

Dear Colleague

LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

I would like to invite you to a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum to be held on **Thursday 29 September 2022, 2.00 pm via Teams.**

Please see below the agenda for the meeting.

Yours sincerely

Rachel Condon
Clerk to the Schools Forum

AGENDA

Paper

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Election of Chair and Vice-Chair | |
| 2. | Apologies and Substitutions | |
| 3. | Minutes and Matters Arising | 1 |
| 4. | 2023/24 Provisional National Funding Formula | 2 |
| 5. | DfE consultation on implementation of the Direct National Funding Formula | 3 |
| 6. | 2021/22 Early Years Dedicated Schools Grant Deficit | 4 |
| 7. | Any Other Business | |

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools Forum
via Teams on Monday 4 July 2022 at 10.00am**

Present

Liam Powell	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Chris Parkinson	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Kath Kelly	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Jane McKay	Primary Academy Headteacher
Karen Allen (Chair)	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Alison Ruff	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Kelly Dryden	Special Academy Headteacher
Graham Bett	DNCC Representative
Jane Dawda	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Ed Petrie	Primary Academy Headteacher
Miss J McBrearty	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Beverley Coltman	PVI Early Years Representative
Kirk Hayles	Primary Academy Headteacher

In attendance

Jane Moore, Director of Children and Family Services
Mrs D Taylor, Lead Member Children and Family Services
Alison Bradley, Interim Assistant Director Education and SEND
Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources,
David Atterbury, Head of service, School Sufficiency

Item		Action
1.	Apologies and Substitutions Apologies were received from Carolyn Lewis, Clive Wright, Jane Lennie and Martin Towers.	
2.	Minutes and Matters Arising The minutes of the meeting held on the 6 June 2022 were agreed.	
3.	Transforming SEND and Inclusion in Leicestershire Jane Moore thanked the Forum for meeting at short notice. The purpose of the meeting is to share the overview of the current SEND and LA position and to share the DfE program the LA is being pulled into because of the scale of the difficulties. A presentation was shared with the meeting. Jenny Lawrence spoke of the financial challenges corporately, saying that that it is widely reported in the media that the levels of	

inflation at 9% and expected to rise further, was having a significant effect on the LCC budget and the financial gap in the MTFs is expected to rise from £40m to £70m. Therefore, immediate actions are taking place to look at where more savings can be found. LCC as a relatively low funded authority will feel the hit more quickly than other areas. In addition, the High Needs deficit is continuing to grow and the LCC have invested £25 million pounds to increase local specialist provision and try and stem the flow into Independent Specialist Schools. Looking at the medium term with delays in savings and a need to work with an external partner the deficit could rise to £99 million. National and Technical accounting changes will require the deficit will have to be covered by revenue which will mean service reductions.

Jenny said that funding alone is not a solution to the problem although part of the solution may have to come back to future school block transfers. The level of EHCP requests in Leicestershire is much higher than other LA's both nationally and in the East Midlands.

Jane Moore then spoke about the DfE position and the launch of the SEN Green Paper. The DfE have launched a 3 tiered intervention program. The first tier being the Safety Valve where the DfE enter into rigid agreements with local authorities requiring specific actions take autonomy away from the LA and the schools. LCC are in the second tier, Delivering Better Value. The DfE are offering delivery support diagnostics and support with implementation with a small grant of £40,000, full details of the support are currently under discussion and yet to be fully identified. LCC has done the diagnostic work the DfE are delivering in phase 1 already and are looking to jump straight into the implementation stage as the timing is now critical in order to avoid moving to a safety valve position. The third tier is support from the Education Skills and Funding Agency.

Jane Moore went on to talk about the work already being done to support the changes. There has been a 54% increase in requests for EHCPs from schools and parents. Over half of this growth cannot be explained by population growth nor is it reflective of children requiring SEND support. The LA is not funded per head so the block of money does not grow as EHCP numbers rise. The SENA service has buckled under the weight of the workload and user satisfaction levels are at the lowest they have ever been.

There has been investment in local sufficiency with new SEMH and C&I places being made available and also investment in a new case management system with a self-serve element for parents and schools as increasing queries are adding to the workloads.

The Transforming SEND and Inclusion Program is already working on the findings of the diagnostic work and is looking at the whole system and why the disproportionate demand.

Alison Bradley then spoke about the Transforming SEND and

Inclusion Program, talking of the notional SEND budget given to schools which is equivalent and that 38% of the LA placement budget is spent in schools.

Alison spoke of the need to work collectively with all stakeholders and to have clear roles and responsibilities. It was reiterated that SENA is the administrative part of the process.

Alison spoke of the ambition should be having the right support at the right time in the right place, meeting the needs of SEND across the system.

The role of schools and Schools Forum are very important in this and the DFE are looking at views and the collective voice.

The proposed changes were then highlighted around decision making and ways of working, developing capacity and autonomy which would promote inclusive and early intervention and redesigning and integrating effective interventions to support schools. Skills and expertise is within schools and should be used. Digital and performance and communication and engagement which promotes engagement with all stakeholders and involving school leaders and parents will be key.

Alison finished by saying that the LA is keen to hear from school's forum any and all ideas in terms of change.

Jane Moore concluded the presentation by saying that the present system doesn't work in the best way for children. There need to be changes to the system and a different way of using the current funding. At the moment schools are limited with what they can do for their children. The LA is looking to redesign the system so that schools can do what they need to do to keep the children in mainstream. Jane said that the LA and partners need to step into the space and do things differently. She said it wasn't just about cutting funding and not spending but finding the place to operate within the budget. This has brought to the forum to engage school leaders from the beginning and work for the best outcome.

The Chair thanked Jane for the presentation and opened the floor for questions and comment.

Liam Powell asked that as there was an increased emphasis on schools, forum and stakeholders to be a part of this, without having had time to absorb everything, is the LA saying the money will come from schools to manage the deficit?

Jane Moore responded by saying that there was no defined answer. The Green Paper is about keeping children in mainstream and this may mean movement of funding come from the High Needs block to the Schools Block. The money needs to go to schools. It is a case of using the High Needs Block differently.

Jane Dawda asked about the SEN notional budget saying that

some schools have a higher proportion of plans than others, is there a suggestion of removing the notional budget from schools and giving it to where it is needed.

In response Jane Moore said that the DFE money to schools and the SEN Notional funding is about the whole child and is for the school to manage the educating of the child. The notional funding will need to be looked at and be clear what it is for. The data is difficult because does a school with a higher number of EHCP's mean it is more inclusive or does it mean that those schools with a fewer number are utilizing SEND support. The general consensus is if the funding is according to number of EHCP's the finding would go up. Jenny Lawrence also said that the DFE have made a conscious policy decision not to use the number of EHCP's as a driver for funding. The SEN notional budget will stay but standardised nationally and the £6000 threshold is believed to be under review.

Graham Bett then observed that schools need to be aware of the context. The LCC has realised that spending is not sustainable and the DfE is also coming in saying this is going to be dealt with. With rising costs and rising inflation in schools, this is not the moment for the LCC to say we have a problem and we will take money from the schools block. If the DFE is interested in the schools and the Forum's views how will this be communicated?

School leadership will want to work in partnership and this should not be around money coming from schools. There should be professional input to get a better system. Graham Bett felt that going to other authorities and school leaders was the best way to find out.

Jane Moore answered Graham Bett by saying that the purpose is to make the right money is in the right place. Putting the LCC deficit in context, it is not the imperative but is an imperative. The department have been working on this since 2017 and none of this work has impacted the budget. Schools need to be fundamentally involved and the LA will ask the DfE how they want to capture the information. Whilst talking to school leaders is a good idea, it should be remembered that Nottingham City schools are better funded.

Karen Allen said that the notional budget in her school is eaten up with high needs children. The EHCP can be more costly than the SENIF funding. Parents are not interested in the provision only in the hours. It is the hours that trigger parents. As the provision is there and can be provided without the hours, concentrate on the provision. Majority of children can be helped in a different way without putting hours in the plan. Karen also said that there are more children with complex needs coming to mainstream and if this is where they are to be then there needs to be more support and less jumping through hoops to get that support otherwise it becomes a babysitting exercise and the child is not benefiting.

Jane Moore thanked Karen for her comments and agreed that moving from an hour's based to an outcome's based resource allocation within an EHCP could be an answer but this has been discussed many times in the past but it hasn't been possible to move to implementation. The LA will need help from schools to move this forward. Schools are able to end plans which are not suitable at the annual review and the parent's expectations can be collectively managed at that point. There are children who shouldn't be in mainstream but the special schools have children who maybe could be in mainstream.

Kelly Dryden commented that all specialist school plans are provision led plans are in place already so it would be culture shift and then judgements made on the support level to achieve the outcomes. A blended approach maybe to start with to help parents.

Alison Ruff said that parents think they are entitled to the hours and the funding. She asked what other authorities do around this. Maybe work with a scoring criteria list i.e. are able to toilet alone, feed themselves or move around the school alone. Children who maybe come to school with low ability would not meet the scoring for an EHCP.

Karen Allen agreed and said a lot of children come into school with plans in place and then they thrive in school. The plans are not necessary but parents are loathe to give them up. Perhaps say that it is SENIF funding until the end of Key stage 1 unless the child has very complex needs.

Deborah Taylor added a link to Government research which she said was very interesting
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1084458/DFE_HN_Budget_case_study_report.pdf

Kirk Hayles asked whether there was any monitoring or policing in places as has been mentioned some schools are more open than others to taking children with a high level of need.

Graham Bett then asked about timelines and when any notification would come into schools particularly in respect of a Schools Block transfer.

Jane Moore answered him by saying that there were multiple timelines, already working on reducing costs in independent placements but they have the monopoly and the power. She said that the conversation at this Forum had been extremely useful on the best way to stem demand and any other solutions would be welcomed.

Both Jane Moore and Deborah Taylor reiterated that whilst the school block transfer action would not be taken off the table it is not being looked at, at the moment, as it is not a solution to the deficit but could be part of a solution. If it is needed then the LA will come

	<p>to the Forum in the usual way, there is a defined process set out by the DFE to pursue a transfer. Mrs Taylor finished by saying we need a system shift and not just throw money at it.</p> <p>Karen Allen said that talking to other authorities about how they do things differently would be a way forward.</p> <p>The meeting was then closed.</p>	
4.	Date of Next Meeting Thursday 29 September, 2.00 pm via Teams.	



SCHOOLS FORUM

2023/24 School Funding

29 September 2022

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	X
PVI Settings		Primary	X
Special Schools / Academies	X	Secondary	X
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	X

1. This report presents the high level detail of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Settlement and the National Funding Formula (NFF) for 2023/24 announced by the DfE in July.

Recommendations

2. That Schools Forum note the report, particularly the approach to be taken in the event of an affordability issue to align school budget allocations to the Schools Block DSG set out in Paragraph 12.

2023/24 School Funding

3. The 2023/24 provisional Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement has given information on the Schools, High Needs and Central Services Blocks;

Schools Block

4. The settlement information is based upon the October 2021 census. Nationally the overall increase in school funding is 1.9% per pupil compared to 2022/23. The DfE state that the overall increase to school funding when compared to 2022/23 is 7.9% per pupil.
5. Whilst the 2023/24 school formula allocations will be updated for the 2022 October census pupil characteristics such as free school meal eligibility the DSG allocation for the local authority will not. As a result, and in line with previous years, the DSG allocation may not be sufficient to meet the costs of delivering the National Funding Formula and individual school allocations may have to be adjusted through either capping or scaling to ensure affordability.
6. It remains a 'soft' funding formula for 2023/24 i.e. local authorities may set their own formula. 2023/24 continues the mandatory movement to the NFF for those authorities who have partially moved towards its delivery in one of two ways: the first being local authorities can only use NFF formula factors and the second being that local authorities must move to with 10% of the NFF values. The Leicestershire Funding Formula for 2022/23 fully reflects the NFF and these national changes therefore do not impact on the level of funding for Leicestershire schools.
7. The DfE have issued a consultation on proposed changes to the NFF from 2023/24 and the movement to a Direct NFF which will see funding allocations calculated nationally by the DfE with exceptionally limited flexibility for local authorities.
8. The changes to school funding for 2023/24 are:
 - Mainstreaming of the 2022/23 Supplementary Grant which results in an increase in the Minimum per Pupil Funding Level (MPPL)
 - MPPL 's set at £4,405 per pupil for primary and secondary £5,715 and as in previous years are mandatory
 - 2.4% increase to the basic entitlement, low prior attainment, FSM, English as an additional language, mobility and sparsity factors.
 - 4.3% increase to FSM6 and IDACI factors
 - 0% increase to premises factors
 - A minimum per pupil increase of 0.5%
9. Overall schools are guaranteed an increase of 0.5% per pupil from 2022/23 funding levels (combined 2022/23 NFF and Supplementary Grant) and there is no limit on gains within the NFF. The provisional position for all Leicestershire schools as published by the DfE is attached as Appendix 1. It should be noted that the DfE published allocations do not include premises funding and are purely the application of the 2023/23 NFF to October 2021 recorded pupil characteristics. The local authority has only recently received the dataset used by the DfE for generating the 2023/24 NFF baselines, as such they are unvalidated.
10. Overall 57 (25%) of primary schools are funded at the funding floor of plus 0.5% per pupil, a slight increase from 72 (32%) in 2022/23. 7 (16%) of secondary schools are funded at the floor which is unchanged from 2022/23. It should be noted that without

a nationally guaranteed increase per pupil these schools would not receive an increase in funding and are vulnerable to future decisions on levels of funding protection.

11. The increase in funding is per pupil, schools with falling rolls will not see increases in cash budgets. Schools with falling rolls can expect a cash reduction in budget as
12. As in previous years the local authorities Schools Block DSG is fixed at a rate reflecting pupil characteristics from October 2021, the school budgets it funds will be based on the pupil characteristics from the October 2022 census. Whilst the grant allocation will flex with changes in pupil numbers the local authority funding rate will not take account of changes in factors such as FSM, IDACI meaning local authorities are unfunded for any increases in the number of pupils qualifying for the additional factors. Should increase in these result in the Schools Block DSG being insufficient adjustments would have to be made to the funding formula, in these instances the DfE allow for local authorities to adjust MFG or generally scale back the allocation within the formula. Should an affordability issue arise the most appropriate adjustment would need to be made and would more likely need to be a capping or scaling adjustment.

High Needs Block

13. High needs funding has been increased nationally, authorities will receive a minimum increase of 5% per head of the 2-18 population and a maximum of 7% per head. Leicestershire remains at the funding floor with an 5% increase. It should be noted that the population factor only generates 34% of the High Needs DSG allocation with other funding more specifically allocated based on levels of attainment, deprivation and health/disability.
14. The provisional allocation is £99.8m and will be confirmed in December and is in line with expectations. Leicestershire continues to receive floor funding which for 2023/24 is 2.9%. Whilst this funding is reducing annually it should be noted that this allocation is the amount at which Leicestershire is funded above the funding generated by the national formula.
15. Pressure remains within the high needs block where the cost and number of SEN placements continues to further increase. The Council has recently engaged Newton Europe to support the local authority's transformation of SEND services through the Transforming SEND and Inclusion in Leicestershire (TSIL) programme.
16. Local authorities remain able to transfer funding of to 0.5% transfer funding from the Schools Block to High Needs following consultation with schools and the approval of Schools Forum and with the Secretary of State permission should Schools Forum not approve and for amounts exceeding 0.5%. Leicestershire is not proposing such a transfer for 2023/24 but it does remain an option for consideration in future years.
17. A consultation on the future of high needs funding was expected to follow the publication of the SEND review but is yet unsighted. Whilst not explicit the expectation is that this will now follow the outcome of the consultation on the SEND Green Paper, the timing of this is uncertain.

Central Services Block

18. The provisional settlement is £3.8m and remains split into two elements:

- On-going responsibilities – this sees an increase of 4.9% against a guaranteed increase of 2.5% nationally, the higher increase is a result of Leicestershire being a low spending authority when baselines were originally set. The cap on gains is set at 5.86%
- Historic Commitments – the DfE's expectation is that historic financial commitments should reduce over time continues and a reduction in this element is a further 20%. This element of funding meets the costs of some former and longstanding school related premature retirement costs and a guarantee remains that no authority will receive less funding than these commitments. This element of the settlement also makes a contribution to School Effectiveness to support maintained schools causing concern and is a pressure within that service that will need consideration within the Council's MTFS process. The DfE maintain their view that de-delegation is an option for local authorities to follow to ensure continuity of funding for non-statutory school improvement activity.

Early Years Block

19. No final information has yet been released on this block for 2023/24. However, the DfE are consulting on a change to the funding allocation which would result in a funding increase for Leicestershire, although we would still be at the floor level of funding.

Resource Implications

20. These are set out in the main body of the report.

Equal Opportunity Issues

21. None arising from this report

Background Papers

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-funding-formula-tables-for-schools-and-high-needs-2023-to-2024>

Officers to Contact

Jenny Lawrence
Finance Business Partner
Email: jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk
Tel: 01163056401

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24					
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]
Ashby-de-la-Zouch Church of England Primary School	Primary	299	£1,335,782	100%	304	£1,361,700	£4,479	1.94%	0.50%
Barrow Hall Orchard Church of England Primary School	Primary	524	£2,296,168	100%	515	£2,269,583	£4,407	-1.16%	0.50%
Blaby Stokes Church of England Primary School	Primary	383	£1,679,511	100%	371	£1,638,414	£4,416	-2.45%	0.50%
Booth Wood Primary School	Primary	232	£1,204,376	100%	229	£1,195,971	£5,223	-0.70%	0.50%
Bottesford Church of England Primary School	Primary	240	£1,064,564	100%	227	£1,018,263	£4,486	-4.35%	0.50%
Burbage Junior School	Primary	377	£1,681,278	100%	365	£1,640,221	£4,494	-2.44%	0.50%
Church Hill Infant School	Primary	209	£975,762	100%	193	£914,776	£4,740	-6.25%	0.50%
Church Langton Church of England Primary School	Primary	206	£903,272	100%	204	£899,584	£4,410	-0.41%	0.50%
Cossington Church of England Primary School	Primary	105	£529,022	100%	101	£516,134	£5,110	-2.44%	0.50%
Ellistown Community Primary School	Primary	209	£944,800	100%	200	£914,593	£4,573	-3.20%	0.50%
Enderby Danemill Primary School	Primary	401	£1,759,070	100%	388	£1,714,083	£4,418	-2.56%	0.50%
Griffydham Primary School	Primary	111	£556,527	100%	108	£547,239	£5,067	-1.67%	0.50%
Hallam Fields, Birstall	Primary	150	£711,036	100%	177	£819,423	£4,630	15.24%	0.50%
Higham-on-the-Hill Church of England Primary School	Primary	88	£477,991	100%	79	£443,768	£5,617	-7.16%	0.50%
Highcliffe Primary School and Community Centre	Primary	416	£1,820,907	100%	402	£1,772,114	£4,408	-2.68%	0.50%
Holy Cross School A Catholic Voluntary Academy	Primary	143	£686,461	100%	135	£657,854	£4,873	-4.17%	0.50%
Hose Church of England Primary School	Primary	50	£336,779	100%	57	£363,989	£6,386	8.08%	0.50%
Lady Jane Grey Primary School	Primary	211	£924,487	100%	209	£920,882	£4,406	-0.39%	0.50%
Little Bowden School	Primary	398	£1,769,815	100%	386	£1,729,019	£4,479	-2.31%	0.50%
Loughborough Church of England Primary School	Primary	206	£975,304	100%	206	£979,540	£4,755	0.43%	0.50%
Lubenham All Saints Church of England Primary School	Primary	61	£396,940	100%	65	£415,061	£6,386	4.56%	0.50%
Manorfield Church of England Primary School	Primary	415	£1,818,840	100%	411	£1,810,915	£4,406	-0.44%	0.50%
Mercenfeld Primary School	Primary	308	£1,352,163	100%	300	£1,326,329	£4,421	-1.91%	0.50%
New Lubbethorpe Primary School	Primary	175	£918,166	100%	253	£1,276,066	£5,044	38.98%	0.50%
Newbold Church of England Primary School	Primary	40	£331,605	100%	40	£332,609	£8,315	0.30%	0.50%
Newbold Verdon Primary School	Primary	240	£1,152,423	100%	233	£1,127,985	£4,841	-2.12%	0.50%
Newlands Community Primary School	Primary	276	£1,318,057	100%	284	£1,357,490	£4,780	2.99%	0.50%
Old Mill Primary School	Primary	397	£1,739,474	100%	380	£1,678,181	£4,416	-3.52%	0.50%
Queniborough Church of England Primary School	Primary	208	£937,325	100%	206	£933,551	£4,532	-0.40%	0.50%
Ravenhurst Primary School	Primary	492	£2,197,835	100%	454	£2,050,389	£4,516	-6.71%	0.50%
Red Hill Field Primary School	Primary	295	£1,292,624	100%	282	£1,246,868	£4,422	-3.54%	0.50%
Rendell Primary School	Primary	364	£1,750,714	100%	375	£1,808,111	£4,822	3.28%	0.50%
Ridgeway Primary Academy	Primary	266	£1,169,574	100%	266	£1,174,781	£4,416	0.45%	0.50%
Saint John Fisher Catholic Voluntary Academy, Wigston, Leicestershire	Primary	202	£900,930	100%	204	£912,486	£4,473	1.28%	0.50%
Saint Peters Catholic Voluntary Academy	Primary	201	£937,212	100%	204	£953,396	£4,674	1.73%	0.50%
Seagrave Village Primary School	Primary	97	£537,538	100%	98	£543,407	£5,545	1.09%	0.50%
Sherard Primary School	Primary	383	£1,679,596	100%	380	£1,675,140	£4,408	-0.27%	0.50%
St Hardulph's Church of England Primary School	Primary	58	£410,529	100%	56	£404,038	£7,215	-1.58%	0.50%
St Peter's Church of England Primary Academy	Primary	246	£1,083,089	100%	245	£1,083,962	£4,424	0.08%	0.50%
St Simon and St Jude CofE Primary School	Primary	150	£790,487	100%	150	£793,800	£5,292	0.42%	0.50%
Stafford Leys Community Primary School	Primary	590	£2,583,264	100%	555	£2,449,161	£4,413	-5.19%	0.50%
Stanton Under Bardon Community Primary School	Primary	110	£570,392	100%	111	£576,360	£5,192	1.05%	0.50%
Swallowdale Primary School and Community Centre	Primary	381	£1,671,552	100%	384	£1,691,520	£4,405	1.19%	0.50%
Swithland St Leonard's Church of England Primary School	Primary	96	£488,587	100%	96	£490,364	£5,108	0.36%	0.50%
The Latimer Primary School	Primary	374	£1,669,038	100%	376	£1,684,790	£4,481	0.94%	0.50%
The Meadow Community Primary School	Primary	410	£1,797,795	100%	400	£1,765,214	£4,413	-1.81%	0.50%
The Pastures Primary School	Primary	314	£1,375,048	100%	308	£1,357,335	£4,407	-1.29%	0.50%
Thorpe Acre Infant School	Primary	124	£721,444	100%	140	£799,872	£5,713	10.87%	0.50%
Thorpe Acre Junior School	Primary	184	£1,002,281	100%	180	£987,774	£5,488	-1.45%	0.50%

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24					
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]
Thrussington Church of England Primary School	Primary	75	£415,416	100%	78	£428,408	£5,492	3.13%	0.50%
Viscount Beaumont's Church of England Primary School	Primary	84	£450,960	100%	77	£425,527	£5,526	-5.64%	0.50%
Warren Hills Community Primary School	Primary	193	£1,163,158	100%	187	£1,136,554	£6,078	-2.29%	0.50%
Westfield Infant School	Primary	289	£1,317,756	100%	283	£1,299,266	£4,591	-1.40%	0.50%
Westfield Junior School	Primary	386	£1,766,427	100%	378	£1,740,886	£4,606	-1.45%	0.50%
Witherley Church of England Primary School	Primary	101	£524,845	100%	104	£538,459	£5,177	2.59%	0.50%
Woolden Hill Primary School	Primary	203	£937,390	100%	201	£933,423	£4,644	-0.42%	0.50%
Worthington School	Primary	73	£450,648	100%	71	£443,530	£6,247	-1.58%	0.50%
Brookside Primary School	Primary	445	£1,948,255	100%	436	£1,920,580	£4,405	-1.42%	0.51%
The Merton Primary School	Primary	418	£1,830,481	100%	411	£1,810,455	£4,405	-1.09%	0.51%
Woodhouse Eaves St Paul's Church of England Primary School	Primary	205	£914,185	100%	205	£918,090	£4,478	0.43%	0.51%
Barwell Infant School	Primary	169	£830,744	100%	166	£823,483	£4,961	-0.87%	0.53%
Townlands Church of England Primary School	Primary	361	£1,583,207	100%	363	£1,599,015	£4,405	1.00%	0.53%
Ratby Primary School	Primary	369	£1,617,933	100%	371	£1,634,255	£4,405	1.01%	0.55%
Mountfields Lodge School	Primary	490	£2,146,670	100%	488	£2,149,640	£4,405	0.14%	0.56%
Brownlow Primary School	Primary	568	£2,487,756	100%	565	£2,488,825	£4,405	0.04%	0.58%
Houghton-on-the-Hill Church of England Primary School	Primary	211	£925,650	100%	212	£934,087	£4,406	0.91%	0.58%
Kirby Muxloe Primary School	Primary	400	£1,750,690	100%	394	£1,735,570	£4,405	-0.86%	0.58%
Battling Brook Primary School	Primary	599	£2,622,978	100%	595	£2,620,975	£4,405	-0.08%	0.59%
Woodland Grange Primary School	Primary	448	£1,960,491	100%	441	£1,942,605	£4,405	-0.91%	0.60%
Broom Leys School	Primary	586	£2,571,032	100%	608	£2,678,240	£4,405	4.17%	0.61%
Outwoods Edge Primary School	Primary	415	£1,818,415	100%	417	£1,836,885	£4,405	1.02%	0.61%
Brocks Hill Primary School	Primary	424	£1,855,718	100%	420	£1,850,100	£4,405	-0.30%	0.62%
Little Hill Primary	Primary	415	£1,818,500	100%	418	£1,841,290	£4,405	1.25%	0.62%
Glen Hills Primary School	Primary	509	£2,229,633	100%	512	£2,255,360	£4,405	1.15%	0.63%
Millfield L.E.A.D. Academy	Primary	405	£1,775,220	100%	410	£1,806,050	£4,405	1.74%	0.63%
Glenfield Primary School	Primary	419	£1,836,203	100%	424	£1,867,720	£4,405	1.72%	0.64%
Holywell Primary School	Primary	418	£1,829,121	100%	414	£1,823,670	£4,405	-0.30%	0.64%
Burton-on-the-Wolds Primary School	Primary	192	£853,607	100%	193	£862,016	£4,466	0.99%	0.65%
Sherrier Church of England Primary School	Primary	399	£1,748,028	100%	402	£1,770,810	£4,405	1.30%	0.65%
Kibworth Church of England Primary School	Primary	615	£2,691,155	100%	610	£2,687,050	£4,405	-0.15%	0.66%
Swannington Church of England Primary School	Primary	82	£449,302	100%	73	£415,954	£5,698	-7.42%	0.67%
Ashby Willesley Primary School	Primary	416	£1,820,142	100%	414	£1,823,670	£4,405	0.19%	0.69%
Greenfield Primary School	Primary	630	£2,808,424	100%	627	£2,814,159	£4,488	0.20%	0.69%
Richmond Primary School	Primary	515	£2,258,185	100%	533	£2,347,865	£4,405	3.97%	0.69%
Ashby Hill Top Primary School	Primary	311	£1,362,812	100%	315	£1,387,575	£4,405	1.82%	0.71%
Riverside Community Primary School Birstall	Primary	482	£2,111,264	100%	490	£2,158,450	£4,405	2.23%	0.71%
Saint Winefride's Catholic Voluntary Academy, Shepshed, Leicestershire	Primary	164	£791,802	100%	167	£808,730	£4,843	2.14%	0.71%
Great Glen St Cuthbert's Church of England Primary School	Primary	285	£1,272,229	100%	290	£1,300,155	£4,483	2.20%	0.72%
Badgerbrook Primary School	Primary	420	£1,881,622	100%	420	£1,894,388	£4,510	0.68%	0.74%
Highgate Primary School	Primary	224	£1,081,176	100%	228	£1,075,511	£4,717	-0.52%	0.74%
Hugglescote Community Primary School	Primary	431	£1,927,903	100%	444	£1,994,411	£4,492	3.45%	0.74%
Elizabeth Woodville Primary School	Primary	210	£936,231	100%	212	£949,796	£4,480	1.45%	0.75%
Long Whatton Church of England Primary School and Community Centre	Primary	96	£494,449	100%	99	£509,332	£5,145	3.01%	0.75%
Meadowdale Primary School	Primary	342	£1,501,542	100%	357	£1,572,585	£4,405	4.73%	0.75%
Desford Community Primary School	Primary	402	£1,785,438	100%	407	£1,817,536	£4,466	1.80%	0.76%
Greystoke Primary School	Primary	357	£1,564,144	100%	364	£1,603,420	£4,405	2.51%	0.76%
Broomfield Community Primary School	Primary	208	£912,761	100%	193	£861,749	£4,465	-5.59%	0.77%
Launde Primary School	Primary	623	£2,724,606	100%	625	£2,753,125	£4,405	1.05%	0.77%

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24						
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)	
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]	
Newcroft Primary Academy	Primary	386	£1,692,002	100%	398	£1,753,190	£4,405	3.62%	0.78%	
The Hall School	Primary	415	£1,853,024	100%	418	£1,875,338	£4,486	1.20%	0.78%	
Saint Peter's Catholic Primary School, A Voluntary Academy	Primary	208	£911,486	100%	204	£902,607	£4,425	-0.97%	0.81%	
Gaddesby Primary School	Primary	187	£820,054	100%	190	£836,950	£4,405	2.06%	0.82%	
Rothley Church of England Primary School	Primary	447	£1,957,574	100%	460	£2,026,300	£4,405	3.51%	0.82%	
St Bartholomew's Church of England Primary School	Primary	528	£2,345,306	100%	536	£2,396,920	£4,472	2.20%	0.83%	
Whitwick St John The Baptist Church of England Primary School	Primary	348	£1,558,096	100%	369	£1,655,909	£4,488	6.28%	0.90%	
Blackfordby St Margaret's Church of England Primary School	Primary	91	£479,605	100%	89	£474,992	£5,337	-0.96%	0.91%	
Burbage Church of England Infant School	Primary	253	£1,126,023	100%	260	£1,162,391	£4,471	3.23%	0.91%	
Market Harborough Church of England Academy	Primary	354	£1,551,738	100%	370	£1,629,850	£4,405	5.03%	0.92%	
Orchard Community Primary School	Primary	314	£1,404,289	100%	326	£1,460,980	£4,482	4.04%	0.92%	
Fleckney Church of England Primary School	Primary	407	£1,812,308	100%	424	£1,897,614	£4,476	4.71%	0.94%	
Ibstock Junior School	Primary	310	£1,384,522	100%	328	£1,469,042	£4,479	6.10%	0.99%	
Gilmorton Chandler Church of England Primary School	Primary	210	£920,465	100%	211	£932,240	£4,418	1.28%	1.00%	
Dunton Bassett Primary School	Primary	86	£510,105	100%	77	£479,842	£6,232	-5.93%	1.07%	
Hinckley Parks Primary School	Primary	505	£2,213,290	100%	559	£2,462,395	£4,405	11.25%	1.13%	
Sketchley Hill Primary School Burbage	Primary	506	£2,244,999	100%	540	£2,410,444	£4,464	7.37%	1.14%	
Measham Church of England Primary School	Primary	210	£1,026,476	100%	200	£993,805	£4,969	-3.18%	1.18%	
Stonebow Primary School Loughborough	Primary	252	£1,112,958	100%	233	£1,049,453	£4,504	-5.71%	1.18%	
Thythorn Field Community Primary School	Primary	196	£954,296	100%	200	£980,732	£4,904	2.77%	1.20%	
Orchard Church of England Primary School, Broughton Astley	Primary	193	£868,569	100%	190	£866,101	£4,558	-0.28%	1.22%	
Croft Church of England Primary School	Primary	141	£684,786	100%	128	£640,982	£5,008	-6.40%	1.23%	
Thringstone Primary School	Primary	170	£849,332	100%	151	£776,770	£5,144	-8.54%	1.26%	
Fernvale Primary School	Primary	259	£1,136,838	100%	280	£1,233,400	£4,405	8.49%	1.35%	
Thurnby, St Luke's Church of England Primary School	Primary	218	£957,519	100%	221	£980,348	£4,436	2.38%	1.36%	
Sacred Heart Catholic Voluntary Academy	Primary	199	£891,474	100%	196	£890,267	£4,542	-0.14%	1.37%	
St Margaret's Church of England Primary School, Stoke Golding	Primary	223	£978,616	100%	221	£982,644	£4,446	0.41%	1.38%	
Bishop Ellis Catholic Primary School, Thurmaston	Primary	294	£1,303,062	100%	281	£1,281,361	£4,560	-1.67%	1.39%	
Asfordby Hill Primary School	Primary	191	£843,247	100%	192	£857,136	£4,464	1.65%	1.41%	
Sileby Redlands Community Primary School	Primary	369	£1,618,188	100%	384	£1,702,460	£4,433	5.21%	1.53%	
Robert Bakewell Primary School	Primary	294	£1,373,900	100%	284	£1,351,139	£4,758	-1.66%	1.63%	
Ullesthorpe Church of England Primary School	Primary	101	£516,470	100%	106	£542,402	£5,117	5.02%	1.64%	
Langmoor Primary School Oadby	Primary	209	£973,471	100%	208	£983,460	£4,728	1.03%	1.67%	
St Denys Church of England Infant School, Ibstock	Primary	260	£1,165,584	100%	258	£1,174,619	£4,553	0.78%	1.67%	
Parkland Primary School South Wigston	Primary	568	£2,578,023	100%	586	£2,698,531	£4,605	4.67%	1.70%	
Kegworth Primary School	Primary	210	£935,089	100%	215	£967,913	£4,502	3.51%	1.72%	
Wymeswold Church of England Primary School	Primary	108	£554,033	100%	118	£597,292	£5,062	7.81%	1.72%	
Ab Kettleby School	Primary	69	£447,273	100%	67	£444,056	£6,628	-0.72%	1.73%	
Sharnford Church of England Primary School	Primary	96	£523,570	100%	98	£538,124	£5,491	2.78%	1.75%	
Hallbrook Primary School	Primary	208	£913,088	100%	198	£888,697	£4,488	-2.67%	1.79%	
Great Dalby School	Primary	141	£645,541	100%	142	£658,427	£4,637	2.00%	1.80%	
Redmile Church of England Primary School	Primary	78	£474,411	100%	73	£460,696	£6,311	-2.89%	1.80%	
Congerstone Primary School	Primary	180	£798,150	100%	182	£818,229	£4,496	2.52%	1.90%	
Farndon Fields Primary School	Primary	259	£1,136,158	100%	293	£1,290,665	£4,405	13.60%	1.94%	
Cosby Primary School	Primary	235	£1,031,470	100%	256	£1,131,452	£4,420	9.69%	1.96%	
Scalford Church of England Primary School	Primary	78	£481,893	100%	72	£464,994	£6,458	-3.51%	1.97%	
Eastfield Primary School	Primary	353	£1,573,750	100%	366	£1,656,686	£4,526	5.27%	1.98%	
Waltham on the Wolds Church of England Primary School	Primary	83	£493,681	100%	95	£548,147	£5,770	11.03%	2.03%	
Belvoirdale Community Primary School	Primary	292	£1,360,663	100%	283	£1,347,698	£4,762	-0.95%	2.07%	

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24					
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]
Ashby Hastings Primary School	Primary	25	£221,450	100%	43	£292,105	£6,793	31.91%	2.10%
Heather Primary School	Primary	111	£556,554	100%	111	£565,342	£5,093	1.58%	2.13%
Oxley Primary School Shepshed	Primary	260	£1,160,328	100%	254	£1,158,195	£4,560	-0.18%	2.14%
St Peter and St Paul Church of England Academy	Primary	408	£1,792,189	100%	401	£1,800,454	£4,490	0.46%	2.25%
Hathern Church of England Primary School	Primary	181	£869,352	100%	189	£911,714	£4,824	4.87%	2.26%
St Charles Catholic Primary Voluntary Academy	Primary	141	£680,055	100%	133	£660,555	£4,967	-2.87%	2.27%
Stathern Primary School	Primary	99	£521,074	100%	94	£511,316	£5,440	-1.87%	2.33%
Claybrooke Primary School	Primary	68	£389,401	100%	74	£419,118	£5,664	7.63%	2.34%
St Botolph's Church of England Primary School	Primary	310	£1,382,253	100%	295	£1,350,274	£4,577	-2.31%	2.36%
Barwell Church of England Academy	Primary	252	£1,166,171	100%	242	£1,148,579	£4,746	-1.51%	2.37%
Glenmere Community Primary School	Primary	214	£938,338	100%	210	£942,165	£4,487	0.41%	2.39%
Richard Hill Church of England Primary School	Primary	140	£658,556	100%	127	£620,911	£4,889	-5.72%	2.41%
St Michael & All Angels Church of England Primary School	Primary	90	£461,757	100%	86	£454,675	£5,287	-1.53%	2.43%
Water Leys Primary School	Primary	421	£1,870,989	100%	422	£1,917,294	£4,543	2.47%	2.45%
Woodstone Community Primary School	Primary	213	£968,553	100%	211	£980,765	£4,648	1.26%	2.47%
Packington Church of England Primary School	Primary	103	£510,002	100%	101	£511,833	£5,068	0.36%	2.48%
St Peter's Church of England Primary School Whetstone	Primary	200	£907,374	100%	201	£930,984	£4,632	2.60%	2.52%
Hemington Primary School	Primary	49	£335,111	100%	50	£344,539	£6,891	2.81%	2.57%
Frisby Church of England Primary School	Primary	107	£551,269	100%	106	£557,593	£5,260	1.15%	2.58%
Belton Church of England Primary School	Primary	103	£550,340	100%	107	£575,393	£5,378	4.55%	2.59%
Saint Mary's Catholic Primary School, Loughborough	Primary	198	£928,613	100%	198	£949,445	£4,795	2.24%	2.60%
Snarestone Church of England Primary School	Primary	75	£451,473	100%	68	£432,051	£6,354	-4.30%	2.60%
Croxton Kerial Church of England Primary School	Primary	61	£434,963	100%	53	£408,574	£7,709	-6.07%	2.61%
Fairfield Community Primary School	Primary	209	£989,773	100%	211	£1,020,789	£4,838	3.13%	2.62%
Fossebrook Primary School	Primary	198	£917,365	100%	207	£975,355	£4,712	6.32%	2.68%
St Andrew's Church of England Primary School, North Kilworth	Primary	65	£371,551	100%	72	£404,329	£5,616	8.82%	2.69%
The Pochin School	Primary	139	£669,615	100%	137	£676,031	£4,935	0.96%	2.70%
Cobden Primary School & Community Centre	Primary	347	£1,757,116	100%	361	£1,868,819	£5,177	6.36%	2.71%
New Swannington Primary School	Primary	200	£910,146	100%	193	£903,435	£4,681	-0.74%	2.71%
St Mary's Church of England Primary School	Primary	197	£929,881	100%	204	£981,189	£4,810	5.52%	2.75%
Long Clawson Church of England Primary School	Primary	75	£489,527	100%	73	£489,704	£6,708	0.04%	2.80%
Diseworth Church of England Primary School	Primary	65	£449,732	100%	66	£461,357	£6,990	2.58%	2.86%
Swinford Church of England Primary School	Primary	115	£585,634	100%	117	£605,788	£5,178	3.44%	2.87%
Beacon Academy	Primary	310	£1,565,072	100%	305	£1,582,668	£5,189	1.12%	2.88%
Old Dalby Church of England Primary School	Primary	138	£674,459	100%	132	£666,074	£5,046	-1.24%	2.90%
Saint Clare's Primary School A Catholic Voluntary Academy, Coalville, Leicestershire	Primary	186	£904,959	100%	201	£992,559	£4,938	9.68%	2.97%
Church Hill Church of England Junior School	Primary	331	£1,456,929	100%	300	£1,368,650	£4,562	-6.06%	3.00%
Sheepy Magna Church of England Primary School	Primary	107	£547,850	100%	108	£563,228	£5,215	2.81%	3.07%
Thornton Primary School	Primary	130	£638,837	100%	132	£662,028	£5,015	3.63%	3.08%
South Kilworth Church of England Primary School	Primary	77	£421,787	100%	73	£415,358	£5,690	-1.52%	3.17%
Albert Village Primary School	Primary	203	£911,920	100%	200	£924,926	£4,625	1.43%	3.18%
St Joseph's Catholic Voluntary Academy	Primary	193	£853,512	100%	203	£915,364	£4,509	7.25%	3.18%
Great Bowden Academy, A Church of England Primary School	Primary	138	£641,343	100%	127	£615,916	£4,850	-3.96%	3.28%
Kingsway Primary School	Primary	302	£1,323,639	100%	311	£1,399,976	£4,502	5.77%	3.31%
Woodcote Primary School	Primary	181	£908,227	100%	174	£903,444	£5,192	-0.53%	3.37%
Newton Burgoland Primary School	Primary	87	£486,604	100%	83	£482,301	£5,811	-0.88%	3.42%
Christ Church & Saint Peter's Cofe Primary School	Primary	417	£1,836,423	100%	418	£1,900,374	£4,546	3.48%	3.50%
Huncote Primary School	Primary	190	£835,334	100%	192	£867,805	£4,520	3.89%	3.50%
Blaby Thistly Meadow Primary School	Primary	201	£913,834	100%	232	£1,096,421	£4,726	19.98%	3.51%

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24					
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]
Billesdon Church of England Primary School	Primary	85	£508,122	100%	85	£519,642	£6,113	2.27%	3.59%
Oakthorpe Primary School	Primary	101	£536,288	100%	103	£559,335	£5,430	4.30%	3.59%
All Saints Church of England Primary School, Sapcote	Primary	272	£1,195,088	100%	305	£1,367,872	£4,485	14.46%	3.62%
Arnesby Church of England Primary School	Primary	70	£446,663	100%	63	£429,003	£6,810	-3.95%	3.63%
Foxtton Primary School	Primary	95	£561,401	100%	90	£554,494	£6,161	-1.23%	3.63%
Sir John Moore Church of England Primary School	Primary	150	£683,002	100%	151	£706,961	£4,682	3.51%	3.67%
John Wycliffe Primary School	Primary	261	£1,161,254	100%	285	£1,298,103	£4,555	11.78%	3.71%
Martinshaw Primary School	Primary	203	£925,265	100%	214	£998,058	£4,664	7.87%	3.81%
St Edward's Church of England Primary School	Primary	205	£929,415	100%	193	£911,567	£4,723	-1.92%	3.81%
Saint Francis Catholic Primary School	Primary	206	£940,979	100%	207	£976,165	£4,716	3.74%	3.82%
Barlestone Church of England Primary School	Primary	198	£872,289	100%	191	£873,618	£4,574	0.15%	3.85%
Husbands Bosworth Church of England Primary School	Primary	88	£539,849	100%	83	£533,559	£6,428	-1.17%	3.91%
All Saints Church of England Primary School, Coalville	Primary	220	£1,100,475	100%	217	£1,124,428	£5,182	2.18%	3.98%
Bringham Primary School	Primary	165	£723,835	100%	173	£778,639	£4,501	7.57%	4.15%
Dove Bank Primary School	Primary	146	£734,046	100%	146	£758,317	£5,194	3.31%	4.19%
Newtown Linford Primary School	Primary	111	£552,805	100%	112	£574,149	£5,126	3.86%	4.44%
Kilby St Mary's Church of England Primary School	Primary	89	£516,586	100%	76	£480,962	£6,328	-6.90%	4.49%
St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Hinckley	Primary	300	£1,358,167	100%	274	£1,304,117	£4,760	-3.98%	4.54%
St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Bitteswell	Primary	107	£517,205	100%	105	£528,160	£5,030	2.12%	4.77%
The Grove Primary School	Primary	155	£829,827	100%	141	£797,463	£5,656	-3.90%	4.86%
Captains Close Primary School	Primary	168	£769,497	100%	176	£833,236	£4,734	8.28%	4.94%
Moir Primary School	Primary	188	£914,795	100%	185	£942,166	£5,093	2.99%	5.25%
Thurlaston Church of England Primary School	Primary	100	£529,448	100%	91	£514,619	£5,655	-2.80%	5.30%
Hallaton Church of England Primary School	Primary	98	£539,101	100%	90	£527,717	£5,864	-2.11%	5.32%
Donisthorpe Primary School	Primary	204	£913,660	100%	204	£954,642	£4,680	4.49%	5.34%
St Peter's Church of England Primary School Wymondham	Primary	36	£323,335	100%	37	£334,853	£9,050	3.56%	5.36%
Harby Church of England Primary School	Primary	85	£461,705	100%	81	£463,354	£5,720	0.36%	5.49%
All Saints Church of England Primary School	Primary	227	£1,128,541	100%	222	£1,161,738	£5,233	2.94%	5.64%
Tugby Church of England Primary School	Primary	49	£365,193	100%	51	£383,718	£7,524	5.07%	5.92%
Buckminster Primary School	Primary	94	£532,554	100%	80	£500,624	£6,258	-6.00%	6.45%
Somerby Primary School	Primary	45	£363,730	100%	41	£360,250	£8,787	-0.96%	7.63%
Total Indicative Primary NFF Funding			£253,341,548			£256,780,320			
Indicative Primary NFF Increase £						£3,438,773			
Indicative Primary NFF Increase %						1.4%			
Ashby School	Secondary	1,036	£6,230,853	100%	1,071	£6,468,575	£6,040	3.82%	0.50%
Brockington College	Secondary	1,217	£6,925,188	100%	1,196	£6,841,298	£5,720	-1.21%	0.50%
Brookvale Groby Learning Campus	Secondary	1,227	£6,982,412	100%	1,219	£6,971,770	£5,719	-0.15%	0.50%
Kibworth Mead Academy	Secondary	847	£4,821,458	100%	860	£4,917,322	£5,718	1.99%	0.50%
Saint Martin's Catholic Voluntary Academy	Secondary	780	£4,437,342	100%	780	£4,458,889	£5,717	0.49%	0.50%
South Charnwood High School	Secondary	866	£4,927,249	100%	857	£4,901,120	£5,719	-0.53%	0.50%
Stephenson Studio School	Secondary	68	£782,035	100%	83	£930,299	£11,208	18.96%	0.50%
Beauchamp College	Secondary	1,428	£8,119,382	100%	1,424	£8,138,160	£5,715	0.23%	0.52%
The Market Bosworth School	Secondary	838	£4,763,196	100%	827	£4,726,305	£5,715	-0.77%	0.52%
Lutterworth College	Secondary	1,129	£6,418,356	100%	1,204	£6,880,860	£5,715	7.21%	0.67%
Bosworth Academy	Secondary	1,256	£7,150,264	100%	1,243	£7,128,681	£5,735	-0.30%	0.74%
The Robert Smyth Academy	Secondary	763	£4,336,406	100%	806	£4,606,290	£5,715	6.22%	0.74%
Welland Park Academy	Secondary	953	£5,423,718	100%	954	£5,486,466	£5,751	1.16%	1.08%

School Name	Phase	Baseline NFF funding		Notional NFF funding in 2023-24					
		2021-22 pupil count	Baseline funding (2022-23) (total cash)	Proportion of the year for which the school was funded (either 2022-23 or 2022/23)	2022-23 pupil count	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (total cash)	Notional NFF funding in 2023-24 (full-year equivalent) (£ per pupil)	Percentage change in total NFF funding compared to baseline (total)	Percentage change in pupil-led NFF funding (per pupil)
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f] = ([e] / [d]) / [c]	[g] = ([e] - [b]) / [b]	[h]
Hastings High School	Secondary	829	£4,716,772	100%	829	£4,773,860	£5,759	1.21%	1.24%
Lutterworth High School	Secondary	833	£4,736,192	100%	851	£4,906,897	£5,766	3.60%	1.51%
Long Field Spencer Academy	Secondary	771	£4,468,647	100%	828	£4,861,257	£5,871	8.79%	1.54%
Manor High School	Secondary	870	£4,977,113	100%	925	£5,387,837	£5,825	8.25%	2.02%
Wreake Valley Academy	Secondary	640	£3,696,414	100%	705	£4,139,506	£5,872	11.99%	2.05%
Rawlins Academy	Secondary	1,218	£6,988,577	100%	1,229	£7,203,167	£5,861	3.07%	2.20%
John Ferneley College	Secondary	1,189	£6,769,910	100%	1,197	£6,962,741	£5,817	2.85%	2.22%
Humphrey Perkins School	Secondary	763	£4,346,666	100%	771	£4,486,945	£5,820	3.23%	2.25%
The Martin High School Anstey	Secondary	776	£4,465,616	100%	818	£4,804,020	£5,873	7.58%	2.27%
Gartree High School	Secondary	779	£4,440,566	100%	836	£4,861,875	£5,816	9.49%	2.29%
Iveshead School	Secondary	731	£4,427,479	100%	797	£4,906,823	£6,160	10.83%	2.32%
Thomas Estley Community College	Secondary	892	£5,075,490	100%	903	£5,262,604	£5,828	3.69%	2.52%
The Cedars Academy	Secondary	913	£5,377,588	100%	913	£5,510,596	£6,036	2.47%	2.53%
The Winstanley School	Secondary	603	£4,052,102	100%	615	£4,233,217	£6,883	4.47%	2.57%
Woodbrook Vale School	Secondary	834	£4,854,863	100%	834	£4,978,119	£5,969	2.54%	2.61%
The Castle Rock School	Secondary	1,034	£6,255,511	100%	1,074	£6,574,049	£6,121	5.09%	2.66%
Countesthorpe Academy	Secondary	1,217	£7,107,389	100%	1,091	£6,552,853	£6,006	-7.80%	2.69%
Wigston Academy	Secondary	1,318	£7,965,651	100%	1,338	£8,300,918	£6,204	4.21%	2.72%
Ivanhoe College	Secondary	958	£5,254,268	100%	928	£5,229,744	£5,636	-0.47%	2.74%
The Roundhill Academy	Secondary	820	£4,734,802	100%	843	£4,996,356	£5,927	5.52%	2.79%
South Wigston High School	Secondary	844	£5,241,787	100%	842	£5,372,806	£6,381	2.50%	2.81%
The Priory Belvoir Academy	Secondary	647	£3,719,745	100%	676	£3,987,282	£5,898	7.19%	2.84%
Heath Lane Academy	Secondary	572	£3,584,427	100%	608	£3,906,927	£6,426	9.00%	2.86%
Castle Donington College	Secondary	565	£3,273,941	100%	625	£3,708,063	£5,933	13.26%	2.87%
The Newbridge School	Secondary	801	£4,803,760	100%	791	£4,881,736	£6,172	1.62%	2.95%
Redmoor Academy	Secondary	916	£5,308,009	100%	914	£5,450,589	£5,963	2.69%	2.98%
Hinckley Academy and John Cleveland Sixth Form Centre	Secondary	825	£4,870,017	100%	840	£5,102,166	£6,074	4.77%	3.02%
Limehurst Academy	Secondary	612	£3,892,846	100%	618	£4,051,592	£6,556	4.08%	3.20%
Charnwood College	Secondary	383	£2,493,390	100%	429	£2,867,837	£6,685	15.02%	3.41%
De Lisle College Loughborough Leicestershire	Secondary	1,075	£6,144,590	100%	1,070	£6,335,627	£5,921	3.11%	3.66%
Ibstock Community College	Secondary	568	£3,160,902	100%	713	£4,109,251	£5,763	30.00%	4.57%
Total Indicative Secondary NFF Funding			£222,522,888			£231,163,296			
Indicative Secondary NFF Increase £						£8,640,408			
Indicative Secondary NFF Increase %						3.9%			
Total Indicative Leicestershire NFF Funding			£475,864,436			£487,943,616			
Indicative Leicestershire NFF Increase £						£12,079,180			
Indicative Leicestershire NFF Increase %						3%			



SCHOOLS FORUM

Implementing the Direct National Funding Formula – Government Consultation

29 September 2022

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	X
PVI Settings	X	Primary	X
Special Schools / Academies		Secondary	X
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	X
Decision		Maintained Secondary School Members	X
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	X
		All Schools Forum	

1. This report sets out the most recent consultation of the DfE's proposals for final stages of implementation of the National Funding Formula for primary and secondary maintained schools and academies

Recommendations

2. That Schools Forum note the issues arising from the consultation and Leicestershire County Council consultation response to it.

Background

3. The DfE began the implementation of the National Funding Formula (NFF) in 2018 based on the principles of fair, simple and transparent and efficient and predictable. It is also now stated that a Direct NFF (formerly known as a Hard NFF) i.e. a system where formula budgets for all maintained schools and academies are generated by the DfE rather than local authorities support the objectives of the schools white paper.
4. The DfE's stated objectives for the NFF have been consistent. The NFF funds all pupils with the same characteristics at the same rate irrespective of which local authority in which they are educated. Whilst there may be concerns in respect of the funding values added to the pupil characteristics, all local authorities are funded at the same level. Whilst Leicestershire schools may have been underfunded in the past, this is not the case for the future. There will continue to be funding differences at school level, this is not an outcome of funding levels it is a result of need. The NFF provides a basic level of funding for all pupils and then additional funding for pupils with low prior attainment, eligible for free school meals and for pupils from deprived backgrounds measured from their home address. Leicestershire schools are funded at the NFF levels, the only exception to this are the schools receiving additional funding as a result of the funding flow who are funded at levels above the NFF.
5. The ability for local authorities to define their own funding formulae remains but is much reduced for 2023/24 where authorities may only use the factors set out in the NFF in their formula but also restricts the variation in funding levels for each of the factors to 10%. These changes were subject to earlier consultation and are confirmed.
6. The latest consultation was issued in July and the consultation closed on 9 September and considers the approach to a number of issues that have remained unresolved since the first phase of implementation in 2018, largely the approach to funding growing schools, the allocation of premises funding that currently remains outside the NFF and the ability for local authorities to fund exceptional circumstances. The issues considered in the consultation are all no-pupil related factors.
7. The consultation further considers the ability to transfer funding from the Schools Block to High Needs and how that can be addressed in the future together with the scope and calculation of the notional SEN budget. The proposals, particularly around a national approach to funding school growth, would introduce new requirements for local authorities to provide data for both maintained schools and academies. The proposals also introduce further financial risk from the DfE's favoured approach to funding school growth.
8. The remit of school funding reform also appears to have expanded and is now stated to be a supporting mechanism to achieving the objectives set out in the schools white paper. It also requires a change in legislation which is being introduced through the Schools Bill to allow the Secretary of State to directly determine schools funding which is currently within the parliamentary process.
9. The consultation is therefore about how funding change will be achieved rather than should it change. The Leicestershire consultation response is attached as Appendix

1 and the remainder of this report sets out the background to the views set out within it. No timeline is set for achieving the change other than within the next five years or sooner.

The interaction between the direct NFF and funding for high needs

10. The consultation considers the future approach to the ability to transfer funding from the school block to high needs. It confirms the ability to do so will remain, subject to the necessary approvals, and the indicative SEND budget for schools as a successor to the notional SEN budget within a school's formula budget.
11. The proposal for consistency in decision making on future based on nationally agreed option on how any adjustment to the funding formula would be made to deliver any transfer is welcomed although the exceptionally tight timescales to achieve consultation and secure the necessary approvals is unchanged.
12. The principle behind an indicative SEND budget remains challenging. Whilst the notional SEN budget has been an integral part of the school finance system for many years it is widely misunderstood. The proposed approach to its calculation will create national consistency but consistent guidance needs to be introduced to ensure that both schools and local authorities are clear in its application within the high needs funding system.

Growth and Falling Rolls Funding

13. There is currently a disconnect between capital and revenue implications arising from the basic need for additional school places whether that be new school or expanding schools. Whilst local authorities are required to have policies to cover the funding arrangements the DfE remains driven by the desire to achieve consistency.
14. The consultation makes two proposals and the DfE's preferred option is for local options within a national framework rather than a full national system. Whilst this may seem like the preferred option as it will achieve some local flexibility the proposals convey additional financial risks to local authorities with little or no tools to address the potential for school block overspends.
15. Currently the DfE allocate growth funding to local authorities by analysing data on pupil growth by Middle Layer Super Output Area, it aggregates areas of pupil growth but ignores areas where pupil number may be falling, it also proposes to and expand the use of funding from the revenue costs of commissioning additional places to include the removal of surplus places. This raises two fundamental issues, the first being that removal of surplus school places usually requires capital funding and there appears to be no proposal to widen the use of DSG to capital, and secondly it is unlikely that surplus school places can all be removed so netting off growth and falling rolls introduces a real risk of insufficient revenue funding for expansion and a schools block deficit that is potentially unrecoverable.
16. The proposal rests on a re-baselining of the national funding pot to be distributed. Given nationally expenditure is less than the current DfE's growth allocation overall funding levels may reduce which for Leicestershire could be a significant issue with the extent of housing developments to be delivered in the medium to long term.

Premises Funding

17. This area of the consultation proposes a nationally consistent criteria for the allocation which is to be welcomed. The proposal contains two factors eligibility i.e. does the school have a split site and distance i.e. how far away is it. It is uncertain whether these proposals will have an impact on Leicestershire schools currently receiving that funding as the balance between the two eligibility criteria is subject to the consultation as will the value that will be used. Consideration is also being given to a sliding scale to schools which just miss out on eligibility in respect of distance.
18. The proposals would introduce some additional and significant data collection burdens on local authorities that will cover both academies and maintained schools and it is interesting to note that the DfE set out they hold insufficient data on schools to manage the system. However, it does not feel appropriate in a direct NFF that local authorities are required to provide premises data for academies for example.
19. Changes are also planned to the ability to provide what are usually small rural schools with additional funding where they incur additional costs from accessing sites other than their school. Proposals further restrict the threshold from a cost of 1% of a schools budget to 2.5% of the schools budget. This would render 7 of the schools currently receiving funding ineligible to do so in the future although the reduction in funding may be compensated for within the proposed changes to funding protection.

Funding protection

20. The current protection arrangements are complex and include the MPPL and the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) both of which protect against different elements of change through the transition to the NFF. There is also often confusion about guaranteed per pupil funding increase, capping and scaling and how these interact with the formula budget and layers of protection, this will be addressed once a full NFF is delivered.

Other Issues

21. Consideration is also given to some other issues one being what would be useful to schools in order to plan their budgets. The proposal to issue a calculator tool is welcomed and is consistent with the approach Leicestershire has introduced to support strategic financial planning in schools and academies.

Conclusions

22. The implementation of a direct NFF is inevitable and appears to be embedded wider in the government's education policy than previously envisaged. The Legislation changes required to deliver the Direct NFF is already included within the Schools Bill currently progressing through parliament. The balance between local and national is difficult to achieve but these proposals appear to require local authorities to address the final barriers to the delivery of the direct NFF including potential future financial risk.

Equal Opportunity Issues

23. None arising directly from this report.

Background Papers

<https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/implementing-the-direct-national-funding-formula/>

Officers to Contact

Jenny Lawrence

Finance Business Partner – Schools and High Needs

Email; jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk

Tel: 0116 3056401

This page is intentionally left blank

Implementing the Direct National Funding Formula

Consultation Response

Question 1

Do you agree that local authorities' applications for transfers from mainstream schools to local education budgets should identify their preferred form of adjustment to NFF allocations, from a standard short menu of options?

Yes / No / Unsure

Do you have any other comments on the proposals for the operation of transfers of funding from mainstream schools to High needs?

It is imperative that local authorities remain able to make transfers between the schools and the high needs block given as it essential that the financial crisis being seen in high needs is a shared responsibility and mainstream schools are a significant element of the SEN system.

We would like some clarity over the decision-making process. Early paragraphs refer a Secretary of State approval and later ones refer to a review the role of the Schools Forum within the proposed partnership arrangements.

In reality within the NFF there are limited options to reduce school budgets particularly given the protections within it and all result in an uneven spread of the impact across schools. We would argue that the most equitable factor to reduce is the minimum per pupil funding level as this would create a wider spread of impact, the consultation states that the Secretary of State would take into account the local authority view on this and the minimum funding guarantee which appears contradictory.

We would also ask for clarity on the intended role of the local partnership in a transfer. Whilst we would agree that there needs to be total transparency in respect of a transfer and the drivers for it but this is a purely financial transaction between schools and their local authority. If partnerships are to have a role in this transaction then there should be an expectation of funding from within the partnership.

We welcome the criteria to be used in determining a request for a transfer but are surprise to see that the consultation states 'continue the use' particularly in respect of the third criteria '*Strong evidence of a transfer of financial responsibility for children with high needs from mainstream schools' NFF funding....*' and we would like to see some clarity over how this will be assessed given there is no visibility of SEN spend within either mainstream schools and academies.

Question 2

Do you agree that the direct NFF should include an indicative SEND budget, set nationally rather than locally?

Yes / No / Unsure

An indicative SEN budget is an anomaly given that it isn't ringfenced and can be spent in whatever way the Governing Body see fit. It is widely misunderstood in schools and often the SENCO has no visibility of it. If the Direct NFF is to be delivered, then it is difficult to see the place for a locally defined calculation.

We would welcome some guidance for school setting out the correlation between the NFF factors and the incidence of SEN. We feel that there is a lack of understanding in schools about what the NFF factors mean in terms of education provision for the categories of pupils that generate the additional factors.

We would welcome a review of the threshold for Element 3 funding across the entire funding system, they have been in place now for some while and increases in pay and pension costs are now totally outdated.

The Green Paper sets out the expectation of needs met within mainstream. It is essential that any rebalancing of funding, or changes in thresholds, to achieve that is appropriately funded and local authorities are not left with high needs deficits and funding being transferred to schools to meet this ambition.

Question 3

Do you have any comments on the proposals to place further requirements on how local authorities can operate their growth and falling rolls fund?

Some form of standardisation with some local flexibility would appear to be appropriate. We would not be in favour of any system that meant that unused growth funding would revert back to the DfE given the exceptionally unstable and unpredictable profile of growth particularly in respect of new housing.

We would not support a system that allocates a specific unit of funding that is not linked to the NFF, we would suggest the use of an 'average per pupil' funding unit but would wish to see some assurance that the allocations for local authorities would be reflective of the allocations to schools

Question 4

Do you believe that the restriction that falling rolls funding can only be provided to schools judged 'Good' or 'Outstanding' by Ofsted should be removed?

Yes / No / Unsure

Dips in pupil numbers can be created by an adverse OfSTED judgement, in many cases aspirational actions will be taken by either local authorities or MAT's to

address performance. It is important that such schools are supported and indeed may be the only school within their community. A restriction based upon an OSTED judgement is not appropriate where barriers to improvement may be funding

Question 5

Do you have any comments on how we propose to allocate growth and falling rolls funding to local authorities?

The rate of growth in places is influenced by a number of things outside a local authorities control the significant issue being the rate of housing growth which in turn is influenced by the national economic outlook. Whilst re-baselining on more recent data would seem appropriate the pattern of historic spend cannot be used a predictor of future spend on growth.

The consultation mentions SCAP data for capital and MSOA data for revenue at different points but there is no clarification on whether the objective is to move to a single data collection feeding growth and falling rolls funding allocations or which it would be, nor is there any information of any correlation of pupil numbers predicted between the two different methodologies. The consultation does not clarify whether it will be a requirement to operate a falling rolls fund. Historically local authorities will have had specific reasons for doing so which may not be relevant to the future and the 'equitable' funding system advocated by the DfE.

Question 6

Do you agree that we should explicitly expand the use of growth and falling rolls funding to supporting local authorities in repurposing and removing space?

Yes / No / Unsure

There is a clear need for growth funding and clear data to support its need, there is less so for falling roll funding and even less for surplus capacity.

Any reconfiguration of space is likely to incur capital costs which is not eligible to be charged to DSG under current rules. Your consultation also refers to the use of surplus space for SEND provision, this funding is within the Schools Block and to use in this way is deemed to be a transfer to High Needs which would require consultation and approvals. This proposal needs far more consideration that given in this consultation.

Additionally, the identification of surplus capacity in academies is something that local authorities simply do not currently have robust data. This would be a significant new requirement for authorities at a time where resources are already stretched to breaking point.

Question 7

Do you agree that the Government should favour a local, flexible approach over the national, standardised system for allocating growth and falling rolls funding; and that we should implement the changes for 2024/25?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 8

Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to popular growth?

We would like to revert to a system where basic needs growth is the only growth funding given with popular growth remaining to be dealt with under lagged funding within the NFF.

With a funding system with an objective of 'simple and transparent' there is no place for funding by application

Popular growth is a flawed concept and it is exceptionally difficult to determine the line between it and basic need. However, there is no place in an equitable funding system for MAT's to access funding not available to maintained schools in exactly the same manner and through the same process. Changes in popularity can be driven by a number of things and not just improved performance which in reality takes some time to achieve, it can also though be the result of aggressive marketing some of which is delivered through negative points and views on other schools.

A local system will not totally align with the manner in which local authorities will be funded and could result with local authorities being left with unrecoverable school block deficits

Question 9

Do you agree we should allocate split site funding on the basis of both a schools' 'basic eligibility' and 'distance eligibility'?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 10

Do you agree with our proposed criteria for split site 'basic eligibility'?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 11

Do you agree with our proposed split site distance criterion of 500m?

Criterion for distance should be shorter / Criterion is about right / Criterion should be longer / Unsure

Question 12

Do you agree with total available split sites funding being 60% of the NFF lump sum factor?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 13

Do you agree that distance eligibility should be funded at twice the rate of basic eligibility?

Distance eligibility should be given lower weighting / The weighting is about right / Distance eligibility should be given a higher weighting / Unsure

Question 14

Do you agree with our proposed approach to data collection on split sites?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 15

Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to split sites funding?

We understand the aim of this proposal but feel that it is based on flawed thinking. Firstly there is no evidence to support the amount allocated to the Lump Sum within the NFF, nor as we can see from the consultation that a split site should be 60% of whatever figure is being used for it.

We would also like to content that costs are likely to be higher from the very presence of a split site rather than the distance from the school so the weighting should he higher on eligibility and lower on distance as a result.

Many schools have permanent use of their site by another school whether that be for early years or SEND provision which attracts fees to their school that will be variable based on decisions in that hosting schools. Consistency of this factor is important but

there should also be some consideration of some national standardisation of fees levied by schools on other DSG funded users of their site.

Question 16

Do you agree with our proposed approach to the exceptional circumstances factor?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 17

Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to exceptional circumstances?

Exceptional circumstances funding is such a minor, albeit important for small schools, budget allocation. Our experience of its use is that it has been allocated to exceptionally small schools where either size or location means that physically their building cannot provide the environment needed. If our experience is replicated nationally we would propose that the exceptional circumstance factor is removed and a differential lump sum introduced for exceptionally small schools which would introduce consistency and provide schools with financial stability.

Initial and future turbulence should be moderated by the protection mechanism, we would wish to see any protection mechanism to recognise that for very small schools the loss of a single pupil can have a significant adverse and destabilising impact on their budget which can impact over multiple years.

Question 18

Do you agree that we should use local formulae baselines (actual GAG allocations, for academies) for the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) in the year that we transition to the direct NFF?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 19

Do you agree that we should move to using a simplified pupil-led funding protection for the MFG under the direct NFF?

Yes / No / Unsure

Question 20

Do you have any comments on our proposals for the operation on the MFG under the direct NFF?

As it stands currently it is almost impossible to explain how protection within the current NFF works and indeed what it is protecting against.

However, we do remain concerned about protection purely on pupil led factors given the apparent imbalance between universal and additional funding which has been further exacerbated within the 2023/24 NFF. Vert small schools can see a significant change in funding levels as a result of changes in pupil numbers and this affects their ability to offer a wide curriculum and remain financially sustainable so we would also ask for some consideration for some level of protection on overall budget.

Question 21

What do you think would be most useful for schools to pan their budgets before they receive confirmation of their final allocations: (i) notional allocations, or (ii) a calculator tool?

Notional allocations / Calculator tool / Unsure

Question 22

Do you have any comments on our proposals for the funding cycle in the direct NFF, including how we could provide early information to schools to help their budget planning?

A July announcement of the following years settlement has improved the ability to financially plan. However we are concerned about the capacity and level of skills within schools to effectively use that information. The pattern we have consistently seen in school financial planning is year 1 ok, year 2 move to deficit and year 3 deficit grows but that reality never materialises.

We have invested in tools an training to encourage school to move out of what can be seen as one year planning cycles. There needs to be more support for headteachers, governors and business managers to do so.

A financial planning tool linked to the NFF would be a significant step forward, it should not be overly complicated, simple to use and understand and allow for scenario planning. Consideration should also be given to encouraging school s to use this rather than locally defined models. Investment would be needed to facilitate this which also should be linked to minimum qualification levels for business managers.

Question 23

Do you have any comments on the two options presented for data collections in regards to school reorganisations and pupil numbers? When would this information be available to local authorities to submit to the DfE?

It is totally inappropriate for local authorities to be required to provide information on split sites and exceptional factors, the definition used locally will be set out in the APT as will the schools that benefit from them, if the funding arrangement is directly between the school and the DfE then the DfE should be responsible for data collection.

The proposals convey significant workloads to local authorities to support the growth proposals which will be a new responsibility for local authorities and should be funded accordingly. Whilst the sufficiency duty rests with local authorities there are school reorganisations that happen for other reasons, the business case for which sit with the Regional Schools Commissioner for approval, local authorities are advised of these so for many reorganisations that data is sitting outside local authorities.

Question 24

Regarding de-delegation, would you refer the Department to undertake one single data collection in March covering all local authorities, or several bespoke data collections for mid-year converters?

Single data collection / several smaller data collections / unsure

Question 25

Do you have any other comments on our proposals regarding the timing and nature of data collections to be carried out under a direct NFF?

We would welcome consideration by the DfE on other data collections already in the system collecting much of the data set out within this consultation such as the termly school census, this would release local authorities of what could be a significant and unfunded burden moving forward given the aspiration for a MAT led education system from 2030.

Whilst not directly included in this consultation we are also exceptionally disappointed that there remains too much flexibility for MAT's to move funding between schools and could result in there being a national funding system but no schools funded by it given the ability to pool GAG. At its absolute extreme this could mean that there could be thousands of different funding formulae rather than the

controlled 150 versions pre funding reform rendering all the objectives reform unachieved and irrelevant.

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS FORUM

2021/22 Early Years Block Deficit

29 September 2022

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	X
Academies	X	Foundation Stage	
PVI Settings	X	Primary	
Special Schools / Academies	X	Secondary	
Local Authority	X	Post 16	
		High Needs	

Purpose of Report

Content Requires;	By;
Noting	Maintained Primary School Members
Decision	Maintained Secondary School Members
	Maintained Special School Members
	Academy Members
	All Schools Forum

1. This report sets out the background to the 2021/2 Early Years Block deficit and the actions to be taken to enable its recovery.

Recommendations

2. That Schools Forum note the content of this report.

Background

3. The Early Years Block Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) should, in theory, be a fully funded service (albeit with timing variances) however over the previous 18months a deficit of £4m has arisen between funding provided and payments made to providers.

4. This has arisen due to a number of factors including providers not submitting full census data (so providers have been paid but funding not received from the DfE); submission errors relating to the way stretched hours were treated and additional support provided to providers during the pandemic based on DfE guidance at that time.
5. Discussions have been held with the DfE who have confirmed that prior year's DSG will not be updated; there will be no further funding and that recovery needs to be led by Leicestershire in conjunction with providers.
6. It is proposed that recovery of the deficit will commence in 2023/24 when, under proposals currently being consulted on by the DfE, Leicestershire will receive an additional £0.25 per hour. Five options for recovery have been considered as set out below:

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Recovery Timeframe (years)	2.4	2.7	3.4	3.7	4.6
Recovery per year	-£1,654,587	-£1,498,507	-£1,186,349	-£1,092,701	-£874,190
Contingency rate per hour	£0.23	£0.21	£0.16	£0.15	£0.12
Increase in PVI rate per hour	£0.02	£0.04	£0.09	£0.10	£0.13
% increase for PVIs	0.5%	0.9%	2.0%	2.3%	2.9%

7. All options hold the additional DSG per hour as a contingency and whilst providers will not receive the full £0.25 per hour, all will receive an increase in the hourly rate. Consultation with all providers will be undertaken in the autumn term prior to funding rates for 2023/24 being set in February 2023.

Resource Implications

8. Local authorities can only contribute to DSG with the approval of the Secretary of State. However, the financial position of the local authority does not allow for any contribution to offset the deficit so recovery from future years funding is the only option available. There is a requirement for 95% of Early Years DSG to be allocated to providers. The proposals above allow Leicestershire to meet that requirement.
9. Aligned to the implementation of a new IT system to collect Early Years data; manage payments and provide improved management information, a working party has been set up comprising the Early Years service, Finance, Business Support and Audit staff to implement any other required improvements.
10. A key element will be to ensure that processes are in place to make sure that all providers have submitted their January Census data. This is being addressed with Senior Managers. This is a significant piece of work given that there is a reliance on over 600 Private Providers of varying sizes to provide Early Years education.

Officers to Contact

Sara Bricknell
Finance Business Partner
Email : sara.bricknell@leics.gov.uk
Tel : 0116 3057869

This page is intentionally left blank