
Budgets for Additional Funds 2022/23

Report being considered by: Schools Forum on 6th December 2021

Report Author: Melanie Ellis

Item for: Decision **By:** All Forum Members / Maintained Primary School Members

1. Purpose of the Report

To set out the proposed 2022/23 budgets for the Growth fund, Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty fund (SIFD) and Additional High Needs fund.

2. Recommendations from Heads Funding Group

- 2.1 To distribute the 2022/23 growth to all schools via the school formula. This is estimated to be in the region of £900K.
- 2.2 To top-up the PSIFD fund to £200k.
- 2.3 To set the Additional High Needs fund at £40k.

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Will the recommendation require the matter to be referred to the Council or the Executive for final determination? | Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|

3. Introduction

- 3.1 The main formula funding a school receives is retrospective and based on pupil numbers from the previous October census. Growth funding is allocated by the Department for Education (DfE) by formula and forms part of the Schools Block DSG allocation. It is allocated to meet the cost of increases in pre-16 pupil numbers either in new schools or bulge classes set up to meet basic need.
- 3.2 The formula for allocating growth funding to each local authority is based on the observed differences between the primary and secondary number on roll between the October 2020 and October 2021 school censuses. The growth is measured within each 'middle layer super output area' (MSOA). In West Berkshire there are 22 MSOAs. Changes in pupil numbers between the two censuses are identified for each MSOA, and any areas with a reduction in pupil numbers are discounted. Growth factor values are then applied:
 - (1) £1,485 for each primary growth pupil
 - (2) £2,220 for each secondary growth pupil
 - (3) £70,800 for each new school which opened in the previous year.
- 3.3 The SIFD fund is de-delegated and supports maintained primary schools in deficit or close to deficit.

3.4 Funding is set aside annually from the high needs block to fund schools with a disproportionate number of high needs pupils that meet the agreed criteria.

4. West Berkshire Growth Allocation Estimate 2022-23

4.1 The DfE issue a growth calculator to generate illustrative growth allocations for 2022-23. Pupil numbers by school (September 2021) have been provided by the Education Place Planning team based upon school Capita data. These have been checked for reasonableness but there may obviously be some variation to those recorded on the October 2021 census.

4.2 Although there is a decrease in primary pupil numbers within the authority, 8 of the MSOA's have an overall growth with 4 of these being greater than 10 pupils, thereby generating eligible primary growth.

4.3 There is actual growth in secondary school pupil numbers with all schools, bar one, demonstrating an increase in pupil numbers, based upon the Capita data.

4.4 The illustrative growth allocation for 2022-23 is £918K. The actual value will be confirmed in December 2021.

| Eligible primary growth (a) | Eligible secondary growth (b) | ACA (c) | Allocation for primary growth (d) (a)*(c) * £1,485 | Allocation for secondary growth (e) (b)*(c) *£2,220 | No. of new schools (f) | Allocation for new schools (g) (c) * £70,800 | Total growth allocation (h) | 2021-22 growth allocation | 2021-22 schools block | Illustrative total growth allocation 2022-23, | Change to 2022-23 growth funding as % of 2021-22 SB DSG |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 81 | 314 | 1.03475 | £123,697 | £721,304 | 1 | £73,260 | £918,261 | £603,831 | £114,831,628 | £918,261 | 0.27% |
| 66 | 225 | 1.03468 | £98,608 | £505,223 | 0 | £0 | £603,831 | 2021/22 Growth figures for comparison | | | |

5. Growth Fund

5.1 The Schools Forum must be consulted on the total size of the growth fund and criteria for use. The criteria formed part of the Schools Funding consultation and was supported.

5.2 As it is within the schools block, a movement of funding between the schools formula and the growth fund is not treated as a transfer between blocks. If funding is not required for growth, it can be added into the school formula, but if there is a shortfall, this needs to be met from a top slice of the main schools' block allocation.

5.3 The growth fund balance at 31.03.21 was £1.5m. Support for Highwood Copse will be the main draw on the fund over the next few years, estimated to be over £400k between 2021-23. Additionally, some of the allocated growth fund will need to be used annually to support Highwood Copse as a growing school. This is because the funding allocated by the DfE via the Authority Proforma Tool (APT) is based upon lagged pupil numbers and, as such, as an authority we will need to estimate and fund the increase in pupil numbers each year.

5.4 The table below shows the estimated draw on the growth fund up to 31.3.23. It does not appear at this point that any schools will be eligible for growth funding, other than Highwood and the Calcots, and so a contingency has been built in to cover three cases per year. This gives an estimated balance of £786k prior to adding any 2022-23 growth allocation, estimated at £918k.

| | Pre Opening | | Diseconomies of Scale | Growth | Balance |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| | Staff | Equipment | | | |
| Balance 31.03.21 | | | | | -1,500,000 |
| Highwood Copse | 14,934 | | | | -1,485,067 |
| The Calcots | | | | 27,500 | -1,457,567 |
| Highwood Copse | 65,000 | 6,300 | | | -1,386,267 |
| Highwood Underwriting | | | 175,000 | | -1,211,267 |
| The Calcots | | | | 38,500 | -1,172,767 |
| Contingency | | | | 115,500 | -1,057,267 |
| Est Balance 31.03.22 | | | | | -1,057,267 |
| Highwood Underwriting | | | 155,000 | | -902,267 |
| Contingency | | | | 115,500 | -786,767 |
| Est Balance 31.03.23 | | | | | -786,767 |

5.5 In 2021/22, it was agreed that the projected balance of the growth fund was sufficient and the 2021/22 allocation was added into the school formula and allocated to schools and not used to further increase the growth fund. This was then used to increase the High Needs Block transfer from 0.25% to 0.5%.

5.6 Based upon the projected growth fund balance at 31.03.23, it is proposed to once again add the DSG growth funding allocation for 2022/23 into the school formula and allocate to schools. Some of this estimated £918k allocation will be required to support the increase in pupil numbers at Highwood Copse (Sept 2022- March 2023). This is estimated to be in the region £75-£100K. The remainder would be distributed to all schools.

5.7 A summary table is shown below:

| Growth Fund | Top up £ | Spend £ | Cumulative Balance £ |
|-------------|-------------|------------|----------------------------|
| 2018/19 | 280,710 | 87,500 | 193,210 |
| 2019/20 | 655,800 | 183,048 | 665,962 |
| 2020/21 | 904,945 | 69,836 | 1,501,071 |
| 2021/22 | 0 | 443,804 | 1,057,267 |
| 2022/23 | 0 | 270,500 | 786,767 |

6. Primary Schools in Financial Difficulty Fund

6.1 The primary schools in financial difficulty fund was topped up by £30k to £200k for 2021/22 budget purposes. No bids have yet been approved, but a decision needs to be made to de-delegate this service in 2022/23, in order to top up the fund to £200k.

| Primary Schools in Financial difficulty fund | Top up £ | Spend £ | Cumulative Balance £ |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------------|
| 2018/19 | 379,120 | 127,073 | 252,047 |
| 2019/20 | 0 | 70,880 | 181,167 |
| 2020/21 | 18,833 | 30,179 | 169,821 |
| 2021/22 | 30,179 | | 200,000 |
| 2022/23 | 0 | | 200,000 |

7. Additional High Needs Funding

7.1 Funding needs to be set aside from the high needs block in order to fund those schools qualifying for additional high needs funding. It is proposed that this remains at £40k.

| Additional High Needs Funding | Budget £ | Spend £ |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| 2018/19 | 100,000 | 83,609 |
| 2019/20 | 100,000 | 68,001 |
| 2020/21 | 100,000 | 33,550 |
| 2021/22 | 40,000 | 26,092 |
| 2022/23 | 40,000 | |

8. Proposals

- To distribute the 2022/23 growth allocation to all schools via the school formula.
- To top-up the PSIFD fund to £200k.
- To set the Additional High Needs fund at £40k.

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix A - EIA

Appendix A

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;*
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Schools' Forum to make: | Approve the budgets for additional funds. |
| Name of Service/Directorate: | Finance and Property/Resources |
| Name of assessor: | Melanie Ellis |
| Date of assessment: | 28.11.21 |

| Is this a ? | | Is this policy, strategy, function or service ... ? | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Policy | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | New or proposed | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Strategy | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Already exists and is being reviewed | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Function | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is changing | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Service | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| (1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it? | |
| Aims: | To approve the budgets for additional funds |
| Objectives: | To approve the budgets for additional funds |
| Outcomes: | To approve the budgets for additional funds |
| Benefits: | To approve the budgets for additional funds |

| (2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this? | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)</i> | | | |
| Group Affected | Potential Positive Impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Evidence |
| Age | none | none | |
| Disability | none | none | |
| Gender Reassignment | none | none | |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | none | none | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|--|
| Pregnancy and Maternity | none | none | |
| Race | none | none | |
| Religion or Belief | none | none | |
| Sex | none | none | |
| Sexual Orientation | none | none | |
| Further Comments: | | | |
| | | | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (3) Result | |
| Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: | |
| Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: | |

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqlA 2.

If an EqlA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqlA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (4) Identify next steps as appropriate: | |
| EqlA Stage 2 required | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Owner of EqlA Stage Two: | |
| Timescale for EqlA Stage Two: | |

Name: Melanie Ellis

Date: 28.11.21

Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website