

### **School Funding Reform – New LMS Funding Formula – Consultation Questions**

Please refer to the following documents for background information before considering these questions:

- York Education Partnership Board Report, 2 October 2012: School Funding Reform – LMS Formula Review.
- Indicative School Allocation Tables and accompanying notes

Further information on the funding reforms can be found on the DfE website at <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/adminandfinance/financialmanagement/schoolsrevenuefunding/a00205567/school-funding-reform-final-arrangements-for-2013-14>

#### **Question 1**

**Do you support the approach taken in constructing the new local funding formula in line with the principles set out in paragraph 4 of the YEP Board report?**

**Yes 4 (100%)      No 0      Not Sure 0**

#### **Comments:**

We agree with the principles set out in paragraph 4, however, recent changes such as the Pupil Premium have not resulted in any main change but simply an addition to the previous/current funding formula.

#### **Question 2**

**Do you support the LA's recommendation to remove the current Infant Class Size funding from the formula and retain it centrally to allocate to primary schools during the year, as described in paragraphs 13-16 of the YEP Board report?**

**Yes 4 (100%)      No 0      Not Sure 0**

#### **Comments:**

1. We needed to employ an additional KS1 member of staff in order to open an additional class in September 2012. We will need to continue to do this next year as we have a projected 72 children in KS1 in September 2013.
2. Infant class size funding should be directed at school that have the specific need rather than be added to AWPU.
3. £39 per pupil would mean that we were seriously disadvantaged so we would definitely be against that as an option. As a school, our only concern with this option is the uncertainty it causes. We have relied very heavily on the infant class-size funding and although it looks hopeful that the proposed system will mean that we will not suffer too much, it is not certain that we will get what we need. The element of discretion is difficult for us in terms of planning our finances.

### **Question 3**

**Do you support the LA's recommendations that the following services should be de-delegated in 2013/14, as described in paragraphs 17-26 of the YEP Board report?**

**a) Schools In Financial Difficulty?**

**Yes 3 (75%) No 0 Not Sure 1 (25%)**

**Comments:**

None

**b) Schools Contingency?**

**Yes 3 (75%) No 0 Not Sure 1 (25%)**

**Comments:**

None

**c) Teacher's Panel?**

**Yes 3 (75%) No 0 Not Sure 1 (25%)**

**Comments:**

None

**d) Behaviour Support Outreach Service?**

**Yes 2 (50%) No 1 (25%) Not Sure 1 (25%)**

**Comments:**

None

**e) Traveller Education & Ethnic Minority Support Service?**

**Yes 1 (25%) No 1 (25%) Not Sure 2 (50%)**

**Comments:**

None

**f) Access & FSM Eligibility Assessment Services?**

**Yes 1 (25%) No 0 Not Sure 2 (50%)**

**Comments:**

None

### **Question 4**

**Under the new LMS Formula arrangements schools will be funded for each financial year based on their pupil numbers as at the previous October Census (i.e. October 2012 for the 2013/14 financial year). There is however an option to adjust funding for primary schools to take account of a January reception intake. This would be done by increasing the October 2012 reception numbers by the actual increase in reception pupils in the previous year (i.e. the actual increase from October 2011 to January 2012 – note any reduction in numbers would be counted as zero and not affect funding allocations). Do you think that this adjustment should be implemented in the new York formula?**

**Yes 3 (75%) No 1 (25%) Not Sure 0**

**Comments:**

1. Because, as far as we know, most schools are having single intake in September.

**Question 5**

**Are there any other comments that you would like to make about the proposed LMS Funding Formula for 2013/14?**

**Comments:**

1. The proposals seem to make the process as fair as it can be.
2. Thank you very much for meeting with the Governors' Chair of Finance and myself to explain the new School Funding Reform – LMS Formula Review and the impact this has on school funding, it was very informative and very much valued.

In the main the governors agree with the four principles outlined by the York Education Partnership Board. Although the previous funding formula was fit for purpose, there have been some recent changes in national funding streams such as Pupil Premium which impact on local funding arrangements.

While there are a number of allowable factors, such as Free School Meals FSM, the proposed funding reiterates the use of FSM a number of times. For instance- Mainstreamed Former Grants: Primary Schools are weighted 60% AWPU, 20% FSM and 20% Prior Attainment. We would remove the weighting of FSM as this is already addressed through Pupil Premium. This point is particularly relevant as the proposed funding review attempts to place greater emphasis on funding allocated on a per pupil basis.

The new regulations condition of determining that the school Lump Sum to be equivalent across both primary and secondary school sectors has a significantly and disproportionately detrimental effect on funding for larger primary schools. The choice of setting the lump sum at the maximum of £200k means that the value of the AWPU is significantly reduced for primary schools. This is counter intuitive to the importance of devolving funding through the AWPU where the new regulations put greater emphasis on funding allocated on a per pupil basis.

The governors would urge the LA to make representation to the government regarding the conflict between lump sum and the counterproductive effect on funding the majority of funds through AWPU. We would argue that there continues to be a split between primary and secondary Lump Sum.

We are concerned at the dampening arrangements proposed by the government are only in place for the next two years, 2013 and 2014. If this is not extended then there will be detrimental impact faced by schools that are at the extremes of potential reductions in funding.