



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: 3 January 2019

To: Members of the  
**SCHOOLS' FORUM**

David Dilling (Chairman)	Primary Academy Governor - Charles Darwin Academy Trust
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Matthew Apsley	Primary Academy Headteacher
Richard Edmunds	Primary Academy Head Teacher
Patrick Foley	Primary Maintained Head Teacher
Izabela Lecybyl	Non-School Representative (Catholic Church)
Angela Leeves	Non-School Representative (Early Years)
Neil Miller	PRU Head Teacher/Governor Academy
Sam Parrett	Non-School Representative (14-19 Partnership)
Karen Raven	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
Andrew Rees	Secondary Maintained School Head Teacher
1 x vacancy	Non-School Representatives (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee)
1 x vacancy	Secondary Academy Governor
1 x vacancy	Special Head/Governor Maintained
1 x vacancy	PRU Head Teacher/Governor Maintained
1 x vacancy	Special Head Teacher/Governor Academy
1 x vacancy	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
2 x vacancy	Primary Academy Governor
David Wilcox	Secondary Academy Governor (Darrick Wood School)

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 10 JANUARY 2019 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 8 NOVEMBER 2018 (Pages 3 - 10)

**4 2019/20 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (Pages 11 - 46)**

**5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

*The Programme of meetings for 2019/20 has not yet been finalised. Members of the Schools' Forum will be notified as soon as dates for future meetings are available.*

## SCHOOLS' FORUM

Minutes of the meeting held at 4.30 pm on 8 November 2018

### Present:

David Dilling (Chairman)	Primary Academy Governor
David Bridger (Vice-Chairman)	Non-School Representative (Church of England)
Richard Edmunds	Primary Academy Head Teacher
Angela Leeves	Non-School Representative (Early Years)
Neil Miller	PRU Head Teacher/Governor Academy
Karen Raven	Secondary Academy Head Teacher
David Wilcox	Secondary Academy Governor

### Also Present:

David Bradshaw	Head of ECHS Finance
Gillian Palmer	Interim Director: Education
Amanda Russell	Head of Schools Finance Support
Philippa Gibbs	Democratic Services Officer

### 15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Patrick Foley, Keith Seed and Matthew Apsley. Janice Box attended as alternate for Patrick Foley.

### 16 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Clerk invited nominations for the position of Chairman of the Schools Forum.

David Bridger proposed that David Dilling be elected Chairman of the Schools' Forum. The motion was seconded by David Wilcox.

Following a vote David Dilling was elected Chairman of the Schools Forum.

The Chairman invited nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman to the Schools' Forum.

Karen Raven proposed that David Bridger be elected Vice-Chairman of the Schools' Forum. The motion was seconded by David Wilcox.

Following a vote David Bridger was elected Vice-Chairman of the Schools' Forum.

**RESOLVED: That David Dilling be elected Chairman and that David Bridger be elected Vice-Chairman of the Schools' Forum.**

**17            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

David Dilling declared that he was the grandparent of children in one of the schools receiving falling rolls funding.

It was agreed that the list of declarations of interest should be recirculated at the next meeting to enable Members of the Schools' Forum to update their interests if necessary.

**18            MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 SEPTEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2018 were approved, and signed as a correct record.

**19            2019/20 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT  
Report ED18085**

The Schools' Forum considered a report which outlined the estimated Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG) allocation for 2019/20 and provided an overview of how the grant would be spent. Due to the overall position for the DSG the LA felt it was important to share this information with the Schools' Forum at the earliest opportunity.

The indicative DSG funding for 2019/20 was based on October 2017 pupil numbers and would be uplifted in December 2018 to reflect the October 2018 census data. The DSG for 2019/20 was divided into four blocks (High Needs, Early Years, Schools, and Schools Central) and for indicative purposes the expected income was, subject to any adjustments made as a result of the October 2018 census data :

2019/20 Dedicated Schools Grant					
	High Needs Block	Early Years Block	Schools Block	Schools Central Block	Total
Gross Grant Funding	£47,671,311	£21,149,813	£206,823,914	£1,915,246	£277,560,284
Recoupment adjustment	-£8,319,000				
Net Grant Allocation	£39,352,311	£21,149,813	£206,823,914	£1,915,246	£277,241,284

Schools Central Block

This newly established block was showing a small overspend of around £24k. This was based on the assumption that there would be a contribution of £250k

from Council reserves to offset the deficit. However, should the Council contribution not be agreed significant savings in this area would need to be identified or DSG reserves used to offset this as in previous years. It was noted that the £1m contribution from the Council was currently a projection as no decisions around this funding had been taken.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, the Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that any deficit at the end of the year would be funded through DSG reserves. The Director of Education confirmed that the Local Authority was reviewing all options to reduce expenditure and that as part of this it would be helpful for the Schools' Forum to be provided with a detailed breakdown of expenditure in order to fully understand how funding was utilised.

### Early Years Block

The Early Years Block was showing as being balanced however, the income was based on October 2017 pupil numbers which were likely to change considerably in October 18 to reflect the impact of the additional 15 hours which was introduced last year. There was a particular pressure on this block due to the fact that historically Bromley has funded two years olds at a higher rate than that received in the DSG. If there was any pressure on this block then this would likely be the first area to be considered rather than adjusting the 3 and 4 year olds funding formula. The Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that fluctuations in pupil numbers in this block would lead to a corresponding fluctuation in funding and if pupil numbers dropped the DfE would claw back funding.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, the Head of Schools Finance Support emphasised that currently there were no proposals in place that would affect the 2 year old funding. There would need to be detailed modelling of any proposed changes in order to assess the impact and in order for this to happen the Local Authority would need to have confirmation of funding. It was also noted that there would need to be detailed consultation.

The Director of Education emphasised that in Bromley the 2 year old offer was not universal. It was a targeted offer intended to support the most disadvantaged pupils. Prior to any decisions being taken the Local Authority would want to ensure that it was doing the right thing for the most vulnerable children.

The Schools' Forum noted that if there was a reduction in the number of providers offering funded places the Local Authority would need to account to the DfE for the falling rate of take-up. There was no evidence of providers withdrawing from the market as a result of funding issues although feedback from providers had demonstrated that a key issue was the complexity of the paperwork they were required to complete in order to receive the funding.

The Early Years representative reported that there were nevertheless challenges for providers and in order to keep afloat they had to look at other ways for fund raising as the funding that was provided by the Government for places did not cover the cost.

## Schools' Block

There had been some changes to the Schools Block Funding. The DfE had moved to a formulaic mechanism for allocating growth funding to LAs as opposed to the practice of using historic funding in previous years. The formula looked at the actual growth in pupil numbers in each LA, broken down into Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs) and only reflecting positive growth meaning that any negative growth (ie reduction in pupil numbers) was not counted. Using this methodology meant that the growth funding for Bromley had decreased by over £1m from £2.85m to £1.84m. The growth funding that was paid directly to schools following the formula previously agreed with the Schools' Forum had reduced to around £1.6m, in line with the income.

The Schools' Block showed a contribution to the High Needs Block of £1m to help to offset the anticipated over spend in that area. This had been achieved by setting the Minimum Funding Guarantee at -1.25% (last year it was set at a positive figure of 0.3%) and the capping factor had been set at 0%. The impact of this was that all primary schools (with the exception of the free schools that were still growing) lost funding at various levels but no more than 1.25%. Secondary schools did not see any increase other than the inflationary factor which had been applied to the rates funding which sat outside of the MFG. This outcome was anticipated following the move to the NFF in 2018/19.

The DfE operational guidance stated that local authorities retained the ability to transfer up to 0.5% of their Schools Block into another block, with the approval of the Schools Forum. The proposal to transfer £1m equated to 0.48%. To make such a transfer, LAs were required to consult with all maintained schools and academies, and it was recommended that the Schools' Forum should take account of the views of schools before giving their approval. The LA would be releasing a consultation document to all schools outlining their proposal to apply the MFG at -1.25% and to set the capping at 0% in order for £1m to be transferred to the High Needs Block. The Schools Forum would then be asked to make a final decision as to whether or not they would support this proposal at its next meeting.

The Schools' Forum discussed the disproportionate impact that the opening of three new Free Schools had on the budgets of the other schools across the Borough. The opening of the schools had led to additional expenditure within the block with no additional income and this had placed significant pressure on the whole block. Members felt that in principal the decision that had been taken by the Government was wrong and that the funding for new children in new schools should not be taken away from existing children in existing schools. It was also noted that this pressure with funding would be ongoing in future years. The Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that Officers at the Local Authority had already raised this with the DfE and would continue to do so as the decision had been ill thought through. Officers would continue to lobby and it would certainly not do any harm if Members of the Schools' Forum also lobbied the DfE. It was suggested that any representations to the DfE should be submitted in conjunction with London Boroughs through London Councils. The Head of Schools' Finance Support reported that a meeting with the DfE and Schools' Finance Teams in other

London Boroughs was due to take place and she would raise this issue with her counterparts in other LAs.

The Vice-Chairman noted that the key issue was one of lagged funding combined with growth and eventually the funding would catch up. The Secondary Academy Representative highlighted that this had been an issue for primary schools for a number of years. However, as there were more schools, with small budgets distributed across the Borough the issues had been less visible. Now the problem had reached secondary schools larger sums of money were under consideration and it was having a greater impact on teaching and learning and the level of reduction in funding was not sustainable in the secondary sector.

### High Needs Block

There continued to be significant pressures on the High Needs Block. The estimated High Needs Funding had increased by £1m to reflect pupil growth in this area. However the expenditure was expected to increase over and above this. Estimated expenditure was based on the pattern of new EHCPs (Education, Health and Care Plans) seen over recent years and on the average cost of a placement. The LA's own special schools and resourced provisions were, in the main, over-subscribed resulting in the continued reliance on independent settings.

A number of savings areas had been identified within the High Needs which were under review or already in place. These included:

- Potential savings of around £280k (part year effect of £163k in first year) by de-commissioning a number of places across three schools where the resourced provision had been carrying vacant places for a number of years;
- To establish a new SEN Advisory Service by bringing together existing teams that offer advice and support to provide support to mainstream schools;
- Improved speech and language therapy offer to hold more children in mainstream and special schools in-borough;
- In partnership with Bromley CCG, Bromley had made a CAHMS Trailblazer application to establish 4 specialist teams to work with secondary schools and pupils in years 5 and 6; and
- Following successful investment in a Primary (school) Outreach Service, planning was underway for a similar short term investment in a Secondary (school) Outreach Service, with a view to reducing permanent exclusion in the secondary sector.

The Director of Education stressed that there were significant pressures in the High Needs Block and circulated some graphs in order to provide context to the funding position. It was noted that the £1m that had been transferred into the High Needs Block from the Schools' Block for 2018/19 would revert back in 2019/20 which was why the Local Authority was once again requesting £1m be transferred. The current pressures in the High Needs Block were a result of the decision that had been taken to transfer funding from the High Needs Block to the Schools' Block 3 years ago. It was acknowledged that the decision had been taken in good faith and that it would not have been possible to foresee the

implications of that decision however; it was now clear that the decision had resulted in pressures in the High Needs Block.

During the extensive discussion that took place, Members of the Schools' Forum agreed that there should be an in principle objection to the idiosyncrasies of the legislation that had been imposed which now left schools facing an unsustainable cut in funding. Concern was expressed around the presumption that children in receipt of funding from the High Needs Block were more important than those in receipt of funding from the Schools' Block as every child mattered and all were equally important. Members of the Forum stressed that whilst it was acknowledged that the high Needs Block needed the funding, schools could no longer afford it from their budgets. Members questioned whether local politicians were fully aware of the huge impact that funding issues were having on schools.

It was noted that through the SEND Reforms the Local Authority were trying to bring money back into the Borough and move away from expensive out of borough independent provision. However this was a long-term goal and there was no quick fix. The Director of Education highlighted that the Council had committed £1m to the High Needs Block for a further year and that this was a significant proportion of its budget.

In response to a question the Head of ECHS Finance and the Director of Education confirmed that if the funding was not agreed and there was an overspend on the High Needs Block in 2019/20 that would be the first call on DSG Funding for 2020/21 as a result of the statutory obligation.

The Schools' Forum noted that there were three possible decisions that it could take:

1. Agree to the transfer of £1m from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block.
2. Not agree to the transfer of £1m from the Schools' Block to the High Needs Block. In which case the Local Authority would follow due process and make an application to the Secretary of State which may or may not be approved.
3. Agree with a lesser amount being transferred between the two blocks.

It was agreed that the Schools' Forum should take a vote on the recommendation in the report. The Chairman therefore proposed that the Local Authority's request for a dis-application of Schools Regulations to transfer £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2019/20 in line with DfE guidelines be agreed.

2 in favour  
5 against

The motion was therefore LOST.

Members of the Schools' Forum agreed that when the Local Authority consulted with schools the option of transferring both £1m and the lesser amount of £500k should be included in the consultation. It was felt that more schools should have

a say in any decision to transfer funding from the Schools Block. In view of this it was agreed that further consultation would take place with the respective Head Teachers' Forums.

**RESOLVED: That the proposal to transfer £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs block not be agreed.**

## **20 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Membership of the Schools Forum

The Vice-Chairman requested an update on the action that was being taken to address the growing number of vacancies on the Forum.

The Head of ECHS Finance circulated a paper outlining the current vacancies on the Forum which were:

- 2 x Primary Academy Governor
- 1 x Special Maintained School Head/Governor
- 1 x Secondary Academy Governor
- 1 x Maintained PRU Head/Governor
- 1 x Non-Schools Representative (Joint Teacher Liaison)

It was noted that this would have been Keith Seed's last meeting as he is due to retire at the end of the year and as a result of this there will be a further vacancy for a Special Academy School Head/Governor. It was also suggested that following the expansion of London South East Colleges, Sam Parrett should be contacted about a 14-19 Representative to ensure that the sector was represented at meetings.

In addition to this, Paul Murphy had indicated that he would be standing down and this would create a vacancy for a Secondary Academy Head Teacher Representative.

It was agreed that the relevant Head Teacher Forums should nominate a representative and inform the clerk of the nomination in writing.

The Head of ECHS Finance confirmed that Governor Representatives would be sought through the Schools' Circular. In relation to the Maintained PRU Head/Governor, this position applied to only one school and the school was due to convert to an academy. It was therefore agreed that no action would be taken in this instance. The Local Authority would make contact with the Joint Teacher Liaison Committee and request a representative.

The Schools' Forum noted that all appointments would be subject to the conditions laid out in the Schools' Forum Constitution regarding members being from the same School or MAT. The Secondary Head Teacher representative highlighted that it was often difficult to know which School or MAT Governors

came from. It was agreed that this information would be included on the agenda front sheet for relevant members.

The Head of ECHS Finance emphasised that the Local Authority was trying to achieve as wide a representation on the Schools' Forum as possible. As Multi Academy Trusts across the Borough grew in size the existing MAT rule within the Constitution may make this problematic and may need to be reviewed. It was noted that the Head of ECHS Finance would review the Constitution and bring any amendments to the next meeting. Any revisions would then require ratification by the Education, Children and Families Budget and Performance Monitoring Sub-Committee.

#### Date of Next meeting

The Head of Schools Finance Support reported that the timing of the next meeting would not give the Forum sufficient time to contribute to the DfE return in a meaningful way. It was therefore agreed that the next meeting would be held a week earlier, at 4.30pm on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

The Meeting ended at 6.35 pm

Chairman

Report No.  
ED18085

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:**        **SCHOOLS' FORUM**

**Date:**                    **Thursday 10 January 2019**

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

**Title:**                    **2019/20 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT**

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

**Chief Officer:**        Executive Director of Education, Care and Health Services

**Ward:**                    (All Wards);

---

1. Reason for report

This report provides an outline of the final DSG allocation for 2019/20 and the budgeted expenditure across the four separate blocks

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- i.        **The Schools Forum is asked to review the final DSG income and forecast expenditure.**
- ii.       **The Schools Forum is asked to re-consider the LA proposal to transfer £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in 2019/20 in line with DfE guidelines.**
- iii.      **The Schools Forum is asked to discuss and make a final decision on the proposal to introduce a falling rolls fund.**

### 3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 The final Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding for 2019/20 has now been provided to all LAs updated to reflect the October 2018 pupil numbers. The final allocation includes the additional funding for SEND announced by the Secretary of State which for Bromley was £788,032 for 2018/19 and 2019/20.
- 3.2 The DSG for 2019/20 is divided into four blocks – High Needs, Early Years, Schools and Schools Central. The expected grant income is detailed below

2019/20 Dedicated Schools Grant					
	High Needs Block	Early Years Block	Schools Block	Schools Central Block	Total
Gross Grant Funding	£48,820,619	£20,691,309	£208,637,223	£1,938,460	£280,087,611
Recoupment adjustment	-£7,813,333				-£7,813,333
Net Grant Allocation	£41,007,286	£20,691,309	£208,637,223	£1,938,460	£272,274,278

- 3.3 The LA has looked at each of these blocks and has forecast the related expenditure for 2019/20 based on information that is currently available at this time. Full details of the projected grant income and expenditure can be seen at Appendix 1 with detailed information regarding each block provided below. Appendices 1a and 1b show the projections with and without the movement between the blocks respectively.

#### 3.4 Schools Central Block

Grant 2019/20	£1,938,460
Contribution from Council	£310,000
Expenditure 2019/20	£2,248,460
Expected (Over)/ Underspend	£0

The Schools Central Block is showing as being balanced, due to a contribution of £310k from Council reserves to offset the original deficit and Officers will continue to work towards bringing this expenditure in line.

### 3.5 Early Years Block

Grant 2019/20	£20,691,309
Expenditure 2019/20	£20,691,309
Expected (Over)/ Underspend	£0

The Early Years Block income has decreased slightly from the original projections due to a decrease in the number of pupils funded for the additional 15 hours. However the projected expenditure has been adjusted to reflect this and the block remains balanced. Officers are aware of the particular pressure on this block due to the fact that historically Bromley has funded two years olds at a higher rate than is received in the DSG.

### 3.6 Schools Block

Grant 2019/20	£208,637,223
Expenditure 2019/20	£207,637,223
Transfer to HN Block	£1,000,000
Expected (Over)/ Underspend	0

There have been some changes to the Schools Block Funding this year. The DfE have moved to a formulaic mechanism for allocating growth funding to LAs as opposed to the practice of using historic funding in previous years. The formula looks at the actual growth in pupil numbers in each LA, broken down into Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs) and only reflecting positive growth meaning that any negative growth (ie reduction in pupil numbers) is not counted. Using this methodology means that the growth funding for Bromley has decreased from £2.85m to £1.93m, which is a loss of almost £1m.

- 3.7 The growth funding that is paid directly to schools following the formula previously agreed with the Schools Forum has reduced to around £1.6m, which appears to be in line with the income. This would allow for £56k to be earmarked for the falling rolls fund that was recently discussed by the Schools Forum. At the meeting in September, the Schools Forum considered an outline proposal of the funding mechanism for a falling rolls fund but opted not to make a decision on this until the October 2018 census information was available.
- 3.8 Appendix 2 shows the reception pupil numbers from the October 2018 census data – based on this data and the principles that were outlined in the earlier Schools Forum report there are a small number of schools that may be eligible to receive falling rolls funding. Further clarification is required from the LA regarding the future pupil numbers in each of the schools and from the schools regarding their individual budget pressures. It is estimated that the total amount of funding required to be paid would be £55k in the first year. The Schools Forum is asked to make a final decision as to whether they wish the LA to proceed with this process.
- 3.9 At their last meeting, the Schools Forum was asked to consider the LAs proposal to move £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. The Schools Forum voted against this proposal. Following the meeting, the LA undertook a full consultation with all schools regarding

this proposal. Full details of the consultation responses can be seen at Appendix 3. The LA submitted an application to the Secretary of State at the end of the November to request permission to move the £1m without the permission of the Schools Forum and is still waiting for the outcome of this request. The Schools Forum are asked to formally agree or disagree to the disapplication request.

3.10 The LA has calculated two sets of funding – one with the £1m being transferred to the Schools Block and one without. The funding parameters have been set as follows:

	£1m to be transferred	£1m NOT to be transferred
MFG	- 1.22%	- 0.25%
Capping	n/a	n/a
Scaling	n/a	n/a

3.11 The MFG (Minimum Funding Guarantee) controls the amount by which the funding can change on a per pupil basis – for example if the MFG is set at -1.22% then the funding cannot reduce by more than 1.22% per pupil. This is used to support schools that would lose funding as a result of moving from the (original) Bromley funding formula to the National Funding Formula

The capping factor controls the amount of funding that a school can gain – schools with gains will keep all gains below the capping factor. For example a capping factor of 1.5% means schools will keep the first 1.5% of gains on a per pupil basis. If there is no cap then there is no limit to the amount of funding that a school can gain.

The scaling factor indicates by how much any gains above the capping factor will be scaled back. For example a scaling factor of 65% means that any gains over the cap are scaled back by 65%.

3.12 No capping or scaling factors have been used for the two proposed allocations as this allows the NFF to be fully implemented for those schools that gain. The MFG has been adjusted to keep the allocations within the funding available. As a result of this, as expected, the funding for secondary schools has increased whereas primary schools will see a decrease. This is because most primary schools are still receiving high amounts of minimum funding guarantee protection as they move towards the NFF. Currently the level of MFG protection across all primary schools is around £6m.

3.13 Full details of the impact of these parameters can be seen at Appendix 4. Appendix 5 shows the level of MFG protection still afforded across the primary sector.

### 3.14 High Needs Block

Income 2019/20	£41,007,286
Expenditure 2019/20	£43,073,286
Transfer from Schools Block	£1,000,000
Contribution from Council	£1,066,000
Expected (Over)/ Underspend	£ 0

The additional SEND funding that was announced by the Secretary of State in December has helped to alleviate the pressure on the High Needs Block and the additional £788k means that the Council has been able to reduce its contribution from £2m to around £1m. If the request to move £1m from the Schools Block is not agreed then the additional contribution would have to be found elsewhere, potentially from a further contribution from the Council or from DSG reserves.

- 3.15 The additional £788k for 2018/19 will be used to offset the expected overspend in the High Needs Block in the current financial year, with any remainder being added to the contingency.
- 3.16 The LA has also recently submitted an expression of interest to the DfE to open a new special school, and has been able to demonstrate that should this be successful it will result in considerable savings in the High Needs Block. As part of his December statement the Secretary of State announced that he has removed the cap on the number of special and alternative provision free school bids that will be approved next year and in view of this Bromley is hopeful that the bid submitted by the LA will be successful.

This page is left intentionally blank

2019/20 DSG

Appendix 1a

High Needs Block

<b>Income</b>		
Baseline		44,611,100
HN Pupil numbers	857	
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4348.33	3,726,519
import/export		483,000
<b>High Needs Block Restated</b>		48,820,619
Academy Units		-2,146,000
PRU Places Recoupment		-1,430,000
High Needs Recoupment		-2,650,000
Academy Post-16 Units		-813,333
		-192,000
Post 16 Transfer		-582,000
		<u>-7,813,333</u>
<b>DSG Grant Amount</b>		<b>41,007,286</b>

Early Year Block

EY Pupil numbers	5,305
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4.91
hours (15 x 38)	570
3 & 4 Years Old Funding	14,847,090
EY Pupil numbers	1,388
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4.91
hours (15 x 38)	570
3 & 4 Years Old Additional 15 Hrs	3,883,254
EY Pupil numbers	549
Baseline £ Per Pupil	5.66
hours (15 x 38)	570
2 Year Old Funding	1,770,265
EY Pupil Premium	126,122
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578
	<u>20,691,309</u>

Schools Block

Primary Pupil Numbers	27,246
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4,200
Total Primary Funding	<u>114,442,816</u>
Secondary pupil numbers	17,471
Baseline £ Per Pupil	5,183
	<u>90,554,639</u>
Growth, Premises and mobility	3,639,768
	208,637,223
	<u>208,637,223</u>
Growth	1,537,574
Falling rolls	56,000
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578
transfer to HN block	1,000,000
	<u>208,637,223</u>

Central Schools Services Block

Pupil Numbers	44,717
Baseline £ Per Pupil	43
Central Schools Services Funding	<u>1,938,460</u>
	280,087,611
Access and Admissions	553,990
Licences	239,330
Capital	76,830
	5,030
Schools Forum	1,000
Pupil Support Advisory Team	194,610
Support to Schools	46,180
Business Support	116,390
Workforce Development	27,980
Schools standard	134,350
<b>Formerly ESG Funding</b>	
Education Welfare Service	470,900
Asset Management - Education	79,060
Statutory / Regulatory Duties - Educa	302,810
Overheads (Finance / HR / etc.)	
Contribution from Council	<u>-310,000</u>
	<u>1,938,460</u>
	<u>272,274,278</u>

Expenditure

Delegated budgets

Special Schools - Pre 16 places	3,070,000
top up	5,049,465
Glebe top up	1,466,577
BTA Top Up	1,681,725
BBA top up	1,962,471
Units - Maintained Places	120,000
- LA Funded Academy Places (Vacant)	11,667
- LA Funded Academy Places	62,500
- Maintained Top Up	85,800
- Academy Top Up	1,569,003
In year changes to recoupment	1,231,500

PVI - estimated	13,747,730
Additional 3 & 4 Year Old Hours	4,028,769
2 Year Old Cost	2,085,100
EY Pupil Premium	126,122
<b>Central Costs</b>	
EY Admin Team	177,800
SEN Support in Pre Schools	461,210
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578

Academy Recoupment	194,677,473
Primary SBS	8,279,668
Secondary SBS	3,086,508

LA Centrally Managed

Darrick Wood HIU	325,130
Darrick wood Deaf centre	464,300
Pupil Referral Costs	-95,000
Progression Courses	625,410
Home and Alternative Provision	735,560
SEN Support in Mainstream	235,900
Matrix Funding	2,969,430
Social Communication Difficulties Team	182,950
Sensory Support	1,012,600
Outreach and Inclusion	232,680
Specialist Support and Disability	238,950
Complex Needs Team	320,770
Phoenix Pre School Service	1,555,218
Early Support Programme	88,070
SEN Transport	230,000
Special Central	41,500
Other Statemeted	53,940
SEN Out of Borough Fees	13,536,920
SEN in Further Education Colleges	3,995,640
Special Capital	12,610

transfer from schools block	-1,000,000
Contribution from council funds	-1,066,000

<b>Total</b>	<u>41,007,286</u>
Variance	<u>0</u>

<b>Total</b>	<u>20,691,309</u>
Variance	<u>0</u>

<b>Total</b>	<u>208,637,223</u>
Variance	<u>0</u>

<b>Total</b>	<u>1,938,460</u>	<u>272,274,277</u>
Variance	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

2019/20 DSG

Appendix 1b

High Needs Block

<b>Income</b>		
Baseline		44,611,100
HN Pupil numbers	857	
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4348.33	3,726,519
import/export		483,000
<b>High Needs Block Restated</b>		48,820,619
Academy Units		-2,146,000
PRU Places Recoupment		-1,430,000
High Needs Recoupment		-2,650,000
Academy Post-16 Units		-813,333
		-192,000
Post 16 Transfer		-582,000
		<u>-7,813,333</u>
<b>DSG Grant Amount</b>		<b>41,007,286</b>

Early Year Block

EY Pupil numbers	5,305
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4.91
hours (15 x 38)	570
3 & 4 Years Old Funding	14,847,090
EY Pupil numbers	1,388
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4.91
hours (15 x 38)	570
3 & 4 Years Old Additional 15 Hrs	3,883,254
EY Pupil numbers	549
Baseline £ Per Pupil	5.66
hours (15 x 38)	570
2 Year Old Funding	1,770,265
EY Pupil Premium	126,122
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578
	<u>20,691,309</u>

Schools Block

Primary Pupil Numbers	27,246
Baseline £ Per Pupil	4,200
Total Primary Funding	<u>114,442,816</u>
Secondary pupil numbers	17,471
Baseline £ Per Pupil	5,183
	<u>90,554,639</u>
Growth, Premises and mobility	3,639,768
	208,637,223
	<u>208,637,223</u>
Growth	1,543,559
Falling rolls	56,000
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578

Central Schools Services Block

Pupil Numbers	44,717
Baseline £ Per Pupil	43
Central Schools Services Funding	<u>1,938,460</u>
	280,087,611
Access and Admissions	553,990
Licences	239,330
Capital	76,830
	5,030
Schools Forum	1,000
Pupil Support Advisory Team	194,610
Support to Schools	46,180
Business Support	116,390
Workforce Development	27,980
Schools standard	134,350
Formerly ESG Funding	
Education Welfare Service	470,900
Asset Management - Education	79,060
Statutory / Regulatory Duties - Educa	302,810
Overheads (Finance / HR / etc.)	
	<u>1,938,460</u>
	<u>272,274,278</u>

Expenditure

Delegated budgets

Special Schools - Pre 16 places	3,070,000
top up	5,049,465
Glebe top up	1,466,577
BTA Top Up	1,681,725
BBA top up	1,962,471
Units - Maintained Places	120,000
- LA Funded Academy Places (Vacant)	11,667
- LA Funded Academy Places	62,500
- Maintained Top Up	85,800
- Academy Top Up	1,569,003
In year changes to recoupment	1,231,500

PVI - estimated	13,747,730
Additional 3 & 4 Year Old Hours	4,028,769
2 Year Old Cost	2,085,100
EY Pupil Premium	126,122
<b>Central Costs</b>	
EY Admin Team	177,800
SEN Support in Pre Schools	461,210
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578

Academy Recoupment	195,599,551
Primary SBS	8,351,605
Secondary SBS	3,086,508
Growth	1,543,559
Falling rolls	56,000

Access and Admissions	553,990
Licences	239,330
Capital	76,830
	5,030
Schools Forum	1,000
Pupil Support Advisory Team	194,610
Support to Schools	46,180
Business Support	116,390
Workforce Development	27,980
Schools standard	134,350

LA Centrally Managed

Darrick Wood HIU	325,130
Darrick wood Deaf centre	464,300
Pupil Referral Costs	-95,000
Progression Courses	625,410
Home and Alternative Provision	735,560
SEN Support in Mainstream	235,900
Matrix Funding	2,969,430
Social Communication Difficulties Team	182,950
Sensory Support	1,012,600
Outreach and Inclusion	232,680
Specialist Support and Disability	238,950
Complex Needs Team	320,770
Phoenix Pre School Service	1,555,218
Early Support Programme	88,070
SEN Transport	230,000
Special Central	41,500
Other Statemeted	53,940
SEN Out of Borough Fees	13,536,920
SEN in Further Education Colleges	3,995,640
Special Capital	12,610

SEN Support in Pre Schools	461,210
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578

Growth	1,543,559
Falling rolls	56,000
EY Disability Access Fund	64,578

<b>Formerly ESG Funding</b>	
Education Welfare Service	470,900
Asset Management - Education	79,060
Statutory / Regulatory Duties - Educa	302,810
Overheads (Finance / HR / etc.)	

transfer from schools block	0
Contribution from council funds	-2,066,000

transfer to HN block	0
----------------------	---

Contribution from Council	-310,000
---------------------------	----------

<b>Total</b>	<u>41,007,286</u>
--------------	-------------------

<u>20,691,309</u>
-------------------

<u>208,637,223</u>
--------------------

<u>1,938,460</u>	<u>272,274,278</u>
------------------	--------------------

Variance	<u>0</u>
----------	----------

<u>0</u>
----------

<u>0</u>
----------

<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
----------	----------

## Appendix 2

School	Reception Year	Total	PAN	Vacant Places	% Vacant Places	No. to be Funded	2019/20	2020/21	Ofsted rating
							AWPU Funding	AWPU Funding	
							£2,972		
Alexandra Infant (+)	60	174	60	0	0%				
Alexandra Junior	0	239	0	0	0%				
Balgowan Primary	90	678	90	0	0%				
Bickley Primary	59	416	60	1	2%				
Biggin Hill Primary	55	377	60	5	8%				
Blenheim Primary	29	217	30	1	3%				
HPA Beckenham Green	28	196	30	2	7%				
Burnt Ash Primary (+)	56	395	60	4	7%				
Castlecombe Primary (nursery)	30	207	30	0	0%				
Chelsfield Primary	13	88	16	3	19%				
Chislehurst Church of England Primary	30	216	30	0	0%				
Churchfields Primary (+) (nursery)	60	400	60	0	0%				
Clare House Primary	58	415	60	2	3%				
Crofton Infant (+)	180	540	180	0	0%				
Crofton Junior	0	712	0	0	0%				
Cudham Church of England Primary	10	94	15	5	33%	2	£3,467	£2,477	Good
Darrick Wood Infant (+) (nursery)	90	270	90	0	0%				
Darrick Wood Junior (+)	0	371	0	0	0%				
Dorset Road Infant	21	66	30	9	30%	3	£5,201	£3,715	Good
Downe Primary	5	83	15	10	67%	7	£20,804		Good
Edgebury Primary	60	308	60	0	0%				
Farnborough Primary	30	273	30	0	0%				
Gray's Farm Primary (nursery)	57	390	60	3	5%				
Green Street Green Primary (+)	46	385	60	14	23%	2	£3,467	£2,477	Good
HPA Beckenham	42	198	60	18	30%	6	Funded as free school		
HPA Shortlands	57	290	60	3	5%				
Hawes Down Primary (+)	48	448	60	12	20%	0			
Hayes Primary	89	647	90	1	1%				
Highfield Infant	89	270	90	1	1%				
Highfield Junior	0	363	0	0	0%				
HPA Orpington (+)	60	375	60	0	0%				
Holy Innocent's Catholic Primary	30	222	30	0	0%				
James Dixon Primary (+) (nursery)	59	414	60	1	2%				
Keston Church of England Primary	27	210	30	3	10%				
Langley Park Primary School	58	155	60	2	3%				
La Fontaine	59	320	60	1	2%				
Leesons Primary	43	329	60	17	28%	5	£8,668	£6,192	Good
HPA Crystal Palace (nursery)	59	385	60	1	2%				
Manor Oak Primary (+)(nursery)	24	183	30	6	20%	0			
Marian Vian Primary	87	643	90	3	3%				
Mead Road Infant	26	81	30	4	13%				
Midfield Primary (+) (nursery)	59	414	60	1	2%				
Mottingham Primary (+)	29	357	30	1	3%				
Oak Lodge Primary	68	600	90	22	24%	4	£6,935	£4,953	Good
Oaklands Primary	56	467	60	4	7%				
Parish Church of England Primary	90	622	90	0	0%				
Perry Hall Primary	60	431	60	0	0%				
Pickhurst Infant	120	361	120	0	0%				
Pickhurst Junior	0	524	0	0	0%				
Poverest Primary (+)	60	355	60	0	0%				
Pratts Bottom Primary	11	81	12	1	8%				
Princes Plain Primary (+) (nursery)	44	366	90	46	51%	28	funded as bulge class		
Raglan Primary (+)	59	416	60	1	2%				
Red Hill Primary	77	658	90	13	14%				
HPA Kent House(nursery)	56	382	60	4	7%				
Scotts Park Primary	55	504	60	5	8%				
Southborough Primary	55	420	60	5	8%				
St Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary	20	171	30	10	33%	4	£6,935	£4,953	Good
St George's, Bickley, Church of England Primary	61	392	60	0	0%				
St James' Roman Catholic Primary	31	218	30	0	0%				
St John's Church of England Primary	24	210	45	21	47%	12			RI
St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary	30	210	30	0	0%				
St Mark's Church of England Primary	49	401	60	11	18%				
St Mary Cray Primary	31	224	30	0	0%				
St Mary's Catholic Primary	55	421	60	5	8%				
St Paul's Cray Church of England Primary (nursery)	39	247	60	21	35%	9	funded as bulge class		
St Peter & St Paul Catholic Primary	30	216	30	0	0%				
St Philomena's Roman Catholic Primary	27	204	30	3	10%				
St Vincent's Catholic Primary	30	216	30	0	0%				
Stewart Fleming Primary	59	468	60	1	2%				
The Highway Primary	30	218	30	0	0%				
The Unicorn Primary	61	458	60	0	0%				
Tubbenden Primary	88	621	90	2	2%				
Valley Primary	87	468	90	3	3%				
Warren Road Primary	119	836	120	1	1%				
Wickham Common Primary	59	410	60	1	2%				
Worsley Bridge Junior	58	360	60	2	3%				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,811</b>	<b>26,970</b>					<b>£55,477</b>	<b>£24,767</b>	

This page is left intentionally blank

## Outcome of Consultation

Number of responses – 70

- Yes (Primary and Special) = 4
- No ( Primary and Special) = 55
- No ( Secondary) =11

## Comments

- We write on behalf of the Bromley Secondary headteachers, to state that we cannot support the proposal to transfer £1m from the Schools' block to the High Needs block, for the second year running. For all of our schools, this equates to considerable losses to school budgets. In the main, this will result in a direct impact on the number of teachers the schools are able to employ; and thereby directly affects the breadth and quality of provision and resulting standards and outcomes for Bromley children and young people. We cannot understate how challenging it will be to find the savings elsewhere in the budget. If additional funding is required in the High Needs block, this should not be at the expense of mainstream schools. We continue to manage only partly funded pay increases; increasing employer costs, (pensions/national insurance), unfunded changes in courses at all key stages, and the costly challenges around recruitment and retention of teachers, particularly in the shortage subjects. The decision is also inconsistent with the findings of send4change. It was explained that funding, and therefore provision, within Bromley showed a bias away from mainstream schools. An increasing number of children in our schools with special educational needs, including social, emotional and mental health needs, are not subject to an Education, Health and Care Plan and the resulting funding, yet require additional support and intervention in our schools. If the balance between mainstream and specialist, independent and out of borough provision is to be redressed, we would not expect a cut in school budgets, in favour of the High Needs block, to be the solution taken two years in a row. Additionally, it was noted by send4change that there is a significant spend on external provision, (i.e. non-maintained, independent, or neighbouring local authorities), to the sum of £11.5m (30% of the Specialist Provision budget). This seems very significant. It may be argued that this offers less value for money than in-house/local provision, and would support the decision in previous years for monies to have been taken from the High Needs' block to support the Schools' block. It had been reported to Headteachers at the LA briefing that there has been progress in reducing the number of such placements, and we would therefore argue that this previous solution does not render it the appropriate or required action to be taken now. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this action is 'fair and just'. We are sure that you are aware that the financial times schools are currently working in are very difficult. The Bromley Secondary Headteachers agree that any additional funding in the High Needs block should be addressed by the Local Authority from central funds. We would be interested to hear if the local authority has considered alternative options. We feel that if this continues, not only will standards drop in our local secondary schools, but going forward, the problem is not being addressed.
- The impact of this transfer of funds, on our individual schools' budget, is significant. 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, 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.

- The continued reduction in funding to schools will place an additional burden and further impact on a situation where we are having to make savings to our school budget. We have been required to and are continued to fund teacher pay increases and pay progression notwithstanding the teacher pay grant, which has been received this year. The recruitment and retention of teachers to our school is an ongoing challenge.

We continue to meet a range of additional needs in school for students without SEND and for whom we receive no additional funding. A further reduction in school funding will likely result in us reducing or withdrawing the mentoring and counselling services we provide and fund in school, which constitute early help for our vulnerable students.

Faced with producing an in-year balanced budget and the proposed cut in funding resulting from the movement of funding from the schools block to the high needs block, we will be required to make staffing cuts, which will necessitate a reduction in the curriculum offered to our students.

In light of the focus of the work Sen4change have been doing, it is especially disappointing that this work has not yet resulted in a redistribution of resource and spend from specialist and out of borough provision to schools in order for us to meet the needs of students with SEN, at a time when there are increased needs which do not meet the threshold for an EHCP.

- We do not support this. As schools we are facing severe financial pressures and have had to make difficult decisions to reduce our costs. This proposal also seems to go against much of the literature shared with Schools regarding the future of SEN. We should be investing in our mainstream schools, building on the idea of 'mainstream plus' not cutting funding for schools at this difficult time.
- I cannot support this proposal in light of the severe deficit we are currently forecasting. I understand the reasons for the request but schools cannot afford to lose funding in order to support the High Needs block.

We anticipate additional expenditure in 2019/20 (e.g. salary increase, employers' pension contribution increase, inflation). Removing £1million from the Schools Block can only add to the strain and I would anticipate an even greater negative impact on the quality of education we can provide should this proposal go ahead.

- With external cost rises, schools trying desperately to retain teachers, a reduction in post 16 funding, a real terms reduction in funding across the board and an only part-funded 3.5% -

1.5% pay award very much in mind, it would clearly be wrong to move funding out of the schools block.

In a bid to maintain teaching standards and following the pattern in the last 5-10 years, I expect things that will be reduced first by primary and secondary schools will be the essential services that impact upon student character, their well-being, mental health initiatives and their safety from the ever growing threat from things such as online safety, criminal or sexual exploitation, gang affiliation and knife crime.

- This is a difficult consultation for me as I am the Head Teacher of an Infant school that has an ASD Specialist Provision (Additional Resourced Provision-ARP) but I cannot agree to money being taken from mainstream Primary Schools yet again to support the High Needs Block. Currently the funding received for the ARP does not cover the costs incurred, so at a time of financial difficulty, I already have to find money within the mainstream budget for the ARP. This is impacting on school finances. In effect you are proposing that yet more money is taken from my mainstream school to allow current funding for my ARP to continue.

Finances in Primary Schools are already strained following:

- Two years of cuts
- A history of under-funding for primary schools compared to other LA's
- Teaching staff pay increase (only part funded by government)
- Increasing pension costs
- National Funding Formula

As a Head Teacher that is passionate about inclusion, and hopeful that the new SEND4Change programme would support this, the suggestion of taking money from schools would work against these suggested changes and therefore, in my view, does not support Borough priorities.

I would also raise the issue of increased pressure on primary schools while the funding for secondary schools appears more protected. I do not want to pass the costs over to them, but I do feel that primary education is as important as secondary and therefore why are the primary schools asked to carry this burden alone?

Recruitment and retention of staff is an increasing problem, and one that further cuts will not support. Morale within the teaching profession is impacted by schools forced to ask staff to pick up additional tasks/ roles as resources are cut. We have a Borough that is striving for 'Brilliant Bromley' in relation to education and as a Head Teacher I am behind this and at the forefront of delivery, but how am I expected to deliver this with an ever-shrinking budget? I do not support the LA proposal to move £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, but do agree the money must be found. The Borough needs to re-evaluate the use of their own reserves before asking schools to operate on a third consecutive year of reduced funds.

I feel that Primary Schools in Bromley have historically not been well funded. As a school on the edge of Lewisham, and having previously worked in Southwark, I have been amazed by the difference in funding. I understand that there was a short period of two years where

primary schools were favoured in the budget allocations, but this has stopped and has not had a long term impact.

The movement of that £1m from the schools block, would leave us and, I am sure, most schools in dire straits. The increase in teacher salaries, and general costs, matched against a decrease in funding is putting huge pressure on leaders and school communities in general. I know that Bromley is very proud of its academic record, but this will become increasingly difficult to maintain, I fear, when reduced funding eventually leads to less adults supporting children's learning, and potential redundancies.

In addition to this, reduced pupil numbers over time, means further reductions in funding. At [REDACTED] our budget has seen significant cuts in allocation of funds in recent years, and next year I estimate that we will lose another £40K – this equates to a teacher, and we do not have additional teachers in our school who are not class teachers.

It seems to me that by reducing the schools block, you will be effectively reducing schools' ability to adequately meet the needs of SEND pupils within schools. Much of the high needs block is used to fund SEND provision outside of the borough. Perhaps if there were more funding and support within schools and within the authority, then we wouldn't need to fund so many pupils out of borough – a catch 22 scenario I think.

All of the above has a massive impact on staff morale and workload, which we are all trying to work to improve, because we are committed to happy, motivated staff working with confidence and support within our schools. Removing even more funding will be effectively working against this aim, and our efforts to improve teacher retention and recruitment.

- As discussed at the Headteachers' forums, Bromley primary schools are facing very challenging financial position. Tonight my school will have a Resources meeting and yet again we will be discussing how we will manage our budgets with increased pressures such as teachers' pay awards and pensions. Our reserves will not last longer than two years (in the best case scenario). In addition there are constant pressures due to the loss of funding such as for diabetic children (we lost £12 k a year ago) but children have not left. This and other reasons were discussed at the Headteachers' forum.
- Like most primary Schools, we are expecting to have to set a deficit budget in the next year or two. We have tried to save money by not replacing support staff who move on or retire, but we have reached the point where we would not be fulfilling our duty of care for pupils and staff if we continue with this depletion of staff. We pride ourselves on being an inclusive school and – unlike some neighbouring schools – we do not turn new pupils away if they have additional needs. However, these pupils need to be supported, and any additional funding for these pupils is minimal. This means that we are using more of our diminishing funds to support pupils with SEN, and / or use existing staff who are TAs to support pupils 1-2-1. This has a negative impact on the support for SEN pupils (because it is not specialist support) and also – quite significantly – on the support for pupils who could reach age-expected levels if they had additional support.

Bromley's high outcomes will go down if fewer pupils receive additional support to reach age-related expectations, and also if the excellent teachers we have are not supported in class to achieve the high standards that they have been achieving.

Morale is the lowest I have seen for a long time because – quite simply – we are being expected to reach some of the highest standards in the country, with fewer staff to share the teaching load.

- Due to ongoing budget cuts the school has had to significantly reduce the number of support staff employed at the school. A lot of their work is supporting children with additional needs. We are already at a point where it is a daily challenge to meet the needs of the children with high levels of needs in the school. If our budget were to reduce again through this proposal we would be unable to meet the needs of these children as further cuts would need to be made.

Our work supporting children with high levels of needs has been highly praised over the last 3 years and we pride ourselves on the work we have done. It would be completely unfair to cause a situation where by this work is compromised and then potentially lead to children currently at our school no longer being able to be.

We have engaged in conversations with the LA about how we can directly support the need to provide for children with high levels of need within the borough and will continue to do so but need to at least maintain the level of funding we are currently receiving. I strongly disagree with the proposal and feel that it sends a very negative message to schools and their leaders when it is so public that schools are struggling financially. I urge the LA to look at an alternative way of funding the high needs block allowing the primary schools in Bromley to continue doing the fantastic job they do.

- Primary schools have had to face and manage cuts to their budgets for the last two years. Transfer of £1m from the schools block to the high needs block will only make matters worse for primary schools. The recent pay increase for teaching staff, without future resourcing from government, will add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise – and there is unlikely to be any grant that will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures.

If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced. We should be investing not cutting.

Morale for many staff is extremely low and recruitment of good quality teachers is nigh on impossible. There are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

Following the Schools Forum considering the Council's proposal to move £1M between the Schools Block to the HN Block [REDACTED] Primary School and [REDACTED] School disagrees with the proposal as primary schools in the Borough of Bromley are underfunded due to the changes to the National Funding Formula and we cannot absorb further funding cuts with the current pressures on budget due to the rising costs, recent teacher's pay award

and upcoming increase to the Teacher Pension employer contributions as well as more challenging recruitment. The shortfall in the HN block needs to be found elsewhere by the Council.

- Whilst I understand the need for the LA to make sure that the short fall in the High Needs budget is addressed, the unevenness of the way in which this is being met (with the shortfall coming from Primary Budgets) seems unreasonable. I understand that this is in part determined by the primary/secondary ratio in the National Funding Formula, but this is a time of incredible pressure in budgets for all schools (whichever phase) as a result of significant increases in on costs. This proposal would compound an already very difficult financial situation in Bromley Primary Schools and as such I cannot support it
- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Staffing has already been cut. [REDACTED] ran at a substantial in-year loss of approx. £60,000 despite being subsidised by [REDACTED]. This year even with myself being split between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we forecast another deficit of approx. £40,000. How can a school stay open when they are running at a loss? Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles. [REDACTED] only had 10 out of 15 places filled. This has had a huge impact upon finances. Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period. In a small school staffing pressures are even greater as there are so many jobs to cover with few people. More cuts will mean less staff and even more work load – this will have a real impact upon retention.
- [REDACTED], like other schools, is now dealing with a third year of reduced funding – funding has fallen in that period and this is against a backdrop of ever-increasing costs. Managing the school's budget whilst maintaining standards relative to the significant accountability measures that schools are subject to is the single most challenging aspect of headship. In relative terms, this has always been a more challenging job for primary headteachers in Bromley given the relative under-funding of primaries in the LA compared Bromley secondaries and primaries outside Bromley. This situation was compounded by the way in which primary schools were unfairly penalised in Bromley by the local arrangements imposed in respect of the NFF (following a vote in which primary schools were fundamentally under-represented).

There is a consensus amongst headteacher colleagues across all sectors in Bromley that school budgets cannot tolerate any further cuts without fundamentally compromising the quality of provision for Bromley's children and young people. As teachers (and, for many of us, as parents) we want the very best for our children and a further cut to funding undermines this. Pressures on budgets has already been compounded over the last year by increases to both support staff and teacher pay which have been, at best, partially funded and, in some cases, unfunded and not budgeted for. Alongside this, on-costs continue to rise, particularly pension contributions and even when central funding is forthcoming it does not fully meet the costs to schools.

Furthermore, in respect of SEND and Bromley's SEND4Change programme, one clear weakness identified across the LA was the failure of some mainstream schools to provide effectively for SEND pupils. Cutting school budgets will only compound this issue; if anything, there should be more investment in mainstream schools to enable them to better meet the needs of some of our most vulnerable mainstream pupils in order to ease the pressure on other sectors.

In spite of the cuts to funding, Bromley schools, particularly primary schools, continue to perform well but the council must be mindful that this is not a sustainable model for continued high performance. For this reason, and all the others outlined above, this further cut cannot be tolerated and must not go ahead.

- Following a history of underfunding for primary schools the ratios between primary and secondary was finally balanced three years ago. This has now stopped but the ratio between primary and secondary is now broadly in line with other LA's and should remain so. The imposition of the move to the NFF (2017) was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of our best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors. The under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have taken an unfair share of the cuts. We are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools can not afford any more cuts to budgets. Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Teaching staff costs at all levels and pension rises are already placing huge pressure on schools in a climate of a decreasing budget. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts. Is our children's future not worth investing in? Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements. Nearly all primary schools are currently looking at deficits in the coming years and additional cuts cannot be managed. We are currently in a recruitment crisis and morale in schools is low. We are being pressurised to consider workload but are being given less and less resources to support this. Bromley is a high achieving authority and to remain so schools need to be provided with the appropriate resources needed in order that they can continue to flourish. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is

one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

I feel Primary schools have been very supportive of High Needs Funding in the past but the time has come to say NO. We can no longer support this.

- As a Infant and Junior school, we have had to manage two years of cuts in real terms and this will be a third year if the £1 million is agreed from the main schools block to high needs block.

I know that the move to the NFF in 2017 was decided at School Forum, however I am aware that primary schools are underrepresented and has led to primary schools, in the past, having a disproportionate amount of the cuts.

There are many increases for budgets that have been agreed by Government without future resourcing such as pension costs and teacher pay rises. This will be a real become a real cost to schools if funding from the government ceases. The recent increase of support staff pay have presented additional pressures to the school budget.

We should be investing in schools if the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts. In our school, morale for many staff is lowering as they are expected to do more as staff are not being replaced when they leave because of budget limitations.

Primary schools in Bromley are one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools as we work hard to prepare children for secondary schools and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. Bromley schools are high regarded and this is a benefit for the Borough, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

I feel that the primary schools in Bromley have been very supportive in the past to the high needs Block but we cannot sustain these loses to our funding any more.

- No I do not support this proposal. School budgets are already at crisis point with Headteachers having to make difficult decisions about spending.
- I thought the explanation and discussion of this proposal was thorough at the Heads Forum. Thank you for that. I appreciate that all areas of the education budget are under pressure and that what happens to the high needs budget either way will impacts on work in schools. However, **NO** school can take any more cuts and we definitely can't. To enable us at Downe to balance our budget last year we had to use all of our remaining surplus and cut staffing – including a commitment to always cover classes internally by my teaching and the part-time Senco teaching a class and covering absences. The inevitable outcome of this is that our work is impacted, everyone is more stressed and tired and morale is low. However, teaching is our core work and the children have had experienced and qualified teachers in their classes.  
We have implemented the DFE percentage pay award to teachers (all of our teachers are top of their respective grades). We have recently discovered that the promised funding of this will not meet the costs fully and therefore this year's budget outcome is likely to be below prediction which will of course impact further on next year's budget.

On top of this we made a commitment to the governors to engage in fund raising, to try to ameliorate the situation with future budgets which we (clearly wrongly) believed would at least be fairly stable if low after the large cut we sustained last year and the LA decision to move towards NFF immediately. We have fund-raised which takes further time and effort. Sadly not enough has been raised to in any way match the surplus we used up last year, but some money has been gained.

**We are doing everything that we possibly can to make this work and to provide a good standard of education for our children,** in respect of that we cannot approve any decision to cut our budget even more. Every department will have to work to meet their own shortfall as much as is possible in these very challenging times. We all understand how difficult that is.

- I do not agree because already the schools block is less, due to sharing it with two new secondary schools. It is not fair to lose that money and an additional £1m. The council need to dip into their reserves for the additional £1m.
- Primary Budgets have historically taken the brunt of Council cuts in education. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. This year our budget saw a 30,000 decrease from the previous year.

Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream, as schools do not have the resources. In our one form entry Primary School we already have over 50 children with SEND and 6 children with an EHCP; with 2 more EHCPs in the pipeline. To further reduce any funding would mean that we would find it even more difficult to support our children with the varying complex needs that we have in our school. Families who have children with special needs choose our school in particular as we are small and have an excellent SEND department – but this service will even harder than it already is to provide and maintain. Due to the cuts this year, we have already got 7 less members of staff in our school, which obviously impacts hugely on the provision we offer our pupils.

At a time where morale is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff is particularly difficult any more cuts would make our job even more difficult and will mean that morale continues to deteriorate as less and less support will be able to be afforded to support staff and the children in their care.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with primary schools. Since 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LAs and secondary schools. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

The imposition of the move to the NFF (2017) was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors. We are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools cannot afford any more cuts to budgets .

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.

Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales present additional pressures. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4Change programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls. Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements. All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

Morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- Following the Schools Forum considering the Council's proposal to move £1M between the Schools Block to the HN Block, [REDACTED] Primary School disagrees with the proposal as primary schools in the Borough of Bromley are underfunded due to the changes to the National Funding Formula and we cannot absorb further funding cuts with the current pressures on budget due to the rising costs, recent teacher's pay award and upcoming increase to the Teacher Pension employer contributions as well as more challenging recruitment. The shortfall in the HN block needs to be found elsewhere by the Council.

[REDACTED] Primary School has had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. We are looking at cutting some of our front line services to pupils.

Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government has added further pressure to our school. Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls.

All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

Morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource. This has led to increased instability at [REDACTED] Primary School.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- The school's budget has continually been reduced due to cuts in education. The funding formula for 2017/18, adopted by Bromley, placed the school under increasing financial pressure causing provision to be impacted negatively. Despite there being a more favourable formula in the two previous years, there was still an imbalance.

[REDACTED] School is one of the highest attaining schools in the Borough. It has however, seen a change in the needs of children joining at Reception. Many of the additional needs presented are complex and specific. As such, the school has been placed under additional pressure by having to seek external specialist staff. By reducing funds to schools in favour of High Needs funding, the already pressured provision for SEND pupils will be further affected.

In addition, the forecast for staffing costs shows that there will be additional financial pressure on the school due to increased costs. Already, the school is having to consider whether vacant posts can be filled by staff of a similar calibre, or indeed whether they can be filled at all.

The school finds itself in a period of low staff morale with staff questioning work life balance.

The proposed movement of funds will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the education of children at the school and on its attainment and progress as well as putting additional pressure on already overworked staff. The school can therefore not support this proposal.

- We cannot support further cuts to our budgets
- Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Staffing has already been cut at [REDACTED] and we still have an in-year deficit. Any more cuts will compound issues and increase the future years in-year deficit.

Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

[REDACTED] has had a few places available for the last few years. This is a cut to our budget.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- In 2017/18 [REDACTED] was required to undertake a restructure of the senior leadership team due to underfunding. This has impacted upon the workload of the remaining staff members who are already feeling the strain of restricted finances. The staff are committed to the community which they serve and passionate in achieving excellent academic outcomes for children. However, further cuts to budgets will undoubtedly increase staff sickness and mental health difficulties, moreover, creating additional costs and problems for schools. Ultimately, this will lead to staff shortages at a time when recruitment is already in crisis.

[REDACTED] has 37% SEND children and is already stretched to its limit in providing the pastoral and academic care necessary to address the vast array of needs our children require. Currently, staff, bear the brunt of this. However, there is only so long that we can sustain and maintain our success. Further cuts will be sure to cause critical damage which in turn will be far more costly to repair in an already deprived school. For example, school currently employ a speech and language therapist to deliver essential intervention to children so that they can acquire the speech sounds, vocabulary and the receptive language necessary to become able readers, writers and develop social relationships. All vital life skills. Further restriction to our finance will result in services such as this being cut. As well as this a further priority is to provide mental health services in school. Another essential area in peril of being cut. Without these basic needs being met, our children will be unable to access the curriculum and teachers will be further pressured to support these needs rather than their priority of academia.

Increases in salaries, pension contributions and a drop in pupil numbers are additional factors which our budgets need to sustain. With these additional costs and impacts as well as further cuts, the education of our children will suffer.

Therefore, I do not agree with funds being moved from the school block as it will have a severely detrimental impact on the education of children and the high quality provision we currently deliver, in an already underfunded service.

- Primary Budgets have historically taken the brunt of Council cuts in education. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. The decision to weight the formula more favourably previously (two years prior) toward primaries was to enable them to gain back funding from the years of historic underfunding. The short term gain did not balance the years of inadequate funding.

The movement of a million pounds exacerbated the funding issues in 2017/18. 2018 / 20 budgets have to withstand funding for teacher's salaries, a movement of the scales for support staff to align with National, pension rises, increased costs to services whilst providing a broad curriculum and extended services. The funds do not stretch.

Pupil numbers are volatile and effect a variety of our schools. Schools are seeing vacancies across year groups or over-number places not being used, this ultimately impacts on budgets. Predicted budgets for 2019/20 show a drop in pupil number across the trust. With one school losing £70k. Even three or four vacancies across a school has a significant impact on the delivery of essential services.

Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream as schools do not have the resources. Our schools are having to only recruit to essential posts to ensure that they do not have to restructure.

At a time where moral is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff, especially those to middle and senior leadership posts, is difficult the Council are proposing to add more financial misery to an already underfunded sector.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with primary schools.

- all schools can not afford any more cuts to budgets .  
Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. It is becoming detrimental to the provision and we are making staff redundant and moral is low – we are unable to secure budgets lasting 3 years with no deficit – this will ruin us! Those of us who struggle to fill pupil spaces this will be in many ways catastrophic – we can even afford to restructure staff out as even the redundancy costs are too high. I oppose this decision and feel that you may well find across Bromley that headship becomes an untenable position for us
- I cannot oppose this proposal strongly enough.  
From 2015-16 to the current year 2018-19, our income has fallen by £139,000. In the same period, staff salaries have increased by £79,600. Next year, we are projected to lose another £88,000.  
The consultation for the local authority to reduce school funding further by moving £1million from the School Block to the High Needs Block would make the school funding situation impossible.  
We have already made our French teacher redundant, lost another teacher and our Finance Officer. We have reduced the time teachers have for PPA, have reduced the intervention support children receive and stopped the rolling programme of building maintenance. Our curriculum budgets for this year have been stripped bare. There is no more blood in the stone. Children and teachers are now going to end up suffering.  
We heard from Cllr [REDACTED] recently at the Heads Forum that we are lucky to have such passionate teachers and leaders in Bromley who make such a difference to our children. Local funding cuts on top of national funding cuts, mean this passion we heard about will be extinguished. We cannot continue to provide a quality education with further cuts. Increasing the burden upon schools by removing further funding from the Schools Block will have a severely detrimental effect upon children in Bromley mainstream schools. It is not a tenable situation.  
If the education and welfare of children in Bromley is valued, the money that has been identified as being needed to support SEN must be found from elsewhere.
- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, a third would be crippling for all schools. Historically in Bromley, prior to 2013, primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary schools. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of underfunding, however this stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of underfunding which is now impacting on primary budgets.  
In addition to this schools are paying for the increase in the teaching staff award without future resourcing by government and for the harmonization of support staff pay scales, both which add further pressure to budgets. Alongside this pension costs have risen and will continue to rise and it is unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases. The grant may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the coming years.  
Furthermore, If the aims and objectives of the SEND4Change programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as

it has and will be given further cuts. We should be investing not cutting. As result of significantly reduced budgets morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload, we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource. Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country; this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

We understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some or all of the proposed cuts?

- We have always been underfunded compared to other LAs, secondary schools and only for the last three years did this change. However this has stopped.  
As a group of primary schools we were underrepresented at the Schools Forum and this has meant the secondary schools having the louder voice consequently receiving greater cuts than our secondary 'friends'.  
As Primary schools we have had to manage two years of cuts whilst being expected to achieve the increased standards bestowed on us by the government.  
We already subsidise our Provision as we do not receive enough funding to cover the cost of salaries, let alone the additional needs of the children. We struggle to keep staff because we can't pay them as much as they receive at special schools so recruitment and retention is a challenge, at times. We are also having to pay more as the academies agenda means there is no longer the sharing of resources, leading to reduced prices e.g. speech and language therapist. We used to pay £9,000, now we are having to pay £27,000!  
At [REDACTED] we work incredibly hard to make sure our pupils achieve of their best. Money is definitely needed to provide first quality teachers who are prepared to work in a more challenging area and for good quality teaching assistants to provide interventions for those with additional needs. Please help us to continue to be Brilliant Bromley!
- The Council cuts in education have historically negatively affected primary school budgets. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. The decision to weight the formula more favourably previously (two years prior) toward primaries was to enable them to gain back funding from the years of historic underfunding. The short term gain did not balance the years of inadequate funding.  
As a school we have had to manage two years of cuts already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. To counter act the cuts in the previous years, I have had to cut back spending in all areas – as a school we cannot cut back any further without seriously affecting the quality of education that we are offering our pupils. Furthermore funding for the rise in teacher's salaries, a movement of the scales for support staff to align with National and increased costs to services has further impacted the budget. Our funds simply do not stretch. .  
Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise – it is unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years. Pupil numbers are volatile and vacancies across a school has a significant impact on the delivery of essential services. Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream as schools do not have the resources. We are having to only recruit to essential posts to ensure that they do not have to restructure.  
At a time where moral is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff, especially those to middle and senior leadership posts, is difficult the Council are proposing to add more financial gloom to an already underfunded sector.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with both [REDACTED] and all primary schools in Bromley.

- Primary school funding is disadvantaged enough as it is, compared with the secondary bias.
- I am against the LA proposal for a number of reasons.  
Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding  
Primary School Heads in Bromley are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools **can not** afford any more cuts to budgets .  
Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs.  
Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.  
Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.  
The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls. All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. **This is unfair and unsustainable.**  
We understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some or all of the proposed cuts?
- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts and a third year is not tenable. We cannot continue to deliver the breadth of service on the present funding arrangements.
- As the COO of the [REDACTED] Trust, I can share with the School's Finance Team that the Trust has experienced a *reduction* in School Budget Share income totalling £277,539 over the two academic years 2016-17 to 2018-19.

This decrease presents significant difficulties and is negatively impacting teaching and learning across each of the Trust's schools. A staffing hire freeze is now in place and staffing cost reductions have been budgeted and are now in plan. Premises improvement and ICT

improvement expenditure has ceased in their entirety asides from Devolved Formula Capital spend.

School budgets for each of the six schools for 2019-20 onwards forecast sizeable outturn deficits.

I'm sure that others will reflect on the morality, fairness and politics of the suggested proposal. I wish only to comment that any further reduction in income will have a profound and negative impact on the outcomes from Bromley primary school children within our Trust

- Following hot on the heels of the Council's deeply flawed decision regarding Primary/Secondary funding ratios last January we are now being asked to accept further reductions in income which take us below even the NFF indicator. For our Trust this reduction would equate to approximately £82,500 – more than the cost of two young teachers. Given that all of our schools are down to the bare bones regarding teacher numbers this would be detrimental to the education of our children. Councillors may well have followed the local press stories last summer regarding staff re-structuring at [REDACTED]. Further staff re-structures would have a hugely detrimental impact on parental confidence and commitment, both in schools and also the London Borough of Bromley!

As a Trust we are rapidly eating into our reserves and anticipate being close to an overall deficit by August 2021. We have exhausted means of reducing costs but continue to have in-year deficits, especially as central government continues to announce pay and pension increases without funding them adequately.

I find the mere suggestion by Councillors that this could be an option deeply insulting, and it appears to be yet more evidence of a disconnect between Bromley Council and its schools.

Councillors should not be looking to resolve their problems by shifting the challenges to others - I am furious. Please do not challenge your already very strained relationship with Primary Schools any further

- Once again Primary schools lose money.
- The national funding for schools has been cut by 8% over the last 8 years and there is a £4 billion short fall nationally in funding that needs to be addressed immediately.

Schools across the country and Bromley are reporting the high likelihood of setting deficit budgets in the future. Many schools have or are considering a reduced timetable to cope with these cuts.

Despite Mr Hammond's little extras and the promise that all schools will receive 0.5% per pupil more this year no school in Bromley is receiving this. Secondary schools will receive no increase in pupil funding and Primary schools will receive a cut of 1.25% per pupil.

This is because of the disastrous government policy of imposing free schools on the borough and their unreasonably high funding. Money is being moved from primary schools to secondary schools where there might not even be children.

This along with the high levels of inflation and increased pension contributions means schools are losing funding in all areas.

And this has become unsustainable.

It is also true that there is a national and local crisis in funding for the most vulnerable children in our schools. The settlement locally and nationally for the high needs block is totally inadequate for the level of need.

Rather than set up a false dichotomy and moving one block of money where it is needed to another place where it is also needed the Council should lead protests about this grossly inadequate settlement for the children in Bromley, for all children in Bromley and they should demand a better and adequate settlement for children across the country and for children in Bromley.

If they are unwilling or unable to do this they should realise that the only way to address this crisis is to access the council's reserves to invest in children in Bromley.

- I do not support the LA proposal to move £1million from the Schools block to the High Needs Block as I have real concerns about the impact another funding cut would mean for our school as there are significant budgets issues already. The decision to adopt the NFF was decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented. This has led to a situation where primary schools have borne a disproportionate burden of cuts. Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts. Awarding teaching staff pay increases without future resourcing by government adds further to the pressure we are under and pension costs have risen and will continue to rise. If the aims of the SEND4CHANGE programme and an inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced. The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term and these have also impacted on school rolls. Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements. Morale for staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resources. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools as we prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure. I understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some of the proposed cuts?
- Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government will cripple our budget. We are a one form entry school already at breaking point. Support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. It is unlikely that any grant from government will fully fund the pension costs (which has risen and will continue to rise). Whilst in the short term the impact will not be as detrimental as it will be in the medium to long term. I am relatively new to the borough and within a very short period of time it has become apparent that the views of the Primary school representatives on the Schools' Forum has been overshadowed. It appears as if the secondary schools representatives have consistently taken a view to represent only the needs of their sector. This and the under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have borne the majority of the cuts. Furthermore, the impact of the free schools is clearly starting to within Bromley. School rolls are falling which is also having a major impact on funding.

- From 2015-16 to the current year 18-19, our income has fallen by a cumulative £142,686. This amount, for an average-sized primary school is simply untenable. Next year, we are due to lose another £40,000 from our budget, meaning a loss in income of nearly £200,000 in just four years.

In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10% and services by more than that. We have had to cut our support staff budget by 25%. The budget for staff training has been halved.

For a short while, we were able to survive from our reserves. However, these have now gone. The impact in the classroom is already being felt and this will be the first year when the quality of education has been directly negatively impacted by the financial situation of our school.

The allocation of money to free schools must be found from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. These new schools have impacted my school directly from the funding allocation, but also from the fall in role because of the opening of a new school 0.4 miles away from ours. Brilliant Bromley will be merely a distant memory unless action is taken this year.

- Historically, our schools have been underfunded and this was acknowledged in the increased funding levels three years ago. The proposed £1m transfer from primary school funding coupled with the planned 1.5% budget cut would see Bromley primary schools struggle once again against a background of increasing staff and other costs. This year's pay award and the imminent increase to pension costs have put enormous pressure on our schools. The SEN funding reforms have compounded this and have had an impact in real terms on my school. Children with high-level need who would previously have begun school with transition funding are now arriving unfunded and we are having to make cuts to other provision to put support in place for them; my SENCO spends her time filling in paperwork and meeting with Bromley's SEN gatekeepers rather than being able to have a direct impact on learning. Unfunded inclusion is not the solution to these children's difficulties.

The introduction of free schools within the vicinity of my school plus the expansion of neighbouring schools has impacted on our admissions. We currently have 10 spaces on roll across Reception and Year 1 and this has affected our budget; we are not unique in this situation.

We have worked hard to build a successful school and have been proactive in recruiting staff of a high calibre. Staff workload has increased as a result of our underfunding and whilst my team are currently willing to go 'the extra mile' for our children, there will come a point when they will not be prepared to do more with fewer resources.

There has been much talk of 'Brilliant Bromley' and our schools being the jewel in the borough's crown. I have been a Bromley headteacher for almost 14 years and times have never been as challenging for our schools as they are now. Further cuts will destabilise our schools and the borough needs to make up for the shortfall from its

reserves, rather than jeopardising the educational opportunities of our children

- We are a one form entry, who have been hit hard over the last two years. Our teaching costs are rising every year and our budget is in deficit with dwindling reserves. We are a high performing school, who secures excellent outcomes for all our children and if we have any more cuts it will have a detrimental effect on our children's education and staff morale. At this rate Bromley will end up with schools closing down as they will no longer be financially viable.
- We at The Highway are quite small as a one form entry primary school but we believe that primary schools of every size cannot deliver the breadth of services expected on the present funding arrangements. Morale for many staff is low, there are already concerns about job security and workload and as always we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures.

All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls.

Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly underfunded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of underfunding, but stopped last year.

The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

The imposition of the move to the National Funding Formula last year was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of our best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors.

Despite attempts by the Primary school representatives on the Schools' Forum to be bipartite and to take a cross sector approach the secondary schools representatives have consistently taken a view to represent only the needs of their sector. This and the under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have borne a disproportionate burden of cuts.

Thankfully secondary colleagues are now in agreement with us as primary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools cannot afford any more cuts to budgets.

If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

As we concluded at our recent Primary heads forum:-

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the top 250 schools in the country.

The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

- Whilst I can see that there are financial difficulties across all phases in education and within the council, I have strong concerns about the impact another funding cut would mean for the primary phase as there are significant budget issues already.
  
- In the past Bromley schools have been justifiably proud of the achievements of all their pupils and have been one of the highest performing local authorities. However, with the current budget cuts this **is not** sustainable. Since 2015-16 to the current year, our income has fallen by almost £140,000. This amount, for a school of our size is simply not manageable. On top of this, next year, we are due to lose more than £45,000 from our budget, which means we have lost £185,000 in only four years.  
In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10%, services by more than that, the budget for staff training has been cut by 50% and the budget for support staff by 25%. The impact of this is already being felt both in the classrooms and by staff and indeed parents and children. Interventions, resources and teaching assistant help has been cut for our most needy children. Whilst reserves have been available in the past to bridge any gap, these are now virtually gone. More vulnerable children are being placed in mainstream schools, particularly Unicorn as we have a good track record with SEN children, and without more funding, let alone a cut in funding, children and staff are at risk. The allocation of money to free schools must be made available from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. With the opening of so many free schools, there is now too many school places available. This has meant that not all schools are able to fill their places which leads to more funding issues and Bromley will fall down the ranking and as schools we will not be able to support our pupils effectively.
  
- As a school, we have already made significant cuts to our annual budget over the past five years. These include:
  - Not replacing the school Librarian (this staff member also played a key role in support speech and language throughout the school)
  - Reducing the school's HLTAs from three to two
  - Not replacing the school's Family Worker and Play Therapist who left the school in July 2018
  - Significantly reducing the budget allocation to support school development priorities from

£30,000 to £15,000

At present, staff at [REDACTED] are working to their limits as everyone has had to take on more work to absorb the workload of those staff members who have not been replaced. There is nowhere else left to cut without further reductions having a significant negative impact on current provision, standards or pupil and staff wellbeing.

The level of need of pupils coming in at Reception or joining mid-year has increased. Our own school resources are stretched and, cuts to school funding centrally is simply not going to work.

Recently, the Interim Director of Education presented on 'Brilliant Bromley' which showed a positive picture of achievement in the Borough compared to the National. However, she pointed out that Bromley were not doing as well as other London Boroughs. It would be most welcome to receive a contextual report of the funding and level of resources Bromley receives compared to the top three performing London Boroughs.

- The proposal to move £1m from the School Block to the High Needs Block will result in cuts for all primaries and for the overwhelming majority will represent a third year of a real term's reduction in budgets. At Warren Road this will represent a real cut of almost £150k.

The impact of the implementation of the NFF has not been a positive one and was implemented after a process which at best was questionable given the underrepresentation of primary schools on the Schools' Forum.

Against a background of rising costs including staffing costs, a gap has opened up in the resources available with staff redundancies and reductions in hours already evident across the local authority and more inevitable if the proposed cuts are allowed to take effect.

Colleagues in secondary schools are facing similar challenges and some have even had to reduce the range of subjects taught.

Staff are being asked to do more and more whilst the government are asking us to review teacher workload. Teachers are leaving the profession in their droves and recruitment is difficult.

Over the past 18 months, we have worked hard to develop a clear vision for children with special needs and disabilities. This is based on the premise of a more inclusive approach in mainstream schools to which we are firmly committed. This will however require adequate resources in mainstream schools which I don't believe will be the case with further cuts.

We understand that Bromley wants to manage its high needs funding more effectively and in time costs will be reduced. In the short and medium term however additional funding is required. An alternative option to the proposed transfer of funds is essential. Whether this is using council reserves, working with a short-term deficit model, increase funding through council tax or other revenue streams, an alternative option is essential if we are to invest for the future of all Bromley children and make Brilliant Bromley a reality now and for years to come.

- From 2015 to the current year and going forward, our income has fallen by almost £140,000. This amount, for an average-sized primary school is simply not sustainable! Next year, we are due to lose another £20,000+ from our budget, meaning a loss in income not much short of £200,000 in just four years.

In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10%, and services by more than that. We have had to cut our support staff budget by 25%. The budget for staff training has been more than halved.

For a short while, we have been able to call upon our reserves. However, these have now virtually gone. The impact in the classrooms is already being felt and this will be the first year when the quality of education has been directly negatively impacted by the financial situation of our school. Teaching assistants, resources and interventions for our most vulnerable pupils have been drastically cut.

More children being placed in main stream schools and more funding for such children being re-allocated elsewhere, this is not maintainable, children and staff are at risk

Additionally, the allocation of money to free schools must be found from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. These new schools have impacted on my school directly from the funding allocation, but also from the fall in roll, my current years 1 & 2 have approx. 25% less pupils than our roll permits. The opening of a new 2 form entry primary school only a mile away from ours has impacted on all the 4 schools in our small multi academy trust in the West Wickham area.

Brilliant Bromley is a wonderful notion that must be paid for from Bromley Local Authority reserves and not from the very service it states is at its heart.

- Working in an already underfunded sector my school cannot sustain yet more cuts. Pupil numbers are volatile across the borough but even more so in my school. In the past year I have seen my pupil numbers change dramatically as over 70 children have moved in and out of my school. Being under subscribed and competing with 3 newly opened and highly funded free schools I have little choice about the children entering onto my roll. The majority of new entrants are coming with additional needs such as EAL, behaviour or emotional needs associated with being evicted and relocated to a new area-stretching my dwindling budget even further. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles. My school roll is already under by 60 places! Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government adds further pressure. Not to mention pension costs that have risen and will continue to rise – it is highly unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it hasn't for the teachers' pay award. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. I have a high number of support staff as I am dependent on my TAs to help meet the demanding needs of the children entering my school.

School Name	2018/19		2019/20		(a)	(b)	difference (b) - (a)
					-£1m MFG -1.22%	+ £1m MFG -0.25%	
	NOR		NOR		No Cap	No Cap	
Alexandra Infant School	193	904,569	190	883,016		890,485	7,468
Alexandra Junior School	251	1,066,065	239	1,011,276		1,019,983	8,707
Balgowan Primary School	677	2,423,419	678	2,398,753		2,421,045	22,292
Bickley Primary School	415	1,650,669	416	1,637,076		1,651,497	14,421
Biggin Hill Primary School	373	1,471,392	377	1,469,349		1,482,511	13,162
Blenheim Primary School	220	1,112,251	217	1,086,890		1,096,364	9,475
Burnt Ash Primary School	416	1,981,844	414	1,950,600		1,968,510	17,910
Castlecombe Primary School	205	1,049,330	207	1,046,951		1,055,983	9,032
Chelsfield Primary School	102	540,142	88	478,036		481,547	3,512
Chislehurst Church of England Primary	219	881,146	216	861,608		868,872	7,264
Churchfields Primary	430	1,833,372	418	1,764,870		1,780,943	16,073
Clare House Primary School	391	1,500,362	415	1,565,714		1,579,765	14,051
Crofton Infant School	558	2,131,075	557	2,103,308		2,122,693	19,384
Crofton Junior School	711	2,543,804	712	2,518,001		2,541,425	23,424
Cudham Church of England Primary School	100	512,368	94	485,004		488,570	3,566
Darrick Wood Infant School	270	1,121,173	275	1,127,949		1,137,799	9,850
Darrick Wood Junior School	382	1,496,504	380	1,473,636		1,486,869	13,233
Dorset Road Infant School	75	471,409	66	425,508		428,508	3,001
Downe Primary School	78	455,863	83	472,867		476,272	3,405
Edgebury Primary School	270	1,148,903	308	1,293,663		1,304,406	10,743
Farnborough Primary School	278	1,129,474	273	1,093,830		1,103,351	9,521
Gray's Farm Primary Academy	400	1,908,080	390	1,842,111		1,858,946	16,835
Green Street Green Primary School	433	1,669,035	406	1,555,712		1,569,724	14,013
Harris Primary Academy Beckenham Green	194	978,467	196	976,824		985,206	8,382
Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace	385	1,839,830	385	1,819,553		1,836,200	16,647
Harris Primary Academy Kent House	403	2,001,061	382	1,882,021		1,899,238	17,217
Harris Primary Academy Orpington	381	1,896,290	391	1,875,700		1,892,878	17,177
Harris Primary Beckenham	139	746,644	198	926,980		934,883	7,902
Harris Primary Shortlands	227	1,083,940	290	1,300,582		1,312,147	11,565
Hawes Down Primary	488	2,000,834	475	1,935,536		1,953,269	17,733
Hayes Primary School	646	2,364,846	647	2,341,009		2,362,685	21,676
Highfield Infants' School	269	1,091,172	270	1,083,503		1,092,919	9,416
Highfield Junior School	379	1,372,824	363	1,317,703		1,318,124	421
Holy Innocents Catholic Primary School	217	915,275	222	924,385		932,149	7,764
James Dixon Primary School	437	2,129,726	426	2,056,637		2,075,580	18,943
Keston Church of England Primary School	216	951,925	210	919,610		927,405	7,795
La Fontaine	273	1,434,946	320	1,391,444		1,404,613	13,168
Langley Park Primary	87	538,064	155	772,941		772,941	0
Leesons Primary School	310	1,499,248	329	1,566,401		1,580,572	14,171
Manor Oak Primary School	202	1,010,439	183	917,472		925,244	7,772
Marian Vian Primary School	656	2,476,818	643	2,406,611		2,428,937	22,327
Mead Road Infant School	89	521,638	81	481,345		484,872	3,528
Midfield Primary School	398	1,900,878	433	2,035,255		2,054,017	18,762
Mottingham Primary School	408	1,981,449	357	1,730,147		1,745,879	15,732
Oak Lodge Primary School	619	2,281,582	600	2,190,251		2,210,464	20,213
Oaklands Primary Academy	504	2,056,567	467	1,893,313		1,910,652	17,338
Parish Church of England Primary School	627	2,406,333	622	2,360,136		2,382,052	21,917
Perry Hall Primary School	427	1,669,459	431	1,665,867		1,680,972	15,105
Pickhurst Infant Academy	360	1,461,043	361	1,448,455		1,461,437	12,982
Pickhurst Junior School	512	1,886,401	524	1,906,076		1,923,511	17,436
Poverest Primary School	343	1,619,695	372	1,725,520		1,741,062	15,542
Pratts Bottom Primary School	79	447,309	81	451,624		454,880	3,256
Raglan Primary School	438	1,700,734	440	1,688,753		1,704,102	15,349
Red Hill Primary School	683	2,763,645	658	2,636,547		2,661,153	24,606
Scotts Park Primary School	501	2,018,213	504	2,006,516		2,024,960	18,444
Southborough Primary School	419	1,851,828	420	1,835,924		1,852,397	16,473
St Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary School	175	918,169	171	891,283		898,822	7,539
St George's, Bickley, Church of England Primary School	379	1,604,039	392	1,636,112		1,650,955	14,843
St James' Roman Catholic Primary School	217	858,674	218	853,159		860,317	7,157
St John's Church of England Primary School	260	1,184,992	210	1,017,047		1,017,047	0
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	206	865,396	210	870,576		877,918	7,342
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	409	1,668,004	401	1,619,765		1,634,432	14,667
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	432	1,638,579	421	1,582,585		1,596,865	14,279
St Paul's Cray Church of England Primary School	243	1,309,169	247	1,314,619		1,325,971	11,352
St Peter and St Paul Catholic Primary School	215	997,862	216	991,262		999,797	8,535
St Philomena's Primary School	209	912,390	204	887,364		894,869	7,505
St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	216	983,030	216	972,946		981,295	8,349
St. Mary Cray Primary Academy	224	1,221,389	224	1,208,267		1,218,908	10,641
Stewart Fleming Primary School	467	1,925,958	468	1,910,776		1,928,264	17,488

The Highway Primary School	214	914,365	218	919,278	927,054	7,776
Trinity Church of England Primary School	401	1,953,577	396	1,908,438	1,925,916	17,478
Tubbenden Primary School	651	2,453,339	651	2,425,015	2,447,513	22,497
Unicorn Primary School	474	1,768,796	458	1,694,619	1,709,966	15,347
Valley Primary School	474	2,058,303	468	2,010,202	2,028,676	18,474
Warren Road Primary School	837	2,989,181	836	2,950,249	2,977,869	27,620
Wickham Common Primary School	425	1,576,463	410	1,508,419	1,521,943	13,525
Worsley Bridge Primary School	366	1,643,889	360	1,604,239	1,618,737	14,498
Bishop Justus CofE School	978	5,144,300	1006	5,471,421	5,471,421	0
Bullers Wood Boys school	179	649,994	284	2,157,588	2,157,588	0
Bullers Wood School	1107	5,478,298	1120	5,682,606	5,682,606	0
Charles Darwin School	1123	5,859,536	1115	5,907,488	5,907,488	0
Chislehurst School for Girls	936	4,883,068	945	5,209,085	5,209,085	0
Coopers School	1218	6,352,419	1276	6,852,007	6,852,007	0
Darrick Wood School	1291	6,275,229	1293	6,370,958	6,370,958	0
Eden Park high School	163	1,439,369	364	2,510,921	2,510,921	0
Harris Academy Beckenham	927	5,078,597	959	5,291,247	5,291,247	0
Harris Academy Orpington	790	4,496,426	781	4,688,578	4,688,578	0
Harris Girls Academy Bromley	713	3,972,217	784	4,564,383	4,564,383	0
Hayes School	1206	5,838,672	1214	5,914,306	5,914,306	0
Kemnal Technology College	514	2,838,339	480	2,911,734	2,911,734	0
Langley Park School for Boys	1095	5,356,657	1087	5,364,421	5,364,421	0
Langley Park School for Girls	1195	5,788,337	1197	5,850,518	5,850,518	0
Newstead Wood School	799	3,793,880	799	3,865,486	3,865,486	0
Ravens Wood School	1127	5,578,068	1141	5,745,363	5,745,363	0
St Olave's and St Saviour's Grammar School	630	3,037,886	636	3,086,508	3,086,508	0
The Ravensbourne School	1116	5,903,253	1101	5,909,057	5,909,057	0
				<b>207,146,262</b>	<b>208,140,276</b>	<b>994,014</b>

## Appendix 5

School Name	2019/20	-£1m	MFG	+ £1m	MFG
	NFF allocation	-1.22%	Protection	-0.25%	Protection
		No Cap		No Cap	
Alexandra Infant School	796,880	883,016	86,136	890,485	93,604
Alexandra Junior School	974,599	1,011,276	36,678	1,019,983	45,384
Balgowan Primary School	2,379,627	2,398,753	19,126	2,421,045	41,418
Bickley Primary School	1,545,864	1,637,076	91,212	1,651,497	105,632
Biggin Hill Primary School	1,417,813	1,469,349	51,537	1,482,511	64,698
Blenheim Primary School	1,009,463	1,086,890	77,427	1,096,364	86,902
Burnt Ash Primary School	1,832,450	1,950,600	118,150	1,968,510	136,060
Castlecombe Primary School	988,723	1,046,951	58,227	1,055,983	67,260
Chelsfield Primary School	453,101	478,036	24,935	481,547	28,447
Chislehurst Church of England Primary	833,389	861,608	28,220	868,872	35,483
Churchfields Primary	1,630,613	1,764,870	134,257	1,780,943	150,330
Clare House Primary School	1,491,867	1,565,714	73,847	1,579,765	87,898
Crofton Infant School	1,941,511	2,103,308	161,797	2,122,693	181,182
Crofton Junior School	2,498,597	2,518,001	19,404	2,541,425	42,828
Cudham Church of England Primary School	449,204	485,004	35,800	488,570	39,366
Darrick Wood Infant School	1,033,673	1,127,949	94,276	1,137,799	104,126
Darrick Wood Junior School	1,413,315	1,473,636	60,321	1,486,869	73,554
Dorset Road Infant School	370,922	425,508	54,586	428,508	57,587
Downe Primary School	421,269	472,867	51,597	476,272	55,002
Edgebury Primary School	1,286,127	1,293,663	7,535	1,304,406	18,279
Farnborough Primary School	1,033,939	1,093,830	59,890	1,103,351	69,411
Gray's Farm Primary Academy	1,732,216	1,842,111	109,896	1,858,946	126,731
Green Street Green Primary School	1,516,435	1,555,712	39,276	1,569,724	53,289
Harris Primary Academy Beckenham Green	829,520	976,824	147,304	985,206	155,687
Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace	1,641,478	1,819,553	178,075	1,836,200	194,722
Harris Primary Academy Kent House	1,628,421	1,882,021	253,599	1,899,238	270,816
Harris Primary Academy Orpington	1,695,769	1,875,700	179,931	1,892,878	197,109
Harris Primary Beckenham	905,768	926,980	21,212	934,883	29,115
Harris Primary Shortlands	1,232,882	1,300,582	67,700	1,312,147	79,265
Hawes Down Primary	1,712,883	1,935,536	222,653	1,953,269	240,387
Hayes Primary School	2,258,962	2,341,009	82,047	2,362,685	103,723
Highfield Infants' School	1,023,973	1,083,503	59,530	1,092,919	68,946
Highfield Junior School	1,317,703	1,317,703	0	1,318,124	421
Holy Innocents Catholic Primary School	924,385	924,385	0	932,149	7,764
James Dixon Primary School	1,897,042	2,056,637	159,595	2,075,580	178,538
Keston Church of England Primary School	889,859	919,610	29,751	927,405	37,546
La Fontaine	1,288,543	1,391,444	102,901	1,404,613	116,069
Langley Park Primary	772,941	772,941	0	772,941	0
Leesons Primary School	1,462,324	1,566,401	104,077	1,580,572	118,248
Manor Oak Primary School	898,007	917,472	19,465	925,244	27,237
Marian Vian Primary School	2,368,934	2,406,611	37,677	2,428,937	60,004
Mead Road Infant School	392,685	481,345	88,659	484,872	92,187
Midfield Primary School	1,880,852	2,035,255	154,403	2,054,017	173,165
Mottingham Primary School	1,625,304	1,730,147	104,844	1,745,879	120,576
Oak Lodge Primary School	2,177,917	2,190,251	12,333	2,210,464	32,546
Oaklands Primary Academy	1,785,221	1,893,313	108,092	1,910,652	125,430
Parish Church of England Primary School	2,324,408	2,360,136	35,727	2,382,052	57,644
Perry Hall Primary School	1,630,904	1,665,867	34,963	1,680,972	50,068
Pickhurst Infant Academy	1,303,734	1,448,455	144,721	1,461,437	157,703
Pickhurst Junior School	1,885,070	1,906,076	21,006	1,923,511	38,441
Poverest Primary School	1,616,585	1,725,520	108,936	1,741,062	124,477
Pratts Bottom Primary School	408,166	451,624	43,458	454,880	46,713
Raglan Primary School	1,631,282	1,688,753	57,471	1,704,102	72,820
Red Hill Primary School	2,501,635	2,636,547	134,912	2,661,153	159,519
Scotts Park Primary School	1,886,813	2,006,516	119,703	2,024,960	138,147
Southborough Primary School	1,717,110	1,835,924	118,814	1,852,397	135,287
St Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary School	816,833	891,283	74,450	898,822	81,989
St George's, Bickley, Church of England Primary School	1,477,183	1,636,112	158,929	1,650,955	173,772
St James' Roman Catholic Primary School	832,907	853,159	20,252	860,317	27,409
St John's Church of England Primary School	1,017,047	1,017,047	0	1,017,047	0
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	845,739	870,576	24,837	877,918	32,179
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	1,528,020	1,619,765	91,744	1,634,432	106,411
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	1,572,662	1,582,585	9,923	1,596,865	24,203
St Paul's Cray Church of England Primary School	1,216,228	1,314,619	98,391	1,325,971	109,743
St Peter and St Paul Catholic Primary School	959,893	991,262	31,370	999,797	39,905
St Philomena's Primary School	878,188	887,364	9,176	894,869	16,681

St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	946,324	972,946	26,622	981,295	34,971
St. Mary Cray Primary Academy	1,082,863	1,208,267	125,404	1,218,908	136,045
Stewart Fleming Primary School	1,867,550	1,910,776	43,226	1,928,264	60,714
The Highway Primary School	868,438	919,278	50,841	927,054	58,616
Trinity Church of England Primary School	1,718,219	1,908,438	190,218	1,925,916	207,697
Tubbenden Primary School	2,376,472	2,425,015	48,544	2,447,513	71,041
Unicorn Primary School	1,642,125	1,694,619	52,494	1,709,966	67,841
Valley Primary School	1,792,491	2,010,202	217,711	2,028,676	236,185
Warren Road Primary School	2,916,511	2,950,249	33,738	2,977,869	61,358
Wickham Common Primary School	1,490,519	1,508,419	17,900	1,521,943	31,424
Worsley Bridge Primary School	1,524,359	1,604,239	79,879	1,618,737	94,377
Bishop Justus CofE School	5,471,421	5,471,421	0	5,471,421	0
Bullers Wood Boys school	2,157,588	2,157,588	0	2,157,588	0
Bullers Wood School	5,682,606	5,682,606	0	5,682,606	0
Charles Darwin School	5,907,488	5,907,488	0	5,907,488	0
Chislehurst School for Girls	5,209,085	5,209,085	0	5,209,085	0
Coopers School	6,852,007	6,852,007	0	6,852,007	0
Darrick Wood School	6,370,958	6,370,958	0	6,370,958	0
Eden Park high School	2,510,921	2,510,921	0	2,510,921	0
Harris Academy Beckenham	5,291,247	5,291,247	0	5,291,247	0
Harris Academy Orpington	4,688,578	4,688,578	0	4,688,578	0
Harris Girls Academy Bromley	4,564,383	4,564,383	0	4,564,383	0
Hayes School	5,914,306	5,914,306	0	5,914,306	0
Kemnal Technology College	2,911,734	2,911,734	0	2,911,734	0
Langley Park School for Boys	5,364,421	5,364,421	0	5,364,421	0
Langley Park School for Girls	5,850,518	5,850,518	0	5,850,518	0
Newstead Wood School	3,865,486	3,865,486	0	3,865,486	0
Ravens Wood School	5,745,363	5,745,363	0	5,745,363	0
St Olave's and St Saviour's Grammar School	3,086,508	3,086,508	0	3,086,508	0
The Ravensbourne School	5,909,057	5,909,057	0	5,909,057	0
	<b>201,292,923</b>	<b>207,146,262</b>	<b>5,853,338</b>	<b>208,140,276</b>	<b>6,847,353</b>