

## CABINET

30 OCTOBER 2012

### A NEW FUNDING FORMULA FOR MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Les Wicks, Children's Services

Report from: Barbara Peacock, Director of Children's and Adult Services

Author: Richard Unsworth, Principal Accountant

#### Summary

Following a consultation exercise in March the government announced its proposals for reforms to the school funding system in June 2012. The reforms include significant changes to the funding formula for mainstream schools and academies with effect from April 2013.

The total funding available for schools through the Dedicated Schools Grant is not expected to change. Consequently, changes to the funding formula will produce gainers and losers amongst individual schools. Officers have formulated and consulted upon options for a revised funding formula for Medway's mainstream schools and academies. The deadline for notifying the Department for Education of the agreed funding formula is 31 October 2012.

#### 1. Budget and Policy Framework

- 1.1 Funding for schools is provided by central government in the form of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The DSG is ring-fenced and regulations prevent the DSG being spent on anything other than schools.
- 1.2 This report deals with the formula used to distribute DSG funds to Medway schools and academies and is therefore a matter for decision by the Cabinet.
- 1.3 The recommendations set out in this report are in accordance with the draft 'School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2013'.

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 The coalition government announced its intention to reform the school funding system in its White Paper *The Importance of Teaching*, referring to the current arrangements as:
  - opaque and extremely complex
  - unfair as they lead to schools with similar intakes receiving very different levels of funding

- failing to reflect need accurately
- failing to support the new school system (i.e. academies and free schools)

2.2 In July 2011 the government launched its first consultation on school funding reform. This included a proposal for a national funding formula for schools and academies but, having reflected on the responses, the government decided to delay its introduction until after 2014/15. However local authorities will be required to simplify their funding arrangements for schools and academies from April 2013 as a first step towards the national funding formula.

2.3 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) will have a significant role in overseeing the new funding arrangements. The EFA was formed in April 2012 to replace Partnership for Schools and the Young People's Learning Agency and to take over the operational functions of the Department for Education. The EFA requires local authorities to confirm their new funding formula by 31 October 2012.

2.4 This deadline allows a very limited time to formulate and consult on a new funding formula. The key steps in the process are as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Milestones</b>
26 March 2012	Government issued a consultation paper on school funding reforms for 2013/14
8 May 2012	Medway's Schools Forum met to consider the government's proposals and agreed to establish a working group to consider the options for Medway schools and academies
21 May 2012	Closing date for responses to the government's consultation
June / July 2012	The working group met to formulate proposals for a new funding formula
18 September to 2 October 2012	Consultation with Medway's schools and academies
9 October 2012	Meeting of the Schools Forum to consider the consultation responses and make recommendations to Cabinet
30 October 2012	Cabinet meeting to take decisions on a new funding formula with effect from 2013/14
31 October 2012	Deadline for reporting the new formula to the EFA

2.5 The government believes that the funding formulae used by local authorities are too complex and therefore wants to simplify them. Currently the regulations allow LAs to use up to 37 different factors in their funding formula but the government intends to reduce this to a maximum of 11 factors from 2013/14, as follows:

- A basic per-pupil entitlement (different rates for primary and secondary aged pupils)

- Deprivation measured by entitlement to free school meals and/or the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI);
- Looked-after children
- Low cost, high incidence SEN (i.e. children with SEN who's additional educational needs cost up to £6,000)
- English as an additional language
- Pupil mobility i.e. casual admissions
- A lump sum not exceeding £200,000
- Split sites
- Rates
- Private finance initiative (PFI) contracts (NB: not applicable in Medway)
- London fringe area enhancements (NB: not applicable in Medway).

2.6 The EFA may allow other factors to be used in the funding formula but only in relation to premises issues and only in exceptional cases. Medway has sought, and received, permission to use a factor relating to the additional cost of maintaining listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments but this affects only one school.

2.7 A working group of headteachers, governors and school business managers helped to draft a new funding formula based on ring-fencing the current totals for primary and secondary schools and academies. Where elements of the current formula are no longer permissible the group considered which factors should be used in future and this is shown in Appendix 1 (primary schools) and Appendix 2 (secondary schools). As well as limiting the number of factors in the new formula the EFA has defined the methodology that LAs must use for calculating allocations through most of these factors. However, where there is scope for local decision-making the working group discussed the options available and these are explained in paragraph 3.

2.8 As the total within each phase will remain unchanged it is only possible to increase the funds allocated through one factor by a corresponding reduction in funding through other factors. For example, if the lump sum is increased it will reduce the rate of funding through the basic entitlement per pupil.

2.9 The potential impact of the new formula has been assessed and the results are shown in Appendix 3. The impact on each school is shown in three parts as follows:

- A) The effect of re-allocating funds from factors in the current formula which are no longer permissible in the new formula
- B) The impact of the new methodology for allocating funds relating to pupil deprivation
- C) The impact of the new methodology for allocating funds relating to SEN.

2.10 The changes to the funding formula create some significant gains or losses for individual schools. Schools need a period of time to adjust to lower levels of funding so the government has set the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) at minus 1.5% next year and the year after. This means that a school cannot have a cut in funding of more than 1.5% per pupil per year over the

next two years. After that there will continue to be an MFG but the government has not announced the rate yet.

- 2.11 To fund the protection for losing schools it will be necessary to cap the gains of schools that are winners from the new formula. The regulations allow local authorities to set their own arrangements for capping gains.

### 3. Options

- 3.1 The new regulations allow little flexibility but where options are available these are explained in the following paragraphs.

- 3.2 Many of the factors in Medway’s current funding formula are not permissible under the new arrangements. These are highlighted in appendices 1 and 2. There was consensus amongst school representatives on the working group about how to re-allocate these and, in most cases the funds were moved to the basic entitlement factor.

#### Pupil Deprivation

- 3.3 Local authorities have a limited choice on how to reflect pupil deprivation in the new funding formula, using data on entitlement to free school meals, or the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI), or a combination of both. Schools were consulted on two options as follows:

- Option 1: 50/50 combination of free school meal eligibility and IDACI
- Option 2: IDACI only

- 3.4 The impact of each option is shown in Appendix 3 and the responses from schools were as follows:

	Option 1		Option 2	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
Primary Schools	13	50%	13	50%
Secondary Schools	1	20%	4	80%

- 3.5 The Schools Forum recommended that option 1 be adopted for primary schools and option 2 for secondary schools.

#### Low Cost, High Incidence SEN

- 3.6 Local authorities do not have any discretion in the method of funding special educational needs (SEN) for secondary schools. However, for primary schools there is a choice from two options, both based on scores in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profiles (EYFSP) as follows:

- Option 1: Number of children not reaching 78 points in the EYFSP
- Option 2: Number of children not reaching 73 points in the EYFSP

3.7 The impact of each option is shown in Appendix 3 and the responses from schools were as follows

	<b>Option 1</b>		<b>Option 2</b>	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
	Primary Schools	15	60%	10

3.8 The Schools Forum recommended that option 2 be adopted for primary schools as it provides a better indicator of special educational needs.

#### Lump Sum

3.9 Small schools suffer from diseconomies of scale and will be adversely affected if funding is allocated only through factors relating to pupil numbers. Currently, Medway's funding formula has factors relating to 'curriculum protection' and vacant places in infant classes to subsidise small schools but these are not allowable in the new formula. To ensure small schools remain viable officers proposed a lump sum of £108,430 and consulted with schools on whether this figure is about right, too low or too high.

3.10 The responses from schools were as follows:

	<b>About right</b>		<b>Too low</b>		<b>Too high</b>	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
	Primary Schools	17	68%	7	28%	1
Secondary Schools	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%

3.11 The Schools Forum recommended that the lump sum be set at £108,430.

#### Transitional Protection

3.12 Schools that lose funding will be protected by the Minimum Funding Guarantee. To fund this protection schools were consulted on a proposal to set a cap of 1.5% per pupil on the gain that schools can achieve each year. Schools were asked whether a cap of 1.5% per pupil was about right, too low or too high.

3.13 The responses from schools were as follows:

	<b>About right</b>		<b>Too low</b>		<b>Too high</b>	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
	Primary Schools	19	76%	4	16%	2
Secondary Schools	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%

3.14 The Schools Forum recommended that a cap of 1.5% per pupil be placed on schools that gain funding from the introduction of the new formula.

### The 'Notional SEN Budget'

3.15 Schools will be expected to fund the first £6,000 of support to meet a child's special educational needs. However, if the funding formula does not provide sufficient funding for this a school will be eligible for top-up funding from the local authority. To quantify how much funding schools have available for SEN support the local authority must define the elements of the funding formula that contribute to each school's 'notional SEN budget'. Schools were consulted on a proposal that the notional SEN budget should be

- 50% of the Pupil Deprivation allocation, **plus**
- 100% of the Low Cost, High Incidence SEN allocation

3.16 Responses were received from four primary schools and one secondary school who all agreed that this is reasonable. The Schools Forum recommended that this approach be implemented.

### 'De-Delegation' of Funds for High Needs SEN

3.17 Under the new funding arrangements schools will be expected to meet the first £6,000 of a child's special educational needs but any costs above £6,000 must be funded by the local authority via a top-up. Currently all funding for SEN in mainstream schools is delegated through the funding formula. To create a budget that can fund the top-ups it will be necessary to 'de-delegate' some funding from schools.

3.18 The Schools Forum approved a request to de-delegate a total of £978,000. However, there was a difference of opinion as to which elements of the funding formula this sum should be drawn from. Five members of the Forum agreed with the proposal that it should come from the SEN element of the funding formula while six members wanted it drawn from all elements of the formula i.e. some from the basic entitlement, some from the lump sum etc.

### Primary/Secondary Funding Ratio

3.19 All the proposals for the new funding formula are based on ring-fencing the existing totals for primary schools and secondary schools. However, there was a proposal from a primary representative on the Schools Forum that £1 million should be transferred from secondary schools to primary schools. This proposal would make the primary/secondary funding ratio in Medway equal to the average of our statistical neighbours but would exacerbate the gains and losses resulting from the new funding formula. Four members of the Forum voted in favour of the proposal but six voted against.

#### **4. Advice and analysis**

4.1 The membership of the Schools Forum includes headteachers and governors from primary and secondary schools and academies. The Forum considered the issues relating to the new funding formula at length and took account of the responses from the consultation with schools and the potential financial impact. The Forum has asked that Cabinet implement the following recommendations relating to the funding formula:

- Pupil deprivation funding for primary schools should be based on a 50/50 combination of entitlement to free schools meals and IDACI data
- Pupil deprivation funding for secondary schools should be based wholly on IDACI data
- Funding for low cost, high incidence SEN in primary schools should be based on the number of children not reaching 73 points in their Early Years Foundation Stage Profiles
- The lump sum should be set at £108,430
- Winners from the new funding formula should have their gains capped to 1.5% per pupil
- The 'notional SEN budget' should consist of 50% of the funds allocated for pupil deprivation and 100% of the funds allocated for low cost, high incidence SEN

4.2 In relation to the de-delegation of £978,000 for high needs SEN, Cabinet will need to decide which elements of the funding formula these funds should be drawn from. The Forum recommended that the funds be drawn from all elements of the formula which is contrary to the officer recommendation at paragraph 8.7 that the funds be drawn only from the SEN element of the formula. In reaching a decision Members may wish to take the following into account:

- when funds for high needs SEN were originally delegated to schools about ten years ago, the funds were allocated through the SEN element of the funding formula. Logically, therefore, the funds should be de-delegated from the SEN element of the formula
- the proposal to de-delegate from all elements of the funding formula was made at the Schools Forum meeting and had not been consulted on so the wider views of schools are not known
- the Forum only voted narrowly (six to five) in favour of the recommendation to de-delegate from all elements of the formula.

## 5. Risk management

<b>Likelihood:</b>	<b>Impact:</b>
A Very high	1 Catastrophic
B High	2 Critical
C Significant	3 Marginal
D Low	4 Negligible
E Very low	
F Almost impossible	

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action to avoid or mitigate risk</b>	<b>Risk rating</b>
Small schools become financially non-viable	The new formula impacts adversely on small schools and leaves them with insufficient funds to operate effectively	A significant lump sum has been included in the new formula to ensure small schools remain viable.	D2
Increase in schools with a budget deficit	Schools that lose funding under the new formula do not act to reduce their expenditure and incur deficits	Officers will work with schools to help them amend their budget plans and manage the impact	C3
Increasing redundancy costs	Schools that lose funding under the new formula may need to reduce their staffing	The minimum funding guarantee provides transitional protection that will help schools take advantage of natural wastage	B3

## 6. Consultation

- 6.1 Proposals for the new funding formula were developed with the help of a small working group consisting of headteachers, governors and school business managers of Medway schools and academies.
- 6.2 All schools were consulted on the options in the period 18 September 2012 to 2 October 2012 and were informed of the potential financial impact of those options.
- 6.3 The Schools Forum met on 9 October 2012 to consider the responses from schools and make recommendations to Cabinet. The recommendations from the School Forum are set out in paragraph 8 below with the exception of recommendation 8.7, the reasons for which are set out in paragraph 4.2 above.



- 6.4 A Diversity Impact Assessment (DIA) screening has been undertaken on the proposals (Appendix 4) and it has been found it is not necessary to undertake a full impact assessment.

## **7. Financial and legal implications**

- 7.1 The report relates to potential changes in the distribution of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Any impact will remain within the DSG and will not affect the Council's general fund.
- 7.2 The potential impact on individual schools is identified in Appendix 3 based on current data. The actual impact will depend on pupil numbers and other data drawn from the autumn 2012 school census.
- 7.3 The new funding formula only affects mainstream schools and academies. The funding of special schools and specialist SEN provision within mainstream schools will be reviewed separately.
- 7.4 The funds provided through the Pupil Premium Grant, the early years single funding formula and school sixth form grants are unaffected by changes to the mainstream schools funding formula.
- 7.5 Other than the legal framework within which Cabinet is being asked to make this decision, which is set out in the body of this report, there are no other legal implications.

## **8. Recommendations**

Cabinet is asked to instruct officers to implement a new funding formula for schools and academies as follows:

- 8.1 To calculate the pupil deprivation element of the funding formula for primary schools using a 50/50 combination of entitlement to free schools meals and IDACI data.
- 8.2 To calculate the pupil deprivation element of the funding formula for secondary schools using IDACI data only.
- 8.3 To calculate the funding for low cost, high incidence SEN in primary schools using the number of children not reaching 73 points in their Early Years Foundation Stage Profiles.
- 8.4 To set the lump sum element of the funding formula at £108,430.
- 8.5 To cap the gains from the new funding formula at 1.5% per pupil.
- 8.6 To calculate the 'notional SEN budget' based on 50% of the funds allocated for pupil deprivation and 100% of the funds allocated for low cost, high incidence SEN.
- 8.7 To de-delegate funds for high needs SEN from the SEN element of the funding formula.
- 8.8 To ensure that the current primary/secondary funding ratio is maintained.

**9. Suggested reasons for decision(s)**

- 9.1 The local authority is required to implement a new funding formula from 2013/14 in accordance with the regulations and to inform the Education Funding Agency of the new formula by 31 October 2012.

**Lead officer contact**

Richard Unsworth, Principal Accountant (Education)  
[richard.unsworth@medway.gov.uk](mailto:richard.unsworth@medway.gov.uk)  
01634 331079

**Background papers**

None

.





## Factors used in the Funding Formula for Schools 2012-13

	Secondary Schools		New Funding Formula										
	£	% of Budget	Basic Entitlement	Deprivation	LAC	SEN	EAL	Pupil Mobility	Lump Sum	Split Site	Rates	MFG	Total
1) Age Weighted Pupil Funding / Weighted Place Funding	50,645,054	62.6%	50,645,054										50,645,054
2) Early Years Single Funding Formula (less abatement)													0
3) Sixth Form Funding less abatement (LA schools only)	2,084,933	2.6%	-1,109,826										-1,109,826
4) Other Pupil Funding:													
Unweighted Pupil Funding / Unweighted Place Funding	7,035,661	8.7%	7,035,661										7,035,661
Key Stage 1 Class Size Protection	-	-											0
<b>Total Other Pupil Funding</b>	<b>7,035,661</b>	<b>8.7%</b>											
5) SEN Related Funding:													
Deprivation data re FS & KS1 pupils	-												
Prior Attainment re KS2, KS3 & KS4 pupils	4,571,986	5.7%				4,571,986							4,571,986
Places in SEN Units / Designated SEN Provision	2,095,217	2.6%											0
<b>Total SEN Related Funding</b>	<b>6,667,203</b>	<b>8.2%</b>											
6) Social Deprivation Funding:													
Free School Meal Entitlement	796,979	1.0%		796,979									796,979
Looked-After Children	106,032	0.1%	24,101		81,931								106,032
Casual Admissions	114,017	0.1%						114,017					114,017
Index of Multiple Deprivation (IDACI)	3,497,921	4.3%		3,497,921									3,497,921
<b>Total Social Deprivation Funding</b>	<b>4,514,949</b>	<b>5.6%</b>											
7) Salary Related Funding:													
Advanced Skills & Upper Pay Scale Teachers	2,920,762	3.6%	2,920,762										2,920,762
Newly Qualified Teachers	320,231	0.4%	320,231										320,231
<b>Total Salary Related Funding</b>	<b>3,240,993</b>	<b>4.0%</b>											
8) Premises Related Funding:													
Buildings Maintenance – Floor Area, Condition & Lifts	3,326,415	4.1%	3,326,415										3,326,415
Grounds Site Area	183,241	0.2%	183,241										183,241
Split Sites & Detached Playing Fields	189,197	0.2%							189,197				189,197
Rent & Rates	462,580	0.6%								462,580			462,580
<b>Total Premises Related Funding</b>	<b>4,161,433</b>	<b>5.1%</b>											
9) Other Funding Factors:													
Curriculum Protection (small school subsidies)	-	-											0
Lump Sum (incl Federation factor)	665,839	0.8%	-1,177,477					1,843,316					665,839
Free School Meals (number of meals taken)	593,469	0.7%		593,469									593,469
Insurance (staff numbers & property values)	709,400	0.9%	709,400										709,400
Admissions (aided & foundation schools only)	78,303	0.1%	78,303										78,303
Schools below floor target or in Ofsted category	104,508	0.1%	104,508										104,508
EAL / Underperforming Ethnic Groups	141,397	0.2%					141,397						141,397
<b>Total Other Funding Factors</b>	<b>2,292,916</b>	<b>2.8%</b>											
10) Minimum Guarantee	244,678	0.3%										244,678	244,678
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>80,887,820</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>63,060,373</b>	<b>4,888,369</b>	<b>81,931</b>	<b>4,571,986</b>	<b>141,397</b>	<b>114,017</b>	<b>1,843,316</b>	<b>189,197</b>	<b>462,580</b>	<b>244,678</b>	<b>75,597,844</b>
			83.4%	6.5%	0.1%	6.0%	0.2%	0.2%	2.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	100.0%

Sixth Forms (from EFA) 3,194,759  
SEN Units (to High Needs block) 2,095,217  
80,887,820

Factors highlighted in yellow will not be allowable from 2013/14



**Gain or Loss(-) resulting from new funding formula  
(Indicative figures based on re-working  
funding allocations for 2012/13)**

**Appendix 3**

DFE No.	School	Pupil Nos.	Current Funding *	A	B		C		Total impact on school before protection **		Total impact on school before protection **	
				Impact of factors excl Dep & SEN	Impact of options for Deprivation	Option 2	Impact of options for SEN	Option 2	Best Case (£)	Worst Case (£)	Best Case (%)	Worst Case (%)
<b>PRIMARY SCHOOLS:</b>												
2194	Stoke Community Primary	110	506,498	-27,061	9,117	3,856	1,639	-14,434	-16,305	-37,638	-3.2%	-7.4%
2196	Glencoe Junior	238	1,183,802	-18,734	-43,164	-31,979	89,847	51,681	39,134	-10,217	3.3%	-0.9%
2198	Greenvale Infant	189	915,661	-3,780	-25,626	-11,019	123,549	168,387	153,588	94,143	16.8%	10.3%
2199	Luton Junior	264	1,168,849	-4,954	-19,181	-1,181	154,331	208,918	202,783	130,196	17.3%	11.1%
2201	Luton Infant	235	1,034,902	24,728	-25,266	7,846	51,956	96,753	129,327	51,418	12.5%	5.0%
2202	New Road Primary	306	1,370,259	-22,187	-47,387	-43,808	62,320	126,843	60,848	-7,255	4.4%	-0.5%
2203	Walderslade Primary	211	728,486	11,196	1,999	-1,297	121,160	174,676	187,871	131,059	25.8%	18.0%
2208	Cuxton Infant	144	552,924	-5,483	2,488	310	12,466	15,351	12,355	7,293	2.2%	1.3%
2209	Chattenden Primary	195	755,662	14,652	15,499	5,695	39,670	1,979	69,820	22,326	9.2%	3.0%
2210	Wainscott Primary	209	785,920	7,533	1,093	-6,489	23,815	23,583	32,441	24,627	4.1%	3.1%
2211	Halling Primary	259	957,480	-16,566	3,281	-7,072	-46,552	-47,026	-59,837	-70,664	-6.2%	-7.4%
2213	Hoo St. Werburgh Primary	477	1,706,950	-3,416	20,780	-5,456	-41,860	-59,590	-24,495	-68,461	-1.4%	-4.0%
2214	Balfour Junior	470	1,587,474	23,012	4,722	2,992	66,870	103,454	131,187	92,874	8.3%	5.9%
2215	Balfour Infant	269	981,148	43,052	1,623	7,311	7,454	-29,699	57,816	14,975	5.9%	1.5%
2216	Delce Infant	238	922,606	9,912	5,627	11,541	141,276	160,238	181,691	156,815	19.7%	17.0%
2220	Gordon Federation	456	1,668,795	29,662	12,765	12,339	-25,661	-32,967	16,766	9,034	1.0%	0.5%
2396	Barnsole Federation	510	2,036,519	-11,271	17,806	11,251	-89,082	-92,234	-82,547	-92,253	-4.1%	-4.5%
2400	Featherby Junior	326	1,147,436	22,878	13,263	23,500	34,283	32,471	80,661	68,612	7.0%	6.0%
2401	Featherby Infant	246	970,231	-13,180	4,615	13,962	-73,761	-76,945	-72,979	-85,509	-7.5%	-8.8%
2403	Hempstead Junior	345	1,149,155	15,198	2,648	4,289	-74,631	-83,433	-55,144	-65,587	-4.8%	-5.7%
2406	Napier Community Primary	416	1,612,775	1,193	20,865	23,573	-90,592	-81,472	-56,706	-68,535	-3.5%	-4.2%
2408	Skinner Street Primary	293	1,282,916	-14,390	-7,347	16,928	-31,519	-61,958	-28,982	-83,695	-2.3%	-6.5%
2412	Woodlands Primary	384	1,540,287	-7,743	6,822	11,985	-141,458	-130,010	-125,768	-142,379	-8.2%	-9.2%
2413	Delce Junior	340	1,342,477	-38,190	1,684	-1,122	94,114	162,249	125,744	54,802	9.4%	4.1%
2421	High Halstow Primary	191	691,379	12,103	2,257	360	23,165	22,145	37,526	34,608	5.4%	5.0%
2433	Oaklands Federation	389	1,604,580	-23,261	-10,690	-34,221	82,473	40,929	48,522	-16,554	3.0%	-1.0%
2439	Horsted Federation	402	1,466,721	14,188	8,886	10,865	-59,729	-96,958	-34,676	-73,885	-2.4%	-5.0%
2448	Lordswood Primary	351	1,325,243	-22,975	12,955	-5,188	-19,986	-81,317	-30,006	-109,480	-2.3%	-8.3%
2450	Sherwin Knight Junior	256	989,513	3,555	2,673	-1,399	75,220	85,137	91,364	77,376	9.2%	7.8%
2469	Sherwin Knight Infant	211	847,884	-17,945	4,161	5,331	1,921	21,840	9,225	-11,864	1.1%	-1.4%
2479	St. Margaret's Infant	261	935,852	15,569	1,843	-2,002	41,174	34,181	58,586	47,748	6.3%	5.1%
2492	Bligh Junior	215	841,025	-17,568	18,280	13,805	7,720	22,893	23,605	3,957	2.8%	0.5%
2493	Parkwood Junior	358	1,199,171	41,593	7,347	2,302	-41,599	-10,617	38,322	2,297	3.2%	0.2%
2494	Parkwood Infant	258	904,641	876	2,638	-1,559	32,504	-2,146	36,018	-2,830	4.0%	-0.3%
2499	Hilltop Primary	425	1,499,729	-22,725	2,018	2,423	-11,280	-38,316	-31,582	-59,023	-2.1%	-3.9%
2537	Bligh Infant	169	688,373	6,068	7,362	2,602	-57,220	-57,552	-43,789	-48,882	-6.4%	-7.1%
2540	Cuxton Junior	155	578,773	26,037	2,396	-338	-9,383	-13,016	19,050	12,684	3.3%	2.2%
2549	Swingate Infant	262	941,265	2,852	4,863	-5,732	-34,573	-25,817	-18,102	-37,453	-1.9%	-4.0%
2570	Allhallows Primary	124	543,883	-10,441	3,626	-2,758	10,067	1,545	3,252	-11,654	0.6%	-2.1%
2580	Maundene Primary	416	1,399,449	35,101	-6,741	-14,607	9,895	-5,409	38,255	15,085	2.7%	1.1%
2592	Thames View Primary	396	1,384,826	-29,718	6,002	4,241	-57,647	-66,587	-81,363	-92,064	-5.9%	-6.6%
2600	All Faiths Primary	164	761,551	2,250	-27,245	-43,295	-19,258	-14,425	-39,420	-60,302	-5.2%	-7.9%
2623	Miers Court Primary	398	1,355,721	1,730	-133	-10,715	-42,425	-59,840	-40,829	-68,825	-3.0%	-5.1%
2630	Spinnens Acre Junior	254	923,746	-8,259	7,951	-6,246	5,345	20,550	20,242	-9,160	2.2%	-1.0%
2638	Hempstead Infant	257	898,741	586	3,302	6,868	-31,427	-29,197	-21,742	-27,538	-2.4%	-3.1%
2640	Warren Wood Primary	236	1,013,876	-23,938	15,634	11,876	-69,616	-67,832	-76,136	-81,678	-7.5%	-8.1%
2644	Byron Primary	512	1,966,905	-49,806	29,634	21,806	30,263	30,324	10,152	2,262	0.5%	0.1%
2646	Brompton Westbrook Primary	283	1,149,930	-8,143	4,884	5,811	-72,219	-65,605	-67,937	-75,478	-5.9%	-6.6%
2652	Kingfisher Primary	202	901,474	3,705	-35,163	-43,370	-104,496	-104,997	-135,954	-144,662	-15.1%	-16.0%
2665	St Peter's Infant	111	481,840	19,596	-552	7,002	-1,781	13,706	40,303	17,263	8.4%	3.6%
2668	Wayfield Primary	170	810,039	-404	-26,348	-43,585	-36,949	-20,531	-47,283	-80,938	-5.8%	-10.0%
2671	Elaine Primary	327	1,374,737	-25,201	-21,510	-27,844	-16,395	11,008	-35,703	-69,439	-2.6%	-5.1%
2684	Deanwood Primary ET	128	542,659	-8,381	4,780	-925	21,588	39,036	35,436	12,283	6.5%	2.3%
2685	Temple Mill Primary	195	754,804	17,270	5,050	1,945	-29,203	-23,920	-1,600	-9,988	-0.2%	-1.3%
2686	Saxon Way Primary	195	953,175	4,521	-29,781	-33,296	-68,554	-52,390	-77,651	-97,330	-8.1%	-10.2%

**Gain or Loss(-) resulting from new funding formula  
(Indicative figures based on re-working  
funding allocations for 2012/13)**

DFE No.	School	Pupil Nos.	Current Funding *	A	B		C		Total impact on school before protection **		Total impact on school before protection **	
				Impact of factors excl Dep & SEN	Impact of options for Deprivation		Impact of options for SEN		Best Case (£)	Worst Case (£)	Best Case (%)	Worst Case (%)
					Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2				
<b>PRIMARY SCHOOLS:</b>												
2754	Twydall Primary	477	1,765,979	-76,156	12,350	17,479	196,028	271,739	<b>213,061</b>	<b>132,222</b>	12.1%	7.5%
3093	All Saints CE Primary	313	1,266,780	22,722	-28,410	-1,251	-56,232	-68,520	<b>-34,761</b>	<b>-74,209</b>	-2.7%	-5.9%
3095	St. John's CEVC Infant	80	423,832	6,776	-6,973	-9,746	-28,773	-33,909	<b>-28,971</b>	<b>-36,879</b>	-6.8%	-8.7%
3096	St. Helen's CE Primary	199	739,010	14,453	18,807	21,380	-17,421	-17,152	<b>18,680</b>	<b>15,839</b>	2.5%	2.1%
3102	St. Nicholas' CEVC Infant	100	452,669	-4,572	-21	2,030	-17,529	-26,390	<b>-20,070</b>	<b>-30,983</b>	-4.4%	-6.8%
3195	St. Margaret's CEVC Junior	335	1,186,259	16,967	-5,578	-14,671	50,797	-21,890	<b>62,187</b>	<b>-19,594</b>	5.2%	-1.7%
3293	St. Margaret's at Troy Town CEVC	210	861,990	6,330	-17,108	-16,967	-14,886	-22,351	<b>-25,523</b>	<b>-33,129</b>	-3.0%	-3.8%
3327	St. James' CEVA Primary	112	498,042	-8,810	1,879	-3,370	-46,851	-40,533	<b>-47,464</b>	<b>-59,031</b>	-9.5%	-11.9%
3712	St. Michael's RC Primary	371	1,486,391	-6,338	3,162	15,025	-26,372	13,731	<b>22,418</b>	<b>-29,548</b>	1.5%	-2.0%
3729	English Martyrs' RC Primary	208	767,606	23,772	2,374	6,414	-13,995	-14,980	<b>16,191</b>	<b>11,166</b>	2.1%	1.5%
3732	St. Thomas of Canterbury RCP	192	700,729	8,571	82	4,113	-3,339	-11,826	<b>9,346</b>	<b>-3,173</b>	1.3%	-0.5%
3736	St. Thomas More RC Primary	414	1,410,823	32,951	12,235	12,465	120,396	148,235	<b>193,651</b>	<b>165,583</b>	13.7%	11.7%
3746	St. William of Perth RC Primary	203	725,428	21,082	2,603	10,949	72,943	31,754	<b>104,975</b>	<b>55,439</b>	14.5%	7.6%
3752	St. Augustine of Canterbury RCP	160	607,532	7,102	2,997	477	-17,605	-31,892	<b>-7,506</b>	<b>-24,314</b>	-1.2%	-4.0%
3753	St. Benedict's RC Primary	210	723,990	27,836	2,968	-2,553	-46,998	-45,001	<b>-14,197</b>	<b>-21,715</b>	-2.0%	-3.0%
3755	St. Mary's RC Primary	406	1,457,296	23,657	18,480	56,838	51,248	19,401	<b>131,743</b>	<b>61,537</b>	9.0%	4.2%
3756	St. Mary's Island CE Primary	404	1,353,928	6,768	7,118	12,023	-76,762	-93,740	<b>-57,971</b>	<b>-79,855</b>	-4.3%	-5.9%
3757	Riverside Primary	140	646,831	-38,974	-4,611	-11,618	20,252	39,107	<b>-4,478</b>	<b>-30,340</b>	-0.7%	-4.7%
3758	Pilgrim CEVC Primary	211	819,445	20,377	11,077	25,031	-22,571	-48,331	<b>22,837</b>	<b>-16,878</b>	2.8%	-2.1%
3759	Fairview Community Primary	501	1,697,391	-25,153	4,498	4,733	50,967	28,419	<b>30,548</b>	<b>7,765</b>	1.8%	0.5%
3760	Burnt Oak Primary	352	1,520,325	-32,841	-21,001	-9	-98,890	-135,595	<b>-131,740</b>	<b>-189,438</b>	-8.7%	-12.5%
	Cliffe Woods Primary Academy	322	1,085,512	-1,871	4,088	3,351	-41,642	-63,911	<b>-39,425</b>	<b>-62,432</b>	-3.6%	-5.8%
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOLS:</b>												
4174	Greenacre Academy	802	3,846,482	82,655	-15,647	-59,610	26,799	n/a	<b>93,807</b>	<b>49,844</b>	2.4%	1.3%
5423	Robert Napier	1197	6,035,317	92,914	56,632	109,276	57,486	n/a	<b>259,676</b>	<b>207,033</b>	4.3%	3.4%
5436	St. John Fisher RC	832	4,539,407	47,350	-80,922	-42,992	-52,724	n/a	<b>-48,366</b>	<b>-86,297</b>	-1.1%	-1.9%
5457	Howard	1207	5,566,819	31,340	10,469	12,997	17,327	n/a	<b>61,664</b>	<b>59,136</b>	1.1%	1.1%
	Strood Academy	1126	5,473,116	51,423	-37,819	-121,435	-7,059	n/a	<b>6,545</b>	<b>-77,070</b>	0.1%	-1.4%
	Bishop of Rochester Academy	979	5,671,319	-112,135	-226,269	-156,107	-15,358	n/a	<b>-283,601</b>	<b>-353,763</b>	-5.0%	-6.2%
	Brompton Academy	920	5,110,983	-23,036	41,537	89,218	-12,320	n/a	<b>53,862</b>	<b>6,182</b>	1.1%	0.1%
	Rochester Grammar	847	3,540,379	65,899	20,955	44,781	-798	n/a	<b>109,882</b>	<b>86,056</b>	3.1%	2.4%
	Fort Pitt Grammar	592	2,703,749	-90,795	-5,530	13,087	-773	n/a	<b>-78,481</b>	<b>-97,099</b>	-2.9%	-3.6%
	Rainham Girls	1314	5,991,600	80,599	70,975	41,819	-9,639	n/a	<b>141,934</b>	<b>112,778</b>	2.4%	1.9%
	Chatham Grammar Boys	596	2,742,627	-74,813	-16,260	18,149	-482	n/a	<b>-57,147</b>	<b>-91,556</b>	-2.1%	-3.3%
	Sir Joseph Williamson's Grammar	868	3,819,216	-79,006	2,004	41,623	-746	n/a	<b>-38,128</b>	<b>-77,748</b>	-1.0%	-2.0%
	Rainham Mark Grammar	879	3,790,392	-8,481	-18,157	5,750	-379	n/a	<b>-3,110</b>	<b>-27,017</b>	-0.1%	-0.7%
	Chatham Grammar Girls	577	2,621,944	-62,031	-12,112	19,921	-762	n/a	<b>-42,872</b>	<b>-74,905</b>	-1.6%	-2.9%
	Hundred of Hoo	1234	5,814,726	-74,327	167,418	51,649	5,989	n/a	<b>99,080</b>	<b>-16,689</b>	1.7%	-0.3%
	Thomas Aveling	923	4,408,474	9,959	63,206	28,906	7,698	n/a	<b>80,863</b>	<b>46,563</b>	1.8%	1.1%
	Walderslade Girls	789	3,676,615	62,942	-20,453	-96,983	-14,258	n/a	<b>28,230</b>	<b>-48,299</b>	0.8%	-1.3%

\* Excluding Nursery funding, Post-16 funding, SEN units and MFG

\*\* The gains and losses shown above are before the application of the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) or a cap on gains. The MFG means that schools will lose funding gradually rather than all in the first year. The MFG for 2013/14 and 2014/15 means that schools cannot lose funding of more than 1.5% per pupil per year. Thereafter the MFG will continue but the government has not said what the level of protection will be.



## Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

<b>Directorate</b>  <b>CHILDREN &amp; ADULTS</b>	<b>Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change</b>  <b>A New Funding Formula for Mainstream Schools and Academies</b>	
Officer responsible for assessment  Richard Unsworth Principal Accountant (Education)	Date of assessment  October 2012	New or existing?  New
<b>Defining what is being assessed</b>		
<b>1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives</b>	The government has placed a duty on local authorities to formulate a new funding formula for mainstream schools and academies. The new formula must adhere to the government's regulations and will take effect from April 2013.	
<b>2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?</b>	The new formula will distribute the same total funds to schools and academies but in a different way to the current formula. Some schools will gain funding while others will lose.	
<b>3. What outcomes are wanted?</b>	A new method of distributing funding to schools and academies that is simpler than the current system.	
<b>4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	Contribute: Guidance from central government and the engagement of the Schools Forum.	Detract:
<b>5. Who are the main stakeholders?</b>	Medway schools and academies	
<b>6. Who implements this and who is responsible?</b>	Medway Council is responsible for setting the new funding formula.	

<b>Assessing impact</b>		
<b>7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	Funding allocated to schools in relation to ethnic minority pupils will be maintained at its current level	
<b>8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	Funding allocated to schools in relation to pupils with a disability or special educational needs will be maintained at its current level	
<b>9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	There is no distinction on grounds of gender in relation to the funding of schools	
<b>10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	There is no distinction on grounds of sexual orientation in relation to the funding of schools	
<b>11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	There is no distinction on grounds of religion in relation to the funding of schools	
<b>12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's <i>age</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	The funding formula specifically relates to children of statutory school age	
<b>13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i>?</b>	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
<b>What evidence exists for this?</b>	There is no distinction on these grounds in relation to the funding of schools	

14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?	YES	If yes, which group(s)?
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Funding arrangements for schools do not adversely impact on other groups	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Funding arrangements for schools do not adversely impact on these groups	

<b>Conclusions &amp; recommendation</b>		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
	NO	Funding arrangements for schools do not adversely impact on any particular groups
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	YES	Please explain
	NO	
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	<b>This function/ policy/ service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.</b>	

<b>Action plan to make Minor modifications</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Actions (with date of completion)</b>	<b>Officer responsible</b>

<b>Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review</b>		
<b>Date of next review</b>		
<b>Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)</b>		
<b>Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?</b>		
<b>Signed (completing officer/service manager)</b>	<b>Date</b>	
<b>Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)</b>	<b>Date</b>	

*NB: Remember to list the evidence (i.e. documents and data sources) used*