

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018 REPORT NO. 3

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Schools Forum 14 June 17

REPORT OF:

Executive Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer: name and email:

Sangeeta Brown

E-mail: sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk

Item: 5c

**Subject: Dedicated Schools Grant
2017/18: Analysis**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is intended to support the wider discussion on the impact of the budget decisions on individual schools with data on how Enfield's mainstream school funding formula compares to the formulae used by Enfield's Statistical Neighbours, Outer London authorities and nationally.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Forum is asked to note this report.

3 INTRODUCTION

3.1 In previous years, the Forum has received benchmarking data taken from information published in the Section 251 Budget Statement as required by Section 251 of the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act. This information will not be available until later this year. For this reason, this paper does not include a detailed analysis of the planned spend of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding, but includes analysis of the allocation of DSG to local authorities and the subsequent funding formulae used by local authorities.

3.2 The data on the DSG allocation and funding formulae has been taken from a summary published by the DfE, which includes specifically the value of the indicators used (the formula unit values) and the proportion of funding allocated via each indicator. The DfE information can be found on the DfE website at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/schools-block-funding-formulae-2017-to-2018>.

3.3 To support the discussion on the impact of the budget decisions on individual schools, this paper compares Enfield's DSG and funding formulae with Enfield's Statistical Neighbours, Outer London authorities and nationally.

4 NATIONAL ANALYSIS

Appendix A attached provide information of the analysis carried out in respect of comparing Enfield's DSG allocation and funding formulae with Enfield's Statistical Neighbours, Outer London authorities and nationally. When considering the data, Members should be mindful of the context for setting the local arrangements, such as:

- (a) Historic decisions on the formula allocations, including how funding for new responsibilities was delegated to schools;
- (b) Local decisions on how funding was allocated across the various DSG Blocks;
- (c) The balance of funding between primary and secondary sectors;
- (d) The level of funding received by each authority;

4.1 DSG Analysis

In summary, the DSG analysis considered the proportion of funding provided across the three blocks and summary of the key points are detailed in the table below.

Table 1: DSG: Percentage of Funding Allocated

Factor	Blocks	England (150 LAs)	Outer London (19 LAs)	Statistical Neighbours (11 LAs)	Comments
Pupil numbers (headcount)	Schools	41	2	4	The Analysis indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Enfield is funded in the upper third across all authorities. for the Schools Block: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well above in comparison to Outer London - above average in comparison our Statistical Neighbours. High Needs block is average when compared with Outer London or statistical neighbours.
Unit of funding	Schools	23	6	6	
Total Mainstream	Schools	39	1	3	
3 & 4 Year olds Entitlement	Early Years	51	8	5	
2 Year olds Entitlement	Early Years	21	1	3	
Disability Access Fund	Early Years	62	7	9	
Total EY	Early Years	47	5	4	
Total High Needs	High Needs	49	9	5	

4.2 Schools Block Analysis

The analysis of the Schools block compared the percentage of total funding and also the unit value for each of the formula factors used by Enfield.

Formula Factor Percentages: The table below ranks Enfield, in descending order, against the percentage of funding allocated for each of the factors used in the local formula. In terms of the layout of the table:

- The number of Local Authorities in each category is shown in the table header;
- Enfield’s position was measured against the number of LAs using that factor.

Table 2: Percentage of Funding Allocated for Each Factor

Factor	England (150 LAs)	Outer London (19 LAs)	Statistical Neighbours (11 LAs)	Comments
Pupil Led Funding	47	12	4	Nationally: above average, Statistical neighbours: average Outer London - below average
Basic Entitlement	35	7	6	Enfield is above average. This reflect the key principle to ensure sufficient funding provided through the per pupil entitlement to ensure stability at individual school level.
Deprivation	89	9	8	Nationally: below average Statistical neighbours: below average Outer London: average
EAL	26 out of 137	10	7	The indicators used by Enfield are reflective of the local decisions of least turbulence when implementing the new funding arrangements.
Prior Attainment	97 out of 143	15	8	
Mobility	23 out of 66	8	6	
Lump Sum	122 out of 151	10	6	Nationally: Below average Outer London & Statistical Neighbours: Average
Rates	31 out of 151	9	4	Nationally Statistical Neighbours: Above average Outer London: Average This could be reflective of higher rates or number of maintained schools in each LA
PFI	39 out of 85	5	4	Nationally: Below average Statistical Neighbours: Above Average Outer London: Average
Growth Fund	59 out of 131	14	10	Nationally & Outer London: Below average Statistical Neighbours: Well below average
MFG	28 out of 148	7	5	Enfield is above average.

Formula Factor Rates: The table below ranks Enfield, in descending order, against each of the per pupil factors used in the local formula.

Table 3: Formula Factors: Unit Values

Factor	Sector	England (151)	Outer London (18)	Statistical Neighbours (11)	Comments
AWPU	Prim	19	4	11	Enfield is above average Nationally: £1,559 below maximum Statistical Neighbours & Outer London : £454 below maximum
AWPU - KS3	Second	38	10	6	
AWPU – KS4	Second	36	7	5	
FSM IDACI	Prim	24 – FSM 106 (Average)	3 – FSM 12 (Average)	2 – FSM 7 (Average)	This reflects the decision to use FSM as the main proxy for supporting deprivation.
FMS IDACI	Second	26- FMS 105 (Average)	5 – FMS 13 (Average)	7 – FMS 7 (Average)	
EAL	Primary	83	11	7	The indicators used by Enfield are reflective of the local decisions for the new funding arrangements to provide least turbulence.
EAL	Second	46	9	6	
Prior Attainment	Prim	76	12	5	
Prior Attainment	Second	74	14	4	
Mobility	Prim	35	8	6	
Mobility	Second	22	6	2	
Lump Sum	Prim	19	5	4	
Lump Sum	Second	19	5	4	

5 Local Analysis

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 2017/18 has been compared with funding delegated in 2016/17. The aim of the comparison was to assess the impact of any national or local requirements 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 the pupil premium grant funding distributed through the Local Authority to each school;
- for academies and free schools includes funding allocated through the DSG. It should be noted that pupil numbers used are estimated and therefore not totally reliable. For this reason, 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.

5.2 Table 4 below shows the range of changes in per pupil funding between 2016/17 and 2017/18, excluding pupil premium for maintained 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 change.

Table 4: Comparison of Per Pupil Funding

Sector		2015/16	2016/17
		Per Pupil Funding £	Per Pupil Funding £
Primary	Lowest	3,851	3,866
	Average	4,498	4,480
	Highest	6,101	6,099
Secondary	Lowest	4,907	4,857
	Average	5,638	5,639
	Highest	6,615	6,617

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

Table 5: Distribution of Schools Block funding

Sector	No of schools above average per pupil funding	No of schools below average per pupil funding
Primary	28	31
Secondary	4	5

5.3 Members will note, at individual school level, there are variations in funding between 2016/17 and 2017/18. There are different reasons for these variations and could include changes in:

- pupil numbers: any increases or decreases will lead to a reduction of direct funding, but also the proportion of non-pupil led factors, such as lump sum, attributable against each pupil;
- contextual changes, such as free school meal eligibility;
- ceasing to host an ARP or Nurture Group.

6 Members are asked to note this report.