

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA

Thursday, 22 September 2016 at 2.00 pm in the Dryden Centre

From the Acting Chief Executive, Mike Barker

Item	Business
1	Apologies
2	Minutes (Pages 3 - 6) The Forum is asked to approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 14 July 2016
3	Show Racism the Red Card (Pages 7 - 10) Steve Horne, Care Wellbeing and Learning
4	National Early Years Funding Formula Consultation (Pages 11 - 26) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
5	Update of Contingency Funding Wording (Pages 27 - 30) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
6	Schools Funding Announcements (Pages 31 - 32) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
7	Schools Block Funding Formula Data 2016 - 2017 (Pages 33 - 38) Carole Smith, Corporate Resources
8	Date and Time of Next Meeting Thursday 13 October 2016 at 2.00pm

Contact: Rosalyn Patterson - email: rosalynpatterson@gateshead.gov.uk,
Tel: 0191 433 2088, Date: Wednesday 14 September 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

GATESHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

Thursday, 14 July 2016

PRESENT:

Ken Childs (Chair)	Special School Governors
Sarah Diggle	Primary Governors
Steve Haigh	Secondary Academy Headteachers
Denise Henry	Nursery Sector Representative
Peter Largue	Trade Union Representative
Mustafaa Malik	Primary Headteachers
Andrew Ramanandi	Primary Headteachers
Chris Richardson	Secondary Headteachers
Matthew Younger	Primary Headteachers
Linda Alder	Secondary Academies

IN ATTENDANCE:

Carole Smith	Corporate Resources
Frank McDermott	Corporate Resources
Gillian Dodds	Care Wellbeing and Learning
Jan Batchelor	Care Wellbeing and Learning
Rosalyn Patterson	Corporate Services and Governance

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Michelle Richards, Alan Symons, Julie Goodfellow, Elaine Pickering, Cllr Chris McHugh, Christine Ingle and Steve Williamson.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

3 USE OF DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT RESERVES

The Forum received a report seeking approval to use Early Years DSG reserves to enable the Council's Design and Technical Services to carry out feasibility work, which is required by the DfE for a capital grant application. The officers became aware on 1 July 2016 that applications could be submitted to the DfE for capital funding to help create additional places for the extended three and four year old provision in time for September 2017.

The four schemes that best match the DfE's selection criteria will be put forward to the DfE. As part of the application process concept designs, preliminary schemes and estimates of costs must be submitted by 31 August 2016. This work will cost £3,500 per scheme. If any scheme is successful this would be returned to reserves,

however for any unsuccessful applications this would not be refunded.

The DfE are allowing Gateshead to make up to four bids and there is only £40M to be awarded nationally, therefore it is highly unlikely that all of the schemes will be successful. It is possible that no Gateshead schemes will be funded.

A request for expressions of interest was sent to all schools and private providers and work is currently ongoing to identify the four schemes to submit to DfE.

It was questioned whether this could be paid through Basic Need Funding. It was confirmed that this would not be allowed because it would be using capital for revenue purposes.

It was also questioned how this relates to need across Gateshead. It was confirmed that in Gateshead the DfE estimate that there will be 1370 children eligible for the extended entitlement in September 2017. Officers have worked to analyse data to allocate these children to ward level and to estimate localised sufficiency of places. Any schemes within those areas that have sufficient places would not be eligible.

It was confirmed that bids will be reviewed next Thursday and up to four schemes that meet all of the criteria will be put forward. The deadline for submitting the worked up schemes is 31 August, and all of the schemes must be able to be completed by August 2017.

The Forum commented that there will be a loss of money through a transfer of schools money to the local authority and that the local authority should have better supported this work.

RESOLVED - That the Schools Forum approved the request for £14,000 in order to proceed with option 2 at a total cost of £14,000.

4 CONTINGENCY FUNDING APPLICATION

The Forum received a report around the decision to award contingency funding to Winlaton West Lane Primary School. The school was judged as requiring improvement since May 2013 and has requested funding to enable additional staff to take voluntary redundancy and additional money for resources and training to assist the new leadership team.

Officers have worked with Education Gateshead to apply the Contingency Funding Criteria and awarded £15,905 for additional redundancy payments and £10,000 for additional resources.

It was queried as to the wording of the criteria as it refers to a school in 'Special Measures'. It was noted that this wording needs to be updated to take into account changes in legislation. It was agreed that the criteria would be brought back to the next meeting as the wording needs updating.

The point was made that this is an historical situation, the school has been led for a

number of years and been supported by the local authority yet still require additional funding. It was noted that previously this situation would be covered by Standards Funding, however this is no longer available and the school has nowhere else to go.

- RESOLVED -
- (i) That the Schools Forum noted the funding provided to the school.
 - (ii) That the Contingency Funding Criteria be brought back to the next meeting.

**Peter Largue declared a non-prejudicial interest in this item.*

5 GATESHEAD SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS - CONSULTATION OUTCOME

The Forum was asked to approve the updated Scheme for Financing Schools. It was noted that all maintained schools were consulted and no responses were received.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Schools Forum approved the revisions to Gateshead's Scheme for Financing Schools.

6 SPECIAL SCHOOL FUNDING REVIEW

The Forum received a report on the current Special Schools Funding Review. The review is underway as funding was moved from ASD to SEMH in 2015/16 and this resulted in large funding swings for some schools, in addition it is likely that the implementation of a National Funding Formula will impact on the High Needs Block.

Meetings have been held with Special Headteachers and work is ongoing to agree an updated set of descriptors.

It was questioned whether banding will impact on ARMS pupils. It was clarified that this is two different systems and currently the review is just looking at Special Schools.

It was suggested that the cost of provision mapping should be looked at by the Schools Forum.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Forum noted the contents of the report.

7 THE ROLE OF SCHOOLS FORUM - SEND AREA INSPECTION

The Forum received a report outlining the new SEND inspection carried out by Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission. The role of the Forum is to look at funding for SEN pupils in Gateshead. The Forum was asked to review at the SEND template.

- RESOLVED -
- That the Schools Forum did not have any amendments for the SEND inspection template and approved the template and noted that the Chair of the Forum could be interviewed as part

of the inspection process.

8 DSG CONSULTATIONS - POSSIBLE VERBAL UPDATE

An update will be given at the next meeting once further information is known.

9 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The date and time of the next meeting is Thursday 22nd September 2016 at 2.00pm.



Title of Report: Anti-Racism Education Workshops – Request for Funding

Purpose of the Report

To request funding from Schools Forum to enable Show Racism the Red Card to provide anti-racism education workshops across schools in Gateshead, in order to encourage a more cohesive and inclusive society.

Background

Show Racism the Red Card (SRtRC) is an anti-racism education charity which was established in the North East in 1996. The charity is governed by a management committee of 11, has 25 employees nationally.

The education team work in communities, workplaces, schools and other institutions delivering anti-racism workshops to young people and training to adults. We have strong partnerships with Local Authorities, Trade Unions and community organisations in the region.

They often use high-profile ex-professional footballers and other role models to talk about their experiences of racism and to express their solidarity with the aims of the campaign. SRtRC standard model of delivery includes Education Workers developing and delivering the session based on the needs of the group and the issues expressed.

They pride themselves as an organisation on building as safe an environment as possible to allow participants to feel free to express their ideas and frustrations without fear of judgement, labelling or punishment. There is however a clear expectation that ideas will be subject to challenge and participants will be exposed to alternative ways of looking at situations and communities.

Over the last 12 months, the North East Education team has worked with 11,844 participants with over 11,500 of those being young people aged 7-18 in schools and colleges in the region.

Anti-Racism Education for Schools in Gateshead:

Young people across Gateshead's primary, secondary and special schools would receive anti-racism education. This would include the delivery of anti-racism and myth busting workshops which are classroom based (a minimum of 2 hours), alongside fun and fitness sessions which relate to themes of inequality and team building, delivered by an ex-professional footballer to young people from year 4 upwards.

Alongside the workshop participants will be provided with anti-racism resources including an anti-racism magazine, action postcards, football team posters of their choice featuring Gateshead Council's logo and handouts explaining terminology and how to challenge racism.

Outputs: 18 Primary Schools, 2 Secondary Schools, 2 Special Schools.
(Weighting of primary vs. Secondary schools could vary dependant on take up e.g. there may be 3 high schools which request us to work with them, this would then reduce the number of primary schools)

Outcomes

By the end of our workshops young people will have:

- A better understanding of what racism is and how it impacts on individuals (targets & perpetrators) and society
- An increased awareness of the responsibility to challenge racism & how this can be done
- An increased awareness of critical thinking and its usefulness in challenging stereotypes and recognising media bias
- More knowledge about appropriate/inappropriate terminology relating to ethnicity

Each session will highlight the following racisms- Anti-Immigrant sentiment, Anti-Muslim prejudice, Anti-Gypsyism (and racism toward Roma and traveller people) and racism toward Black and other minority communities.

The team at SRtRC are responsive to the prejudice ideas and attitudes that arise in their sessions and therefore the degree to which each of the aforementioned racisms are discussed will vary.

Twilight Teacher Training

Alongside anti-racism education for young people, the schools in Gateshead will be offered twilight teacher training sessions. These take place at the end of the school day where education has been delivered to young people. The sessions typically will last 1 ½ to 2 hours (we could offer more time, however CPD schedules and teacher working hours restrict the time we have to deliver).

By the end of our twilight teacher training session participants will:

- Understand the need to critically reflect on their personal prejudices and professional practice
- Have an increased understanding of how to recognise racism
- Will be better equipped to respond to racist incidents

Responsiveness

Whilst the above is an outline of the broad outputs and a description of content that could be covered if funding was provided by Gateshead Schools Forum SRtRC

understand that the climate in schools can change and we strive to be responsive to that.

Changes to legislation and with the unfolding of national and international events, what is delivered may differ slightly from what is described in this document. That being said SRtRC are still firmly committed to their organisational aim of being an anti-racism education charity but at the same time they are willing to be flexible to the needs of schools and communities. For example the Prevent agenda is already having an impact in schools and if necessary we can work to support schools to fulfil their duty.

SRtRC team currently sit on the Hate Crime Tension Monitoring Group at Gateshead Council. Because of this they are able to pick up on issues of tension in communities and would be able to be responsive to this in contacting schools to offer our services should any school be in particular need of support.

Cost: £ 11,083

Anti-Racism Teacher Training Conferences for Gateshead Staff:

Show Racism the Red Card also deliver full day CPD programmes for teachers and school staff.

The one day conference will bring together frontline workers that have a role working with young people. The conference will include the delivery of the following workshops:

- Recognising and responding to racist incidents
- Clearing up the confusion on terminology relating to ethnicity
- Understanding how to make schools more equal
- Dismantling the myths relating to equality and anti-racism
- Legislation and the prevent duty

The delegates will also be asked to reflect on what change they will make to their practice following the course.

Outcomes:

By the end of our adult workshops adults will:

- Understand the need to critically reflect on their personal prejudices and professional practice
- Have a greater understanding of appropriate terminology relating to ethnicity.
- Have an increased understanding of how to recognise racism.
- Be better equipped to respond to racist incidents.
- Be more aware of the need for a culturally affirming curriculum/school ethos for all pupils

- Understand their legislative duties in relation to Equalities
- Will be more aware for the need for anti-racist practice

Cost: £3,800 *This price is per conference. The conference can be delivered to up to 60 teachers and schools staff per conference.*

Proposal

That Gateshead Schools Forum provides a total of £14,883 in funding to provide anti-racism education in schools and an anti-racism teacher training conference.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Schools Forum consider the funding request from Show Racism the Red Card and be minded to support the proposals as outlined above.

For the following reason:

To ensure children and young people across Gateshead feel safe and supported, and are part of a confident and diverse growing population.

Contact: Steve Horne



TITLE OF REPORT: Early Years National Funding Formula Consultation

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum attention the Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) consultation issued by the Department for Education (DfE) 11 August, and to ask if Schools Forum would like to respond to the consultation.

Background

The EYNFF was launched by the DfE on the 11 August 2016 and is open until 22 September 2016.

In order to incentivise providers to deliver enough free childcare places to secure an additional 15 hours of childcare entitlement for working parents from September 2017, the Government committed in the Autumn Statement to make changes to the way the 3 and 4 year old entitlements to childcare are funded.

The proposals include:

- introducing a new early years national funding formula for 3 and 4 year olds
- changing the way local authorities fund the early years providers in their area
- making sure that children with special educational needs or disabilities attract the extra funding they need

Proposals for an early year's national funding formula to allocate funding to LAs for 3 and 4 year-olds

The Local Authority (LA) is currently funded by the DfE for 3 and 4 year olds based on an early year's unit of funding £3882.71 multiplied by full time equivalent numbers of children. Initial funding allocations are based on estimated numbers and then updated during the year based on actual take up of provision. There are no supplements and each LA has a different unit of funding.

The proposed new national funding formula to allocate funding to LAs will be based on three elements;-

1. An hourly base rate for both the existing 15-hour entitlement for all three and four year-olds and the additional 15 hours for children of working parents from September 2017. The proposed allocation is £3.53.

2. Additional needs funding based on:-

- Free school meal (FSM) eligibility - the proposed national rate per eligible child is £2.13 (the number of children is based on the percentage of FSM children in KS1 & KS2 as at January 2016).
- English as an Additional Language (EAL) - the proposed national rate per eligible child is £0.29 (the number of children is based on the percentage of EAL children in KS1 and KS2 for whom English is not their first language).
- Disability Living Allowance (DLA) –the proposed national rate per eligible child £0.74 (based on data from the Department of Work and Pensions).

3. The above elements will then be multiplied by and An Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) factor based on:-

- General Labour Market (based on data provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government)
- Nursery Rates Cost Adjustment (Valuation Office Data)

Gateshead's rates are calculated by using the national funding rates multiplied by Gateshead's area cost adjustment of 1.14.

The hourly funding rates allocated to Gateshead as provided in the illustrated LA allocations are:-

National Funding Formula elements	National Funding Rate	Area Cost Adjustment	Gateshead's Funding Rate
Hourly Base rate	£3.53	1.14	£4.02
FSM (for each eligible child)	£2.13	1.14	£2.43
EAL (for each eligible child)	£0.29	1.14	£0.33
DLA (for each eligible child)	£0.74	1.14	£0.84

The resultant funding will then be subject to a proposed “floor” – where no LA can lose more than 10% of its early years funding and a “ceiling” so that no LA can gain more than 22.9% compared to 2016/17. These numbers have been proposed as the capping, at 22.9%, will fund losses above 10% at LA level. This does not apply to Gateshead.

The DfE have also acknowledged the higher costs and the dis-economies of scale that nursery schools have compared to other providers. To provide some transitional protection (initially proposed for 2 years), there will be a Maintained Nursery School supplementary rate. However at the time of writing we are waiting for clarification from the DfE on what figures were used to calculate this additional funding for Gateshead.

Proposals on how Local Authorities will fund the 3 and 4-year old free entitlement

Currently all LAs must have an Early Years Single Funding Formula that complies with the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations. However there is much variation in how the different formula in each LA are designed with different supplements/factors.

In order to overcome this inconsistency the DfE have made several proposals to standardise local formulas:-

- LAs must pass at least 93% of funding to providers in 2017/18 rising to 95% in 2018/19.
- There must be a universal base rate of funding to all providers no later than 2019/20 which would equate to at least 89.5% of available funding
- There will be supplementary funding for Nursery Schools to enable the transition to the universal base rate.
- The additional factors/supplements that the DfE are proposing that LAs may have as part of their formula are:
 - Deprivation - already in our current formula and will probably be mandatory as it is now.
 - Rurality / Sparsity – for small settings in rural areas that are unavoidable in sparsely populated rural areas.
 - Flexibility – to encourage providers to provide childcare that fits with parents working patterns
 - Efficiency – to encourage providers to be more efficient by sharing back office facilities and ensuring they maximise their adult to child ratios.
 - Delivery of additional 15 hours – to encourage childcare providers to offer the additional 15 hours of free childcare.
- The DfE are also proposing that funding channelled through the additional factors/supplements should be limited to 10% of the total funding allocated to settings.
- The DfE are proposing that DLA funding be ring-fenced and fully pass-ported to providers who have children in receipt of DLA as an annual amount to the setting. This funding can be used to either:-
 - Help children access their free entitlement, by supporting providers to make initial adjustments
 - Build capacity of the setting to support more disabled children.
 - Target one specific child's needs
 - Improve the setting for a cohort of children

Currently there is no Special Educational Needs (SEN) funding in Gateshead's current EYSFF, and all additional support is provided either from Contingency funding or the High Needs block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) after children have been assessed.

The consultation proposes that all LAs should set up an Inclusion Fund to:

- Support LAs to work with individual providers to resource support for the needs of individual children with SEN.
- Enable LAs to carry out an effective strategic role in their local area to increase the capacity of their childcare market so that it appropriately supports and develops children with SEN in the early years.
- Help LAs in developing their plans for strategically commissioning services as required under the Children and Families Act 2014.

To establish an inclusion fund it is proposed that LAs should pool an amount of funding from either one or both of their early years and high needs allocations from the DSG.

Over the course of the financial year LAs would use the fund to facilitate discussions with their providers about the needs of children with SEN taking up the free entitlements and pass the majority of the funding through to providers in the form of 'top ups' on a case by case basis.

Where LAs wish to use part of their inclusion fund to support local services, for example specialist services, they must continue to be able to do so. Some of these services may be delivered by LAs to providers free at the point of use. Where this is the case the DfE are minded that such services not be considered as part of the 95% of funding which must be passed through to providers, although the DfE welcomes views on this. LAs may wish to move to offering more of these specialist services with a charge to providers ('buy-back' models).

If LAs did set up an inclusion fund the amount and the process for allocating funding could be at local discretion.

Currently there is no inclusion funding within the Early Years funding Block of the DSG. All SEN funding in Gateshead is contained within the High Needs Block of the DSG, and is free at the point of service.

To ensure transparency there is an expectation by the DfE that the inclusion fund is linked directly to the LAs published 'Local Offer' and be allocated clearly and transparently so it is easily understood by parents and providers.

Conclusion

Based on the information provided, it is estimated that there will be additional funding in total for Gateshead settings. However under the proposals the additional funding will not increase funding for all settings, and it is anticipated that the maintained nursery classes and nursery schools will see a decrease in funding. At present the extent of the decreased funding is not known as no detailed financial modelling is possible, however, if the illustrative funding amounts and proposals within the consultation are implemented there could be a threat to the viability of Gateshead's only nursery school, putting more financial pressure on primary schools with nursery classes.

Attached in appendix 1 is a draft of the Gateshead's proposed response to the consultation questions. The DfE no longer provide a downloadable document to respond to the consultation, and therefore the questions have been copied from the DfE's website which has resulted in the formatting of the draft response. To aid clarity multiple choice answers have also been highlighted in yellow.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report and the draft LA response at appendix 1 and consideration be given to Schools Forum submitting a consultation response in their name.

Schools Forum will also need to give consideration to the forming of a subgroup of Schools Forum to review Gateshead's Early Years Single Funding Formula. Although the outcome of the consultation is not yet known, due to the short time span between now and March, it is proposed that work on a new EYSFF should start in the immediately.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum considers making a response to the Early Years National Funding Formula proposals, and sets up a subgroup of Schools Forum to review the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

For the following reasons:

- To provide Schools Forum with information to enable a consultation response to be submitted in their name if requested.
- To form a subgroup to start work on the need of a new EYSFF for Gateshead.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

About you

Progress

Page 2 of 11

We would like to know a little about you. This will help us understand, overall, whether certain parts of the sector or areas of the country have certain views about what we propose.

Please note, your responses on this page will only be saved when you click Next or Submit.

3 We'd like to know which area of the early years sector your answers represent. Which of these categories best describes your role in the sector?

This is a drop down menu of different categories of respondent - from nursery to local authority

If you have answered 'other' please provide more details:

4 In which region do you work?

A drop-down menu of the 9 regions of England

5 If you are not responding as a local authority, which local authority you work in?

A list of all the local authorities in England

6 If you are a childcare provider, do you consider yourself to work in a:

Please tick as many boxes as apply to you.

Multiple choice checkboxes

- chain of providers?
- single setting?
- rural, or sparsely populated community?
- inner city area?
- area of deprivation?

7 If you are a childcare provider, how many children can your individual setting offer places to?

Single choice radio buttons

- 10 or fewer children
- 11-30
- 31-60
- 61-90
- Over 91 children

8 If you are a childcare provider, do you offer the free entitlement to:

Multiple choice checkboxes

- three-and four-year olds?
- two-year olds?

On this page, we ask your views on our proposals for the way money is distributed from Government to local authorities. That's the Early Years National Funding Formula and its component parts.

Please note, your responses on this page will only be saved when you click Next or Submit.

9 Should there be an early years national funding formula (to distribute money from Government to each local authority)?

Please see paragraphs 89-96 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

10 Considering a universal base rate of funding which does not vary by local area...

Please see paragraphs 98-101 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should a universal base rate be included in the early years national funding formula?	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Is 89.5% of overall funding the right amount to channel through this factor?	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>

11 Considering an additional needs factor...

Please see paragraphs 102-112 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should an additional needs factor be included in the early years national funding formula?	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Do we propose the correct set of metrics?	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Do we propose the correct weightings for each metric?	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>

12 Considering an area cost adjustment...

Please see paragraphs 113-119 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should the early years national funding formula include an area cost adjustment?	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Should that adjustment be based on staff costs (based on the General Labour Market measure) and on nursery premises costs (based on rateable values)?	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>

13 If you have any comments or recommendations for alternative metrics or weightings to be used in the early years national funding formula, please explain here:
This box allows you to write an answer freely

Q10 For Gateshead in the illustrative funding allocations, the universal base rate after ACA equates to 88.73% of total funding. Therefore to enable 89.5% of total funding to be allocated via a base rate to providers would mean reducing either the FSM or EAL funding as the DLA fund is proposed as a ring fenced grant.

Q11 We agree with an additional needs factor, however we do not agree with using DLA as the metric as we consider the level of SEN required to access DLA is too high a threshold, and application and assessment process can be a lengthy process when children would benefit from support earlier. There is also some concern that this metric is not suitable for very young children who may not yet have been assessed.

Q12 We agree that there should be some form of ACA, however the use of the general labour market rate does not take into account that nursery classes and nursery schools must employ qualified teachers. The other issue is ratable value of nursery premises. Does this include schools? Also settings that are in rented accommodation, run out of church halls, community centers or their own homes will not have the same premises costs as other providers. It would not be equitable to have a metric that does not include the schools sector. For Gateshead the split in pupils attending settings is 51.6% in the schools sector and 48.4% in PVI settings.

It is difficult to comment on other metrics or weightings until they are fully understood. However if other metrics are considered, were possible they should already be easily available to settings, LA's or central government and be an additional admin burden. The ACA metric that is proposed is also different to that used for mainstream school funding which is also part of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

14 To what extent do you agree with the proposed funding floor limit, so that no local authority would face a reduction in its hourly funding rate of greater than 10%?

Please see paragraphs 91-93 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

15 To implement the increased hourly rate for the two-year old free entitlement...

Please see paragraphs 122-123 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should we retain the current two-year-old funding formula?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Unsure
Should we use the additional funding secured at the spending review to uplift local authorities' allocations based upon this?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Unsure

16 Considering the Dedicated Schools Grant, should the free entitlement be capped at 30 hours for children of eligible working parents and 15 hours for all other children?

Please see paragraphs 124-126 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

On this page, we can assume that money from Government has now been distributed fairly to local authorities. Here, we ask your views on the proposed high pass-through of local authority funding to childcare providers in their area.

Please note, your responses on this page will only be saved when you click Next or Submit.

17 Should Government set the proportion of early years funding that must be passed on to providers?

Please see paragraphs 132-140 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

18 Do you think that 95% is the correct minimum proportion of the money that should be passed from local authorities to providers?

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes, I agree
- No, 95% is too high
- No, 95% is too low
- Unsure

19 If you would like to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

This box allows you to write an answer

Q19 Whilst recognising the importance of passing on very high proportion of early years funding to providers, as Gateshead has always done, the DfE need to recognise that LA's officers workload has increased significantly in recent years during times of significant budget reductions. LA's have implemented the 2 year old offer and the distribution of EYPP which has created considerable amounts of additional work. The extended entitlement and the DLA proposals will significantly add to workloads.

20 Should local authorities be required to give the same universal hourly base rate to all childcare providers in their area?

Please see paragraphs 141-146 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure**

21 Considering funding supplements that local authorities could choose to use (above the universal base rate)...

Please see paragraphs 150-156 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should local authorities be able to use funding supplements?	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Should there be a cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements?	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>

22 If you agree that there should be cap on the proportion of funding that is channelled through supplements, should the cap be set at 10%?

Please see paragraphs 157-158 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes, I agree with a 10% cap
- No, the cap should be higher than 10%**
- No, the cap should be lower than 10%
- I'm unsure

23 Should the following supplements be permitted?

Please see paragraphs 159-182 in the Consultation Document.

	Yes	No	Unsure
Deprivation	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Sparsity / rural areas	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Flexibility	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	Unsure <input checked="" type="radio"/>

		Yes		No		Unsure
Efficiency	Yes <input type="radio"/>			No <input type="radio"/>		Unsure <input type="radio"/>
Additional 15 hours of childcare	Yes <input type="radio"/>			No <input type="radio"/>		Unsure <input type="radio"/>

24 When using funding supplements, should local authorities have discretion over the metrics they use and the amount of money channeled through each one?

	Yes - over the metric they use	Yes - over the amount of money	No - over the metric they use	No - over the amount of money	Unsure when it comes to metrics	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money
Deprivation	Yes - over the metric they use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes - over the amount of money <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to metrics <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>
Sparsity / rural areas	Yes - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - over the amount of money <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to metrics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility	Yes - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to metrics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	Yes - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to metrics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Additional 15 hours of childcare	Yes - over the metric they use <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - over the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>	No - over the metric they use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No - over the amount of money <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to metrics <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure when it comes to the amount of money <input type="checkbox"/>

25 If you agree that efficiency (efficient business practices that provide excellent value for money) should be included in the set of supplements, do you have a suggestion of how should it be designed?

Please see paragraphs 175-178 in the Consultation Document.

This box allows you to write an

26 If you agree the delivery of the additional 15 hours of free childcare should be included in the set of supplements, do you have a suggestion of how should it be designed?

Please see paragraphs 179-182 in the Consultation Document.

This box allows you to write an answer

27 If you think that any additional supplements should be permitted which are not mentioned here, please set out what they are and why you believe they should be included:

The consultation document explains the importance of efficient allocation of resources that offer value for money. Early years funding must be used wisely, for the benefit of childcare sufficiency, quality and value for money. A key part of this is for us to be clear about what our funding is for so please, wherever possible, provide evidence to support your recommendation.

This box allows you to write an answer

Q27 We believe that there should be a qualification supplement. All settings should be encouraged to employ staff with higher skill levels irrespective of setting. In general individuals with higher levels of qualifications will require a higher rate of pay, and therefore to remove the barrier to employee more skilled staff, LA's should be able to have a qualification supplement.

Funding is also being allocated for EAL children, however EAL is not a supplement that is proposed for allocating funding to settings.

28 Finally, for this page, if you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

This box allows you to write an answer

Q20 If the base rate is set too high and there is no scope for additional supplements, this will be a significant disadvantage to the schools sector that have to employ qualified teachers on teachers terms and conditions and therefore in general have higher staffing costs. All schools must also have a headteacher, again this is not a requirement for non-school settings.

Q21 We agreed with the supplements, however the 10% cap would not work in Gateshead as actual supplementary funding is 11.27% of the illustrative total funding, this could disadvantage settings with higher levels of FSM and EAL children as the proposal is for DLA funding to be ring-fenced.

Q23 After exploring a flexibility supplement when we designed our current EYSFF we found that it would be too complex to design and administer a system that could be applied consistently and accurately without very resource intensive processes.

After considering an efficiency supplement we felt that this would be very subjective and it would be very difficult to design and monitor any efficiency metric.

All free hours should be funded at the same level. If a child attended multiple settings for their 30 hour entitlement how could it be determined which hours were which?

29 Should there be a Disability Access Fund to support disabled children to access their free entitlement?

Please see paragraphs 191-197 in the Consultation Document.

Single choice radio buttons

Yes

No

Unsure

30 Should eligibility for the Disability Access Fund be children aged 3 or 4 which are a) taking up their free entitlement and b) in receipt of Disability Living Allowance?

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

31 When it comes to delivering the funding for the Disability Access Fund, is the most appropriate way the existing framework of the Early Years Pupil Premium?

Single choice radio buttons

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

32 If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

This box allows you to write your answer free

Q29 We do believe there should be a disability access fund.

Q30 We agree that the supplement should only be available to children accessing their free entitlement, however we consider the condition that they are in receipt of DLA too high a threshold, as children with lower levels of need or currently undergoing the application process will benefit from additional funding.

Q31 We were unsure. We agreed that the funding should be ring-fenced, but disagreed with the annual allocation as children can move settings. Another concern is how the data would be gathered, and how would the individual children be identified to the different settings.

33 To what extent do you agree that a lack of clarity on how parents / childcare providers can access financial support results in children with special educational needs not receiving appropriate support? (We mean children who do not already have an Education, Health and Care Plan)

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

34 When it comes to establishing an inclusion fund...

Please see paragraphs 198-210 in the Consultation Document.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Should local authorities be required to establish an inclusion fund?	Strongly agree <input type="radio"/>	Agree <input type="radio"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="radio"/>
Would an inclusion fund help improve the supply of appropriate support children receive when in an	Strongly agree <input type="radio"/>	Agree <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input type="radio"/>	Disagree <input type="radio"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="radio"/>

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

early years setting?

35 If you envisage any barriers, arising from existing practice or future proposals, to introducing a new requirement on local authorities to establish an inclusion fund, please tell us what they are and how they might be overcome:

This box allows you to write an

We think having an inclusion fund is a good idea, however it until detailed modeling of the proposals can be undertaken it is difficult to ascertain where funding for this fund would come from as our High Needs Block of the DSG is fully utilized and there has to be an at least 95% pass through to settings.

36 When it comes to the SEN inclusion fund, should local authorities be responsible for deciding...

Yes

No

Unsure

The children for which the inclusion fund is used?

Yes

No

Unsure

The value of the fund?

Yes

No

Unsure

The process of allocating the funding?

Yes

No

Unsure

37 Where specialist SEN or SEND services are delivered free at the point of use, should they be considered as funding passed directly to providers for the purposes of the 95% high pass-through?

Please see paragraphs 132-140 in the Consultation Document.

Part 2 of our proposals explores whether local authorities should be required to pass through a minimum of 95% of their early years funding to childcare providers. This question explores whether SEN or SEND services for childcare providers (free at the point of delivery) should be included in that 95% pass-through rule.

Single choice radio buttons

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

38 If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

We were unsure about this proposal as detailed modeling and consideration of the services provided need to be carefully considered. If funding was delegated to providers, they may not buyback the high quality specialist services provided by the LA.

39 To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for the Early Years National Funding Formula (money distributed from Government to local authorities)?

Please see paragraphs 213-216 in the Consultation Document.

We propose to cap local authority reductions in hourly rates to 5% in 2017-18 and 5% 2018-19.

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

40 To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for the high pass-through of early years funding from local authorities to providers?

Please see paragraphs 217-218 in the Consultation Document.

Our proposal is that, once fully implemented, 95% of early years funding allocated to local authorities will be passed directly to childcare providers. We recognise however that moving directly to 95% may be challenging for some areas. We therefore propose to transition the policy, starting at 93% in 2017-18 and moving to 95% by 2018-19.

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

41 To what extent do you agree that our proposals on the high pass-through of funding from local authorities to childcare providers makes the existing Minimum Funding Guarantee for the early years unnecessary?

Please see paragraph 219 in the Consultation Document.

The high pass-through of funding from local authorities to childcare providers (proposed as 95% once implemented) would provide a firm guarantee of funding to the front line. As such, we propose it should replace the minimum funding guarantee for the early years, as it becomes unnecessary.

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

42 To what extent do you agree with the transition approach proposed for introducing the universal base rate for all providers in a local authority area?

Please see paragraph 220 in the Consultation Document.

We recognise that, for some local authorities, moving to a universal 'per child' base rate of funding to providers will be a significant change. We therefore propose to allow local authorities until 2019-20 to implement this while encouraging them to do so sooner if possible and monitoring their progress.

Single choice radio buttons

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

43 If you want to explain a response you've submitted on this page in more detail, please do so here:

Q40 Agree with this proposal as detailed modeling has not yet been undertaken to review the turbulence the proposals will cause Gateshead settings.

Q41 MFG still needs to exist to protect settings that will loose funding under the new proposals. The high % pass through will not protect all settings, and they need time to adapt to the funding changes in an already very difficult financial environment where staff costs have continued to rise and funding has remained stagnant.

Q42 The universal base rate does not take into account the different cost drivers that different settings have, e.g. having to pay staff on different terms and conditions. Also Gateshead's universal base rate is below the 89.5% pass level proposed in the consultation as is actually 88.73 of Gateshead's total funding before any admin top-slice. If the full 89.5% was to be passed through then this could disadvantage settings with high levels of deprivation.

TITLE OF REPORT: Contingency Criteria Wording Update

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum the proposed updated wording for Gateshead's Contingency Criteria.

Background

Gateshead's Contingency Criteria has been in place for at least ten years and was last updated in 2008 when the financial difficulty criterion was revised when the Financial Difficulty Procedure was first developed. Schools Forum has discussed the criteria on several occasions, but no changes have been made.

The last time the contingency process was applied it was noted that the legislation quoted in the criteria were out of date. The legislation has now been updated and below in bold is the updated legislation, and the wording that has the double lines through is the proposed wording to be removed.

4. The provision of additional resources or other special support, temporarily, in response to a school **as described in the DfE guidance "Schools Causing Concern" issued March 2016, and in accordance with Section 44 of the Education Act 2005, sections 60, 61 and 62 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006** ~~found to be in need of Special Measures within the meaning of Part V of the Education Act 1993 and in accordance with DfE Circular 17/93.~~

6. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of the admission of pupils permanently excluded by other schools. Such allocations will be determined in accordance with Regulations made by the Secretary of State under Section 47 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.

Below is a link to the DfE Schools Causing Concern Guidance.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/510080/schools-causing-concern-guidance.pdf

The complete proposed updated contingency criteria is attached at appendix 1.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum considers the suggested changes to the contingency criteria to ensure that the most recent legislation is being quoted.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum approves the proposed changes to Gateshead's Contingency Criteria.

For the following reasons:

- To ensure that Gateshead's Contingency Criteria is up to date and quotes the most recent legislation and guidance.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1

Updated July 2016 Contingency Funding Criteria

The LEA will retain centrally contingency funding that **could** provide in-year support to schools for:

1. Cost pressures specifically identified and caused by a relatively large numerical change in pupil numbers, especially if it relates to a single age-group, where the change is outside the control of the governing body and where the timing of the change in circumstances prevents no opportunity to the school to plan accordingly (e.g. housing demolition or compulsory purchase orders, or reorganisation)
2. The correction of significant errors in the data or in the application of the resource allocation formula.
3. Emergency costs arising from incidents outside the control of the governing body of the school (e.g. flood or fire damage). The money allocated for these purposes will be earmarked for specific use.
4. The provision of additional resources or other special support, temporarily, in response to a school as described in the DfE guidance "Schools Causing Concern" issued March 2016, and in accordance with Section 44 of the Education Act 2005, sections 60, 61 and 62 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
5. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of pupils with new or revised statements of SEN, or for statemented pupils transferring between schools within the LEA.
6. For in-year allocations to schools in respect of the admission of pupils permanently excluded by other schools. Such allocations will be determined in accordance with Regulations made by the Secretary of State under Section 47 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998.
7. Schools that are in financial difficulty, and can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to address financial issues, and that the current financial difficulties are not as a result of financial mismanagement. Schools must apply the LEA's "Model of Reasonableness" before making an application to demonstrate that they meet the criteria.

If contingency is given and a school ends the same financial year with a surplus balance in excess of 16% for primary and special schools or 10% for secondary schools the contingency payment, or a proportion of it, will be clawed back.

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE OF REPORT: School Funding Announcements

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum attention school funding announcements made by the Department for Education (DfE) and a number of documents published on 21 and 22 July.

Background

Below is a summary of the main announcements:-

- The National Funding Formula will be delayed until 2018/19
- For 2017/18 no local authority will see a reduction from their 2016/17 funding (adjusted to reflect authorities' most recent spending patterns) on the schools block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (per pupil funding) or the high needs block (cash amount).
- The post 16 factor has been removed from the Authority Proforma Tool, (APT).
- The Looked After Children and Mobility Factors have been retained for 2017/18
- There will be a new national weighting for secondary low attainment following the introduction of the new KS2 SATS
- New bandings have been created for the 2015 Index of Deprivation Affecting Children Indices (IDACI)
- Only one APT will be submitted in January 2017
- LA's will be able to retain funding from the DSG for maintained schools, relating to statutory duties previously covered by the Education Services Grant (ESG)
- From September 2017, the ESG retained duties will be included in the DSG baseline at £15 per child (3 to 19 year olds). This is a £77 per child reduction.
- The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) will be set at negative 1.5% for 2017/18
- Final allocations for schools and high needs blocks will follow in December on the basis of pupil numbers recorded in the October census.
- The proposals to create a new central schools block, allow local flexibility on the MFG or to ring-fence the schools block within the DSG will not be implemented for 2017/18.
- For 2017/18 Post 16 high needs place funding for Further Education (FE) colleges and private providers will be transferred from the DfE's budget into LA's high needs block. For 2017/18 all of these places will be funded from the LA's high needs block. The DfE will deduct the funding for these institutions from the LAs high needs block and directly fund them before the DSG it is finalised in March 2017.

The announcements on the Early Years National Funding formula were the subject of an earlier report on this agenda.

Also, in the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation “Self-sufficient local government: 100% Business Rates Retention (which runs from Tuesday 5 July until Monday 26 September), Section 4 “Devolution of responsibilities should be made with consideration for the medium-term financial impact on local government” includes early years as one of the proposed areas to be funded from 100% business rates retention with the following narrative;

“The grant is provided to English local authorities to fulfil their duties under sections 6, 7, 7A, 9a, 12 and 13 of the Childcare Act 2006 and under regulations that will be made pursuant to section 2(1) of the Childcare Act 2016. It is currently part of the Dedicated Schools Grant. Consideration of this grant for devolution would take place after successful delivery and establishment of the Manifesto commitment to 30 hours free childcare from September 2017.”

On Wednesday 27 July to 1 August, the DfE released a test Authority Proforma Tool (APT) to some LA’s for testing. The test APT was based on the January 2016 submission but two areas were updated, the MFG calculation using January 2016 APT data as baselines and the updated Indices of Deprivation Affecting Children IDACI bandings.

To test the APT, the funding amounts used for January 2016 were input and compared to The APT submitted in January 2016. The updated IDACI bandings have caused probably as much turbulence as the updated data set from 2010 to 2015 did. But as a point of comparison for the test APT the same amount of funding was allocated to the new IDACI factor. With this allocation, (even with the turbulence) the test APT suggests a fall of £263,412 in MFG from £598,548 to £335,136.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report detailing announced funding arrangements for 2017/18.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum notes the contents of the report detailing announced funding arrangements for 2017/18

For the following reasons:

- To keep Schools Forum informed of the current schools funding announcements.

CONTACT: Carole Smith

TITLE OF REPORT: Analysis of Local Authorities Schools Block Funding Formulae

Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to bring to Schools Forum analysis produced by the Department for Education (DfE) on the values and funding factors used by all other local authorities (LAs) in England, and a summary of work carried out over the summer on benchmarking Gateshead's mainstream schools formula against national data and regional and statistical neighbours.

Background

In July 2016 the DfE published a report which provided an overview of the 2016/17 funding factors and values used by all LAs to fund mainstream schools. They also published the factor values and percentages of total funding for all LAs.

Below is the link to the documents.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/schools-block-funding-formulae-2016-to-2017>

Benchmarking of funding factors

There are 152 Local Education Authorities (LEAs) in England, and therefore 152 different mainstream funding formulas. For regional neighbours there are a total of 13 LAs and there are 11 LAs in the statistical neighbour group.

Not all factors are mandatory and were not all LA's have used all factors. Where this differs to the above LAs the number in the group will be stated.

Basic per pupil entitlement

The primary basic entitlement for Gateshead is £2,905. This was in the most commonly used bracket of £2,750 to £3,000 and ranked 79th nationally, 3rd against our regional neighbours and 4th against our statistical neighbours.

The KS3 basic entitlement for Gateshead was £3,750. This again was in the most commonly used bracket of £3,750 to £4,000 and ranked 124th nationally, 10th against of our regional neighbours and 9th against our statistical neighbours.

The KS4 basic entitlement for Gateshead is £4,360. This again this was in the most commonly used bracket of £4,250 to £4360 and ranked 107th nationally, 11th against our regional neighbours and 8th against our statistical neighbours.

Gateshead allocated 74.32% of the total funding to the basic entitlement. Most LAs were in the bracket of 75% to 80% with the average being 76.8%. The percentage range for regional neighbours was 69.24% to 86.23% with an average of 74.35%. For statistical neighbours the range was 69.25% to 84.27% with an average of 75.14%.

Summary

The primary basic entitlement is mid-table nationally; however against regional and statistical neighbours it is higher than both averages.

KS3 basic entitlement is in the lower quartile of all three comparison groups, and is lower than the average amount for regional and statistical neighbours.

KS4 basic entitlement is in the lower half of national funding values, and is lower than regional and statistical neighbour values.

Deprivation

122 LA's used IDACI as a deprivation measure. Only 17 LA's used IDACI to distribute more than 6% of total deprivation funding with most distributing between 2 to 4%. Gateshead distributed 2.8% of deprivation funding via IDACI.

The DfE calculated the total amount of deprivation funding allocated per Free School Meal child. Funding ranged from 1% to 19% of total funding with the average being 7.6%. Gateshead distributed 10.86% of total funding, but had a lower than average factor value of £1,479 compared to 64% of LAs with a factor value range of £1,500 to £3,000 per FSM child.

The highest percentage distributed regionally was 14.19%, with an average of 10.10% and Gateshead was ranked 7th.

For statistical neighbours the highest was 12.93% with an average of 10.17% and Gateshead was ranked 6th.

8 regional LAs used primary FSME6, and Gateshead ranked 4th out of the eight with average funding of £955, Gateshead's rate is £850. For statistical LAs ranked 2nd out of 8 with the average funding of £742.

8 regional LA's used secondary FSM6, and Gateshead ranked 3rd, with a value of £1,400, and the average was £1,189. There were also eight statistical neighbours that used FSME6 and Gateshead ranked 2nd and the average fund is £1,040.

Most LA's used a combination of FSM and IDACI to distribute their deprivation funding with the exception of Durham only using IDACI for primary schools and Redcar and Cleveland only using IDACI.

Summary

IDACI is too complex to fully analyse easily. The overall deprivation funding percentage that Gateshead allocates is higher than the national average and midrange against regional and statistical neighbours.

Primary FSM6 average funding was lower than the regional neighbours and higher than statistical neighbours.

Secondary FSM6 funding was ranked 3rd regionally and 2nd against statistical neighbours and the factor value was higher than the average value for both regional and statistical neighbours.

Looked After Children (LAC)

Only a small proportion of funding is allocated via this factor and only 88 LAs out of 152 chose to use this factor. The most commonly used funding bracket was £1,000 to £1,500 and 75% of LA's funded under £1,250. Gateshead factor value was £1,500.

Nine of the regional and seven of Gateshead's statistical neighbours used the LAC factor. Gateshead's factor was the highest regional amount and the second highest as compared to statistical neighbours. Average funding amounts were £888 and £1,046 respectively.

Summary

Gateshead's LAC factor value is relatively high compared to all 3 groups.

Prior Attainment

143 LAs used the primary low prior attainment factor. The most commonly used funding bracket was £500 to £750. Gateshead's value was £320.

For secondary low prior attainment 148 LAs used this factor. The most commonly used bracket was £750 to £1,000. Gateshead's value was £550.

71% of LA's allocated between 2% and 6% of funding. The average was 4.3% with Gateshead allocating 2%.

Compared regional and statistical neighbours Gateshead's low prior attainment factors are well below average. Gateshead's value was £320 for primary and ranked 12th against regional neighbours and 10th against statistical neighbours with average funding amounts of £732 and £570 respectively.

Secondary low prior attainment funding was not quite as low, with Gateshead's allocating £550, which ranked 10th regionally and 8th against statistical neighbours with average funding values of £740 and £654 respectively.

Summary

Prior attainment funding is relatively low compared to all groups, with primary sector being particularly low.

English as an additional language (EAL)

136 LA's used this factor for 2016/17 funding. The most commonly used funding bracket for primary EAL was £250 to £500, with Gateshead allocating £260.

For secondary schools the most commonly used bracket was £500 to £750, with Gateshead allocating £260.

The average amount funding allocated via this factor is 0.9% Gateshead allocates 0.18% which is in the most commonly used allocation range of 0% to 1%.

Gateshead's used the same funding amount for both primary and secondary EAL allocating £260. For primary this ranked 8th out of the 9 regional LAs that used this factor and 6th out of 6 for statistical neighbours. The average allocations were £533 and £639 respectively.

For secondary schools Gateshead ranked 6th out of 9 and 6th out of 6 for regional and statistical neighbours, with average funding amounts being £969 and £889 respectively.

Summary

Gateshead funding for EAL children against all comparators is low, especially in the primary sector.

Mobility

Only 68 out of 152 LAs use the mobility factor. For primary the funding range was from £10 to £3,000 and for secondary the range was £10 to £19,068. The most commonly used bracket for primary mobility funding was £500 to £750. In Gateshead we allocate £2,000.

5 regional LAs and only one statistical neighbour used this factor. Gateshead ranked 1st for both regional and statistical neighbours groups, with average funding regionally being £995 for primary and £915 for secondary schools. For the statistical neighbour using this factor, the funding value was £250 for both primary and secondary schools. In 2016/17 no Gateshead secondary schools qualified for mobility funding.

Summary

Gateshead has a high mobility factor compared to all groups. Less than half of all LAs in all groups used this factor.

Overall Pupil-Led Factors

It is the requirement of all LAs to channel at least 80% of mainstream school funding via pupil-led factors. The average for all LAs was 89.84% the highest % of LAs were in the bracket 90% to 92%. Gateshead allocated 87.82% of funding to pupil-led factors.

Gateshead ranked 10th against regional neighbours with a range of funding from 93.55% to 83.29%, and 9th against statistical neighbours with a range of 92.42% to 83.29%.

Lump Sum

All LAs chose to have a lump sum in their formula. The range for both primary and secondary schools was £48,480 to the maximum amount of £175,000.

14 LAs had their maximum lump sum for their primary schools and 36 for their secondary schools. The most commonly used range for primary lump sum was £140,000 to £150,000.

The most commonly used range for secondary lump sum was £170,000 to £175,000. Overall the average % of funding allocated was 8.2%; Gateshead allocated 8.66% which was in the second highest distribution band of 8% to 10%. The most commonly used banding rate was 6% to 8%.

Gateshead had differentiated lump sums for 2016/17 of £115,000 for primary schools and £140,000 for secondary schools. Gateshead ranked 9th regionally for the primary lump sum and 8th for statistical neighbours with the average funding being £137,454 and £130,616 respectively. For the secondary lump sum Gateshead ranked 11th for secondary schools regionally and 7th against statistical neighbours, with average funding being £153,416 and £136,824 respectively.

Gateshead allocated 8.66% of funding to the lump sum compared to the average for regional neighbours 9.6% and statistical neighbours 8.82%

Primary: Secondary Ratio

The national primary: secondary ratio for 2016/17 was 1:1.29. In 2015/16 the ratio was 1:1.28. Gateshead's ratio was 1:1.27 for 2016/17. The calculation is undertaken before the application of MFG and capping and scaling.

The average for regional and statistical neighbours ratio was 1:31, and Gateshead rank 9th and 7th respectively.

Gateshead's Schools Block Unit of Funding ranked 8th against regional neighbours and 6th against statistical neighbours.

Gateshead average primary school size is 218 which ranks 7th out of 11 against regional neighbours and with an average school size of 223. Against statistical neighbours Gateshead ranked 8th out of 10 for primary school size with an average pupil numbers of 245. LAs with a 3 tier system were not included in this calculation.

The average secondary school size in Gateshead is 961 pupils with a rank of 4th for both regional and statistical neighbours out of 11 and 10 LAs respectively. The regional average secondary school size was 838. Statistical neighbour's average size of school is 876 pupils.

Notional SEN

All LAs have to have a notional SEN budget. 84% of LAs have a notional SEN % of between the ranges of 5% to 15%, with an overall average of 10%. The most

commonly used % bracket is 7.5% to 10%. Gateshead's notional SEN percentage was 7.5%.

Proposal

It is proposed that Schools Forum notes the contents of the report and the comparisons of Gateshead funding against the national, regional and statistical neighbours. It is proposed that a subgroup of Schools Forum is formed to review data, agree the areas to review and model potential outcomes.

The possible areas for review are:-

KS3 basic entitlement
KS4 basic entitlement
IDACI following the banding changes
Primary and secondary FSM6 funding
Low Prior Attainment
EAL
Mobility

Schools Forum to agree the areas to be reviewed from area's proposed by the sub group. Outcomes from the groups work will be reported to Schools Forum, however it must be noted there will be changes to the factor values once final allocations and the most up to date data set are released by the DfE in December 2016.

Recommendations

It is recommended that School Forum notes the contents of the report and considers the suggested areas to be reviewed for Gateshead's mainstream Schools Fair Funding Formula for the financial year 2017/18.

For the following reasons:

- To provide Schools Forum with information to inform the debate and consider the suggested areas for review of Gateshead's mainstream Schools Fair Funding Formula.
- To set up a sub group of Schools Forum to undertake a review of Gateshead's mainstream schools fair funding formula.

CONTACT: Carole Smith