

Public Document Pack



Northumberland County Council

Your ref:

Our ref: AT

Enquiries to: Andrea Todd

Email: Andrea.Todd@northumberland.gov.uk

Tel direct: 01670 622606

Date: 22 September 2022

Dear Sir or Madam,

A virtual meeting of the **SCHOOLS' FORUM** will be held on **WEDNESDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER 2022** at **10.30 AM**. It is anticipated the meeting will be completed by 12.00 midday. You will be sent a link to the meeting and I would be grateful if you could accept or decline the invitation accordingly.

I remind you that if you are unable to attend, you should arrange for an appropriate substitute to attend on your behalf. Alternatively forward any written representations to me in advance.

In the current situation can I ask that Forum members read all papers prior to the meeting and forward any questions or contributions to me in advance of the meeting, however, we will do everything possible to take comments at the meeting too.

Yours faithfully,

Andrea Todd
Clerk to the Forum

To: Members of the Schools' Forum

Copy to Graham Reiter, Interim Director of Children's Services and Councillor Guy Renner-Thompson

AGENDA

It is expected that the matters included in this part of the agenda will be dealt with in public.

		Decision/Consultation/ Information/Action
1.	MEMBERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP UPDATE	Information
2.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	Information
3.	DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS (IF ANY)	Information
4.	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (Pages 1 - 8) Minutes of the meeting of the Schools' Forum held on Wednesday, 6 July 2022, as circulated, to be confirmed as a true record, and signed by the Chairman.	Action
5.	COMMUNICATION: F40 NFF CONSULTATION RESPONSE SEPT 2022 (Pages 9 - 36)	Information
6.	NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA AND SCHOOL FUNDING UPDATE (Pages 37 - 44)	Information / Consultation
7.	2022/23 WORK PROGRAMME AND MEETING DATES (Pages 45 - 46)	Information
8.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	Information / Action
9.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING The next scheduled meeting of the Schools' Forum is Wednesday, 16 November 2022.	Information

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

SCHOOLS' FORUM

At a virtual meeting of the Schools' Forum on Wednesday, 6 July 2022 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT

G. Wilkins (Vice-Chair, in the Chair)
St Wilfrid's RC Primary School

Headteacher Representatives

F. Hartland, Kielder Primary

A. Mead, Cramlington Hillcrest
School

Governor Representatives

J. Fisher, Newbrough Primary School
(on behalf of Barbara Mansfield)
K. Faulkner, Collingwood School

B. Watson, St Robert's RC First
School

Academies Representatives

C. Hodgson, West Prudhoe Academy

S. Spark, Hadrian Learning Trust (on
behalf of G. Atkins)

Roman Catholic Diocese – Vacant Post

Church of England Diocese – N. Threlfall

Pupil Referral Unit Representative – Vacant Post

Trades Union Representative – Vacant Post

16 - 19 Provider of Education Representative – W. Stephenson

County Councillor – G. Renner-Thompson

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

A. Kingham
B. Parvin

Service Director - Education and Interim DCS
Education and Skills Business Manager

Ch.'s Initials.....

C. Ponting	Senior Manager – Schools HR
A. Russell	Principal Accountant – Non Team Leader
D. Street	Deputy Director of Education
N. Taylor	Head of Inclusive Education and SEN Transformation
A. Todd	Democratic Services Officer

1. MEMBERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP UPDATE

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Warick Stephenson, from Northumberland College to the Schools’ Forum as the new Post 16 Representative.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from N. Brannen, M. Deane-Hall, N. Rodgers, B. Ryder, B. Mansfield (J. Fisher attending as substitute), K. Dickinson, G. Atkins (S. Spark attending as substitute), A. Hardie, C. Pearson, A. Thelwell, S. Wild, D. Wylie, Councillor R. Wearmouth, S. Aviston and D. Cookson.

3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Schools’ Forum held on Wednesday, 16 February 2022, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

4. COMMUNICATION: HN Committee Draft Minutes 20 June 2022

- 4.1 Members received the draft minutes of the HN Committee of the 20 June 2022. (A copy of the minutes has been filed with the signed minutes).
- 4.2 Members were advised that an invitation to attend the meeting of the High Needs Committee of 20 June 2022 had been extended to all members of the Schools’ Forum. At the meeting the proposal for distribution of further HN grant to maintained special schools, special academies and the pupil referral unit on the basis of a lump sum was agreed. In relation to maintained schools, the changes were proposed to the way a schools Notional SEN figure would be used to distribute additional SEN funding to the most inclusive schools.
- 4.3 The High Needs Committee also discussed the SEN green paper “SEND Review Right Support, Right Place, Right Time”. Members of the High Needs Committee and Schools’ Forum Members were encouraged, in consultation with their schools to submit consultation responses in their own right, but a proposed draft response was be circulated in advance of the Schools Forum meeting on 06 July 2022.

Ch.’s Initials.....

- 4.4 Further developments had taken place since the High Needs Committee regarding the SEN Green Paper. N. Taylor, Head of Inclusive Education and SEN Transformation was invited to update Schools' Forum on the paper as the Government had extended the date to submit submissions on the review to 22 July. She reiterated that it was extremely important that the voice of schools was heard in the consultation.
- 4.5 There were 22 key consultation questions to be answered as part of the review. Briefly Members were advised of some of the suggested ways to tackle the three key challenges identified by the review:
- 4.6 -The first part of the consultation related to a set of national standards that would apply across the whole system which would describe everyone's roles and responsibilities with greater clarity than before including the criteria for decisions to assess EHC plans.
- 4.7 -In terms of local area management there were proposals to have new SEND partnerships, inclusion boards and for those inclusion boards to have inclusion plans. This would help ensure continued partnership work, less duplication and help build on current good practice in Northumberland.
- 4.8 -Regarding finance, it was hoped to create a cap on provisions, price guides to provide more consistency within the system and develop a strong set of framework arrangements around commissioning, particularly on a regional basis.
- 4.9 -On EHCPs, it was proposed to introduce a standardised and digitised EHCP process and template to minimise bureaucracy and deliver consistency. Also, more emphasis on preparation for adulthood.
- 4.10 -Early Years Provision. More emphasis on early intervention and identifying needs. Also improving information sharing protocols between health, social care and education.
- 4.11 -Build expertise and leadership, by consulting on a new SENCO national professional qualification, alongside increasing the number of staff with an accredited SENCO qualification in early years settings.
- 4.12 -Many had stated a preference that both specialist and mixed MATs to coexist. This would allow current local authority maintained special schools and alternative provision settings to join either type of MAT. This would help build on the expertise within specialist provisions and broaden and upskill mainstream schools where necessary.
- 4.13 -To develop a reformed and integrated role for alternative provision.
- 4.14 -System roles, accountabilities, and funding reform. Funding to be better linked to key performance indicators for alternative providers and a minimum

Ch.'s Initials.....

funding guarantee and or a lump sum so that the alternative provisions were able to plan more effectively.

- 4.15 -The need to identify key metrics that should be used to measure local and national performance. Twenty-one areas had so far been identified which would help track progress around improvement journeys and allow comparisons between areas.
- 4.16 -The review asked how to best develop a national framework for funding bands and tariffs to achieve objectives and mitigate unintended consequences and risks. It was thought this could be achieved by better clarity around funding and placing the responsibilities for local authorities to work with schools and colleges to quality assure the fundings being used effectively. Also, for settings to work with local authorities to facilitate this.
- 4.17 The Council had begun to draft a collaborative response to the Green Paper and the key consultation questions working across different departments related to SEN provision. A workshop had also taken place to gather views. It was confirmed that once the response had been finalised it would be shared with Schools' Forum.
- 4.18 For those wishing to access the documents the link to the Government paper would be recirculated.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

5. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG) PROVISIONAL OUTTURN 2021-22

- 5.1 A. Russell, Principal Accountant – Non Team Leader presented that report which provided details of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) outturn position for 2021-22 to School Forum members, together with the implications of the outturn and upcoming pressures. (A copy of the report has been filed with the signed minutes).
- 5.2 Members were reminded that at the Schools' Forum meeting in January 2021 the budgets for each block within the DSG were set, with details for the Early Years and the High Needs blocks being agreed at the meeting in February 2021. The DSG allocation was then updated during the year by the DfE to consider school academy conversions, changes to high needs place funding and early years census data. The budget reflected the latest DSG allocation from the DfE issued in March 2022.
- 5.3 It was reported that there was now an overall surplus of £4.033 million at the end of 2021-22 compared to an overall surplus of £0.898 at the end of 2020-21. This was a change of £3.135million compared to the previous year and was a result of underspends across the Central Schools Block, Schools Block and the Early Years Block. There had been a continued impact on expenditure as many services had continued to work from home which resulted in reduced travel and running costs of the services.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- 5.4 The rise in demand for SEN Support and the Inclusion Service were expected to continue for the foreseeable future and it was anticipated this would be an additional budget pressure on the High Needs block for 2023-24 and beyond.
- 5.5 It was the intention to ring-fence the year end position on each block this year to ensure that funds carried forward would be utilised effectively and to provide services with additional resource to meet the emerging priorities within the specific areas of the Dedicated School Grant.
- 5.6 In response, to a query regarding the underspend this year, it was confirmed that budgets had been set for this year. However, looking ahead at budget setting for the next financial year, Schools' Forum members would need to be conscious of the fact that it had been an exceptional year. Over the next few months officers would be working on a medium-term budget plan to ensure budgets balanced going forward and to be proactive with some of the major pressures coming up in the next few years such as the opening of the Special Free School. It was hoped this piece of work would be available to be considered at the November meeting of the Schools' Forum.
- 5.7 A member commented on the increasing pressures being faced by special schools to take on additional children and asked if this was affecting budgets. In response it was stated that there were pressures on special school budgets, but additional students attracted both additional place and top up funding to support schools. Measures had been put in place to help all special schools, particularly those smaller special schools where they did not have the same economies of scale via the proposed introduction of a lump sum. However, it was an area that would continue to be monitored.
- 5.8 Additional comments were made about the pressure on the special school and that of the mainstream system. It was noted that there was an increased demand without any facility to make change. However, there was the relatively small carry forward, which hopefully could be invested to ensure there were enough special school places (both physical space as well as the expertise within the special schools to take the learners) and help support the mainstream systems.
- 5.9 A Member commented on the schools block and the high needs block funding and the need to ensure one was not used to subsidise another. The Chair advised that the High Needs Committee continued to monitor this and had over the last few years had successfully reduced the transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs block from 1% to 0.25% for the current year. Pressures arose from the continuing high number of pupils transferring from mainstream to special schools increasing the demand for places and therefore the pressures on the HN block.
- 5.10 The Schools' Forum were reminded of the decision a few years ago to transfer funding to support the HINT team. It was reported that the review of the SEN two-year pilot would be considered at the November meeting of the Schools' Forum which would evaluate how successful that decision had been.

RESOLVED:

- a) to approve the carry forward of the 2021/22 Trade Union Facility surplus of £93,463 in line with the request attached at Appendix A.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- b) to approve the carry forward of the 2021/22 English as an Additional Language (EAL) surplus of £81,280 in line with the report attached at Appendix A
- c) to note the intention to carry forward the respective DSG blocks (Central Services Schools) Early Years, High Needs and Schools Block) on a ringfenced basis into 2022/23.

6. MAINTAINED SCHOOL BALANCES AS AT 31 MARCH 2022

- 6.1 B. Parvin, Education and Skills Business Manager introduced the report which informed Schools' Forum of the position regarding Maintained School Balances as at 31 March 2022. (A copy of the report has been filed with the signed minutes).
- 6.2 As previously reported schools had been working within a couple of exceptional years and that had been reflected in terms of school figures. Schools had managed budgets very prudently over the course of the two years outlined and should be congratulated in relation to that.
- 6.3 It was reported that in general, as a group, the maintained schools were again showing positive movement in terms of their overall balances. It was pleasing that 73 of the 89 first/primary phase schools were in surplus. The number of schools in deficit overall had not changed. 16 schools remained in the same as this time last year but of those 16 schools, six had managed to now balance their balance and move into surplus.
- 6.4 Seven of the eight special schools had a surplus balance and again had increased over the course of the couple of years. However, as previously discussed there was extra demands placed by the additional numbers, and the need to invest not just in the educational support, but the provision and buildings in relation to special schools was noted.
- 6.5 As in previous years, it was noted that individual school figures would not be brought to the Forum but were subsequently made publicly available later on in the year via the ESFA's Schools Financial Benchmarking Service.

RESOLVED that the report be received for information.

7. SCHEME FOR FINANCING MAINTAINED SCHOOLS 2022/23

- 7.1 B. Parvin, Education and Skills Business Manager introduced that report which asked the Schools' Forum to review and approve the revised Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools for the period commencing 1 September 2022. (A copy of the report has been filed with the signed minutes).
- 7.2 It was reported that local authorities were required to publish schemes for financing schools, setting out the financial relationship between them and the schools they maintained. This was reviewed on an annual basis, in consultation with Schools and the Schools' Forum. The draft Scheme was sent out to all via the e-courier on 09 June 2022 with a closing date of 2 July 2022, and at the time of writing this

Ch.'s Initials.....

report no comments had been received. A copy of the proposed Scheme for the academic year 2022/23 had been circulated with this report, proposed changes had been highlighted in yellow, with the exception of those Schools to whom the Scheme is no longer applicable due to academisation (shown as strike through in Annex A).

- 7.3 Other than the minor change outlined above, no major improvements were proposed by the ESFA or NCC to the Scheme for Financing Schools for 2022/23. The format and the content of the Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools was largely dictated by the requirements of the ESFA, but collaborative work with schools to identify and resolve any potential problems would continue.

RESOLVED that Schools Forum approve the attached draft Scheme for Financing Maintained Schools.

8. 2022 WORK PROGRAMME AND MEETING DATES

- 8.1 The schedule of dates had been circulated with the agenda papers and a copy filed with the signed minutes.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday, 28 September 2022 at 9:30 a.m.

CHAIR _____

DATE _____

Ch.'s Initials.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Fair funding for
all schools

Page 9

Implementing the Direct National Funding Formula

DfE consultation

Launch date: 7 June 2022

Respond by: 9 September 2022

Agenda Item 5

The Proposal

Background

It is a DfE [consultation](#) to seek views on its approach to implementing the direct National Funding Formula to mainstream schools.

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

Page 10
It builds on the previous consultation and considers next steps in more detail regarding the implementation of the direct NFF over the coming years. It includes a number of proposed changes, whilst maintaining protections to minimise disruption.

In this submission:

- Words in blue are f40's response
- Words in red are f40's additional thoughts, where we were not invited to give a comment but where we wanted to get a specific point across. We have provided these additional comments to the DfE separately.

Scope

Principles

By moving towards a hard NFF, the DfE aims to further embed the following principles in the funding system:

- **Fairness** – each mainstream school funded on a consistent basis, to reflect their needs and circumstances.
- **Simplicity and transparency** – every individual mainstream school's funding calculated through a single national formula, transparent to all in the system.
- **Efficient and predictable** – a single national formula through which funding is matched to relative need, creating greater predictability in funding and ensuring resources are distributed and used across the system as efficiently as possible.

Question is whether, in order to achieve these principles and the goal of delivering an equitable funding system for every school, all elements of funding should be distributed through a hard NFF or whether there would continue to be merit in local control of certain aspects of mainstream school funding.

Proposal

Subject to the further development of premises and growth funding factors, it is proposed to include all NFF funding factors – pupil-led and school-led – in the hard formula, without further local adjustment through local formulae.

Questions - SEND

Q1. Do you agree that local authorities' applications for transfers from mainstream schools to local education budgets should identify their preferred form of adjustment to NFF allocations, from a standard short menu of options? Do you have any other comments on the proposals for the operation of transfers of funding from mainstream schools to high needs? (Y/N/Unsure + 200 word comment)

Page
12

Response - Yes

We support the flexibility of seeking transfers from mainstream schools to other funding blocks to support relevant activities. This should, however, be unnecessary in an effective funding system and we don't consider this a viable alternative to providing sufficient and equitable levels of funding.

As transfers will support all schools, we welcome the greater flexibility to include all schools within the scope, irrespective of phase or where a school may be in their current level of funding (e.g. MPPL or MFG). It's important to recognise that a school's ability to contribute will be impacted by the national distribution of funding.

Any solution should ensure LAs have sufficient time to consult appropriately (in term time) regarding transfers.

Confirmation of decisions regarding transfers should be provided in a timely manner as a delay could have wider implications for the LA and may prevent agreement of overall budgets for the year.

In taking on greater responsibility, the DfE has an obligation to monitor the impact and justify decisions in a transparent way to ensure fair outcomes. Changes to the framework and exceptions may be required in exceptional/unforeseen circumstances or where the need for transfers can't be matched fairly through contributions from schools.

Questions – SEND

Q2. Do you agree that the direct NFF should include an indicative SEND budget, set nationally rather than locally? *(Y/N/Unsure + 200 word comment)*

Response – No

Page 13 We're unclear as to the value of a notional budget for SEN and feel the Department should consider the value of this being maintained. This adds to the level of confusion in schools and among parents regarding SEN funding, with many assuming it is separate (additional) funding or seeking further funding where they view they have "spent" their allocation.

With the NFF, a conscious move was taken to move away from linking specific levels of funding to activities and encourage schools to use their whole budget effectively to achieve their overall aims and objectives. The notional SEN budget, therefore, feels a legacy of a previous funding system. We'd consider a clear and detailed definition of Ordinary Available Provision as a much better way of defining what a school should be spending, which is supported by the proposals in the SEN Green Paper.

A direct NFF would lend itself to the consistency of a nationally-set notional budget if there was a need, but the DfE would need to ensure the reasonableness of the calculation and give an assurance around sufficiency of the budget and the £6,000 threshold. The methodology should consider the complexities of the MPPFL and impact on school funding.

Growth and falling rolls

Q3. Do you have any comments on the proposals to place further requirements on how local authorities can operate their growth and falling rolls funding? *(200 word comments)*

Response

Page 14
We recognise the Department's desire for consistency, however, we consider it important to allow for a high level of flexibility in allocation to ensure LAs are able to fulfil their statutory duties. LAs have a range of statutory duties centred around place planning, with solutions often requiring tailored approaches. Standardisation should take this into account to allow for exceptional circumstances.

Wider DfE funding policy may also have a bearing, for example, where the DfE provides a level of funding for pre-opening costs in direct application free schools, there is an expectation on LAs to mirror this for basic need new schools, therefore, sufficient funding should be provided.

Any standard criteria applied should consider the wider context of school finances and fluctuations in pupil numbers, and the potential impact on the wider local education system. This may be supporting small, necessary schools through a period of low pupil numbers or providing a reasonable level of funding to support growth in an established school.

Local factors should be considered, including area-based demographics (general decline in pupil numbers), turbulence of pupil numbers presenting planning challenges, and the ability to restructure to optimum models to ensure the pupil:teacher ratio is financially sustainable.

Growth and falling rolls

Q4. Do you believe that the restriction that falling rolls funding can only be provided to schools judged “Good” or “Outstanding” by Ofsted should be removed? (Y/N/Unsure)

Page 15
Response - **Yes**

The need for a school in an area does not change whether or not a school requires educational performance improvements. Typically, performance issues and falling pupil numbers are linked with additional expenditure required in the short-term to support performance improvements. Funding is, therefore, even more essential in this scenario. (No text permitted)

Growth and falling rolls

Q5. Do you have any comments on how we propose to allocate growth and falling rolls funding to local authorities?
(200 word comment)

Response

Whilst we're supportive of ensuring current funding reflects current need, we wish to ensure any losses at LA level are managed gradually through transitional arrangements. Growth funding is allocated to schools over time, and schools have commitments against it. A lack of transitional support could place schools in financial difficulty.

Funding levels that are required to encourage schools to change pupil numbers will be influenced by current funding expectations, so there's a risk current funding inequities in the NFF will be reflected.

We are unclear in the proposal regarding the growth and decline of pupil numbers and would recommend providing greater clarity, and suggest testing of any proposals before implementing changes.

Falling rolls funding has been applied flexibly to meet local need and to support LAs in meeting statutory responsibilities, supporting both necessary small schools and academies, and complimenting provisions for growing schools. We're unsure local circumstances can be adequately reflected nationally and may risk school viability. Where growth is short-term, it's better value to meet costs of temporary classrooms from revenue, rather than capital. With decreasing flexibility to move funding across the DSG, LAs need assurance they can manage risks from an in-year shortfall in growth funding. (200 words)

Growth and Falling rolls

Q6. Do you agree that we should explicitly expand the use of growth and falling rolls funding to supporting local authorities in repurposing and removing space? (Y/N/Unsure)

Response – Yes

We strongly support this proposal. As the proposal outlines, some space capacity is required in the system to accommodate short-term fluctuations in pupil numbers and long-term growth, however, a more flexible approach to funding to enable capacity to be used to best effect is welcomed and can only be considered a positive in the overall best use of public funds.

There are other limiting factors relating to this proposal, as the consultation document outlines, LAs are dependent on partners to be supportive of change where there can be a tension between what an individual partner feels is desirable and what is in the best interests of the education system as a whole.

Further strengthening of LA statutory powers regarding place planning for all schools is essential, along with strong support from the Regions Group to achieve long-term improvements. (No text permitted)

Growth and falling rolls

Q7. Do you agree that the Government should favour a local, flexible approach over the national, standardised system for allocating growth and falling rolls funding; and that we should implement the changes for 2024-25?

(Y/N/Unsure)

Page

Response – Yes

Growth and falling rolls

Q8. Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to popular growth? *(200 word comment)*

Response

We are strongly supportive of ensuring equity of access to funding to support popular growth.

Pupil growth, as a result of school improvement, is driven by high quality school leadership and teaching, which can occur irrespective of a school's governance structure, so should be accessible to all schools. Changes to the NFF should be driven by funding policy, rather than seeking to further other Government policy objectives.

Popular growth can also be seen in relation to relative performance in an area. An academy or maintained school may see significant growth as its popularity rises as a consequence of issues arising in neighbouring schools. This will also drive essential costs and would warrant support, again with governance models having no bearing on the change.

We are supportive of a local approach to growth funding as we feel it would not be possible to support schools and LAs effectively through a national system due to the variety of circumstances the growth and falling rolls fund will need to accommodate. (167 words)

Split sites

Q9. Do you agree we should allocate split site funding on the basis of both a school's 'basic eligibility' and 'distance eligibility'? (Y/N/Unsure)

Response – Yes

Split sites should be considered in the context of the lump sum i.e. what costs / savings are incurred compared to separate schools each receiving a lump sum. As such, a basic factor should be considered due to essential duplication of staffing and facilities and a distance factor included for the marginal cost of time and transport for staff / pupils moving between sites. (No text permitted)

Split sites

Q10. Do you agree with our proposed criteria for split site 'basic eligibility'? (Y/N/Unsure)

Response – Yes

We are broadly supportive of the proposed criteria. We would ask in any final policy for further clarity around definitions as queries have occurred around the status of roads and what is classified as an “ancillary” building. Further consideration regarding these proposals may be required in relation to other proposals made in relation to exceptional circumstances. If the threshold for eligibility for funding for exceptional circumstances changes, this may result in further use of split site funding where schools need to access facilities remotely due to inadequate provision within the schools site. (No text permitted)

Split sites

Q11. Do you agree with our proposed split site distance criterion of 500m? (*Shorter/about right/longer/unsure*)

Response - Unsure

Split sites

Q12. Do you agree with total available split sites funding being 60% of the NFF lump sum factor? (*Higher/about right/lower/unsure*)

Page 23
Response – **Unsure**

Split sites

Q13. Do you agree that distance eligibility should be funded at twice the rate of basic eligibility? (*Higher distance weighting/about right/higher basic weighting/unsure*)

Response – Higher basic weighting

By linking the funding to the lump sum this recognises quite rightly that the majority of costs are fixed, therefore, would be incurred irrespective of distance. A greater weighting should, therefore, be applied to basic eligibility.

We also favour the application of a taper to distance funding in recognition of the variable costs incurred, therefore, this proposed split would also not work on that basis and there would be instances where the basic eligibility funding would be proportionately higher. (No text permitted)

Split sites

Q14. Do you agree with our proposed approach to data collection on split sites? (Y/N/Unsure)

Response – **Yes**

We agree that LAs have an ongoing role in this area supporting the process to ensure appropriate funding is received by schools in its area. As stated in the consultation, this will make use of the local knowledge LAs have access to and will be more efficient for all parties. (No text permitted)

Split sites

Q15. Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to split sites funding? *(200 word comment)*

Response

Page 26
Any minimum distance criterion is subjective and can create unnecessary funding “cliff edges”. It’s a complex issue, with often unique and challenging circumstances. We would favour the tapering approach, which would avoid ‘cliff edges’ and would better recognise the differences in costs incurred between schools operating over different distances. This would also mean the proportions of funding for basis and distance funding would also be variable.

The huge variety of circumstances means taking a national average to cap funding won’t provide a fair reflection of the likely costs some schools will incur. Clearly, there should be some limit with the maximum being the level of funding received if each site was a separate school and in receipt of its own lump sum. Any limit below this figure would need a greater level of consideration and justification.

Consideration should be given to instances where a school either receives a reduction in split site funding or funding ceases completely. This is most likely as part of the transition from local to national calculations, but on rare occasions can occur locally e.g. change of entrance or change of road distance.

An exceptions process should be considered where a more tailored approach is necessary. (200 words)

Exceptional circumstances

Q16. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the exceptional circumstances factor? *(Y/N/Unsure)*

Response – No

Exceptional circumstances

Q17. Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to exceptional circumstances? *(200 word comments)*

Response

We recognise the DfE's desire for standardisation, but the priority for this factor should be to recognise genuine, unavoidable, and significant additional costs. Applying a standard criteria may exclude some genuine cases therefore, an exceptions process should be created.

The proposal to increase the minimum threshold is likely to have a significant impact, albeit on a small number of schools, leading to significant funding problems. The proposal appears arbitrary. Redefining what the DfE considers 'exceptional' will in no way reduce the unavoidable costs schools will incur as a result of their circumstances. If any change to the threshold is applied, a protection mechanism should protect schools against any immediate loss of funding. Consideration should be given to any interplay between this and the split site proposals.

In taking on greater responsibility, the DfE has an obligation to monitor the impact of any existing or amended policies to ensure they continue to achieve a fair outcome at individual school level as the Department will be held accountable for any adverse impacts. We recognise the challenges in reflecting local needs and exceptional circumstances and suggest setting aside a small element of the NFF for this, directed at MAT level or Schools Forum. (200 words)

Minimum funding guarantee

Q18. Do you agree that we should use local formulae baselines (actual GAG allocations, for academies) for the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) in the year that we transition to the direct NFF? *(Y/N/Unsure)*

Response - Unsure

Minimum funding guarantee

Q19. Do you agree that we should move to using a simplified pupil-led funding protection for the MFG under the direct NFF? (*Y/N/Unsure*)

Response - Unsure

Minimum funding guarantee

Q20. Do you have any comments on our proposals for the operation of the minimum funding guarantee under the direct NFF? *(200 word comment)*

Response

Page 31
We support this proposal in principle and recognise it addresses concerns previously raised, however, we have concerns whether sufficient testing has been undertaken to ensure no unintended consequences. An assessment should be made at school level for varying scenarios, such as changes to school-led factors that impact all or some schools, to assess for unintended consequences. Changes should be made to the proposals to ensure a fair outcome.

In taking on greater responsibility for this area, the DfE has an obligation to monitor the impact of existing or amended policies on an ongoing basis to ensure it continues to achieve a fair outcome for individual schools.

It's important not to lose sight of the minimum funding level protection mechanism, which is embedded in the formula. This factor should not be required in an effective funding system where sufficient funding meets basic need, and further funding meets specific pupil and school-related requirements. The current methodology excludes schools equally in need, including vulnerable small schools due to the disproportionate impact of school-led factors on the per pupil value, or schools that provide a high level of additional need, with the lack of further support at risk of becoming another barrier to inclusion. (200 words)

Planning

Q21. What do you think would be most useful for schools to plan their budgets before they receive confirmation of their final allocations: (i) notional allocations, or (ii) a calculator tool?

(Notional/calculator/unsure)

Response – Unsure

Planning

Q22. Do you have any comments on our proposals for the funding cycle in the direct NFF, including how we could provide early information to schools to help their budget planning? *(200 word comment)*

Response

Page 33
We're supportive of both notional allocations and a calculator to support schools' financial planning. Notional allocations provide schools a greater level of certainty and confidence as this is a (provisional) figure the DfE has derived using existing data. And the tool would allow those schools with more confidence to update datasets to provide a better indication of the likely figure they will actually receive, with the assurance available from the notional allocations as a way of validation.

In principle, maintaining the existing timescales seems sensible through the period of transition. There are, however, points of risk regarding any new requirements and LAs would need to be assured information is provided to them from the DfE in a timely manner to allow for communication to schools e.g. consultation, top-slice and de-delegation.

The current challenge for schools is where an affordability gap arises between the allocation to LAs and the NFF unit values. If this is removed, it will solve one challenge to financial planning, though it may present a challenge to the DfE in terms of quantum of funding. If this is not removed, the DfE will be held responsible for reductions to unit values / perception of reduction in funding. (200 words)

Data

Q23. Do you have any comments on the two options presented for data collections in regards to school reorganisations and pupil numbers? When would this information be available to local authorities to submit to DfE? *(200 word comment)*

Response

We would recommend initially aligning the collection of data and deadlines to the existing APT timescales. During a period of change, this would provide some continuity, which can be reviewed when the process becomes more stable.

This would also ensure access to more tailored information in the pre-populated form and avoid risks and issues regarding estimated / forecast data.

It should be noted that current timescales are already challenging, therefore, the DfE would need to be mindful that any delays in provision of necessary information to LAs is likely to result in delayed responses back. (95 words)

Data

Q24. Regarding de-delegation, would you prefer the Department to undertake one single data collection in March covering all local authorities, or several smaller bespoke data collections for mid-year converters?
(Single/several/unsure)

Response - Several

Data

Q25. Do you have any other comments on our proposals regarding the timing and nature of data collections to be carried out under a direct NFF? *(200 word comment)*

Response

Page 36
The existing process and timescales for agreeing de-delegation and informing the DfE of any mid-year conversions should continue. Maintained schools need to be informed of any deductions for de-delegation or top-slice before the new financial year to support planning. This is also essential for LAs to meet statutory budget setting deadlines and to ensure service delivery.

Currently, LAs are able to confirm this through data provided for completing the APT. It will be essential that the DfE provide LAs with the equivalent data to a similar timescale. As LAs have a statutory duty to issue budget shares by a set deadline, the DfE should also be held to a similar statutory deadline.

Further consideration should be given to LA data requirements. The data provided to LAs as part of the current arrangements informs a number of processes internally, which will need to be maintained. Further clarity is also required regarding queries schools have on allocations. Schools currently contact their LA to resolve any queries, however, with the transfer of responsibilities to the DfE, schools need assurance that their queries will be answered in a timely manner. More detail is also required around the actual financial transactional implications of these proposals. (200 words)



Agenda Item 6

Northumberland County Council

Schools Forum : 28 September 2022

National Funding Formula and School Funding Update

1. Purpose of Briefing Note

To provide an update in relation to the implementation of the National Funding Formula (NFF) and initial information published by the ESFA in relation to School Funding for 2023/24, including updated NFF values for 2023/24.

2. Recommendations

Schools Forum are recommended to:

- note the report; and
- anticipate a further report as part of formal school funding consultation with the Schools Forum at the 16 November 2022 meeting.

3. Background

Schools Forum has previously received reports outlining developments in relation to the National Funding Formula (NFF). Information from the Department for Education (DfE) has confirmed their intention to move to a National Funding Formula (previously known as the “Hard” Formula though the ESFA are now using the term “Direct” Formula). Once the NFF hard formula is fully implemented, local authorities will have no discretion in the values of the individual factors used to distribute funding to schools, as is the case now, within the overall framework provided by the ESFA Revenue Funding Guide and the associated Authority Proforma Tool (APT) used to calculate individual school budget shares.

While previously no firm fixed target date had been proposed, in July 2022 the DfE indicated an expectation for LAs “to have moved to the direct NFF within the next 5 years – that is by the 2027/28 funding year at the latest.

Furthermore, the DfE have introduced a requirement that all NFF factors must be used within a local authority’s formula. Northumberland satisfies this following the introduction to include the mobility element last year.

There are also assessment criteria, classifying LAs in 3 categories, based on a comparison of individual local authority’s formula values with the NFF:

- A. Local Authorities that mirror the NFF** are where all formula factors are within 2.5% of the NFF;
- B. Local Authorities that mirror the NFF in most factors** where at least 7 out of 9 factors “mirror” the NFF. Northumberland is in this category as while 8 of the 9 factors mirror NFF, the mobility factor currently sits at 50% of the NFF value.
- C. Local authorities whose formulae are substantially different from the NFF**, where authorities use different factors or values more than 2.5% different from the NFF in 3 or more factors

Local authorities in categories B & C will be required to move their 2023/24 formula factors a minimum of 10% closer to NFF, and the DfE have produced minimum and

maximum formula value tables (available [HERE](#)) reflecting this. Northumberland's table is shown below:

Local authority (LA) name	Local authority number		
Northumberland	929		
Factor	2023 to 2024 national funding formula (NFF) value including area cost adjustment (ACA)	2023 to 2024 authority proforma tool (APT) minimum value	2023 to 2024 APT maximum value
Primary basic entitlement	£3,394.00	£3,309.15	£3,478.85
KS3 basic entitlement	£4,785.00	£4,665.38	£4,904.63
KS4 basic entitlement	£5,393.00	£5,258.18	£5,527.83
Primary FSM	£480.00	£468.00	£492.00
Secondary FSM	£480.00	£468.00	£492.00
Primary FSM6	£705.00	£687.38	£722.63
Secondary FSM6	£1,030.00	£1,004.25	£1,055.75
Primary IDACI F	£230.00	£224.25	£235.75
Primary IDACI E	£280.00	£273.00	£287.00
Primary IDACI D	£440.00	£429.00	£451.00
Primary IDACI C	£480.00	£468.00	£492.00
Primary IDACI B	£510.00	£497.25	£522.75
Primary IDACI A	£670.00	£653.25	£686.75
Secondary IDACI F	£335.00	£326.63	£343.38
Secondary IDACI E	£445.00	£433.88	£456.13
Secondary IDACI D	£620.00	£604.50	£635.50
Secondary IDACI C	£680.00	£663.00	£697.00
Secondary IDACI B	£730.00	£711.75	£748.25
Secondary IDACI A	£930.00	£906.75	£953.25
Primary EAL3	£580.00	£565.50	£594.50
Secondary EAL3	£1,565.00	£1,525.88	£1,604.13
Primary LPA	£1,155.00	£1,126.13	£1,183.88
Secondary LPA	£1,750.00	£1,706.25	£1,793.75
Primary mobility	£945.00	£529.20	£968.63
Secondary mobility	£1,360.00	£761.50	£1,394.00
Primary lump sum	£128,000.00	£124,800.00	£131,200.00
Secondary lump sum	£128,000.00	£124,800.00	£131,200.00
Primary sparsity	£56,300.00	£54,892.50	£57,707.50
Secondary sparsity	£81,900.00	£79,852.50	£83,947.50
Middle-school sparsity	£81,900.00	£79,852.50	£83,947.50
All-through sparsity	£81,900.00	£79,852.50	£83,947.50

In practice the only formula factor of note is Mobility, where the intention for 2023/24 was to move to NFF anyway following its introduction into the Northumberland formula last year.

Despite the DfE classification criteria placing Northumberland in category B, it should be remembered that most formula values are now in line with NFF. It is anticipated that moving to full NFF should present no significant issues, on the basis of the information currently available.

Overall school funding is increasing by 1.9% in 2023/24 compared to 2022/23. Year on year comparisons include the School Supplementary Grant paid in addition to the DSG in 2022/23. In their updated policy document The National Funding Formula for Schools and High Needs 2023-24 published in July, and available [HERE](#), the DfE have been keen to emphasise the impact of additional funding over 2 years, making comparisons of an 7.9% per pupil increase compared to 2021-22 but schools should be aware that the funds available for 2023/24 will not increase by the same amount as in 2022/23.

The main features of the 2023/24 figures are:

- Additional support directed to disadvantaged pupils, by increasing the FSM6 and IDACI factors in the schools NFF by a greater amount than other factors. These factors will increase by 4.3%, compared to their 2022-23 values. This means that we will be targeting a greater proportion of schools NFF funding towards deprived pupils than ever before - 9.8% of the schools NFF will be allocated according to deprivation in 2023-24.
- The core factors in the schools NFF (such as the basic entitlement, and the lump sum that all schools attract) will increase by 2.4%.
- Through the minimum per pupil funding levels, every primary school will receive at least £4,405 per pupil, and every secondary school at least £5,715.
- The funding floor will ensure that all schools attract at least 0.5% more pupil-led funding per pupil compared to its 2022-23 NFF allocation.
- Rolling the 2022-23 school supplementary grant into the schools NFF ensuring that this additional funding forms an on-going part of schools' core budgets. Appropriate adjustments have been made to NFF factor values and baselines to reflect this, using the following values:
 - £97, £137 and £155 have been added to the Primary, KS3 and KS4 AWPUs
 - £85 and £124 to the Primary and Secondary FSM6 factors; and
 - £3,680 to the Lump Sum

There is a 0.5% rise in the Minimum Per Pupil Funding (MPPF) figures, demonstrated below:

Phase	2022/23 MPPF Level	Increase	2023/24 MPPF Level
Primary	£4,265	£119 (2.8%) SSG + £21 (0.5%) inc	£4,265
KS3	£5,321	£155 (2.9%) SSG + £27 (0.5%) inc	£5,503 #
KS4	£5,831	£173 (3.0%) SSG + £29 (0.5%) inc	£5,525 #

the secondary value of £5,705, is a weighted average of the KS3 (3/5) and KS4 (2/5) figures

The announcement was accompanied by indicative figures at a LA level using the previous October 2021 data. Final allocations will of course be based on October 2022 School Census data, and published in late December.

Appendix A shows the ESFA NFF values for 2023/24, plus the estimated spending attributed to those values nationally. Appendix B provides a comparison of the movement in NFF Values from 2022/23 to 2023/24 plus an indication of the potential impact of this for Northumberland. It should be noted that the 2023/2 figures includes an increase in respect of the School Supplementary Grant distributed separately in 2022/23, and included in the main DSG for 2023/23.

5. High Needs

Information from the DfE reports a £570 million (6.3%) increase in funding nationally for 2023/24, compared to a £760 million (9.6%) increase nationally in 2022/23. Each local authority will receive an increase of between 5 and 7% per head based on population aged between 2 and 18.

Based on our 2022/23 allocation, after deductions, this could be worth between £2.174 million and £3.044 million in 2023/24.

6. Central Schools Services Block

The ongoing 20% reduction in the historic commitment element has previously been highlighted and should continue to cover Northumberland’s costs in relation to ongoing prudential borrowing costs and termination of employment costs for which the historic element is intended. While there is a small 2% increase in the ongoing responsibilities element, this needs to be balanced against the significant pay and price inflation pressures anticipated.

	2022/23 (actual)	2023/24 (provisional)	Change	
			£	%
Ongoing Responsibilities	£1,410,271	£1,438,455	+£28,184	+2.0%
Historic Commitments	£1,044,000	£835,200	-£208,800	-20.0%
TOTAL CSSB	£ 2,454,271	£ 2,273,655	-£180,616	-7.4%

6. Early Years

As in previous years, there has been no information released in relation to the Early Years Block for 2023/24. Early Years funding is based on January census data

7. Timetable

The provisional timetable for the process, spelling out both the LA and DfE’s responsibilities is attached at Appendix C. Further information will be provided to November’s School Forum meeting, at which formal consultation will take place, followed by a period of consultation with Schools before Christmas.

Bruce Parvin
Education and Skills Business Manager
21 September 2022

Factor values and total spend in 2023-24

	Unit Values	Total Funding (incl ACA)	Proportion of core total	2022-23 Unit Values	22-23 Total Funding (incl ACA)	22-23 Proportion of Core Total
Basic per pupil Funding		£31,566m	76.0%			76.3%
Basic entitlement		£31,342m	75.5%		£29,490m	75.4%
Primary basic entitlement	£3,394	£15,549m	37.5%	£3,217	£14,821m	37.9%
KS3 basic entitlement	£4,785	£9,235m	22.2%	£4,536	£8,624m	22.0%
KS4 basic entitlement	£5,393	£6,558m	15.8%	£5,112	£6,045m	15.5%
Minimum per pupil		£223m	0.5%		£372m	0.9%
Primary Minimum Per Pupil funding	£4,405	£178m	0.4%	£4,265	£279m	0.7%
Secondary Minimum Per Pupil funding	£5,715	£46m	0.1%	£5,525	£92m	0.2%
Additional Needs Funding		£7,209m	17.4%		£6,662m	17.0%[^]
Deprivation		£4,062m	9.8%		£3,566m	9.1%
Primary FSM	£480	£510m	1.2%	£470	£453m	1.2%
Secondary FSM	£480	£332m	0.8%	£470	£282m	0.7%
Primary FSM6	£705	£799m	1.9%	£590	£639m	1.6%
Secondary FSM6	£1,030	£887m	2.1%	£865	£730m	1.9%
Primary IDACI A	£670	£103m	0.2%	£640	£99m	0.3%
Primary IDACI B	£510	£151m	0.4%	£490	£147m	0.4%
Primary IDACI C	£480	£139m	0.3%	£460	£135m	0.3%
Primary IDACI D	£440	£122m	0.3%	£420	£118m	0.3%
Primary IDACI E	£280	£146m	0.4%	£270	£143m	0.4%
Primary IDACI F	£230	£113m	0.3%	£220	£109m	0.3%
Secondary IDACI A	£930	£93m	0.2%	£890	£86m	0.2%
Secondary IDACI B	£730	£146m	0.4%	£700	£136m	0.3%
Secondary IDACI C	£680	£135m	0.3%	£650	£127m	0.3%
Secondary IDACI D	£620	£118m	0.3%	£595	£111m	0.3%
Secondary IDACI E	£445	£158m	0.4%	£425	£148m	0.4%
Secondary IDACI F	£335	£111m	0.3%	£320	£104m	0.3%
Low Prior Attainment		£2,662m	6.4%		£2,662m	6.4%
Primary LPA	£1,155	£1,472m	3.5%	£1,130	£1,497m	3.8%
Secondary LPA	£1,750	£1,190m	2.9%	£1,710	£1,142m	2.9%
English as an Additional Language		£434m	1.0%		£412m	1.1%
Primary EAL	£580	£318m	0.8%	£565	£307m	0.8%
Secondary EAL	£1,565	£116m	0.3%	£1,530	£105m	0.3%
Mobility		£50m	0.1%		£44m	0.1%
Primary Mobility	£945	£40m	0.1%	£925	£35m	0.1%
Secondary Mobility	£1,360	£11m	0.0%	£1,330	£9m	0.0%
School Led Funding		£2,739m	6.6%		£2,599m	6.6%
Lump Sum		£2,642m	6.4%		£2,503m	6.4%
Primary lump sum	£128,000	£2,207m	5.3%	£121,300	£2,092m	5.3%
Secondary lump sum	£128,000	£435m	1.0%	£121,300	£411m	1.1%
Sparsity		£97m	0.2%		£95m	0.2%
Primary sparsity	£56,300	£91m	0.2%	£55,000	£89m	0.2%
Secondary sparsity	£81,900	£6m	0.0%	£80,000	£7m	0.0%
Premises		£539m	1.3%		£527m	
Area Cost Adjustment: Multiplier applied to basic entitlement, additional needs and school led funding (It is included in the factor subtotals)		£1,060m			£989m	
Core total (excluding funding floor)		£41,513m			£39,123m	
Floor		£326m			£497m	
Primary floor funding		£175m			£279m	
Secondary floor funding		£151m			£218m	
Total		£42,378m			£42,378m	

**COMPARISON OF FINAL 2022-23 AND POTENTIAL 2023-24 FORMULA VALUES FOR
NFF AND NORTHUMBERLAND**

Factor (all figures £)	NFF Values		NCC Values		Movement in	Movement in
	2022/23	2022/23	2023/24	Potential 2023/24	NFF values 22/23 to 23/24	NCC values 22/23 to 23/24
	col (b)	col (c)	col (d)	col (e)	2021/22 col (f) #	2021/22 col (g) #
AWPU Primary	3,217	3,217	3,394	3,394	5.50%	5.50%
KS3	4,536	4,536	4,785	4,785	5.49%	5.49%
KS4	5,112	5,112	5,393	5,393	5.50%	5.50%
Lump Sum Primary	121,300	121,300	128,000	128,000	5.52%	5.52%
Middle	121,300	121,300	128,000	128,000	5.52%	5.52%
High/Secondary	121,300	121,300	128,000	128,000	5.52%	5.52%
Deprivation - Free School Meals Primary	470	470	480	480	2.13%	2.13%
Secondary	470	470	480	480	2.13%	2.13%
Deprivation – FSM6 Primary	590	590	705	705	19.49%	19.49%
Secondary	865	865	1030	1030	19.08%	19.08%
Deprivation – IDACi:						
Primary Band F	220	220	230	230	4.55%	4.55%
Band E	270	270	280	280	3.70%	3.70%
Band D	420	420	440	440	4.76%	4.76%
Band C	460	460	480	480	4.35%	4.35%
Band B	490	490	510	510	4.08%	4.08%
Band A	640	640	670	670	4.69%	4.69%
Secondary Band F	320	320	335	335	4.69%	4.69%
Band E	425	425	445	445	4.71%	4.71%
Band D	595	595	620	620	4.20%	4.20%
Band C	650	650	680	680	4.62%	4.62%
Band B	700	700	730	730	4.29%	4.29%
Band A	890	890	930	930	4.49%	4.49%
Low Attainment Primary	1,130	1,130	1,155	1,155	2.21%	2.21%
Secondary	1,710	1,710	1,750	1,750	2.34%	2.34%
EAL Primary	565	565	580	580	2.65%	2.65%
Secondary	1,530	1,530	1,565	1,565	2.29%	2.29%
MOBILITY : Primary	925	463	945	945	2.16%	104.10%
Secondary	1,330	665	1,360	1,360	2.26%	104.51%
SPARSITY(max): Primary	55,000	55,000	56,300	56,300	2.36%	2.36%
Middle	80,000	80,000	81,900	81,900	2.38%	2.38%
Secondary/All Through	80,000	80,000	81,900	81,900	2.38%	2.38%
Capping		13%				
Scaling		50%				
Minimum Funding Guarantee		2%		0.5%		
<i>(max of 0.5% dictated by ESFA for 2023/24)</i>						

Local authority activity

6 October 2022

- School census day

10 October 2022

Deadline for submitting disapplication requests (for response by December) for:

- MFG exclusions
- exceptional circumstances
- sparsity factors
- lump sum variations for amalgamating schools
- pupil number reductions

28 October 2022

- First deadline for local authorities to provide evidence of the total value of their ongoing prudential borrowing and termination of employment costs, in order for this funding to be protected in the December DSG allocations

Mid-November 2022

- Closing date for submission of the 2022 to 2023 high needs place change workbooks

18 November 2022

Deadline for submitting disapplication requests (for response by the APT deadline) for:

- MFG exclusions
- exceptional circumstances
- sparsity factors
- lump sum variations for amalgamating schools
- pupil number reductions
- Deadline for submitting disapplication requests if the local authority wishes to move more than 0.5% of the schools block
- A request must also be submitted if the schools forum has turned down a proposal from the local authority to move funding out of the schools block, but the local authority wishes to proceed with the transfer—the department aims to issue decisions before the APT deadline

November 2022

- School census database closed
- Check and validate school census

Mid-January 2023

- Schools forum consultation and political approval required for final 2022 to 2023 funding formula
- 13 January schools block disapplication submission amendment date

20 January 2023

- Deadline for submission of final 2023 to 2024 APT to ESFA

28 February 2023

- Deadline for confirmation of schools budget shares to mainstream maintained schools

DfE or ESFA activity

July to September 2022

- NFF arrangements for 2023 to 2024 for schools, central school services and high needs published (illustrative allocations, PUFs, SUFs, policy document, technical notes)
- Operational guidance published setting out arrangements for 5 to 16 mainstream schools implementation for 2023 to 2024
- High needs funding operational guide for 2023 to 2024 published
- Further information to illustrate 2023 to 2024 growth funding allocations has been provided to local authorities

October to November 2022

- Publish 2022 to 2023 high needs place change process guidance.
- Check and validate school census
- We have issued an early modelling version of the APT to help decision making

December 2022

- Final APT issued to local authorities, containing October 2022 census-based pupil data and factors
- Publication of 2023 to 2024 DSG schools block (prior to academies recoupment), central school services block, initial early years block allocations and updated high needs block allocations for 2023 to 2024

By 31 March 2023

- Confirmation of 2023 to 2024 general annual grant for academies open by 9 January 2023
- 2022 to 2023 allocation statements issued to post-16 institutions, academies, and non-maintained special schools
- Publication of 2023 to 2024 high needs place numbers at institution level

April 2023

- First DSG payments to local authorities based on 2023 to 2024 allocations, including academies recoupment (DSG allocations updated termly for in-year academy conversions), FE high needs place funding deductions, and other adjustments

Summer 2023

- Early years block updated for January 2023 early years pupil numbers

Summer 2024

- Early years block updated for January 2024 early years pupil numbers (pro rata seven twelfths, as this relates only to the period September 2022 to March 2023)



Northumberland County Council

SCHOOLS' FORUM

Agenda Item 7

06 July 2022

Wednesday 28 September 2022 : 10.30-12.00 (Virtual Meeting)
NFF update

Wednesday 16 November 2022 : 9.30-12.00 (Virtual Meeting)
National Funding Formula Update & Consultation for 2023/24
SEN Update

Wednesday 18 January 2023: 9.30-12.00 (Virtual Meeting)
Setting the DSG for 2022/23 – overall allocations
De-delegation decisions for 2022/23

Wednesday 15 February 2023: 9.30-12.00 (Virtual Meeting)
Setting the DSG budget for 2022/23 – individual budgets
Review of Schools Forum Membership

Wednesday 05 July 2023: 9.30-12.00 (Virtual Meeting)
DSG Provisional Outturn
Scheme for Financing Schools
Analysis of School Balances

This page is intentionally left blank