

Report subject	<b>School Funding Consultation and Budget Proposals 2022-23</b>
Meeting date	13 January 2022
Status	Public
Executive summary	<p>This report sets out the outcome of the 2022-23 school funding consultation and proposals for the DSG budget</p> <p>The schools block proposals include that the mainstream schools funding formula is to continue to adopt the National Funding Formula (NFF), the existing growth fund policy is maintained, and the balance of funding is transferred to support the high needs budget. Also included are budget proposals for the central school services block and services to support maintained schools.</p>
Recommendations	<p><b>It is RECOMMENDED that Schools Forum agree for 2022-23 the following:</b></p> <p><b>School Members:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommend to Council that the schools NFF continues to be adopted as the local mainstream school formula.</li> <li>2. Agree the existing growth fund policy is to continue for 2022-23 with the resulting budget requirement of £0.531 million as set out in paragraph 29.</li> </ol> <p><b>All Members:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Agree surplus school block funding estimated at £0.751 million (0.3%) can be transferred to support the high needs budget as set out in paragraph 32.</li> <li>4. Agree the central school services block budgets as set out in table 5 of paragraphs 36.</li> </ol> <p><b>Maintained School members only:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Agree collectively the retention rates per pupil and budgets for LA duties supporting maintained schools as set out in paragraphs 43 and 44.</li> <li>6. Agree separately for primary, secondary, special/PRU the de-delegation of funding for school improvement duties as set out in paragraph 49.</li> </ol>
Reason for recommendations	The Schools Forum must be consulted on the local funding formula for mainstream schools and agree a range of central DSG budgets.

Portfolio Holder(s):	Councillor Mike White, Children and Young People Councillor Nicola Greene, Council Priorities and Delivery
Corporate Director	Adam Richens, Chief Finance Officer and Director of Finance
Report Authors	Nicola Webb, Assistant Chief Finance Officer
Wards	All
Classification	For recommendation and decision

## Background

1. The deployment of the DSG is regulated by the DfE through the School Finance Regulations, which are updated annually. The local School's Forum must be consulted on how the grant is used and has a range of decision-making powers.
2. The council is responsible for setting the formula for mainstream schools for reception to year 11, after taking account of the recommendations of the School's Forum which in turn should be based on the views of schools.

## Schools Funding Consultation

3. The consultation with schools was undertaken over 3 weeks, closing on 17 December 2021. A consultation paper (included at appendix 3) and link to the online survey were sent out to all schools by e-mail. A virtual consultation meeting was held on 9 December, aided by a presentation, that was well-attended by schools.
4. The mainstream funding formula proposed was to continue to adopt the NFF, provided this was affordable. There were no proposals to scale back the NFF for other reasons.
5. The consultation then sought views regarding:
  - how any shortfall or surplus in funding should be managed,
  - whether a transfer of school block funding to high needs could be supported up to the 0.5% limit if funding was available,
  - growth fund policy and allocations,
  - the central schools services block supporting all schools,
  - central retention / de-delegation from maintained schools for education functions.
7. Responses were received from all categories of schools (mainstream and special, academy and maintained) representing 51 schools (57%). Some multi academy trusts responded on behalf of all their schools in BCP with the response rate and data taking this into account as appropriate. A list of those responding is included in appendix 1.

## Schools Block Budgets

8. Final school block funding for 2022-23 is £238.108 million through the schools NFF and funding for growth. The School's Forum should consider the outcome of the consultation with all schools when making a recommendation to Council on the mainstream schools formula and deciding on the level of the growth fund and any transfer to high needs.

**Mainstream schools formula: use of the NFF as the local formula (consultation question 1)**

9. All schools agreed that the NFF methodology and unit values should remain as the local mainstream funding formula. The detail of the formula is included in appendix 2a.
10. A summary of the NFF applied locally with the updated October 2021 school data received in December for both pupil characteristics and pupil numbers is included below in table 1.

**Table 1: Factor Summary of NFF as the Mainstream Formula 2022-23**

<b>NFF Factor</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>Change</b>	
Basic	£174,977,290	£183,022,714	£8,045,424	4.6%
Deprivation	£15,554,494	£16,964,872	£1,410,378	9.1%
EAL	£1,846,925	£1,954,375	£107,451	5.8%
Prior Attainment	£14,126,224	£14,277,757	£151,533	1.1%
Mobility	£162,359	£384,080	£221,721	136.6%
Sparsity	£50,400	£57,600	£7,200	14.3%
MFG	£1,052,255	£831,198	-£221,057	-21.0%
MPPFL	£7,323,495	£6,614,389	-£709,106	-9.7%
Lump Sum	£10,552,917	£11,038,300	£485,383	4.6%
Split Sites	£230,288	£230,288	£0	0.0%
Exceptional Circumstances	£101,017	£101,017	£0	0.0%
Rates	£1,367,288	£1,367,288	£0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£227,344,951</b>	<b>£236,843,879</b>	<b>£9,498,927</b>	<b>4.2%</b>

11. The basic entitlement has increased by 4.6% reflecting the 3% increase in NFF unit values plus a 1.3% increase in numbers on roll (NOR) largely within the secondary school phase.
12. Census data for measures of deprivation (FSM, FSM6 and IDACI) have increased significantly between years continuing the trend from last year, with an increase significantly greater than for the underlying unit values increases (3% except for annual FSM measure at 2%) and NOR increase. This latest trend is a reversal of that seen before the pandemic.
13. Prior attainment funding has not increased by as much as expected from the 3% unit value increase and increase in NOR due to data changes. The most recent data available from before the pandemic is now used across three year groups in each phase. This data reflects improved prior attainment for most schools (primary and secondary phase) and across all year groups in the secondary phase, and particularly for years 10 and 11 based on earlier data. Changes between years are small for years 7 and 8 as expected as the same data is used in both years with the small changes reflecting pupil movements only between schools. Primary year groups are not shown individually in the data, but the change is much smaller than for secondary year groups.
14. The increases for mobility and sparsity reflect the change in the NFF use of data as well as the increase in funding values and NOR.
15. The minimum funding guarantee (MFG) is applicable largely for those schools with relatively high levels of deprivation that are transitioning to lower NFF funding levels.

The increased data noted above coupled with unit value increases in the main of 3% has reduced the level of top up funding needed compared with the 2% uplift on historic allocations.

16. Similarly, the top up funding to the minimum per pupil funding levels (MPPFL) has reduced due to the increase in characteristic data and unit value increases in the main of 3% compared with MPPFL increases of only 2%.
17. The lump sum increase beyond the 3% uplift in unit value reflects that one combined school has structurally changed to form separate primary and secondary schools with an additional lump sum now payable plus the new Livingstone Academy is open for a full financial year in 2022-23.
18. A summary of the NFF funding positions for schools is provided in table 2 below with school level detail in appendix 2b.

**Table 2: Summary of NFF Positions for Schools**

Formula Position	2021-22 Number	%	2022-23 Number	%
MPPFL	50	55	47	52
MFG	16	18	10	11
Formula	24	27	34	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100%</b>

19. The majority (63%) of schools in BCP for 2022-23 will be funded above that provided through the NFF formula factors alone with additional funding provided up to the MPPFL or through the MFG. This has reduced compared with 73% last year. It is likely that this trend will continue as after the initial boost in funding levels for low funded schools the government's longer term aim is to fund all schools according to the same formula. The DfE have signalled that for 2023-24 all local formula could be mandated to move towards the NFF, with the Schools Forum then having a reduced role in recommending a local formula.

**Transfer of surplus school block funding to high needs (consultation question 2)**

20. Schools Forum is to decide if any schools block funding should be transferred to high needs up to the permitted limit of 0.5% (£1.2 million) of funding. Any higher level of transfer requires the agreement of the DfE. Funding available in 2022-23 is less than 0.5% and estimated at only £0.751 million. This balance remains estimated as the formula funding total in table 1 could be adjusted following further review and checking by DfE.
21. Most schools (75% of responses) agreed surplus schools block funding should be transferred to high needs up to the limit of 0.5% (estimated at consultation at £1.2 million). Note that at the time of most responses, the additional £6.8 million (3%) from the spending review for mainstream stream schools was not known. Reasons for disagreeing include:
  - There is a collective responsibility to support the high needs places required across BCP, but there is more the LA could do to reduce the cost of providing these places and could work more closely with the schools providing higher than average exclusion rates to address this.

- Being inclusive and keeping more children in mainstream schools can be done only with adequate funding. It was appreciated that the band funding could increase from the review underway, but concern expressed that schools could make better use of the funding directly.
- The funding was allocated for schools and academies and is needed for those schools to make a small additional contribution to the work of mainstream settings, assisting them to retain increasing numbers of high needs pupils, until wider capacity improves.

### **Managing a shortfall in funding for the NFF (consultation question 3)**

22. There is sufficient funding in the schools block to provide the NFF in full to all mainstream schools in 2022-23.
23. If the full NFF had not been affordable, 82% would have supported reductions in the unit values of the basic entitlement as proposed, 10% that an alternative approach be developed with 8% unsure. No alternatives were suggested.

Comments provided included:

- The approach is agreed provided that the MFG protection would not be reduced
- It is the only feasible element of the overall funding block that can be used without undermining other specific elements
- No method should reduce the MPPFL

### **Use of any surplus funding (consultation question 4)**

24. The surplus to be considered in question 4 is after the schools NFF has been provided in full, an appropriate level of the growth fund budgeted, and a 0.5% transfer made to high needs with the proposal for any surplus being to reduce the historic DSG deficit.
25. There is no further surplus in school block funding to consider for 2022-23. However, 84% agreed the proposal was the right approach. Comments provided included:
- It should go to schools to enable them to support all SEN pupils to prevent more EHCPs being sought.
  - Any further surplus funding should be spread equally between schools to help them meet the continued pressures they face.
  - There is no alternative as the historic DSG deficit will not disappear or get written off by the LA.
  - This is a very small amount in terms of the high needs deficit and could be better used assisting schools to keep students in mainstream until places are created to assist them.
  - Would prefer to further address high needs first

### **Growth fund (consultation question 5)**

26. The Schools Forum is responsible for deciding the policy and level of the growth fund.

27. There was significant support (94% in agreement) that the existing growth fund policy is to continue in 2022-23, with the remaining 6% unsure. Comments included:
- There should be no more free schools. Invest the funds in schools that have the site capacity to expand. Establish which schools have the willingness and capacity to meet future growth.
  - There is already significant over capacity in Christchurch. Consideration should be given to support infant class sizes.
28. In response to providing additional funding for maintaining infant class sizes at 30 pupils, the current policy does not include as BCP is an urban area with all schools considered to be of sufficient size to manage this issue. This potential use is more relevant for rural areas where there may be small schools.
29. According to the current growth fund policy, a budget of £513,324 as set out in the consultation and Table 3 below, would be required in 2022-23.

**Table 3: Proposed Growth Fund 2022-23**

School	Description	2022-23 Budget £	2023-24 Indicative £
Bournemouth School	1 FE Y7 from Sep 2019	79,380	79,380
BSG	14 pupils Y7 from Sep 2019	37,044	37,044
Carter	2 FE Y7 from Sep 2019	158,760	158,760
Year 7 Bulge	2 FE Avonbourne schools	158,760	158,760
Year 7 Bulge	1 FE Christchurch area	79,380	79,380
<b>Total</b>		<b>513,324</b>	<b>513,324</b>

Note: FE is forms of entry of 30 pupils

30. Funding for the September 2022 intake of Livingstone Academy is included in the formula totals in table 1 (intrinsic growth) as the new school is still increasing year groups, rather than funding being set aside in the central growth fund in table 3.

### Summary of recommendations for schools block funding 2022-23

31. The financial impact of proposals for the schools block funding is in table 4 below.

**Table 4: Proposed School Block Allocations 2022-23**

Allocation of Funding	£000's
Individual school budgets using NFF	236,844
Growth fund according to existing policy	513
Balance available to transfer to high needs (0.3%)	751
<b>DSG schools block total funding</b>	<b>238,108</b>

32. **Recommendations** for Schools Forum to agree the following schools block proposals for 2022-23:

**School members only:**

1. **Recommend to Council that the local mainstream schools formula continues to adopt the school NFF unit values and methodology in full.**
2. **Agree the existing growth fund policy is to apply for 2022-23 with the resulting growth fund budget set at £0.513 million.**

**All members:**

3. **Agree the surplus schools block funding estimated at £0.751 (0.3%) million can be transferred to the high needs budget.**

**Central School Services Block (CSSB) (consultation question 6)**

33. Schools Forum is to agree the budgets within the central school services block.

34. Consultation question 6 asked for comments on these budgets with responses received as follows:

- Disappointing that the funding has reduced and the education welfare budget by £19,000 as a result. This puts extra pressure on schools to provide services. There are no services that schools could use for SEND, for example.
- Query whether the £44,000 reduction is due to efficiency within the system or the fact that expenditure has just been transferred directly to the schools and academies.

35. The budgets for on-going functions are reducing each year to stay within the reduced funding level from the DfE. This funding has increased slightly since consultation due to the increase in pupils at census. The budget for licenses paid for by the DfE has also increased.

36. Funding for historic commitments has not been restored to previous levels by the DfE, with this still being progressed. In the meantime, the budget for statutory and regulatory duties within ex ESG services has been reduced to balance to the level of funding.

**Table 5: Proposed Central School Services Budgets 2022-23**

<b>Central School Services</b>	<b>2021-22 £000's</b>	<b>Change £000's</b>	<b>2022-23 £000's</b>
School admissions and access arrangements	423	0	423
Licences purchased by DfE	234	13	247
Servicing Schools Forum	18	(8)	10
Commitments - premature retirements (ex DCC)	20	(3)	17
Commitments - ASD Base / other	275	0	275
Ex ESG Services:			
Statutory and Regulatory Duties	507	(63)	444
Education Welfare	433	(19)	414
Asset Management	148	0	148
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>2,058</b>	<b>(80)</b>	<b>1,978</b>

37. The detail of each budget is included within the consultation paper in appendix 3 (pages 18 and 19).
38. If the historic commitments funding is restored by the DfE then it is proposed that the funding for statutory and regulatory duties is increased closer to previous levels.
- 39. Recommendation 4: Schools Forum members to agree the CSSB budgets in table 5 in paragraph 36.**

#### **Maintained School Budgets only**

40. There are currently 14 mainstream maintained schools, and these will need to be accounted with this status for a full year on the APT containing the budget shares sent to the DfE in January. In addition, there are 3 specialist maintained providers. There may be conversions to academy status during 2022-23. The LA budgets in this section are indicative based on there being 17 maintained schools for a full financial year but as funding reduces as schools convert, expenditure will need to reduce accordingly.

#### **Central retention from maintained school budget shares for LA statutory duties (consultation question 7).**

41. The detail of these budgets was set out in the consultation paper (appendix 3 to this report) with the consequences if funding was not agreed. Comments received from the 5 maintained schools responding included:
- It seems unfair that all maintained schools are charged the same even when not all services are used (such as HR).
  - It would be useful to see an overall figure of how much time and therefore the cost of providing these services to schools - especially where they overlap with other services such as finance and HR.
  - We still do not feel we get value for money from services in the central retention as we do not receive significant benefit from the services listed and would prefer a pay as you go option.
  - Only that a reduction should be made for those schools that buy HR services elsewhere than from BCP.
42. It is appreciated that the retention is unpopular, but it is the only funding source for these duties that do not readily translate into pay as you go services – such as paying budget shares, accounting for school information, general landlord duties, general health and safety advice, and determining the pay and conditions of employment for non-teaching staff. The HR aspect may be used less by foundation and VA schools, but other services may be used more. In terms of the second comment above there are no longer dedicated staff teams working only with maintained schools and there are no records of time spent on this activity only.
43. It is proposed that the level of the central retention for 2022-23 remains as agreed last year as follows:
- |                                    |        |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| Mainstream School rate per pupil   | £23.17 |
| Specialist Provider rate per place | £98.46 |
44. The above central retention rates derive a budget of £213,000 with the allocation for each service for the 12-month period from April 2022 as set out in table 6 below.



**Table 6: LA Budget for Maintained School Statutory Duties April 2022 to March 2023**

Service	Budget Retained £000's
<p><b>Statutory &amp; Regulatory Duties:</b></p> <p><b>Education and Service Planning</b> - including appointment of governors, government data returns, functions under the equality act, legal services advice, handling complaints, academy conversion support.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">58</p>	
<p><b>Finance &amp; Audit</b> - Production of budget schedules and payment of funding allocations and DfE grants, consolidation of annual accounts and quarterly returns. CFR advice, best value and procurement advice, scheme of financing maintained schools, Internal audit, banking and treasury, financial regulations adaptation for schools (for example delegation of some CFO approvals to school governors).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">70</p>	
<p><b>Human Resources</b> - Employee investigations, pension administration, pay scales and conditions of service, TU negotiations for local government employees, support for school improvement activities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">15</p>	
<p><b>Total Statutory &amp; Regulatory</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>143</b></p>	
<p><b>Asset Management</b> - premises management support, including condition surveys and liaison with dioceses for VA schools, asbestos risk management, general health &amp; safety duty as an employer. DfE bids for condition grants and LA staff support relating to condition works.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">50</p>	
<p><b>Monitoring National Curriculum Assessments</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>	
<p><b>Total All Duties to be agreed</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>213</b></p>	

**De-delegation from maintained school budget shares replacing lost LA grant income for school improvement functions (consultation question 8).**

45. The outcome from the DfE consultation on reducing the LA grant by 50% in 2022-23 has not been received at the time of writing this report. Therefore, the proposal may need to change by the time of the meeting.
46. The proposal to introduce de-delegation for statutory school improvement functions was supported by 2 schools with 3 opposing. The alternatives proposed were a pay as you go service, or the LA should make a saving (and therefore deliver the service at half the cost as previously).
47. The proposal to use pupil/place numbers as the basis of the de-delegation if agreed to be implemented was supported by 3 out of the 5 responding to the question. Those disagreeing wanted to see only a pay as you go service.
48. Further comment was provided by a maintained special school as the DfE consultation focused only on mainstream schools where the funding in 2022-23 had been uplifted nationally by 3% within the NFF but special schools have seen no such increase (or any increase in band funding in recent years locally). It was felt also in this context that special schools contributed disproportionately to both the central retention and the de-

delegation. The response also mentioned that academies received separate funding for these services, but it should be noted that this is no longer the case and the government's argument for the change is that maintained schools currently have the advantage with the separate LA grant in place.

49. Primary, secondary and special/PRU are to agree the proposal separately that lost grant income of £25,000 is replaced by de-delegation according to a fixed amount per pupil/place in 2022-23 as follows:

- Mainstream schools £2.72 per pupil
- Special schools and PRU £11.56 per place

50. The financial impact of the above two proposals for maintained schools is shown in the table below:

**Table 7: Financial Impact of Maintained Schools Central Retention and De-delegation Proposals**

Maintained School	NOR/ Places	Central Retention £	De- delegation £	Total £
Christchurch Infant School	350	8,110	952	9,062
Somerford Primary School	238	5,514	647	6,162
Mudeford Community Infants' School	181	4,194	492	4,686
Mudeford Junior School	263	6,094	715	6,809
Burton Church of England Primary School	343	7,947	933	8,880
Hillbourne Primary School	219	5,074	596	5,670
St Katharine's Church of England Primary School	437	10,125	1,189	11,314
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School	431	9,986	1,172	11,159
The Priory Church of England Primary School	207	4,796	563	5,359
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Christchurch	217	5,028	590	5,618
Highcliffe St Mark Primary School	650	15,061	1,768	16,829
St. Walburga's Catholic Primary School	417	9,662	1,134	10,796
St Edward's Roman CA/CE School, Poole	912	21,131	2,481	23,612
Poole High School	1616	37,443	4,396	41,838
Mainstream Total	6,481	150,165	17,628	167,793
Winchelsea Special	188	18,510	2173	20,683
Christchurch Learning Centre	48	4,726	555	5,281
Linwood Special	397	39,089	4589	43,678
Special Total	633	62,325	7,317	69,642
<b>Total Budget</b>		<b>212,490</b>	<b>24,945</b>	<b>237,435</b>

51. It is proposed that with the additional funding received for high needs in the December settlement that special school band levels are uplifted. This is considered further in the final comments from the consultation in paragraph 53 below.

## **52. Recommendations for maintained schools only:**

- 5. Collectively agree the central retentions and related budgets in paragraphs 43 and 44.**
- 6. Each phase separately – primary, secondary, special to agree the delegation of school improvement funding as set out in paragraph 49.**

## **High Needs Block (consultation question 9)**

53. All the final comments in the consultation related to the high needs block:

- Concern expressed that the same long term budget deficit is being discussed. Whilst Sir Anthony Douglas highlighted the issue of SEND banding, top slicing mainstream budgets to meet the SEND deficit continues to be counter-productive. If the ambition of BCP & central government is for maintained BCP schools to home more EHCP children, a radical approach to managing the deficit needs to be taken.
- Actions to address the high needs block should be prioritised and increased banding to keep students in mainstream should be an urgent priority. If these cannot be calculated prior to the start of the academic year, they should be backdated to September when they are calculated.
- Special schools really do need BCP to consider the impact of static funding, resulting in real terms cuts. While mainstream schools are rightfully receiving rises, the ability of BCP's special schools to support the developments is hampered by low funding (reference was made particularly to cost pressures in 2022-23).

54. The council continues to focus on reducing the high needs deficit and the additional funding from government will support this, but the growth in EHCPs and level of special school funding remains challenging. The band funding review for mainstream EHCP top ups is underway and proposals will be brought forward in due course.

55. The level of band funding for special schools similarly needs to be reviewed but this will be a longer term project. However, interim proposals will be brought forward as soon as possible for 2022-23 given the cost pressures in the system and additional funding provided by government in the December Settlement.

## **Summary of financial implications**

56. The budgets for the schools and central school services blocks are set within the available DSG funding.

57. The 0.3% transfer of funding from the schools block to high needs is the maximum affordable with all schools receiving their full NFF allocations.

## **Summary of legal implications**

58. The consultation undertaken and the recommendations are compliant with the School Funding Statutory Framework for 2022-23.

59. School budgets must be finalised and notified to maintained schools by 28 February 2022 with the DfE timetable the same for academy budgets.

### **Summary of human resources implications**

60. Implications for staffing levels from mainstream funding changes rests within individual schools. The reduction in the budgets within the CSSB will need to be absorbed across all services within the council.

### **Summary of sustainability impact**

61. None

### **Summary of public health implications**

62. None

### **Summary of equality implications**

63. An equalities impact assessment has not been undertaken. The DfE have undertaken equality impact assessments in determining how DSG funding is to be allocated and the structure of the mainstream funding formulae. The local budgets are aligned with the national scheme.

### **Summary of risk assessment**

64. There remains a financial risk for the council from the unsustainable level of the high needs budget and accumulated DSG deficit.

### **Background papers**

65. Schools Forum September 2021

[http://ced-pri-cms-02.ced.local/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=149&MId=5093&Ver=4&\\$LO\\$=1](http://ced-pri-cms-02.ced.local/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=149&MId=5093&Ver=4&$LO$=1)

66. Schools Forum November 2021

[http://ced-pri-cms-02.ced.local/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=149&MId=5094&Ver=4&\\$LO\\$=1](http://ced-pri-cms-02.ced.local/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=149&MId=5094&Ver=4&$LO$=1)

67. DSG Announcements December 2021

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dedicated-schools-grant-dsg-2022-to-2023>

68. Supplementary Grant 2022-23

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schools-supplementary-grant-2022-to-2023>

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 List of schools responding to the consultation 2022-23
- Appendix 2a National and proposed local mainstream schools funding formula 2022-23
- Appendix 2b School level impact of the NFF for 2022-23
- Appendix 3 School funding consultation 2022-23 paper

**Schools Responding to the School Funding Consultation 2022-23**

Bearwood Primary and Nursery School

Ambitions Academies Trust 11 schools in BCP

TEACH Poole schools (not included in statistics as individual schools responded)

Livingstone Academy Bournemouth

Hamworthy Park Junior School

Twin Sails Infant School & Nursery

Bishop Aldhelm's CE Primary School

Twynham Learning MAT (2 x secondary + 4 x primary)

Burton CE Primary School

Ad Astra Infant School

Canford Heath Infant School

TEACH Trust (as above)

Canford Heath Junior School

Haymoor Junior School

Talbot Primary School

The Bourne Academy

Coastal Learning Partnership (12 schools in BCP)

St Edward's

Linwood School

Highcliffe School

St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School Christchurch

St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Poole

St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Poole

Christ the King, Bournemouth

(Plus 2 schools remained anonymous, narrative response identifies one as maintained)

## Appendix 2a

### National and Proposed Local Mainstream School Funding Formula 2022-23

Factors within the NFF	2021-22	2022-23
Basic Entitlement - Primary	£3,123	£3,217
Basic Entitlement - Secondaries	KS3 £4,404 KS4 £4,963	KS3 £4,536 KS4 £5,112
Deprivation - FSM data	£460 FSM £575 Primary FSM6 £840 Secondary FSM6	£470 FSM £590 Primary FSM6 £865 Secondary FSM6
Deprivation IDACI bands	Range £215 to £865	Range £220 to £890
Prior Attainment Primary	£1,095	£1,130
Prior Attainment Secondary	£1,660	£1,710
EAL Primary	£550	£565
EAL Secondary	£1,485	£1,530
Lump Sum Primary	£117,800	£121,130
Lump Sum Secondary	£117,800	£121,130
Mobility	£900 Primary £1,290 Secondary	£925 Primary £1,330 Secondary
Sparsity	NFF method	NFF method
Minimum per pupil funding levels (MPPFL)	Primary £4,180 KS3 £5,215 KS4 £5,715	Primary £4,265 KS3 £5,321 KS4 £5,831
Minimum increase per pupil (MFG)	+2%	+2%
<b>Other Factors (funded at cost)</b>		
Business Rates	At cost	At cost
Joint use agreements (2 schools)	£101,017	£101,017
Split sites (2 schools)	£230,288	£230,288

Schools' business rates will be paid by the ESFA to billing authorities directly on behalf of all state funded schools from 2022/23 onwards.

Exceptional premises and split sites factors are funded by the ESFA at historic levels outside the NFF for 2 schools (split site) and 2 different schools (joint use). Their use has previously been agreed by the ESFA based on evidence provided of additional costs of operating over a split site or from the provision of joint use with the community of sports facilities. A formulaic approach has been signalled by the ESFA for 2023/24 for factors currently funded outside the NFF to achieve greater national consistency.

## School level impact of the NFF for 2022-23

	2021-22 APT		2022-23 APT	
<b>Primary</b>				
Ad Astra Infant School	£1,117,973	MPPFL	£1,154,874	Formula
Baden-Powell and St Peter's CE Junior	£3,025,728	MPPFL	£3,074,133	MPPFL
Bayside Academy	£1,389,797	MFG	£1,365,651	MFG
Bearwood Primary and Nursery School	£886,009	Formula	£927,095	Formula
Bethany Church of England Junior School	£1,649,085	Formula	£1,713,252	Formula
Bishop Aldhelm's CE Primary School	£2,541,086	MPPFL	£2,566,921	MPPFL
Broadstone First School	£1,258,890	MPPFL	£1,292,920	MPPFL
Burton Church of England Primary School	£1,423,749	MPPFL	£1,490,524	MPPFL
Canford Heath Infant School	£1,502,328	MPPFL	£1,519,963	MPPFL
Canford Heath Junior School	£2,006,181	MPPFL	£2,046,811	MPPFL
Christ The King Catholic Primary School	£1,626,604	MFG	£1,634,365	MFG
Christchurch Infant School	£1,508,583	MPPFL	£1,538,333	MPPFL
Christchurch Junior School	£2,077,299	MPPFL	£2,102,314	MPPFL
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School	£1,813,184	MPPFL	£1,863,189	Formula
Courthill Infant School	£1,450,504	MPPFL	£1,535,359	MPPFL
Elm Academy	£2,031,921	MFG	£2,158,827	MFG
Hamworthy Park Junior School	£1,950,562	MPPFL	£2,002,882	MPPFL
Haymoor Junior School	£1,509,836	MPPFL	£1,527,556	MPPFL
Heatherlands Primary School	£2,567,634	MPPFL	£2,619,654	MPPFL
Heathlands Primary Academy	£949,411	MFG	£981,682	MFG
Highcliffe St Mark Primary School	£2,724,925	MPPFL	£2,784,355	MPPFL
Hill View Primary School	£2,575,736	MPPFL	£2,657,781	MPPFL
Hillbourne Primary School	£1,057,864	Formula	£1,044,920	Formula
Jewell Academy Bournemouth	£1,904,002	MFG	£1,875,005	MFG
King's Park Academy	£2,804,995	MFG	£2,888,921	MFG
Kingsleigh Primary School	£3,237,088	Formula	£3,455,795	Formula
Kinson Academy	£1,110,277	MFG	£997,043	Formula
Lilliput Church of England Infant School	£1,494,746	MPPFL	£1,512,211	MPPFL
Livingstone Road Infant School	£1,119,268	Formula	£1,092,877	MFG
Livingstone Road Junior School	£1,104,199	MFG	£1,200,467	Formula
Longfleet CE Primary School	£2,649,458	MPPFL	£2,703,093	MPPFL
Malmesbury Park Primary School	£2,569,014	MPPFL	£2,710,599	MPPFL
Manorside Academy	£1,691,184	MFG	£1,807,537	MFG
Merley First School	£1,272,582	MPPFL	£1,289,807	MPPFL
Moordown St John's CE Primary School	£1,762,768	MPPFL	£1,798,468	MPPFL
Mudford Community Infants' School	£802,525	MFG	£819,572	MFG
Mudford Junior School	£1,125,950	Formula	£1,170,695	Formula
Muscliff Primary School	£2,624,350	MPPFL	£2,626,210	MPPFL
Oakdale Junior School	£2,067,376	MPPFL	£1,949,545	MPPFL

	2021-22 APT		2022-23 APT	
Ocean Academy Poole	£1,319,378	Formula	£1,315,934	Formula
Old Town Infant School and Nursery	£799,262	MFG	£810,394	Formula
Pokesdown Community Primary School	£1,714,400	MPPFL	£1,770,405	MPPFL
Queen's Park Academy	£2,005,226	MPPFL	£2,054,301	MPPFL
Queen's Park Infant Academy	£1,499,684	MPPFL	£1,530,029	MPPFL
Somerford Primary School	£1,239,313	Formula	£1,206,173	Formula
Springdale First School	£1,237,938	MPPFL	£1,280,073	MPPFL
St Clement's and St John's CE Infant School	£1,263,510	MFG	£1,331,455	MFG
St James' CE Primary Academy	£1,715,559	MPPFL	£1,771,649	MPPFL
St Joseph's CA Primary School, Christchurch	£937,038	Formula	£999,790	Formula
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Poole	£1,628,391	MFG	£1,645,064	Formula
St Katharine's CE Primary School	£1,960,713	MPPFL	£1,877,368	MPPFL
St Luke's Church of England Primary School	£1,854,407	MPPFL	£1,933,267	MPPFL
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	£1,746,816	MPPFL	£1,790,706	MPPFL
St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Poole	£1,659,804	MPPFL	£1,761,619	MPPFL
St Michael's Church of England Primary School	£2,743,653	MPPFL	£2,838,501	Formula
St Walburga's Catholic Primary School	£1,757,359	MPPFL	£1,784,444	MPPFL
Stanley Green Infant Academy	£1,003,039	MPPFL	£1,027,619	MPPFL
Stourfield Infant School	£1,460,016	MPPFL	£1,447,602	MPPFL
Stourfield Junior School	£1,969,841	MPPFL	£2,035,296	MPPFL
Talbot Primary School	£2,459,464	Formula	£2,578,340	Formula
The Epiphany School	£1,733,163	MPPFL	£1,781,063	MPPFL
The Priory Church of England Primary School	£885,267	MPPFL	£886,142	MPPFL
Twin Sails Infant and Nursery School	£1,419,105	MPPFL	£1,503,195	MPPFL
Twynham Primary School	£908,024	MPPFL	£926,384	MPPFL
Winton Primary School	£3,492,523	MPPFL	£3,597,363	MPPFL
<b><u>Middle-deemed Secondary</u></b>				
Broadstone Middle School	£2,564,162	MPPFL	£3,028,216	MPPFL
<b><u>Secondary</u></b>				
Avonbourne Boys' Academy	£3,340,612	Formula	£4,000,549	Formula
Bournemouth School	£4,478,444	MPPFL	£4,728,869	Formula
Bournemouth School for Girls	£4,840,008	MPPFL	£4,926,638	Formula
Cornerstone Academy	£2,918,945	MFG	£3,380,655	MFG
Corfe Hills School	£3,589,513	Formula	£3,814,021	Formula
Glenmoor Academy	£4,853,003	MPPFL	£4,983,199	Formula
Highcliffe School	£6,739,354	MPPFL	£6,963,934	Formula
LeAF Studio	£1,453,025	Formula	£1,526,093	Formula
Magna Academy	£4,867,932	MFG	£5,135,113	Formula
Oak Academy	£2,808,845	Formula	£3,126,757	Formula
Parkstone Grammar School	£5,023,055	MPPFL	£5,107,790	Formula
Poole Grammar School	£4,907,548	MPPFL	£4,956,823	Formula
Poole High School	£8,903,411	Formula	£9,152,767	Formula



	<b>2021-22 APT</b>		<b>2022-23 APT</b>	
St Aldhelm's Academy	£4,523,627	MFG	£5,085,102	MFG
St Edward's RC/CE School, Poole	£5,027,949	Formula	£5,222,595	Formula
The Bishop of Winchester Academy	£6,007,653	Formula	£6,149,573	Formula
The Bourne Academy	£5,036,664	Formula	£5,160,691	Formula
The Grange School	£2,406,194	Formula	£2,434,852	Formula
Twynham School	£7,263,589	MPPFL	£7,377,289	Formula
Winton Academy	£5,154,165	Formula	£5,240,659	Formula
<b><u>Avonbourne</u></b>				
Avonwood Primary School	Consolidated		£2,418,255	MPPFL
Avonbourne Girls Academy	£6,918,280	Formula	£5,349,889	Formula
<b><u>All-through</u></b>				
Livingstone Academy	£577,357	Formula	£1,563,634	Formula
Parkfield School	£2,509,523	Formula	£2,634,704	Formula
St Peter's Catholic Comprehensive School	£8,234,531	Formula	£8,389,831	Formula
	<b>£227,344,951</b>		<b>£236,843,879</b>	