document would not include all seven options but that the SF would agree one option from the NFF and one from the Bromley FF to issue to schools. This consultation would then be issued immediately after the SF meeting to allow schools time to respond to this and for the LA Officers to assess the results in preparation for the next SF meeting on the 11th January.

2018/19 Funding Estimate

Appendix 1

High Needs Block

Early Year Block

Schools Block

Central Schools Services Block

Income							
Baseline	47,062,000	3 & 4 Years Old Funding	Primary Pupil Numbers	26,803	Pupil Numbers	43,332	
Transfer of Funding to the School Block - see 7 (v) of the Operational Guidance	-1,538,545	3 & 4 Years Old Additional 15 Hrs	Baseline £ Per Pupil	4,194	Baseline £ Per Pupil	44	
Increase	818,000		Total Primary Funding	112,417,691	Central Schools Services Funding	1,926,600	249,631,334
High Needs Block Restated	46,341,455						
Academy Units	-1,966,500		Secondary pupil numbers	16,529			
PRU Places Recoupment	-1,490,000	2 Year Old Funding	Baseline £ Per Pupil	5,118			
High Needs Recoupment	-2,712,500			84,601,734			
Academy Post-16 Units	-252,000	EY Pupil Premium	Growth, Premises and mobility (based on LA spend on growth and rates)	4,343,854			
Post 16 Transfer	-582,000						
	-7,003,000	EY Disability Access Fund					
DSG Grant Amount	39,338,455			201,363,279		1,926,600	242,628,334
							242,628,334
Expenditure			(0.5 % = £1,006,816)				
Delegated budgets							
Special Schools - Pre 16	7,956,750	Maintained	Academy Recoupment				
Riverside nursery	171,000						
Special school growth - 25 places @ £35k x 7/12	510,417						
Glebe top up	1,537,185		Primary SBS				
Glebe places	287,500		Secondary SBS				
BTA Top Up	1,462,725			198,563,279			
BBA top up	1,777,925						
Units - Maintained Places	240,000						
- LA Funded Academy Places	0						
- Maintained Top Up	166,767						
- Academy Top Up	1,381,073						
Unit Growth - 25 places @ £10,300 x 7/12ths	150,208						
LBB managed budgets		LBB managed budgets	LBB managed budgets		LBB managed budgets		
Darrick Wood HIU	291,730	PVI	Growth	2,800,000	Access and Admissions	444,890	
Darrick wood Deaf centre	450,800	Additional 3 & 4 Year Old Hours			Licences	219,350	
Pupil Referral Costs	-180,500	2 Year Old Cost			Capital	70,890	
Early Intervention - Primary	0	EY Pupil Premium	0			4,870	
Progression Courses	383,940				Schools Forum	1,000	
Home and Alternative Provision	460,450				Pupil Support Advisory Team	234,570	
SEN Support in Mainstream	244,030				Support to Schools	46,180	
Matrix Funding	2,754,000	Central Costs			Business Support	95,580	
Primary Academy Matrix	0	EY Admin Team			Workforce Development	31,010	
Secondary Academy Matrix	0				Schools standard	130,750	
Maintained Matrix	0	SEN Support in Pre Schools			additional post	80,000	
Social Communication Difficulties Team	228,750						
Sensory Support	1,012,860				Formerly ESG Funding		
Outreach and Inclusion	218,160				Education Welfare Service	390,060	
Specialist Support and Disability	243,730	EY Disability Access Fund	0		Asset Management - Education	80,720	
Complex Needs Team	296,930				Stat/ Reg Duties - Education	260,550	
Phoenix Pre School Service	1,396,310				Overheads (Finance / HR / etc.)		
Early Support Programme	98,110						
SEN Transport	234,600						
Special Central	41,990						
Other Statemented	62,640						
SEN Out of Borough Fees	12,637,500						
SEN in Further Education Colleges	4,469,640						
YOS	46,920						
Special Capital	11,560						
	41,045,700		0	201,363,279	2,090,420	244,499,399	
Total	-1,707,245		0	-0	-163,820	-1,871,065	
Variance			(0.5 % = £1,006,816)				

This page is left intentionally blank

Number of responses received = 17

Number of yes responses = 3

Number of no responses = 9

Number of neither yes or no = 5

Comments;

- There is insufficient information in the proposal to have an opinion – Oaklands would need to know what that therefore means for the High Needs block, what are the strategies for managing that/ or any issues.
Are the impacts the same for Primary/Secondary /Special schools?
Can't answer as I don't know what I'm saying yes to.
Don't know what the financial movement is for Oaklands – can it be quantified yet?
- Schools are already facing huge financial challenges. The LA needs to put in place a clear plan for the High Needs Block which deals with the root of the issue and not just plug the gap by taking from the schools block. In order to resolve the current issue new funding needs to be invested.
- It is important that the provision for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged students is maintained at, or close to, current levels. It is for this reason that I support the request to move £1m from the Schools block to the High Needs Block for 2018/19.
- There is not enough money to go round. We have struggled to meet our costs this year 2017/18 with the decreased budget and would be severely compromised to ensure we can meet the needs of all our children if we get even greater cuts in 2018/19. This is probably the same for all schools and also those who have high needs.
The authority can only meet the needs of all the children in Bromley by either going in to deficit or lobbying for more money from central government.
The additional £1m needs to be found from other council revenue or from the government but not from the education budget, therefore I neither agree or disagree
- I neither support nor do not support this request. We are already supporting the High Needs Block by having to use money allocated for the mainstream to finance our provision.
Is there no other money available from the council that we could use instead?
- It is not possible to support this proposal and I must strongly object to it.
Schools are already facing huge financial challenges. The LA needs to put in place a clear plan for the High Needs Block which deals with the root of the issue and not just plug the gap by taking from the schools block. In order to resolve the current issue new funding needs to be invested.

- Increased funding is desperately needed to safeguard our pupil's education. Many schools use Pupil Premium stream funding to plug the gaps caused by cuts in the value of other funding. However, St Joseph's does not have much additional funding as PP and EAL numbers are low. As St Joseph's is a one form entry any cuts to funding will particularly have a negative impact. The reduction in funding for SEND, either from the notional budget or top up funds will reduce the support we are able to provide to SEND pupils. We are currently funding directly from our notional budget the speech therapist, the social and communication advisor, EP visits as well as in class support.
- We are concerned about the poor funding of Kemnal Technology College in comparison to the NFF and the impact that a reduction in the schools block will have on that funding going forward.
- It is difficult to see how we can support this. I have not seen any modelling of the impact on schools and can only assume it will impact negatively. This year our budget was reduced by over £300,000. We have not yet agreed how the NFF will be applied in 2018/19. We do not yet know what impact the removal of the 1% pay cap on public sector workers will have on school budgets next year and there is the likelihood of further employer pension contribution increases. It is being requested whilst there is a review of SEND spending which may provide some other ways to reduce the deficit in High Needs Block.
- The impact of this transfer of funds, on our individual schools' budget, is unclear. This proposal precedes further decisions about the DSG distribution to schools and there is no modelling of likely impact on an individual school.

We have also not yet been provided with any indication of the LA Schools' Forum intended modelling of the "soft" national funding formula for our school in 2018-19 and 2019-20 prior to the full introduction of the NFF.

We have recently responded to the SEND review currently taking place to address the perceived imbalance between funding for SEN within schools compared to funding in specialist provision. The review is necessary to instigate a sustainable plan for SEND funding in the local authority. 'Topping up' the high needs block in this way does not address the ongoing imbalance in funding allocation and subsequent impact.

The proposed transfer takes yet more funding away from Schools with lower levels of high needs students. Schools are already under significant financial pressure as we tackle unplanned pay increases set out in the STPCD (which have not been funded), increases in pension and national insurance contributions, pressures to recruit and retain quality staff, meeting the SEND needs of students without EHCPs and the increased pressure on resources to support all students with emotional health issues.
- It is not clear what the impact of this will be on our individual schools' budget because this decision precedes further decisions about the DSG distribution to schools and there is no modelling of likely impact on an individual school.

We have also not yet been provided with any indication of the LA Schools' Forum intended modelling of the "soft" national funding formula for our school in 2018-19 and 2019-20 prior to the full introduction of the NFF.

Whilst I understand the pressure on high needs and the existing liabilities/commitments which need to be met by the LA, the SEND review currently taking place is underway to address the perceived imbalance between funding for SEN within schools compared to funding in specialist provision etc.

We are increasingly expected to and required to meet a range of SEN needs in school for students without EHCPs from the notional £6k within our school budget, which is already stretched and under significant pressure. This is further exacerbated by pressures to recruit and retain quality staff and pay increases set out in the STPCD which have not been funded.

- Schools are struggling to make ends meet as it is and get little back from the LA in terms of SEN funding. We are already having to support provision that would historically have come from health and a further squeeze is unreasonable.
The fact that changes in personnel within the LA and the awaited report by SEND4Change have prevented savings being achieved is regrettable, but should not result in further pressure on school budgets.
- It is not possible to support this without any modelling to show the impact; in particular the impact on AWPU.
The proposal removes money from the Schools Block – which has already been reduced by the “Growth Fund”. The proposed disapplication of a further £1million means an overall 1.5% reduction in the Schools Block. This is unacceptable for all the oft publicised reasons – not least of which is the anticipated removal of the 1% pay cap without any additional funding.
The SEND review currently taking place aims to make more efficient and effective use of limited resources – ideally leaving more money available at the proactive end of the intervention spectrum (in schools) rather than the reactive (and far more expensive per pupil/young person) end. The proposed adjustment simply takes even more money out of schools, reducing their capacity to intervene early and proactively – thereby continuing the vicious circle which exists and so ill serves the most vulnerable of our young people; and for whom early and proactive intervention (in mainstream school) would be most transformative.
- I neither support nor do not support this request. There is chronic underfunding of schools in Bromley and nationally, so that that an effective education system is no longer possible. There is a cut of £100million pounds in the SEND funding nationally and a cut of £2 billion in the schools budget up to 2020 and £6 billion up to 2022. These cuts will rise further as inflation rises and funding stays static. These cuts are unsustainable for all schools nationally and are unsustainable for schools in Bromley.
Schools cannot lose £1 million from their budgets in Bromley and provide an effective education for the children in their care .The high needs budget cannot sustain a cut of £1.7 million to ensure that the most vulnerable children have access to effective provision. Neither option is sustainable for the children in Bromley.
The only sustainable option is to lobby and to campaign for the £100 million cuts to be put back into the High Needs budget nationally and the £2 billion to be put back into the Schools Block so that schools are able to deliver high quality learning for all the children in their care, nationally and in Bromley.
There are specific issues about the funding of education, both the High Needs Block and the Schools Block in Bromley but overwhelmingly there is not enough money for Bromley children and all children nationally. This is what needs to be addressed and exposed. It would be invidious to support either option so therefore I cannot, in all fairness, support either.
Two further options should be considered; funding the shortfall through accessing the council’s surplus to fund the High Needs Block or by setting a surplus budget on the High Needs Block to show the government that their funding is insufficient and unsustainable.

This page is left intentionally blank

School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations

Local Authority Application to Disapply Regulations Form

1 Please complete this form to formally apply to the Secretary of State for Education to disapply the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations. Please complete all relevant fields and return the completed form via an attachment on the [ESFA contact form](#).

When submitting this form via the ESFA contact form please ensure that you select **LA Funding Formula – Disapplication / exceptional factor request** from the drop-down list in the **2. Enquiry Details** screen

2 You may wish to include brief supporting attachments with your request such as forum minutes (if links not available) or spreadsheet calculations. Attachments should only be included as supplementary evidence and referenced in the 'details of the request' box.

3 In the 'details of request' box, you should include, where appropriate:

- What is the impact on the schools concerned?
- Do the schools benefit from the proposal?
- Will maintained schools and academies be affected in the same way?

4 In the 'Assessment of the equalities implication' box, please:

- Identify and assess the [equality] impact of the disapplication request, having due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010.

Local Authority number	
Local Authority	
Funding year request relates to	
Type of request	
Which requirement in the Regulations does this request relate to?	
Number of schools affected	
Have the schools affected by this request been consulted?	
What are the views of the schools affected by this request?	
Does schools forum agree with this request?	
If yes, please provide link(s) to the minutes showing schools forum agreement	

Details of request (2,500 characters maximum)	Please note that if attached files are more than 2.5mb in size then please email them separately to academy.questions@education.gov.uk

Assessment of the equalities implication	Please note that if attached files are more than 2.5mb in size then please email them separately to academy.questions@education.gov.uk

Name of requestor	
Job Title	
Email address	
Date	

For Official use only

Request number	
ID	
Decision outcome	
Details of the Decision (including any conditions)	

Name	
Date	
Type of Notification	
If this notification type is listed as 'intention to approve' the Department will notify you when the regulations are laid.	

This page is left intentionally blank

Modelling Data

Appendix 4

School Name	17/18 Dfe Baseline	2018/19 DfE NFF 18/19 Baseline	Option 1 NFF 3% cap /no MFG	Option 2 NFF 3% cap/-1.5% MFG	Option 3 NFF 2% cap/-1.5% MFG	Option 4 NFF 1% cap/-1.1% MFG	Option 5 NFF 1% Cap/-0.5% MFG	Option 6 BFF 3% cap/ no MFG	Option 7 BFF 3% cap/-1.5% MFG
Alexandra Infant School	902,000	906,000	906,387	894,631	894,631	898,550	902,469	905,265	893,690
Alexandra Junior School	1,033,000	1,037,000	1,036,936	1,023,233	1,023,233	1,027,800	1,032,368	1,036,936	1,023,397
Balgowan Primary School	2,417,000	2,428,000	2,426,766	2,392,298	2,392,298	2,403,788	2,415,277	2,426,766	2,400,448
Bickley Primary	1,651,000	1,659,000	1,661,610	1,639,164	1,639,164	1,646,646	1,654,128	1,653,035	1,630,754
Biggin Hill Primary	1,393,000	1,399,000	1,403,172	1,384,066	1,384,066	1,390,435	1,396,803	1,403,172	1,384,230
Bishop Justus C of E School	4,834,000	4,975,000	5,027,363	5,027,363	4,980,216	4,933,069	4,933,069	4,885,922	4,885,922
Blenheim Primary School	1,128,000	1,133,000	1,114,322	1,099,447	1,099,447	1,104,405	1,109,364	1,114,322	1,099,611
Bromley Road Primary School	857,000	861,000	843,548	832,735	832,735	836,339	839,944	843,548	832,900
Bullers Wood School	5,286,000	5,441,000	5,495,730	5,495,730	5,444,060	5,392,389	5,392,389	5,340,719	5,340,719
Burnt Ash Primary School	2,026,000	2,035,000	2,034,039	2,005,428	2,005,428	2,014,965	2,024,502	2,033,502	2,005,064
Castlecombe Primary School	1,056,000	1,061,000	1,065,030	1,050,971	1,050,971	1,055,657	1,060,344	1,065,030	1,051,135
CHARLES DARWIN	5,408,000	5,566,000	5,613,656	5,613,656	5,560,770	5,507,883	5,507,883	5,454,997	5,454,997
Chelsfield Primary School	529,000	531,000	530,482	524,329	524,329	526,380	528,431	530,482	524,494
Chislehurst (CofE) Primary	872,000	876,000	875,250	863,948	863,948	867,715	871,482	875,250	864,112
Chislehurst School for Girls	4,660,000	4,797,000	4,843,238	4,843,239	4,797,826	4,752,413	4,752,413	4,707,000	4,707,000
Churchfields Primary School	1,760,000	1,768,000	1,725,086	1,701,138	1,701,138	1,709,121	1,717,104	1,724,515	1,700,740
Clare House Primary School	1,372,000	1,378,000	1,375,855	1,357,065	1,357,065	1,363,328	1,369,591	1,375,855	1,357,229
Coopers School	6,027,000	6,204,000	6,255,620	6,255,621	6,196,546	6,137,471	6,137,471	6,078,396	6,078,396
Crofton Infant School	2,111,000	2,121,000	2,120,974	2,091,090	2,091,090	2,101,051	2,111,012	2,120,607	2,090,893
CROFTON JUNIOR SCHOOL	2,537,000	2,549,000	2,550,123	2,513,860	2,513,860	2,525,947	2,538,035	2,550,123	2,550,123
Cudham CE Primary School	513,000	515,000	519,406	513,499	513,499	515,468	517,437	519,406	513,663
Darrick Wood Infant School	1,106,000	1,111,000	1,110,543	1,095,745	1,095,745	1,100,678	1,105,611	1,110,543	1,095,910
Darrick Wood Junior School	1,486,000	1,493,000	1,491,731	1,471,223	1,471,223	1,478,059	1,484,895	1,491,731	1,471,387
Darrick Wood School	6,161,000	6,343,000	6,410,033	6,410,033	6,349,610	6,289,187	6,289,187	6,228,764	6,228,764
Dorset Road Infant School	432,000	434,000	432,326	427,629	427,629	429,195	430,760	432,326	427,794
Downe Primary School	479,000	481,000	479,816	474,504	474,504	476,275	478,045	479,549	474,401
Edgebury Primary School	1,011,000	1,015,000	1,046,317	1,033,250	1,033,250	1,037,606	1,041,961	1,011,893	998,991
FARNBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,105,000	1,110,000	1,110,536	1,095,751	1,095,751	1,100,679	1,105,608	1,110,536	1,095,915
Gray's Farm Primary Academy	1,716,000	1,724,000	1,723,416	1,699,459	1,699,459	1,707,445	1,715,430	1,723,416	1,699,624
Green Street Green Primary	1,669,000	1,676,000	1,678,687	1,655,435	1,655,435	1,663,185	1,670,936	1,678,133	1,655,053
Harris Academy Beckenham	5,337,000	5,387,000	5,048,458	5,048,458	5,000,925	4,953,391	4,953,391	4,905,857	4,905,857
Harris Academy Orpington	4,561,000	4,694,000	4,755,601	4,755,601	4,711,184	4,666,768	4,666,768	4,622,231	4,622,231
Harris Girls Academy Bromley	3,596,000	3,700,000	3,732,537	3,732,537	3,697,771	3,663,004	3,663,004	3,628,237	3,628,237
Harris Primary Academy Beckenham	1,609,000	766,680	769,927	760,213	760,213	763,451	766,689	764,484	764,484
Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace	1,895,000	1,904,000	1,772,130	1,747,400	1,747,400	1,755,643	1,763,886	1,772,130	1,747,564
Harris Primary Academy Kent House	1,926,000	1,935,000	1,935,559	1,908,461	1,908,461	1,917,494	1,926,527	1,935,559	1,908,626
Harris Primary Academy Orpington	1,798,000	1,806,000	1,804,432	1,779,238	1,779,238	1,787,636	1,796,034	1,803,809	1,778,789
Harris Primary Academy Shortlands	1,655,000	1,091,864	1,095,802	1,081,210	1,081,210	1,086,074	1,090,938	1,092,605	1,078,226
Hawes Down Primary School	1,978,000	1,987,000	1,994,919	1,966,891	1,966,891	1,976,234	1,985,577	1,994,199	1,966,346
Hayes Primary School	2,364,000	2,375,000	2,366,816	2,333,141	2,333,141	2,344,366	2,355,591	2,366,817	2,333,306
Hayes School	5,643,000	5,787,000	5,845,211	5,844,527	5,811,625	5,756,386	5,756,386	5,701,180	5,701,180
Highfield Infants' School	1,076,000	1,081,000	1,081,279	1,066,924	1,066,924	1,071,709	1,076,494	1,081,279	1,067,088
Highfield Junior School	1,344,000	1,350,000	1,349,750	1,331,375	1,331,375	1,337,500	1,343,625	1,349,750	1,345,917
Holy Innocents Catholic Primar	913,000	917,000	918,033	906,128	906,128	910,096	914,064	918,033	906,293
James Dixon Primary	2,107,000	2,117,000	2,112,193	2,082,373	2,082,373	2,092,313	2,102,254	2,111,720	2,082,071
Kemnal Technology College	2,752,000	2,831,000	2,884,482	2,884,482	2,858,154	2,831,826	2,831,826	2,805,498	2,805,498
Keston C.E. Primary School	955,000	959,000	959,157	946,624	946,624	950,802	954,979	959,157	946,789
La Fontaine Academy	2,594,000	1,551,690	1,555,491	1,534,003	1,534,003	1,541,165	1,548,328	1,551,791	1,530,523
Langley Park Primary School	1,621,000	551,351	555,460	550,954	550,954	551,138	553,299	551,928	551,928
Langley Park School for Boys	5,155,000	5,284,000	5,391,519	5,390,896	5,363,324	5,312,966	5,312,966	5,262,832	5,262,832
Langley Park School for Girls	5,620,000	5,769,000	5,777,791	5,777,111	5,739,269	5,684,257	5,684,257	5,629,244	5,629,244
Leesons Primary School	1,407,000	1,414,000	1,410,678	1,391,355	1,391,355	1,397,796	1,404,237	1,410,678	1,391,520
Manor Oak Primary School	988,000	992,000	991,512	978,483	978,483	982,826	987,169	991,512	978,647
Marian Vian Primary School	2,442,000	2,454,000	2,451,405	2,416,557	2,416,557	2,428,173	2,439,789	2,451,405	2,424,746
Mead Road Infant School	504,000	506,000	506,145	500,372	500,372	502,296	504,221	506,145	500,536
Midfield Primary School	1,784,000	1,792,000	1,788,962	1,763,979	1,763,979	1,772,306	1,780,634	1,788,407	1,763,597
Mottingham Primary School	1,967,000	1,976,000	1,975,602	1,947,885	1,947,885	1,957,124	1,966,363	1,975,602	1,948,049
NEWSTEAD WOOD SCHOOL	3,571,000	3,675,000	3,726,337	3,726,338	3,691,818	3,657,298	3,657,298	3,622,778	3,622,778
OAK LODGE PRIMARY SCHOOL	2,259,000	2,269,000	2,272,643	2,240,547	2,240,547	2,251,246	2,261,944	2,272,643	2,240,712
Oaklands Primary Academy	1,973,000	1,983,000	1,978,582	1,950,765	1,950,765	1,960,037	1,969,309	1,978,582	1,950,930
Parish C.E. Primary School	2,303,000	2,314,000	2,316,702	2,283,946	2,283,946	2,294,865	2,305,783	2,316,702	2,310,610
Perry Hall Primary School	1,650,000	1,658,000	1,657,010	1,634,047	1,634,047	1,641,701	1,649,356	1,657,010	1,634,212
Pickhurst Infants' School	1,461,000	1,467,000	1,467,770	1,447,646	1,447,646	1,454,354	1,461,062	1,467,770	1,447,810
Pickhurst Junior School	1,863,000	1,872,000	1,872,219	1,846,058	1,846,058	1,854,778	1,863,498	1,872,219	1,858,938
Poverest Primary School	1,462,000	1,468,000	1,463,755	1,443,918	1,443,918	1,450,531	1,457,143	1,462,875	1,443,212
Pratts Bottom Primary School	441,000	443,000	442,218	437,385	437,385	438,996	440,607	442,218	437,550
Raglan Primary School	1,664,000	1,671,000	1,670,985	1,647,807	1,647,807	1,655,533	1,663,259	1,670,338	1,647,334
Ravens Wood School	5,454,000	5,614,000	5,672,972	5,672,973	5,619,619	5,566,266	5,566,266	5,512,913	5,512,913
Red Hill Primary School	2,782,000	2,796,000	2,794,557	2,754,606	2,754,606	2,767,923	2,781,240	2,794,557	2,754,771
Scotts Park Primary School	2,041,000	2,051,000	2,049,120	2,020,291	2,020,291	2,029,901	2,039,511	2,049,120	2,020,456
Southborough Primary School	1,778,000	1,786,000	1,780,284	1,755,916	1,755,916	1,764,039	1,772,161	1,779,700	1,755,497
St George's CE Primary	1,559,000	1,566,000	1,564,347	1,542,749	1,542,749	1,549,948	1,557,147	1,564,347	1,542,913
St James RC Primary School	841,000	845,000	846,550	835,719	835,719	839,329	842,940	846,550	835,883
St John's CE Primary School	1,213,000	1,218,000	1,218,091	1,208,088	1,208,088	1,208,088	1,212,621	1,218,091	1,206,480
St Joseph's R.C.Primary School	866,000	870,000	870,323	859,113	859,113	862,849	866,586	870,323	859,277
St Mark's C.E. Primary School	1,690,000	1,698,000	1,696,565	1,672,995	1,672,995	1,680,851	1,688,708	1,696,565	1,673,159
St Mary Cray Primary Academy	1,222,000	1,228,000	1,227,593	1,211,042	1,211,042	1,216,559	1,222,076	1,227,593	1,211,207
St Mary's Catholic Primary	1,590,000	1,597,000	1,595,266	1,573,200	1,573,200	1,580,556	1,587,911	1,595,266	1,573,365
ST OLAVE'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL	2,952,000	3,035,000	3,030,776	3,030,422	3,030,422	2,975,993	2,975,993	2,954,693	2,954,693
St Paul's Cray CE Primary	1,272,000	1,278,000	1,276,130	1,259,267	1,259,267	1,264,888	1,270,509	1,283,648	1,266,950
St Peter & St Paul Catholic Primary	1,004,000	1,009,000	1,007,504	994,225	994,225	998,651	1,003,078	1,007,504	994,389
St Philomena's Catholic Primary	921,000	925,000	923,951	911,928	911,928	915,935	919,943	923,951	912,092
St Vincent's Catholic Primary	941,000	945,000	944,481	932,146	932,146	936,258	940,370	944,481	932,311
St.Anthony's R.C Primary	959,000	963,000	958,795	946,289	946,289	950,458	954,626	958,795	946,454
The Highway Primary School	911,000	915,000	919,330	907,453	907,453	911,412	915,371	919,330	907,618
The Pioneer Academy	1,889,000	1,898,000	1,895,199	1,868,642	1,868,642	1,877,495	1,886,347	1,895,199	1,868,807
The Ravensbourne School	5,753,000	5,922,000	5,968,118	5,968,118	5,911,783	5,855,449	5,855,449	5,799,415	5,799,415
Trinity Church of England Primary School	2,187,000	2,197,000	2,194,115	2,163,087	2,163,087	2,173,430	2,183,772	2,193,34	

This page is left intentionally blank