MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 4

MEETING TITLE AND DATE: Education Resources Group – 16 June 2016 Schools Forum – 6 July 2016

REPORT OF:

Chief Education Officer

Contact officer and telephone number: Sangeeta Brown – 0208 379 3109 E-mail: <u>sangeeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk</u> Item: 5a

Subject: School Funding Review: 2016/17

Wards: All

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides information on the Section 251 and also comparative data on funding provided to school in 2016/17 and 2015/16.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members are asked to note and comment on this report.

3. BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

3.1 This report is in three parts and includes the following information:

Part 1: Section 251 Analysis Part 2: Funding delegated to individual schools from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

4. Section 251 Analysis

Tabla 1

- 4.1 In line with the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009, local authorities are required to complete and submit to the DfE annually the Section 251 Budget Statement. The Statement provides information to schools and members of the public about the spending plans for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and other children's services funding. The Statements submitted enable some benchmarking to be carried out. Enfeild's Section 251 Statement can be found by using the following link: https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/children-and-education/children-young-people-and-education/school-welfare-and-information/school-budgets-and-finances/#2.
- 4.2 Following the Schools Forum discussions on the use of the DSG and the savings requirement, a comparison of the Statement submitted for 2015/16 and 2016/17 has been carried out. A summary is attached at Appendix A.

Table 1 below provides a top level comparison between 2015/16 and 2016/17 as reported on the S251 Statement.

Item	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17
Item	£m	%	£m	%
Delegated Funding	£272.7m	87.5%	£273.2m	88.0%
De-delegation	£0.6m	0.2%	£0.6m	0.2%
Pupil Led	£24.3m	7.8%	£25.8m	8.3%
Centrally Held	£13.9m	4.5%	£11.0m	3.5%
Total	£311.5m	100%	£310.6m	100%

4.3 Unlike previous years, the DfE have not as yet published the Statements they have received from all local authorities. This has meant a comparison of Enfield's Section 251 with our statistical neighbours and outer London has not been possible. This will be carried out when the information becomes available.

5. PART 2: FUNDING DELEGATED TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS FROM THE DSG

5.1 The funding delegated, inclusive of the minimum funding guarantee, to individual mainstream schools, academies and free schools in Enfield through the DSG in 2016/17 has been compared with funding delegated in 2015/16. The aim of the comparison was to assess the impact of any requirements as part of the Government's School Funding Reforms and also any contextual changes at individual school level.

It should be noted that the information:

- -used for the comparison refers solely to the revenue funding provided through the DSG and also the pupil premium grant funding distributed through the Local Authority to each school;
- -for academies and free schools was included in the DSG for the first time last financial year. This was because the responsibility for calculating transferred from the Education Funding Agency to local authorities. The pupil numbers for academies and free schools is based on estimates and therefore not totally reliable, so it has not been possible to do a full comparison, which includes academies and free schools.
- -for special schools has not been included. This is because special schools are funded on a place plus approach and the funding is agreed separately as part of the arrangements for the High Needs block.

Members are reminded that data used to allocate funding to individual schools is informed by the October Pupil Census as supplied by the Education Funding Agency. For this reason, the data may not necessarily match the local dataset held by either individual schools or the Local Authority.

The comparison was analysed to assess the impact of any contextual changes at individual school level. The attached Appendix B is in three parts and includes school level information on:

- per pupil funding;
- total funding from each of the blocks that forms the DSG and pupil premium funding delegated;
- data such as pupil numbers, numbers of pupils identified for free school meals, IDACI, prior attainment, English as an additional language and mobility funding.

This section of the report highlights the key areas from the analysis carried out.

5.3 Table 2 below shows the range of changes in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17, excluding pupil premium and also academies and free schools. In line with the school funding regulations, it can be seen there is very little variation in the per-pupil funding between the two years. This is due to the effect of the minimum funding guarantee and lack of local flexibility to interrogate and inform any change.

Sector		2015/16 Per Pupil Funding £	2016/17 Per Pupil Funding £
Primary	Lowest	3,852	3,851
	Average	4,554	4,498
	Highest	6,279	6,101
Secondary	Lowest	4,924	4,907
	Average	5,655	5,607
	Highest	6,676	6,615

Table 3 below summaries the numbers of schools, excluding academies and free schools, above and below the average per pupil funding for their delegated budget from the Schools Block 2016/17.

Table 3							
	Sector	No of schools above average per pupil funding	No of schools below average per pupil funding				
	Primary	30	32				
	Secondary	4	8				

5.4 Members will note, at individual school level, there are variations in funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17. There are different reasons for these variations and could include changes in pupil numbers, contextual changes, such as free school meal eligibility or a school not continuing to host an ARP or Nurture Group.

Detailed below is an analysis carried out for a sample of schools to further understand any significant increases / decreases in the per-pupil funding:

- (a) <u>Primary</u>
 - (i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Firs Farm: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was -4.0%. It was found the School:

- As part of the expansion programme, had an increase of 31 pupils. With the admission of the additional pupils
 - the School was not eligible to continue to receive the growth fund protection;
 - the non-pupil led funding was distributed across a greater number of pupils;
- Experienced a 3% drop in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- Received IDACI funding for 1 pupil in 2016/17 as opposed to 119 in 2015/16.
- (ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

Raglan Junior: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was 1.9%. It was found the School:

- Saw little change in pupil numbers;
- No change in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- A reduction in numbers attracting IDACI and EAL funding;
- An increase in the number of pupils eligible for low prior attainment funding;
- As the unit rate for low prior attainment is higher than that for IDACI and EAL, this may have contributed to the slight increase in funding.

(b) Secondary

(i) Low Percentage Change in per pupil funding

Edmonton County: the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was -2.6%. It was found the School:

- As part of the expansion programme, had an increase of 82 pupils. With the admission of the additional pupils
 - the School was not eligible to continue to receive the growth fund protection;
 - the non-pupil led funding was distributed across a greater number of pupils;
- Received no funding through the IDACI factor.
- (ii) High Percentage Change in the per pupil funding

Highlands - the percentage change in per pupil funding between 2015/16 and 2016/17 was 0.4%. It was found the School:

- Saw little change in pupil numbers;
- No change in number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- A reduction in numbers receiving IDACI;
- An increase in the number of pupils eligible for low prior attainment;
- As the unit rate for low prior attainment is higher than that for IDACI, this may have contributed to the slight increase in funding.